122/v12

A GENERAL

DICTIONARY,

Hiſtorical and Critical:

IN WHICH

A New and Accurate TRANSLATION
of that of the Celebrated

Mr. BAYLE,

WITH THE

CORRECTIONS and OBSERVATIONS printed in the late Edition at *Paris*, is included; and interſperſed with ſeveral thouſand LIVES never before publiſhed.

The whole containing the Hiſtory of the moſt illuſtrious Perſons of all Ages and Nations, particularly thoſe of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*, diſtinguiſhed by their Rank, Actions, Learning and other Accompliſhments.

With Reflections on ſuch Paſſages of Mr. BAYLE, as ſeem to favour *Scepticiſm* and the *Manichee* Syſtem.

By the Reverend Mr. JOHN PETER BERNARD;
The Reverend Mr. THOMAS BIRCH, M.A. and F.R.S.
Mr. JOHN LOCKMAN;
And other HANDS.

VOLUME VIII.

LONDON,

Printed by *James Bettenham*,

For G. STRAHAN, J. CLARKE, in *Cornhill*; J. GRAY in the *Poultry*; J. SHUCKBURGH, C. CORBET, G. HAWKINS in *Fleetſtreet*; J. WILCOX, A. MILLAR in the *Strand*; T. OSBORNE in *Grays-Inn*; J. BRINDLEY in *New-Bond-ſtreet*; J. WOOD in *Pater-Noſter-Row*; C. WARD and R. CHANDLER at the *Ship* without *Temple Bar*, and at their Shops in *Coney-Street York*, and at *Scarborough-Spaw*; J. BETTENHAM near, and E. CAVE at St. *John's* Gate.

MDCCXXXIX.

TO THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE

ALGERNON,

EARL of HERTFORD,

BARON PIERCY,

This EIGHTH VOLUME of the

GENERAL DICTIONARY,

Hiſtorical and Critical,

Is humbly dedicated by

His Lordſhip's moſt obliged and

Moſt devoted Servants,

The Authors.

A GENERAL

DICTIONARY

Hiſtorical and Critical.

O

OBSEQUENS (JULIUS) a Latin writer, whoſe native country is unknown, as well as the time when he lived. It is only conjectured that he lived ſome time before the Emperor Honorius's reign. Scaliger hints (*a*) that he flouriſhed before St. Jerome wrote his Supplements to Euſebius's Chronicle (*b*). Friſius has been groſly miſtaken [*A*]. It is not well known of what religion Obſequens was; but we may infer from what is extant of his collection of prodigies, that he was an heathen. That work contained chiefly a catalogue of the prodigies, which Livy related in his hiſtory [*B*]. What remains of it begins with the Conſulſhip of Lucius Scipio and Caius Lælius, that is to ſay, about the year of Rome 561 [*C*]. There are ſeveral editions of thoſe remains [*D*]. Lycoſthenes endeavoured to ſupply what is wanting in the original. Moreri in this article quotes his authorities in the moſt wretched manner [*E*].

(*a*) Scaliger, *Animadv. in* Euſeb. *num.* 1186, *p. m.* 347.

(*b*) He wrote them under the Emperor Valens: and Valens died in the year 379.

[*A*] *Friſius has been groſly miſtaken* (1).] He aſſerts that our Obſequens lived in the time of Panætius and Polybius, 240 years before Chriſt; which is impoſſible, ſince Obſequens ſpeaks of Auguſtus.

(1) Joh. Jacobus Friſius, in ſua Bibliotheca, apud Schefferum in Præfat. in Jul. Obſequentem.

[*B*] *His work contained . . . a catalogue of the Prodigies, which Livy related in his Hiſtory.*] There are two reaſons to make us think ſo: 1. That collection ends with the year of Rome 743, like Livy's decads. 2. Obſequens often makes uſe of the ſame expreſſions with that author.

[*C*] *That is to ſay, about the year of Rome* 561.] Some authors put that Conſulſhip under that year; others put it under the year 563; none ſhould venture to put it under the year 505; and yet Beatus Rhenanus aſſerts in the title page of his edition of Obſequens's remains, that they begin with the year of Rome 505. Balthazar Bonifacius has tranſcribed that blunder (2). The learned Schefferus could not but know that theſe two authors aſſert this (3), and yet he does not paſs any cenſure on them, nor does he give us notice of their blunder. It is alſo to be met with in the Epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque.

(2) Balth. Bonifac. de Scriptor. Hiſt. Rom. *Obſerves that* Zeller, *who quotes him in* Hiſtoricis, part I. p. 55. puts 55 inſtead of 505.

(3) See what he puts after his preface, and alſo his firſt note.

[*D*] *There are ſeveral Editions of thoſe remains.*] Schefferus mentions the following (4). Aldas Manutius is the firſt who publiſhed that work; he printed it at Venice in the year 1508 (5). Beatus Rhenanus had it printed ſix years after at Strasburg, with ſome other tracts. Aſulanus, Aldas Manutius's father-in-law, gave a new edition of it in the year 1518. Robert Stephens publiſhed it ſome time after at Paris. In the year 1552, John Oporinus printed it at Baſil with the Supplements of Lycoſthenes, who was then Corrector and Director of the Preſs to Oporinus (6.). He took care to diſtinguiſh with *Stars* Lycoſthenes's additions. The next year John de Tournes counterfeited that edition, but he took care to preſerve the marks of diſtinction very exactly But ſince Voſſius (7) mentions an edition of John de Tournes, in which Lycoſthenes's additions are blended together with Obſequens's work, without any mark to diſtinguiſh them, there are reaſons to think, that that Printer became more careleſs in a ſecond edition. His careleſſneſs has occaſioned many miſtakes. Some expreſſions of Lycoſthenes have been quoted as the words of an old Author, and his authority has been urged as that of an antient Writer (8). That defect has been corrected in Schefferus's edition (9). All that Obſequens wrote, is printed in a Roman letter, and Lycoſthenes's ſupplements are printed in Italicks. Let us give an inſtance of the miſtakes occaſioned by the confuſion we have mentioned. Alexander ab Alexandro aſſerts, that when Tarquin was driven from Rome, a dog ſpoke, and a ſnake barked (10). Tiraqueau, who has acquainted us with the originals from which that Author extracted his remarks, obſerves that Livy ſays only, that a ſnake fell down from a wooden ſtatue (11). Julius Obſequens, adds he, has related that prodigy, with all that Alexander ab Alexandro aſſerts here. But it is Lycoſthenes, and not Obſequens *, who relates that a dog ſpoke and a ſnake barked. He had no doubt borrowed that prodigy from Alexander ab Alexandro; and thus by a ſtrange *reciprocation*, the Tranſcriber is quoted to ſupport the original. Is not this what the School-men call *mutua cauſalitas?*

(4) In the preface to his edition.

(5) From the manuſcript, which Jucundus of Verona gave him.

(6) Voſſius, *de Hiſtor. Latinis*, p. 711.

(7) Idem, ibid.

(8) See Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 711.

(9) Printed at Amſterdam, 1679, in 8vo.

(10) *Satis conſtat . . . canem loquutum fuiſſe, ſerpentemque latraſſe.* Alex. ab Alexandro, Genialium Dierum. Lib. 3. cap. 15. p. m. 733.

(11) Tiraquellus, Not. *in hunc locum* Alex. ab Alexandro.

* The Printers have put here Alexander ab Alexandro, inſtead of Obſequens, which makes Mr. Bayle talk nonſenſe.

[*E*] *Moreri . . . . quotes his authorities in the moſt wretched manner.*] He quotes *Sebaſtian, Conrad*, in Quæſt. p. 41. This leads the reader to think, that two Authors, the one named Sebaſtian, and the other Conrad, will acquaint him with ſeveral particulars concerning Obſequens, if he will but take the trouble to conſult them; and yet theſe are chimerical authors: But ſuppoſe Sebaſtian Corradus were quoted, this would nevertheleſs miſlead us. For that Author gives us only the bare name of Obſequens. He cannot be quoted, but juſt to let us know that he thought Oroſius lived before Obſequens: and this is the only uſe Voſſius makes of the quotation from Corradus. *Sebaſtianus Corradus in quæſtura ſua, p.* 41 *videtur in alia fuiſſe ſententia (quam quæ ſtatuit antiquiorem Obſequentem Oroſio) quia utrumque nominans Oroſium præmittit* (12); *i. e.* "Sebaſtian Corradus ſeems to have "been of another opinion (namely than that of thoſe "who think that Obſequens was more eminent than "Oroſius) for mentioning theſe two Authors, he "names Oroſius firſt."

(12) Voſſius, *de Hiſtor. Latinis*, p. 711.

OCHINUS (BERNARDINUS) was one of thoſe Italian clergymen, who left their native country in the 16th Century, in order to profeſs the Proteſtant Religion. He was born at Sienna, and had been firſt a Cordelier, and afterwards a Capuchin *(a)*: He continued in the order of the Capuchins from 1534 to the year 1542 (*b*). They who have aſſerted that he was the founder of that order, or one of the four who firſt engaged in it, were miſtaken [*A*]; but it is true that he was father confeſſor to the Pope (*c*), as ſome have aſſerted. He practiſed the rules of his order with a wonderful regularity [*B*], and preached with an incomparable zeal [*C*]: It is very probable that he had not the leaſt thought of leaving his order and his church, when the converſations he had with a Spaniſh Civilian (*d*), who had reliſhed Luther's doctrine in Germany, raiſed ſcruples in his mind. He ſpoke with that civilian at Naples, and began there to preach ſome things which appeared very ſtrange and new [*D*]. This raiſed ſuſpicions againſt him; he was ſummoned before the court of Rome *(e)*, and was going thither, when he met at Florence with his good friend Peter Martyr [*E*], whom he acquainted with the

(a) Spondanus, ad ann. 1547. num. 22.

(b) Idem, ad ann. 1525. num. 27.

(c) See the Remark (*D*) towards the end.

(d) His name was John Valdeſius.

(e) Spondanus, ad ann. 1525. n. 27.

[*A*] *They who have aſſerted that he was the founder of the Order of the* Capuchins . . . . *were miſtaken.*] Zacharias Boverius proves it both by authorities and by arguments (1). He obſerves among other things, that it is certain the Order of the Capuchins was eſtabliſhed in the year 1525, and that above 300 perſons entered in it, before Ochinus took the habit of that Order in the year 1534. Monſieur Varillas (2) urged the ſame argument to refute the Biſhop of Amelia (3), who aſſerted the ſame thing with Beza (4), namely, that Ochinus was the founder of the Order of the Capuchins. That paſſage of Varillas is quoted in the ſupplement to Moreri's Dictionary.

(1) In his Annals of the Capuchins, *apud* Spondan. ad ann. 1525. num. 27.

(2) *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie*, Liv. 17. p. 59. of the Dutch Edition.

(3) Antonio Maria Gratiani, *Hiſtorei du Cardinal Commendon*, Liv. 2. c. 9.

(4) Barnardinus ille Ochinus *maximi prius in Italia nominis monachus, & Capucinorum* (*quos vocant*) *ordinis auctor*, i. e. "Bernardinus "Ochinus, firſt "a celebrated "Monk in Ita- "ly, and the "founder of the "Order of the "Capuchins, as "they are cal- "led." Beza *in* Iconibus, *in* Petro Martyre.

[*B*] *He practiſed the rules of his Order with a wonderful regularity.*] The Biſhop of Amelia, in the chapter which I have quoted from the hiſtory of Cardinal Commendon, obſerves, that Ochinus was revered like a Saint, and that he performed very exactly all the viſible acts of mortification. *His old age*, ſays he, *his auſtere way of living, the rough garment of a Capuchin, his long beard which reached below his breaſt, his grey hairs, his pale and lean face, a certain appearance of a weak conſtitution very artfully affected, the opinion of his Holineſs, which was ſpread all around, made him be looked upon as a very extraordinary man . . . Not the common people only, but even the greateſt Lords and ſovereign Princes revered him for a Saint. When he viſited them, they uſed to go and meet him with the greateſt demonſtrations of love and eſteem imaginable, and waited upon him after the ſame manner, when he went away. For his part, he made uſe of all the artifices that could ſupport the good opinion men had of him. He always walked on foot in his journies; and though he was old, and of a weak conſtitution, yet he was never ſeen on horſeback. When Princes obliged him to lodge at their palaces, neither the ſtatelineſs of the buildings, nor the magnificent dreſſes, nor all the pomp of this world, could make him abate any thing of his uſual poverty, nor omit the leaſt mortification required by the ſtatutes of his Order. At entertainments he would never eat but of one ſort of meat, and even of the coarſeſt and the moſt common, and he drank hardly any wine. He was deſired to lye on very good beds, richly adorned, to refreſh himſelf a little of the fatigues of his journies; but he would only ſpread his cloke upon the ground and lye on it. The reputation he gained, and the honours he received throughout all Italy are incredible.*

[*C*] *He preached with an incomparable zeal.*] Let us hear again the Biſhop of Amelia. *We may ſay* (5) *that he had ſome learning, but he had applied himſelf to eloquence, and to the beauty of expreſſions, rather than to the doctrines of the Church, and to the art of reaſoning. He hardly learned any Latin; but when he ſpoke in his mother-tongue, he expreſſed what he knew with ſuch a grace, ſuch a politeneſs, and ſo copiouſly, that he raviſhed his whole audience. When he was to preach any where*, ſays again the Biſhop of Amelia, *people flocked thither; whole Cities came to hear him, nor was there a Church large enough for the multitude that thronged to hear him. The number of women was generally larger than that of men. When he was to paſs through ſome town, an infinite number of people went to meet him, to hear his inſtructive diſcourſes.* Bzovius has ſummed up in a few words a great elogy of him. *In tanta tum erat exiſtimatione* (Ochinus) *ut unus optimus totius Italiæ concionator haberetur, ut qui admirabili quadam cum actione, tum linguæ facundia auditorum animos quocunque vellet raperet, ac tanto magis quod vita doctrinæ reſonaret* (6), *i. e.* "Ochinus was ſo highly eſteemed, "that he was looked upon as the beſt preacher in all "Italy, who by a wonderful delivery, and admira- "ble eloquence, turned people's mind as he pleaſed, "the rather, becauſe his life was anſwerable to his "preaching."

(5) Mr. Varillas, *Hiſtoire de l'Hereſie*, Liv. 17. p. 59, & 60. has paraphraſed this paſſage and the foregoing with his uſual liberty.

(6) Bzovius, ad ann. 1542. n. 32.

[*D*] *He began* at Naples *to preach ſome things, which appeared very ſtrange and new.*] Tomaſo Coſto (7) who wrote the hiſtory of the troubles which aroſe at Naples, when they would eſtabliſh the Court of Inquiſition there, aſſerts, that Ochinus had ſpread the firſt ſeeds of theſe diſorders by his ſermons (8). The Biſhop of Amelia does not ſay that any Heretick, who came from Germany, as for inſtance John Valdes, ſpoiled this Capuchin; he pretends that his pride ruined him, and that out of ſpite that he was not promoted to the dignity of a Cardinal: *He dropt artfully in his ſermons ſome expreſſions and ſome opinions tending to leſſen and to cry down the authority of the ſee of Rome* (9). Bzovius ſays in general terms, that Ochinus dropt ſomething amiſs in a ſermon, *Quod pro concione quadam ſecus dicta effudiſſet* (10). Here follows a commentary on theſe words: It is pretended that on a Palm-Sunday he preached before the Pope, and ſeverely cenſured his pride, making a parallel between Jeſus Chriſt and him. It is added, that after ſermon a Cardinal gave Ochinus notice of the Pope's reſentment, and adviſed him to make his eſcape immediately. *Nimirum (prout alii ſcripto conſignarunt) quod in Dominica palmarum faſtum Papæ Romani in ipſius præſentia ex ſuggeſtu acriter perſtrinxerit, (facta comparatione Domini Jeſu in pauperi ſtatu Hieroſolymam ingredientis) et Pontificum Romanorum vitam. Qua concione finita unus Cardinalium Papam offenſum eſſe ipſi ſignificat, atque ut protinus præſenti periculo fuga ſeſe eripiat, ſuadet* (11). Some have aſſerted that he propoſed the cenſure of the pride and pomp of the Pope's court only as ſo many objections made by the Hereticks, but that having ſpent upon this topick the whole time his ſermon was to laſt, he ended it without anſwering thoſe objections. The author, from whom I borrow this obſervation, aſſerts, that Ochinus was Father Confeſſor and preacher to the Pope. *Fuit is patria Senenſis, conditione monachus, & Pontifici Rom. à ſacris concionibus & confeſſionibus. Is ob parrheſiam, qua motus in auribus ſummi Pontificis & totius Aulæ Romanæ Pontificiam arrogantiam & tyrannidem antichriſtianam, velut ex mente Lutheranorum, non addita objectionum, poſtquam eis ſtudio præſtitutam horam impendit, ſolutione, Italia cedere . . . . neceſſe habuit* (12). Here are many particulars, which I relate without pretending to warrant the truth of them. I have read, for inſtance, in the learned Seckendorf's large work (13), that they printed in Germany twenty ſermons, which Ochinus preached whilſt he was ſtill a Monk, and which contain almoſt the ſound doctrine of the Proteſtants concerning juſtification, good works, auricular confeſſion, ſatisfaction, indulgence, purgatory, and other articles. There is a little difficulty ſtill behind, namely, whether theſe ſermons were printed in Germany exactly as they had been preached in Italy. However it be, they were printed at Newburg in 4to in the year 1545, having been tranſlated into Latin by Joſeph Hochſteter.

(7) Supplem. ad Mambrin. Liv. 4. apud Spondanum, ad ann. 1547. num. 22.

(8) *Eos ſeminatis ab impio Ochino dum ante aliquot annos publice concionaretur in Eccleſia Metropolitana falſis dogmatibus attribuat, quibus à mentibus & linguis hominum iis infectorum reſecandis, Prorex Inquiſitionis remedium afferre voluerit.* Spondan. Ibid.

(9) Ant. Maria Gratiani, *Vie du Cardinal Commendon*, p. 205. of Monſieur Flechier's French tranſlation, Paris edition in 12mo.

(10) *Ad ann.* 1542. *num.* 34. *apud Bibliothec. Anti-Trinitariorum, p.* 3.

(11) Idem, ibid.

(12) Staniſlaus Lubieniecius, *Hiſt. Reformat. Poloniæ*, Lib. 2. cap. 5. p. m. 110. See alſo *Bibliothec. Anti-Trinitar. p.* 2.

(13) *In Hiſt. Lutheran. Supplem. Indicis* 1.

[*E*] *He met at Florence with his good friend Peter Martyr.*] This I think muſt be taken for matter of fact; for nothing could oblige Peter Martyr to falſify the

the intelligence he had received of the danger he would run, if he ſhould put himſelf in the Pope's power. Having ſeriouſly conſidered the matter together, they both reſolved to retire into ſome country where they might be ſafe. Ochinus ſet out firſt, and went to Geneva: Martyr went off two days after, and retired into Switzerland (*f*). A Continuator of Baronius aſſerts, that Ochinus provided himſelf with a female companion, who followed him to Geneva, and that he married her there publickly, to give an authentic proof of his having entirely renounced Popery (*g*). If we are to judge of this particular by ſome others which the ſame author relates, we might think that he did not extract his Hiſtory from very good Memoirs [*F*]. Ochinus's eſcape vexed the Pope extremely [*G*]. He did not ſettle at Geneva, but went to Augſburg, where he publiſhed ſome ſermons. He made a voyage to England with Peter Martyr in the year 1547 (*b*); Cranmer Archbiſhop of Canterbury had ſent for them both, when he found, after the death of Henry VIII. that things were ripe for a reformation (*i*). The alterations which were made in the national religion after King Edward's death, obliged thoſe two doctors to leave their country. They croſſed the ſea again in the year 1553, and

(*f*) Joſias Simler, *in* Vita Petri Martyris, *apud* Melchiorem Adamum, p. 36.

(*g*) Spondanus, ad ann. 1525. num. 27.

(*b*) Sleidan. Lib. 19. fol. m. 358 *verſo*.

(*i*) Simler, in Vita Petri Martyris, p. 40.

the circumſtance of the place; he has therefore related it faithfully in the Memoirs, which have furniſhed materials for writing his life; ſo that Joſias Simler, who drew up that life, is to be credited rather than the Biſhop of Amelia, who relates, 1. That Ochinus was at Verona, *when the Pope's order was notified to him*. 2. That Matthew Giberti Biſhop of Verona adviſed him to go and clear himſelf. 3. That Ochinus, who followed that advice with reluctancy, *went as far as Bologna, where Cardinal Gaſpar Contarini, Legate of that place, was then*. 4. That finding the Legate was ſick, ſo that he could not confer with him about his buſineſs, *he reſolved to make his eſcape*, and that *caſting off his Monk's hood, he took a Layman's habit, and retired amongſt the Hereticks* (14). Monſieur Varillas, who pretends, that before Ochinus left Verona, he conſulted Peter Martyr by letters, did in all likelihood forge that circumſtance out of his own brains; we may reject it as a mere falſity, ſince there is no room to queſtion, but theſe two men were together at Florence, when they reſolved to retire into a Proteſtant country,

(14) *Hiſt. du Cardinal Commendon*, p. 205, &c.

MISTAKES of Spondanus.

[*F*] *We might think that he did not extract his Hiſtory from very good Memoirs*]. For indeed, Spondanus gives us a very erroneous account of Ochinus's life (15). He makes him immediately an Arian, who did not dare to diſcover his hereſy in a city where Michael Servetus had been put to death. We have already quoted Sleidan, who with regard to ſuch particulars, muſt paſs with all the world for an unqueſtionable witneſs: now, he aſſerts that Ochinus went from Geneva to Augsburg, before he ſet out for England; and he went thither in the year 1547; he did not therefore retire from Geneva on account of Servetus's puniſhment: for that Heretick was not burnt but in the year 1553. Spondanus adds, that Ochinus, concealing his opinions for the reaſon we have already mentioned, left Geneva, either of his own accord, or, as others pretend, becauſe Calvin had him baniſhed (16). If Calvin had cauſed him to be baniſhed, he would not have given him in the year 1550 the good character he gave him then. *Quos hac noſtra ætate monachos habuit Germania, qui vel doctrina vel ſanctitate cum Luthero, Bucero, Oecolampadio & ſimilibus conferre ſe niſi nimis impudenter audeant? Quos Itali Bernardino Ochino & Petro Vermilio opponent* (17)? *i. e.* "What Monks have there "been in Germany in our time, who with re"gard to learning and an holy life could without the "utmoſt impudence compare themſelves with Luther, "Bucer, Oecolampadius, and others? What Monks "can Italy compare with Bernardinus Ochinus, and "Peter Vermilius?" He would have had him baniſhed before the year 1547, which is the year when Peter Martyr and Ochinus went into England. The Annaliſt continues thus: Ochinus retired from Geneva to Zurich, whence he was alſo baniſhed ſome time after: He met with the ſame fate at Baſil: He came afterwards to England with Martyr, he left that country under Queen Mary's reign, and retired into Germany; and finally into Poland and Tranſilvania. There are ſeveral errors in that account. A man, who is obliged to retire from England under a Roman Catholick Queen, was no doubt came thither under a Proteſtant Prince. Ochinus therefore muſt have come to England in King Edward's reign. Now before he ſet out for this country, he had left Geneva, according to Spondanus, becauſe he dreaded the flames which had conſumed Servetus. He could not therefore retire from Geneva before the latter end of the year 1553. How could he then come to England under King Edward's reign? That Prince died in July 1553, and Servetus was not burnt till the month of October following. The Annaliſt has been guilty here of a prodigious careleſſneſs. Further, it is not true, that Ochinus was baniſhed from Zurich and Baſil before he left England under Queen Mary. He was not driven from Zurich till in the year 1563. He wrote in Poland, ſays Spondanus, a dialogue againſt the Sect of the Gods upon Earth, (he meant the miniſters of Switzerland, and thoſe of Geneva) and afterwards ſome other dialogues, which abounded with atheiſtical notions, and in which he not only aſſerted the doctrine of Polygamy, but alſo attacked the holy Scripture, the Divinity of Chriſt, the Trinity, and even God himſelf. This alſo is not accurate. The dialogues mentioned here were the occaſion of his being baniſhed from Switzerland, which obliged him to go into Poland. He did not therefore write them in Poland. They contain indeed ſeveral errors, but no impious doctrines; nor is it true, that Ochinus, one of the perſons introduced in theſe dialogues, always confeſſes himſelf vanquiſhed by the adverſary, whom he makes to argue againſt him. *Ita ſe iis geſerens, ut quamvis omnia Catholica dogmata defendere præ ſe ferret, demum ſe tamen adverſarii argumentis victum profiteretur*. (18) *i. e.* "He acts as though he would defend all the "Catholick doctrines: but yet at laſt he confeſſes "himſelf vanquiſhed by his adverſaries." Bzovius has committed ſome errors like theſe. He pretends that Ochinus being forced to retire from Cracow, made his eſcape into Tranſilvania, and wrote his dialogues there, and that theſe dialogues have been ſince tranſlated into Latin by Caſtalio (19). There are three errors here: For 1. theſe dialogues were written before the author went into Poland. 2. He did not go from Poland into Tranſilvania. 3. Caſtalio was dead before Ochinus left Poland.

(15) Ad ann. 1547. num. 22.

(16) *Cum non auderet eam ibi profiteri ubi Servetus illam igne luiſſet, ſive ſponte, ſive, ut quidam habent, à Calvino pulſus.* Spondanus, ad ann. 1547. num. 22.

(17) Calvin. de Scandalis, Opuſculor. p. 96.

(18) Spondanus, ad ann. 1547. num. 22.

(19) Bzovius, ad ann. 1542. num. 30. p. 88.

[*G*] *Ochinus's eſcape vexed the Pope extremely.*] The Pope's anger was ſo great, that he was ready to vent it upon the whole Order of the Capuchins; he had a mind to ſuppreſs the whole Order, and could hardly be pacified, even when he came to know that the whole Order was innocent, and Ochinus alone guilty. *Cujus apoſtaſia adeo animus Pontificis perculſus eſt, ut de extinguendo univerſo Ordine tractaverit, vixque placari potuerit cognita Ordinis innocentia* (20). Monſieur Varillas (21) can hardly believe this, becauſe he thinks *Paul* III. . . . *was too great a politician to give Ochinus an opportunity to boaſt, that the Roman Catholicks had ſo great an eſteem for him, as to revenge on an whole Order the loſs they ſuffered when he left them*. This author's incredulity here is more excuſable, than the liberty he took to paraphraſe Spondanus's words; for he had unqueſtionably that original before him when he ſpoke of our Ochinus. Conſider well Spondanus's words which we have juſt now quoted *; is it poſſible to gather from them, that the Pope's anger was owing to Ochinus's impudence, who inſerted into his writings *the moſt outragious things he could imagine againſt the religion he had forſaken*,

(20) Spondanus, ad ann. 1547. num. 22.

(21) *Hiſtoire de l'Hereſie*, Liv. 17. p. 64.

* The whole ſenſe of them is given in the words which precede them.

and retired to Straſburg (k) [H]. Ochinus was at Baſil in the year 1555 [I]; but he was called the ſame year to Zurich, to be miniſter of an Italian church which was gathering there. It conſiſted of ſome refugees from Locarno (l), who had not been able to obtain in their own country the liberty of profeſſing the Reformed Religion, becauſe the Roman Catholick Cantons oppoſed it. Ochinus made no difficulty to ſubſcribe the articles of faith agreed upon by the church of Zurich, and met in that city with Bullinger, who proved a very good friend to him (m). He performed his functions in the Italian church of Zurich till the year 1563, where he was baniſhed by the magiſtrates becauſe of ſome Dialogues which he publiſhed, and which amongſt other errors, contained the erroneous doctrine of Polygamy (K). He retired to Baſil, and deſired the miniſters and profeſſors of that city to get leave for him from the magiſtrates to ſettle there. Some examined him upon the doctrines contained in his dialogues: He anſwered that he was of the ſame opinion with them on all thoſe articles; he conſented even to give a clear and diſtinct declaration of his faith, as they required of him; he conſented to it, I ſay, on condition that they ſhould get him leave from the magiſtrates to paſs the winter at Baſil with his children. But the magiſtrates being acquainted with his requeſt, and having heard the advice of the doctors concerning his opinions, commanded him to retire immediately, and declared that they would take his dialogues into conſideration another time, and conſider alſo of the diſgrace he had done their city, by cauſing them to be printed there (n). Andrew Dudithius complained to Beza of the cruel uſage that old man

(k) Sleidanus, Lib. 25. folio 721 *verſo*.

(l) One of the four Bailiwicks which the Switzers poſſeſs in Italy.

(m) Joſias Simlerus, in Vita Bullingeri, folio 28 *verſo*.

(n) Idem, ibid. folio 38 *verſo*, and 39.

ſaken, and the moſt abuſive reflections againſt the Holy See in general, and particularly againſt Pope Paul III. *himſelf?* And yet Monſieur Varillas found all this in Spondanus's words. I do not deny but Spondanus obſerved (22), that this Monk's apology abounds with reproaches againſt the Holy See, and againſt the Roman Catholick Church.

(22) I quote his words in the remark [Q], quotation (58).

[H] *Peter Martyr and he retired to Straſburg.*] We ſhall now quote an hiſtorian, who is not much more accurate than Spondanus: I mean father Maimbourg. He aſſerts that Ochinus being baniſhed from England left Peter Martyr, and retired into Poland, that he might be at liberty to profeſs Arianiſm (23). *There,* ſays he, *he wrote his dialogues, which abound with a thouſand abominable blaſphemies againſt Jeſus Chriſt and the Holy Ghoſt. But as he was ſo impudent as to preach in behalf of Polygamy, and to dedicate to King Sigiſmund Auguſtus a book in which he pretended to prove the lawfulneſs of Polygamy, he was forced to retire from Poland, all the world riſing up againſt him.* Ochinus, after his return from England, continued about ten years in Switzerland, and would have been glad to end his days there, if they would have ſuffered him, upon the terms of the recantation he promiſed: Which ſhews that he did not ſo earneſtly wiſh to profeſs Arianiſm freely in Poland. The ſecond fault of that writer is, that he goes beyond the truth in the character he gives of the errors diſperſed throughout Ochinus's dialogues. Laſt he did not know, that the book upon Polygamy was written before Ochinus's journey to Poland. I queſtion very much whether Ochinus ever dedicated a work upon that ſubject to Sigiſmund. The Biſhop of Amelia would not have omitted ſo remarkable a particular, nor would the Socinians be ſo little acquainted with it as they are; they know nothing of that book but what they read of it in Bzovius, namely, that Ochinus wrote it in Poland, and dedicated it to the King (24). I ſay it again, I do not queſtion but Bzovius tells us a falſity there, nor do I think that Ochinus ever preached in vindication of Polygamy. If I am not miſtaken, he only wrote what he thought upon that ſubject; and if he had preached it at Poland, the Biſhop of Amelia, who was upon the ſpot, would certainly have known it and publiſhed it.

(23) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. de l'Arianiſme*, Tom. 3. p. 353, of the Dutch edition.

(24) *Liber de Polygamia in Polonia conſcriptus, & Sigiſmundo 2 Regi Poloniæ dedicatus, teſte Bzovio ſub an.* 1542. *num.* 30. Biblioth. Anti-Trin. p. 5.

[I] *Ochinus was at Baſil in the year* 1555]. This appears from a letter of Olympia Fulvia Morata, *Salutem dic meis verbis tuæ familiæ, & D. Bernardino Ocello quem in Chriſti valde diligo,* i. e. "This "ſervice to your family, and to Bernardinus Ochinus, "whom I very much love in Chriſt." This is the concluſion of a letter, which ſhe wrote to Curio from Heidelberg, May the 7th 1555 (25). Curio lived at Baſil; he anſwered her the 26th of Auguſt following, and let her know that he had acquitted himſelf of her commiſſion. *Tuo nomine ſalutavi . . . Bernardinum Ocellum ſenem doctiſſimum & ſanctiſſimum* (26), i. e. "I have given your ſervice to Ber-"nardinus Ochinus, a moſt learned and moſt holy "old man." We read in another letter (27): *Audio Bernardinum Ocellum Senenſem virum ſincerè Chriſtianum ex Anglia Genevam profugiſſe,* i. e. "I hear that "Bernardinus Ochinus of Sienna a ſincere Chriſtian, "is fled from England to Geneva." This letter was not written in the year 1555, as the author of the Bibliotheque of the Anti-Trinitarians imagines (28), but in the year 1554.

(25) Lib. 2. p. m. 168. The year is not ſet down there; but Curio's anſwer being dated 7 *Calend. Sept.* (Auguſt the 26th) 1555, ſhews evidently that I have ſet down the true year.

(26) Curio, Ibidem, p. 169.

(27) Pag 178.

(28) Pag. 3.

[K] *His dialogues . . . . contained amongſt other errors the erroneous doctrine of Polygamy*]. The work conſiſts of thirty dialogues, the twenty firſt of which treats of Polygamy. Ochinus compoſed and publiſhed them in Italian: Caſtalio tranſlated them into Latin, and had them printed at Baſil in the year 1563. Some Senators of Zurich received letters from foreign countries, in which they had notice given them that Ochinus had publiſhed a book, in which he taught hereſies, and particularly Polygamy. This was the reaſon why the Senate ſent for the miniſters, who declared that being told, Ochinus had ſome works printing which it were better to ſuppreſs, they had exhorted him to remember that he had promiſed to publiſh nothing without the Synod's approbation. They add, 1. That when they knew his book was printed, they complained to him of his contempt for their admonition. 2. That he ſaid in his defence, that his book was already in the preſs, when they firſt admoniſhed him. 3. That though he argues for and againſt Polygamy, yet it is eaſily perceived that he approves it. *Quod dialogum de Polygamia attinet, diſputari in utramque partem, ſed ita ut facile appareat quonam ipſe inclinet, præſertim cum ita concludat, & moneat eum qui plures ducere volebat, ut ſi non poſſit ſe continere & una contentus eſſe, ſequatur inſtinctum ſpiritus in hac re* (29), i. e. "As to his dialogue on Polygamy, though "he argues *pro* and *con*, yet he does it ſo as to "declare plain enough to which ſide of the queſ-"tion he inclines; eſpecially ſince he adviſes the "man, who would marry ſeveral wives, that if he "cannot contain himſelf, and be content with one "woman, he ſhould follow the motion of the ſpirit." That they had received letters full of complaints againſt the other dialogues, and that they would examine the whole work with the utmoſt attention. They adviſed the author privately both before and after the Senate's ſentence to explain his opinion in an orthodox manner, but they could not prevail upon him to hearken to their advice. Here follows the ſentence that was paſt upon him (30). *Quoniam Ochinus contra leges & edicta Magiſtratuum librum publicaſſet, quem ſatius erat ſupprimi, & cujus nomine Eccleſia & Reſpublica male audit, ideo ſe velle & jubere ut quam primum ex urbe & agro Tigurino diſcedat,* i. e. "Whereas Ochinus, againſt the laws and edicts "of the magiſtrates, has publiſhed a book, which it "had been better to ſuppreſs (31), and on account "of which the church and ſtate are traduced, there-"fore we command him to withdraw himſelf imme-"diately out of the city and territories of Zurich."

(29) Simler. in Vita Bullingeri, fol. 39.

(30) Idem, ibid.

(31) Would they have expreſſed themſelves ſo faintly, if the book had been ſuch as F. Maimbourg repreſents it, who certainly never looked into it?

man met with [L] from them, who forced him to go and look for a ſanctuary in the coldeſt ſeaſons of the year. Ochinus was then threeſcore and ſixteen years old [M]. He retired into Poland; but the Nuncio Commendon ſoon drove him from thence by the edict, which was publiſhed againſt all the Hereticks who were foreigners. They retired to ſeveral places. Ochinus went into Moravia where he died ſoon after. The plague carried him off with his wife, his two daughters and his ſon (o), if we may believe the writer of Cardinal Commendon's life [N]. The circumſtances of his death are variouſly reported

(o) The life of Cardinal Commendon, by Antonio Maria Gratiani, Liv. 2. c. 9.

[L] *Andrew Dudithius complained . . . of the cruel uſage that old man met with.*] Our work not being a book of controverſy, no man ought to find fault with us, for obſerving that Beza did not anſwer Dudithius with the ſincerity which became him. He imagined his Wit would bring him off, and he endeavoured only to caſt a miſt before the Reader's eyes. You will ſoon be able to judge of it, by comparing the objection with his anſwer. *Ochinum præterea narras indicta cauſa, hyeme acri, decurſa jam ætate ſenem cum uxore & liberis Tiguro ejectum*; *i. e.* "You aſſert that Ochinus "was baniſhed from Zurich without a Tryal, in the "midſt of a ſevere winter, in his old age, attended "with a wife and children." Thus Beza propoſes the objection (32). It renders the Senate of Zurich odious for theſe three reaſons: 1. Becauſe the affair had not been examined. 2. Becauſe the ſeverity of the weather had not been minded in the leaſt. 3. Becauſe a man of a decrepit age, and incumbred with a family, had been forced to travel in a ſharp winter. With regard to the firſt head, Beza anſwers, that is a falſity, and a great injury to a wiſe and pious Senate, to ſay that Ochinus's cauſe was not examined. That it is true indeed, that every particular was not thoroughly canvaſſed, but that this was done from a principle of great mercy (33). On the 2d head, that Ochinus had not one day's journey to go (34). On the 3d head, that the older he was, the greater offender he was (35); and further, that he had loſt his wife. The firſt anſwer is very wretched; for it is certain, that the Senate of Zurich condemned Ochinus, not only without hearing his defence, but alſo without having his dialogues examined. The Miniſters, who were conſulted by the Senate, made no poſitive anſwer, except to what related to Polygamy; they declared in general, that they had letters, containing many complaints againſt Ochinus's dialogues, and promiſed to examine the matter carefully. But in the mean time, what did the Senate do? They commanded Ochinus to depart immediately from the City and Canton of Zurich. Simler, who, as he was Profeſſor at Zurich, was ſtill more obliged than Beza, to give this affair the beſt turn he could, does yet relate it exactly as I have done. To ſay that if any thing was not canvaſſed with the utmoſt accuracy, it was owing to a principle of mercy, is a mere evaſion, to which any Judge may have recourſe, when he thinks fit to condemn a man without a fair tryal. The third anſwer is not much better; it tends to the overthrowing of a maxim grounded on common ſenſe, and which is univerſally practiſed. Old age is revered even in criminals; if two men, the one of threeſcore and ten, and the other of forty years, were condemned to the rack, it would be ordered to torture the old man leſs ſeverely than the other. So that our Ochinus's old age was very proper to render the ſentence of the Senate of Zurich odious, but not to excuſe it. If Beza had made a good uſe of his wit, he would have granted Dudithius's maxim, and anſwered, that the Magiſtrates of Zurich had really ſome regard for Ochinus's old age, and that if he had been a young man, they would not have condemned him only to baniſhment. This is what Beza ought to have anſwered, inſtead of urging that maxim, that the older the Hereticks are, the leſs they deſerve any mercy from their Judges. The ſecond anſwer is not fair; for it ſuppoſes that all Ochinus's trouble conſiſted in travelling five or ſix leagues. This would be well enough, if he could have met with a ſanctuary in the neighbourhood: but we have ſeen above, that he could not get leave to paſs the winter in that neighbourhood. Beza was not ignorant of it; he knew very well, that Dudithius could add new ſtrength to his objection, by inſiſting upon what was done at Baſil. How then could Beza imagine he anſwered Dudithius effectually? for that man's deſign was only to upbraid the Proteſtants beyond the Rhine with their ſevere uſage towards the Hereticks. He urges among other inſtances, the treatment which Ochinus met with from the Magiſtrates of Zurich, who baniſhed him in the midſt of winter. To which it is anſwered, that this Baniſhment expoſed him only to the inconveniencies and fatigues of a journey of five or ſix leagues. Ochinus met therefore with a ſafe retreat at five or ſix leagues diſtance; for if he met with no ſafe retreat, but on the contrary, with a good Proteſtant Senate, who drove him away, Dudithius's objection, grounded on the circumſtance of the time, remains in its full ſtrength, with regard to the deſign he had to ſhew, that Ochinus was a remarkable inſtance of the ſevere temper of the Evangelicks. It is morally impoſſible, but Beza muſt have known this, and yet he choſe to anſwer as he has done, rather than be ſilent. He took care not to hint in the leaſt, that he had any knowledge of what paſt at Baſil (36). The little extent of the Canton of Zurich furniſhed him with a ſhew of argument, with a little artifice: He makes uſe of it, hoping, no doubt, that the Reader would be amuſed by it.

A COMPARISON between Dudithius's objection and Beza's anſwer.

(32) Beza, *Epiſt. prima, Oper.* Tom. 3. p. 190.

(33) *Delatus ad Magiſtratum, pro eo quod ſeveram pœnam pro tantis ſceleribus merebatur, non ſane indicta cauſa (quod qui dicunt magnam juſto & pio Magiſtratui injuriam faciunt) ſed non ad vivum reſectis omnibus, ut cum illo quam clementiſſime ageretur, juſſus eſt è Tigurinorum agro diſcedere.* Beza, ibidem.

(34) *At hyems erat: nempe longa fuit non unius integri diei via.* Ibidem.

(35) *At ſenex erat? tanto nocentior veterator.* Ibid.

(36) I mean of Ochinus's baniſhment; for he confeſſes that the opinions of that Heretick were condemned there. *Baſileam igitur venit, ubi quum itidem ſuos errores damnatos videret, tandem ad ſuos ſive Tritheitas, ſive Arrianos, ſive Samoſatenianos ſe contulit*; *i. e.* "He came "therefore to "Baſil, and "finding that "his errors were "alſo condemn-"ed there, he "retired to his "friends the "Tritheites, "or Arians, or "Samoſetani-"ans." Would not one think, that Ochinus retired from Baſil of his own accord? and yet he was commanded to leave that City. Was it fairly done to conceal that particular?

[M] *Ochinus was then threeſcore and ſixteen years old.*] Peter Perna aſſerts it in his letters to Czechovicius. I have not read it, I have only ſeen it quoted (37.) At that rate, Gratiani muſt be miſtaken, who aſſerts that Ochinus turned Heretick at the age of threeſcore years, *without conſidering*, ſays he (38), *either his age, or his profeſſion, or the vow of continence he had made; but being a Prieſt, a Capuchin, and ſixty years old, he married immediately a young girl.* Ochinus left his Convent, and retired to Geneva in the year 1545. He was not therefore ſixty years old then, but at moſt fifty-five, if it be true, that in the year 1563, when he was baniſhed from Zurich, he was but threeſcore and fifteen.

(37) *Anno* 1563 *natus annos* 76 *(teſte Petro Perna in Epiſtola ad Czechovicium) a Tigurinis pulſus eſt.* Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar. p. 3.

(38) *Vie du Cardinal Commendon*, p. 208.

(39) Oper. Tom. 3. p. 190.

[N] *The plague carried him off, with his wife . . . if we may believe the Writer of Cardinal Commendon's life.*] I make uſe of this reſtriction, becauſe he is miſtaken with regard to the wife. Ochinus was a widower, when he was baniſhed from Zurich, and it is not at all probable that he married again. It is from Beza I learn that Ochinus was a widower: Beza does even pretend to dive into the impenetrable judgments of Providence; he aſſerts in a theological ſtyle, that Ochinus's wife broke her neck, divine juſtice purſuing that wicked wretch within his own houſe, before his impiety was known abroad. *At uxorem & liberos habebat*, but he had a wife and children. This is part of Dudithius's objections. Beza anſwers (39): *De uxore falſum eſt, quod ex bono Alciato ſive quovis alio cognoviſti. Fregerat enim collum, horrendo Dei judicio domi impium ſenem perſequente, priuſquam foras productum eſſet ipſius ſcelus*; *i. e.* "It is falſe with regard to his wife, "as honeſt Alciat, or any other man may have told "you; for ſhe broke her neck, *&c.*" Staniſlaus Lubienietzki (40) gives an account of Ochinus's laſt moments after this manner. Ochinus retired into Moravia and into Poland, and even there he was not out of the reach of Calvin's letters. He returned into Moravia after King Sigiſmund's edict, who in the year 1564, puniſhed with baniſhment all thoſe who were called Tritheites, Arians, *&c.* Some gentlemen endeavoured to keep him in Poland; but he anſwered, that men muſt obey the Magiſtrates, and that he would obey them, even were he to die amongſt the wolves in the woods. During his journies, he fell ſick of the plague at Pinczow, and received there all poſſible offices of charity and kindneſs at the houſe of one of the brethren, name Philippovius. His two ſons and his daughter (41) died of the Plague. As for him, he continued his journey to Moravia, and died within three weeks at Sclavonia (42). Lubienietzki did not know more particulars of him. I do not find in any good Author, that Ochinus ever was in Tranſilvania: for Maimbourg who aſſerts it, is not in that reſpect a credible witneſs. *He was obliged*, ſays he,

(40) *Hiſtor. Reformat. Polonica*, Lib. 2. c. 4. p. 110. See alſo Budzinius, *Hiſt. Eccleſiar. Poloni-car.* MS. c. 26. apud Bibl. Anti-Trin. p. 3.

(41) Gratiani ſays on the contrary his two daughters and his ſons.

(42) I think it ſhould be at Slaukovia, or Slawkaw.

ported [O], nor are writers agreed with regard to the hereſies he embraced, after he left Switzerland: Some ſay he turned Anabaptiſt, after he had openly preached the hereſy of Macedonius (p); that is to ſay, denied the *Perſonality* of the Holy Ghoſt: Others ſay in general, that he refuted the myſtery of the Trinity. The Anti-Trinitarians place him amongſt their authors. He wrote ſeveral works, a catalogue of which is inſerted in their Bibliotheque [P]: but they forgot to inſert in that catalogue the apology he wrote for his changing

(p) *In Poloniam cum perveniſſet dicitur palam illic oppugnaſſe hypoſtaſin Spiritus Sancti. Sed nec illic ei diutius conſiſtere licuit. Quare ſe in Moraviam ad Anabaptiſtarum conventicula recepit, & illic obiit.* Simler. in Vita Bullingeri, folio 40.

he (43), *to leave Poland . . . and after he had wandered for ſome time in Tranſilvania, he retired at laſt, being overwhelmed with miſery and want, into a village, where he died of the plague, being forſaken by all the world.* The Biſhop of Amelia is quoted for theſe particulars, and yet he mentions neither Ochinus's Poverty, nor his being thus forſaken; he aſſerts (44) on the contrary, that Ochinus ended his days at the houſe of one of his antient friends. He left a conſiderable eſtate to his heirs, if we may depend on Beza's teſtimony. *Ochinus . . . . familia non mediocri ſumptu circumducta tandem obiit, tam inops & egens ſcilicet, cui nec petere nec accipere unquam religio fuerat, ut plus ſanè reliquerit hæredibus, quam bona collegii noſtri pars poſſideat* (45). This is the laſt ſtroke that is levelled at him in the anſwer to Dudithius; he was never aſhamed to aſk and to receive, and got a good ſum of money by that means.

(43) *Hiſt. de l'Arianiſme*, Tom. 3. p. 352.

(44) *Hiſt. du Cardinal Commendon*, p. 213.

(45) Beza, *Epiſt. ad* Dudithium, Opeſcum Tom. 3. p. 190.

[O] *The circumſtances of his death are variouſly reported*]. I have given ſeveral proofs of this aſſertion in the foregoing remark; here follows another argument to the ſame purpoſe. It is aſſerted in the Annals of the Capuchins that he died a good Roman Catholick. *Eum tamen immenſa Dei benignitate ante mortem reſipuiſſe, & hæreſes abjuraſſe, ac peccata ritu Catholico confeſſum eſſe, denique vere pœnitentem obiiſſe, Annales Capucinorum multis diverſorum teſtimoniis affirmant* (46), i. e. "It is nevertheleſs aſſerted in the "Annals of the Capuchins, and confirmed by many "authorities, that through God's infinite mercy he "repented before his death, abjured his hereſies, con-"feſſed his ſins after the Roman Catholick manner, "and died at laſt a true penitent." Others (47) on the contrary ſuppoſe, that he died, not only *being forſaken of all mankind, and the moſt miſerable wretch in the world*, but alſo *like an Atheiſt*.

(46) Spondanus, ad ann. 1547, num. 22. He quotes the Annals of the Capuchins, ad ann. 1543. See the remark [AA].

(47) Moreri is one of them.

Theophilus Raynaud relates, that ſome perſons were offended at his writing, that Ochinus died miſerably in the communion of the Arian Hereticks, and not a Martyr at Geneva repenting of his apoſtacy. Theſe perſons complained of it to John de Montacaliero General of the Capuchins, which obliged him to read Theophilus Raynaud's book (48), but he did not meet with any thing in it, which in his opinion deſerved to be cenſured. You have here an inſtance of the ſtrange and odd temper of the Capuchins; they are ſorry that men will not admit all thoſe fables, which would make the world believe that Ochinus had a mind to enter again into their Order, and that he was murthered for that reaſon. The author, againſt whom they brought their complaints before their General, obſerves that when he mentioned the unhappy end of that Heretick, he followed Andrew Traſius's account; and that Toſſinianus, in the ſecond book of his Seraphick Hiſtory, Florimond de Raymond in the fifth chapter of the third book of his hiſtory of Hereſies, Arthur of Munſter * in the Martyrology of the Franciſcans, under January the 4th, in the third paragraph, and in general all thoſe who wrote before the year 1630 (49), gave the ſame account of Ochinus's death (50).

(48) Intitled *Judæ poſteri, apoſtatæ à religioſis ordinibus.*

* F. Th. Raynaud ſays, *Arturus a Monaſterio*, which ſhould be tranſlated *Arthur du Monſtier*, a French Recollect Monk, born at Roan, who wrote a martyrology of the Franciſcans, in Latin, printed at Paris in folio, in the year 1638. Taken from the remarks printed at the end of the Paris edition of Mr. Bayle's Dictionary.

[P] *He wrote ſeveral works, a catalogue of which is inſerted in the Bibliotheque* of the Anti-Trinitarians.] He publiſhed ſix volumes of ſermons in the Italian tongue; an expoſition of St. Paul's Epiſtle to the Galatians; a treatiſe *De Cœna Domini contra Joachimum Weſtphalum*, i. e. "Of the Lord's Supper againſt "Joachim Weſtphalus." *Labyrinthi de Prædeſtinatione et libero arbitrio*, i. e. "Diſcourſes concerning Pre-"deſtination and Free Will." Apologues (51); a dialogue concerning Purgatory, *&c.* I do not believe that he publiſhed any work in Latin. He compoſed all that he wrote in the Italian tongue, and had it afterwards tranſlated. Some of his works have been tranſlated into ſeveral languages. It is but one day ſince I looked over his Labyrinths (or diſcourſes concerning Predeſtination) they ſeemed to me the work of a man, who had a very clear head, and a quick genius. Ochinus proves there by very ſtrong arguments, that they, who aſſert that man acts freely, entangle themſelves in four very great difficulties; and that they who maintain that man acts neceſſarily, expoſe themſelves to four other ſtrong objections; which altogether make up eight Labyrinths, four againſt free will, and four againſt neceſſity or fate. He turns himſelf every way imaginable, in order to find out an iſſue; and meeting with none, he concludes every article by a fervent prayer to God, to be delivered out of theſe mazes. However in the following part of his work he attempts to furniſh us with ſome hints to extricate ourſelves out of thoſe perplexities: but he concludes upon the whole, that the only method is to ſay with Socrates, *Unum ſcio, quod nihil ſcio*; the only thing I know is, that I know nothing: We ought to be ſilent, ſays he, and to judge that God does not require of us to take either the affirmative or the negative ſide of the queſtion upon ſuch difficult ſubjects. Here follows the title of the laſt chapter. *Qua via ex omnibus ſupradictis labyrinthis cito exiri poſſit, quæ docta * ignorantiæ via vocatur*, i. e. "By what means we may ſoon get out of the foregoing "Labyrinths, by what is called the way of a learned "ignorance." *D'Aubigné* mentions a book of our Ochinus, and ſpeaks of it after ſuch a manner as to perſuade us that it is a very curious piece. Here follow his words (52). *Firſt that divine ſervice be performed in French, provided ſome fooliſh things were left out, which would make people laugh; as for inſtance, to begin the maſs with* and, *and ſome other abſurdities, which are very pertinently and juſtly deſcribed by Bernard Ochinus, in his treatiſe* della Nativita della Miſſa (of the birth of the Maſs). *As for the ornaments, let the moſt ridiculous be ſuppreſſed, and for the reſt, let it be anſwered, as the ſaid Ochinus does, that it is the Lord's Supper diſguiſed, and turned a nun* per parer piu ſanta, *in order to appear more holy.* I think that to ſpeak more accurately *D'Aubigné* ſhould not have ſaid *in the treatiſe*, but *in the ſermon* della Nativita della Miſſa. For having juſt now looked over Ochinus's twelve ſermons on the Lord's Supper (53), I have found that the ſeventh is intitled, *Miſſæ Tragœdia, ac primum quomodo concepta, nata, baptizata fuerit*, i. e. "The tragedy of the Maſs, and firſt how ſhe "was conceived, born, and baptized." The eighth is intitled, *Quemadmodum nutrita educataque fuerit Miſſa, adoleveritque, et ornata, ditataque, ad ſummam dignitatem præſtantiamque pervenerit*, i. e. "How the "Maſs was nurſed, and educated, how ſhe grew up, "and how being adorned and enriched, ſhe arrived "at laſt to the higheſt dignity and pre-eminence." The title of the ninth is, *Miſſæ accuſatio, ejuſdemque reſponſio, et adverſus eam acta*, i. e. "The Maſs's im-"peachment, and her anſwer, with the proceedings "againſt her." The tenth is intitled, *Sententia à Deo contra Miſſam lata*, i. e. "God's ſentence againſt the Maſs." This dramatick method of preaching is too much in the taſte of the Italians.

* I ſuppoſe it ſhould be *doctæ*.

(52) *Confeſſion Catholique de Sancy*, Liv. 2. c. 2. p. m. 390, 391. See alſo Chap. 6. of the 1 Book, p. 346.

(53) Tranſlated into Latin, and printed at Baſil with the ſame Author's Labyrinths.

Sleidan obſerves, that there was publiſhed a moſt abuſive ſatyr againſt Paul III. in the year 1549, which was not written by Ochinus, though his name was prefixed to it. Sleidan gives the ſubſtance of this libel. *Prius quam decederet libellus exiit Italicus vehemens in illum atque gravis, titulo quidem Bernardini Ochini, ſed ab aliis, ut creditur, compoſitus, cum præfatione ad Aſcanium Columnam quem ille proſtigarat* (54), i. e. "Before he (Paul III.) died, there came out a "moſt violent and ſmart ſatyr againſt him, which "in the title page was aſcribed to Bernardinus Ochi-"nus, but which was thought to be written by ano-"ther hand; with a preface to Aſcanius Colonna, "whom he had routed." I have already mentioned the 30 dialogues, which were the occaſion of Ochinus's baniſhment: but I muſt add here, that Monſieur Simon gives a very good account of them (55). He acknowledges that he did not openly declare in thoſe dialogues his Anti-trinitarian Hereſies.

(54) Sleidanus, *Hiſtor. Lib* 21. folio m. 602 *verſo*.

(55) He is miſtaken, when he ſuppoſes that Ochinus was called to Zurich in the year 1562, and when he aſcribes to Melchior Adam the life of Bullingerus, which was written by Joſiah Simler.

(49) He ſuppoſes Boverius wrote his Annals of the Capuchins that year.

(50) *Ex* Theophil. Raynaudo, *Syntagm. de Libris propriis, num.* 23. *p.* 42. *Apopompæi.* See hereunder the remark [AA].

(51) Which have been tranſlated out of Italian into German by Chriſtopher Wirſungus.

changing of his Religion [Q]. He addreſſed it to the Pope, and filled it with the moſt outrageous reflections againſt the Roman Catholick Church. That piece did not remain unanſwered. The confeſſion he made publickly is remarkable. He acknowledged in a preface, that if he could have continued without danger of his life, to preach the truth, after the manner he had preached it for ſome years, he would never have laid down the habit of his Order (q), but as he did not find within his breaſt that courage, which is requiſite for a man to expoſe himſelf to martyrdom (r), he took ſanctuary in a Proteſtant country. Some have erroneouſly aſſerted that he was the author of the book *De Tribus Impoſtoribus* [R]; (of the three Impoſtors). It is ſaid that he promiſed Cardinal de Lorrain, that he would convict the Proteſtant Churches of two dozen of errors [S]. I find that writers have often exaggerated the particulars which concern him [T]. Monſieur Varillas has related many falſities with regard to this ex-Capuchin [U]. Nor is Moreri's account

(q) *Non diſſimulans manere ſe voluiſſe, modo Chriſtum, etſi occultius & veluti obvelatum, prædicare ſibi licuiſſet.* In the preface to the *Sermons*, which he preached in Italy, and which were printed in Germany in the year 1545. See Seckendorf, in *Supplementis Indicis* I *Hiſtoriæ Lutheran.*

(r) *Cum ſe ad mortem ſponte obeundam non ſatis firmum eſſe deprehenderet.* In the ſame *Preface.*

ſies. *He did not ſet up there for a downright Unitarian, he gives only the arguments on both ſides . . .* In his dialogue on the Trinity, *he relates at large the arguments of the Catholicks, and of the Anti-Trinitarians, and inſiſts very much upon thoſe of the latter, with a pretence to refute them* (56). Bullingerus aſſerts (57), that theſe dialogues were burnt in a noted city.

(56) Simon, *Hiſt. Critique des Comment. du Nouv. Teſtam.* Chap. lv. p 831.

(57) *Apud* Boxhorn. *Hiſt. Univerſ.* p. 74. ad ann. 1552.

[Q] *The apology he wrote for his changing of his religion.*] One of the continuators of Baronius mentions it after this manner. *Genevam appulſus Apologiam de fuga ſua ad Pontificem ſcripſit, maledicentiis et calumniis in ſedem Apoſtolicam, et Eccleſiam Catholicam Rom. refertiſſimam* (58), i. e. "Being arrived at Geneva he wrote an apology for his flight, directed to the Pope, which abounded with ſlanders and calumnies againſt the Apoſtolick See, and the Roman Catholick Church." Cardinal John Peter Caraffa, who was afterwards Pope under the name of Paul IV. wrote an anſwer to Ochinus, which has been inſerted in the hiſtory of the Theatins. *Contra Ochini Apologiam nonnulli ſtylum acuerunt; inter quos Joannes Petrus Caraffa Cardinalis Theatinus, qui deinde fuit Paulus Papa* IV. *paræneticam egregiam ſcripſit Epiſtolam, quam Joannes Baptiſta Acerrarum Epiſcopus Hiſtoriæ Theatinorum inſeruit* (59), i. e. "Some exerted their pen againſt Ochinus's apology, amongſt whom Cardinal John Peter Caraffa, Biſhop of Theate *, who was afterwards Pope under the name of Paul IV. wrote an excellent admonitory epiſtle, which John Baptiſt Biſhop of Acerra inſerted in his hiſtory of the Theatins.

(58) Spondanus, ad ann. 1547. num. 22.

(59) Idem, ibid. See alſo Varillas, *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie*, Liv. 17. p. m. 64.

* Thence the Theatins, which Order he eſtabliſhed took their name.

[R] *Some have erroneouſly aſſerted that he was the author of the book* De Tribus Impoſtoribus.] The perſon who wrote the notes on the Phyſician's Religion *(Religio Medici)* does not affirm it poſitively; he ſpeaks only doubtfully of it, *neſcio an Bernhardinus Ochinus . . . . an alius hujus auctor ſit* (60), i. e. "I cannot tell whether Bernardinus Ochinus . . . or ſome other be the author of it." Micrælius is not more poſitive (61); but Scavonius aſſerts it. See what Rhodius ſays upon this ſubject (62), towards the end of Placcius's work *De Scriptoribus Anonymis*, (of anonymous writers). He declares amongſt other things, that he does not know of any perſon, who ever found fault with the other twenty nine dialogues of Ochinus's. It is very ſtrange that ſo learned a man as he was could declare this. I have related above (63) ſeveral particulars, which prove the contrary.

(60) In Sect. 19. p. m. 126.

(61) *Syntagm. Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* p. m. 863.

(62) Pag. 33.

(63) See the remarks [F] [H] and [K].

[S] *It is ſaid that he promiſed Cardinal de Lorrain, that he would convict the Proteſtant Churches of . . . errors.*] The whole fact, as Simler relates it (64), is as follows. Ochinus met with that Cardinal on the road to Schaffhauſen, and told him that he thought himſelf very unhappy, ſince he was condemned to baniſhment for a book, which he wrote with no other view but to vindicate againſt the objections of the adverſaries thirty true doctrines, hard to be believed, which he found in the Reformed Religion. He preſented the Cardinal with ſome copies of his dialogues, and deſired that he would be pleaſed to read them. *We ſhall ſee them*, anſwered the Cardinal, *and if we do not like them, we ſhall throw them into the fire.* Ochinus added, that he would undertake to convince the Reformed Churches of twenty four errors. *Take away twenty of them*, replied the Cardinal, *and there will ſtill remain too many.* Beza relates the ſame particular, and gives it as a matter of fact: but he carries the number of falſe doctrines, which Ochinus promiſed to confute, much higher †. The Cardinal deſpiſed

(64) In *Vita Bullingeri*, folio 40.

† To the number of an hundred.

a Monk, who was ſo often guilty of apoſtacy. *Vix Baſilea egreſſo (quod narro, ſcito me non ut rumorem incertum, ſed ut certam hiſtoriam narrare) occurrit Lotharingus Cardinalis ex Italia rediens, cui ſeſe operamque ſuam omnem obtulit, pollicitus ſeſe centum errores iſtorum inter quos tamdiu hæſiſſet hæreticorum demonſtraturum. Sprevit hominem toties apoſtatam Cardinalis* (65).

(65) Beza, Operum, Tom. 3. p. 190. The ſenſe of that paſſage is given in the words before it.

[T] *Writers have often exaggerated the particulars which concern him.*] Beſides what I have touched upon in the other remarks (66), I ſhall obſerve here that they do not give a faithful account of his opinions, who aſſert with Gratiani, that *he endeavoured to prove by inſtances, and by arguments fetched from the holy ſcripture and from the art of politicks, that it is proper every man ſhould labour to people the world, and to get a numerous family, and that it is not only lawful for the Chriſtians, but that they are even commanded to marry as many women as they pleaſe* (67). Read the beginning of the dialogue *De Polygamia*, you will ſee that the ſtate of the queſtion is this: *When a man, who wiſhes to have children, is married with a woman who is barren, and ſickly, and with whom we cannot agree, is it not lawful for him in ſuch a caſe to marry another wife, without divorcing the firſt?* Ochinus ſuppoſes that his advice is aſked upon a caſe of conſcience: He takes the negative ſide of the queſtion; and having made the perſon who conſults him urge the ſtrongeſt arguments in favour of Polygamy, he anſwers them with very good reflections; though he inſiſts but faintly upon them, he concludes with adviſing his friend to have his recourſe to prayer, and by aſſerting that if a man begs the gift of continence from God with faith, he ſhall certainly obtain it: Laſtly he obſerves, that if God do not grant that gift, nor the faith neceſſary to pray for it with ſucceſs, a man may in ſuch a caſe act without ſin according to that inſtinct, which he will know certainly to come from God. Is this then aſſerting dogmatically that the goſpel commands *Chriſtians to marry as many wives as they pleaſe?* Ochinus is certainly miſtaken; he introduces Fanaticiſm; but as we ought to do juſtice to all the world, it muſt be confeſſed that the writings in which his opinions are mentioned, contain a very unfair account of them.

(66) Above, remarks [F] and [H].

(67) *Vie du Cardinal Commendon*, p. 212.

[U] *Monſieur Varillas has related many falſities with this ex-Capuchin.*] Let us refer them to ſeveral heads.

I. I do not queſtion but his whole account of the quarrels between Calvin and Ochinus is nothing but a mere romance, which he forged himſelf, or ſtole from ſome other writer. But I can warrant that he is certainly miſtaken when he aſſerts (68), that Ochinus being at Geneva *attacked the holy Trinity, and revived the Arian Hereſy . . . .* and that he *publiſhed upon that ſubject an hundred extravagant notions, in the libels which he compoſed in Italian, and which his friends tranſlated into Latin.* One can demonſtrate that all this is falſe. Ochinus had left Geneva before the year 1547. I have quoted Sleidan's words, which aſſure us of this particular. Calvin commends Ochinus in a book (69), which he publiſhed in the year 1550. Whence it follows that he had not yet obſerved at that time thoſe monſtrous Hereſies of Ochinus. Farther, would they have ſent into England in the year 1547 an ex-Capuchin, who had been known for a Tritheiſt or for an Arian? But we want no other arguments againſt Varillas, than the paſſages in Beza, by which it appears that Ochinus concealed his hereſies for a long while within his breaſt, and that they were not obſerved till he printed his dialogues: Now

(68) *Hiſtoire de l'Hereſie*, Liv. 17. p. m. 65.

(69) His book *de Scandalis.*

account of him every way accurate [*X*]. Palearius (*s*) has very much commended this Monk.

(*s*) Orat. 3. p. 91, 92. *Editionis* 1696. See alſo p. 505.

There was nothing againſt Florimond de Remond in the firſt edition of this article; and yet that writer is not accurate in the account he gives us of Ochinus [*Y*]. It is from him

Now they were not publiſhed before the year 1562. *Sceleratus hypocrita Arrianorum clandeſtinus fautor, polygamiæ defenſor, omnium Chriſtianæ Religionis dogmatum irriſor, quum eò tandem audaciæ erupiſſet ut ſua portenta in publicum ederet (juſto ſanè Dei judicio ne* LATERE *diutius tantum malum poſſet) delatus ad Magiſtratum . . . juſſus eſt è Tigurinorum agro faceſſere* (70), i. e. "That "wicked Heretick, the ſecret ſupport of the Arians, "the aſſertor of Polygamy, the ridiculer of all the "doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion, came out at "laſt to that height of audaciouſneſs, that he pub- "liſhed his monſtrous opinions (God's juſt judgment "not ſuffering that ſo great an evil ſhould continue "any longer CONCEALED) ſo that he was accuſed "before the magiſtrates . . . . and commanded to re- "tire from the territories of Zurich." With theſe words Beza begins his anſwer to Dudithius's complaints. It appears moſt evidently from that paſſage, that Ochinus's ſecret opinions were not known but by the printing of his dialogues. The friendſhip which Bullingerus (71) had for him till that publication, is another unqueſtionable proof of the ſame fact. Beza ſeldom mentions Ochinus without obſerving that he continued a great while an hypocrite. *Favit etiam illis*, ſed NIMIUM SERO *detectus, Bernardinus ille Ochinus, impuriſſimus hypocrita* (72), i. e. "Bernardi- "nus, that moſt abominable Heretick, but who was "TOO LATE diſcovered, favoured them alſo." Beza obſerving that Peter Martyr went to England in the year 1547, and that Ochinus accompanied him thither, adds (73), *Maximi prius in Italia nominis monachus & Capucinorum (quos vocant) ordinis auctor, idemque quod* MULTIS *demum* POST *annis patefecit, ſceleratus hypocrita*, i. e. "Firſt, a very famous Monk "in Italy, and the founder of the Order of the Capu- "chins (as it is called) but a moſt wicked Hypocrite, "which however he did not diſcover till after "MANY YEARS."

(70) Beza, Operum, Tom. 3. p. 190.

(71) See his life by Joſiah Simler, folio 28 *verſo*, 39 *verſo*.

(72) *Epiſt* 81. *Operum*, Tom. 3. p. 295.

(73) *In* Iconibus, *in* Petro Martyre.

II. Here follows another romance. "It is ſurpri- "ſing that Calvin had him only baniſhed from Ge- "neva, and did not put him into the hands of the "magiſtrates, to have him burnt, as he did after- "wards with regard to Servetus, who was guilty of "the ſame crime (74)." Varillas endeavours to find out the reaſons of ſuch an inconſiſtent behaviour; he mentions two or three of thoſe reaſons, after which he adds that *Ochinus was baniſhed from Geneva by a ſentence of the Senate, and that he retired to Baſil.* A man muſt have a great deal of time to ſpare, who endeavours to find out the reaſons of a wild fancy. The fact muſt be firſt clearly proved, and then you may inquire after the cauſes of it. It is falſe that Ochinus was baniſhed from Geneva, and that he diſcovered his Hereſies there.

(74) Varillas, *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie*, Liv. 17. p. 65.

III. *He would have ſuffered a long perſecution* at Baſil, continues Monſieur Varillas, *becauſe Calvin's friends had a great intereſt there, had not Bucer, who could eaſily agree with all ſorts of Hereticks, prevailed with the Magiſtrates of Strasburg, to offer Ochinus the Profeſſorſhip of Divinity, which he accepted. The ſame Bucer took him and Vermilli with him to England.* I have neither time, nor the neceſſary books to collect good arguments againſt this account of Varillas: but I am perſuaded, that all reaſonable men will be ſatisfied with Sleidan's ſilence. Would that famous hiſtorian, who reſided at Straſburg, have only obſerved (75), when he mentioned Peter Martyr and Bernardinus Ochinus's voyage to England, that the latter retired firſt to Geneva, and then to Augſburg? Would he have ſaid nothing of that Profeſſorſhip of Divinity, which Bucer *prevailed upon the Magiſtrates of Strasburg to offer* Ochinus, *and which he accepted?* He does not forget to obſerve expreſly, that Peter Martyr had been Profeſſor in that City. I have juſt now met with ſomething which is more to the purpoſe ſtill. Ochinus was at Augſburg in the year 1546, and preached there in the Italian tongue (76). It is falſe that Bucer took Ochinus and Vermilli with him to England; he did not go thither before the year 1549; and the two others were gone thither towards the end of the year 1547.

(75) Lib. 19. ad ann. 1547.

(76) See Seckend. *Hiſtoire du Lutheran.* Liv. 3. p. 613.

IV. *The Duke of Somerſet* had no reaſon to be *ſatisfied with their behaviour . . . Ochinus diſperſed ſecretly his fanatical notions on the myſtery of the Trinity* (77). This is ſaid at random, and cannot be ſupported by any authority; and it is inconſiſtent with the elogium, which one of the moſt zealous Anti-papiſts of England beſtows on Ochinus (78).

(77) Varillas, *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie*, Liv. 3. p. 66.

[*X*] *Moreri's account of him is not every way accurate.*] I. He is in the wrong to aſſert that Ochinus *took the Monks habit amongſt the Capuchins towards the year* 1525, *or* 26. He ſhould have ſaid in the year 1534. II. It was not in the year 1543 but in 1542 that Ochinus and Martyr ſtript themſelves of their monkiſh habit. III. No man, that I know of, ever reproached Ochinus with aſſerting the doctrine of Pologamy for his own private intereſt, and becauſe *he would marry ſeveral wives, not being ſatisfied with one.* IV. It is falſe, that *in order to juſtify his diſſoluteneſs and incontinence, he publiſhed that Polygamy is lawful.* When he publiſhed his dialogues he was a widower, and threeſcore and ſixteen years old (79). Neither his private intereſt nor his paſſions could at that time make him wiſh that Polygamy were permitted: for being a widower he might marry again according to the laws; and as he was threeſcore and ſixteen years old, one woman would only have cut out more work for him, than he would well have compaſſed. He ought to have been well pleaſed, and to have looked upon himſelf as a very extraordinary man, if at that age he could have gratified all the deſires of one woman only. Moreri betrays therefore a very great want of judgment, and an exceſſive ignorance of the particulars of this man's life, when he aſſerts, that he publiſhed that doctrine in order to juſtify his own deſire of marrying ſeveral women. It has been obſerved of ſome looſe Caſuiſts, that they were more ſtrict and ſevere with regard to their own conduct, than with regard to other people's. The ſame may be ſaid of ſome authors, who have aſſerted the doctrine of Polygamy: one Lyſerus (80) ſpent his time, his health, and his very life, in maintaining that doctrine, and yet he had no manner of occaſion to wiſh it had been lawful to marry ſeveral wives, for it is thought that if he had had one only, he would not have known what to do with her. I will not be ſo unjuſt as to aſſert that the author of the Paſtoral Letters * was of the ſame opinion with Lyſerus; let it only be obſerved that his morals were too remiſs in that reſpect, and countenanced incontinency too much; I mean principles of morality, which he aſſerted in order to excuſe thoſe reformers, who gave the Landgrave of Heſſe leave to marry two wives together (81). Now of all the miniſters, he was perhaps the perſon, who on account of his private intereſt, had the leaſt reaſons to wiſh that Polygamy were lawful. V. It is not true that Ochinus *put himſelf at the head of thoſe infamous Libertines, who were called Polygamiſts.* Theſe people never formed a Sect, nor did Ochinus leave any more Diſciples united in a body, than Lyſerus did. VI. It is falſe that Ochinus left Germany to retire into Tranſilvania: it is more falſe ſtill, that he retired thither, *becauſe he did not meet in Germany with ſufficient opportunities to gratify his pride and his ambition.* Being baniſhed from Zurich he took ſanctuary at Baſil, whence he was alſo driven. He would have been baniſhed after the ſame manner from all the cities in the world, where the miniſters had any credit with the magiſtrates; ſo that he had no choice left; the only courſe he could take was to retire into Poland, and caſt himſelf into the arms of the Hereticks of thoſe quarters. In caſe God did not ſhew him mercy, they, who have promoted his baniſhment with ſo much zeal and eagerneſs, will be anſwerable for the loſs of that ſoul. VII. Moreri ought not to have quoted *Prateolus* V. *Polig.* for he ſays nothing of Ochinus in that place.

(78) *Deum immortalem, quales illi duo ſenes peregrini, quos in urbem veſtram recepiſtis* (he ſpeaks to the people of Zurich) *Petrus Martyr & Bernardinus Ochinus? Quæ duo luminaria? quorum alterum ſi aliæ haberent Eccleſiæ, magno theſauro & ornamento ditatæ & beatæ viderentur. Felix Anglia dum hæc paria habuit, miſera dum amiſit.* Balæus, *Præfat. in Act. Rom. Pontific.* i. e. "Good God! "how worthy "theſe two men "are, whom "you have re- "ceived in your "City (*Zurich*) "I mean Peter "Martyr and "Bernardinus "Ochinus, "thoſe great "Luminaries: "if other "Churches had "but either of "them, they "would think "themſelves "bleſſed with "an immenſe "treaſure; "happy Eng- "land, when ſhe "enjoyed them "both; wretch- "ed when ſhe "loſt them."

(79) See above, the remark [*L*].

(80) See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for April 1685, Article 2.

* Monſieur Jurieu.

(81) See the Article LUTHER, remark [*K*].

[*Y*] *Florimond de Remond . . . . . is not accurate in the account he gives us of Ochinus.*] He aſſerts (82) that this Monk leaving Geneva, retired to Zurich, whence he was baniſhed ſoon after, as alſo from Baſil.

(82) *Florimond de Remond, Hiſt. de l'Hereſie*, Liv. 3. c. 5. p. m. 293, 294.

him Bzovius extracted the following particular, namely, that this Monk's wife was obliged to get her bread by following the trade of a laundreſs [*Z*]. But he has borrowed much more particulars ſtill, from the Annaliſt of the Capuchins. It is from him he tranſcribed a long account of the apoſtacy and pretended martyrdom of our Ochinus [*AA*]. This deſerves to be examined.

OCTAVIA,

ſil, *of which Dudithius complains in his letter to Beza.* That man being expelled from Switzerland, adds he, went into Germany, and thence into Poland. *He wrote a book on Polygamy dedicated to King Sigiſmund* II. *He preached the ſame doctrine at Cracow, as Reſcius the Polander writes. The whole female ſex in thoſe quarters was not leſs concerned at this, than formerly the Roman ladies, when they found themſelves impoſed upon by young Papirius: ſo that poor Ochinus, who was accuſed of having left his wife at Geneva, though ſhe died of her fall, was forced to leave the city, and to retire into Tranſilvania. He publiſhed his dialogues, which have been ſince tranſlated into ſeveral languages. Caſtalio was the author of the Latin tranſlation.* This whole account abounds with chronological errors, and other falſities; the Reader will be convinced of it, by reading what I have obſerved, either againſt Spondanus, or againſt Monſieur Varillas, or againſt other Writers who copied from Florimond de Remond, the chief Author whom the Roman Catholick Writers tranſcribe, when they ſpeak of the Reformers who lived in the XVIth Century.

[*Z*] . . . *It is from him Bzovius extracted . . . that this Monk's wife was . . . a laundreſs.*] Florimond de Remond is never merrier, than when he mentions the wives of the Monks. Let us hear him on the ſubject before us. *When they came to Zurich and Baſil,* ſays he (83), ſpeaking of Peter Martyr and Bernardinus Ochinus, *their arrival thither was ſuſpicious. The people wondering to ſee theſe two eminent preachers, whoſe fame was ſpread over all Italy, come thither, feared leſt they ſhould be two crafty Sinons, who came ſlily into their city, with a deſign to hatch ſome treaſon, and to ſeduce their ſouls, after they had ſubdued them. But the company which Bernard Ochinus led with him, namely a young and beautiful Italian wench, whom he had debauched, having promiſed her marriage, and alſo the dreſs he appeared in, removed their fears. For inſtead of his hair-cloth, he wore a ſoldier's habit. In order to make an indiſſoluble contract with the Hereticks, he entered into articles with that girl, and married her. This is the Gordian knot, with which thoſe, whom the paſſions of pride and luſt drive from their convents, tye themſelves to that party. This Okinus † continued ſome time at Geneva with his wife, who was almoſt reduced to get a livelihood by the meaneſt and moſt contemptible labour: for they had both brought but a very little money with them. She was therefore Madam Okinus the laundreſs* (84). *. . Martyr took alſo* (85) *his nun with him, to comfort him in his labours and lucubrations. He did not do like Okinus, who being ſatiated with his laundreſs, got rid of her. For though Beza aſſerts that ſhe broke her neck, ſupporting his aſſertion by the teſtimony of Alciat, that other Arian, who did ſo much miſchief in Poland, yet there were ſome ſuſpicions that Okinus had haſtened her death; however they would not make any further inquiries into the matter, becauſe he had not yet declared himſelf an Arian, and behaved like a good brother in* CHRIST. This is what that writer dares to aſſert, without giving the leaſt proof of it, or quoting any author whatſoever. So that I have no occaſion to criticiſe any further upon him.

(83) Ibid. p. 293.

† Thus Florimond de Remond ſpels our Author's name.

(84) Ibid. p. 296, 297.

(85) That is to ſay, when he ſet out for England.

Bzovius (86) has tranſcribed faithfully, and word for word, almoſt ſix pages (87) of the hiſtory of Peter Martyr and Bernardinus Ochinus, as he found them in Florimond de Remond (88). He has not omitted the paſſage, in which it is obſerved, *that Martyr had the ſame inclinations with Luther, longing after the nuns, as it is the practice of thoſe who caſt off their Monk's habit. And ſince that time he always ſighed for thoſe recluſe maidens, who under a veil do much eaſier preſerve the beauty of their complection.* But I wonder he did not tranſcribe that other paſſage (89); though Peter Martyr "was already loaded with years, he could "not yet curb the deſire of the fleſh: he went to "meet a nun at Geneva, whom the like deſires had "drove from her nunnery; her name was Catherine "Merande; ſhe had been recommended to him, ſo "that he married her. He cared for no other wo-"men, but ſuch as left their nunneries . . . . Brence "attacked him very ſeverely upon that account, and "Martyr being exaſperated at Brence's audaciouſ-"neſs, who had treated him after ſo unchriſtian a "manner, was preparing an anſwer to him; but "being quite ſpent with the fatigues, which it be-"came him to undergo in order to pleaſe his new "ſpouſe, he fell ſick and died in the ſame city of "Zurich."

(86) Bzovius, Annal. Tom. 20. p. 87, &c. ad ann. 1542. He quotes the Author he tranſcribes.

(87) That is to ſay of the edition in 4to, of Florimond de Remond

(88) Florimond de Remond, *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie*, Liv. 3. c. 5. p. 293.

(89) Ibid. p. 297.

Let us obſerve here, that if it were true that Ochinus paſſed the Alps with the perſon who was afterwards his wife, we ought to judge charitably that he conducted her into Switzerland, only becauſe he feared leſt ſhe would otherwiſe loſe the opportunity to retire from Babylon. For he would have been very ſilly, and too cautious, had he imagined that it was neceſſary to provide himſelf before hand againſt the want of women, when he was going into a Proteſtant country. Such a want is not to be feared there, no more than in any other country in the world. He muſt have been ſenſible, that in caſe it were neceſſary for him to marry at the age of fifty five, either that he might not be obliged to ſtruggle with the lewd deſire of nature, or in order to undeceive thoſe, who might have thought that he ſtill judged the monaſtick vows to be binding, there would not be wanting officious perſons, who would find him a wife. I do not believe there is one ſingle inſtance of a converted Monk, who continued unmarried for want of meeting with a woman willing to join in wedlock with him.

[*AA*] *Bzovius has tranſcribed from the Annaliſt of the Capuchins a long account of the apoſtacy and pretended martyrdom of Ochinus.*] I ſhall confine myſelf to what regards his martyrdom. Bzovius, tranſcribing the very words of Zachariah Boverius who wrote the Annals of the Capuchins, relates that Ochinus, living at Geneva, fell ſick there, and had ſuch remorſe as obliged him to ſend ſecretly for a curate of the neighbourhood, to whom he confeſſed his ſins, and begged of him to be admitted again into the pale of the Catholick Church, ſince he repented that he ever left it, and that he preached heretical doctrines for about fifteen years ſucceſſively (90). The curate adminiſtred him the ſacrament of penance, and repreſented to him that he was under an obligation to make a publick recantation of his hereſies. Ochinus promiſed he would do it as ſoon as he was recovered, or if he did not recover, that he would declare poſitively his converſion to his followers, and to all thoſe who would come to ſee him: Upon thoſe terms he received abſolution, and was readmitted into the pale of the Church. He wiſhed to take the Sacrament; but the Prieſt judging it was dangerous to bring him the *Viaticum*, comforted him with theſe words of St. *Auguſtin, crede & manducaſti, believe, and you have eat it.* Ochinus ſoon declar'd his converſion to thoſe of his followers who came to viſit him, and earneſtly exhorted them to forſake, like him, the Hereſies he had taught them. They imagined at firſt that he was light-headed: but finding afterwards that he was in his ſenſes, and talked very ſeriouſly, they gave the Magiſtrates notice of it, who commanded them to inquire of him whether he continued in thoſe ſentiments, and if he did, to kill him. His followers obey'd that command; for as ſoon as they had heard the fine diſcourſes he made to them concerning his repentance and converſion, they ſtabbed him in his bed. Others aſſert that he was dragged out of the City by the Magiſtrates command, and ſtoned to death (91). The Annaliſt of the Capuchins urges the teſtimonies of ſeven perſons, whoſe names and titles he ſets down. At the head of theſe ſeven witneſſes you ſee a Doge of Venice: the others are all perſons of note, conſiderable either by their birth, or by the employments they have had in Monaſteries: however none of them aſſert any thing elſe, but

(90) Take notice of this date; it would follow from thence, that Ochinus was murthered at Geneva in the year 1557, or thereabout; and it can be proved that he was baniſhed from Zurich in the year 1563.

(91) *Quare mox illi arreptis pugionibus quos occultos geſtabant in lecto jacentem & manus ad Cœlos tendentem confodiunt. Alii vero eum Magiſtratus edicto extra Urbem raptatum, lapidibuſque obrutum fuiſſe tradunt.* Bzovius, ad ann. 1542. num. 68. p. 96.

OCTAVIA, to whom Julius Cæsar was great uncle (*a*), was the sister of Augustus, and one of the most illustrius Ladies of antient Rome. She was first married to Claudius Marcellus, who was Consul the year of Rome 704, and who died a little after the war of Perusia. Soon after she married Mark Anthony [*A*]; the friends of both parties having promoted those nuptials (*b*), hoping that it would make the peace, which had been just before concluded between Augustus and Mark Anthony, lasting. This virtuous Lady was formed with a very happy disposition for that purpose; but Mark Anthony became so much enamoured with Cleopatra, and so great a slave to her charms, that he was quite lost to wisdom and conduct. Before he was so completely captivated by that Egyptian Queen, his wife's counsels were of great advantage to him (*c*). He left her in Italy (*d*) after he had had a conference at Tarentum with Augustus, *anno* 717, and returned into the East. Some time after she set out to meet him; and being informed by the letters she received from him, that he was desirous she should stop in Athens, she accordingly stopt there, till she had evidently found that her husband only made a fool of her. She then returned to Rome, and could not be prevailed upon by Augustus to leave her husband's palace; but continued to live there, and to take the same care of every thing, as though he had been the best of husbands (*e*). She was as affectionate to the children of Mark Anthony and Fulvia as before, and equally careful of their education (*f*). She would not for the world have consented, that the injurious treatment she met with from Mark Anthony should occasion a civil war (*g*); and, for that reason in obeying the order he sent her to quit her house, she burst into tears upon no other account (*h*), than because she saw that she should be considered as one of the causes of the war. This glorious behaviour of Octavia was, though very much against her inclination, of the highest prejudice to her husband (*i*); the Romans hating and despising Mark Anthony, when they saw him prefer, to her, a woman of Cleopatra's abandoned character [*B*]. 'Tis well known that Mark Anthony was completely ruined by this war. Fortune

(*a*) She was the daughter of Caius Octavius, and of Atia, daughter of Atius Balbus; and of Julia, sister to Julius Cæsar.

(*b*) Plutarch *in* Anton. p. 929.

(*c*) See the remark [*A*].

(*d*) Plutarch *in* Anton. p. 932.

(*e*) Idem, ibid. p. 940.

(*f*) Idem, ibid. p. 941.

(*g*) Idem, ibid. p. 940.

(*h*) Idem, ibid. p. 912.

(*i*) See remark [*B*] citat. (8).

but that he has heard so. To these testimonies is added what Beza has acknowledged (92), namely, that Ochinus shewed himself at last a very great hypocrite (93). But, as Theophilus Raynaud (94) has very well proved it by a letter of Beza (95), that hypocrisy did not consist in Ochinus's returning to popery, but in his asserting the heresy of the Anti-trinitarians, *&c.* Pray, observe with how little judgment the Monks compose the Chronicles of their Orders. There are positive and unquestionable proofs, that Ochinus retired with the Sectaries of Poland, and that he died in those parts; and yet the Capuchins make no scruple to publish that he died a Martyr of the Catholick religion at Geneva, and they think it strange that any person should question it, as we have seen above (96).

(92) Beza, *in* Iconibus, *in* Petro Martyre.

(93) Bzovius, ad ann. 1542. num. 70 *& seq.*

(94) Th. Raynaud, in *Syntagm. de Libris propriis*, num. 23. p. 42. *Apopompæi.*

(95) That which he wrote to Dudithius; see the remark [*L*].

(96) In the remark [*O*], quotation (48).

[*A*] *Soon after she married Mark Anthony.*] All widows were forbid, by the laws of Rome, to marry till ten months after the decease of their husbands; but Octavia was dispensed from this statute by a decree of the Senate (1). This the publick welfare required; the Romans having but too much cause to fear, that Mark Anthony and Augustus would engage in eternal contests, and prolong the civil war, if some good mediator did not preserve a good harmony between them; and nothing was thought so proper to bring about this happy mediation, as Mark Anthony and Octavia. 'Twas therefore concluded with all imaginable dispatch; they not waiting even till Octavia was brought to bed (2). 'Twas hoped that her prudence and beauty would be productive to the most happy effects. Τοῦτον ἅπαντες εἰσηγοῦντο τὸν γάμον, ἐλπίζοντες τὴν Ὀκταβίαν, ἐπὶ κάλλει τοσούτῳ σεμνότητα καὶ νοῦν ἔχουσαν, εἰς ταυτὸ τῷ Ἀντωνίῳ παραγενομένην, καὶ στέρξειν εἰκὸς, τοιαύτην γυναῖκα, πάντων πραγμάτων αὐτοῖς σωτηρίαν ἔσεσθαι καὶ σύγκρασιν (3); *i. e.* "Every one "was for promoting this match, from a supposition "that Octavia, whose exquisite beauty was heightened by gravity and prudence, when married to "Anthony, would certainly enflame him with her "numberless charms, and consequently bring about "a most happy and lasting peace." These nuptials were solemnized the year of Rome 714 (4). Three years after, the hopes of the Romans were fulfilled. Augustus was carrying on a war against Pompey's son, and was to have been succoured by Mark Anthony. The last mentioned returned from the East into Italy, not so much with a design of assisting Augustus, as to enquire into the state of affairs, and to take advantage of the conjunctures at that time. Their correspondence lessened daily; they complained of each other; and there was but too just reason to fear, lest their jealousy should rise still higher; but Octavia imployed so much skill in her endeavours to reconcile them, that she at last succeeded (5). Plutarch is much more circumstantial in this affair than Dion. He relates, that after these Triumvirs had concluded a peace with Pompey's son, the one continued in Italy, and the other went, with his wife Octavia, into Greece. Mark Anthony spent the winter with her in Athens; and having been exasperated against Augustus by some ill reports which were spread, he set sail towards Italy; and being refused entrance into the harbour of Brundusium, he went ashore at Tarentum, whence he sent Octavia to Augustus. This Lady met her brother by the way, and affected him to such a degree, that he was quite pacified and went to Tarentum, where the interview between him and his brother-in-law was heightened by a thousand demonstrations of Friendship. Plutarch's words are as follow: Ἡ δὲ ἀπαντήσασα καθ' ὁδὸν Καίσαρι, καὶ παραλαβοῦσα τῶν ἐκείνου φίλων Ἀγρίππαν καὶ Μαικηνᾶν ἐντυγχάνει, πολλὰ πονηρευομένη καὶ πολλὰ δεομένη μὴ περιιδεῖν αὐτὴν ἐκ μακαριωτάτης γυναικὸς ἀθλιωτάτην γενομένην. νῦν μὲν γὰρ ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις εἰς αὐτὴν ἀποβλέπειν, αὐτοκρατόροιν δυοῖν, τὸν μὲν γυναῖκα, τὸν δὲ ἀδελφὴν οὖσαν. Εἰ δὲ τὰ χείρω κρατήσειεν, (ἔφη) καὶ γένοιτο πόλεμος, ὑμῶν μὲν ἄδηλον ὁτῳ κρατεῖν ἢ κρατεῖσθαι πέπρωται, τὰ ἐμὰ δὲ ἀμφοτέρως ἄθλια. τούτοις ἐπικλασθεὶς ὁ Καῖσαρ, ἦκεν εἰρηνικῶς εἰς Τάραντα (6). *i. e.* "Octavia meeting Cæsar by the "way, had a conference with him, together with his "friends Agrippa and Mecænas. She conjured him "in the most pathetic terms, not to let her, from being the most happy of her sex, become the most "wretched. For now, says she, the whole world "looks upon me as related to two Emperors; the one "as wife, the other's sister; but if pernicious counsels, added she, should prevail, and a war break "out, 'tis doubtful which of you two would conquer; "but my fate would either way be wretched. Cæsar being overcome by these words, came to Tarentum quite pacified."

(1) Plutarch *in* Anton. p. 929, 930.

(2) Dio, Lib. 48. p. m. 429. ad ann. 714.

(3) Plut. ibid. p. 829. [*F*].

(4) According to Calvisius, ann. 713.

(5) See Dion, Lib. 49. *fub fin.*

(6) Plutarch *in* Anton. p. 931. [*E*].

[*B*] *The Romans hating and detesting Mark Anthony, when they saw him prefer to her a woman of Cleopatra's abandoned character.*] Those who had seen Cleopatra, were more surprized than the others at Mark Anthony's infatuation; they not finding her to be younger or more beautiful than Octavia. He consequently shewed a great deal of folly in not preferring Octavia to her, as this latter was infinitely her superior in virtue and wisdom. Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ οὐκτιρον οὐκ ἐκείνην ἀλλ' Ἀντώνιον, καὶ μᾶλλον οἱ Κλεοπάτραν ἑωρακότες, ὅτε κάλλει τῆς Ὀκταβίας ὅτε ὥρᾳ διαφέρουσαν. *Populum vero Romanum miserebat non ita illius* (Octaviæ), *ut Antonii, atque impensius eos qui Cleopatram viderant, neque forma Octaviæ neque ætatis flore præcellentem* (7). The admi-

(7) Plutarch *in* Anton. p. 942 [*D*].

tune ſeemed to flatter Octavia with the proſpect of the higheſt worldly felicity. She had a ſon, a moſt accompliſhed youth, who married Auguſtus's daughter, and was conſidered as the preſumptive heir of the Empire: but he died in the bloom of his years [C], which afflicted his mother to ſo violent a degree, that ſhe continued for ever inconſolable

admiration in which the Romans held Octavia, who did all the good offices in her power to the children and friends of her huſband, without reſenting in any manner the ill treatment ſhe met with from him, did great prejudice to Mark Anthony; ſo that this illuſtrious Lady, contrary to her intentions, expoſed him prodigiouſly to the hatred of the Romans. Ἄκυρα δὲ ἐγένετο διὰ τοῦτον Ἀντώνιον· ἐμίσουν γὰρ ἀδικῶν τοιαύτην. *Enimvero hiſce rebus effecit invita Antonio. Invidia namque flagrabat, quod talem fœminam violaret* (8). And indeed it is ſaid, that the only reaſon which prevailed with Auguſtus to conſent that Octavia ſhould go to her huſband, was, his ſuppoſing that ſhe would meet with ſome ſignal ill uſage from him; and he knew very well, that this would be conſidered by the Romans as a juſt cauſe for him to light up the war anew. To this I may add, that he did not doubt but ſuch a conduct would exaſperate the Romans in the higheſt degree againſt Mark Anthony. Ἐν δὲ Ῥώμῃ βουλομένης Ὀκταβίας πλεῦσαι πρὸς Ἀντώνιον ἐπέτρεψε Καῖσαρ, ὡς οἱ πλείους λέγουσιν οὐκ ἐκείνῃ χαριζόμενος, ἀλλ' ὅπως περιωδυρισθεῖσα καὶ καταμεληθεῖσα, πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον αἰτίαν εὐπρεπῆ παράσχοι. *Romæ inſtituenti ad Antonium navigare Octaviæ annuit Cæſar, non, ut plerique tradunt, quo illi indulgeret: verùm quo contumelia affecta deſpectaque colorem præberet bello movendo honeſtum* (9). What good opinion ſoever Cleopatra entertained of her charms, ſhe yet dreaded thoſe of Octavia in a prodigious degree; for which reaſon ſhe had recourſe to the moſt ſtudied artifices, in order to perſuade Mark Anthony not to let her come near him. Αἰσθομένη δὲ ἡ Κλεοπάτρα τὴν Ὀκταβίαν ὁμόσε χωροῦσαν αὐτῇ, καὶ φοβηθεῖσα μὴ τῷ τρόπῳ τῇ σεμνότητι καὶ τῇ Καίσαρος δυνάμει προσκλησαμένη τὸ καθ' ἡδονὴν ὁμιλεῖν καὶ θεραπεύειν Ἀντώνιον, ἅμαχος γένηται, καὶ κρατήσῃ παντάπασι τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, ἐρᾶν αὐτὴ προσεποιεῖτο τοῦ Ἀντωνίου. *At Cleopatra conferre ſecum pedem animadvertens Octaviam, veritaque ne cum gravitate morum & Cæſaris potentia placidam adjungens conſuetudinem & Antonii obſervantiam, inſuperabilis eſſet & ſemel potiretur viro, deperire ſimulabat ſe Antonii amore* (10). She made her inamorato believe, that it would be impoſſible for her to live in caſe he ſhould abandon her; ſhe repreſented to him, that it was enough for Octavia to be a lawful wife; whilſt Cleopatra, Queen of ſo mighty a nation, went by no other name but that of Concubine; a name which yet ſhe would ſubmit to (11), provided that Mark Anthony's abſence did not plunge her into deſpair. Ὀκταβίαν μὲν . . . τὸ τῆς γαμετῆς ὄνομα καρπώσασθαι· Κλεοπάτραν δὲ, τοσούτων ἀνθρώπων βασιλεύουσαν, ἐρωμένην Ἀντωνίου καλεῖσθαι· καὶ τοῦνομα τοῦτο μὴ φεύγειν μηδ' ἀπαξιοῦν ἕως ὁρᾷν ἐκεῖνον ἕξοι καὶ συζῇν, ἀπελαυνομένην δὲ τούτου μὴ περιδώσεσθαι. *Octaviam enim . . . nomine frui uxoris. Cleopatram verò, tam multorum reginam mortalium, pellicem Antonii nominari: neque eam hoc defugere vel dedignari nomen, quoad aſpicere illum & una liceat vivere: quo ſi orbaretur, non ducturam ultra ſpiritum* (12). Mark Anthony's friends adviſed him to ſend Cleopatra back into Egypt, ſhe having followed him as far as Epheſus, where all things ſeemed to ſpeak a moſt fatal rupture; but fearing leſt Octavia ſhould once again reconcile her brother with her huſband, Φοβουμένη τὰς δι' Ὀκταβίας πάλιν αὐτῷ διαλύσεις, *Novam interprete Octavia timens reconciliationem* (13), ſhe bribed a certain perſon, who perſuaded Mark Anthony to take her along with him whitherſoever he might go. So great was her emulation, that being in Athens where Octavia had received the higheſt honours, ſhe was extremely liberal to the people, in hopes of obtaining the like (14).

(8) Plutarch *in* Anton. p. 941.

(9) Idem, ibid. p. 940 [B].

(10) Idem, ibid. [C].

(11) Compare this with what Heloiſe ſaid in the remark [U] of her article.

(12) Plutarch *in* Anton. p. 942 [D].

(13) Idem, bid. p. 941 [F].

(14) Idem, ibid. p. 942 [C].

[C] *Her ſon died in the bloom of his years.*] This was Marcus Claudius Marcellus. His elogium was introduced with ſuch exquiſite ſkill into the Æneid, and turned in ſo wonderful a manner, that the moſt ſtupid reader muſt neceſſarily be ſtruck with it. I have read it above an hundred times, and never without tranſports of admiration; and upon my reading it again, the inſtant I am writing, it appears more beautiful than ever. Several excellent Judges have aſſured me that they are of the ſame mind. I am therefore perſuaded that my Readers will excuſe me for tranſcribing the whole upon this occaſion.

Atque hic Æneas (unâ namque ire videbat
Egregium formâ juvenem, & fulgentibus armis;
Sed frons læta parùm, & dejecto lumina vultu)
Quis, pater, ille, virum qui ſic comitatur euntem?
Filius? an-ne aliquis magnâ de ſtirpe nepotum?
Quis ſtrepitus circa comitum! quantum inſtar in ipſo eſt!
Sed nox atra caput triſti circumvolat umbrâ.
Tum pater Anchiſes lacrymis ingreſſus obortis:
O nate, ingentem luctum ne quære tuorum.
Oſtendent terris hunc tantum fata; neque ultra
Eſſe ſinent: nimium vobis Romana propago
Viſa potens, Superi, propria hæc ſi dona fuiſſent.
Quantos ille virûm magnam Mavortis ad urbem
Campus aget gemitus! vel quæ, Tiberine, videbis
Funera, cum tumulum præterlabêre recentem!
Nec puer Iliacâ quiſquam de gente Latinos
In tantum ſpe tollet avos: nec Romula quondam
Ullo ſe tantum tellus jactabit alumno.
Heu pietas, heu priſca fides, invictaque bello
Dextera! non illi quiſquam ſe impunè tuliſſet
Obvius armato; ſeu cùm pedes iret in hoſtem;
Seu ſpumantis equi foderet calcaribus armos.
Heu miſerande puer! ſi quâ fata aſpera rumpas,
Tu Marcellus eris: manibus date lilia plenis:
Purpureos ſpargam flores, animamque nepotis
Hic ſaltem accumulem donis, & fungar inani
Munere (15).

(15) Virgil. Æneid. Lib. 6. verſe 860, &c.

" Æneas, here, beheld of form divine
" A God-like youth, in glitt'ring armour ſhine:
" With great Marcellus keeping equal pace;
" But gloomy were his eyes, dejected was his face.
" He ſaw, and, wond'ring, aſk'd his airy guide,
" What, and of whence he was, who preſs'd the
" hero's ſide?
" His ſon, or one of his illuſtrious name,
" How like the former, and almoſt the ſame:
" Obſerve the crowds that compaſs him around;
" All gaze, and all admire, and raiſe a ſhouting
" ſound:
" But hov'ring miſts around his brows are ſpread,
" And night, with ſable ſhades, involves his head.
" Seek not to know (the ghoſt reply'd with tears)
" The ſorrows of thy ſons in future years.
" This youth (the bliſsful viſion of a day)
" Shall juſt be ſhewn on earth, and ſnatch'd away.
" The Gods too high had rais'd the Roman ſtate,
" Were but their gifts as permanent as great.
" What groans of men ſhall fill the martial field!
" How fierce a blaze his flaming pile ſhall yield!
" What fun'ral pomp ſhall floating Tiber ſee,
" When, riſing from his bed, he views the ſad
" ſolemnity!
" No youth ſhall equal hopes of glory give:
" No youth afford ſo great a cauſe to grieve.
" The Trojan honour, and the Roman boaſt;
" Admir'd when living, and ador'd when loſt!
" Mirror of antient faith, in early youth!
" Undaunted worth, inviolable truth!
" No foe unpuniſh'd in the fighting field,
" Shall dare thee, foot to foot, with ſword and
" ſhield.
" Much leſs, in arms, oppoſe thy matchleſs force,
" When thy ſharp ſpurs ſhall urge the foaming
" horſe.
" Ah, cou'dſt thou break through fate's ſevere
" decree,
" A new Marcellus ſhall ariſe in thee!
" Full caniſters of fragrant lilies bring,
" Mix'd with the purple roſes of the ſpring:
" Let me with funeral flowers his body ſtrow,
" This gift which parents to their children owe,
" This unavailing gift at leaſt I may beſtow.

Dryden.

The Emperor and Octavia burſt into tears at the reading

ble [D]. Octavia withdrew to a deep ſolitude, where, in the deepeſt melancholy, ſhe ſpent the remainder of her days. She died in 744 (k), leaving two daughters ſhe had brought Mark Anthony, and who both married to very great advantage (l). Thoſe who ſay that ſhe was not Auguſtus's ſiſter by the mother's ſide, are miſtaken [E].

(k) Dio, Lib. 54. p. 625.

(l) See the article ANTONIA.

OCTAVIA,

reading of theſe verſes; and Virgil was obliged to inform them the book was near ending, otherwiſe they would not have let him go on. He was rewarded in a very ſplendid manner. *Et conſtat hunc librum tanta pronuntiatione Auguſto & Octaviæ eſſe recitatum, ut fletu nimio imperarent ſilentium; niſi Virgilius finem eſſe dixiſſet, qui pro hoc ære gravi donatus eſt, id eſt, maſſis* (16). Others ſay that Octavia fainted away at theſe words,

(16) Servius, *in* Æneid. Lib. 6. verſe 862.

Tu Marcellus eris——

i. e. *A new Marcellus ſhall ariſe in thee*, and that was with the greateſt difficulty ſhe was recovered: after which ſhe rewarded the Poet with a conſiderable ſum for every verſe. *Tres omnino libros recitavit, ſecundum videlicet, quartum & ſextum, ſed hunc præcipue ob Octaviam, quæ cum recitationi intereſſet, ad illos de filio ſuo verſus,* Tu Marcellus eris, *defeciſſe fertur atque ægrè refocillata, dena ſeſtertia pro ſingulo verſu Virgilio dari juſſit* (17). Marcellus died the year of Rome 731 (18). Authors are univerſally agreed that he died very young, but few give his exact age. This Propertius has done (19), he declaring him to have been twenty, in which he ſeems to write with more truth than Servius, who ſays he was but eighteen (20). Glandorpius is miſtaken, in affirming that Servius ſaid he was twenty three (21). He aſſerts, elſewhere (22), without citing any author, that Marcellus died at twenty four years of age.

(17) Donatus, *in* Vita Virgil.

(18) Dio, Lib. 53. *circa fin.*

(19) Propert. Eleg. 17. Lib. 3.

(20) Servius, *in* Virgil. Æn. Lib. 6. verſe 862.

(21) Gland. Onomaſt. p. 233.

(22) Ibid. p. 434.

[D] . . . *She continued for ever inconſolable.*] In my opinion, the particulars of her affliction were worth the notice of all thoſe hiſtorians who mention her and her ſon; they being ſo vaſtly ſingular that they have almoſt the air of a prodigy. Octavia grew ſo ſick of the world, that ſhe ſought for nothing but ſolitude, and ſhe even was diſpleaſed at her brother's glory. The being a mother was enough to become the object of her indignation. She did not keep any portrait of her ſon; would never hear him mentioned, and rejected all the verſes which were made in honour of his memory (23). Seneca is the only author, who informs us of theſe particulars: and he is ſo circumſtantial on this occaſion, that his words deſerve to be tranſcribed. *Octavia Marcellum, cui & avunculus & ſocer incumbere cæperat, in quem onus imperii reclinare: adoleſcentem animo alacrem, ingenio potentem; ſed & frugalitatis continentiæque in illis aut annis aut opibus non mediocriter admirandum; patientem laborum, voluptatibus alienum; quantumcumque imponere illi avunculus, & (ut ita dicam) inædificare voluiſſet, laturum. Benè legerat nulli ceſſura ponderi fundamenta. Nullum finem, per omne vitæ ſuæ tempus, fiendi gemendique fecit: nec ullas admiſit voces, ſalutare aliquid afferentes: ne avocari quidem ſe paſſa eſt. Intenta in unam rem, & toto animo affixa, talis per omnem vitam fuit, qualis in funere: non dico non auſa conſurgere, ſed allevari recuſans: ſecundam orbitatem judicans, lacrimas omittere. Nullam habere imaginem filii cariſſimi voluit, nullam ſibi fieri de illo mentionem. Oderat omnes matres, & in Liviam maximè furebat: quia videbatur ad illius filium tranſiſſe, ſibi promiſſa felicitas. Tenebris & ſolitudini familiariſſima, ne ad fratrem quidem reſpiciens, carmina celebrandæ Marcelli memoriæ compoſita, alioſque ſtudiorum honores rejecit, & aures ſuas adverſus omne ſolatium clauſit, à ſolemnibus officiis ſeducta, & ipſam magnitudinis fraternæ nimis circumlucentem fortunam exoſa, defodit ſe, & abdidit. Aſſidentibus liberis, nepotibus, lugubrem veſtem non depoſuit; non ſine contumeliâ omnium ſuorum, quibus ſalvis orba ſibi videbatur* (24), i. e. "Octavia bewailed with tears, ſo long as ſhe lived, the "death of Marcellus, on whoſe ſhoulders his uncle "and father-in-law was thinking to lay the bur-"then of Empire: a youth of a chearful diſpoſition, "and a very ſtrong genius. So great was his tempe-"rance and reſerve, that it was juſtly the ſubject of ad-"miration in one ſo young and of ſuch high quality; "he was patient under toils, and averſe to pleaſures; "and able to ſupport all that his uncle might be de-"ſirous of laying, or (if I may uſe the expreſſion) of "building upon him. Such foundations were laid as "could never be ſhaken. She would not allow any "perſon to adminiſter the leaſt conſolation to her, "nor could be prevailed with to take the leaſt diver-"ſion. Having fixed her whole mind and ſoul on "this ſingle object, ſuch was her deportment through-"out the whole courſe of her life, as if ſhe had "been at a funeral; I don't ſay not daring to riſe, "but refuſing to be lifted up; imagining that, were "ſhe to refrain from tears, it would be a ſecond loſs "to her. She would not have any image or por-"trait of her deareſt ſon, nor allow the leaſt mention "to be made of him. She had all mothers in ab-"horrence; but directed her rage chiefly againſt "Livia, becauſe the happineſs ſhe had promiſed her-"ſelf ſeemed to be transferred to her ſon. Solitude "and darkneſs were her delight, not having any re-"gard for her brother. She rejected all poems wrote "in honour of Marcellus's memory, and compliments "of every kind. She was deaf to all conſolation, "withdrawing from every ſort of ſolemnity; and "abhorring even her brother's too dazzling great-"neſs, ſhe hid, and buried herſelf. She appeared in "her weeds, before her children and grandchildren; "a circumſtance that gave great diſguſt to her family; "as though ſhe had ſeemed to be bereaved of them, "notwithſtanding they were living and well."

(23) This does not agree with what I mentioned in the foregoing remark.

(24) Senec. Conſol. *ad* Marciam, c. 2. p. m. 736, 737.

[E] *Thoſe who ſay that ſhe was not Auguſtus's ſiſter by the mother's ſide, are miſtaken.*] Plutarch has committed this error. He imagines that our Octavia was the daughter of Ancharia, firſt wife of Caius Octavius; and that Atia, ſecond wife of this Octavius, was Auguſtus's mother (25). But the contrary may be ſhewn many ways. Glandorpius (26) furniſhes two very good ones, the firſt being founded on a paſſage of Cicero, and the ſecond on a paſſage of Dion. The latter ſays that Caius Marcellus made Conſul in 703 (27), was Julius Cæſar's enemy though his relation by marriage. Τῷ Καίσαρι καίπερ ἐξ ἐπιγαμίας προσήκων ἐχθρὸς ἦν. *Cæſaris quamquam cum eo ipſi affinitas intercedebat, inimicus erat* (28). Now this kindred or relation aroſe from this Marcellus's marriage with Octavia. His wife muſt therefore have been Atius's daughter; for had ſhe been Ancharia's daughter, ſhe would not have been Julius Cæſar's relation. Had Glandorpius confirmed this by a paſſage from Suetonius, his proof would have amounted to a demonſtration. Suetonius informs us, that Julius Cæſar was deſirous of marrying Octavia, the wife of Caius Marcellus, and his ſiſter's grandaughter; that he was deſirous, I ſay, of marrying her to Pompey. *Ad retinendam autem Pompeji neceſſitudinem ac voluntatem, Octaviam ſororis ſuæ neptem, quæ C. Marcello nupta erat, conditione ei detulit* (29). With regard to the paſſage in Cicero, it informs us that Lucius Philippus was married to a woman of Aricia, who had a daughter married to Caius Marcellus. This wife of Lucius Philippus was Auguſtus's mother (30). 'Tis therefore indiſputably true, that the wife of Caius Marcellus was that Emperor's ſiſter by the mother's ſide; for, to uſe the words of a Journaliſt, *no perſon can ever think it falſe*, that the wife of this Marcellus was the daughter of that Philip's wife, *ſince 'tis ridiculous to ſuppoſe, that Cicero had made ſuch an aſſertion in open Senate, without well knowing it to be a truth* (31). 'Tis in the third Philippic that Cicero ſays this. Doubtleſs Lucius Philippus, and Caius Marcellus, were preſent when he ſpoke it, as Perizonius obſerves (32), *Sed hoc clariſſimi viri viderint, L. Philippus qui habet Aricinam uxorem, C. Marcellus qui Aricinæ filiam: quos certo ſcio dignitatis optimarum feminarum non pœnitere* (33), i. e. "But let thoſe "illuſtrious men look to this; L. Philippus, whoſe "wife is of Aricia, and C. Marcellus, who mar-"ried an Arician's daughter; who, I am certain "entertain no mean idea of the dignity of thoſe "excellent women." In this manner Cicero ends his anſwer to an objection of Mark Anthony againſt Octavia; an objection, I ſay, grounded on Octavia's mother being born in Aricia (34). *Ignobilitatem objicit C, Cæſæris filio: cujus etiam naturalis pater, ſi*

(25) Plut. *in* Anton. p. 929 [D].

(26) Gland. Onomaſt. p. 86.

(27) 704, according to others.

(28) Dio, Lib. 40. p. 166.

(29) Sueton. *in* Cæſare, c. 27.

(30) Sueton. *in* Auguſt. c. 8.

(31) *Nouv. de la Republique des Lettres*, June 1685. article 1. p. 597.

(32) Animadv. Hiſt. p. 116.

(33) Cic. Philipp. 3. p. m. 782.

(34) Idem, ib. p. 781.

OCTAVIA, daughter of the imperial Claudius and Meſſalina, was born the year of Rome 795 [*A*]. She was bethrothed very young to Lucius Silanus; but this contract was broke by the ambitious artifices of Agrippina, who was deſirous of marrying Octavia to Nero her ſon. It was neceſſary to make uſe of ſome ſpecious pretences on this occaſion, and ſome were found. Vitellius, an artful courtier and great flatterer, undertook to do this; and accordingly drew up a ſpacious accuſation [*B*], by virtue of which he diveſted

vita ſuppeditaſſet, Conſul factus eſſet. Aricina mater. Suetonius's teſtimony is expreſs againſt Plutarch. *Decedens Macedonia* (C. Octavius) *prius quam profiteri ſe candidatum conſulatus poſſet, morte obiit repentina, ſuperſtitibus liberis, Octavia majore, quam ex Ancharia: & Octavia minore; item Auguſto, quos ex Atia tulerat* (35), i. e. "Caius Octavius leaving "Macedon, before he could ſet up as a Candidate "for the Conſulate, was ſnatched away ſuddenly; "leaving the following iſſue, the elder Octavia "whom Ancharia had brought him; and Octavia "the younger, with Auguſtus, his children by his "wife Atia." See Perizonius, who has ſet all theſe reaſons in a fair light, to ſhew the error of Plutarch, which was followed by Antoninus Auguſtinus, Juſtus Lipſius, and ſome other Literati (36). The author of *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* expatiated very much on this criticiſm, in giving the extract of Perizonius's work. But he committed a conſiderable miſtake, in ſaying that Marcellus's wife was *the daughter of Aricina* (37). This expreſſion ſignifies that *Aricina* was the name of that Lady's family, which is abſolutely falſe, it being only an epithet given her becauſe ſhe was born in *Aricia*. The learned Manutius affirms, that Octavius's mother was not born there; and wonders how ſhe came to have ſuch a ſirname. *Miror autem Aricinam Atiam eſſe dictam, cum nec ipſa nec pater ejus Balbus Ariciæ natus eſſet, fuit enim, Suetonio teſte, paterna ſtirpe Aricinus* (38), i. e. "I wonder how Atia happened to be called a "native of Aricia, ſince neither herſelf, nor Balbus "her father, were born in Aricia; he being an "Arician by the father's ſide, according to Sueto-"nius." But he is greatly in the wrong in ſpeaking after this manner; for if Atius and his daughter had not been natives of Aricia, Cicero could not have failed to make uſe of that proof, in order to convict of an untruth, Mark Anthony, who upbraided Octavius's mother with being born in that country. He was too well ſkilled in the art of refuting, and too dextrous in taking advantages of the moſt inconſiderable circumſtances, to have overlooked ſo flagrant a falſhood in his adverſary. Since therefore he grants the matter of fact, and only refutes the conſequence which Mark Anthony had drawn from it; we cannot doubt but that Manutius had made a very falſe remark on this occaſion. But then, will it be objected, where will become of the paſſage from Suetonius? I anſwer, that it reſembles a phraſe frequently enough employed by the French writers. They ſay that ſuch a man is *originaire* (ſprung from) ſuch a place (39); and mean, not only that his anceſtors were born there, but likewiſe himſelf. I own that this expreſſion is not very accurate in the laſt ſenſe. *Originaire*, in writers who pretend to be extremely correct, relates only to a man's father, grandfather, *&c.* But who will pretend to ſay that Suetonius ever ſet up for a very accurate writer?

Perizonius has juſtly cenſured Triſtan, who imagined that the mother of Marcellus, Auguſtus's ſon-in-law, was not married to Mark Anthony. He grounds his aſſertion on the paſſage of Seneca, relating to the deep affliction, with which that Lady was ſeized on account of her dear ſon. *Whatever is here ſaid of Octavia*, ſays Triſtan (40), after citing the paſſage in queſtion from Seneca, *cannot, in my opinion, be any ways underſtood of her (of the two Octavia's, ſiſter to Auguſtus) whoſe ſecond husband was Mark Anthony. For that ſo ſingular and ſavage a way of life, of a woman, who was every day drowned in tears, and who eclipſed the ſplendor and luſtre of her auguſt houſe, in darkneſs, retirement, and in ſhunning, to the utmoſt of her power, company and light, covering her ceaſeleſs grief with mournful weeds; cannot be reconciled with what hiſtory relates concerning her marriage with Mark Anthony; of what followed thereupon; of the honours and extreme affliction which Auguſtus had for her; of the great honours which was paid her elſewhere, particularly in Corinth, where, as Pauſanias informs us in his* Corinthiaca, *a temple was built to her; with the reputation ſhe enjoyed and deſerved,* viz. *of being a brave, conſtant, and virtuous wife; and of bringing up the ſeven children whom Mark Anthony had by her and Cleopatra* (41), *as though they had been her own, though he had put her from him. To conclude, with all the honourable particulars related concerning her in hiſtory.* His opinion is therefore, that the oldeſt of Auguſtus's ſiſters was married to Marcellus, and fell into the diſconſolate ſtate mentioned by Seneca, and that the youngeſt married Mark Anthony. Now this is a falſe ſuppoſition, and raiſing ſcruples about a mere trifle; for had he but called to mind, that Octavia was married to Mark Anthony, almoſt ſeventeen years before the death of young Marcellus, he might very eaſily have reconciled Seneca with the other authors (42). In the *Journal des Savans* (43) is a learned *Diſſertation on the true degree of conſanguinity, between Auguſtus and Octavia*, communicated to the Journaliſt by an able antiquary (44), and a man of honour. In that diſſertation he ſets the truth in the cleareſt light; but is a little miſtaken in ſtating Triſtan's objection. The Octavia of Marcellus, ſays he (45), *whom Suetonius calls young Octavia* †, *had already been propoſed for a wife to Pompey by her great uncle; ſo that ſhe was twice conſidered as an inſtrument of reconciliation. This furniſhes us with an anſwer to the objection made by ſome moderns, who, becauſe they read in Seneca* §, *that the widow of Marcellus was inconſolable, after her husband's death, declare that ſhe was not afterwards married to Mark Anthony; it being well known, that perſons of ſuch exalted quality are commonly victims to the government. Octavia, in ſpite of her grief, was forced to conſent to this ſecond marriage for the good of the publick, and her brother's intereſt; and 'tis highly probable, that 'twas merely from a political view Mark Anthony was prompted to marry a woman, whoſe extraction he had inveigh'd againſt: accordingly, he abandoned her ſoon after, to devote himſelf entirely to Cleopatra.* 'Tis plain this writer ſuppoſes, that Triſtan quoted Seneca to prove that this abovementioned Lady was inconſolable for her huſband's death. Nevertheleſs he does not quote him, and ought not to be quoted upon any account, but to ſhew the deep affliction into which her ſon's death threw her. 'Tis alſo plain, that he ſuppoſes that Octavia named, with the utmoſt reluctance, Mark Anthony, in the afflicted ſtated in which ſhe is drawn by Seneca. But if the Reader conſults the laſt mentioned Author, he will find this ſuppoſition entirely groundleſs.

[*A*] *She . . . was born the year of Rome* 795.] If we may credit Tacitus; but there is ſome reaſon to believe he is miſtaken. He relates (1) that Octavia was in her twentieth year, when ſhe was put to death; and that this was under the Conſulate of P. Marius and L. Aſinius, *i. e.* the year of Rome 815. This implies therefore, that ſhe was born in the year 795: but ſince he has fixed (2) her marriage with Nero, under the Conſulſhip of D. Junius and Q. Haterius, *i. e.* the year of Rome 806, we muſt conclude that ſhe was then, at leaſt, twelve years of age, and conſequently that ſhe was born in the year 794. Add to this, that her father betrothed her to Silanus, in the firſt year of his reign (3), *i. e.* the year of Rome 793; and that Suetonius gives us to underſtand that Britannicus was born after her (4). Now Britannicus was born the twentieth day of his father's empire (5).

[*B*] *Vitellius, an artful courtier . . . drew up a ſpecious accuſation.*] One of the moſt advantageous qualities a courtier can poſſeſs, is to foreſee, from far, thoſe perſons, for whom fortune is preparing her moſt ſhining favours; for the ſervices which are done them beforehand, whilſt they are aggrandizing themſelves,

(35) Suet. *in* Auguſt. c. 4.

(36) Jac. Perizon. Animadv. Hiſt. p. 116, *& ſeq.*

(37) *Nouv. de la Republique des Lettres*, for June 1685, article 1. p. 597.

(38) Paulus Manut. *in* Cicer. Philipp. 3. p. m. 782.

(39) Moreri often employs that phraſe.

(40) Triſtan. *Comment. Hiſtoriques*, vol. 1. p. 54.

(41) Why does not Triſtan take ſome notice of the children of Mark Anthony and Fulvia, brought up by Octavia? How comes he to be ignorant of what Plutarch ſays in Antonio, p. 955. that, of the ſeven children whom Mark Anthony left behind him (including the two daughters whom Octavia had brought him) the eldeſt was killed by Auguſtus, and the other ſix were brought up by Octavia?

(42) See Perizonius, *Animadv. Hiſtoric.* p. 120. and the *Nouv. de la Republique des Lettres*, for June 1685, art. 1. p. 598.

(43) Of January 21, 1686, p. 25 *& ſeq.* Dutch edit.

(44) Mr. Rainſſant, Phyſician in Rheims, Keeper of the medals in the King's cabinet.

(45) *Journal des Savans*, for Jan. 21, 1686, p. 27, 28.

† Suet. Jul. 27.

§ Senec. *Conſ. ad Marc.*

(1) Tacitus, Annal. Lib. 14. c. 64.

(2) Idem, Annal. Lib. 12. c. 58.

(3) Dio, Lib. 60. p. 668. cited by Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* Tom. 1. p. 1019.

(4) Suetonius *in* Claudio, c. 28.

(5) Idem, ibid.

diveſted Silanus of his ſenatorial Dignity. Octavia was betrothed ſoon after to Agrippina's ſon, and was married to him when he had attained his ſixteenth year (*a*): but becauſe Claudius had adopted him, *ſhe was transferred to another family by a ſimulated adoption* (*b*); otherwiſe this would have been an inceſtuous marriage. She was very unhappy in it, her huſband immediately entertaining an averſion for her [*C*], and divorcing her upon pretence that ſhe was barren. Poppea, who married him the inſtant after, ſuborned a man, who accuſed Octavia of being engaged in a criminal correſpondence with one of her ſlaves (*c*). Accordingly the female attendants of that Princeſs were put to the torture, to oblige them to inform againſt their miſtreſs. Some of them, unable to bear up under the violence of the torments, accuſed her; but the greateſt part of them had the courage to pronounce her innocent; and one of them employed a very particular expreſſion on that occaſion [*D*]. However, Octavia was baniſhed, and a ſtrong guard ſet

(*a*) Tacitus, Annal. Lib. 12. p. 58.

(*b*) Dio, Lib. 60. p. 687. cited by Tillemont, Tom. 1. p. 391.

(*c*) Tacitus, Annal. Lib. 14. c. 60.

ſelves, aſpire them with greater gratitude, than for thoſe ſervices which are done them when they are raiſed to the zenith of power and authority. Vitellius had the talent to foreſee thoſe perſons whom fortune prepared for future grandeur. By this talent he knew that the Emperor Claudius would marry Agrippina, and that ſhe would manage her conſort as ſhe pleaſed. The artifices of the wife, and the huſband's imbecillity, were ſure foundations for this prognoſtic. 'Tis therefore no wonder, that Vitellius ſet every engine at work to ruin Silanus, for Agrippina's intereſt required him to fall a ſacrifice. She wanted Octavia to be at liberty to be betrothed to Nero; and, before this could be done, it was neceſſary to diſengage her from her contract with Silanus. Silanus had a ſiſter very famous for her beauty and gaiety. There were no proofs that he had enjoy'd her perſon; but then he had not taken the leaſt care to conceal the paſſion he had for her. This gave Vitellius an opportunity of diveſting him of the ſenatorial dignity; for being Cenſor, he was impowered by his office to remove all perſons who behaved ill. The inſtant Silanus had been thus diſgraced, Claudius broke off the match, and obliged Silanus to diveſt himſelf of the Pretorſhip. But Tacitus's words give a nobler account than I can of this affair. *Igitur Vitellius nomine Cenſoris ſerviles fallacias obtegens, ingruentiumque dominationum proviſor, quo gratiam Agrippinæ pararet, conſiliis ejus implicari, ferere crimina in Silanum, cui ſane decora & procax ſoror Junia Calvina haud multum ante Vitellii nurus fuerat: hinc initium accuſationis, fratrumque non inceſtum, ſed incuſtoditum amorem ad infamiam traxit. Et præbebat Cæſar aures, accipiendis adverſum generum ſuſpicionibus caritate filiæ promptior. At Silanus inſidiarum neſcius, ac forte eo anno prætor, repente per edictum Vitellii ordine ſenatorio movetur, quamquam lecto pridem ſenatu, luſtroque condito. Simul affinitatem Claudius diremit; adactuſque Silanus ejurare magiſtratum, & reliquus præturæ dies in Eprium Marcellum collatus eſt* (6). Silanus killed himſelf on the day that Claudius and Agrippina were married. His ſiſter was ſent into baniſhment, and expiations were appointed on account of their inceſtuous commerce. The whole world laughed at this, becauſe the Emperor, who gave orders for theſe expiations, had himſelf ſo lately engaged in an inceſtuous marriage. *Die nuptiarum Silanus ſibi mortem conſcivit; ſive eo uſque ſpem vitæ produxerat, ſeu delecto die, augendam ad invidiam. Calvina ſoror ejus Italia pulſa eſt. Addidit Claudius, ſacra ex legibus Tullii regis, piaculaque apud lucum Dianæ per pontifices danda: inridentibus cunctis, quod pœnæ procurationeſque inceſti id temporis exquirerentur* (7).

(6) Tacitus, Annal. lib. 12. c. 4. ad ann. 801.

(7) Idem, ibid. c. 8.

[*C*] *Her huſband immediately entertained an averſion for her.*] His friends obſerved to him, that he was greatly in the wrong to have his wife ſo ſoon in contempt, and to deprive her of thoſe blandiſhments and careſſes which he owed to her, as being her huſband. *Let her reſt ſatisfied*, ſays he, *with being called my wife; for this is an ornament and honour that ought to content her.* Fine contemplation indeed! *Octaviæ conſuetudinem cito adſpernatus, corripientibus amicis, ſufficere illi debere reſpondit uxoria ornamenta. Eandem mox ſæpe fruſtra ſtrangulare meditatus, dimiſit ut ſterilem, ſed improbante divortium populo, nec parcente convitiis, etiam relegavit. Denique occidit ſub crimine adulteriorum, adeo impudenti falſoque, ut in quæſtione pernegantibus cunctis, Anicetum pædagogum ſuum indicem ſubjecerit, qui dolo ſtupratam à ſe fateretur* (8). *i. e.* "Having ſoon "deſpiſed his wife's careſſes, and his friends repro- "ving him for it, he replied, that ſhe ought to be "contented with having the honour of being his "conſort. Intending ſoon after to ſtrangle her, and "being diſappointed in his horrid deſign, he put "her from him, upon pretence that ſhe was barren: "but the people being diſpleaſed at him for divor- "cing her, and exclaiming againſt him on that ac- "count, he ſent her into baniſhment. At laſt he "put her to death, upon pretence of her having been "guilty of adulterous practices; but the charge was "ſo ſcandalous and falſe, that, upon its being denied "by all the witneſſes when put to the rack, he "prevailed with Anicetus, who had been his ſchool- "maſter, to confeſs that he had debauched her by "a ſtratagem." 'Twas doubtleſs a freſh mortification to Octavia, to ſee Nero fall diſtractedly in love with a maid-ſervant, and perſons of the greateſt wiſdom conniving at ſo ſhameful a conduct: for theſe had rather he ſhould ſatiate his luſt with that creature, who did not concern herſelf with affairs of government, rather than ſee him ſtrike at the honour of the moſt illuſtrious Ladies, as he would infallibly have done, had he not been ſmit with the ſervant-wench in queſtion; he not being endued with the gift of continence, and making no uſe of his wife. He had not the leaſt affection for her; whether this aroſe from ſome natural antipathy, or that he was infinitely more delighted with unlawful pleaſures, than with thoſe of a lawful kind. I will cite a Roman Author, to ſhew the antiquity of this ridiculouſly-abominable conduct in love ſo much in vogue. *Delapſo Nerone in amorem libertæ cui vocabulum* Acte *fuit . . . ne ſevérioribus quidem principis amicis adverſantibus, muliercula nulla cujuſquam injuria cupidines principis explente: quando uxore ab Octavia nobili quidem, & probitatis ſpectatæ, fato quodam, ad quia prævalent illicita, abhorrebat: metuebaturque ne in ſtupra feminarum illuſtrium prorumperet, ſi illa libidine prohiberetur* (9).

(8) Sueton. *in* Nerone, c. 35.

(9) Tacitus, Annal. lib. 13. c. 12.

[*D*] *One of her female attendants employ'd a very particular expreſſion on that account.*] Tigellinus, a creature the moſt devoted to the moſt infamous and moſt cruel paſſions of Nero, was preſent, when Octavia's maids were put to the torture, and was urgent with them to confeſs the accuſations which were laid to their miſtreſs's charge (10). One of them made him the following reply; *Her private parts are chaſter than thy mouth. Actæ ob id de ancillis quæſtiones, & vi tormentorum victis quibuſdam, ut falſa annuerent, plures perſtitere ſanctitatem dominæ tueri. Ex quibus una inſtanti Tigellino, caſtiora eſſe muliebria Octaviæ, reſpondit, quàm os ejus* (11). Dion informs us that ſhe was called Pythias; but declares that ſhe was the only one among Octavia's female attendants who was faithful, and that all the reſt betray'd her, in order to make their court to Poppea. He adds, that Pythias ſpit in Tigellinus's face, ſaying the words juſt mentioned. The Greek words of Dion are as free, at leaſt, as Tacitus's Latin. Μόνη δ' ἡ Πυθιὰς ὅτί τι καὶ ἐφιύσαλο αὐτῆς, καίπερ πικρόταλα βασανισθεῖσα, ἢ τίλ☉ ὡς ὁ Τιγελλῖν☉ ἐνέκειλο αὐτῇ, προσέπλυσέ τε αὐτῷ καὶ εἶπε, Καθαρώτερον, ὦ Τιγελλῖνε, τὸ αἰδοῖόν ἡ δέσποινά μου τοῦ σοῦ σ'όμαλ☉ ἔχει, i. e. *Sola Pythias, licet acerrimis tormentis coacta, noluit in eam mentiri: quumque Tigellinus inſtaret vehementius, faciem ejus conſputt, Mundior eſt (inquit) Tigelline, vulva dominæ meæ, quàm os tuum* (12). By the way, the ſervant, whom it was pretended this Princeſs had had an intrigue with, was a flute-player.

(10) Xiphilin. *in* Nerone, p. m. 176.

(11) Tacitus, Annal. lib. 14. c. 60.

(12) Xiphil. *in* Nerone, p. 176.

ſet over her ; but the common people, who generally are bolder than thoſe who have poſts and employments to loſe, murmured to ſuch a degree, that Nero was determined to recall her. *Inde crebri queſtus, nec occulti per vulgum, cui minor ſapientia, & ex mediocritate fortunæ pauciora pericula ſunt* (*d*). Words could never expreſs the joy that was ſpread univerſally over Rome at the return of this Princeſs, nor the honours that were paid her (*e*). Poppea thought ſhe ſhould be ruined in caſe ſhe did not ruin Octavia, for which reaſon ſhe fell at Nero's feet, and inforced her intreaties with ſo many political reaſons, that her deſires were ſatisfied (*f*) : for Nero prevailed with a man, who had diſpatched his mother [*E*], to ſwear that he had lain with Octavia, upon which ſhe was baniſhed to an iſland ; and forced, a few days after, to bleed herſelf to death, then her head was cut off, and preſented to her rival (*g*). Nero changed his note ; for having before complained that Octavia was barren, he now charged her with deſtroying the fruit of her womb [*F*]. This

(*d*) Tacitus, Annal. Lib. 14. c. 60.

(*e*) Idem, ibid. c. 61.

(*f*) Tacitus, Lib. 14. c. 61.

(*g*) Idem, ibid. c. 63, 64.

player. *Quemdam ex miniſtris Octaviæ impulit, ſervilem ei amorem objicere. Deſtinaturque reus cognomento Eucærus, natione Alexandrinus, canere tibiis doctus* (13). Muſicians are lucky fellows; and it is my opinion, that among the profeſſions in this claſs, none can furniſh ſo great a number of perſons as theſe, who have been ſuſpected by Kings and Princes. Nevertheleſs, Nero did not think it probable that Octavia had committed adultery with this man ; he thinking his ſtation of life too low, to give riſe to the leaſt juſt ſuſpicions of that kind. *Parum valebat ſuſpicio in ſervo* (14).

(13) Tacitus, Annal. lib. 14. c. 60.

(14) Tacitus, ibid. c. 62.

[*E*] *Nero prevailed with a man, who had diſpatched his mother.*] This man, if Suetonius (15) may be credited, was Nero's maſter ; but Tacitus informs us, that he commanded the fleet which that Emperor had at Miſenus. Ever ſince the time that Nero had employed him to murder Agrippina, he at firſt treated him with ſome coldneſs, but at laſt hated him ; for the ſight of thoſe who have been employed to perpetrate mighty crimes, is no ways agreeable, it being thought that they are for ever reproaching their guilt. *Levi poſt admiſſum ſcelus gratia, dein graviore odio : quia malorum facinorum miniſtri quaſi exprobantes adſpiciuntur* (16). But wanting him to execute a freſh crime, he was extremely kind ; putting him in mind of the former ſervices he had done him, which he declared was of the higheſt importance ; and told him, that now he had another opportunity of doing him another, which was no leſs eſſential ; and was only this, to declare that he had lain with Octavia. He promiſed this man a handſome, tho' not an immediate, reward ; but threatened to murder him in caſe he refuſed to comply. *Accitum eum Cæſar operæ prioris admonet ; ſolum incolumitati Principis adverſus inſidiantem matrem ſubveniſſe ; locum haud minoris gratiæ inſtare, ſi conjugem infenſam depelleret. Nec manu aut telo opus. Fateretur Octaviæ adulterium. Occulta quidem ad præſens, ſed magna ei præmia, & receſſus amœnos promittit ; vel ſi negaviſſet, necem intentat* (17). This villain promiſed to comply with whatever Nero deſired of him ; and he even declared more falſities than had been deſired. He was baniſhed to Sardinia for form ſake ; but lived calm and undiſturbed in that iſland, and there died a natural death. *In Sardiniam pellitur, ubi non inops exſilium toleravit, & fato obiit* (18).

(15) I cited his words above, remark [*C*].

(16) Idem, ibid.

(17) Idem, ibid.

(18) Ibid.

It will not, in my opinion, be improper to make a reflection or two on Suetonius's relation. It cannot be denied but that this author epitomizes with ſkill, but he ſometimes carries the contracting art too far, whereby it ſometimes happens, that the intervals and diſtinctions of events do not always appear in his works. Here follows an inſtance of what I now aſſert. He makes the injuſtice of Nero towards Octavia to riſe but by three ſteps or degrees (19) She was firſt divorced, as being barren ; afterwards baniſh'd becauſe the people exclaimed againſt Nero for divorcing her ; and laſtly, put to death, upon pretence of her having committed adultery ; though all who had been put to the torture denied it, and Anicetus only depoſed that he had lain with her by a ſtratagem. If the reader conſults Tacitus, he will not doubt but that Suetonius has committed ſome errors on this occaſion. The misfortunes of this Princeſs ought, according to Tacitus, to be ranked or diſpoſed in the following manner. Nero's falling in love with Poppea, made him weary of his wife, and reſolve to divorce her. Accordingly Octavia was divorced, upon pretence of barrenneſs, and Nero married Poppea. And now, by the artifices and intrigues of this latter, Octavia was impeached as guilty of adultery, when her female attendants being put to the torture, moſt of them inſiſted ſhe was a woman of ſtrict virtue ; nevertheleſs the decree of divorce continued in force, and after ſome preſents had been beſtowed upon her, *Domumque Burri, & prædia Plauti, infauſta dona accepit* (20), ſhe was baniſhed to Campania, and there put under an arreſt. However, the murmurs of the common people, or ſome remorſe of conſcience, obliged Nero to recal her ; which delighted the people to ſuch a degree, that Poppea did not think ſhe could be ſafe unleſs Octavia was put to death. Accordingly ſhe applied ſo artfully to the Emperor on this occaſion, that he prevailed with Anicetus to depoſe that he had lain with Octavia, upon which the unhappy Princeſs in queſtion was carried to the iſland of Pandathara, and there put to death. It does not appear that ſhe returned to Rome after the divorce, ſhe being ſtill in Campania, where the people diſcovered ſo much joy for her being recalled, as appears from the following words of Poppea : *Vitam ipſam in extremum adductam à clientelis & ſervitiis Octaviæ, quæ plebis ſibi nomen indiderint, ea in pace auſis quæ vix bello evenirent. Arma illa adverſus principem ſumpta. Ducem tantum defuiſſe, qui motis rebus facile reperiretur. Omitteret modo Campaniam, & in urbem ipſam pergeret, ad cujus nutum abſentis tumultus cierentur* (21) ; and as the rejoicings abovementioned by the people, made Poppea intreat Nero to make away with Octavia, and that her requeſt was indulged ; 'tis not probable that the order for Octavia's return was ever put in execution ; and therefore the following words of Tacitus, *conjugem revocavit Octaviam* (22), i. e. " He recalled his wife Octavia," are a little fallacious. But Suetonius's faults are much more inexcuſable. 'Tis manifeſt he has confounded the incidents, and omitted particulars, the omiſſion of which is not to be permitted, for the ſake of being conciſe. Is it any way probable, that the falſe witneſs, whom Nero ſuborned, ſhould depoſe, that he was obliged to employ artifice, in order to ſatiate his paſſion with Octavia ? Was not this extenuating the guilt of that Princeſs ? And this was not what Nero wanted. 'Tis to be obſerved, that Triſtian ſuppoſes, that Octavia returned actually to her huſband, and even that ſhe was recalled from the iſland of Pandathara (23) ; the former circumſtance is no ways probable, and the latter is abſolutely falſe.

(19) See his words in the remark [*C*].

(20) Tacitus, Annal. lib. 14. c. 60.

(21) Ibid. c. 51.

(22) Ibid. c. 60.

(23) Triſtan, *Comment. Hiſt.* Tom. 1. p. 138.

[*F*] Nero *charged her with deſtroying the fruit of her womb.*] I have met with ſome people, who found fault with Tacitus, for looking upon the two pretences of Octavia's diſgrace as a contradiction. *At Nero præfectum in ſpem ſociandæ claſſis corruptum, & incuſatæ paullo ante ſterilitatis oblitus, abactos partus conſcientia libidinum, eaque ſibi comperta, edicto memorat* (24), i. e. " But Nero, forgetting that he had ſo " lately accuſed Octavia of barrenneſs, charges her, " (by an edict) with cauſing herſelf to miſcarry ſe- " veral times, in order to conceal her intrigues with " Anicetus, whom (he ſaid) ſhe had corrupted, in " the hopes of making herſelf miſtreſs of the fleet." Nero grounded Octavia's divorce, upon pretence of her being barren ; a little after which he affirmed that he knew very well, that ſhe had taken things in order to procure abortion. Now there is no contradiction in all this. When we take notice that a married woman is never with child, we juſtly ſuppoſe that ſhe is barren ; but if we diſcover that ſhe makes herſelf

(24) Tacitus, Annal. lib. 14. c. 63.

This Princeſs's life was almoſt one perpetual ſeries of ill fortune [*G*].

herſelf miſcarry, 'tis no contradiction in us to deny her being barren. Where then is Nero's contradiction? I replied to thoſe criticks, that the hiſtorian does not pretend to ſay that the Emperor was guilty of an expreſs contradiction; he only obſerved, that 'twas great imprudence in Nero, to charge Octavia with procuring abortions, a little after he had accuſed her of being barren. The imprudence did not conſiſt, in Nero's giving the world room to ſuppoſe, that he was miſinformed with regard to Octavia's conduct, at the time that he divorced her; for he might have anſwered, that the moſt ſagacious Princes are very often not quick ſighted enough, to pry into all the ſecrets of their wives bedchambers; and that chance ſometimes diſcovers to them in a ſingle hour, what their moſt viligant ſpies had been ignorant of for many years; ſo artful are the fair in concealing their intrigues. But the injuſtice of the divorce lay here. He informed the whole world, that he had not performed conjugal duty with regard to Octavia; for had he done this, ſhe would not have had any cauſe to take things to procure abortion, to conceal her adulterous practices. Now is it not a flagrant injuſtice for a huſband to put away his wife upon pretence of barrenneſs, after living with her in a manner no ways matrimonial (25). For this reaſon, Tacitus ſays nothing, that can reflect on his judgment, when he obſerves a contradiction between the Emperor's firſt and ſecond pretence. I muſt not omit one circumſtance which makes Nero's injuſtice ſtill more flagrant, *viz.* his being perſuaded at the ſame time that Octavia was a woman of virtue. The expreſs words of Nero have been recorded, which he uttered, when he imagined that an opportunity for marrying Poppea preſented itſelf. *Ipſa principis verba referam*, ſays Tacitus (26), *quin* inquit *Nero depoſito metu nuptias Poppææ ob ejuſmodi terrores dilatas maturare parat, Octaviamque conjugem amoliri, quamvis modeſte agat, & nomine patris, & ſtudiis populi gravem?* i. e. "I will repeat the Emperor's own words: Nero "laying aſide all fear, prepared to haſten his nup- "tials with Poppea, which the apprehenſions he was "under had till then ſuſpended; and to put away "his wife, notwithſtanding her modeſty, and the "reverence due to her, on account of her father's "memory and her great popularity."

(25) See the article of GUISE (CLAUDE DUKE of) remark [*A*].

(26) Tacitus, Annal. lib. 14. c. 59.

[*G*] *This Princeſs's life was almoſt one perpetual ſeries of ill fortune.*] The inhabitants of the iſland, to which ſhe was baniſhed, were more touched with her miſfortunes, than they had been with thoſe of other Ladies who had been exiled among them. Thoſe were now advanced in years, and conſequently abler to bear up under the reverſes of fortune; not to mention that they might comfort themſelves from the reflection of their paſt felicity. But Octavia was but about twenty years of age, and had always been unfortunate. The firſt year after her marriage proved a ſeaſon of mourning, becauſe of the affliction into which ſhe was plunged by her father and brother's death, who had been killed by poiſon. A concubine enjoyed all her huſband's love; ſhe herſelf was divorced, and afterwards expoſed to the violent hatred of Nero's new wife; and, at laſt, ſent into exile, as guilty of a crime, the *ſtigma* of which is more grievous than death itſelf. Nevertheleſs, it was with the utmoſt ſtruggles ſhe could think of parting with life, tho' the ſwords of the ſoldiers who guarded her were perpetually over her head; and when ſhe received orders to diſpatch herſelf, ſhe employ'd all the entreaties ſhe could think of, to ſuſpend that fatal hour. However, it was all to no purpoſe: Octavia was bound, and her veins opened; but her terrors were ſo great, that little or no blood came from her, ſo that they were obliged to ſtifle her with the ſteam of a hot bath. Tacitus paints the paſſions with ſo maſterly a hand, that every one of his lines is ſuch a ſtroke as is above imitation, for which reaſon I will cite his words (27): *Non alia exſul viſentium oculos majore miſericordia affecit. Meminerant adhuc quidam Agrippinæ, à Tiberio; recentior Juliæ memoria obverſabatur, à Claudio pulſæ. Sed illis robur ætatis affuerat. Læta aliqua viderant, & preſentem ſævitiam melioris olim fortunæ recordatione allevabant* (28). *Huic primus nuptiarum dies loco funeris fuit, deductæ in domum, in qua nihil niſi luctuoſum haberet, erepto per venenum patre, & ſtatim fratre. Tum ancilla domina validior. Et Poppæa non niſi in perniciem uxoris nupta. Poſtremo crimen omni exitio gravius. Ac puella viceſimo ætatis anno, inter centuriones & milites, præſagio malorum jam à vita exempta, nondum tamen morte acquieſcebat. Paucis dehinc interjectis diebus, mori jubetur: cum jam* viduam ſe & tantum ſororem *teſtaretur, communeſque* Germanicos & *poſtremo* Agrippinæ *nomen cieret,* qua incolumi infelix quidem matrimonium, ſed ſine exitio pertuliſſet. *Reſtringitur vinculis, venæque ejus per omnes artus exſolvuntur: & quia preſſus pavore ſanguis tardius labebatur, præfervidi balnei vapore enecatur.* He had forgot to obſerve, that Octavia, before her marriage, had ſeen her mother Meſſalina murthered. It is here ſhe begins the relation of her misfortunes, in the tragedy that bears her name, and which is printed with thoſe of Seneca. She continues it, by relating the ſeverity of Agrippina, who was doubly her ſtep-mother; and of ſuch a temper, as qualified her exactly in every reſpect for that character, and to verify whatever we are told with regard to the antipathy, which ſuch women are ſaid to entertain againſt their daughters-in-law.

(27) Idem, ibid. lib. 14. c. 63.

(28) This was purſuant to the precepts of Epicurus. Many people, on the contrary, grieve in adverſity, upon calling to mind their paſt happineſs, and ſay with one of the French Poets,

Felicité paſſée
qui ne peut revenir,
Tourment de ma penſée,
Que n'ai-je en te perdant perdu le ſouvenir!

i. e. "Paſt happineſs that can return no more: death to my thought! why did I not, in loſing thee, loſe my memory at the ſame time.

Tulimus ſævæ juſſa novercæ,
Hoſtilem animum, vultuſque truces.
Illa illa meis triſtis Erinnys
Thalamis Stygios prætulit ignes,
Teque extinxit miſerande pater.

The ſenſe is,

"Beneath a cruel ſtep-mother I groan'd.
"Her face, her mind, for ever rag'd with paſſion.
"To her, dread fury, all my ills are owing.
"'Twas ſhe brought death inſtead of nuptial joys;
"And ſent my tortur'd father to his tomb."

If Homer could not admit, that ſome perſons are ſerved only out of the bad veſſel (29); he at leaſt could have ſaid, that Jupiter does not mix above two or three drops out of the good veſſel, in the large goblet, filled with bad liquor, out of which he makes them drink. Such was the Fate of our Octavia, and yet ſhe was deſirous of living, death appearing, in her eye, more dreadful than all her calamities; but her youth ought to plead for her want of judgment on this occaſion.

(29) See the article of the MANICHEES, remark [*C*] from citation (35) to the end.

OECOLAMPADIUS (JOHN) one of the reformers of the Church in the 16th Century, was born in Winſperg in Franconia, *anno* 1482. His mother was the occaſion of his being devoted to a ſtudious life, his father intending to make a merchant of him, but changed his reſolution at the earneſt ſolicitations of his wife. They ſent their ſon to the College of Heilbrun, and afterwards to the univerſity of Heildelberg, where he took his bachelors degree at fourteen years of age. He afterwards was ſent to Bologna to ſtudy the law; and after reſiding there ſix months, he returned to Heidelberg, where he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of divinity. The authors he ſtudied with the greateſt application, where Thomas Aquinas, Richard and Gerſon; he deſpiſing the ſubtleties of Scotus, and not following the humour which prevailed at that time in the Univerſities. He took very little notice of the chicane of the ſchoolmen, and abſtained from diſputations, but endeavoured to ſtock his mind with uſeful knowledge, regardleſs of the fame which is gained in the publick exerciſes in the Univerſities. He nevertheleſs was looked upon

upon as a very learned young man. His reputation in this reſpect, joined to his well known character for virtue and wiſdom, prompted the Elector Palatine to make choice of him for preceptor to his youngeſt ſon; but being ſick of the court, after having exerciſed the employment above mentioned ſome time, he went and reſumed his theological ſtudies.

OENONE, the daughter of Cebrenus, a river of Phrygia (*a*), and wife to Paris, was, according to ſome writers, a famous ſorcereſs [*A*]. Others ſay only that ſhe was perfectly well ſkilled in the virtue of herbs, and that ſhe attained this knowledge in exchange for her maidenhead [*B*]. The gift of prophecy is alſo aſcribed to her (*b*). By her knowledge in futurity, ſhe foreſaw that her huſband's voyage to Helen would be productive of numberleſs evils; for which reaſon ſhe uſed all the arguments poſſible to divert Paris from that enterprize. Finding all her remonſtrances were to no purpoſe, ſhe foretold him that he would be wounded [*C*]; and that then he would be obliged to have recourſe to her, as the only perſon who was able to cure him (*c*). Having been wounded by Philoctetes at the ſiege of Troy, he called to mind Oenone's prediction, and therefore

(*a*) Apollodor. lib. 3. Parthenius, *in* Eroticis, c. 4.

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

(*c*) Apoll. & Parthen. ibid.

[*A*] *She was a famous Sorcereſs.*] Oenone, by the power of her incantations, could draw down the moon from the ſkies; lions grew as tame as ſheep, and rivers ran back to their ſprings. Paris affirms that he had been an eye-witneſs of all theſe things (1).

(1) In the epiſtle feigned, by Sabinus, as written by Paris; in anſwer to that which Ovid feigns Oenone had writ to him.

Quod ſi vertendæ ſpem mentis concipis hujus;
Cur ceſſant herbæ, carmina curve tua?
Nam te nec Phœbi ſollertior artibus ulla eſt;
Phœbeæque Hecates ſomnia vera vides.
Te cum ſideribus, te cum deducere Lunam
Nubibus, & memini ſurripuiſſe diem.
Paſcebam tauros: interque armenta leones
Obſtupui placidos vocibus ire tuis.
Quid retro Xanthum, retro Simoënta vocatum
Adjiciam curſus non tenuiſſe ſuos?
Ipſe pater Cebren, natæ male tutus ab ore,
Cantatus quoties reſtitit inter aquas!

" If any hope, Oenone, you retain,
" Of ever freeing me from Helen's chain,
" Quick to thoſe pow'rful herbs and arts repair,
" By which thou rul'ſt in heaven, in earth, and air.
" Not Phœbus ſelf is learneder than thee,
" Scarce are the Gods from thy ſtrong magic free.
" Thou, by the mighty workings of thine art,
" From their pale orbs the trembling ſtars canſt
" part,
" Call down the moon, the ſun's ſwift motion ſtay,
" Protract the darkneſs, and arreſt the day.
" As bulls I fed, among the herd there came
" Fierce lions, made by thy enchantments tame.
" Swift Simois and Xanthus' cryſtal wave
" Forbore to flow, when your command you gave.
" Your father Cebres waters too ſubmit;
" Nor ſlight thy charms, ſince all acknowledge it.
Saluſbury.

'Tis very probable that Apollodorus related that the nymph in queſtion practiſed magic; whence we may look upon the following words of book III. as a falſe reading; Ἡ γὰρ Οἰνώνη ἰατρικὴν καὶ μουσικὴν ἤσκει. i. e. (2) " For Oenone was verſed in the ſciences of phyſic " and muſic." If we ſubſtitute μουσικὴν, inſtead of μαγικὴν, we ſhall give a very juſt ſenſe to this author's words. He had juſt before ſaid, that Oenone carried medicines to Paris when dangerouſly wounded; if he adds, as the editions have it, *for ſhe practiſed phyſic and muſic*, he adds a groſs ſuperfluity to the context; but if he adds, *for ſhe practiſed phyſic and magic*, the ſenſe is much more proper and agreeable. Paſſerat underſtood this paſſage perfectly well, he tranſlating it as follows; *for ſhe was perfectly well ſkilled in phyſic, and the art of charming diſeaſes* (3).

(2) Apollodor. Biblioth. lib. 3. p. 227.

(3) See Meziriac, on Ovid's epiſtles, p. 460.

[*B*] *She attained to this knowledge, in exchange for her maidenhead* (4).] If the Reader peruſes Oenone's epiſtle to Paris, he will find that our nymph boaſts her having been courted by the ſatyrs, and even by Faunus himſelf; but that ſhe eluded all their amorous deſigns. She confeſſes that Apollo cropt her virgin-flower, tho' ſhe ſtruggled with all her might, and even ſcratched his face. In fine, ſhe obſerves, that ſhe did not require either gold or precious ſtones for a reward, but that Apollo revealed to her all the ſecrets of Botany; ſo that ſhe could perform a thouſand wonderful cures; but that this knowledge was of no ſervice to her in curing the paſſion of love, there being no herb capable of producing that effect.

(4) Compare this with what is ſaid of CASSANDRA, remark [*A*] of her article.

Me fide conſpicuos Trojæ munitor amavit.
Ille meæ ſpolium virginitatis habet.
Id quoque luctando, rupi tamen ungue capillos;
Oraque ſunt digitis aſpera facta meis.
Nec pretium ſtupri gemmas aurumve popoſci.
Turpiter ingenuum munera corpus emunt.
Ipſe, ratus dignam, medicas mihi tradidit artes;
Admiſitque meas ad ſua dona manus.
Quæcumque herba potens ad opem, radixque medendi
Utilis in toto naſcitur orbe, mea eſt.
Me miſeram, quod amor non eſt medicabilis herbis (5)!

(5) Ovid, *in Epiſtola Oenones ad Parid.*

" Me Faunus too, who o'er the mountains fled,
" Purſu'd, with leafy chaplets on his head;
" And Phœbus, who, but with much force, ob-
" tain'd
" That bliſs, for which the reſt in vain complain'd.
" I tore my hair, while my ſoft limbs he preſt,
" And that curſt fate for which I was digrac'd.
" No ſordid recompence of wealth I ſought;
" That creature's mean, whoſe love is to be bought:
" But me the grateful God with knowledge ſtor'd,
" And the ſame gifts for which himſelf's ador'd.
" For no one plant the fertile earth does yield,
" But in its virtues I am amply ſkill'd.
" Wretch! of what uſe does thy vain knowledge
" prove?
" No drug, alas! can cure the wounds of love.
Mr. John Cooper.

Ovid is not very obſervant of decorum and veriſimilitude. Confeſſions like theſe are ſeldom made to a huſband; and this was not a proper method to make Paris repent of his inconſtancy. For a man to be told, that he was taken for a fool, and that he falſely imagined he had cropt the virgin-flower in the nuptial bed, is far from being any agreeable piece of news; the ſcratching the inamorato's face on the one hand, and the ſecrets of phyſic on the other, are far from making up the breach. What therefore was Ovid thinking on? Tho' he had added the gift of prophecy (6) to the knowledge of plants, in the rewards beſtowed by Apollo, he would not have gilded the pill ſufficiently. Clemens Alexandrinus was not ignorant that our nymph pretended to prophecy. See, in the margin, a conjecture on his words (7).

(6) According to Apollodor. lib. 3. Oenone learnt divination of Rhea.

(7) Ἔλενον δὲ καὶ Λαοκόωντα, καὶ Οἰνώνην, καὶ Βρῆνον ἐν Ἰλίῳ. *Tam Helenus, & Laocoon, & Oenone, & Brenus in Ilio.* Clem. Alexand. Strom. lib. 1. p. 334. Inſtead of καὶ Βρῆνος, Canterus would read Κασσάνδρος. But we had better read ἢ Κασσάνδρος, which would ſignify, Oenone, daughter of Cebren. See Canterus on Lycophron, verſe 57.

[*C*] *She foretold him that he would be wounded.*] Conon has confounded and blended the different periods, and by that means claſhed with veriſimilitude. He ſuppoſes that Oenone did not utter this prediction, nor leave her huſband's houſe, till after Paris had killed her ſon Corythus (8). The Reader is to know, that Corythus, the ſon of Paris and Oenone, was ſo great with Helen, that Paris was fired with the ſtrongeſt jealouſy on that account, and for that reaſon reſolved to make away with Corythus. 'Tis no ways probable, that Oenone cohabited with her huſband, after Helen had taken poſſeſſion of the houſe; ſo that Conon has embarraſſed himſelf unreaſonably with a chronology different from that of other Authors.

(8) Conon, *apud* Photium, *num.* 186. p. 434, 436.

had himſelf carried upon mount Ida, to get the cure which ſhe only could favour him with; but he died before he had got far enough to be cured by Oenone (*d*). Some authors ſay, that ſhe made ſo little haſte [*D*], purely out of revenge, that ſhe let him die before ſhe applied her remedies; and nevertheleſs that ſhe was ſeized with deſpair, when ſhe found her huſband had breathed his laſt. This is variouſly related [*E*]; and ſome writers ſay, that ſhe attempted an early revenge. She employed her ſon for this purpoſe [*F*]; whom ſome ſay ſhe ſent into Greece, to ſtir up the Princes to make war againſt the Trojans; whilſt others declare, that ſhe cauſed him to inflame the breaſt of Helena, in order to make Paris feel the direct effects of jealouſy.

(*d*) Apollodor. lib. 3. Parthenius, *in* Eroticis, c. 4.

[*D*] *She made . . . little haſte.*] The meſſenger who brought her word, that Paris had ordered himſelf to be carried to mount Ida, that he might be cur'd by her, was ſent back roughly with the following jealous words, *let him go to Helen, and have his wounds dreſſed* (9). However, her former tenderneſs ſoon reviving, ſhe repented that ſhe had been ſo unkind; and therefore reſolved to go and meet her huſband with the medicaments neceſſary, but came too late. The anſwer ſhe had made the meſſenger was faithfully told Paris; and it afflicted him to ſuch a degree, that he expired that inſtant (10). The firſt thing that Oenone did at her arrival was, to throw a ſtone at the abovementioned meſſenger, which killed him, for having preſumed to ſay, that ſhe was the cauſe of Paris's death. She then embraced, with the utmoſt tenderneſs, the corps of her unfaithful huſband; and after making great moan, ſhe put her girdle about her neck, and ſtrangled herſelf (11).

(9) Conon, *apud* Photium, *num.* 186. p. 434, 436.

(10) Parthenius *in* Eroticis, c. 4.

(11) Conon, *apud* Photium, *num.* 186. p. 436.

[*E*] *This is variouſly related.*] We juſt now ſaid, that ſhe ſtrangled herſelf with her own girdle. Apollodorus ſays (12) barely that ſhe hanged herſelf. Parthenius (13) ſays only that ſhe killed herſelf. Quintus Calaber (14) affirms that ſhe threw herſelf on the funeral pile where Paris's body was burnt. Lycophron (15) ſays, that ſhe flung herſelf from the top of a tower. "Dictys Cretenſis relates, that Paris being "dead, his relations cauſed his body to be carried "to Oenone, in order that ſhe might procure it bu"rial; but that Oenone ſeeing the dead body, was "ſtruck to ſuch a degree, that ſhe ran diſtracted; and "devoting herſelf to melancholy, by inſenſible de"grees, ſhe died of grief, and was buried with Pa"ris. This paſſage from Dictys Cretenſis makes me "ſuſpect, either that the Latin verſion of this Au"thor, altho' very antient, is not very juſt, or that "it is corrupted in many places; for Tzetzes on "Lycophron, ſays expreſly, that Oenone, according "to Dictys Cretenſis, ſtrangled herſelf; and Cedre"nus, who ever follows Dictys in all things relating "to the war of Troy, alſo makes Oenone die the "ſame kind of death: whence I conjecture, that "theſe two Authors had Dictys's work in Greek; "and that the Latin tranſlation we have of it, does "not always agree with the Greek text (16)." This is ſo curious a piece of literature, that I could not diſpenſe with quoting exactly as we find it in Meziriac. By the way, Quintus Calaber ſuppoſes that Oenone treated her huſband with the utmoſt inhumanity (17), when lying proſtrate at her feet (18), and being ready to expire (19), he implored her aſſiſtance, and begg'd a thouſand pardons for his infidelity; but that ſhe was ſo deeply concerned at his death, that ſhe threw herſelf on the funeral pile, and was there burnt alive, together with the body of Paris.

(12) Liv. 3. p. 227.

(13) *In* Eroticis, c. 4.

(14) Lib. 10. ver. 467.

(15) *In* Caſſandra, ver. 61.

(16) Meziriac *ſur les Epitres d'Ovide*, p. 509.

[*F*] *She employed her ſon for that purpoſe.*] The river Cebren upbraiding in ſuch harſh terms his daughter Oenone for loving a huſband who was ſo falſe to her, rouzed her to ſuch a pitch of revenge, that ſhe ſent her ſon Corythus to the Grecian Princes; commanding him to excite them to denounce war againſt Troy, and likewiſe to be their guide (20). The Scholiaſt on Lycophron relates theſe particulars (21). Conon (22) makes Corythus the inſtrument of Oenone's revenge after another manner. He informs us that Corythus was ſtill handſomer than Paris his father; and that Oenone ſent him to Helen, both to fire Paris with jealouſy, and to procure an opportunity of ruining Helen. This Lady was ſoon captivated by the charms of Corythus; and ſo great a familiarity was contracted between them, that Paris was no ways pleaſed at it: in ſhort, the father grew ſo very jealous of his ſon, that ſeeing him one day with Helen, he killed him. Oenone muſt have been born under a moſt ill-fated planet; the expedient ſhe employ'd to ſatiate her revenge on her rival, coſt her only ſon his life; and was productive of no other effect, but to give Helen an opportunity of ſpending ſome moments delightfully. Some (23) have related, that Helen indeed loved Corythus; that he had a reciprocal paſſion for her, and that Paris killed him; however, they do not obſerve that his mother had ſuborned him to enſnare her rival; but ſay that he went to the ſiege of Troy. Others (24) pretend, that Corythus ſprung from the amours of Paris and Helen, which is abſurd; for, from the rape of Helen to Paris's death, there was not an interval of time ſufficient for any ſon of theirs to attain an age neceſſary for enabling a man to content a woman; and yet Corythus was killed at years of maturity, as is evident from his father's jealouſy, and his intrigue with Helen. However this be, we here have an account of a moſt horrid inceſtuous commerce (25), in which this renowned beauty was engaged, that is mentioned by few Authors.

(17) Quint. Calab. lib. 10. ver. 306.

(18) Ὁ δ' ἀρ' αἶψα πίσυν παρὰ ποσσὶ γυναικὸς. *Ipſe verò ſtatim ad pedes uxoris ſe abjecit.* Ibid. ver. 272.

(19) Καί ῥ' ὀλίγου ῥαΐων τοῖον ποτὶ μῦθον ἔειπεν. *Atque vix trabens animam hoc tandem ſermone illam affatur.* Quintus Calaber, lib. 10. ver. 283.

(20) Meziriac, on Ovid's epiſt. p. 508. citing the Scholiaſt on Lycophron.

(21) On theſe words of Lycophron, ver. 58. Στείλασα χεῖρον τὸν κατήγορον χθονός. *Miſſo juvene terræ proditore.*

(22) *Apud* Photium, *num.* 86. p. 436.

(23) Hellanicus, *in* Troicis, & Cephalon Gergithius, *apud* Parthenium, *Capite* 34.

(24) Nicander, *apud* Parthenium, ibid.

(25) Upon the ſuppoſition that Corythus was Helen's ſon; for had he been only her ſon-in-law, ſhe would have been preceded by many in her guilt.

☞ OGILBY (JOHN), an eminent Engliſh geographer and coſmographer in the 17th Century, was born in or near Edinburgh in Scotland about the 17th of November 1600. His father, who was of an antient and genteel family, having ſpent his eſtate, and being priſoner in the King's Bench for debt, could give his ſon but little education at ſchool. However, the youth being very induſtrious, obtained ſome knowledge in the Latin Grammar, and afterwards ſo much money, as not only to procure his father's diſcharge from priſon, but alſo to bind himſelf apprentice to Mr. Draper, a dancing-maſter in Gray's-Inn Lane in Holborn London. Soon after, by his dexterity in his profeſſion, and his complaiſant behaviour towards his maſter's cuſtomers, he got ſo much money from them, as to buy out the remaining part of his time, and ſet up for himſelf. But being afterwards appointed to dance in the Duke of Buckingham's great maſk, by a falſe ſtep he ſtrained a vein in the inſide of his leg, which ever after occaſioned him to go lamiſh. He afterwards taught to dance the ſiſters of Sir Ralph Hopton at Wytham in Somerſetſhire; where at leiſure he learned of that gentleman how to handle the pike and muſket. When Thomas Earl of Strafford became Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, he was entertained in his family to teach the art of dancing; and having a good command of his pen, was frequently employed by the Earl to tranſcribe papers for him. In his family it was, that he firſt gave proof of his inclination to poetry, by tranſlating ſome of *Æſop*'s *Fables* into Engliſh verſe; which afterwards when he came to underſtand Latin better, and had communicated them to ſeveral learned men, he publiſhed, and being then one of the troop of guard belonging to the Earl, compoſed a humorous piece, intitled, *The Cha-*

ratler of a Trooper. About that time he was appointed by his Lordſhip maſter of the Revels in the Kingdom of Ireland, and built a little Theatre for the repreſentation of dramatic entertainments in St. Warburgh's Street in Dublin. But upon the breaking out of the Rebellion, he was ſeveral times in great danger of his life, particularly when he narrowly eſcaped being blown up in the caſtle of Refernam near Dublin. About the time of the concluſion of the war in England, he left Ireland, and being ſhipwrackt came to London in a very neceſſitous condition. Thence, after a ſhort ſtay, he walked to Cambridge, where his great induſtry and greater love to learning being diſcovered, he was encouraged by ſeveral ſcholars there, by whoſe aſſiſtance he became ſo compleat a maſter of the Latin tongue (*a*), that in 1649 he publiſhed a tranſlation of Virgil [*A*], and in 1651 a paraphraſe in verſe upon Æſop's Fables [*B*]. About the year 1654 he learned the Greek language. In 1658 he publiſhed at London in folio a beautiful edition of Virgil, with the ſame cuts, which had adorned the folio edition of his tranſlation of that poet 1654. In 1660 he publiſhed at London in folio a tranſlation of Homer's Iliad, adorned with ſculptures, and illuſtrated with annotations, and dedicated to King Charles II. The ſame year he publiſhed at Cambridge in a large folio the *Bible*, according to the tranſlation ſet forth by the ſpecial command of King James I. with the *Liturgy* and *Articles* of the Church of England, with chorographical ſculpture. In the beginning of the year following he received orders from the commiſſioners for the ſolemnity of his Majeſty's coronation, for the conduct of the poetical part thereof, as the ſpeeches, mottoes, and inſcriptions; upon which he drew up for the preſent, *The relation of his Majeſty's entertainment paſſing through the city of London to his coronation; with a deſcription of the triumphal arches and ſolemnity*: London 1661 in ten ſheets in folio. But ſoon after, our author, by his Majeſty's command, publiſhed it in a large folio, with ſculptures, and ſpeeches at large. About the year 1662 he went into Ireland, being then by patent made maſter of the Revels there, after Sir William Davenant had in vain ſollicited for that place; and he built at Dublin a theatre, which coſt him about 2000*l*. the former being ruined during the troubles. In 1665 he publiſhed at London in folio a tranſlation of *Homer*'s *Odyſſey*, adorned with ſculptures, and illuſtrated with annotations. He afterwards wrote two Heroic Poems, one intitled, *The Epheſian Matron*, the other, *The Roman Slave*, both dedicated to Thomas Earl of Oſſory. The next work, which he compoſed, was *Carolics*, an Epic Poem in twelve books, in honour of King Charles I. but this was intirely loſt in the Fire of London in September 1666, when Mr. Ogilby's houſe in White-Fryars was burnt down, and his whole fortune, except to the value of five pounds, deſtroyed. However he ſoon procured his houſe to be rebuilt, ſet up a printing-houſe therein, was appointed his Majeſty's coſmographer and geographic printer, and printed ſeveral great works tranſlated or collected by himſelf and his aſſiſtants [*C*]. He died Sept. 4, 1676, and was interred in the vault under part of the church of St. Bride's in Fleet-Street. Mr. Edward Philips (*b*) ſtiles him "one of the prodigies of his age for producing from ſo late "an initiation into literature ſo many large and learned volumes as well in verſe as proſe:" and tells us, that "his *Paraphraſe* upon *Eſop*'s *Fables*, for ingenuity and fancy, beſides "the invention of new fables, is generally confeſſed to have exceeded whatever hath "been done before in that kind."

(*a*) Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. 2. col. 378, 379. 2d edit.

(*b*) *Theatrum Poetarum*, modern poets, p. 114. edit. Lond. 1675.

[*A*] *In* 1649 *he publiſhed an Engliſh tranſlation of Virgil.*] It was printed in large 8vo, and dedicated to William Marquiſs of Hereford. He reprinted it at London in 1654 in a royal folio with this title; *The Works of* Publius Virgilius Maro, *tranſlated, and adorned with Sculptures, and illuſtrated with Annotations.* Mr. Wood tells us (1), that "this was the faireſt edi- "tion, that till then the Engliſh preſs ever produced."

(1) Athen Oxon. vol. 2. col. 379.

[*B*] *In* 1651 *a paraphraſe in verſe upon Æſop's Fables.*] It was printed in 4to with this title; *Fables of* Æſop *paraphraſed in verſe, and adorned with ſculptures.* Sir William Davenant, then in the Tower, and Mr. James Shirley wrote verſes in commendation of this work. In 1665 he publiſhed a ſecond volume of Æſop's Fables paraphraſed, with ſeveral of his own, adorned with ſculptures, and printed at London in folio. In 1673 he publiſhed at London in two volumes 8vo, *The Fables of* Æſop, *paraphraſed in verſe, adorned with ſculptures, and illuſtrated with annotations.*

[*C*] *Printed ſeveral great works tranſlated or collected by himſelf and his aſſiſtants.*] As 1, *An Embaſſy from new Batavia to the Emperor of China*, &c. London 1669 in folio, adorned with maps, proſpects, and various ſculptures, as all the following books, which he publiſhed, were. 2. *Deſcription of* Africa, &c. London 1670 folio. This is the firſt part of his *Engliſh Atlas*. 3. *Deſcription of* America, &c. London 1671, folio. This is the ſecond part. 4. Atlas Japanenſis, *being remarkable addreſſes by way of Embaſſy from the* Eaſt India *company of the united Provinces to the Emperor of* Japan, &c. London 1670 folio. 5. Atlas Chinenſis: *being the ſecond part of a relation of remarkable paſſages in two Embaſſies from the* Eaſt India *company of the united Provinces to the Vice-Roy of* Simmalong, &c. London 1671 folio. 6. Aſia, *the firſt part; being an accurate deſcription of* Perſia *and the ſeveral Provinces thereof*, &c. London 1673 folio. Our author did not live to finiſh the ſecond part. However this is looked upon as another part of the *Engliſh Atlas*. 7. *Deſcription of Europe*; not finiſhed by our author, who intended it to be the fourth part of the *Engliſh Atlas*. 8. Britannia: *an hiſtorical and geographical deſcription of Britain*, &c. The firſt part in folio. All theſe books were printed on imperial paper, adorned with maps and excellent ſculptures, and carried on and ſold by way of lotteries. There goes under our author's name, *A pocket-book of roads in England*, and *a new map of the city of London, as it is now built*, &c. printed in one ſheet of large paper. He alſo in conjunction with Mr. William Morgan made *a new and accurate map of the city of London diſtinct from Weſtminſter and Southwark*, &c. which is ſix feet long and ſix feet deep, with a long narrow book to deſcribe the places therein; as alſo *a Map of London, Weſtminſter, and Southwark, and a ſurvey of Eſſex, with the roads therein exactly meaſured*, &c. T.

OGINSKI (CHARLES) a gentleman of Lithuania, tranſlated into Latin Faret's *Honnête Homme* or *Gentleman*, and publiſhed it at Franeker in 1643 (*a*). He dedicated it to SAMUEL OGINSKI his father, who had a conſiderable employment in the Palatinate of Trecko

(*a*) In 12mo. It contains 188 pages.

Trecko in Lithuania. There is no doubt but that Mr. Oginski, who has been ſo often mentioned in the news papers for theſe five or ſix years (*b*), and who is at the head of the party which oppoſes the houſe of Sapieha, is of the ſame family with him who tranſlated Faret. Had Konig ſeen this verſion, he would not have ſaid that Charles Oginſki invented in 1643 the art of pleaſing at court (*c*), for the title would have informed him of the contrary (*d*). One wrote a French ſonnet in praiſe of the tranſlator. This little poem is prefixed to the work, and filled with the moſt abominable faults that can be committed againſt the rules of *Proſodia*. The author of the Sonnet obſerves, that this book of Faret was already tranſlated into Italian, Spaniſh, Engliſh, and German. The Latin verſion is tolerably well done, but it is pity there are ſo many typographical errors.

(*b*) I write this in 1703.

(*c*) *Excogitavit artem placendi in aula, an.* 1643. Konig. Biblioth. p. 586.

OKOLSI (SIMON) a religious Dominican, lived in the 17th Century. He publiſhed a book entitled *Orbis Polonus*, which is worthy of peruſal. Le Laboureur has cited it more than once (*a*).

(*a*) *See* La Relation du Voyage de la Reine de Pologne, Part II. p. 50, 58.

☞ OLDENBURG (*a*) (HENRY), a learned gentleman in the 17th Century, was born in the Dutchy of Breme in Germany, and was Conſul for his countrymen at London in the time of the long Parliament and Cromwell. He afterwards became tutor to the Lord Henry O Bryan, a young Iriſh Nobleman, and in June 1656, entered himſelf a ſtudent in the Univerſity of Oxford by the name of *Henricus Oldenburg, Bremenſis, nobilis Saxo* (*b*). He was afterwards tutor to William Lord Cavendiſh, and at length, upon the foundation of the Royal Society, was elected Fellow and Secretary thereof. He was a very intimate friend and conſtant correſpondent of Mr. Robert Boyle [*A*], ſeveral of whoſe

(*a*) He ſometimes wrote himſelf Grubendole. Wood, Faſti Oxon. vol. 2. col. 114. 2d edition.

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

[*A*] *He was a very intimate friend and conſtant correſpondent of Mr. Robert Boyle.*] We have read over a great number of original letters of his to that great man, now in the hands of the Reverend Mr. Henry Miles; and ſhall preſent the reader with extracts from ſome of them. In a letter dated at Paris March 20, 1660, he writes thus: " Sir Ken. Digby will him-" ſelf aſſure you by the annexed of his reſpects to " you. We met lately at the houſe of a Chymiſt, " where the queſtion was agitated about the diſſol-" vent of gold, whether the univerſal ſpirit of the " world in its undetermined nature, or as it is ſpeci-" fied and contracted to a mineral, be the menſtruum " of that noble metal? The diſcuſſion hereof being " rather made by authority than reaſon, gave ſmall " ſatisfaction to the auditors; whereof the learned " Knight himſelf being the chief did moderate the " action, but not determine the queſtion, interlac-" ing the diſcourſes of others with ſeveral conſidera-" ble relations, whereof two did raviſh the hearers " to admiration. The one was of a King's houſe in " England, which having ſtood covered with lead " for five or ſix ages, and being ſold after that time, " was found to continue $\frac{1}{4}$ of ſilver in the lead there-" of. The other was of a fixed ſalt, drawn out of a " certain Potter's-earth here in France, at a place " called Arcueil; which ſalt being for ſome time " expoſed to the ſun-beams became ſalt-peter, then " vitriol, then lead, tin, copper, ſilver, and at the " end of fourteen months gold; which he aſſured " to have experienced himſelef, and another able " Naturaliſt beſides him. I muſt confeſſe I would " rather ſee this, than believe it, though the author " be a very authentique gentleman." In a letter dated at London October 20, 1664, he writes thus: " To divert you and myſelf a little, *poſt Muſas has* " *ſeveriores*, I ſhall draw to an end with annexing " ſome lines out of the penitential letter of Monſieur " Sorbiere's written to the Biſhop of Laon, to make " him employ my Lord Aubigny for prevailing with " our King, to interpoſe by the King of France, " that Sorbiere may be reſtored from his baniſhment. " As much as he depreſſed the Chancellor (1) in his " printed Pamphlet, ſo much does he now extol him " in this unprinted letter. For he ſaith; *Facilè alias* " *ſubjungerem literas, ſi opus eſſet expugnandæ ſummi* " *Viri* (meaning the Chancellor) *indignationi telis &* " *machinis pluribus, quod de inſigni ipſius clementiâ ſperare* " *non auſim. Audit enim in patriâ ſuâ hominum mitiſ-* " *ſimus; & ſanè unus ille homo Anglis cunctando & per-* " *cendo reſtituit rem. Quam laudem minimè conſecutus* " *eſſet, niſi à ſapientiſſimo rege primarium regni munis* " *difficillimis temporibus, exul, cum de ſalute unuſquiſque* " *deſperaret, nec ambiens, obtinuiſſet. Nimirum ad id* " *operis aptiſſimum oſtendebant ſuaviſſimi mores, ingenium* " *perſpicax, inſignis facundia, Eruditio multiplex, &* " *civilis præſertim doctrinæ uſus & contemplatio. Ad* " *quæ potiſſimum in illo ſpectanda [ne ſatis attenderem,* " *leviorum ſtudiorum pulvis & ſortis meæ tenuitas ve-* " *luti nubem oculis noſtris objecere. Eram enim, ut ve-* " *rum fatear, totus in admirationem Regiæ Phyſicorum* " *Londinenſium Academiæ defixus; ſcilicet quod Medi-* " *corum erat, tractabam Medicus, & fabrilia Faber, in* " *interiora & ſocietatis ſagaciſſimæ arcana nuper admiſſus;* " *ad alia autem planè cæcutiebam, & ſiquid in Diario,* " *quod majoris eſſet ponderis, forte fortuna irrepſit, ab* " *inquinatis fontibus proculdubio, nec ſatis advertens,* " *hauriebam. Condonabit itaque Vir in illo honorum fa-* " *ſtigio poſitus, & cujus fama totum terrarum Orbem* " *pervolitat, homini in Litterulas ſuas benè affecto, ad* " *phyſicas tantum auſcultationes idoneo, ſed* Ἀνθρωποµεσρίας " *& ſublimiorum ſcientiarum ac Politices inprimis rudi* " *& ignaro, &c.* Sir, I want an Amanuenſis ex-" ceedingly; elſe you ſhould have received the whole " letter, which argues as much an abject ſpirit as " can well be; and whereby the writer hath now " made himſelf hateful by all perſons of honor, " whereas by his printed book he appeared only " guilty of imprudence and partiality." In a letter dated at London October 27, 1664, he writes thus: " I muſt not omit acquainting you what Dr. " Charlton affirmed to me of the laſt anatome [at " Greſham-College before the Royal Society, Octob. " 22,] that the veines on the right and left ſide of " the heart were tranſpoſed, ſo that the *vena arte-* " *rioſa* was where the *arteria venoſa* uſeth to be, & " *viciſſim*; as alſo that Dr. Scarborow had aſſured " him, that in the body diſſected by him at the ſame " time there had been wanting the *muſculus pectora-* " *lis*. He added, that when he and Dr. Ent told " Dr. Scarborow of the ſaid tranſpoſition of the " veines, he urged, that the body already buried " might be unburied again to give him the ſight of " ſo unuſuall a ſtructure; which whether it be done " or not, I cannot yet informe you." In his next letter dated at London Nov. 3, 1664, we have the following paſſage: " Dr. Charlton being called to " an account of his laſt diſſection, and particularly " preſſed concerning the tranſpoſition, which I men-" tioned to you in my former from his own mouth in " the preſence of others, who heard him, as well as I, " alledge Dr. Ent for a witneſſe of his aſſertion, was " obliged at our yeſterday's aſſembly at Greſham to " yield, that he was miſtaken, both Dr. Ent, who was " with us, and Dr. Scarborough, having, upon the " unburying of the heart, and a ſtrict ſearch and " examination, found no ſuch tranſpoſition. Which " diſcovery of the Doctor's error ſpread by his " very poſitive affirmation (which made me without " ſcruple deliver it alſo to you) addeth but very little " to his credit. In the meane time the other anato-" micall obſervation concerning the defect of the " Pectoral

(1) Hyde.

whoſe works he tranſlated into Latin. He publiſhed the *Philoſophical Tranſactions* from N°. I. March 6, 1664, to N°. CXXXVI. June 25, 1677. He died at Charlton near Greenwich in Kent in Auguſt 1678, and was interred there. He married the daughter and only child of the famous John Dury, with whom he had an eſtate of 60 *l. per ann.* in the Marſhes of Kent; and by her he left iſſue a ſon, named *Rupert*, who was godſon to Prince *Rupert*, and a daughter named *Sophia* (c). While he was engaged in publiſhing the *Philoſophical Tranſactions*, he held a correſpondence with above ſeventy people in all parts of the world:

(c) Wood, Faſti Oxon. vol. 2. col. 114. 2d edition.

" Pectoral Muſcle is confirmed, Dr. Ent himſelfe, " upon my particular enquiry, aſſerting it with all " confidence, and that the perſon, while alive, had " not appeared defective in his motions." In his letter dated at London November 19, 1664, he writes thus: " The Queen of France is brought to " bed of a daughter of eight months, which hath " the ſhape of a More, and ſomewhat of that com- " plexion; whereat that King is ſo enraged, that " he hath baniſhed all the Mores, dwarfs, and Mon- " keys from his court, the Queen having a little " More about her, that ſeems to have ſo tainted her " imagination, as to give ſuch a colour and ſuch " features that reſemble him. In the mean time, " the Queen hath been very dangerouſly ill, and " was given over by the Phyſicians; but that Ma- " dame de Fouguet came and preſented a medicine, " which ſhe exalted highly as ſuch a one that would " infallibly cure her, by bringing away the *Secun- " dina*, which had caſt the Queene into ſuch convul- " ſions, as made her caſe appear deſperate." In his letter dated at London July 4, 1665, he writes thus concerning the plague then in that city. " It is a " great mercy, that Southwark and Redriffe, where " ſeamen are ſo numerous, and other people, that " relate to and work in the Navy, remaine ſo free yet " of the contagion, that there are not above two " houſes ſhutt up in thoſe quarters. If it ſhould " come into this row, where I am, I think, I " ſhould then change my thoughts, and retire into " the country, if I could find a ſojourning corner. " In the meane time I am not a little perplexed con- " cerning the bookes and papers belonging to the " Society, that are all in my cuſtody. All I can " think of to doe in this caſe is to make a liſte of " them all, and to putt them up by themſelves " in a boxe, and ſeale them together with a ſuper- " ſcription; that ſo, in caſe the Lord ſhould viſit " me, as ſoon as I find myſelfe not well, it may be " ready to be immediately ſent away out of mine to " a ſound houſe, *& ſic deinceps*." In his letter dated at London October 10, 1665, he writes thus: " I " am very glad, that I have not been ſo forward as " ſome of my correſpondents would have had me, " in diffuſing the wonders ſaid to be performed by " *Greatrix* into all parts of the world, and that " with my owne aſſeverations of the truth thereoff; " for I find their intelligence much differing from " mine; though indeed I heard lately, that this " healer did faile in ſome cures, but that it was " about ſuch perſons, as had their ſinnews quite " whithered, and their vitals totally deſtroyed, and " the balls of their eyes loſt; and that therefore " himſelfe did ſadly complaine over, and much com- " miſerate the ill-adviſed journeys of ſuch perſons, " ſaying, that God had given him the guift of " *healing*, and not of *creating* limbs. By the very " laſt I receaved this information, that a childe in " Dr. Beale's neighbourhood is cured of the ſtone or " other ſtoppage of urine, which came all, as he " ſaith, with horrid paine in threads or ropy, but " now, after the touch, is very perfectly naturall, " and without paine. Having related this, he adds, " *It cannot be denyed, that innumerable great cures are " done; and 'tis not poſſible, that all expectations ſhould " be ſatisfied, without a general reſtauration equivalent " to a reſurrection.* And then he concludes, that *the " fame muſt ſuddenly fall, becauſe 'tis odious to many, " and winter hinders the paſſage, and himſelfe is tyred " with the infinite reſorte, and men's expectations* . . . . " Monſieur du Son being the other day at my houſe, " where we talkt at randome of many things, told " me among the reſt, that he had knowne the blind " man at Maſtrich, that ſees colors with his fingers " ends; and had converſed with him a good while, " during which he had ſeen him play at cards with " better ſucces than any man he played with; as " alſo, to diſtinguiſh men and women from one " another by feeling their hands or necks, and to " diſcriminate the ſeveral colors of haire; and laſt- " ly, to diſcern the beauty of women by their " voyce." In his letter dated at London March 13th, 166$\frac{4}{5}$, he writes thus: " *Greatrix* does certainly " ſome cures by his frictions, inſinuating (perhaps) " ſome ſalubrious ſteams or ſpirits of his owne into " ſickly people's bodies. Monſieur de Son hath been " ſtroked by him; and he tells me, that whereas he " hath been for ſeverall years troubled with great " back-aches, (which indeed have been ſometimes " ſuch in my preſence, that he could not ſtirr or " turn himſelf without great paine, which ſometimes " forced him to cry out,) he now finds himſelf, " upon being ſtroked, very well, inſomuch that he " purpoſes, in caſe of continuance, to goe to ſea " with P. Rupert, in whoſe lodgings this cure was " performed, his Highneſſe, as the patient told me, " having urged him to ſuffer the friction." In his letter dated at London Sept. 10th, 1666, we have the following paſſage: " I cannot omit acquainting " you, that never a calamity, and ſuch an one, was " ſo well boarne, as this is, [*viz. the Fire of Lon- " don.*] 'Tis incredbile how litle the ſufferers, " though great ones, doe complaine of their Loſſes. " I was yeſterday in many meetings of the principal " citizens, whoſe houſes are laid in aſhes, who in- " ſtead of complaining diſcourſed almoſt of nothing " but of a ſurvey of London, and a deſſein for re- " building, and that in ſuch a manner, with bricks " and large ſtreets, leaving great intervals, parti- " tions in ſeveral places, that for the future they may " not be ſo eaſily ſubject to the like deſtruction. I " hope, that ſome of our Society will ſignalize " themſelves in this ſurvey and deſſein; which " when done to the ſatisfaction of the King, may by " his Majeſty be offered and recommended to the " Parliament. I was this very morning with our " Preſident, and ſuggeſted this buſineſs to his Lord- " ſhip, who liked it ſo well, that he intends to " move it to morrow at the Councill of the Society, " which is ſummonned to meet at Greſham in ſome " other room than formerly, our ordinary meeting " places both for the Councill and the Society being, " as I heare, taken up by the Lord Mayor and the " Court of Aldermen, as is the quadrangle for the " meeting of the Merchants, *pro tempore*. I doubt, " I ſhall find it very difficult to continue the print- " ing of the *Tranſactions*; Martyn and Alleſtree " being undone, with the reſt of the Stationers at " Paul's Church-yard, and all their books burnt, they " had carried for ſafety into St. Faith's Church, as " they call it: beſides that, the City lying deſolate " now, it will be very hard to vend them at the " preſent. I had hopes to have once waited on you " to diner to Sir William Morrice's, there to have " opened to him my deſires of thinking on me, in " caſe the Latin Secretarie's place ſhould fall vacant; " eſpecially now there is ſmaller hopes than ever of " Benefactors to the ſociety, and the *Tranſactions* like " to be interrupted; but charges to encreaſe, I ha- " ving been neceſſitated within this 10 dayes to pay " 24 s. to the public for chimneys, taxes, and watch- " ing, which, if it hold long, will force me to " run away. Sir, if you would not think it a " trouble to ſollicite, by a line or two of your owne " hand, my Lord Brounker and Sir Robert Moray, " to recommend me for the ſaid employment, you " would exceedingly oblige me. For though I " think they both have an affection for me, yet I " am aſſured, their care for me in this particular " would be redoubled upon your recommendation." In his letter dated at London, Sept. 18th, 1666, he writes thus: " Your very obliging letter I receaved, " and

world: "I aſked him, ſays Dr. Liſter (*d*), what method he uſed to anſwer ſo great a "variety of ſubjects, and ſuch a quantity of letters as he muſt receive weekly; for I "knew he never failed, becauſe I had the honour of his correſpondence for ten or twelve "years: he told me, he made one letter anſwer another; and that to be always freſh, "he never read a letter before he had pen, ink, and paper, ready to anſwer it forthwith; "ſo that the multitude of his letters cloyed him not, or ever lay upon his hands." Among *Milton*'s *Epiſtolæ Familiares* there is a letter to our author dated at Weſtminſter July

(*d*) *Journey to Paris in the year* 1698. p. 78. 2d edit. London 1699.

" and delivered the annexed to my Lord Brounker, " who preſents his affectionate ſervice to you, and " deſires you would pleaſe to ſend the mentioned ex- " periment to me, and reſt perſuaded, he will doe " what is in his power for the perſon recommended. " And I believe verily, his Lordſhip will not come " ſhort of his words, and, which is more, I am " perſuaded, if he had knowne my condition ſooner, " that is, ſo very low, as indeed it is, whatever " face I have put upon it, he would have ſooner taken " care for me. For he was pleaſed to ſay as much " to me, when upon this occaſion I related to " him, that my dear wife had brought me 400 l. " whereof, upon our agreement of marriage, ſhe cal- " led in 200, laying out 100 upon furniſhing our " houſe, and the other 100, partly upon the fine for " the houſe, partly for other neceſſary occaſions, as " far as it would goe; and before ſhe died, left me " the other 200 l. then in the hands of Sir Brocket " Spencer and Sir John Cotton, from whom I re- " ceaved them, (being neceſſitated to call them in " alſo,) and ſpent them partly for her funerall, and " payment of debts, and partly upon my ſubſiſt- " ence hitherto; that which the *Tranſactions* have " yielded, being conſumed in my houſe-rent, and " taxes, and duties, thoſe ſummes not amounting al- " ſo by farr to what was at firſt imagined, and be- " ing now like to fall lower yet. Having been " forced to repreſent this to his Lordſhip, and added, " that I had declined ſeverall offers of conducting " young Noblemen abroad, which would at leaſt " have been worth to me 100 l. *per ann.* if not alſo " ſome annuity *ad vitam*, after the employment end- " ed; his Lordſhip told me plainly, that if he had " knowne ſo much by times, I ſhould not have ſuf- " fer'd ſo much, expreſſing particularly what ad- " vantagious employment in the navy (but now pro- " vided for) he could have conferred on me, which " he believed I would have performed to more ſa- " tisfaction than he that is now in it. But yet he " would be mindfull of me, and not ſuffer me to " want . . . . Dr. Wren (1) has, ſince my laſt, drawn " a modell for a new citty, and preſented it to the " King, who produced it himſelf before his Coun- " cill, and manifeſted much approbation of it. I " was yeſterday morning with the Doctor, and ſaw " the modell; which, methinks, does ſo well pro- " vide for ſecurity, conveniency, and beauty, that I " can ſee nothing wanting as to thoſe three maine " articles: but whether it has conſulted with the " populouſnes of a great citty, and whether reaſon " of ſtate would have that conſulted with, is a quære " to me. I then told the Doctor, that if I had had " an opportunity to ſpeake with him ſooner, I ſhould " have ſuggeſted to him, that ſuch a modell, con- " trived by him, and reviewed and approved by " the Royal Society, or a committee thereof, before " it had come to the view of his Majeſty, would " have given the Society a name, and made it po- " pular, and availed not a little to ſilence thoſe, " who aſke continually *What have they done?* He an- " ſwered, that he had been ſo preſſed to haſten it, " before other deſigns came in, that he could not " poſſibly conſult the Society about it. However, " ſince 'tis done without taking in the Society, it " muſt ſuffice, that 'tis a member thereof, that hath " done it; and, by what I ſee, hath done it ſo, " that other models will not equall it. And I hope, " that when it comes to be preſented to the Parlia- " ment, as the Author will be named, ſo his rela- " tion to the Society will not be omitted." In his letter dated at London, Sept. 25th, 1666, he writes thus: " I have good hopes, the generous inclinati- " ons of thoſe two worthy perſons, the Lord Broun- " ker and Sir R. Moray, thus excited by the ready " favour of your recommendation, will prove effec- " tuall for my relief. I am ſure, I am eternally obli- " ged to you for your ſo carefull a concern for me. " Your commands to me for my Lord Brounker, I " hope I ſhall have occaſion to obey to morrow, " when we meet at Greſham; which perhaps will " be the laſt meeting in that place, the Citty ſtriving " hard to get that Colledge totally into their hands " for this time of diſtreſs; which if they obtain, the " Society are provided with another place to meet " in, to wit, in Arundel-houſe, by the generoſity of " Mr. Howard." In his letter dated at London, Octob. 16th, 1666, is the following paſſage: " The " other grand affaire about rebuilding the Citty, is " not neglected neither, ſtrict injunctions being now " iſſued by the Lord Mayor, in the King's name, " to clear the foundations of all burnt houſes of the " rubbiſh, within a fortnight; which done, the " ſurvey and admeaſurement of all ſuch foundations " is to be forthwith taken in hand, and that by the " care and management of Dr. Wren and Mr. Hook; " which ſurvey is to be exactly regiſtred, for the " better ſtating hereafter every one's right and pro- " perty. And then the method of building will be " taken into nearer conſideration, and, 'tis hoped, " within a ſhort time reſolved upon. All which may " be more fully ſeen in the printed paper for that pur- " poſe made public by the Lord Mayor." In his letter dated at London, Sept. 3d, 1667, he writes thus: " I was ſo ſtifled by the priſon-air, that as " ſoon as I had my enlargement from the Tower, " I widen'd it, and took it from London into the " Contry, to fann myſelfe for ſome days in the " good air of Craford in Kent. Being now return- " ed, and having recover'd my ſtomach, which I " had in a manner quite loſt, I intend, if God will, " to fall to my old trade, if I have any ſupport to " follow it. My late misfortune, I feare, will much " prejudice me; many perſons unacquainted with " me, and hearing me to be a ſtranger, being apt to " derive a ſuſpicion upon me. Not a few came to " the Tower, merely to enquire after my crime, " and to ſee the warrant; in which when they " found, that it was for dangerous deſſeins and prac- " tices, they ſpred it over London, and made others " have no good opinion of me. *Incærcera audac- " ter, ſemper aliquid hæret.* Before I went into the " contry, I waited on my Lord Arlington, kiſſing " the rod. I hope, I ſhall live fully to ſatisfy his " Majeſty, and all honeſt Engliſhmen, of my inte- " grity, and of my reall zeal to ſpend the remainder " of my life in doing faithfull ſervice to the na- " tion, to the very utmoſt of my abilities. I have " learned, during this commitment, to know my " reall friends. God Almighty bleſſe them, and " enable me to convince them all of my gratitude." In his letter dated at London, Sept. 24th, 1667, he writes thus: " Mr. Martyn is now printing the " *Tranſactions* of this month, which will compriſe " alſo the two next precedent, and containe in the " beginning an animadverſion on the Engliſhed let- " ter of Monſieur Denys, concerning Transfuſion; " which tranſlation I diſowne for mine, inſcribing " this tract with *Numb.* 27, which the Stationer too " boldly preſumed to give to that tranſlated letter. " I hope my cenſure on the there mentioned ten " years conception before its birth here in England, " will ſatisfy thoſe ingenious Gentlemen of England, " that are concerned in that invention; of which I " alſo diſcourſed lately with Dr. Lower, who gave " me a kind viſit, and took occaſion to ſpeak of " that particular; whom I aſſured, that I had no " hand at all in the tranſlation of that letter, which " I was ſo farr from, that though I had the French " original, before any body had it in England, which " was the ſame day of my confinement, yet would " I not impart it to any perſon, becauſe I fully in-

(1) Afterwards Sir Chriſtopher Wren.

July 6, 1654; another dated there June 25, 1656; another dated there Auguſt 1, 1657; and another dated there Decemb. 20, 1659. He tranſlated into Engliſh, I. The *Prodromus to a Diſſertation concerning ſolids naturally contained within ſolids*, &c. London 1671, in 8vo, written by *Nich. Steno*. II. *A genuine Explication of the book of Revelations, full of ſundry new Chriſtian Conſiderations*, &c. London 1671, in 8vo, written by *A. B. Piganius*. III. *The Life of the Dutcheſs of Mazarine*, printed in 8vo, and tranſlated out of the French.

" tended not to publiſh it without ſuch an animad-
" verſion as I now have ſent to the preſſe. Mean
" time, Mr. Martyn deals very mercenarily with
" me; for knowing, that others will hardly under-
" take the printing of theſe papers, now ſo many
" of them have been printed by ſeverall, which renders
" it difficult for one to compleat them, without re-
" deeming the intereſt of others; he knowing this,
" I ſay, hath conſtrained me to abate him the rate
" yet lower, ſo that, after the proportion he allows
" now, I ſhall hardly bring it to 30 l. a year. Sir,
" I find the now Biſhop of Saliſbury, Dr. Ward, is
" concerned for me; and I know, that he hath oc-
" caſions to advance perſons to beneficiall employ-
" ments, and that frequently there fall places, that
" come to his knowledge, and for the ſupply where-
" of his advice is deſired. If it were not, that you
" muſt employ an Amanuenſis, I could preſume to
" intreat your favour of recommending me to him
" and to his remembrance, in caſe any ſuch place
" ſhould fall, that he ſhould heare of, and think
" conſiſtent with my office to the Royal Society."
In his letter dated at London, Decemb. 17th, 1667, he writes thus: " I am ſure, no man imagines
" what ſtore of papers and writings paſſe to and
" from me in a week from time to time, which I
" muſt rid myſelf of, without any aſſiſtance. I have
" no leſſe at preſent, than thirty correſpondents,
" partly domeſtick, partly forrain. Many of them, I
" am not only to write to, but alſo to do buſineſs
" for; which requires much time to enquire after
" ſuch particulars, and diſpatch ſuch buſineſſes as
" they deſire, if I mean to be gratified reciprocally
" in ſuch things as I beſpeake of them. Beſides my
" conſtant attendance on the meetings of the Society
" and Council, and preſerving what is ſaid and
" done there, and giving order to have all regiſtred,
" and reviewing all the entries, ſolliciting alſo the
" performances of the manifold taſkes, recommended
" and undertaken by the members of the Society,
" and deſtributing and ſending abroad ſuch directi-
" ons and inquiries as are thought conducive to ad-
" vance our deſſein, &c. I confeſſe, I extend my
" patience as far as I can; but I am afraid, I have
" ſtretched it ſo farr already, that it will breake, un-
" leſſe ſomething be done to fortify it in ſome mea-
" ſure, which I find not that any of thoſe, who are
" upon the place, and cannot but ſee my daily labors
" and toyle, are in the leaſt ſollicitous of, though
" ſome of them are forced to acknowledge even in
" my hearing, that no man in England would doe
" what I do, upon the terms I goe away with. Sir,
" pardon me for this ſally; I am confident, you
" doe not much blame me for this complaint, which
" I dare lodge in the boſom of ſo good and noble a
" friend, that in great meaſure knows my work and
" my condition, and upon occaſion repreſents it too.
" I have ſome ground to believe, that there are
" perſons, who think the *Tranſactions* bring me in
" a ſufficient revenue; but I will make it out to
" any man, that I never receaved above 40 *l.* a year
" upon their account, (and that is litle more than my
" houſe rent) and now by a new agreement, I have
" been obliged to make, I ſhall not bring it to above
" 36 *l.* a year at moſt. How ſtrangely therefore
" I muſt needs ſhift for my ſubſiſtence, and with
" what diſtraction I muſt performe my tedious work,
" let any ſober man judge." In his letter dated at London March 10th, $166\frac{7}{8}$, we find this paſſage: " The Biſhop of Saliſbury took occaſion the other
" day of his own accord to expreſſe his great earneſt-
" neſſe to ſee me provided for, with a recognition
" for my labours, and concerns for the Society. He
" would, he ſaid, have it urged in Councill; and
" was pleaſed to add, that he for his owne part was
" aſhamed, that I was ſo long neglected, who had
" ſo many years ſpent all my time and all my pains
" upon the buſineſs of the Society, without any con-
" ſideration for it. I confeſſe, Sir, I make very
" hard ſhift to weather it out; and I could be
" contented it were inſiſted on in the Councill, but
" that I ſhall want your preſence and favor there, to
" repreſent a litle the particulars, that paſſe through
" my hands, and the difficulties I groane under,
" which I cannot ſo well ſpecify to others, as I know
" you will give me leave to do to you." T.

☞ OLDHAM (JOHN), an eminent Engliſh Poet in the 17th Century, was ſon of Mr. John Oldham, a Nonconformiſt Miniſter, and grandſon of Mr. John Oldham, Rector of Nun-Eaton near Tedbury in Glouceſterſhire. He was born at Shipton (where his father had a congregation) near Tedbury, and in the ſame county, on the 9th of Auguſt 1653 (*a*). He was educated in grammar learning under the care of his father, till he was almoſt fit for the Univerſity; and to be compleatly qualified for that purpoſe he was ſent to Tedbury-ſchool, where he ſpent about two years under the tuition of Mr. Henry Heaven occaſioned by the earneſt requeſt of Alderman Yeat of Briſtol, who having a ſon at the ſame ſchool, was deſirous, that Mr. Oldham ſhould be his companion, which would, as he thought, very much conduce to the advancement of his learning. This ſome time retarded Mr. Oldham in the proſecution of his own ſtudies; but for the time he loſt in forwarding Mr. Yeat's ſon, his father afterwards made him an ample amends. Mr. Oldham being ſent to Edmund-Hall in Oxford was committed to the care of Mr. William Stephens, B. D. of which Hall he became a batler in the beginning of June 1670. He was ſoon obſerved to be a good Latiniſt, and chiefly to addict himſelf to the ſtudy of poetry, and other polite acquirements. May 30, 1674, he took the degree of Batchelor of Arts, but left the Univerſity before he compleated that degree by detetmination, being, though very much againſt his inclination, compelled to go home, and live for ſome time with his father. The next year he was very much afflicted for the death of his dear friend and conſtant companion, the Reverend Mr. Charles Morvent, as appears by his ode upon that occaſion. In a ſhort time after he became uſher to the free-chool at Croyden in Surrey. Here it was, that he received a viſit from the Earl of Rocheſter, the Earl of Dorſet, Sir Charles Sedley, and other perſons of diſtinction, merely upon the reputation of ſome verſes, which they had ſeen in manuſcript. The maſter of the ſchool was not a little ſurprized at ſuch a viſit, and would have taken the honour of it to himſelf; but was ſoon convinced, that he had neither wit nor learning enough to make a party in ſuch company. This adventure is ſaid to have been of ſome length, and

(*a*) Life of Mr. John Oldham, p. 2, prefixed to his works, vol. 1. edit. London 1722. and Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. 2. col. 751. 2d edit.

and to have brought him acquainted with ſome perſons of note. For after about three years continuance at Croyden-ſchool, he was recommended by his good friend Harman Atwood, Eſq; [*A*], Counſellor at Law of Saunderſted in Surrey, to Sir Edward Thurland, a Judge, near Rygate in the ſame county, who appointed him tutor to his two grandſons. He continued in this family till 1681. After this he was ſometime tutor to a ſon of Sir William Hickes, a gentleman living within three or four miles of London, who was intimately acquainted with that excellent Phyſician Dr. Richard Lower, by whoſe peculiar friendſhip and encouragement Mr. Oldham at his leiſure hours ſtudied phyſick for about a year, and made ſome progreſs therein; but the bent of his poetical genius was too ſtrong for him to become a proficient in any ſchool but that of the muſes [*B*]. When he had diſcharged the truſt repoſed to him of qualifying young Mr. Hickes for foreign travels, not caring, though earneſtly preſſed to go abroad with him, he took leave of the family, and with a ſmall ſum of money, which he had ſaved, haſtened to London, and became a perfect votary to the bottle, being a moſt agreeable companion [*C*]. He had not been long in London, before he was found out by the Noblemen, who had viſited him at Croyden, and who now brought him acquainted with Mr. Dryden. But amongſt the men of Quality, he was moſt affectionately careſſed by William Earl of Kingſton, who would fain have had him his chaplain; but he declined that employment [*D*]. He lived with the Earl at Holme-Pierpoint in Nottinghamſhire, where

[*A*] *His good friend* Harman Atwood, Eſq;] Mr. Aubrey informs us (1), that "the name and family "of *Atwood* have been of long duration in the vil-"lage of Saunderſted, in a lineal deſcent; though "the firſt I can find, ſays he, is one buried in the "Church, *anno* 1520. Of this family was *Harman* "*Atwood*, Eſq;. This gentleman was a ſingular bene-"factor to this and other Churches, whereof he was "a patron, by building houſes for the incumbents, "and reſtoring the impropriated tythes, which ſacri-"lege had deſpoiled them of, and for which he de-"ſerves honourable mention; though his reputation "can never die, while any reſpect is due to ſo exem-"plary virtue, or while the celebrated *Oldham* bears "any vogue in the world."

(1) Natural Hiſtory and Antiquities of the County of Surrey, vol. 2. p. 60.

[*B*] *But the bent of his poetical genius was too ſtrong for him to become a proficient in any ſchool but that of the Muſes.*] This he freely acknowledges in a *letter to a friend in town*, written in July 1678, in which he ſpeaks thus (2):

(2) See his works, vol. 1. p. 239. & ſeqq. edit. London, 1728.

While ſilly I all thriving arts refuſe,
And all my hopes and all my vigour loſe
In ſervice of the worſt of jilts, a muſe.
For gainful buſineſs court ignoble eaſe,
And in gay trifles waſte my ill-ſpent days.
. . . . . .
Oft (I remember) did wiſe friends diſſuade,
And bid me quit the trifling barren trade.
Oft have I try'd, Heav'n knew, to mortify
This vile and wicked luſt of poetry;
But ſtill unconquer'd it remains within,
Fix'd as a habit, or ſome darling ſin.
In vain, I better ſtudies there would ſow;
Oft have I try'd, but none will thrive or grow.
All my beſt thoughts, when I'd moſt ſerious be,
Are never from its foul infection free:
Nay (God forgive me) when I ſay my prayers,
I ſcarce can help polluting them with verſe.
That ſab'lous wretch of old reverſ'd I ſeem,
Who turn, whate'er I touch, to droſs and rhime.
. . . . . .
Deaf to all means, which might moſt proper ſeem
Towards my cure, I run ſtark mad in rhime;
A ſad poor haunted wretch, whom nothing leſs
Than prayers of the church can diſpoſſeſs.
. . . . . .
What was't, I raſhly vow'd? Shall ever I
Quit my beloved miſtreſs poetry?
Thou ſweet beguiler of my lonely hours,
Which thus glide unperceiv'd with ſilent courſe:
Thou gentle ſpell, which undiſturb'd doſt keep
My breaſt, and charm intruding care aſleep:
They ſay, thou'rt poor and unendow'd, what tho'?
For thee I this vain worthleſs world forego.
Let wealth and honour be for fortune's ſlaves,
The alms of fools, and prize of crafty knaves.
To me thou art, whate'er th' ambitious crave,
And all that greedy miſers want or have.
In youth or age, in travel or at home,
Here, or in town, at London, or at Rome;
Rich, or a beggar, free, or in the fleet;
Whate'er my fate is, 'tis my fate to write.

[*C*] *Being a moſt agreeable companion.*] Mr. *Robert Gould*, in his verſes to the memory of our Author, thus addreſſes him:

"The company of beauty, wealth, and wine,
"Were not ſo charming, not ſo ſweet as thine:
"They quickly periſh'd; your's was ſtill the ſame,
"A lambent, but an everlaſting flame;
"Which ſomething ſo reſiſtleſs did impart,
"It never paſs'd the ear, but reach'd the heart.
"Unlike the wretch, that ſtrives to get eſteem,
"And thinks it fine and jaunty to blaſpheme,
"Nor can be witty, but when God's the theme:
"Miſtaken men (but ſuch thou didſt deſpiſe,)
"That muſt be wicked to be counted wiſe.
"Thy converſe from this reigning vice was free;
"And yet was truly all that wit could be:
"None had it, but ev'n with a tear does own,
"The ſoul of dear ſociety is gone."

[*D*] William *Earl of* Kingſton . . . . *would fain have had him his chaplain; but he declined that employment.*] The writer of his *Life* (3) obſerves, that our author, in his *Satyr addreſſed to a friend, that is about to leave the Univerſity, and come abroad into the world*, lets his friend know, that "he was affrighted "from the thought of ſuch an employment, by the "ſcandalous ſort of treatment, which often accom-"panies it. This uſage deters men of generous minds "from placing themſelves in ſuch a ſtation of life, "and by that means frequently excludes perſons of "quality from the improving and agreeable conver-"ſation of a learned and obſequious friend." In that *Satire* Mr. Oldham writes thus (4):

(3) p. 10.

(4) Works, vol. 2. p. 125, 126.

Some think themſelves exalted to the ſky,
If they light in ſome noble family.
Diet, and horſe, and thirty pounds a year,
Beſides th' advantage of his Lordſhip's ear;
The credit of the buſineſs and the ſtate,
Are things that in a youngſter's ſenſe ſound great.
Little the unexperienc'd wretch does know,
What ſlavery he oft muſt undergo;
Who tho' in ſilken-ſtuff and caſſock dreſt,
Wears but a gayer livery at beſt.
When dinner calls, the implement muſt wait
With holy words to conſecrate the meat;
But hold it for a favour ſeldom known,
If he be deign'd the honour to ſit down.
Soon as the Tarts appear, Sir Crape *withdraw,*
Thoſe dainties are not for a ſpiritual maw.
Obſerve your diſtance, and be ſure to ſtand
Hard by the ciſtern with your cap in hand:
There for diverſion you may pick your teeth,
Till the kind voider comes for your relief.
For meer board-wages ſuch their freedom ſell,
Slaves to an hour, and vaſſels to a bell:

where he being ſeized with the ſmall-pox, he died December 9, 1683, in the 30th year of his age, and was interred with the utmoſt decency, his Lordſhip attending as chief mourner, in the church there (*b*), where the Earl ſoon after erected a monument to his memory [*E*]. He wrote ſeveral poems [*F*]. He was tall of ſtature; the make of his body very thin; his face long, his noſe prominent, his aſpect unpromiſing, but ſatire was in his eye. His conſtitution was very tender, and inclined to a conſumption; and it was not a little injured by his ſtudy and application to learned authors, in whom he was greatly converſant, as appears from his *Satires againſt the Jeſuiſts*, in which there is as much learning as wit diſcovered. Mr. Dryden had a great eſteem for him [*G*]. In the

(*b*) Life, p. a—14.

And if th' employment of one day be ſtole,
They are but priſ'ners out upon parole:
Always the marks of ſlavery remain,
And they, tho' looſe, ſtill drag about their chain.
And where's the mighty proſpect after all,
A Chaplainſhip ſerv'd up, and ſev'n years thrall?
The menial thing perhaps for a reward
Is to ſome ſlender benefice preferr'd,
With this proviſo bound, that he muſt wed
My Lady's antiquated waiting-maid,
In dreſſing only ſkill'd and marmalade.
Let others, who ſuch meanneſſes can brook,
Strike countenances to ev'ry great man's look:
Let thoſe, that have a mind, turn ſlaves to eat,
And live contented by another's plate:
I rate my freedom higher, nor will I
For food and raiment truck my liberty.
But if I muſt to my laſt ſhifts be put,
To fill a bladder, and twelve yards of gut;
Rather with counterfeited wooden leg,
And my right-arm ty'd up, I'll chooſe to beg.
I'll rather chooſe to ſtarve at large, than be
The gaudieſt vaſſal to dependency.

[*E*] *The Earl ſoon after erected a monument to his memory.*] The inſcription on it is as follows. *M. S.* Joh. Oldhami *Poetæ, quo nemo ſacro furore plenior, nemo rebus ſublimior, aut verbis felicius audax; cujus famam omni ævo propria ſatis conſecrabunt carmina. Quem inter primos Honoratiſſimi* Gulielmi *Comitis de* Kingſton *Patroni ſui amplexus Variolis correptum, heu nimis immatura mors rapuit, & in cæleſtem tranſtulit Chorum. Natus apud Shipton in Agro Gloceſtrenſi, in Aulâ Sti Edmundi Graduatus. Obiit die Decembris nono, Anno Domini* 1683. *Ætatis* 30.

[*F*] *He wrote ſeveral Poems.*] His works were printed at London 1722, in two volumes in 12mo. The firſt volume contains, 1. *Four ſatires upon the Jeſuits, written in the year* 1679. 2. *A Satire againſt Virtue: a Pindaric Ode.* Our Author, in his *Advertiſement* prefixed to his *Satires againſt the Jeſuites*, tells us, that this Poem, "tho' the world has given it the name of the *Satire againſt Virtue*, was never deſigned "to that intent, how apt ſoever ſome may be to "wreſt it. And this appears by what is ſaid after "it, and is diſcernable enough to all, that have the "ſenſe to underſtand it. 'Twas meant to abuſe "thoſe, who valued themſelves upon their wit and "parts in praiſing vice; and to ſhew, that others of "ſober principles, if they would take the ſame liberty in poetry, could ſtrain as high rants in profaneneſs as they. At firſt he intended it not for "the public, nor to paſs beyond the privacy of two "or three friends; but ſeeing it had the fate to ſteal "abroad in manuſcript, and afterwards in print, "without his knowledge, he now thinks it a juſtice "due to his own reputation, to have it come forth "without thoſe faults, which it has ſuffered from "tranſcribers and the preſs hitherto, and which "make it a worſe Satire upon himſelf, than upon "what it was deſigned." 3. *An Apology for the foregoing Ode, by way of Epilogue.* 4. *The Paſſion of Byblis, from the ninth Book of Ovid's Metamorphoſis, imitated in Engliſh.* 5. *Satire upon a Woman, who by her Falſhood and Scorn, was the Death of his Friend.* 6. *Horace's Art of Poetry, imitated in Engliſh. Addreſſed by way of Letter to a Friend.* 7. *An Imitation of Horace, Book* 1. *Satire* 9. *written in June* 1681. 8. *Paraphraſe upon Horace, Book* 1. *Ode* 31. 9. *Paraphraſe upon Horace, Book* 2. *Ode* 14. 10. *The Praiſe of Homer, a Pindaric Ode.* 11. Bion; *a Paſtoral, in Imitation of the Greek of* Moſchus, *bewailing the Death of the Earl of Rocheſter. Ann.* 1680. 12. *The Lamentation for Adonis, imitated out of the Greek of Bion of Smyrna.* 13. *Paraphraſe on the* 137*th Pſalm: a Pindarit Ode.* 14. *Paraphraſe upon the Hymn of St. Ambroſe: A Pindaric Ode.* 15. *A letter from a friend in the country to a friend in town, giving an account of the Author's inclinations to poetry. Written in July* 1678. 16. *Satire upon a Printer, that expoſed him by printing a piece of his groſly mangled and faulty.* The ſecond volume contains, 1. *The eighth Satire of* Boileau *imitated. Written in October* 1682. 2. *The thirteenth Satire of Juvenal imitated.* 3. *David's lamentation for the death of Saul and Jonathan. Written in September* 1677. 4. *An Ode of Ariſtotle in Athenæus upon honour paraphraſed.* 5. *Upon the works of* Ben Johnſon. *Written in* 1678. 6. *The ninth Ode of the third book of Horace imitated.* 7. *Upon a Lady, overturned in a coach. Out of* Voiture. 8. *Catullus, Epigram* 7. *Imitated.* 9. *Some Elegies out of Ovid's Amours, imitated.* 10. *A Fragment of* Petronius, *imitated.* 11. *An Ode of* Anacreon, *paraphraſed.* 12. *An alluſion to* Martial, *Book* 1. *Epigr.* 118. 13. *The Dream. Written March* 10, 1677. 14. *A Satire touching Nobility. Out of Monſieur* Boileau. 15. *A Satire addreſſed to a friend, that is about to leave the Univerſity, and come abroad in the world.* 16. *Some Verſes written in September* 1676, *preſenting a book to Coſinelia.* 17. *The Parting.* 18. *Complaining of Abſence.* 19. *Promiſing a viſit.* 20. *The careleſs good Fellow, written March* 9, 1680. *A Song.* 21. *A Satire; in which the perſon of* Spenſer *is brought in diſſuading the author from the ſtudy of poetry, and ſhewing how little it is eſteemed and encouraged in this preſent time.* 22. *A Satire in imitation of the third Satire of Juvenal. Written May* 1682. 23. *A Dithyrambick: a drunkard's ſpeech in a maſk. Written in Auguſt* 1677. 24. *Remains of Mr.* Oldham *in verſe and proſe,* viz. 1. *Verſes on his death by Mr.* Thomas Hotman, *Mr.* Nahum Tate, *Mr.* Durfey, *Mr.* Thomas Andrews, *Mr.* Thomas Wood, *Mr.* Robert Gould, *&c.* 2. *The Counterpart to the Satire againſt Virtue.* 3. Virgil's *Eclogue* 8. *tranſlated.* 4. *Upon the marriage of the Prince of* Orange *with the Lady Mary.* 5. *Ode for an anniverſary of muſick on St. Cecilia's day, ſet by Dr.* Blow. 6. *To Madam* L. E. *upon her recovery from a late ſickneſs.* 7. *On the death of Miſs* Katherine Kingſtone, *a child of excellent parts and piety.* 8. *To the memory of his dear friend Mr.* Charles Morwent. 9. *To the memory of that worthy gentleman Mr.* Harman Atwood. 10. *Character of a certain ugly old Parſon.* 11. *A Sunday thought in ſickneſs.*

[*G*] *Mr.* Dryden *had a great eſteem for him.*] This appears from that Poet's verſes to his memory, which are as follow:

"Farewel, too little, and too lately known,
"Whom I began to think and call my own;
"For ſure our ſouls were near allied, and thine
"Caſt in the ſame poetic mould with mine.
"One common note on either lyre did ſtrike,
"And knaves and fools were both abhorr'd alike.
"To the ſame Goal did both our ſtudies drive;
"The laſt ſet out, the ſooneſt did arrive.
"Thus *Niſus* * fell upon the ſlippery place,
"While his young friend perform'd and won the race.
"O early ripe! to thy abundant ſtore
"What could advancing age have added more?
"It might, what nature never gives the young,
"Have taught the ſmoothneſs of thy native tongue.
"But ſatire needs not thoſe, and wit will ſhine
"Thro' the harſh cadence of a rugged line:
"A noble error, and but ſeldom made,
"When Poets are by too much force betray'd.
"Thy

* Niſus, famous in Virgil for his friendſhip with Euryalus, with whom he loſt his life.

the ſecond volume of *a great hiſtorical, geographical, and poetical Dictionary*, he is ſtiled "the darling of the Muſes, a pithy, ſententious, elegant, and ſmooth writer. His "tranſlations exceeded the original, and his invention ſeems matchleſs. His *Satire* "*againſt the Jeſuiſts* is of ſpecial note; and he may juſtly be ſaid to have excelled all "the Satiriſts of the age."

"Thy gen'rous fruits, tho' gather'd e'er their prime,
"Still ſhew'd a quickneſs; and maturing time
"But mellows what we write to the dull ſweets of rhime.

"Once more hail and farewel; farewel, thou young,
"But ah! too ſhort, *Marcellus* of our tongue;
"Thy brow's with ivy and with laurels bound;
"But fate and gloomy night encompaſs thee around."

T.

OLEN, a Greek poet, antienter than to Orpheus (*a*), was a native of Xanthus a city of Lycia [*A*]. He compoſed ſeveral hymns which were ſung in the iſland of Delos on ſolemn days, dedicated to religion (*b*), particularly in honour of the Goddeſs Lucina (*c*), who he ſaid was Cupid's mother (*d*). He was the firſt that aſſerted, that Achaia came from the country of the Hyperboreans to the iſland of Delos (*e*). Others ſay (*f*), that he was one of the Hyperboreans who founded the oracle of Delphi; and that he was the firſt Prieſt of Apollo there, that is, gave one of the oracular anſwers, which he did in hexameters. Mention is made of him in a paſſage of Pauſanias, which Romulus Amaſeus did not correct [*B*]. I muſt make ſome remarks on the ſupplement to Moreri [*C*].

(*a*) Pauſan. lib. 9. p. 302.
(*b*) Herodot. lib. 4. c. 35.
(*c*) Pauſan. lib. 1. p. 16.
(*d*) Pauſan. lib. 9. p. 302.
(*e*) Idem, lib. 5. p. 154.
(*f*) Idem. lib. 10. p. 320, 321.

[*A*] *He was a native of Xanthus, a city of Lycia.*] Herodotus and Pauſanias inform us that he was a Lycian, but then they do not tell us the city in which he was born. The reader will ſee the name of it, in the two following verſes of Callimachus:

Οἱ μὲν ὑπαείδουσι νόμον Λυκίοιο γέροντος
Ὃν τοι ἀπὸ Ξάνθοιο θεοπρόπος ἤγαγεν Ὠλήν.

(1) Callimachus, *Hymno in Delum*, ver. 304. p. 132. edit. Græv. 1697.

The Senſe is,

"For theſe repeat the Lycian Sage's ſong,
"Which Olen formerly from Xanthus brought."

[*B*] *A paſſage of Pauſanias, which Romulus Amaſeus did not correct.*] 'Tis this: Λύκιος δὲ ὃς ἦν ἀρχαιότερος τὴν ἡλικίαν Δήλιος ὕμνους καὶ ἄλλοις ποιήσας, καὶ ἐν Εἰλειθυίαν τε, ἔυλινόν τε αὐτὴν ἀνακαλεῖ (2). "But Lyceus, "who was much older, a native of Delos, gives her "the name of *Eulinon*, or ſpinſter, in hymns writ- "ten in honour of other deities, and of Lycina "herſelf." Gregorius Gyraldus conjectures that we ought to read ὠλὴν inſtead of Δήλιος (3); however, the correction ought to be made there, but immediately after Λύκιος δὲ; for, inſtead of ὃς ἦν, we muſt read ὠλὴν; and afterwards, inſtead of Δήλιος, we muſt write Δηλίους. This conjecture occurred to me before I ſaw the new edition of Pauſanias: I have conſulted it ſince, and found a note of Kuhnius, which explains the paſſage after that manner. Here we have one of the cauſes, which have given birth to many chimerical authors; for here we are told of a very antient poet, one Lycius of Delos, who owes his exiſtence entirely to the error of a copiſt.

(2) Pauſan. lib. 8. p. 253.

(3) *Pro* Delion Olena *legendum.* Lilius Gregor. Gyraldus, *de Poët. Hiſt. Dialogo* 3. *init.* p. m. 118.

[*C*] *I muſt make ſome remarks on the ſupplement to Moreri.*] I. 'Tis an error to ſay barely, that Olen *was of the city of Dyme in Achaia*; for though Suidas called him Δυμαῖος (a Dymæan), he yet adds, that it is now juſt to ſuppoſe him a native of Xanthus in Lycia, after Callimachus Polyhiſtor. II. The following paſſage is not very accurate: the hymns of Olen *uſed to be ſung, in the iſland of Delos, during the ſolemnities obſerved there for ſick perſons, by throwing upon them duſt taken from the Sepulchre of the goddeſs Opis or Cybele, called by the Greeks Hecaerge.* This probably was copied from a work of Gyraldus (4), where we read that the hymns of Olen uſed to be ſung in Delos, whilſt the aſhes, taken from the Sepulchre of Opis ſirnamed Hecaerge, were caſt on a numberleſs multitude of ſick and diſeaſed perſons who ſtood near the altar. For this he cites Herodotus, and adds, that Pauſanias ſaid almoſt the ſame thing: *idem fere ſcribit Pauſanias* (5); but it is certain that Gyraldus was miſled by Laurentius Valla's tranſlation. This is not the ſenſe of Herodotus's Greek text (6); he is a little confuſed in that place; and may be underſtood in a ſenſe vaſtly oppoſite to that of Valla, as is plain from another verſion printed in the margin. Herodotus does not ſay that Ops or Opis was ſirnamed Hecaerge. He does not ſpeak of Ops mother of the Gods, but of a young woman who came from that country of the Hyperboreans to the iſland of Delos, with another young woman named Arge. Theſe two young women undertook this journey, to offer up Lucina the gifts deſigned for her, in order to obtain a ſpeedy and propitious delivery (7). But as Pauſanias ſcarce mentions any of thoſe particulars; how therefore can it be affirmed, that he relates almoſt the ſame particulars as Herodotus is ſuppoſed to have done? The continuator of Moreri would perhaps be very much puzzled, ſhould he be required to prove that the Goddeſs Cybele was ſirnamed *Hecaerge*, that is, who poſſeſſes the virtue or power of operating things at a diſtance. But were the ſolemnity he ſpeaks of true, ſhould we not have an Aſhwedneſday in the heathen Syſtem, as well as in the Popiſh religion, and that accompanied with ſome very ſingular characteriſticks of ſuperſtition? Perſons afflicted with diſeaſes of every kind, would have flattered themſelves with the hopes of getting cured, by the virtue of aſhes taken from the Sepulchre of Opis; but then they muſt have been near the altar, and therefore the epithet of Hecaerge does not ſuit on this occaſion. If the reader conſults the learned Mr. Spanheim's notes on Callimachus (8), he will find ſtrong proofs, that Hecaerge was not an epithet of Cybele, or of the Opis who was one of the Hyperborean young women that came to Delos with offerings; but the name of a female companion of Opis in that journey.

(4) Gyraldus, *de Poëtar. Hiſt. Dialogo* 3. *init.* p. m. 118.
(5) Idem, ibid.
(6) Theodot. lib. 4. c. 35. p. m. 236.
(7) Ἀντὶ τοῦ ὠκυτόκου, *i. e.* "To forward "the birth." Theodot. lib. 4. c. 35. p. 235.
(8) Ezech. Spanhemius *in* Callimachi Hymnum *in* Delum. p. 503.

OLYMPIAS, the mother of Alexander the Great, made herſelf ſo ſtrongly ſuſpected of adultery by her huſband King Philip of Macedon, that he divorced her [*A*]. It is even pretended that ſhe confeſſed to him that he was not the father of Alexander, and that ſhe

(1) *Cujus* (Attali) *ſororem nuper expulſo Alexandri matre Olympiade propter ſtupri ſuſpicionem in matrimonium receperat*; i. e. "Whoſe (*i. e.* "Attalus's) ſiſ- "ter he had "lately married, "having divor- "ced Olympias,

[*A*] *She made herſelf ſo ſtrongly ſuſpected of adultery by . . . . King Philip that he divorced her.*] Juſtin ſays no more than this in the 5th chapter of his 9th book (1); but in another place he aſſerts, that the matter was brought to a full conviction, which was the reaſon why ſhe was divorced. *Namque mater ejus Olympias confeſſa viro ſuo Philippo fuerat, Alexandrum non ex eo ſe, ſed ex ſerpente ingentis magnitudinis concepiſſe. Denique Philippus ultimo prope vitæ ſuæ tempore,* filium ſuum non eſſe *palam prædicaverat. Qua ex cauſa Olympiadem, velut ſtupri compertam, repudio dimiſerat* (2), i. e. "For his mother Olympias had con- "feſſed to King Philip her huſband, that ſhe had not "conceived Alexander by him, but by a ſerpent of "an immenſe bigneſs. And further, Philip had "openly declared towards the latter end of his life, "that

"Alexander's "mother, be- "cauſe he ſuſ- "pected her of "adultery." Juſtin. lib. 9. c. 5.
(2) Idem, lib. 11. c. 11.

ſhe had lain with a ſerpent when ſhe conceived that ſon (a) [B]. She is not the only perſon of whom ſuch ſtories have been related (b). They are miſtaken, who pretend that Nectanebus, who was baniſhed from Egypt, and took ſanctuary at the Court of Macedon, debauched Olympias [C]. She was ſo exaſperated againſt her huſband when he married another wife, that ſhe encouraged Pauſanias to kill him. She was not ſorry that the

(a) See the remark [A].

(b) See the remark [H].

" that Alexander *was not his ſon*. For which reaſon " he had divorced Olympias as a woman convicted " of adultery." There are ſome diſſolute women who are very civil and complaiſant to their huſbands, which in ſome manner atones for their ſins: but Olympias was croſs and peeviſh (3); ſo that Philip had a very hard taſk upon his hands, being obliged to ſuffer at once both from the ill humour and from the adultery of his wife.

(3) Ἡ τῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος χαλεπότης, δυσζηλία καὶ βαρυθυμία γυναικός. " The ill hu- " mour, of O- " lympias, who " was a miſtruſt- " ful and peeviſh " woman." Plutarch *in* Alexandro, p. 669. *A*.

[B] *She had lai with a ſerpent when ſhe had conceived that ſon.*] Beſides Juſtin's authority quoted above, I may alledge what Plutarch relates, namely, that a large ſerpent was ſeen lying upon Olympias whilſt ſhe was aſleep; that the King having ſeen it through the chink of the door, loſt the eye which he put to that chink (4); that he alſo became ſenſible after that time that his love for Olympias grew leſs and leſs; that he lay but ſeldom with her afterwards, either becauſe he feared leſt ſhe ſhould bewitch him, or that ſhe revered the God, who in the ſhape of a ſerpent came to careſs the Queen. Ὤφθη δὲ ποτὲ καὶ δράκων, κοιμωμένης τῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος, παρικλιθεὶς αὐτῇ τῷ σώματι. καὶ τοῦτο Φιλίππῳ τὸν ἔρωτα καὶ τὰς φιλοφροσύνας ἀμαυρῶσαι λέγουσιν, ὡς μηδὲ φοιτᾶν ἔτι πολλάκις παρ' αὐτὴν ἀναπαυόμενον. εἴτε δεισιδαίμονας τινὰς μαγείας αὐτῷ καὶ φάρμακα τῆς γυναικὸς, εἴτε τὴν ὁμιλίαν, ὡς κρείττονι συνοῦσαν, ἀφοσιούμενον, i. e. " A ſerpent, or dragon, was ſeen " ſtretched out over Olympias whilſt ſhe was aſleep: " and it is ſaid that this leſſened Philip's love and " fondneſs for her, ſo that he went but ſeldom to " lye with her, either becauſe he feared her charms " and incantations, or did not care to keep company " with a woman who converſed with a greater being " than himſelf (5)." It is alſo aſſerted, that Eratoſthenes related that Olympias imparted that fine ſecret to Alexander only, and not before he ſet out for the war. Behave yourſelf, added ſhe, in a manner ſuitable to your high birth. Ἡ δὲ Ὀλυμπιὰς (ὡς Ἐρατοσθένης φησὶ) προπέμπουσα τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον ἐπὶ τὴν στρατείαν, καὶ φράσασα μόνῳ τὸ περὶ τὴν τέκνωσιν ἀπόῤῥητον, ἐκέλευεν ἄξια φρονεῖν τῆς γενέσεως, i. e. " When Alexan- " der was ſetting out for the war, Olympias (as Era- " toſthenes relates) told him privately the ſecret of " his birth, exhorting him at the ſame time to be- " have himſelf ſuitably to his high deſcent (6)." Obſerve that according to Juſtin, Olympias's lying with a ſerpent happened only in a dream. That Queen dreamed that a large ſerpent enjoyed her the night ſhe conceived Alexander (7). One of our beſt criticks obſerves upon this paſſage, that there were ſerpents in Macedonia, which were ſo eaſily tamed that the women uſed to put them round their arms, and round their necks, like bracelets or necklaces, either to play with them, or to cool themſelves; whereupon he quotes Lucian's authority. *Hoc autem non abs re fuerit meminiſſe, (nam ex nihilo, ut ajunt, nihil) reperiri in Macedonia ſerpentes, qui tam facile manſuefieri poſſint, ut ex iis olim & puellæ & matronæ ſibi armillas, ſibi monilia facerent, vel ut animulas ſuas oblectarent, vel ad corpuſculum frigerandum. Hujus rei auctorem ciere poſſum Lucianum in Alexandro, ſive Pſeudomanti* (8). Lucian does not mention thoſe bracelets, nor thoſe Necklaces; but he relates ſome particulars, which are not leſs ſurpriſing. He aſſerts that the women at Pella uſed to feed large ſerpents, who were ſo well tamed that they ſucked them, and ſuffered them to lye with their children. He is apt to think that the tradition, which was ſpread abroad concerning Olympias, came originally from thence. Ἐλαῦνα ἰδόντες δράκοντας τεραμναγίους, ἡμέρους πάνυ, καὶ τιθασσοὺς, ὡς καὶ ὑπὸ γυναικῶν τρέφεσθαι καὶ παιδίοις συγκαθεύδειν, καὶ πικρμένους ἀνέχεσθαι, καὶ θηλαζομένους μὴ ἀγανακτεῖν, καὶ γάλα πίνειν ἀπὸ θηλῆς καὶ ταῦτα τοῖς βρέφεσι, πολλοὶ δὲ γίνεσθαι τοιοῦτοι παρ' αὐτοῖς, ὥστε καὶ τὸν περὶ τῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος μῦθον διαφοιτῆσαι πάλαι ἴσως, ὁπόταν ἴδωσι τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον, δράκοντός τινος οἶμαι τοιούτου συγκαθεύδοντος αὐτῇ, δυσὶ λαβοῦσαι ταῖν ἰρπίσιν ἐν τὸ κάλλιστον, ὀλίγων δεομένοις, i. e. " They ſaw there ſome ſerpents immenſely large, " but ſo tame and mild, that they were fed by wo- " men, and lay with children: they ſuffered them- " ſelves to be trod upon, nor would they be angry " when they were ſqueeſed; they even ſucked the " milk out of the women's breaſts, like children. " (There are many of theſe ſerpents in thoſe parts; " whence it is probable that the ſtory of Olympias " was owing to her lying with ſuch a ſerpent, when ſhe " conceived Alexander) one of the moſt beautiful of " thoſe ſerpents is ſold for a trifle (9)." According to Plutarch (10) the women of that country made uſe of thoſe ſerpents during the Feſtival of Bacchus; for they took a pride in celebrating it with all the ſigns of the moſt furious fanaticiſm. They took care to make thoſe ſerpents creep upon the ſpears * which they carried in their hands, and upon the crowns which they wore on their heads, thinking the more to frighten the men thereby. Plutarch obſerves that Olympias affected to be more tranſported with fury at thoſe ſolemnities, than the other women. Ἡ δὲ Ὀλυμπιὰς μᾶλλον ἐτέρων ζηλώσασα τὰς καλοχὰς, καὶ τοὺς ἐνθουσιασμοὺς ἐξάγουσα βαρβαρικώτερον, ὄφεις μιγάλους χειροήθεις ἐφιλκίλο τοῖς θιάσοις, i. e. " Olympias, who " affected more than the other women, to be tranſ- " ported with fury, and to celebrate that enthuſiaſtical " ſolemnity after a more fierce manner, uſed to lead " huge ſerpents, which were tamed, in her dances (11)."

(4) Ἀποβαλεῖν δὲ τῶν ὄψεων αὐτὸν τὴν ἑτέραν, ἣν τῷ τῆς θύρας ἀρμῷ προσβαλὼν, κατώπτευσεν ἐν μορφῇ δράκοντος συνευναζόμενον τῇ γυναικὶ τὸν Θεόν, i. e. " That he " loſt one of his " eyes, which " he applied to " the chink of " the door to ſee " the God, who " in the ſhape of " a ſnake lay " with his " wife." Plut. *in* Alex. *init.* p. m. 665.

(5) Idem, ibid.

(6) Idem, ibid.

(7) *Qua nocte eum mater Olympias concepit, viſa per quietem ab cum ingenti ſerpente volutari* (others read *voluptari*.) Juſtin. lib. 12. c. 16.

(8) Tanaquillus Faber, *in* Juſtin. p. 291. edit. Græv. 1683.

(9) Lucianus, *in* Pſeudomanti, p. 863. Tom. 1. edit. Salmurienſis, 1619.

(10) Plutarch, *in* Alexandro, p. 665.

* In Latin *Thyrſi*, ſpears wrapt about with Ivy, or Bay-leaves.

[C] *They are miſtaken, who pretend that Nectanebus .. debauched Olympias.*] Plutarch (12) tells us, that Nectanebus or Nectanabus, forſaking Tachus, a relation of his, who had made him General of his army, cauſed himſelf to be proclaimed King of Egypt (13), and that Ageſilaus followed his party. The Perſians vanquiſhed him, and drove him out of Egypt. Some pretend that he took ſanctuary in Æthiopia; but others aſſert that he went to the Court of Macedon, becauſe he imagined that King Philip would aſſiſt him powerfully againſt the Perſians. But, ſay ſome, he was ſo unthankful for the kind reception he met with from that Prince, that he made uſe of all poſſible means to enjoy Olympias, having recourſe even to the magical Art; in which he was a great proficient (14). By that means he made the Queen yield to his wiſhes, ſo that ſhe conceived Alexander by him. It is added that King Philip diſcovered ſomething of this, and that after that time he ſuſpected his wife of adultery, which was the true reaſon why he divorced her. This is a mere ſtory. It appears from Chronology that Alexander was ſix years old when Nectanebus was driven from his Kingdom. I owe this obſervation to the learned Freinſhemius, and leave the whole glory of it to him. *Nec deſunt*, ſays he, *qui* fabuloſum id quidem; non tamen adulterium matris falſo jactatum *aſſerant*. Quippe pulſum Ægypti regno Nectanebum, non, ut vulgo arbitrantur, in Æthiopias conceſſiſſe; ſed quum adverſus vim Perſicam in Philippo maxime præſidium ſperaret, in Macedoniam vectum, magicis præſtigiis inluſiſſe Olympiadi, torumque hoſpitis temeraviſſe. Suſpectam quidem exinde Philippo, neque aliam tam intimam divortii quod inter eos ſequutum eſt, cauſſam, pro comperto poſtea fuiſſe .... (16) *Cæterum Nectanebi fuga temporibus hiſce non congruit; ſexennis enim jam erat Alexander, quum ille ab Ocho victus, avitis opibus excideret*, i. e. " There are ſome authors who pretend " that this ſtory is falſe, though they acknowledge " that Alexander's mother was not unjuſtly charged " with adultery. The ſtory is as follows. Nectane- " bus being driven out of his Kingdom of Egypt, " went not into Æthiopia, as it is commonly thought, " but into Macedon, being in hopes that King Philip " would aſſiſt him againſt the Perſians. That he abuſed " Olympias by the means of his magical arts, and " defiled the bed of his Hoſt. That Philip ſuſpected " Olympias after that time, which was the chief " reaſon why he divorced her afterwards .... *But* " *Nectanebus's flight cannot be referred to that time;* " *for Alexander was ſix years old when Nectanebus* " *was vanquiſhed by Ochus, and obliged to abdicate* " *the Kingdom of his anceſtors.*"

(11) Plutarch, *in* Alexand. p. 665.

(12) Idem, *in* Ageſilao, p. 617.

(13) See the article TACHUS.

(14) We read of a certain magician called Nectanabus, that he made a number of ſhips and gallies of wax; and as he ſunk them in a large baſon of water, the ſhips of his enemies ran the ſame danger. *Vigenere ſur la Statue d'Eſculape de Philoſtrate*, folio 157, Tom. 2. edit. in 4to.

(15) Freinſhemius, Supplem. in Q. Curtium, lib. 1. c. 1. num. 15.

(16) Idem, ibid. num. 19.

world

world ſhould know ſhe was concerned in that murder [D]. At firſt ſhe was glad men ſhould think that ſhe got Alexander by Jupiter (c); but afterwards ſhe ridiculed that opinion, as appears from a letter ſhe wrote to that Prince [E], when ſhe knew that he proclaimed himſelf loudly the ſon of Jupiter, and would be worſhipped as a God [F], Antipater was almoſt perpetually at variance with her during Alexander's abſence; and it was indeed very difficult for a woman ſo ſuſpicious and ſo ill humoured as ſhe was (d) to agree with the perſon who commanded in Macedon. For that was the poſt which Alexander conferred on Antipater, when he ſet out to conquer Aſia. After that Conqueror's death his mother was obliged to retire into Epirus, whence Polyperchon called her back ſix years after. Arideus and his wife Eurydice, who reigned in Macedon, attempted to prevent her return, but their endeavours proved ineffectual; the Macedonians declared for her, and by her command they diſpatched both Eurydice and her huſband (e). She put Nicanor Caſſander's brother to death; and having pitched upon an hundred illuſtrious Macedonians, friends to the ſame Caſſander, ſhe cauſed them to be all murdered. That cruel behaviour made her ſoon loſe the love of her ſubjects; they all called then to mind Antipater's laſt words; and the advice he gave them on his death-bed never to ſuffer that a woman

(c) See the remarks [A] and [B].

(d) See the remark [A] quot. 3.

(e) See above, the article of EURYDICE, the daughter of Amyntas, in the Text.

[D] *She was not ſorry that the world ſhould know, ſhe was concerned in that murder.*] The diſgrace occaſioned by her divorce, and her huſband's new marriage (17), exaſperated her to ſuch a degree, that he endeavoured to perſuade her brother the King of Epirus to make war againſt Philip; ſhe would have ſucceeded in that deſign, had not Philip prevented it by marrying his daughter to that King (18). She prevailed upon Pauſanias to murder her huſband; ſhe cauſed horſes to be kept ready to carry the murderer off; and the very night ſhe arrived in Macedon to aſſiſt at that Prince's funeral, ſhe cauſed a crown to be put on Pauſanias's head, whoſe body was hanged on a croſs. A few days after ſhe had his funeral celebrated; ſhe raiſed a monument to him; and inſpired the people's breaſts with ſuch a ſuperſtition, as to make them celebrate annually a ſolemn Feſtival to the honour of that murderer. Afterwards ſhe cauſed the daughter to be killed, whom her huſband had got by Cleopatra; ſhe had her killed, I ſay, in her mother's lap, and then ſhe cauſed the mother to be hanged before her eyes (19). Laſtly ſhe conſecrated to Apollo the dagger, with which Pauſanias had killed Philip, and would have that dagger called by the name (of Myrtalis) by which ſhe went when ſhe was a child. She did all theſe things ſo publickly, that one would have thought ſhe feared, leſt people ſhould not have ſufficient proofs to be ſatisfied that all this was done by herſelf. See whether I have miſtaken Juſtin's ſenſe (20). *His ſtimulis irarum utrique* (21) *Pauſaniam, de impunitate ſtupri ſui querentem, ad tantum facinus impuliſſe creduntur. Olympias certe fugienti percuſſori equos quoque præparatos habuit. Ipſa deinde, audita regis nece, cum titulo officii ad exequias cucurriſſet, in cruce pendentis Pauſaniæ capiti, eadem nocte qua venit, coronam auream impoſuit: quod nemo alius audere, niſi hæc, ſuperſtite Philippi filio, potuiſſet. Paucos deinde poſt dies, refixum corpus interfectoris ſuper reliquias mariti cremavit, & tumulum ei eodem fecit in loco, parentarique eidem quotannis, incuſſa populo ſuperſtitione, curavit. Poſt hæc Cleopatram, a qua pulſa Philippi matrimonio fuerat, in gremio ejus prius filia interfecta, finire vitam ſuſpendio coëgit, ſpectaculoque pendentis ultionem potita eſt, ad quam per parricidium feſtinaverat. Noviſſime gladium, quo rex percuſſus eſt, Apollini ſub nomine Myrtalis conſecravit: hoc enim ante Olympiadis parvulæ fuit. Quæ omnia ita palam facta ſunt, ut timuiſſe videatur, ne facinus ab ea commiſſum non probaretur.*

(17) He married Cleopatra, Attalus's daughter, according to Juſtin, lib. 9. c. 5. or his niece, according to Plutarch. *in* Alexandro, and to Diodorus Siculus, lib. 16. c. 94.

(18) Extracted from Juſtin, lib. 9. c. 7

(19) Juſtin's words may be underſtood in that ſenſe; but they may alſo ſignify, that Olympias went to ſee Cleopatra only after ſhe was hanged.

(20) Juſtinus, ibid. p. m. 204, 205.

(21) That is to ſay, Olympias, and her ſon Alexander.

[E] *This appears from a letter ſhe wrote to that Prince.*] When he wrote to his mother, he ſtiled himſelf ſon of Jupiter Hammon. Whereupon ſhe made him the following anſwer. *Pray, ſon, keep yourſelf quiet; do not ſet up for my accuſer before Juno; for ſhe will do me ſome great miſchief, ſince in your letters you confeſs me her rival.* We know this particular only from Aulus Gellius; for Varro's work, from which he tranſcribed it, and ſeveral other Authors, who mentioned it alſo, are not extant now. Here follow the words of Aulus Gellius (22): *In pleriſque monumentis rerum ab Alexandro geſtarum, & paulo antè in libro M. Varronis, qui inſcriptus eſt* Oreſtes vel de inſania, *Olympiadem Philippi uxorem feſtiviſſimè reſcripſiſſe legimus Alexandro filio. Nam quum is ad matrem ita ſcripſiſſet; Rex Alexander Jovis Hammonis filius Olympiadi matri ſalutem dicit. Olympias reſcripſit ad hanc ſententiam:* Amabo, *inquit*, mi fili, quieſcas: neque deferas me neque criminere adverſum Junonem. Malum mihi prorſum illa magnum dabit, quum tu me litteris tuis pellicem illi eſſe confiteris. Freinſhemius is miſtaken, when he aſſerts that Olympias wrote to Alexander, that ſhe had not deſerved to be expoſed to Juno's reſentment. *Miſſaque epiſtola petiviſſe*, ne ſe nihil tale commeritam odiis Junonis objectare pergeret (23). Moreri, who never conſulted originals, has given us the ſubſtance of that letter erroneouſly, becauſe he relied on the tranſlation (24) of Freinſhemius. I do not deny but Olympias's words ſeem to be a mere raillery; but upon the whole, if one would lay a ſtreſs on the literal ſenſe of her expreſſions, one might aſſert, that this Princeſs does not deny ſhe converſed with Jupiter formerly, but that ſhe only wiſhes her ſon would not boaſt of it, leſt Juno, who would otherwiſe be perhaps ignorant of it, or who would not mind it, as long as it was not boaſted of, ſhould revive all the fury of her ancient jealouſy, upon ſeeing that new baſtard of her huſband, proclaim to all the world, the favours Olympias had granted him. Since therefore this is all that can be inferred from the literal ſenſe of Aulus Gellius's words, they ought not to have been quoted in Italicks, as though it were there poſitively aſſerted, that Olympias proteſted ſhe was innocent. The expreſſions (25), which Plutarch uſed (26), ſignify only, that Olympias would have her ſon keep his tongue: Now there is a great difference between ſaying, *I will not be accuſed to Juno*, and ſaying, *I have done nothing, at which Juno can be offended.* Ælian relates a particular, which ſhews that this Queen made once a very pious reflection on the weakneſs which Alexander betray'd, when he would paſs for a God. Olympias hearing that he had been dead ſome days, without being yet buried (27), cried out, *Oh! my poor ſon, you have done all your endeavours to have a place amongſt the Gods, and you have not even obtained yet what is common to all mortal men, the honour of a burial.* Ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν ἁρπαῦ μαθασχεῖν βυλόμενος, καὶ τῦτα σπεύδων, νῦν οὐδὲ τῶν κοινῶν ὄλπυ, καὶ ἴσων πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις μαθασχεῖν ἔχεις, γῆς τε ἅμα, καὶ ταφῆς; *i. e.* "You would be placed amongſt the "Celeſtial Beings, you ſtudied it with all your endeavours, and you have not been able to procure "even that which is the common right of all mankind, a piece of ground for a burial place (28)." This calls to my mind a joke of the ſophiſt Theocritus (29), who hearing of Alexander's death, ſaid to his countrymen, have a good courage, Gentlemen, ſince you ſee the Gods die before the men.

(22) Aulus Gellius, lib. 13. c. 4.

(23) Freinſhemius, Supplem. lib. 1. c. 1. num. 20. He quotes Agell. 13. 4.

(24) Made by Du Rier, and added to Vaugelas's French tranſlation of Quintus Curtius.

(25) That is to ſay, thoſe which he aſcribes directly to Olympias.

(26) Ἔτεροι δέ φασιν αὐτὴν ἀφεσιῶσθαι καὶ λέγειν, Οὐ πεποίηταί με δυσελπλων Ἀλέξανδρος πρὸς τὴν Ἥραν. "Others ſay, "ſhe did not "like it, and "ſaid, Shall A- "lexander never "ceaſe accuſing "me to Juno?" Plutarch, *in* Alexandro.

(27) See Ælian. Var. Hiſt. lib. 12. c. 64.

(28) Ælian. Ibid. lib. 13. c. 30.

(29) Clem. Alexandr. *Admonit. ad Gentes*, p. 61.

[F] *Alexander proclaimed himſelf the ſon of Jupiter, and would be worſhipped as a God.*] By uſurping thus divine honours, he had ſeveral views, and particularly that of clearing the reputation of Olympias, who was thought to have acted againſt the rules of chaſtity. I ſhall quote my voucher for this, who will tell us at the ſame time how venal the heathen Oracles were become. We ſhall ſee, that Alexander cauſed the Prieſts of Jupiter Hammon to be bribed, that they might be prevailed upon to anſwer according to his deſire, about Jupiter's being his father. *Igitur Alexander cupiens originem divinitatis acquirere, ſimul & matrem infamia liberare, per præmiſſos ſubornat antiſtites, quid*

a woman ſhould aſcend the throne [*G*] was looked upon as an Oracle. Olympias therefore, diſtruſting the people's good will towards her, went and ſhut herſelf up at Pydra, as ſoon as ſhe heard of Caſſander's arrival; ſhe was beſieged there, and obliged to capitulate for want of proviſions. Caſſander promiſed to grant her her life, but he did not perform that article of the capitulation. He called the people together, and aſked them what they would have him do with that Princeſs: whereupon they, whom he had bribed, and who were nearly related to the perſons whom Olympias had put to death, required that ſhe might be puniſhed for all her cruelties. Their complaints were favourably heard, and

quid ſibi reſponderi velit. Ingredientem templum ſtatim antiſtites ut Hammonis filium ſalutant. Ille lætus dei adoptione hoc ſe patre cenſeri jubet. Rogat deinde, an omnes interfectores parentis ſui ſit ultus; reſpondetur, patrem ejus nec poſſe interfici, nec mori; regis Philippi peractam plene ultionem eſſe (30), *i. e.* "Alexander therefore wiſhing to be of a divine deſcent, and alſo to "clear his mother's reputation from infamy, ſent "meſſengers before him to bribe the Prieſts, that "they might anſwer according to his wiſh. The "moment he entered the Temple, the Prieſts wor"ſhipped him as Jupiter Hammon's ſon. He being "overjoy'd at the God's adoption, ordered, that for "the future Jupiter ſhould be conſidered as his father. "He aſked afterwards, whether he had puniſhed all "his father's murtherers: the anſwer was, that his "father could not be murthered, and could not die; "but as to King Philip, that his death had been ful"ly revenged." I have obſerved in another place (31), that a refined piece of policy was the reaſon why he would paſs for a God: he confeſſes it to his father in one of Lucian's dialogues (32). I have alſo obſerved, that he behaved with more reſerve upon that point among the Greeks, than among the Barbarians: but I muſt add here, that at laſt he left off that kind of diſcretion: for he would have all the Greek Cities to make decrees concerning his Godhead. They differed in the reſolutions, to which they came upon that ſubject. The decree of the Lacedemonians was ſet down in theſe words; *Since Alexander will be a God, let him be one:* Ἄλλοι μὲν ἄλλα ἐψηφίσαντο. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ ἐκεῖνα, ἐπειδὴ Ἀλέξανδρος βούλεται θεὸς εἶναι, ἔστω θεός (33). The Author, I quote, did not know all that the Athenians did: he mentions only their oppoſition, to the decree, which Demades propoſed to them, namely, that, for the future, Alexander be reckoned the thirteenth of the great Gods (34). He was fined for propoſing ſuch an impious decree. This is all that Ælian knew: but it is very probable, that Demades did not deſiſt from his attempt, and that the decree paſſed at laſt (35). He repreſented to the Athenians, that they ſhould take care not to loſe the earth, by pretending too zealouſly to preſerve the heavens. Eraſmus did not underſtand that Orator's meaning. *Quum Athenienſes*, ſays he (36), *vellent Alexandro divinos honores decernere, videte, inquit* (Demades) *ne dum cœlum cuſtoditis, terram amittatis. Alexander enim ambiebat Monarchiam. Abſurdum autem erat eos ſic alium donare cœlo, ut ipſi terra ſua pellerentur*, i. e. "When the Athenians were going to decree divine "honours to Alexander, Demades told them, take "care leſt you loſe the earth, whilſt you are about "to preſerve the heaven. For Alexander aimed "at univerſal monarchy: now it was abſurd for "them to place another in heaven, ſo as to run the "danger of being themſelves driven from their na"tive ſoil." Eraſmus ſuppoſes, that Demades was againſt beſtowing divine honours upon Alexander, and he makes him reaſon in a confuſed manner. Theſe are two faults. The truth of the matter is, that Demades adviſed the deification, and the ground of his advice was, that it was to be feared, leſt Alexander ſhould conquer the country of the Athenians, to puniſh them for refuſing him a place in heaven. See Diogenes Laertius, book the 4th, page 345; you will find there that the Athenians decreed the Godhead of Bacchus to Alexander. Ψηφισαμένων Ἀθηναίων Ἀλέξανδρον Διόνυσον, καίμοὶ, ἔφη, Σάραπιν ποίησατε: *i. e.* "When the Athenians had "decreed that Alexander was Bacchus, make me "then Serapis, ſays Diogenes." I have obſerved in the remark [*F*] of that conqueror's article, that it is very little probable that he himſelf was firmly perſuaded of his pretended divine nature; for he confeſſed that there were two things, which chiefly made him ſenſible of his mortality; he lay with women, and he ſlept: he imagined theſe were two frailties, inconſiſtent with a divine nature. But how could he then imagine that Jupiter begat him? A wound he received made him ſenſible he was a man, and gave him an opportunity to banter a little thoſe flatterers, who ſtiled him a God.

This is true blood, and not the noble ſtream,
Which from th' immortal Gods is us'd to flow,

ſaid he to them, ſhewing them what iſſued out of his wound. Τοξεύματι δὲ πληγεὶς εἰς τὸ σκέλος, ὡς πολλοὶ συνέδραμον τῶν πολλάκις εἰωθότων αὐτὸν Θεὸν προσαγορεύειν, διαχυθεὶς τῷ προσώπῳ, Τυτὶ μὲν, αἷμα, εἶπεν, ὡς ὁρᾶτε, ἧ οὐκ ἰχὼρ, - - - οἷός πέρ τε ῥεῖ μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν (37), *i. e.* "Being wounded in his leg with a dart, as a "great many of thoſe, who were uſed to worſhip "him as a God, came round him, he told them "with a ſmile, *This is mere blood, and not ſuch a li"quor as flows from the bleſſed Gods.*" Some ſay it was not he, but Calliſthenes, that employ'd that joke. See upon all this Freinſhemius's Commentary on the 7th chapter of the 4th book of Quintus Curtius. The particular, which Zonaras mentions, namely, that this Prince, finding he was going to die, would throw himſelf into the Euphrates, is not at all improbable: for what artifices had he not made uſe of to perſuade the world, that he was a God, and to eſtabliſh the worſhip of his pretended divinity? *Jamque omnibus præparatis quod olim prava mente conceperat tunc eſſe maturum, quonam modo cœleſtes honores uſurparet, cepit agitare. Jovis filium non dici tantum ſe, ſed etiam credi volebat, tanquam perinde animis imperare poſſet ac linguis. Itaque more Perſarum Macedonas venerabundos ipſum ſalutare proſternentes humi corpora*, &c. (38), i. e. "All things being prepared, and "ripe for the deſign he had framed in his wicked "mind, he began to conſider how he might uſurp "divine honours. He would not only be ſtiled, "but even be thought the ſon of Jupiter, as though "he could govern men's thoughts as well as their "tongues. He commanded therefore that the Ma"cedonians, ſhould adore him after the manner of "the Perſians, that is to ſay, by falling down to the "ground before him."

The Sieur Naudé affords me here an opportunity to criticiſe upon him. *Alexander*, ſays he (39), *would make men believe, that when he came into the world, the Goddeſs Diana was ſo buſy at Olympias's lying in, that ſhe did not think of going to the relief of her temple at Epheſus, which during that time was accidentally* (40) *conſumed by the flames. Some ſlaves having acquainted him with a remedy againſt the poiſoned darts of the Indians, before he would make uſe of it, he made the world believe, that God had revealed that ſecret to him in a dream. But his inſatiable ambition having carried him ſo far as to claim a divine worſhip, he found at laſt by Calliſthenes's remonſtrances, by the obſtinacy of the Lacedæmonians, and by the wounds he received daily in his battles, that he ſhould never have power enough to eſtabliſh that new Apotheoſis, and that a man muſt have much greater luck to get a little place in Heaven, than to conquer the whole earth, and to rule over it.* It is not true, that Alexander made the world believe, that Diana was ſo buſy about Olympias's lying in, that ſhe ſuffered the temple of Epheſus to be burnt. It was a thought of an hiſtorian, whom Plutarch ridicules (41): but no body aſcribed it to Alexander. Did the Lacedemonians oppoſe his deification? Did they not make a decree for it (42)? And though they gave it a malicious turn, yet it cannot be ſaid that they thwarted his deſign.

[*G*] *The advice* Antipater *gave them on his death bed, never to ſuffer that a woman ſhould aſcend the throne.*]

(30) Juſtin. lib. 11. c. 11. p. m. 241, 242. See alſo Oroſius, lib. 3. c. 16.

(31) In the article MACEDON, remark [*F*].

(32) Lucian, Tom. 1. p. m. 256.

(33) Ælian. Var. Hiſt. lib. 2. c. 19.

(34) Idem, lib. 5. c. 12. See alſo Athenæus, lib. 6. p. 251.

(35) See Plutarch. *in* Vita Lycurgi Oratoris, p. 842. Clement. Alexandrin. *Admonit. ad Gentes*, p. 61. S. Chryſoſtom. *Homil.* 26. *in poſter. ad Corint.* (where by miſtake he aſcribes to the Romans, what ſhould have been ſaid of the Athenians, as Salmaſius obſerves in Lamprid. Alexandr. Sever. c. 63.) S. Cyrill. in Julian. lib. 6.

(36) Eraſm. *Apophthegm.* lib. 6. p. m. 499.

(37) Plutarch. *in* Apophtheg. p. 180. *D.*

(38) Q. Curtius, lib. 8. c. 5.

(39) *Naudé*, *Coups d'Etat*, c. 3. p. m. 318.

(40) It was not accidentally, ſince a wicked wretch confeſſed he ſet fire to that Temple, in order to make himſelf famous.

(41) See the article FONTARABIA, quotation (9).

(42) See above, Ælian. quotat. (33).

and ſhe was condemned to death (*f*). She ſuffered it with courage, and gave even then particular proofs of modeſty [*H*]. I read no where but in a modern writer, that the ſerpent

throne.] This is a particular, which Diodorus Siculus has tranſmitted to us (43). Lambinus tranſcribed in one of his books the whole chapter, in which that antient hiſtorian diſplays Olympias's cruelties; and he did it unqueſtionably with a deſign to give more weight to his concluſion. *Talibus, & tam atrocibus, atque injuſtis facinoribus iram ſuam explens* (Olympias) *citò hoc efficit, ut Macedones ejus crudelitatem abominarentur. Omnes enim Antipatri verba memoria repetebant, qui tanquam oracula fundens, & vaticinans, Macedones moriens hortatus eſt,* UT NE UNQUAM MULIEREM SINERENT REGNI CLAVUM TENERE. *Hactenus Diodorus.* i. e. "Olympias proſecuting her re- "venge, by ſuch wicked and barbarous attempts, "ſoon made the Macedonians deteſt her cruelty: "for they all called to mind the words of Antipater, "who being on his death-bed, as though he had "been propheſying, and delivering Oracles, adviſed "the Macedonians, *never to ſuffer that a woman ſhould* "*ſway the ſcepter.* Thus far Diodorus Siculus." In order to vindicate Antipater's advice, Lambinus adds the following reflection: *Præclarè verò Antipater. Nam ſi mulieres omnes jure civili propter infirmitatem conſilii in tutorum ſunt poteſtate, neque ſuarum rerum gerendarum ſunt dominæ aut arbitræ, & quod mulier ſine tutore promiſerit, id ratum non eſt neque debetur, quanto minus debet mulieri reipub. procuratio, & regni adminiſtrandi poteſtas permitti, aut committi? & ſi viri interdum, quorum maximè propria eſt fortitudo, quique ſapientiores & cordatiores ſolent eſſe natura, imperium adepti, tamen licentia corrumpuntur, ac depravantur: quid à mulieribus, quibus nihil natura finxit mollius, neque mobilius, neque infirmius, expectandum* (44)? i. e. "This "is admirably well obſerved by Antipater. For if "by the civil law, all the women, on account of their "weakneſs of mind, are under the care of guardi- "ans, and have not the power and authority to ma- "nage their own affairs, and if what a woman pro- "miſes without the conſent of her guardian, be "void and of no effect, how much leſs ought a wo- "man to be truſted with the adminiſtration of a "Kingdom or State? And if even the men, to whom "ſtrength of mind belongs in a more particular man- "ner, and who uſe to be more wiſe and prudent, "are depraved and corrupted by an unlimited power, "what can be expected from the women, than "whom there is nothing in nature more tender, "weak, and inconſtant?" Is it not poſſible to condemn more ſtrongly the conduct of thoſe nations, who truſt women with the ſovereign power; and yet Lambinus publiſhed his book at Paris, with the King's licence, and even dedicated it to Charles the IXth, at a time when Catharine de Medicis had the whole royal authority in her own hands. We ought not to wonder that he had then ſuch thoughts: that Queen's bad adminiſtration would have raiſed them in the mind even of thoſe, who had been the leaſt prepoſſeſſed in favour of the Salic Law: but we may be ſurpriſed that he had courage to publiſh his thoughts, and that he did not pay dear for his boldneſs. People did not take notice of his reflection; which is the reaſon why Francis Hotman (45) aſked his adverſaries, why they made ſuch an outcry againſt his *Francogallia* (46), printed beyond the Alps, whereas they ſaid nothing againſt Lambinus, whoſe work was printed even at Paris.

[*H*] *She ſuffered death with courage, and gave even then particular proofs of modeſty.*] So true is it, that the moſt abandoned wretches will ſooner forſake virtue itſelf, than the appearance of virtue. We have here a woman, who had been divorced for her adultery, and who was alſo guilty of the moſt enormous crimes, and who yet employs her laſt cares, that when ſhe ſhould come to fall, her cloaths ſhould be ſo diſpoſed, as to hide from men's ſight all that modeſty forbids to ſhew. *Inſuper exſpirans capillis os, veſte crura contexiſſe fertur, ne quid poſſet in corpore ejus indecorum videri* (47), *i. e.* "It is alſo ſaid, that when ſhe expi- "red, ſhe covered her face with her hair, and her "thighs with her gown, that nothing indecent might "be ſeen in her body." Such a care is leſs to be wondered at in Polyxena, who was a young virgin, and very virtuous: Euripides did not forget to obſerve, that ſhe took all poſſible care not to fall indecently (48).

Ἡ δὲ, κἂν θνήσκουσ', ὅμως
Πολλὴν πρόνοιαν εἶχεν εὐσχήμονως πεσεῖν,
Κρύπτειν θ', ἃ κρύπτειν ὄμμαθ' ἁρσένων χρεών (49.

i. e. "When ſhe died, ſhe took care to fall decently, "and to hide what it is proper to conceal from the "eyes of men."

Pliny the younger obſerves the ſame thing, concerning the great veſtal, whom Domitian condemned to be buried alive. *Quinetiam quum in illud ſubterraneum cubiculum demitteretur, hæſiſſetque deſcendenti ſtola, vertit ſe, ac recollegit. Cumque ei carnifex manum daret, adverſata eſt, & reſiluit: fœdumque contactum quaſi planè à caſto puroque corpore noviſſima ſanctitate rejecit: omnibuſque numeris pudoris,* πολλὴν πρόνοιαν εἶχεν εὐσχήμονως πεσεῖν (50); *i. e.* "When they let her down into "that ſubterraneous chamber, her gown ſtuck at ſome- "thing, whereupon ſhe turned back to put it down. "And when the executioner offered her his hand, "ſhe refuſed it, and ſtarted back, and would not "ſuffer the filthy touch on her pure and chaſte "body, which was a new inſtance of ſanctity: and "ſhe was in every reſpect ſo modeſt, that ſhe took all "poſſible care to fall decently." I ſay nothing of the Amazon Penthaſilea; for the Poet who obſerves, that when ſhe expired, ſhe fell from her horſe without ſhewing any thing, gives us room to think it happened ſo by mere chance.

Ἥ δ' ὦκα μίγη κονίῃ, κὐ ὀλίθρῳ,
Εὐσταλέως ἐπέπεσε κατ' ὄθλους· οὐδέ οἱ αἰδὼς
Ἤσχυνεν δίμνας· ἧΰ τάδη δ' ἐπὶ νηδύα μακρὴ (51.)

i. e. "She is ſoon mingled with duſt, and dies: ſhe "fell decently upon the ground; nor did any thing "diſgrace her beautiful body; for ſhe lay all along "on her belly."

But what ſhall we ſay of Cæſar, the moſt immodeſt of all men, who yet took a precaution like that of Polyxena? *Utque animadvertit undique ſe ſtrictis pugionibus peti, toga caput obvolvit: ſimul ſiniſtra manu ſinum ad ima crura deduxit quo honeſtius caderet, etiam inferiore corporis parte velata* (52), *i. e.* "Obſerving that he "was ſurrounded with drawn daggers, all levelled "at him, he covered his head with his gown, and "with his left hand he let it down alſo over his "thighs, that the loweſt parts of his body being all "covered, he might fall more decently." We muſt ſay, not only that laſciviouſneſs is kept within certain bounds, even in thoſe perſons, in whom it reigns; but alſo that there are ſome men, who being moſt diſſolute in their actions, do yet moſt ſtrictly obſerve all the rules of decency in their words, and outward behaviour (53). Here follows a beautiful deſcription of the courage, which Olympias ſhewed the laſt day of her life. *Sed Olympias ubi obſtinatos venire ad ſe armatos vidit, veſte regali, duabus ancillis innixa ultro obviam procedit. Qua viſa, percuſſores attoniti fortuna majeſtatis prioris, & tot in ea memoriæ occurrentibus regum ſuorum nominibus, ſubſtiterunt; donec à Caſſandro miſſi ſunt, qui eam confoderent, non refugientem gladium, nec vulnera, aut muliebriter vociferantem, ſed virorum more fortium, pro gloria veteris proſapiæ, morti ſuccumbentem, ut Alexandrum poſſes etiam in moriente matre cognoſcere* (54), i. e. "But when Olym- "pias beheld a number of armed men coming di- "rectly to her with a deſign to kill her, ſhe went re- "ſolutely to meet them, being dreſſed in her royal "garment, and leaning on two of her women. The "murtherers were ſtruck with awe, at the ſight of "her ancient majeſty, which called to their mind the "names of ſo many of their Kings, whom they beheld "in her perſon; they did not perform their deſign; "but Caſſander ſent ſome other perſons who ſtabbed "the Queen. She did not endeavour to ward off the "blow, nor to avoid the wound; ſhe did not cry or "lament like a woman, but ſhe fell like the braveſt "men, in a manner becoming the glory of her an- "ceſtors;

(43) Diodor. Sicul. lib. 19. c. 9.

(44) Dionyſ. Lambin. in Cornel. Nepot. p. 345. edit. Pariſ. 1569.

(45) See *Matagonis de Matagonibus adverſus Italogalliam ſive Antifrancogalliam Antonii Matharelli*, p. 245, 246.

(46) It is a work in which he condemns the reign of the women. See above, the article of HOTMAN, quotation (19), and remark [*I*], at the break.

(47) Juſtin. lib. 14. *ſub finem.*

(48) She had alſo the courage to behold the ſtroke that was given her. See Monſieur Drelincourt, p. 126, of his *Achilleus Index*, where you will meet with very good and learned obſervations concerning Polyxena.

(49) Euripides *in* Hecuba, ver. 568. p. m. 35. See alſo Ovid's Metam. lib. 13. where he ſays of Polyxena,
Tunc quoque cura fuit partes velare tegendas
Cum caderet, caſtique decus ſervare pudoris. i. e.
"And as ſhe
"fell, ſhe ſtrove
"with decent
"pride
"To hide, what
"ſuits a virgin's
"care to hide."

(50) Plinius, *Epiſt.* 11. lib. 4. p. m. 240.

(51) Quintus Calaber, *in* Supplem. Homeri, lib. 1. ver. 619. p. m. 168.

(52) Sueton. *in* Cæſare, c. 82.

(53) Compare this with the article NAPLES (Alfonſus) remark [*H*].

(54) Juſtin. lib. 14. c. 6. p. m. 328, 329.

ſerpent which lay with her, left ſpots upon her body, which never wore away [*I*]. This has

" ceſtors ; ſo that one might know Alexander again, " even in the perſon of his expiring mother." This ſhews that they, who aſſert, that cruelty is a ſign of a baſe mind, and that nothing is ſo mean and cringing, as a barbarous and guilty ſoul, when it is deſtitute of all hopes, may be refuted by great and remarkable inſtances.

[*I*] *I read no where, but in a modern writer, that the ſerpent, which lay with her, left ſpots upon her body which never wore away.*] Savaro is the modern writer I mean : I ſhall tranſcribe his words, after quoting the text of Sidonius Apollinaris, which he comments.

Magnus Alexander, nec non Auguſtus, habentur
Concepti ſerpente Deo : Phœbumque, Jovemque
Diviſere ſibi : namque horum quæſiit unus
Cynthia ſub Scyrte patrem maculis genitricis.
Alter Phœbigenam ſeſe gaudebat haberi,
Pæonii jactans Epidauria ſigna draconis (55).

(55) Sidon. Apollinaris, carm. 2. ver. 121.

i. e. " Alexander the Great, and Auguſtus, are ſaid " to have been conceived by a God in the ſhape of a " ſerpent ; they have divided Jupiter and Apollo " between them. The former would reſtore his mo- " ther's reputation, by looking for his father in the " temple of Jupiter Hammon : the latter boaſted to " be thought the ſon of Apollo, and took a pride in " the marks, which the Epidaurian ſerpent left on " his mother's body."

Savaro's note on the fourth of theſe ſix lines, is as follows : *Hæc de Alexandro dicta ſunt, non de Auguſto, ut vir doctus* (56) *ſcribit, qui quidem Alexander quærebat patrem ſuum inſignitum ſerpentis maculis, quibus inſignita erat Olympias mater, qua cum Jupiter Hammon ſub ſpecie ſerpentis concubuerat, & ſerpentinas maculas inuſſerat ſui concubitus teſtes. Idem, de Accia Auguſti matre, Sueton. cap.* 94. *i. e.* " This is ſaid of Alex- " ander, and not of Auguſtus, as a learned man (Caſau- " bon) writes : Alexander looked for his father, who " was to be remarkable by the ſpots of a ſerpent, " with which his mother Olympias was marked : " Jupiter Hammon having lain with her in the ſhape " of a ſerpent, and having marked her with his ſpots, " as ſo many proofs of his lying with her. The ſame " is obſerved of Accia, Auguſtus's mother. Sueto- " nius in Auguſt. chap. 94." He is in the right to aſſert, that that line relates to Alexander, and not to Auguſtus. But where did he read that Olympias had on her body the marks of the animal, whoſe ſhape Jupiter borrowed ? It is not mentioned by any writer : I imagine therefore, that the ſpots, the Poet ſpeaks of, are thoſe of that Queen's reputation : he means, no doubt, that Alexander looked for his father in the temple of Jupiter Hammon, in order to blot out thoſe ſpots, that is to ſay, to reſtore his mother's reputation. The words which I have quoted from Juſtin (57), lead us to that ſenſe. I had made this obſervation, before I conſulted Freinſhemius's Commentary, where I met with the ſame criticiſm on Savaro's opinion. *Neſcio num ita potius accipendus ſit Sidonius Carm.* 2. 124. *ubi dicit quæſiſſe Alexandrum* Cynthia ſub Syrte patrem maculis genitricis : *quam, ut explicat Vir doctiſſimus, de maculis à concubitu draconis, in matris corpore relictis, ut nimirum Sidonius velit, eum per infamiam matris, quam eo modo adulterii ream agebat, Hammonem ſibi patrem quæſiviſſe. Certe enim de maculis ejus generis ſerpentinis nihil recordor legiſſe, quod ad Olympiadem pertineat* (58). If Atia, the mother of Auguſtus, was meant here, we ſhould be obliged to ſpeak otherwiſe : for we read in Suetonius, that the marks ſhe had on her body, after a ſerpent had lain with her, prevented her ever after, during her whole life, from going to the bath, becauſe ſhe did not care to ſhew her ſpotted body. This ſtory is ſo ſtrong and wonderful, that if it were true, it would put all the Free-thinkers to a *non-plus*. Let me beg leave to tranſcribe it here. *In Aſclepiadis Mendetis* Θεολογουμένων *libris lego, Atiam, cum ad ſolenne Apollinis ſacrum media nocte veniſſet, poſita in templo lectica, dum cæteræ matronæ dormirent, obdormiſſe, draconemque repente irrepſiſſe ad eam, paulloque poſt egreſſum, illamque expergefactam quaſi à concubitu mariti purificaſſe ſe, & ſtatim in corpore ejus extitiſſe maculam, velut depicti draconis, nec potuiſſe unquam exigi, adeo ut mox publicis balneis perpetuo abſtinuerit* (59), i. e. " I have read in the " books of Aſclepiades of Mendes concerning things " divine, that Atia came once at midnight to a ſo- " lemn feſtival of Apollo, and having cauſed her ſe- " dan to be put in the temple, whilſt the other ma- " trons were aſleep, ſhe fell aſleep alſo ; a ſerpent " ruſhed all of a ſudden upon her, and went away " ſoon after ; Atia being awake, waſhed herſelf, as " though ſhe had lain with her huſband ; but there " appeared immediately a large mark on her body, " as it were the picture of a ſerpent, which could " never be worn out, ſo that ſhe was obliged for " ever to leave off going to publick baths." If ſuch a ſtory had been related but once, and only in a philoſophical age, one ſhould more ſcruple to laugh at it ; but when one conſiders, that ſuch ſtories were firſt publiſhed in the fabulous times, and revived in ſeveral ages, one may ſafely aſſert, that poetical fictions firſt raiſed them, and that flattery ſoon multiplied them, ſometimes in behalf of one great man, and other times in favour of another. The Meſſenians related, that Ariſtomenes was born of a God transformed into a ſerpent. The Sicyonians publiſhed the ſame of Ariſtodamas (60). The Romans were glad that their Scipio ſhould have the ſame advantage with Alexander, and afterwards ſome flatterers conferred the ſame honour on Auguſtus. Such a birth was looked upon as ſo honourable, that the Emperor Galerius, who was the ſon of a country fellow (61), aſcribed it to himſelf (62), in order to raiſe his reputation. Obſerve, that Scipio was pleaſed that people ſhould believe that ſtory of his mother ; and I am much miſtaken, if the crafty Romans did not labour to ſupport that opinion. For conſidering the ſad condition to which Hannibal had reduced Rome, it was to be wiſhed that popular errors might raiſe the people's expectations, and make Scipio be look'd upon as a man deſigned by the Gods for ſome great actions. Here follows a noble paſſage from Livy. *Fuit enim Scipio, non veris tantum virtutibus mirabilis, ſed arte quoque quadam ab juventa in oſtentationem earum compoſitus : pleraque apud multitudinem aut per nocturnas viſa ſpecies, aut velut divinitus mente monita, agens : ſive & ipſe capti quadam ſuperſtitione animi, ſive ut imperia conſiliaque velut ſorte oraculi miſſa, ſine cunctatione aſſequeretur. Ad hoc jam inde ab initio præparans animos, ex quo togam virilem ſumpſit, nullo die prius ullam publicam privatamque rem egit, quam in Capitolium iret, ingreſſuſque ædem conſideret : & plerumque tempus ſolus in ſecreto ibi tereret. Hic mos, qui per omnem vitam ſervabatur, ſeu conſulto, ſeu temere, vulgatæ opinioni finem apud quoſdam fecit, ſtirpis eum divinæ virum eſſe ; retulitque famam, in Alexandro Magno prius vulgatam, & vanitate & fabula parem, anguis immanis concubitu conceptum, & in cubiculo matris ejus perſæpe viſam prodigii ejus ſpeciem, interventuque hominum evolutam repente, atque ex oculis elapſam. His miraculis numquam ab ipſo eluſa fides eſt : quin potius aucta arte quadam, nec abnuendi tale quicquam, nec palam affirmandi, Multa alia ejuſdem generis, alia vera, alia aſſimulata, admirationis humanæ in eo juvene exceſſerant modum : quibus freta tunc civitas, ætati haudquaquam maturæ tantam molem rerum tantumque imperium permiſit* (63, i. e. " Scipio was not only admi- " rable by his real virtues, but alſo by a certain art, " which he had from his youth, to ſhew them to the " beſt advantage. He made the world believe, that " he was directed by dreams, or by a kind of divine " inſpiration ; either being himſelf a little inclined " to ſuperſtition, or that he might the eaſier get cre- " dit and power, as it were by the means of an oracle. " He had prepared mens mind to this from his " youth ; for he never tranſacted the leaſt public or " private buſineſs, before he had been up to the Ca- " pitol, where he ſat himſelf down in the Temple, " uſing often to ſpend there ſome time alone in a re- " tired place. The cuſtom which he continued all " his life, either with or without a particular de- " ſign, made ſome people believe the common opi- " nion, that he was deſcended from ſome God ; the " ſame idle and fabulous ſtory, which was formerly " told of Alexander the Great, was alſo told of him ; " namely, that he was begotten by an huge ſer- " pent,

(56) That is to ſay, Caſaubon, *in* Sueton. Auguſt. c. 94.

(57) In the remark [*F*], quotation (30).

(58) Freinſhemius, *in* Q. Curtium, lib. 4. c. 7. num. 25.

(59) Sueton. *in* Auguſto. c. 94.

(60) *Velandæ ignominiæ repetitum ex antiquis fabulis de dracone commentum : idem enim olim de Ariſtomene Meſſeniis, de Ariſtodama Sicyonios jactaviſſe.* Freinſh. Supplem. *in* Q. Curtium, lib. 1. c. 1. num. 17.

(61) Aurel. Victor, *in* Epitome, p. m. 222.

(62) *Is inſolenter affirmare auſus eſt matrem more Olympiadis Alexandri Magni creatricis compreſſam dracone ſemet conceptiſſe.* Idem, ibid.

(63) T. Livius, lib. 26. p. m. 442. See alſo A. Gellius, lib. 7. c. 1.

has been ſaid of Auguſtus's mother.

" pent, whoſe figure was often ſeen in his mother's " bed-chamber; but upon any perſon's coming in, it " retired and diſappeared of a ſudden. He never " endeavoured to diſcredit theſe miracles; he uſed " rather a certain artifice, which was never to deny " them, but alſo not to affirm them openly. There " were in that young man many other things, either " true or affected, which raiſed him far above human " admiration. The City truſting to all this at that time, " committed the moſt weighty and important affairs " to his care, though he was ſtill under age." There are conſiderable families in Europe, which pretend to be deſcended from the converſation of a woman with ſome ſpirit. Marſhal de Baſſompiere relates it of the founder of his family. See his *Memoirs*, and the *Comte de Gabalis*. See alſo the article PLATO *.

* Mr. Bayle has not given that article.

☞ OMAR EBN AL KHATTAB, the ſecond Khâlif of the Moſlems or Mohammedans after Mohammed, began his reign in the 13th year of the Hejra, or the year of our Lord 634 (*a*). He at firſt was a violent oppoſer of Mohammed (*b*) [*A*]; and many years after, was one of the Candidates for the Khalîfat, after the death of that falſe Prophet, who having left no poſitive directions concerning a ſucceſſor, ſuch a conteſt enſued, as would very probably have been the utter ruin of the Mohammedan religion and polity, had not Omar and Abu Becr timely interpoſed. The conteſt lay between the inhabitants of Mecca and thoſe of Medina; and they were going to nominate two Khalîfs, when Omar, ſeeing the diviſion increaſe, gave Abu Becr his hand, when all the reſt followed his example, and accordingly the latter was ſaluted Khalîf; acknowledged the rightful ſucceſſor of Mohammed; and, in conſequence thereof, became abſolute judge of all cauſes both ſacred and civil (*c*). Omar was afterwards greatly diſguſted at this relation, and expreſſed his diſſatisfaction on that account in the ſtrongeſt terms (*d*). Multitudes were alſo diſpleaſed at this choice: one party maintaining that Ali the ſon of Abu Tâleb was the true heir; and the other, that the right of ſucceſſion belonged to Abu Becr, Omar, &c. Of the latter opinion are the Turks, and of the former the Perſians, who ſtill treat one another as hereticks upon that account (*e*). Abu Becr acted with more prudence than Mohammed; he not leaving the ſucceſſion at random, but appointing Omar by his will to ſucceed him [*B*]. It is ſaid that Omar ſhewed ſome reluctance to accept of the Khalîfat (*f*): and it does not appear that Ali or his party made any oppoſition. Omar was the firſt Khâlif on whom the title of *Amirol Mumenina*, or Emperor of

(*a*) D'Herbelot, *Bibliotheque Orientale*, under the article Omar Ebn al Khattab, and Ockley's *Conqueſts by the Saracens*, p. 121. London 1708. 8vo.

(*b*) *Preliminary Diſcourſe*, p. 45, to Sale's *Korân*. London 1734.

(*c*) Ockley's *Conqueſts of the Saracens*, p. 2. & ſeqq.

(*d*) Ibid. p. 6.

(*e*) Ibid. p. 7.

(*f*) Ibid. p. 116.

[*A*] *He at firſt was a violent oppoſer of Mohammed.*] According to ſome authors, after the converſion of Hamza, Mohammed's uncle, the Koreiſh, the moſt noble tribe among all the Arabians, reſolved, in their aſſembly, to murder the Prophet (1). The buſineſs was to find a perſon intrepid enough to perpetrate ſuch an action: upon which Omar preſented himſelf, and offered to ſtrike the blow; ſaying which, he left the aſſembly, having his ſword girded on. He was going upon his expedition, when meeting with Saad Ebn Abi Wakkâs, they quarrelled, and drew their ſwords. But Saad, to pacify Omar, ſaid to him, *Why doſt thou quarrel with me? Surely thou oughteſt rather to wreak thy anger on thy ſiſter Amena, and on Saïd her huſband.* Omar aſking; how! do they both profeſs Iſlâm (2)? *Yes, indeed do they*, replied Saad. Omar leaving him, ran to the houſe of Amena his ſiſter, and ruſhing into it, fell upon Saïd his brother-in-law; when throwing him down, he ſet his foot on his neck, and was going to ſtab him. In vain his ſiſter flew to his aſſiſtance, and endeavoured to reſcue her huſband; Omar gave her a furious blow on the face, at which ſhe cried (the blood trickling down her face) *O enemy of God! doſt thou ſtrike me in this manner, becauſe I profeſs the unity of God! but yet I will be a Moſlem in ſpite of thee.* At the ſame time ſhe repeated aloud the double profeſſion of Faith: *There is no other God but God, and Mohammed is his Prophet.* She added, *Finiſh, O Omar, the work which thou haſt begun.* Theſe words ſtruck Omar, who began to repent of his raſh treatment. And now, pacifying Amena, and perſuading her and her huſband to ſhow him a roll of paper (paper of the Korân) which they held in their hands; they at laſt were prevailed upon, (after he had waſhed and purified himſelf) to ſhow it him. He then read the following words in it: " In the name of God moſt merciful. We " did not ſend the Korân from Heaven to make thee " miſerable; but to make it ſerve as a memorial " with regard to him who fears God, &c. (3). I " am certainly God. There is no God but me. " Serve me therefore, and offer up thy prayers in " remembrance of me only." Omar hearing theſe words cried: *He who ſpeaks in this manner, ought to be ſerved only. How beautiful are theſe words! how greatly do I revere them! I want to profeſs ſuch a religion.* Omar then enquired where Mohammed was, and was conducted to the houſe, where he found him with above forty perſons, among whom were Hamza, Abu Becr and Ali. Omar's ſword was ſtill by his ſide, when knocking at the door, moſt of thoſe in the houſe were running to hide themſelves; but the Prophet not only ordered his people to let them in, but went himſelf to meet Omar as far as the porch; when taking the lappet of his gown with one hand, and ſeizing the hilt of his ſword with the other, he drew him into the houſe, ſaying at the ſame time, *Son of al Khattab, come in. Why doſt thou ſtay there? Art thou not afraid, ſhouldſt thou continue any longer there, that the porch will fall upon thee?* Omar was going to kneel before him; but the Prophet would not permit him to do it. He then ſaid; *I am come to believe in God and in his Apoſtle*; immediately after which he repeated the double profeſſion of Faith, at which the whole aſſembly ſhouted ſo loud for joy, that the noiſe was heard even by thoſe who were praying in the Moſque. Omar then intreated that they might all go thither, to return thanks to God; at which the Prophet ſaid, that God had a little before revealed to him in prayer, all that then happened; upon which they all ſet out for the Moſque, Mohammed being between Hamza and Omar, and entered it with great ſolemnity. The Koreiſh ſeeing this pompous proceſſion were terrified; Omar and Hamza appearing with the menacing air of two Lionneſſes, who had been robbed of their young (4).

(1) Mohammed, who is called the Prophet, by way of eminence, by the eaſtern writers.

(2) The Mohammedan religion.

(3) As far as the 14th verſe.

(4) *La Vie de* Mahomet, *par* Mr. Gagnier. Tom. I. p. 125. Amſterdam, 1732, 12mo.

[*B*] *He appointed Omar to ſucceed him.*] Abu Becr finding his time approaching, ſent his Secretary, and commanded him to write as follows:

In the name of the moſt merciful God.

This is the teſtament of Abu Becr Ebn Abi Kohâfa, which he made at that time when he was going out of this world, and entering into the other; a time in which the Infidel ſhall believe, and the wicked perſon be aſſured (5), *and the liar ſhall ſpeak truth. I appoint Omar Ebno'l Chitâb* (6), *my ſucceſſor over you; therefore hearken to him, and obey him. If he does that which is right and juſt, 'tis what I think and know of him. If he does otherwiſe, every man muſt be rewarded according to his works. I intend to do for the beſt, but I do not know hidden things: but thoſe who do evil ſhall find the conſequences*

(5) *i. e.* The infidel and wicked ſhall then be aſſured of the reality of theſe things relating to a future ſtate, which they diſbelieved and ridiculed in their life-time.

(6) 'Tis the ſame with Ebn al Khattab.

of the Believers, was beſtowed (*g*). At his acceſſion to the throne, he was not deſirous of any thing more than to make ſome conqueſts in Irak (*b*) [*C*]. At the time of Abu Becr's death, the Arabians, under the command of Khaled and Abu Obeidah, were laying ſiege to Damaſcus, which belonged to the Grecian Emperor Heraclius. 'Tis well known that ſeveral bloody battles were fought on this occaſion; that a great number of Chriſtians loſt their lives, and that Damaſcus was at laſt taken by the Arabians, under the Khalifat of Omar. A remarkable ſtory is told of Jonas a Chriſtian Nobleman of Damaſcus [*D*], and an apoſtate to the Mohammedan Faith. After the taking of Damaſcus, Omar

(*g*) Ockley's *Conqueſts of the Saracens*, p. 121.

(*b*) The country called Babylonia by Ptolemy.

conſequences of it. Fare ye well, and the mercy and bleſſing of God be upon you (7). How inconſiſtent are theſe expreſſions of goodneſs and piety with the wild havock which the Saracens made in their conqueſts?

(7) Ockley's *Conqueſts of the Saracens*, p. 116.

[*C*] *To make ſome conqueſts in Irak.*] For this purpoſe he ſent an army under the command of Abu Obeidah, joining to him Al Mothanna, Amrû and Salit, who marched their forces till they came to Thaalabiyah, where they pitched their tents juſt by the river. The Perſian army being very numerous, Salit, and the other commanders, adviſed Abu Obeidah not to croſs the river and engage the enemy; but the latter was deaf to their counſel; and engaging with the Perſians, the Moſlems were routed. Omar the Kalîf afterwards ſending a reinforcement, under Jarîr Ebn Abd'llah, the Moſlems made frequent excurſions; deſtroying that part of Irak which lies next the Euphrates. Arzemidocht, Queen of the Perſians, thinking it high time to look to herſelf, ſent an army, under Mahran, to repreſs the inſolence of the Arabians. The two armies engaging, a bloody battle enſued, Mothama and Mahran fought very furiouſly hand to hand; but the latter being killed, the Perſians were diſarmed and fled. The Perſians being diſguſted at their Queen for the loſs of this battle, though not through her fault, depoſed her; and placed on her throne Yazdejerd, a young man of the Royal Family, deſcended from Khoſrû the ſon of Hormuz or Hormiſdas. That Monarch immediately raiſed two armies to oppoſe the Arabians; however the Perſians, as if the period of their Empire was at hand, could have no ſucceſs; but were forced to ſubmit to the riſing greatneſs of the ſaracenical Empire. Both the Perſian Generals loſt their lives, and both armies were entirely routed and defeated. Yazdeſerd was the laſt idolatrous King of Perſia (8). Mr. Ockley is of opinion that Abu'lpharagius is miſtaken as to the time in which thoſe battles were fought (9).

(8) Abu'lpharagius, quoted in ibid. p. 122 & *ſeq.* See alſo d'Herbelot, p. 687. col. 2.

(9) Ockley, p. 122.

[*D*] *A remarkable ſtory is told of Jonas, a Chriſtian nobleman of Damaſcus.*] Whilſt the Arabians were beſieging this city, ſome of their ſcouts who were upon duty, heard the neighing of a horſe which was coming out of one of the gates. The ſcouts halted, and ſaid nothing till he came up cloſe to them, and then took the rider priſoner. Immediately after, there came out of the ſame gate, another perſon on horſeback, who called the man that was taken priſoner by his name. The Saracens commanded him to anſwer him, that he might come up, and be taken alſo: but inſtead of this, the captive cried aloud in the Greek tongue, the *bird is taken*. The perſon he ſpoke to, underſtood his meaning perfectly, and returned to the city. The Saracens or Arabians could not tell what he ſaid; but then they knew that they had loſt a priſoner by his means. This made them conclude to put him to death; however, after conſidering this matter, they reſolved to carry him to Khaled the General, that he might diſpoſe of him as he pleaſed. Khaled aſking him who he was? *I am*, replied he, *a Nobleman; and I married a young Lady who was dear to me as my life: but when I ſent for her home, her parents made a ſlighting anſwer, and ſaid they had other buſineſs to mind. Upon this, I found an opportunity to get to the ſpeech of her, when we agreed to leave the city in the evening; and, for that purpoſe, to give a conſiderable ſum of money to the perſon who ſhould be on guard that night. I leaving the city firſt, was ſurpriſed by that man; and to prevent my beloved wife from falling into their hands, I cried aloud*, the bird is taken. *The dear creature underſtanding my meaning, returned, with her two ſervants, into the city; and now, who can blame me for ſhewing this tenderneſs* . . . . ſays Khaled; what have you to ſay to the Mohammedan religion? "If you think proper "to embrace it, your wife ſhall be reſtored to you as "ſoon as we take the city; if not, you are a dead "man." The poor wretch being ſtruck with terror, renounced the Chriſtian Religion, and made confeſſion of that of Mohammed in theſe words: *I teſtify that there is but one God; he has no partner, and Mohammed is the Apoſtle of God.* He then devoted himſelf entirely to them, and fought with great bravery againſt the Chriſtians. Damaſcus being ſurrendered, Jonas ran in ſearch of his beloved; and upon enquiry, was told that ſhe had immured herſelf in a nunnery. As Jonas was fallen into the hands of the Arabians, ſhe never expected to ſet eyes on him more; and ſince the only object ſhe prized in this world was gone, ſhe had reſolved to ſpend the remainder of her days in the contemplation of a better. And when Jonas went to the Church where ſhe was, expecting to be received with the utmoſt joy, he was very much miſtaken; for aſking the motives which had prompted her to take the veil, and ſhe telling it him; he no ſooner diſcovered himſelf, and informed her that he had changed his religion, but ſhe treated him with the utmoſt contempt and averſion. She juſtly concluded, that it was her duty to renounce him, as he had firſt renounced the Chriſtian Faith: ſo that, neither the remembrance of former love, nor the conſideration of the ſad extremity which had made him become an apoſtate, could once move the diſconſolate Lady, nor prevail with her to entertain one charitable thought in his favour. For this reaſon, ſhe ſtill reſolved to bid adieu to all terreſtrial enjoyments, and never converſe with him more: and therefore, when Thomas and Herbis (10), with the reſt of the miſerable Damaſcenes left the city, ſhe went along with them. Jonas's heart was wounded at her departure: and therefore he ſtrongly urged Khaled to detain her by force; but the latter anſwered; "that this could "not be done, ſince they had ſurrendered them-"ſelves; and that all of them muſt be allowed free "liberty to go whitherſoever they pleaſe." . . . After that Damaſcus was taken, and the inhabitans had left it, and were upon their march (which the Saracens agreed they ſhould continue unmoleſted) Khaled treacherouſly reſolved to purſue them, and ſeize upon the rich effects they had been allowed to carry away. Jonas hearing Khaled's deſign, ſtrongly ſollicited him to purſue it, and offered to be his guide. His thoughts were ſtill fixed on his wife, and nothing could ſatisfy him but the poſſeſſion of her: ſo that he was for ever teizing Khaled to ſet out upon the purſuit of the Chriſtians, which he at laſt agreed to. Khaled and Jonas left the city, at the head of four thouſand horſe, who were all diſguiſed in the habit of Chriſtian Arabs. Theſe, after a moſt troubleſome march, came up at laſt with the Chriſtians, who were repoſing themſelves in a delightful meadow. Immediately Khaled and his Arabians fell on the Chriſtians who were headed by Thomas and Herbis. A ſharp conteſt enſuing, Thomas was killed, and his forces put to flight. Jonas, during the battle, was got among the women, in ſearch of his wife. Raphi Ebn Omeirah coming up that way, ſaw him fighting with his Lady, whom he at laſt threw with violence on the ground, and took her priſoner. A little after, Raphi ſeized upon the Emperor Heraclius's daughter, Thomas's wife, a young Lady of exquiſite beauty. Raphi having diſpoſed of his fair captive, came to the place where Jonas was, and found him bathed in tears, and his wife weltring in blood. Raphi aſking the ſad occaſion of this; Jonas wrung his hands and cried. *Alas! I am the moſt miſerable man upon earth! I came to this woman, whom I prized above all things in life, and would fain have perſuaded her to return with me. However, ſhe was deaf to my intreaties, becauſe I had changed*

(10) Two Chriſtians who commanded in the town; the former ſon-in-law to Heraclius.

Omar appointed Abu Obeidah commander over the Moſlems in Syria, and depoſed Khaled, whom he hated. However, Khaled was afterwards ſent by Abu Obeidah upon an expedition againſt the Chriſtians, who were defeated by him (*i*). Abu Obeidah ſet out from Damaſcus at the head of an army, (he having ſent Khaled before) and marched toward Hems (*k*), the inhabitants of which city conſented to make a truce with him for one whole year (*l*). Abu Obeidah exerciſing great lenity, many of the Syrians ſubmitted to him (*m*). He then proceeded towards Alhâdir and Kinniſrîn, with whoſe inhabitants he alſo concluded a truce (*n*), which pacifick conduct diſpleaſed Omar. An odd accident had like to have created a miſunderſtanding between the Chriſtians and Saracens of

(*i*) p. 157 & *ſeq.*

(*k*) Emiſſa.

(*l*) Ockley, p. 177, 178.

(*m*) Ibid. p. 179.

(*n*) Ibid. p. 184.

changed my religion; and vowing ſhe would go to Conſtantinople, and there end her days in a Cloiſter, I reſolved, if I could not perſuade her by gentle means, to employ force; and accordingly threw her down, and took her priſoner. Seeing herſelf in my power, ſhe ſat quietly a little while; but drawing out a knife ſecretly, ſhe ſtabbed herſelf in the breaſt before I was aware, and fell dead at my feet. Raphi could not refrain from tears at this mournful relation, and ſaid thus to him: "Heaven did not intend that you ſhould live with "her, and therefore has provided better for you." *What do you mean?* Said Jonas: *Ill ſhew you,* replied Raphi, *a captive I have taken; a Lady of wonderful beauty, and in the richeſt attire. I will make you a preſent of her, to compenſate your loſs.* Jonas being brought to the Princeſs they talked together in Greek, and Raphi gave her freely to him. Khaled made a horrid ſlaughter of the Chriſtians, and being returned from it, aſked Jonas what was become of his wife? Who gave him the ſad relation abovementioned. Khaled hearing that the Princeſs was taken priſoner, commanded her to be brought into his preſence; when ſeeing her rare beauty, graceful proportion, and charming mein, he turned his head aſide, and ſaid: *Glory be to thee, O God, who doſt make whatever ſeems fitting to thee!* He then told Jonas, that ſhe ſhould be his, in caſe the Emperor did not redeem her; and Jonas accepted his preſent very thankfully, after which they ſet out for Damaſcus. In the way, a meſſenger came from the Emperor, with a deſire that his daughter might be diſmiſſed. Khaled having conſulted with Jonas about it, agreed to releaſe the Princeſs; but ſaid to the meſſenger; "Tell your maſter that there will never "be any peace between us, till I have ſeized upon "every foot of land poſſeſſed by him; and though "I have now ſent him his daughter, I hope to get "him one day inſtead of her." The Arabians being returned to Damaſcus, were amply rewarded for their valour. Abu Obeidah gave Jonas a conſiderable ſum of money for him to purchaſe another wife: but Jonas anſwered in a very melancholy tone of voice, that he would never entertain any ſuch thoughts whilſt in this world; and that his next wife ſhould be one of thoſe black-ey'd beauties mentioned in the Korân. He continued among the Saracens, and did them great ſervice; till at laſt, being ſhot in the breaſt at the battle of Yermûk, he breathed his laſt (11).

(11) Ockley's *Conqueſts of the Saracens*, from p. 136 to 153.

The late ingenious Mr. John Hughes made this ſtory the ſubject of his Tragedy of the *Siege of Damaſcus*. The Poet, according to the liberty which many criticks allow tragick writers, has diſguiſed the name of ſome of the characters in his Drama, he changing the name of *Jonas* into that of *Phocyas*, &c. and has alſo made a great many alterations in the incidents, particularly in the cloſe of this ſtory, he repreſenting Phocyas dying in the moſt gallant manner; previous to which he ſuppoſes a reconciliation between him and his beloved Eudocia, as he calls her. Mr. Hughes has drawn the paſſion between theſe two lovers in the ſtrongeſt light, and finely heightened the diſtreſs. How tender are the lines, where Eudocia agrees to leave Damaſcus ſecretly with Phocyas, who addreſſes her thus.

Phocyas. *Fear not;——thy innocence will be our guard.*
I've thought already how to ſhape our courſe.
Some pitying Angel will attend thy ſteps,
Guide thee unſeen, and charm the ſleeping foe,
Till thou art ſafe!——O I have ſuffered nothing;
Thus gaining thee, and this great generous proof,
How bleſt am I in my Eudocia's love!
My only joy farewel!——

Eudocia. *I've now no friend but thee——yet thee I'll call*
Friend, father, lover, guardian!——Thou art all (12).

(12) The ſiege of Damaſcus, end of act 2.

How pleaſing is Eudocia's ſoliloquy in the garden, at the opening of the Scene whence the Verſes above are taken.

Eudocia. *Why muſt we meet by ſtealth, like guilty lovers!*
But 'twill not long be ſo——what joy 'twill be
To own my hero in his ripen'd honours,
And hear applauding crowds pronounce me bleſt!
Sure he'll be here——ſee! the fair riſing moon,
E're day's remaining twilight ſcarce is ſpent,
Hangs up her ready lamp, and with mild luſtre
Drives back the hovering ſhades! Come Phocyas, *come,*
This gentle ſeaſon is a friend to love,
And now methinks I cou'd, with equal paſſion
Meet thine, and tell thee all my ſecret ſoul (13).

(13) Ibid.

How fine are Phocyas's reflections upon death, after Khaled has threatned to take away his life.

Phocyas.

. . . . . .
What art thou, O thou great myſterious terror!
The way to thee we know; diſeaſes, famine,
Sword, fire, and all thy ever——open gates
That day and night ſtand ready to receive us.
But what's beyond them?——Who will draw that veil?
Yet death's not there——No; 'tis a point of time,
The verge 'twixt mortal and immortal Being.
It mocks our thought! on this ſide all is life;
And when we've reach'd it, in that very inſtant
'Tis paſt the thinking of! O if it be
The pangs, the throes, the agonizing ſtruggle
When ſoul and body part, ſure I have felt it,
And there's no more to fear (14).

(14) Ibid. act 3.

How movingly has the Poet deſcribed in Act IV. Scene II. the interview between Phocyas and Eudocia, in the convent, after Damaſcus was taken: as alſo their laſt interview, at the concluſion of the Tragedy, when the lovers are reconciled, and Phocyas dies. . . . With how much tenderneſs does Phocyas addreſs his mournful fair-one, after ſhe had bid him riſe.

Phocyas. *Never---No, here I'll lay my burthen down;*
I've try'd its weight, nor can ſupport it longer.
Take thy laſt look; if yet thy eyes can bear
To look upon a wretch accurſt, caſt off
By Heav'n and thee——A little longer yet
And I am mingled with my kindred duſt,
By thee forgotten and the world——

How beautiful are the lines in which he craves her to pardon him.

Phocyas. *Say only thou forgiv'ſt me——O Eudocia!*
No longer now my dazzled eyes behold thee
Thro' paſſions miſts; my ſoul now gazes on thee,
And ſees thee lovelier in unfading charms,
Bright as the ſhining Angel Hoſt that ſtood!
Whilſt I——but there, it ſmarts——

And how mournful are the lines, when Phocyas draws out, in Eudocia's preſence, the arrow from his breaſt, and dies.

Phocyas. *Then all is done——.*

of Kinnisrîn [*E*]. Abu Obeidah besieged and took Baalbek (*o*), of which Herbis was Governor, who afterwards growing insatiably covetous, was killed by his own people (*p*), who invited Raphi Ebn Abdo'llah the Saracen, on account of his great moderation, to be their Governor, and he accepted of their offer (*q*). Abu Obeidah now sat down before Hems, which was forced to surrender to him (*r*). During this interval, the Saracen took the town of Arrestân by stratagem [*F*], and afterwards Shaizar opened its gates to him (*s*). In the siege of Hems, I'krimah, Khaled's cousin, thirsting after the imaginary joys of Mohammed's fool's Paradise, broke into the enthusiastic words following: *Methinks I see the black-ey'd girls gazing at me. Should one of these appear in this world, all mankind would die for the love of her. I see in one of their hands a handkerchief of green silk, and a cap made of precious stones; and she beckons me, and calls out, come hither quickly, for I love thee*; saying which words, he made great havock among the Christians, till at last he was killed with a javelin (*t*). The Emperor Heraclius, grieved at the rapid successes of the Saracens, raised several armies; and gave the command of the main body, which was designed to fight the whole forces of the Saracens to Mahân an Armenian (*u*). The christian army in their march committed as many outrages as the Arabians, who were intimidated at their approach; notwithstanding which the Christians made overtures of peace, but they were haughtily rejected. Khaled engaging Jabalah Ebno'l Ayham, who headed the Christian Arabs, put them into vast disorder, and killed great numbers of them. Omar being informed of the then situation of affairs, sent his blessing to Abu Obeidah and his army, and a reinforcement of eight thousand men. After this there was an interview between Mahân and Khaled, in order for the ransoming of some prisoners, on which occasion much blood had like to have been spilt (*w*) [*G*]. Not long after, the Christians and Saracens fought with great fury for several days near Yarmûk, a place in Syria, Abu Obeidah resigning the command to Khaled, who told his men, that *Paradise was before them, and the Devil and Hell-fire behind them.* The Saracen women exerted themselves with great vigour on these engagements. The ruin of the Christians was hastened, by the inhumanity at Yarmûk

(*o*) 'Tis thought to be that which was anciently called Heliopolis.

(*p*) p. 191 & *seq.*

(*q*) p. 209.

(*r*) p. 210 & *seq.*

(*s*) p. 215.

(*t*) Ibid. p. 219.

(*u*) Ibid. p. 221. Mr. Ockley takes this to be the same whom the Greek Historians call Manuel.

(*w*) Ibid. p. 224 & *seq.*

'Twas the last pang——at length
I've given up thee, and the world now is--nothing (15).

(15) Ibid. scene the last.

The catastrophe in the Tragedy is quite different from what we find it in the true history; the former supposing that Phocyas dies bravely in the defence of his countrymen: but that Eudocia lives, and vows to keep the remainder of her days in a convent at Constantinople.

[*E*] *A misunderstanding between the Christians and Saracens of Kinnisrîn.*] At the concluding of the truce, the Greeks had erected a pillar, on the top of which, Heraclius sitting on his throne was carved. This pillar was set up as a sign for the Saracens, that whenever any of them saw it, they might not forage in the country about Kinnisrîn. Now it happened upon a time, that some of the Saracen horse passing that way, admired the curious workmanship of the pillar in question. They spent some time in viewing it; riding backward and forward, and exercising themselves round about it. At last, one of them passing by it, in full career, with his javelin in his hand; the iron fastned to the lower end of the javelin, struck out, by accident, one of the eyes in the Emperor's statue. This taking air, the Greeks misconstrued it as a most vile indignity offered to the Emperor in effigy, and a manifest breach of the truce. Immediately messengers were dispatched to Abu Obeidah; expostulating with clamour, about the injury done, and insisted upon satisfaction. The Saracen commander declared, that he intended to keep his word inviolably; that he was assured, whoever did it, no ways intended to shew the least disrepect to the Emperor; and, to prove the sincerity of his intentions, offered any reasonable satisfaction. However, nothing could satisfy them but retaliation; and they insisted upon having the affront offered the Emperor returned upon the Khalif. The person who said these words expressing himself unwarily, and talking about putting out one of Omar's eyes; the rude Saracens thinking he meant literally as he spoke, were so inflamed, that had not Abu Obeidah restrained them, by saying that those people wanted sense, and must be borne with, they would have killed them on the spot. Abu Obeidah told the Greeks, that they might set up his statue if they thought proper, and treat it as they pleased. However, nothing would serve but the Khalif's statue, to carve which, being wearied with their importunity, Abu Obeidah at last consented. Having made a statue representing Omar, and put two glass eyes into the head of it, they commanded a Greek soldier to strike out one of them with a lance, which was accordingly performed. Thus having received sufficient reparation for the injury, they were very well satisfied (16). How much soever the zeal of the Christians might be applauded on this occasion, few people, I believe, would say that they acted very wisely.

(16) Ockley's *Conquests of the Saracens*, p. 185, 186.

[*F*] *Took the Town of Arrestân by surprize.*] This was a strong place, well watered, and had a good garrison. Abu Obeidah's summons being rejected, he desired the Governor of the castle to let him leave some old lumber, which would otherwise encumber him in his speedy march. This request was soon granted, the Christians being desirous of their absence upon any terms. Upon this, the Saracen takes twenty chests, and inclosing twenty chosen men in them, to prevent all suspicion, he puts locks on the outside of them; the bottom of the chests being so contrived, as to slip backward or forward, as those within them pleased. These being received into the castle, the Saracens marched away; only Khaled was left with some forces, by way of ambuscade, to assist those in the chests. The Saracens being gone, the Christians went to Church, to offer up thanks to Heaven for the departure of their enemies, and were heard singing psalms by Derar, Abdo'rrhamân, and Abdo'llah in the chests, who taking this opportunity, came out of them, and having seized the Governor's lady, demanded the keys of the gates, and went from thence to the church, where they easily overpowered the unarmed multitude. Then Abdlo'lah Ebn Jaafar, who commanded them, sent five of them with the keys to open the gates, and cry out, *Allâh Acbar* (17), which Khaled, who was within, hearing, came up, and Arrestân was taken without opposition (18). Had Homer's Iliad been translated into Arabic at that time, one would have concluded, that the Saracens borrowed this stratagem from that of the Trojan horse.

(17) *i. e.* God is most mighty.

(18) Ockley, pp 213, 214.

[*G*] *Much blood had like to have been spilt in this interview.*] Khaled being come with an hundred of the best soldiers in the army, they were ordered, by the out-guards, to stay till the General's pleasure should be known. Mahân would have had Khaled come singly to him, which the latter refusing, they were commanded, upon their drawing near, to alight from their horses, and deliver up their swords; which the Saracens refusing, they at last were permitted to enter as they pleased. They found Mahân seated on a throne;

mûk [*H*]. In theſe battles fought at Yarmûk, which were all in November, *Anno Dom.* 636, the Chriſtians had the worſt; till at laſt Mahân's army being quite ſhattered, he was forced to fly, and leave the Saracens maſter of the field, now quite freed from thoſe dreadful apprehenſions, which the news of this preparation made by the Chriſtians had at firſt filled them with; and this determined the fate of Syria. According to a letter which Abu Obeidah ſent to Omar, to acquaint him with the news of this great victory, about an hundred and forty thouſand Chriſtians loſt their lives, and forty thouſand were taken priſoners; and of the Moſlems, only four thouſand and thirty loſt their lives, Mahân being afterwards killed in Damaſcus by Namân Ebn Alkamah (*x*). And now Abu Obeidah marched to beſiege Jeruſalem, which the Saracens were extremely deſirous of taking, becauſe it was the ſeat and burying place of many of the antient Prophets, in whom they thought themſelves more intereſted than any other people. The Ieroſolymites ſuſtained the ſiege with prodigious bravery for four months, it being the winter ſeaſon. Omar, to encourage his Moſlems, came thither in perſon, and lived with ſurpriſing frugality during his whole march [*I*]. Being come near Jeruſalem, he was met by Abu Obeidah, and conducted to the Saracen camp with abundance of joy. The Ieroſolymites being intimidated by the preſence of Omar, capitulated and opened their gates to him (*y*). The articles of ſurrender, which are curious enough, may be ſeen in Ockley (*z*). The Chriſtians were allowed liberty of conſcience, upon condition of paying a certain tribute. However this city, once the glory of the Eaſt, was forced to ſubmit to a heavier yoke (as it afterwards proved) than ever it had done before (*aa*). The Khalîf entering the city, the Patriarch attended him to ſeveral places in it, and talked familiarly with him [*K*]. Omar, after ſtaying about ten days in Jeruſalem, to ſettle the affairs of Syria, returned to Medina, whoſe inhabitants received him with the higheſt demonſtration of joy (*bb*). The ſame year in which Jeruſalem was taken, Saad Ebn Abi Wakkâs, one of Omar's Generals, made great havock in Perſia [*L*]. The Khalîf, before he left Jeruſalem, divided Syria into two parts; and committed the Government of all that lies between

(*x*) Ibid. p. 241, 242.

(*y*) Ibid. p. 255 & *ſeq.*

(*z*) Ibid. p. 257.

(*aa*) Ibid. p. 259.

(*bb*) Ibid. p. 265 and 268.

a throne; and ſeats were prepared for them, but they refuſed to make uſe of them, and ſat upon the ground. Mahân then expoſtulated with Khaled, concerning their coming into Syria, and the hoſtilities they had committed there. . . . Sometimes they argued very cooly, and then flew into a violent paſſion, till at laſt, Khaled told Mahân, that he ſhould one day ſee him led, with a rope about his neck, to Omar, to be beheaded. Mahân anſwered, that the received laws of all nations ſecured Embaſſadors from violence, which, he ſuppoſed, had encouraged him to take that indecent freedom; however, he was reſolved to chaſtize his inſolence in the perſon of his five friends, the five priſoners, for whoſe liberty he was come to ſue, who ſhould inſtantly be beheaded. Khaled ſwore by God, by Mohammed, and the holy Temple of Mecca, that if he killed them, he ſhould die by their hands; and every Saracen preſent ſhould kill his man, whatever might be the conſequence. The reſt of the Saracens did the like. But Mahân ſaying, that he would not do him any hurt, for the reaſon abovementioned, they ſheathed their ſwords, and talked calmly again; after which Mahân made Khaled a preſent of the priſoners, and the former received from Khaled the ſcarlet tent which he had pitched hard by (19). This ſeems to be a ſtrange ſort of interview, and no ways in the manner of the Europeans.

(19) Ibid. p. 232 & *ſeq.*

[*H*] *By the inhumanity* of the Chriſtians *at Yarmûk.*] There was, in this place, a Gentleman of a very plentiful fortune, who removed thither, from Hems, for the benefit of the air. When Mahân's army came thither, this Gentleman uſed to treat the officers, and entertain them very nobly. In return for his courteſy, whilſt they were revelling at his houſe, they bid him bring out his wife to them, which he refuſing, they took her by force, and abuſed her all night; and, to heighten his affliction, they took a little ſon of his, and cut off his head. The poor Lady took her ſon's head, and carried it to Mahân; when giving him an account of the outrages committed by his officers, ſhe demanded ſatisfaction. He took but little notice of her complaint, and put her off with a ſlight anſwer. This exaſperated her huſband, who now reſolved to take the firſt opportunity of being revenged, went over, privately, to the Saracens, and acquainted them with his deſign. Returning back to the Greeks, he told them, it was now in his power to do them ſingular ſervice. Accordingly he takes a great number of them, and brings them to a great water, very deep, and fordable only at one place. Five hundred Saracen horſe, inſtructed by him, came over where the water was ſhallow, and attacked the Greeks; but ſoon returned orderly the ſame way they came. The injured Gentleman then called out, and encouraged the Greeks to purſue; who plunging into the water confuſedly, and being not at all acquainted with the place, periſhed in great numbers (20). How inconſiſtent was this ſhocking behaviour of the Grecian ſoldiers, with the religion they pretended to profeſs, and for the protection of which they fought?

(20) Ibid. p. 239.

[*I*] *He lived with ſurprizing frugality during his whole march.*] He rode upon a red camel, with a couple of ſacks, in one of which he carried the proviſions, called *Sawîk*, viz. barley, rice, or wheat, ſodden and unhuſked; and the other was filled with fruits. Before him he carried a very great leather bottle for water, and behind him a large wooden platter. . . After ſaying his prayers every morning . . . and filling his platter with Sawîk, he entertained very liberally his fellow travellers, who all eat with him, without diſtinction, out of the ſame diſh (21).

(21) Ibid. p. 250, 251.

[*K*] *The Patriarch attended the* Khalîf *to ſeveral places in the city.*] There goes a ſtory, that the Khalîf deſiring the Patriarch to aſſign him a place to build a moſque; the Patriarch ſhewed him the ſpot where Jacob's ſtone lay, on which he ſlept when he ſaw the viſion. The ſtone being quite covered with dirt, the Kalîf took up as much as he could of it in his veſt, and removed it. The Moſlems aſſiſted the Khalîf very readily; ſome filling their bucklers, ſome their veſts, and others baſkets; ſo that they very ſoon removed all the rubbiſh and dirt, and cleared the ſtone (22). Another learned Writer obſerves, that the Chriſtians had thrown filth on this place, out of hatred to the Jews (23). Omar leaving the Churches to the Chriſtians, built a new Temple, in the place where Solomon's formerly ſtood, and conſecrated it to the Mahommedan ſuperſtition: after this he went to Bethlehem, and entring the Church, prayed there (24).

(22) Ibid. p. 263.

(23) d'Herbelot, *Bibliotheque Orientale*, p. 687. col. 2.

(24) p. 263 & *ſeq.*

[*L*] *Saad . . . made great havock in Perſia.*] He marched to Madayen, formerly the treaſury and magazine of Khoſrû, King of Perſia, and there the Saracens found prodigious treaſures, and furniture, to an immenſe value. Another (25) relates, that they took there no leſs than three thouſand millions of ducats, beſides Khoſrû's crown, and his exceeding rich ward-robe; all his clothes being adorned with gold and jewels of great value. They next opened the roof of Khoſrû's porch, and found another conſiderable ſum. They alſo plundered his armory, which was well ſtored with weapons of every kind (26). The Arabians found ſuch immenſe riches in Madayen,

(25) Elmacin.

(26) Ockley, p. 264.

tween Haurân and Aleppo to Abu Obeidah, with orders to carry on the war till he had conquered it. He gave to Yezid Ebn Abi Sofyan the command of all Paleſtine and the Sea-ſhore; and ſent Amrû Ebno'l Aâs to invade Egypt, a very conſiderable part of the Emperor's dominions, which now mouldered away continually (*cc*). The people of Aleppo ſubmitted to Abu Obeidah; but Yûkinna, who commanded in the caſtle, made a very long and vigorous reſiſtance, till at laſt it was taken by ſtratagem [*M*]; as alſo Aazâz, a place of great importance. The Governor's ſon of the caſtle committed an action of a moſt barbarous nature [*N*]. Yûkinna inſidiouſly went over to the Emperor Heraclius, who was ſo far impoſed upon by his ſpecious proteſtations, that he made him Captain over a band of men who were to conduct a daughter of his from a certain place to Antioch; which being afterwards beſieged by Abu Obeidah, was taken chiefly by Yûkinna's treachery. Heraclius continued for ſome time in Antioch, after it was attacked by the Saracens; but being diſheartned by an uninterrupted ſeries of ill ſucceſs; and terrified with a dream he had, of a perſon thruſting him out of his throne, and his crown falling from his head, he took ſome of his Domeſticks, and eſcaping privately to the ſea-ſhore, embarked for Conſtantinople. Thus fell the Metropolis of Syria, the year of the Hegira 17, and *Annô Dom.* 638 (*dd*). Advice being ſent of this to the Khalîf, he ordered Abu Obeidah to purſue the enemy, and enter into the mountainous part of the country (*ee*); who accordingly ſent ſome forces thither, when Abd'ollah Ebn Hodâpha was taken priſoner [*O*]. Khaled alſo was very ſucceſsful, he having marched through the country as far as the Euphrates, taken Menbigz upon ſurrender, and ſome other neighbouring towns, as Berâa and Balés (*ff*). We obſerved above, that the Khalîf had commanded Amrû Ebno'l Aâs to go into Egypt; but before he ſet out upon his march, he continued ſome time in Paleſtine, to take certain places that ſtill held out (*gg*). Conſtantine, Heraclius's ſon, guarded that part of the country where Amrû lay, with a conſiderable army. The armies drawing near, and the Greeks deſiring to have a conference with the Saracens, Amrû had an interview with Conſtantine, but to no purpoſe. Both armies being come in ſight of one another, a Chriſtian officer fought ſingly with ſome Saracens [*P*]. At laſt, Conſtantine being diſcouraged, and having no hopes of victory; took

(*cc*) Ibid. p. 267.

(*dd*) Ibid. p. 296 & *ſeq.* and p. 312.

(*ee*) Ibid. p. 317.

(*ff*) Ibid. p. 317, 318.

(*gg*) Ibid. p. 324.

(*bb*) Ibid. p. 325 & *ſeq.*

Madayen, at that time the capital of Perſia, that they began to deſpiſe their ancient poverty (27). In the ſame year, the Saracens defeated the Perſians in a great battle near Jalûlah. Yazdejerd perceiving that things grew worſe daily, retired to Ferganah, a city in Perſia (28).

(27) D'Herbelot, p. 687. c. 2.

(28) Ockley, ib.

[*M*] *Aleppo at laſt was taken by ſtratagem.*] Among the reinforcements which Omar ſent to the Saracen camp before Aleppo, was a very remarkable man, named Dames, of a gigantic ſize, and an admirable ſoldier. Dames deſired Abu Obeidah to give him the command of thirty men, aſſuring him that he would exert all his abilities; and then prevailed with the latter to remove his army about a league from the caſtle. In the dead of the night, Dames went under it, and ſeized a man who dropt from the wall; and was by him informed of the ſtate of the garriſon. Then covering himſelf with a goat's ſkin, and taking a dry cruſt in his hand, he crept on all four as near to the caſtle as he could; and, to prevent being diſcovered, made ſuch a noiſe with his cruſt, as a dog does when gnawing a bone. The reſt of his companions ſtole after him. Then Dames ſitting down on the ground, ordered another man to ſit upon his ſhoulders, and ſo five more, one above the other; when the uppermoſt reaching to the top of the wall, they all cried, *O Apoſtle of God, help and deliver us!* He that was uppermoſt, after ſtabbing, and throwing down among the Saracens, three watchmen whom he found drunk and aſleep, let down his turbant, and drew up the ſecond, after which all the reſt were drawn up. Dames enjoining them ſilence, went and peeped into a place, where he ſaw Yûkinna the Governor, richly dreſſed, ſitting on a tapeſtry of ſcarlet ſilk flowered with gold, and a large company with him, eating and drinking, and very merry. However, Dames did not think it adviſable to fall upon them; but waiting till day-break, he ſet open the gates, and Khaled coming with a party of ſoldiers, the garriſon ſurrendred. Yûkinna was the firſt who turned Mahommedan here, and became a moſt inveterate enemy to the Chriſtian intereſt (29).

(29) Ibid. p. 282 & *ſeq.*

[*N*] . . . *committed an action of a moſt barbarous nature.*] The Governor of Aazâz was named Theodorus, couſin-german to Yûkinna, whom he had taken, with an hundred diſguiſed Saracens, and brought priſoners to his caſtle. It happened that Theodorus had a ſon named Leon, whom he uſed to ſend, now and then, for a month or two, to be with his uncle Yûkinna at the caſtle of Aleppo, where Leon fell in love with his uncle's daughter, a very beautiful young lady. Being one day returned from thence, he informed his mother of his paſſion; and ſhe, out of tenderneſs for her ſon, was willing to contribute any thing that might be the means of procuring a proper remedy. Theodorus had put Yûkinna and his hundred diſguiſed Saracens into Leon's apartment. He, overjoyed at this opportunity of ingratiating himſelf with his uncle, told him, that he was deſirous of releaſing him and his friends. Yûkinna told him, that if he had an inclination to turn Mohammedan, he ought not to do it upon any proſpect of worldly advantage. The young villain, fired with luſt, anſwered, "That his family and relations were "dear to him; but the faith was dearer." In a word, he ſet them all at liberty, gave them their arms, and bad them go in God's name; ſaying that he would go and get his father, whom he was ſure to find drunk and aſleep, murdered; and accordingly the unhappy Governor was killed by Luke, Leon's brother (30). A horrid inſtance of barbarity, and very ſeldom found among the Greeks.

(30) Ibid. p. 290 & *ſeq.*

[*O*] *Abdollâh Ebn Hodâpha was taken priſoner.*] He was a Saracen of great note, Mohammed's couſin-german, and much beloved by the Khalîf. Being come to Conſtantinople, and brought into Heraclius's preſence, that Emperor made him very advantageous proffers, upon condition that he ſhould renounce the Mohammedan faith, but all in vain; nor were his threats more effectual than his promiſes. He offered him his liberty, provided he would make one ſingle adoration before a crucifix. Heraclius would have perſuaded him to drink wine and eat hog's fleſh; which he refuſing, was ſhut up in a room where there was nothing elſe. Abdollâh being viſited the fourth day, all was found untouched. The Emperor aſking what hindered him from eating and drinking? he replied, "The fear of God and his Apoſtle: however, (add-"ed he) I might have lawfully eat, after three days "abſtinence, yet I abſtained, becauſe I would not "be reproached by the Moſlems (31)." Afterwards Heraclius, at Omar's requeſt, diſmiſſed this priſoner very honourably.

(31) Ibid. p. 320 & *ſeq.*

[*P*] *A Chriſtian officer fought ſingly with ſome Saracens.*]

took an opportunity, in a ſtormy night, to march away, leaving his camp to the Saracens (*ii*). Much about this time Tripoli was ſurprized by the treachery of Yûkinna, and Tyre inveſted and taken by Yezid Ebn Abi Sophyan, when the greateſt part of the inhabitants turned Mahommedans. Conſtantine hearing that Tripoli and Tyre were loſt, was ſo much caſt down, that he embarked with his family and wealth, and ſailed for Conſtantinople. News of this coming to Cæſarea, which Amrû Ebno'l then beſieged, the inhabitants unanimouſly ſurrendered to him. This was the year of the Hegira 17, and *Anno Dom.* 639; after which all the towns in Syria ſurrendered, ſo that the Saracens made an entire conqueſt of it (*ll*). Abu Obeidah, and a great many thouſand Saracens were, ſoon after, ſwept away by a plague, and Khaled ſurvived them but three years (*mm*). Amrû Ebno'l Aâs prepared for his expedition into Egpyt; and coming before Miſrah, formerly called Memphis, and now grand Cairo, laid cloſe ſiege to it. He employed ſeven months in it to no purpoſe, at the end of which the Khalîf ſent him a reinforcement of four thouſand men, by which means he poſſeſſed himſelf of that important city [*Q*]. Amrû, after fighting ſome ſucceſsful battles in his march towards Alexandria, laid cloſe ſiege to it. Thoſe Greeks who had eſcaped from the ſlaughter made by the Saracens, retired to Alexandria; where they made all the preparations they could for a ſiege; and made a gallant reſiſtance, during fourteen months, but at laſt were forced to open the gates to the triumphant Saracens [*R*]. Alexandria being taken, all Egypt followed the fortune of its Metropolis, and the inhabitants compounded for their lives, fortunes, *&c.* A tribute being fixed on every Egyptian, there aroſe from thence a prodigious revenue to the Khalîf. This, joined to their frugal way of life, greatly contributed to the extending their power and conqueſts (*nn*). At this time the Alexandrian library was deſtroyed [*S*]. Amrû began now to turn his eyes to the Weſtern part of Africa; and in a ſhort time made himſelf maſter of the country lying between Barca and Zeweila, and ſoon after of Tripoli. The victorious arms of the Saracens made no leſs progreſs Eaſtward; and the Mahommedan creſcent began

(*ii*) Ibid. p. 336.

(*kk*) Ibid. p. 338.

(*ll*) Ibid. p. 337, to p. 342. The greateſt part of the particulars related (by Ockley,) concerning the conqueſt of Syria by the Saracens, is extracted from an Arabian Author called Alwâkidi. The future particulars mentioned by Ockley, are taken from Eutychius, Elmacin, and Abûlpharagius.

(*mm*) Ibid. p. 344.

(*nn*) Ibid. p. 357 & *ſeq.*

cens.] This officer came from Conſtantine's army, and being very richly dreſſed, ſeveral of the Saracens were deſirous to fight him, in hopes of carrying off his ſpoils... There came forth to this officer a beardleſs ſtripling, whoſe forward zeal had prompted him to leave Arabia Fælix, and venture himſelf in the wars; and his mother and ſiſter had hitherto accompanied him. This youth uſed to ſay, *That he had not been invited, by the delicacies of Syria, to go thither, (as the delights of this world are fading, and thoſe of the other durable;) but that it was his deſire to fight for the ſervice of God, ſeeking his favour, and that of his Apoſtle: becauſe he had heard one ſay, that the martyrs (32) ſhall be maintained with their Lord.... How can that be,* anſwered his ſiſter; *how can they be maintained when dead?* He replied, *That he had heard one, who was acquainted with the Apoſtle of God, ſay, that the ſpirits of the Martyrs ſhall be put into the crops of green birds that live in paradiſe; which birds ſhall eat the fruits of paradiſe, and drink the rivers; ſuch is the maintenance which God has provided for them.* Saying this, he went out to fight the Chriſtian, after taking leave of his mother and ſiſter; and told them, that they ſhould meet again at that large water in paradiſe, which belongs to the Apoſtle of God. The Chriſtian officer not only killed him, but two or three more, and was himſelf ſlain ſoon after (33).

(32) By this name the Mohammedans call all thoſe who loſe their lives in the wars undertaken for the propagation of their religion.

(33) Ockley, p. 331 & *ſeq.*

[*Q*] *He poſſeſſed himſelf of that important City.*] The Lieutenant who held it for Heraclius was one Mokaukas, of the ſect of the Jacobites (34), and a mortal enemy to the Greeks. He had no deſign to ſerve the Emperor, but to provide for himſelf; having behaved ſo ill, that he durſt not come into Heraclius's preſence, for he had taken into his own hands the whole tribute of Egypt. In Miſrah was an ancient caſtle of great ſtrength. Mokaukas's chief care was to ſecure himſelf and his treaſures, without valuing what became of all the Greeks and orthodox Chriſtians. In the river, between the beſieged caſtle and the oppoſite bank, was a little iſland, into which Mokaukas treacherouſly prevailed with the Greeks to go, after abandoning the caſtle. He then made overtures to Amrû; and the caſtle being taken, Mokaukas ſurrendred upon certain conditions (35).

(34) Theſe were ancient hereticks, ſprung from the Eutychians, and called from one James or Jacobus of Syria.

(35) Ockley, p. 347 & *ſeq.*

[*R*] ... *at laſt were forced to open the gates of Alexandria to the triumphant Saracens.*] The Greeks made frequent ſallies, ſo that great numbers were killed on both ſides. The Saracens making a vigorous attack on one of the towns, and entering it, were repulſed from it; on which occaſion Amrû the General, Muſlemah Ebno'l Mochalled, and Werdan, Amrû's ſlave, were taken priſoners. Being brought before the Governor, he aſked them what they meant by running about the country in the manner they did, and infeſting their neighbours? Amrû anſwered according to the uſual form, and told him, that they intended to make them either Moſlems or Tributaries before they had done. This reſolute anſwer had like to have coſt him his life; for the Governor having taken notice of his behaviour, concluded that he was no vulgar perſon; and ſpoke to ſome who were near him to ſtrike off his head. Werdan, his ſlave, underſtanding Greek; the inſtant he heard what the Governor ſaid, took his maſter Amrû by the collar, and gave him a box on the ear, ſaying, "That "he was ever putting himſelf forward, and prating, "when 'twould better become him to hold his "tongue: That he was a mean, contemptible fel"low; and that he would adviſe him to learn more "manners, and let his betters ſpeak before him." By this time Muſlemah Ebno'l Mochalled had bethought himſelf, and told the Governor, *That their General intended to raiſe the ſiege: that Omar the Khalif had wrote to him concerning it, and intended to ſend an honourable embaſſy, conſiſting of ſeveral diſtinguiſhed perſons, and men of note, to treat with him; and if he pleaſed to let them go, they would acquaint their General how courteouſly he had uſed them, and employ their utmoſt endeavours to procure an accommodation.* He added, *That he did not in the leaſt queſtion, when the Khalif's Embaſſadors had treated with him, but that affairs would be made eaſy on both ſides, and the ſiege raiſed very ſpeedily.* The impolitic Governor diſmiſſed theſe three or four vulgar men, as he ſuppoſed them to be, in hopes of ſeizing upon ſome of the chiefs of the Arabs, whom he imagined ſhould be ſent to treat with him. Not long after, the city was taken; but whilſt Amrû marched farther up into the country, the Greeks, who had gone on board their ſhips, and whoſe return was not in the leaſt ſuſpected, came back, ſurprized the city, and killed all the Saracens in it. However, Amrû returning ſpeedily, the Greeks who had retaken the caſtle, defended it with great bravery, but were at laſt repulſed, and as many as could, returned back to their ſhips (36).

(36) Ibid. p. 353 & *ſeq.*

[*S*] *The Alexandrian library was deſtroyed.*] Hitherto the Arabians had applied themſelves to no other ſtudy but that of poetry in their own language. Amrû, though no ſcholar, was yet fond of the converſation of learned men; and, among others, was particularly delighted with that of one John of Alexandria, ſurnamed

began to ſhed its malignant influence over as large and conſiderable dominions as the Roman Eagle had ever flown over. About the year of the Hegira 21, and *Anno Dom.* 641, the Saracens poſſeſſed themſelves of Aderbijân, Ainwerdah, Harrân, Roha, Rakkah, Niſibin, Ehwaz, Siwas, and Choraſan (*oo*). About two years after, Omar the Khalif was killed by a ſlave [*T*], the twenty third year of the Hejra, *Anno Dom.* 643: after having reigned ten years, ſix months and eight days, being ſixty three years of age (*pp*). Omar had the ſirname *Al Farûk* beſtowed upon him [*U*]. The countries won by the Saracens, only in this Khalif's reign, were ſo conſiderable, that they alone would have made a very formidable Empire. He drove all the Jews and Chriſtians out of Arabia; ſubdued Syria, Egypt and other territories in Africa; beſides the greateſt part of Perſia. Khondemir obſerves, that the Saracens, under Omar, poſſeſſed themſelves of thirty ſix thouſand towns, fortreſſes or caſtles; deſtroyed four thouſand temples or churches belonging to the Chriſtians, Idolaters, or Perſees; and built fourteen hundred Moſques. But theſe mighty atchievements gained by the Khalif, had no effect upon his manner of living, he ſtill continuing his former way of life; nor did the increaſe of his riches ever appear by his retinue or expences. He built a wall about Cuſa, and repaired, or rather rebuilt, the temples of Jeruſalem and Medina. He was the firſt of the Saracens who made rolls to enter the names of all that were in military ſervice, or received any ſtipend from the publick. He firſt made uſe of the date of the Hejra (*qq*), the occaſion of which may be ſeen in Dr. Prideaux (*rr*). An Arabian author beſtows the higheſt encomiums on Omar [*W*]. Mohammed had married Omar's daughter Haphſa (*ss*), and our Khalif fought with great bravery under the falſe Prophet (*tt*). A ſtory is related concerning the converſion of a Perſian Lord to the Mohammedan Religion [*X*]. We are told of a famous

(*oo*) Ibid. p. 361 & *ſeq.* and d'Herbelot, *Bibliotheque Orientale*, p. 687. col. 2.

(*pp*) Ibid. p. 634. and d'Herbelot, ibid.

(*qq*) Ockley, p. 367.

(*rr*) *Life of Mahomet*, p. 59.

(*ss*) Prideaux's *Life of Mahomet*, p. 41.

(*tt*) Ibid. p. 82.

ſurnamed the Grammarian, a man eminent for learning. John one day obſerving that Amrû, in taking an inventory of the valuable things in the city, took no notice of the books, petitioned to have them. Amrû wrote to the Khalif for that purpoſe, who ſent an order to have them deſtroyed; upon which Amrû, in obedience to the Khalif's command, diſtributed the books throughout all the city, among thoſe who kept warm baths (of which there were then no leſs than four thouſand in Alexandria) to heat the baths with. And notwithſtanding the great havock that muſt needs be made of them at this rate, yet former Princes had been ſo induſtrious in collecting ſuch numbers, that it was ſix months before they were conſumed. A loſs that could never be compenſated to the learned world (37).

(37) Ibid. p. 359 & *ſeq.*

[*T*] *Omar the Khalif was killed by a ſlave.*] His name was Firûz, who one day came and complained to Omar, that his maſter inſiſted upon his giving him two pieces of ſilver every day, which, he ſaid, was often all he could earn by a day's work. Omar having aſked him how many trades he was ſkilled in? and finding that he was an architect, a carpenter, and ſculptor, he replied, that this was no great ſum, but that his maſter might oblige him to give him three pieces of ſilver, ſince he was ſkilled in three trades; and afterwards ſaid, that he would employ him in building windmills, to grind the corn for the public granaries. Firûz exaſperated at the Khalif's anſwer, and ſhuddering with rage, ſaid, I will make you ſuch a mill, as ſhall be ſpoken of ſo long as the wheel of that of heaven ſhall turn over the heads of men. Omar hearing theſe words, ſaid, methinks this fellow threatens me; and his ſuſpicion was juſt; for Firûz, took his opportunity ſo well, that he ſtabbed him ſome days after, with a knife or dagger, in the belly, of which wound he died three days after. Immediately the Saracens about Omar fell on the aſſaſſin; but he defended himſelf with ſo much bravery, that he wounded the greateſt part of them with the ſame dagger, and afterwards killed himſelf (38).

(38) D'Herbelot, p. 688. col. 2. and Okley, p. 363, who relates it with a little variation from this.

[*U*] *Omar had the ſurname al Farûk beſtowed upon him.*] This alludes to Omar's diſtinguiſhing between truth and falſhood, and to his ſeparating a knave's head from his body; the ſtory of which is as follows. "A certain Jew having a diſpute with a wicked "Mohammedan, the latter appealed to the judgment "of Caab Ebn al Aſhraf, a principal Jew, and the "former to Mohammed. But at length they agreed "to refer the matter to the prophet ſingly, who giv-"ing it in favour of the Jew, the Mohammedan re-"fuſed to acquieſce in his ſentence, but would needs "have it re-heard by Omar, afterwards Khalif. "When they came to him, the Jew told him that "Mohammed had already decided the affair in his "favour, but that the other would not ſubmit to his "determination; and the Mohammedan confeſſing "this to be true, Omar bid them ſtay a little, and "fetching his ſword, ſtruck off the obſtinate Moſ-"lem's head, ſaying aloud, *This is the reward of him "who refuſeth to ſubmit to the judgment of God and his "Apoſtle.* And from this action, Omar had the ſur-name of al Farûk (39).

(39) Sale's *Koran*, p. 69. London, 1734, 4to. and d'Herbelot, p. 688. col. 2.

[*W*] *An Arabian Author beſtows the higheſt encomiums on Omar.*] "This Khalif, ſays he (40), fed others "deliciouſly, and at the ſame time lived very abſte-"miouſly himſelf. He beſtowed rich garments on "others, whilſt himſelf went very meanly clad. He "paid his creditors very punctually, and generally re-"turned them more than the debt. Having pro-"miſed a perſon to give him four thouſand pieces of "ſilver, he ordered him ſix thouſand; when a per-"ſon obſerving that he gave away his ſubſtance in "this manner, and obſerving to him, that he ſeemed, "by this action, to have more affection for a ſtranger "than for his own ſon, ſince he thus diſpoſſeſſed "him of money that ought one day to be his; Omar "replied, my ſon has a father who provides for his "daily wants, but this ſtranger has none (41)." A noble anſwer, but not very well ſuited to a man who had plundered ſo many countries, and deſtroyed ſuch multitudes of people.

(40) D'Herbelot, p. 689. col. 1.

(41) Idem, ibid.

[*X*] . . . *The converſion of a Perſian Lord to the Mohammedan religion.*] The 17th year of the Hegira, a Perſian Lord named Hormozan, a Governor of Khûziſtan, &c. under the Perſian Monarch, having been obliged to ſurrender, in one of his caſtles, was ſent to Medina where Omar reſided. Hormozan being immediately conducted to the moſque where Omar was; found him, to his great ſurprize, ſleeping on the ſteps among the poor. Omar waking ſoon after, and ſeeing this ſtranger, roſe from the place where he was, and went and ſeated himſelf in the gallery of the moſque, which ſerved him for a throne. He there received the Perſian very honourably and affectionately; praiſing God for the ſucceſs he indulged the Moſlem arms, and for ſending him perſons of ſuch high quality; and after giving him a rich robe, he diſcourſed him, for a conſiderable time, on different matters. The converſation being ended, Hormozan deſired ſome drink; when Omar aſking if he was a-thirſt, and Hormozan anſwering no; but that the ſole reaſon of his deſiring to drink, in his preſence was, to ſecure his life; Omar replied, that he was ſafe. So that Hormozan abſtained from drinking on his word; and inſtantly renouncing the idolatrous worſhip of fire, profeſſed Iſlâm (42). We alſo are told another ſtory of Giabala, an Arabian Prince, who came to Omar, to recognize him in quality of Khalif, and to embrace his religion. Omar received him very graciouſly, and took him to Mecca, whither

(42) D'Herbelot, p. 688. col. 1.

famous ſentence pronounced by Omar [*Y*]. Abu Becr and Omar, the firſt and ſecond Khalifs of the Saracens, were ſo like in their manners and behaviour, that the Moſlems call them by one common name, *viz.* the two Omars (*uu*); and yet they differed in one particular [*Z*]. A miraculous eſcape of Omar related [*AA*]. Among other particulars, in which the Perſians ſhew their deteſtation of Omar, *&c.* is the whimſical one hereunder [*BB*]. Omar uſed to ſay, that the Empire of the Arabs will come to an end, when the Prince who governs it ſhall not practiſe the piety of the Moſlems, nor exert the liberality of the Gentiles (*ww*). Omar made no will, but appointed ſix Commiſſioners; and allowed them three days time to conſult about the ſucceſſion after his death, who accordingly raiſed Othman Ebn Affân to the Khalifât (*xx*).

(*uu*) D'Herbelot, p. 689. col. 1.

(*ww*) Ibid. p. 689. col. 1.

(*xx*) Ockley p. 369 *& ſeq.*

ther he was going in pilgrimage. As Giabala was performing the duties required on that occaſion, and going round the temple of Mecca, a mean man, pulling him by the ſleeve, drew him out of his place. Giabala offended at this man's rudeneſs, gave him a box o'the ear; and afterwards reproached him, in the moſt injurious terms, for his ſhocking incivility to a perſon of his quality. Omar hearing this Prince continue to threaten and abuſe the man who had drawn him from his place, ſaid to him, hold your peace for otherwiſe, that man ſhall return you the box o'the ear: for know, that the religion of the Moſlems has put you both upon a level, the prince and the ſlave, with regard to the exerciſe and practice of the duties of piety and religion, and particularly with reſpect to thoſe of the pilgrimage. Giabala was ſo highly exaſperated at the Khalîf's words, that he left him; went to Conſtantinople, and there turned Chriſtian (43).

(43) Ebn Shohriah.

[*Y*] *We are told of a famous ſentence pronounced by Omar.*] The Governor of his new city of Baſſora, at the mouth of the Tigris, having been accuſed of adultery by four witneſſes, inhabitants of that city; Omar ſent for the witneſſes before him, when three of them made oath, that they had ſeen the action thro' one of the windows of the ſame room; but the fourth witneſs who was a perſon of gravity and authority, ſaid, that he had ſeen only ſome circumſtances which might ſerve as an indication of the crime. Omar being urgent with him, aſked, whether he had ſeen him put the needle into the box of Surmeh, which is a powder of Antimony, uſed by the Eaſterns as an eye-ſalve. This witneſs knowing that Omar by this decent form of expreſſion, hinted at the crime of adultery, anſwered, that he had not ſeen it; Omar thereupon cleared the Governor, and ſentenced the three abovementioned as falſe witneſſes (44).

(44) Ibid.

[*Z*] *They differ in one particular.*] This was in the beſtowing their favours. For Abu Becr, on thoſe occaſions, had regard only to the merit of perſons; whereas Omar conſidered nothing but their neceſſities, ſaying, that virtue is a ſufficient reward in the world to come; but that the good things of this world were given by the Almighty, chiefly to relieve the neceſſities incident to this life (45).

(45) D'Herbelot, p. 689. col. 1 and 2. and Ockley, p. 368.

[*AA*] *A miraculous eſcape of Omar is related.*] Whilſt Antioch was beſieging by the Saracens, and upon the point of being taken, the Emperor aſſembled the Biſhops, *&c.* when Jabala, General of the Chriſtian Arabs, told Heraclius, that if the Khalîf was killed, the affairs of the Saracens would be embroiled; and this action would greatly contribute to the recovery of what the Chriſtians had loſt. Upon this Jabala prevailed with the Emperor, to let him ſend one of his Chriſtian Arabs, Wathek Ebn Moſâpher by name, a reſolute young man, with orders to take a convenient time to kill the Khalîf. Omar, after prayers, went out of the city, to take a walk, according to his uſual cuſtom. Wathek went before him, and got upon a tree, where he hid himſelf; till at laſt he obſerved Omar lie down to ſleep, very near him. Having this fair opportunity, he drew his dagger, and was juſt coming down; when caſting his eyes about, he ſaw a lion walking round Omar, and licking his feet, who guarded him till he awoke, and then went away. Surprized at this, and ſtruck with a profound reverence for the Khalîf, whom he now conſidered as the peculiar gift of heaven, he came down and kiſſed his hand; and telling him his errand, immediately made profeſſion of the Mahommedan religion, being ſtrangely affected with this wonderful deliverance (36). This ſtory ſeems contrived by the Arabian Author, to draw the greater veneration on Omar.

(46) Ockley, p. 308, 309.

[*BB*] *The Perſians ſhew their deteſtation.*] Of the three great Doctors of the Mohammedan law, viz. Abu Becr, Oſman and Omar. 'Tis this. The Perſians have a cuſtom at their marriages, to ſet up the images of thoſe three Doctors in paſte or ſugar, at the entrance of the bridal chamber, on which the gueſts firſt caſting their looks, leave the impreſſion of any ſecret magic which may iſſue from their eyes, to the prejudice or misfortune of the married couple; for in the Eaſtern parts of the world, they hold that there is a ſtrange faſcination innate in the eyes of ſome people, who looking attentively on others, as commonly they do on the bride and bridegroom at marriage, produce macerations and imbecillity in the body, and have a peculiar quality contrary to procreation; and therefore when the gueſts are entered, having the malignity of their eyes fixed on thoſe ſtatues, they afterwards cut them down and diſſolve them (47).

(47) Ricaut's *Hiſtory of the preſent ſtate of the Ottoman Empire*, p. 226. Lond. 1682. 8vo.

I.

OMNIBONUS, in Italian *Omnibuono*, was one of the beſt Grammarians in the 15th Century. He took the ſirname of *Leonicenus* becauſe he was born at Lunigo (*a*) in Latin *Leonicum*, in the Vicentino. He ſtudied under Victorinus of Feltri, one of the firſt reſtorers of the antient Latin ſtile (*b*). He applied himſelf to the Greek tongue at Venice under Emanuel Chryſoloras (*c*). He wrote commentaries on Lucan, Salluſt, Valerius Maximus, on Tully's Offices, on his treatiſe *De Oratore*, *&c.* He tranſlated into Latin ſome of Æſop's Fables, Xenophon's treatiſe *De Venatione*, that of St. Athanaſius, *Contra Gentes et Hæreticos* (*d*). But theſe are only part of his works.

(*a*) Leandro Alberti, *Deſcritt. di tutta Italia*, folio 470. edit. of Venice 1561, in 4to.

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

(*c*) Geſnerus, in *Biblioth.* folio 527.

(*d*) Epitome in Biblioth. Geſneri, p. 641.

OREGIUS (AUGUSTINE) a great Philoſopher, was charged by Cardinal Barberini (*a*) Legate of Bologna, to examine whether Ariſtotle taught the mortality of the Soul. The Legate's deſign was to perſuade the Popes to prohibit the Lectures upon Ariſtotle with regard to that ſubject, in caſe he were found guilty of that impiety. But Oregius cleared him of the charges. See his Book *De Immortalitate Animæ* (*b*). He wrote one *De Angelis*, and another *De Operibus ſex Dierum*, i. e. "Of the works created ſix "days:" they were printed at Rome in the year 1632.

(*a*) Who was afterwards Pope, under the name of Urban VIII.

(*b*) Chapt. the Vth. Conſult Fromondus, *Philoſ. Chriſt. de Anima*, p. 761.

ORICELLARIUS (BERNARD) a native of Florence, and a relation to the Medicis (*a*), was raiſed to the moſt noble employments in his own country (*b*). He flouriſhed towards the end of the 15th Century. The paſſages we ſhall quote in the remarks prove that

(*a*) See the remark [*B*].

(*b*) *Vir conſularis graviſſimus.* Poggiantius, *de Scriptor. Florent.* p. 32.

that his works were written in a very good ſtile. He wrote with great partiality of Charles VIII.'s expedition in Italy (*c*). I do not think he is to be diſtinguiſhed from Bernard OCARICULARIUS (*d*), of whom Eraſmus relates a particular which deſerves to be known [*A*]. Pierius Valerianus has mentioned our Bernard [*B*], and Peter Crinitus ſpeaks

(*c*) *Qua in Hiſtoria moderatio ſcriptori probo conveniens, & alienus à ſtudiis partium animus deſiderantur.* i. e. " In which " hiſtory the " moderation " proper to a " good writer, " and a mind free " from a ſpirit of " party are " wanting." Mabill. Muſæi Ital. Tom. 1. p. 169.

(*d*) Konig makes two Authors of this one.

[*A*] *Eraſmus relates a particular of him which deſerves to be known.*] He could never perſuade him to ſpeak Latin: it was not becauſe Ocricularius did not underſtand it; but becauſe as he had ſtudied the beauties and delicacies of that language, he was afraid to ſpeak barbarouſly, if he ſhould venture to ſpeak it *ex tempore*. Eraſmus tells us this with reſpect to an apophthegm of Pollio. That Orator acknowledged, that by pleading well, he had acquired a great readineſs of pleading; and that by pleading often he had made himſelf leſs capable to plead well. The ſame thing happens to thoſe, who ſpeak often Latin; they get an habit to ſpeak it eaſily, but loſe the uſe of ſpeaking it correctly and with politeneſs. *Pollio dicebat*, Commode agendo factum eſt, ut ſæpe agerem: ſed ſæpe agendo factum eſt ut minus commode, quia ſcilicet aſſiduitate nimia facilitas magis quam facultas, nec fiducia ſed temeritas paratur. *Quod accurate factum velimus, raro faciendum eſt. Hac ratione duci videntur Itali quidam eruditi, qui licet pulchre calleant Latine, tamen vix unquam adduci poſſunt ut in familiari congreſſu Latine loquantur. At ſi quando compellit neceſſitas, dicunt exacte, quaſique de ſcripto. Novi Venetiæ Bernardum Ocricularium civem Florentinum, cujus hiſtorias ſi legiſſes, dixiſſes alterum Salluſtium, aut certe Salluſtii temporibus ſcriptas* (1). *Nunquam tamen ab homine impetrare licuit, ut mecum Latine loqueretur: ſubinde interpellabam, ſurdo loqueris, vir præclare, vulgaris linguæ veſtratis tam ſum ignarus quam Indicæ. Verbum Latinum nunquam quivi ab eo extundere* (2), i. e. " Pollio uſed to ſay: *from pleading well, I came to* " *plead often; but by doing it often I did not do it ſo* " *well; becauſe by too great an aſſiduity one acquires a* " *readineſs rather than a good faculty of pleading; a* " *temerity and not a boldneſs.* We ſhould do ſeldom " what we would do accurately. This ſeems to be " the reaſon why ſome learned Italians, though " they underſtand the Latin tongue perfectly well, " can yet hardly be prevailed upon to ſpeak it in a " familiar converſation. But if ſometimes they are " under a neceſſity to do it, they ſpeak it properly " as it were from a book. I was acquainted " at Venice with Bernard Ocricularius, a citizen of " Florence; if you had read his hiſtory, you would " think it was written by another Saluſt, or at leaſt " that it was compoſed in Saluſt's time. And yet I " could never perſuade him to ſpeak Latin with me: " I uſed to tell him ſometimes: you ſpeak to a deaf " man; I am as unacquainted with your mother-" tongue, as with the language of the Indians: I " could never draw one ſingle Latin word from his " mouth." That precaution of the Italians laſted a great while: for Scioppius tells us, that Paul Manutius could not but with the utmoſt difficulty be prevailed upon to ſpeak three or four Latin words: which was the reaſon why the Germans, who went to viſit him, eſteemed themſelves more learned than him; becauſe they ſpoke Latin more readily, whence they inferred that he did not come up to them. Father Maffeus would not venture to keep up a converſation with the ſame Scioppius, becauſe he would have been obliged to anſwer in Latin. Though theſe Gentlemen did not care to ſpeak that language, it was not ſo much becauſe they could not ſpeak it readily, as becauſe they feared leſt they ſhould uſe themſelves to barbarous expreſſions, which are almoſt unavoidable to thoſe who ſpeak Latin in converſation. I imagine the reader will not be diſpleaſed to meet here with the paſſage from Scioppius, after ſeeing the words of Eraſmus. The affinity, which theſe ſubjects have to each other, is a ſufficient reaſon for tranſcribing Scioppius's words. *Nihil non faciunt* (Itali) *ut evitent omnia, unde aliquid infuſcandæ & contaminandæ orationis periculi oſtenditur. Latine igitur nunquam loquuntur, quod fieri vix poſſe perſuaſum habeant, quin quotidianus ejus linguæ uſus, ad inſtar torrentis lutulentus fluat, & cujuſquemodi verborum ſordes ſecum rapiat, quæ poſtea quodam familiaritatis jure, ſic ſe ſcribentibus ingerant, ut etiam diligentiſſimos fallant, & haud dubie pro Latinis habeantur. Hoc eorum conſilium cum haud intelligant Tranſalpini, id eorum inſcitiæ perperam adſignant. Sic recte Paulo Manutio uſu venit, ut quoniam vix tria verba Latina in familiari ſermone proferre poterat, eum Germani complures, qui loquentem audituri ad eum venerant, vehementer præ ſe contemnerent. Huic tamen nemo, qui ſanus ſit, ad puritatis & elegantiæ Latinæ ſummam quicquid defuiſſe dixerit.* (3). . . . *Mihi quoque Petrus Maffeus Jeſuita nomini atque famæ parum reſpondere viſus eſt, cum ad eum Romæ undeviginti abhinc annis ſalutatum veniſſem. Neque enim inducere animum poterat, ut Latine mihi reſpondendi aleam ſubiret. Poſtea vero lecta, relectaque ejus hiſtoria, quam de rebus per Luſitanos in India geſtis condidit, conſilium hominis ſibi parum fidentis, labemque nomini ſuo metuentis intelligere mihi viſus ſum, quod etiam facere non potui, quin prudentiſſimum judicarem* (4), i. e. " The Italians uſe all " poſſible means to avoid every thing that might " ſpoil their Latin ſtyle. They never ſpeak Latin, " becauſe they are perſuaded it is almoſt impoſſible " but a daily uſe of that language muſt in time be-" come flowing like a torrent, and carry all " ſorts of improper expreſſions with it: which being " thus becoming familiar, will eaſily creep even into " one's writings, ſo that the moſt careful writer will " not be able to take notice of them, and will un-" queſtionably imagine them good Latin. The fo-" reigners not being acquainted with this reaſon of " the Italians, aſcribe it erroneouſly to their igno-" rance. Thus it happened to Paul Manutius; as " he could hardly ſpeak three words in Latin, in " familiar diſcourſe, a great many Germans, who " came to hear him ſpeak, deſpiſed him prodigiouſly " in compariſon to themſelves; and yet no man in " his ſenſes will pretend that he did not arrive at the " higheſt degree of politeneſs and eloquence in the " Latin ſtyle. . . . Peter Maffeus a Jeſuit did not " ſeem to me to anſwer his great reputation, when I " went to viſit him at Rome nineteen years ago; " for he could never be reſolved to run the riſk of " anſwering me in Latin. But afterwards when I " read over and over again the hiſtory he wrote of " what the Portugueſe did in the Indies, I found out " that he did not dare to ſpeak Latin, becauſe he " miſtruſted his own abilities, and would not expoſe " his reputation; which in my opinion was very " prudently done." I may aſſert, I think, that Thuanus followed the example of thoſe over nice Italians, for I met with the following paſſage in a modern writer. *The Jeſuit Maffeus . . . . uſed to repeat his breviary in Greek, leſt the ſoleciſms and the low and mean expreſſions, in which the holy Bible is written, as Origen obſerves, * ſhould ſpoil the elegance and beauty of that ſtile, which we admire in his works. And for the ſame reaſon Thuanus, who ſpoke Latin with the fluency and majeſty of Livy, never anſwered the orations and compliments that were made him in that tongue, but by an interpreter* (5).

(1) See what Poccianti, p. 33. *de Scriptor. Florentinis*, obſerves of Bernard Oricellarius. *Dictitavit quinetiam Florentinas hiſtorias, quas adeo phraſi extulit eloquentiſſima, quod (teſte Michaele Urbinate) ipſum Saluſtium ſuperaſſe videatur*; i. e. " He " wrote the Hiſtory of Florence, in ſuch " a polite and elegant ſtile, " that (according to Michael " Urbinas) he " ſeemed to have " excelled even " Saluſt himſelf."

(2) Eraſm. Apophth. lib. 8. p. 634. edit. 1556.

(3) Scioppius, *in Judicio de Stilo Hiſtorico*, p. m. 57.

(4) Idem, ibid. p. 58.

* Περὶ σολικισμῶ, καὶ τούτοις φράσεως τῆς γραφῆς.

(5) Girac, *Réponſe à la Défenſe des Oeuvres de Voiture*, ſect. 18. p. 120.

WHY ſome learned men will not ſpeak Latin.

[*B*] *Pierius Valerianus has mentioned our Bernard.*] It is where he ſpeaks of the deceitful hopes of John Oricellarius, Bernard's ſon. He aſpired to get a Cardinal's hat under Leo X. and more ſtill under Clement VI. but after ſeveral delays, which vexed him without tiring his patience, death came at laſt and diſappointed all his hopes of preſent (16) and future preferments. *Eodem in albo reponendus Joannes Oricellarius ſummæ vir integritatis, quique litterarum ſtudia vel à teneris unguiculis ſectari cœperat, & apud Bernardum patrem eruditiſſimum virum, & apud Mediceos hujuſmodi ſtudiis in ea domo florentibus educatus fuerat. Erat is Leoni Decimo Pont. Max. amitinus frater, neque ullus erat, qui tum morum, tum litteraturæ, nobilitatis, & conſanguinitatis gratia non eum ſperaret ad Cardinalatus apicem in horas evehendum. Sed fortuna illi quoſdam oppoſuerat* (7). . . . *Adridere mox Joanni viſa ſors melior.. Hic igitur Oricellarius, dum ſe totum litterarum ſtudiis reſtituit, & fortunæ demum fallacias declinaſſe haud temerè ſibi perſuadet, dumque Clemens de more quodam ſuo contator ordinandi hominis diem de die ducit; ille in rapidiſſimam*

(6) He was Governor of the caſtle of St. Angelo, under Clement VII. *Pier. Valerian. de Literator. Infelicitate*, lib. p. m. 74.

(7) Idem, ibid. p. 73.

ſpeaks alſo of him [*C*]. John de la Caſa had a ſiſter who was married with one Oricellarius. The ſons of this ſiſter took care of their uncle's burying, and of his works. I relate this only that I may have an opportunity to correct a miſtake relating to Naogeorgus [*D*].

Thuanus mentions one HORACE ORICELLARIUS of Florence, who got a prodigious eſtate by being concerned in the Exciſe upon Salt in France, and who finding he had made himſelf odious by his immenſe gain, returned into his own country. In the year 1588 the great Duke of Tuſcany ſent him Embaſſador to treat of his marriage with a daughter of the Duke of Lorrain (*e*). There was at the ſame time one CHARLES ORICELLARIUS belonging to the Univerſity of Florence, and Canon of the Metropolitan Church of that city; he was very much eſteemed by Peter Victorius, who beſtowed great elogies upon him in the Preface to his Commentary on the third book of Ariſtotle's Ethicks (*f*). Obſerve that the common name of that family is *Rucellai*. I ſhall give proofs of it, not ſo much with a deſign to clear up a doubtful fact, for this is not in the leaſt doubtful, as that I may have an opportunity to mention ſome perſons of that name [*E*].

I add,

(*e*) Thuan. lib. 92. p. 230.

(*f*) See p. 247, of the *Notizie Letterarie ed Iſtoriche intorno agli huomini illuſtri dell' Accademia.* This work, written by Jacobo Rilli, was printed at Florence in 4to, in the year 1700.

pidiſſimam illapſus febrem magnæ doctorum hominum ſpei præreptus eſt (8), i. e. "We muſt alſo reckon amongſt "them John Oricellarius, a man of the utmoſt ho- "neſty; who from his moſt tender years applied "himſelf to the ſtudy of Literature; having been "educated by his father Bernard a very learned man, "and at the houſe of the Medici's, where thoſe ſtu- "dies flouriſhed exceedingly. He was a Couſin- "German to Pope Leo X. and there was no man "who, it was hoped, would ſooner be raiſed to the "dignity of a Cardinal, conſidering his morals, his "learning, his noble deſcent, and his being the "Pope's relation. But fortune put ſome other perſons "in his way. . . . Soon after a happier fate ſeemed "to ſmile upon him. . . . Oricellarius therefore ap- "plied himſelf again to his ſtudies, thinking he had "at laſt overcome the deceitful inconſtancy of for- "tune: but whilſt Pope Clement, who was naturally "a delayer of time, put off his ordination from day "to day, he fell ſick of a moſt violent fever, which "ſnatched him away very quickly, whereby the "great hopes, which the learned had conceived of "him, were all diſappointed."

(8) Ibid. p. 74.

[*C*] *Peter Crinitus ſpeaks alſo of him.*] Poccianti having obſerved that Marcilius Ficinus and Peter Crinitus gave in their letter a great character of Bernard Oricellarius's learning and wit, adds this: *Poſteritati tranſmiſit (teſte eodem Chrinito) in primis libros quos de urbe Roma intitulaverat, in quibus admodum elaboravit in illuſtrandis atque obſervandis antiquorum monumentis* (9), i. e. He left to poſterity (according to the "ſame Crinitus) particularly ſome books, which he "entitled, *Of the City of Rome*, in which he took "much pains to illuſtrate and explain the monuments "of the antients."

(9) Pocciant. *de Scriptor. Florentinis*, p. 32.

[*D*] *A miſtake relating to Naogeorgus.*] It appears by the inſcription on John de la Caſa's (10) tomb, that HORACE ORICELLARIUS took care to erect that monument to his uncle by the mother's ſide. *Horatius Oricellarius avunculo optime merito P.* A German author obſerves, that the Latin verſes which were written by John de la Caſa, againſt thoſe who charged him with having commended ſodomy, are not to be met with in the collection of his works, entitled *Joannis Caſæ Latina Monumenta*. He imagines that Alexander Strozza, Inquiſitor of the Faith, cauſed thoſe lines to be omitted in that collection. He gives us the licence for printing it, which was granted by that Inquiſitor June 7, 1564; and he obſerves that Hannibal Oricellarius collected thoſe remains of John de la Caſa (11). He gives us the Poem that had been omitted, and he imagines that the author wrote it in anſwer to the Satyr, which Naogeorgus had added to the ſecond edition of the *Regnum Papiſticum* (12). He is miſtaken; for John de la Caſa wrote that Poem only to remove the bad impreſſions which Vergerio gave the Germans of him, by charging him with writing the praiſe of ſodomy. Here follows a paſſage, by which it appears unqueſtionably, that he does not complain of a ſatyr publiſhed by a German; but of the reports ſpread by a fugitive.

(10) See *Imperialis, in Muſæo Hiſtor.* p. 28. *Ghilini Theatr.* part. 1. p. 79.

Quare habere tranſfugæ
De me fidem nolite perditiſſimo:
Sed enecate eum indies magis ſiti,
Pedoribuſque & eſuritionibus:
Quod belle adhuc feciſſe vos exiſtimo,
Virtute natio & fide atque induſtria
Et literis clara, ingeniique gloria (13).

(11) Daniel Francus, *Diſquiſit. Academ. de Pap. ſtarum Indicibus Librorum prohibitorum*, p. 3.

(12) *Scripſerat ani ſtum* Caſæ *juvenilem, ut ipſe quidem excuſat, librum Thomas Naogeorgus, ſatyram regno papiſtico ſecundæ editionis quæ Baſileæ* 1559 *prodiit, adjectam. In hunc ergo* Caſa *ſequenti, quod ſubjiciemus carmine inſurrexit.* Idem, ibid. p. 109.

(13) Theſe lines are the concluſion of the poem tranſcribed by Daniel Francus. It is to be met with in the 1ſt vol. of the *Delitiarum Poetarum Italorum*, p. 702.

i. e. "Give no credit to a moſt abandoned fugitive's "report againſt me: but kill him daily more and "more with hunger, thirſt, and naſtyneſs, as I fan- "cy you have done well enough to this time: you "who are a nation eminent by your virtue, honeſ- "ty, induſtry, wit and learning." Paul Vergerio is the fugitive mentioned here. See at the end of the Anti-Baillet, the diſcourſe which John de la Caſa wrote againſt him in proſe.

[*E*] *The common name of that family is* Rucellai. *I ſhall give proofs of it . . . that I may have an opportunity to mention ſome perſons of that name.*] Signor Rilli, in his hiſtory of the Academicians of Florence, calls the ſame learned man *Carlo Rucellai*, whom Peter Victorius calls *Carolus Oricellarius*. You have heard in the foregoing remark of *Horace Oricellarius*, and of *Hannibal Oricellarius*, who were the ſons of one of John de la Caſa's ſiſters. They are called Rucellai in Cardinal d'Oſſat's letters (14): "The ſecond thing, with "which . . Cardinal Aldobrandini charged us by the "Pope's order, was to recommend the Biſhop of "Carcaſſonne to the King, that he might enjoy the "revenues both of the ſaid Biſhoprick, and of an "abbey (15) he has in Champagne. The Cardinal "added, that his Holineſs acknowledged that the "ſaid Biſhop, and his brother Signor *Horace Rucel- "lai*, were his friends, and had always been friends "to his family, and were well affected towards "France." Mr. Amelot de la Houſſaye obſerves, in his remarks upon this paſſage (16); 1. That that Biſhop of Carcaſſonne was Hannibal Rucellai, *a Gentleman of Florence, who had been formerly Governor of Rome, and who was known at the court of France, by means of the negotiations in which he had been employed by the Popes Paul* IV. *and Pius* V. That *in the year* 1567, *he was ſent to Venice by Charles* IX, *to aſk the Senate for a ſupply in money, but he could not obtain any thing, becauſe of the war with the Turks, with which the Republic was threatened at that time.* 2. That Horatio Rucellai *was firſt Steward to Ferdinand, Great Duke of Tuſcany.* 3. That *the* Aldobrandini's *and the* Rucellai's *had always been of that party, which is called at Florence* THE LIBERTINES (17), *that is to ſay, the good Republicans, and the Anti-Medicis, who would preſerve the liberty of their country. Hence came the great love, which Clement* VIII *had for theſe two brothers, whoſe father, as well as his own, had ſuffered very much under the Popes Leo* X, *and Clement* VII, *by whoſe means the houſe of Medicis had acquired Sovereign Power.* That Biſhop of Carcaſſonne, died January the 28th, 1601 (18). His brother Horatio Rucellai, *one of the moſt able men in the world* (19), ſent immediately an expreſs into France (20). Catel obſerves, that Hannibal Oricellai was Biſhop of Carcaſſonne, in the year 1569 (21). The Abbot Rucellai, who made himſelf ſo much talked of in France, in the reign of Lewis XIII, was no doubt ſon to this Horatio, for he was John de la Caſa's grand-nephew (22), and (23) *born of a father who was grown rich* (24) *by his correſpondence with Zamet, Bandini, Cenamy, and the other Italians, who at that time had farmed the Duties in France.* You will find in the

(14) *Lettre* 34 *d'Oſſat*, p. 176, of the 1ſt vol. of the Paris edit. 1698. That letter is dated the 25th, 1595.

(15) It was that of Jard, near Melun. *Amelot de Houſſaie, ubi infra.*

(16) *Amelot de la Houſſaie*, notes upon that paſſage of Cardinal d'Oſſat.

(17) You may ſupport this by a paſſage cited above, quotation (12) of the article MACHIAVEL, concerning COSIMIN RUCELLAI.

(18) D'Oſſat, *Letter* 257. p. 299 of the 2d vol.

(19) Ibid. *Lettres* 267, p. 341.

(20) Ibid. *Lettre* 257.

(21) Catel, *Memoires de l'Hiſt. du Languedoc*, p. 1009.

(22) See Vigneul Marville, in the 1ſt vol. of his *Melanges*, p. 173 of the 1ſt edit. of Rouen.

(23) Ibid. p. 271 of the 2d vol. Dutch edit.

(24) He carried off with him from the duties upon ſalt in France, 17 hundred thouſand livres. Scaligerana, under the word Rucellai.

I add, that "Catharine de Medicis took with her into France the firſt perſon of that "family, who ſettled there; and that it is not long ſince an Envoy of Florence (*g*) ... "ſet up his claim to ſome eſtate, which he pretended was deſcended to him from his "anceſtors, who had ſettled in that Kingdom." ... That this Queen *had a very kind affection for all the perſons of that family*, and that ſhe looked upon them *as being in ſome manner her relations*, for they deſcended from the Viſcounti's by the women, and were by that ſide related *to the houſe of Medicis*.

(g) He was of the family of the Rucellai's.

(b) *Mercure Galant*, for February, 1703, p. 318, &c.

(25) Vign. Marville, p. 173 of the 1ſt vol. edit. of Roan, and p. 271 of the 2d vol. Dutch edit.

Melanges of Vigneul Marville (25) the moſt curious particulars, which Monſieur de Baſſompierre, and the Author of the Duke of Epernon's life, have obſerved concerning that Abbot. Here follows a paſſage, which relates to another perſon of that family. "They promiſe us from Florence a work, in which "the Author, named Rucellai, has collected all that "the antients wrote upon that Science; from all "which he has drawn up as many different ſyſtems "of natural philoſophy, as amount up to the number "of thirty-ſix. As that work, which he wrote in "Italian, and which contains twelve volumes, could "not be printed before his death, there are reaſons "to fear, left it will not be publiſhed ſo ſoon, con-"ſidering the loſs, which the Republic of Letters "has ſuſtain'd by the death of Cardinal de Medicis, "who alone could forward the impreſſion (26)." The book from which I extracted this paſſage, was printed in the year 1676. I do not queſtion, but that paſſage relates to the ſame Horatio Rucellai, whom Signor de Creſcimbeni mentions in theſe words. *Il Sonetto moderno lo torremo dal ſecolo del ſecento ora corrente, e da uno de' più illuſtri Letterati, ch'egli abbia annoverato, cioè dalle Rime ſcritte a mano appreſſo di me del leggiadro Poëta, a profondo Filoſofo Orazio Rucellai Fiorentino Cavaliere, e Priore di ſua Patria, il quale à fiorito à noſtri tempi, ed à laſciato all'eruditiſſimo Signor Prior Luigi ſuo figlivolo un'opera nobiliſſima di Dialoghi filoſofici, la quale ſe un giorno vedrà la luce, conoſceranno i Poſteri quanto per sì chiaro intelletto queſto ſecolo fia degno d'invidia* (27). *i. e.* "That modern ſon-"net, which we took to be of the ſeventeenth centu-"ry, is of one of the moſt learned men that lived in "this age; it is a piece which I have by me in "manuſcript, written by that witty poet, and pro-"found philoſopher, Horatio Rucellai, a Gentleman "of Florence, and a Prior in his native country, "who flouriſhed in our time: he left to his moſt "learned ſon Lewis, a noble work, containing philo-"ſophical dialogues; by which, if it be ever printed, "poſterity will judge how much our age deſerves to "be envied, ſince it was poſſeſſed of a man, whoſe "underſtanding was ſo great and clear." The ſame Author tells us, that Giovanni Rucellai, compoſed at Rome, in the year 1524, a poem, entitled, *le Api*, (the Bees), which was printed in the year 1539, and afterwards at Florence, for Philip Giunti, in the year 1590, with Robert Titius's Notes, and with Lewis Alamannis *Coltivazione* (28). He does not mention the edition printed at Paris, 1546, for Robert Stephens. It is mentioned in the catalogue of Thuanus's library (29). This John Rucellai was of Florence (30), and we ought not to queſtion but he was of the family of the Oricellarii. See the article RUCELLAI.

(27) *Giovanne Mario de' Creſcimbeni, l'Iſtoria della volgar Poeſia*, p. 35, of the edition publiſhed at Rome, 1698, in 8vo.

(26) Rapin, *Reflections ſur la Phyſique*, num. 7. p. 418 of the Dutch edition.

(28) Idem, ibid. p. 327.

(29) In page 339 of the 2d part of that catalogue.

(30) *Creſcimbeni, Iſtoria della volgar Poeſia*, p. 272.

ORICHOVIUS, or ORECHOVIUS (STANISLAUS) a Gentleman of Poland, was born in the Dioceſs of Premiſlaw in Ruſſia, towards the beginning of the 16th Century. He was called the Demoſthenes of Poland on account of the great freedom and ſtrength of his eloquence. He ſtudied at Wittemberg under Luther and under Melanchthon, and afterwards at Venice under John Baptiſt Egnatius. Being returned into his own country, he dedicated himſelf to the Eccleſiaſtical State, and was made Canon of Premiſlaw. He ſhewed ſome inclination for Luther's opinions, and was often cenſured upon that account by his Biſhop in a full chapter: but he deſpiſed thoſe cenſures, reſigned his living, and married. He was anathematiſed by his Biſhop, and cared ſo little for it, that he not only wrote againſt the Clergy, but alſo vexed them in the poſſeſſion of their eſtates, and put himſelf at the head of their enemies: and by the readineſs of his wit, and his flowing tongue, he raiſed great diſorders. He altered his courſe a few years after, and returned again into the Pale of the Catholick Church at the Synod held at Warſaw in the year 1561. Some time after he made publickly his confeſſion of faith at the Synod of Petricow, and had it printed; and from that time he ſhewed great zeal againſt the Sectaries, both in his books, and in verbal diſputes. He diſputed with Andrew Fricius before the Archbiſhop of Gneſna, and then with Stancarus in the King of Poland's preſence, and afterward on ſeveral other occaſions, and always in a triumphant manner (*a*), if we may believe the author from whom I have borrowed theſe particulars. I have obſerved in another place (*b*), that Orichovius would hint that when he married whilſt he was a Prieſt, he did not thereby break off with his Church, ſince he ſubmitted to the penalty ſhe requires, which is the forbearing all ſacerdotal functions: but he contradicted himſelf moſt groſly; for he had prefixed to his book a plain confeſſion of his adhering to the Lutheran Party [*A*]. I ſhall quote ſomething from a Treatiſe, which he wrote to endeavour

(a) Extracted from Starovolſcius, in *Elogiis centum Polonorum*, num. 58. p. m. 78, 79.

(b) In the remark [*M*] of the article STANCARUS.

[*A*] *He prefixed to his book, a plain confeſſion of his adhering formerly to the Lutheran party.*] The book I mention, is entitled, *Chimera, ſive de Stancari funeſta Regno Poloniæ Secta*, i. e. "The Chimera; or of Stan-"carus's ſect fatal to the kingdom of Poland." It was printed at Cologne, for *Maternus Cholinus*, in the year 1563, 8vo. There is prefixed to it a declaration of the Author, in which he ſubmits both his perſon and his writings to the moſt holy Council of Trent. He compares himſelf to the prodigal ſon, who returns to his father's houſe. It will be ſufficient to tranſcribe only ſome of his expreſſions. *En ego a finibus terræ ad vos clamo, dum anxiatur cor meum ... ſupplex manus tendo cum principe publicanorum illa, in conſpectu conſeſſuque veſtro fraudata compenſans quadruplo. Namque ego honorem debitum non homini, ſed ordini veſtro ſæpe detraxi; atque commune veſtrum patrimonium vexavi, dicendo in vos quæ non oportuit: ſcribendo de vobis, quæ non licuit; agendo contra vos, quæ non decuit agere, dicere ſcribere. Defraudavi igitur vos, cum hereticis dum conjuro, dicto, ſcripto, facto. In quibus tot ac tantis damnis, detrimentiſque veſtris, ex auctoritate veſtra reſarciendis, nolite, pro indulgentia veſtra, aliud a me expectare velle, præter illud quadruplum*, Pater peccavi in Cœlum coram te (1); *i. e.* "I call upon you from "the extremity of the earth, whilſt my heart is hea-"vily oppreſſed. ... I ſtretch out my hands to you, "like the chief of the Publicans, deſigning to make "you amends four-fold in your preſence, and in "your aſſembly, for what I have done amiſs. For "I have

(1) Orichovii *Chimæra*, folio 2 verſo.

deavour to obtain for the Prieſts the liberty of marrying [*B*]. I ſhall alſo ſet down the titles of his works [*C*].

" I have deprived you of that honour, which is due, " not to a man, but to your Order. I have diſtreſ- " ſed you in your common inheritance, by ſaying " againſt you what ſhould not have been ſaid; by " writing of you, what it was not lawful to write, " by acting againſt you, as it did not become me to " act, to ſpeak, or to write. I have therefore in- " jured you, whilſt I conſpired with the Hereticks, " by my words, writings, and actions. But to make " you a full reparation for theſe many and great " injuries, be pleaſed, according to your indulgence, " not to expect more from me, than the *four-fold* I " have mentioned: *Father, I have ſinned againſt* " *heaven, and before thee.*"

[*B*] *I ſhall quote ſomething from a treatiſe, which he wrote, to endeavour to obtain for the Prieſts the liberty of marrying.*] " Staniſlaus Orichovius, Biſhop of Ruſſia, " preſented a petition, in the year 1551, to Pope " Julius III. praying that he might have leave to " marry; and repreſenting to him the injuſtice of " Syricius's law, which were againſt the laws of God: " he alledged at the ſame time, that Pope Paul II. " had condemned it amongſt his friends, being ſor- " ry that he was obliged to conſider a daughter of " his as a baſtard, whom by the law of God he " might keep as a lawful child. He would even have " acted againſt that unjuſt law, had not death pre- " vented him. Orichovius alſo objected to him the " children of Paul III, who deſerved, ſaid he, to " have been born in lawful wedlock; nor did he " ſpare him, with regard to his own diſſoluteneſs " (2)." Theſe are Du Pleſſis Mornai's words. I do not think the title of Biſhop belongs to Orichovius, and after all, his biſhoprick ſhould have been referred to ſome particular See, and not mentioned thus under the general name of a country: for a man would expreſs himſelf very ill, who ſhould ſay, ſuch an one is Biſhop of Italy or of France. Monſieur Du Pleſſis Mornai publiſhed another book ten or twelve years after the former, in which he had an opportunity to mention the natural daughter of Paul II. He quoted two lines of Pannonius, adding theſe words; *and indeed Stephen Orichovius, Biſhop of Ruſſia, tells us, that as all the world knew ſhe was his daughter, he did ſometimes ſpeak with deteſtation of celibacy, which obliged him to look with ſhame on a child, which he might have lawfully begotten* (3). Bullenger and Fronto-Ducæus, who examined carefully all the blunders which crept into the former book of that learned Proteſtant, and Coeffeteau, who anſwered the laſt book, did not make the leaſt remark on the pretended epiſcopacy of Orichovius. But Gretſer, in his Examination of the Myſtery of Iniquity (4), cenſures Du Pleſſis for transforming the perſon whom Bale names *Staniſlaus Ruthenus*, into *Stephanus Orichovius* (5), *Biſhop of Ruſſia*. The Author of the State of the Church relates (6), that *it is aſſerted in Staniſlaus Ruthen's book, that Paul* II. *having read ſome poems written againſt him, and againſt his daughter, fell a crying, and complained to his friend againſt the ſevere laws of his predeceſſors*, &c. Whence I infer, that that Author tranſcribed the paſſage from Bale, more accurately than Monſieur Du Pleſſis Mornai had done. Obſerve, that Rivetus imagined Orichovius was Biſhop of Ruſſia, and that his chriſtian name was Stephen (7).

(7) Rivet, *Remarques ſur la Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité*, Tom. 2. p. 618.

[*C*] *The titles of his works.*] Let us tranſcribe Staro-volſcius's own words. *Scripſit multa & in re civili, & in noſtrum hominum laudibus, ſed præcipue tamen in oſores Religionis Catholicæ; ut puta* Quicuncem Latine & Polonicè. Apologiam Quincuncis. Fidei Confeſſionem. Hymeram. *Hanc Concilio Tridentino dicavit*; Mediatorem. Fricium. Dialogos Latinè & Polonicè. Fidelem Subditum: Orationes de Notis Eccleſiæ: Exequias Tarnovii. Geſta ſui temporis; *id eſt regnantibus apud nos Sigiſmundo Seniore & Auguſto F. ſuo.* Panegyrim nuptiarum ejuſdem Regis Auguſti. Panegyrim Nuptiarum Jo. Tarnovii, Exercituum Generalis. Orationem pro Dignitate Sacerdotali. De Præſtantia Legum Polonicarum. In obitum Sigiſmundi Senioris. Turcicas ad Regem, Senatum & Equites. Pro & contra Celibatum. Pro Eccleſia Chriſti, contra M. Lutherum Præceptorem ſuum. Inſtitutionem Principis. Apocalypſin ſuam, ſeu faciem pertubatæ & afflictæ Reipublicæ, ejuſque reſtaurandæ rationem, *quæ nuper anno* 1625 *prodiit, edita in Lucem a Nicolao Orichovio Nepote ſuo.* Epiſtolas familiares *quoque ſcripſit; ſed harum pars maxima adhuc in obſcuro eſt, ut & liber* de ſumma Regni. *Audio & alia quædam de Repub. Autographa ipſius a quibuſdam privatis, cum nominis ejus forſan, certe cum publicæ utilitatis jactura detineri* (8); *i. e.* " He wrote a great deal upon politi- " cal ſubjects, and in praiſe of our countrymen; but " yet chiefly againſt the enemies of the Chriſtian re- " ligion: as for inſtance, the *Quincunx*, or *Five Parts*, " in Latin and Poliſh. A *Vindication* of the *Quincunx*. " A *Confeſſion of Faith*. The *Hymera*, (or *Chimera*) " which he dedicated to the Council of Trent. The " Mediator. Fricius. A *Dialogue* in Latin and Poliſh. " *The Loyal Subject. Orations concerning the Marks* " *of the true Church. The Funeral of Tarnovius. The* " *Hiſtory of his own Time*, that is to ſay, during the " reign of Sigiſmund the elder, and his ſon Auguſtus. " A Panegyrick on the Nuptials of the ſame Au- " guſtus. Another on the marriage of John Tarno- " vius, General of the Armies. An Oration on the " Dignity of the Prieſthood. Of the Excellency of " the Poliſh Laws. On the death of Sigiſmund the " elder. Letters to the King, the Senate and the " Knights, concerning the Turks. For and againſt Ce- " libacy. In defence of the Church of Chriſt, againſt " M. Luther, his Maſter. The Education of a Prince. " His Apocalyps, or Revelation; or the diſturb- " ed and afflicted condition of the Commonwealth, " and the means to retrieve it, *which had been printed* " *lately in the year* 1625, *being publiſhed by his nephew* " *Nicholas Orichovius. He wrote* alſo familiar letters, " *the greateſt part of which are ſtill unpubliſhed, as well* " *as his book concerning the* Sovereign Power in the " Kingdom. *I hear that there are ſome Manuſcripts* " *of his upon poetical ſubjects, which are kept by ſome* " *private perſons, which is a great injury, perhaps, to* " *his Reputation, or at leaſt certainly to the Public.*"

(8) Simon Starovolſcius, in *Elogiis centum Polonorum*, p. 76. I ſuſpect, that the ſtops are not accurately put every where in that paſſage; and, I believe, that inſtead of *Hymeram*, we ſhould read *Chymæram*.

(2) Du Pleſſis Mornai, *Inſtitut. de S. Euchariſt.* Liv. 2. c. 10. p. m. 322. He quotes, *Orich. de Lege Syricii, ad Jul.* 3. *Orich. Epiſc. Ruſſien. de Celibat.*

(3) Du Pleſſis, *Myſtére d'Iniquité*, p. 544.

(4) p. 536.

(5) They have perhaps printed Orichovius in the Latin editions, which Gretſer anſwered; but it is Orichovius in the French edition.

(6) p. m. 484. under the year 1465.

ORIGEN, one of the moſt fruitful writers, and of the moſt eminent wits that ever flouriſhed in the Primitive Church, lived in the third Century. As there is a very large account of him in Moreri's Dictionary, where a great many authors are referred to (*a*) who may very eaſily be met with, and who contain the hiſtory of his life, I ſhall give but a ſhort article of him. I confine myſelf to theſe four heads. I. I point out two French writers (*b*) who acquaint us fully with all Origen's actions and opinions. II. I obſerve in the ſecond place, that a remark of Monſieur Daillé on Monſieur Cottibi's quoting *Saint Origen*, has been attended with ſome conſequences, which deſerve to be known [*A*]. III. That

(a) Eſpecially in the Dutch edit.

(*b*) La Motte, *Vie de Tertullien & d'Origene*, printed at Paris in the year 1675, in 8vo. Du Pin, *Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques*, Tom. 1. p. 121, &c. of the Dutch edit. 1690, in 4to. Theſe two Authors are not mentioned in Moreri's Dictionary, printed in Holland.

[*A*] *A remark of Monſieur Dailléen . .* Saint Origen, *has been attended with ſome conſequences, which deſerve to be known.*] Monſieur Cottibi a Miniſter of Poitiers, having changed his religion in the year 1660, wrote a letter to his conſiſtory, in which he gave ſome reaſons for his conduct. Monſieur Daillé was deſired to anſwer him, and did it in the moſt accurate manner. His anſwer was printed with the Ex-Miniſter's letter in the year 1660 with this title. *Lettre eſcrite à M. le Coq Sieur de la Talonniere ſur le changement de Religion de Monſieur Cottiby*, i. e. " A " letter written to Monſieur le Coq Sieur de la Talon- " niere, concerning Monſieur Cottibi's changing of " his religion." Monſieur Daillé obſerved, among other things, that the new convert, who pretended to ſpeak of the fathers, and to cry up the Primitive Church, was very little acquainted with thoſe matters. He convicted him of ignorance by ſeveral arguments,

III. That a Miniſter in Holland made lately a very juſt obſervation concerning one of Origen's

guments, the ſecond of which was grounded on the title of *Saint* which he gave to Origen. *That way of ſpeaking betrays him, and ſhews that he is a perfect ſtranger, both in the republick of the Antiquarians, who are not uſed to ſpeak thus of a man condemned by a general council; and chiefly, to the records of the Popes, where poor Origen was ſo far from obtaining the title of Saint, that on the contrary he was ſtiled a ſchiſmatick as early as the year* 494, *and all his books, except very few, were condemned, by Pope Gelaſius* *. *It is not quite two hundred years ſince John Picus, Count of Mirandola, having publiſhed at Rome among his nine hundred propoſitions,* that it is more reaſonable to believe Origen is ſaved, than to think him damned; *the maſters in divinity cenſured him for it, aſſerting, that his propoſition* was raſh, blameable, ſavouring of Hereſy, and contrary to the determination of the Catholick Church; *as he himſelf relates it in his Apology* †. *What would they not have done, if he had placed Origen amongſt the Saints, as Monſieur Cottibi has done? Since they would not even ſuffer that a man ſhould queſtion his damnation, or judge that it was more reaſonable to think him ſaved, than to think him damned* (1)? This is what we may ſafely call a conquering cenſure; and though we had no other proofs that the Miniſter of Poitiers knew nothing of the fathers, but what he learnt by reading ſome writings upon controverted ſubjects, this obſervation of Monſieur Daillé would be ſufficient fully to convince us of Cottibi's ignorance. Let us continue the hiſtory of this cenſure; it will teach us, that an author, who is found guilty of a miſtake, and plainly convinced of his blunders, has no other courſe to take, but fairly to acknowledge his fault, or at leaſt not to ſay one word in his defence: for it happens generally that a man's endeavours to vindicate himſelf in ſuch a caſe prove ſilly and impertinent. Monſieur Cottibi anſwered, that the title of *Saint* was not perhaps in the original draught of his letter, or *that it dropt from his pen by placing Origen amongſt the great number of fathers, to whom the title of Saint does not truly belong* (2). Theſe are mere evaſions, which were unanſwerably refuted. It was maintained that the words *Saint Origen*, were in the original, written in the author's own hand, and it was proved that they could not come there by a mere overſight. *Who will believe*, ſaid Monſieur Daillé (3), *that he did not tranſcribe, and read over and over, more than once, a letter, which he wrote to a Conſiſtory, whoſe religion he forſaked, and amongſt whom he refuſed to perform his paſtoral functions for the future? A letter, in which he endeavoured to perſuade his flock to follow his example; and which he knew could not but fill their hearts with grief and indignation? A letter therefore, which he could not but know would be narrowly examined by perſons who were angry and extremely exaſperated againſt him? Indeed, he muſt want common ſenſe, if he did not reviſe and poliſh that letter, if he did not over and over examine the firſt copy of it before he ſent it, that he might have nothing in it, that might afford an handle for raillery to thoſe who did not love him, or give a diſguſt to them that loved him. And yet notwithſtanding all this, the words* Saint Origen *remained in the letter as he has ſent to us, and as we have ſeen it. It is therefore certain, that the author did not know that the title of Saint does not lawfully belong to Origen. If he had known it, he would have left it out of his letter. And if he did not know a ſecret, which is known to all thoſe who are any ways acquainted with antiquity, I do not ſee how I can truſt to the promiſes he makes me,* &c. The following part of Cottibi's Apology is worſe ſtill; for he expatiates on the common topic of the Miniſters hatred againſt the Saints; and he ſays a thouſand things that are not at all to the purpoſe, as you ſhall ſee now. "But, as it ſeems the Miniſters "are paid to wage war againſt the Saints, you imagined it was your duty to attack this, though he "had but the ſhew and outward appearance of a "Saint: for if one does but appear under that habit, "and takes that name, he is no longer ſecure againſt "your ſtrokes. If you diſpute that glorious title as to "thoſe, who have loudly deſerved it, and whoſe "praiſes the Church ſings daily, it is no wonder, "you could not ſuffer in a man, on whom it was "never conferred. I am therefore very far from "being ſurpriſed at your proceeding, and I find "indeed that it is very much your intereſt, not to "ſuffer the number of Saints to encreaſe; for the "more Saints there will be in Heaven, the more "enemies your party, and the more interceſſors the "Church will have there. I wiſhed only that men, "who made St. Paul ſay, that *the children of the "faithful are holy, or Saints from their mother's womb* *, "would not deny that elogy to him, who was the "ſon of a father and a mother, who not only were "*faithful*, but alſo Martyrs; to him, who having "himſelf in his moſt tender youth ſuffered perſecu-"tions for Jeſus Chriſt's name, ſhewed afterwards that "he wiſhed with the utmoſt zeal and piety to crown "his former labours with the glory of Martyrdom. "That man of wit *, whoſe authority you uſe to "quote with commendations, had ſo much eſteem "for the wiſdom of Socrates, that whenever he "thought of that great man, he could hardly for-"bear crying out aſtoniſhed, *Saint Socrates, pray for "us*. It would not therefore be an unpardonable "crime in me, if my ſoul had been ſtruck with "ſome veneration for the virtues of a Chriſtian, "which the Goſpel renders valuable, ſince the eyes "of your friend were dazzled by the actions of an "Heathen, which after all were only ſhining ſins †. "If ſome perſons have obſerved ſpots in the ſun, I "do not wonder that this Doctor had ſome ble-"miſhes; and I ſhall not pretend to vindicate him "after the Councils have condemned him. How-"ever I muſt obſerve with that noble writer ‖, who "at the age of twenty four offered publickly to "maintain at Rome, that Origen was above ſixty "before he determined himſelf to any particular "opinion in his writings, and that he may have de-"fended erroneous doctrines, without being an He-"retick, ſince he never perſiſted in them with obſti-"nacy, nor defended them with rebellion; ſince "they were not condemned till after his death, "and ſince he did even penance for them dur-"ing his life. It is therefore in vain that you en-"deavour to raiſe againſt me all the *Maſters in Di-"vinity*; that young Count encourages me, who "tells me, he had the Pope on his ſide §, with a "great number of thoſe who made up the Apoſtolick "Senate, whilſt ſome envious men murmured againſt "his propoſitions. After all, if by your credit and "ſollicitations I was to fall under the diſpleaſure of "the ſacred Conclave, I would rather chooſe it were "for putting innocently one Doctor more into the "catalogue of the Saints, without approbation and "conſent, than for oppoſing, like you, the glory "and fame of thoſe whom the Church has canonized, "and endeavouring by the moſt ſacrilegious of all at-"tempts, to eraſe their names, both out of the "Church Calendar, and out of the memory of "men (4)." All this deſerved no other anſwer but the following. Learn (5) *the difference there is, in the ſtile of the Court and Church of Rome, between a* Conſiſtory *and a* Conclave. *This blunder is pardonable in a young beginner. The misfortune is, that in all theſe excurſions, in which he ſuffered himſelf to be carried away far beyond the ſcope of this controverſy, he could not meet with the leaſt thing proper to ſhew, that it is agreeable to the ſtile of men verſed in antiquity, to ſay* Saint Origen.

Father Adam would alſo meddle with Cottibi's apology upon this article; but he acquitted himſelf ſo ill of his taſk, that ſuch wretched and impertinent ſophiſtry is perhaps no where elſe to be met with. The paſſage which I ſhall tranſcribe is ſomewhat long; but as it contains ſeveral particulars relating to Origen's hiſtory, and as it may alſo ſerve to cure thoſe writers, who uſe to ramble in wild excurſions, I did not think proper to leave one word out of it. See then here how Monſieur Daillé ſpeaks to the Jeſuit John Adam (6). "Finding yourſelf there-"fore in an uneaſy ſituation (7), you are not ſo ſilly "as to pretend to ſtand your ground there: and as "you are as bold and reſolute as a man of your "cloth

* *Cont. Rom. Gelaſ.* Tom. 3. *Concil.* p. 662. col. *B, C.*

† Joan. Pic. Apol. c. 7. p. 199.

(1) Daillé, *Lettre à M. le Cog.* p. 70, 71.

(2) Cottibi, *Replique à Mr. Daille*, p. 221, 222.

(3) Daillé, *Replique à Adam & à Cottibi*, part 3. c. 9. p. 190.

* In the form for adminiſtring baptiſm.

* Eraſmus.

† St. Auguſt. *ſplendida peccata.*

‖ Joh. Picus Mirandulæ Comes, *in* Apolog. concl. 7.

§ *Summi Pontificis & ex Apoſtolico Senatu complurium judicio contentus, videbar facile & odium poſſe negligere, & convicia hominum improborum.* In Præfat. Apol.

(4) Cottibi, *Replique à Mr. Daille*, p. 222, &c.

(5) Daillé, directing his diſcourſe to F. Adam. *Replique à Adam & à Cottibi*, part 3. c. 9. p. 191.

(6) Daillé, ibid.

(7) That is to ſay, the ſuppoſition of Cottibi's having been guilty only of an equivocation.

Origen's tenets [*B*]. If the author of the *Janua Cœlorum reſerata* had made uſe of that obſervation

" cloth can be, leaving that uneaſy poſt, you fall
" upon me with opprobrious language as it is cuſto-
• Ad. p. 267. " mary with you •, charging me with ignorance,
" and with *a magiſterial audaciouſneſs, which is only a*
" *ſwelling, and not a true and well digeſted learning.*
† p. 268. " And then †, having deſired me duly to weigh
" what you are going to tell me, you give me a
" Lecture on the difference there is between perſons
" who err, and the errors themſelves, wherein you
" blend together St. Auguſtine and St. Jerom,
" Janſenius and St. Cyran, and their opinions.
" Thence you come to Origen, and to the errors of
" which he has been ſuſpected, particularly Aria-
" niſm, of which you ſay St. Athanaſius cleared
§ p. 269. " him. Afterwards § you commend the incompara-
" ble innocence of his youth, his chaſtity, his zeal:
‖ p. 270. " you ſay ‖ that if I have read hiſtory, I know very
" well that Origen ſeeing ſome Martyrs going to the
" place of execution, went out of his houſe, and
" falling on his knees before the executioners, *he*
" *entreated them to cut his head off at the ſame time as*
" *they cut off that of the other Chriſtians.* You ſay
" again, that I know very well he has filled the
" earth with his works, and that his father and mo-
" ther were Martyrs, *and that his mother uſed*
" *often to draw the curtain of his bed, when he was*
" *aſleep, and to kiſs her ſon's breaſt, ſaying theſe words;*
" *I kiſs the temple of the holy Ghoſt.* You name St.
" Gregory of Neocæſarea, Chryſoſtom, and Baſil,
" who had a great eſteem for him: (to ſhew you
" that I am not ſo much out of humour as you would
" make the world believe, I ſhall not quarrel with
" you for placing Chryſoſtom before Baſil, though
" the latter be more ancient) you aſk me what ar-
" guments I have to prove that that great man died
" without repentance, and you alledge to me an old
" ſtory to refute that opinion. This is the ſubſtance
" of your diſpute concerning Origen. Whereupon I
" ſhall obſerve to you in the firſt place, that you
" wrong me when you charge me with knowing that
" he entreated the executioners to cut his head off.
" I did not know that particular, having read no-
• Euſ. Hiſt. l. 6. c. 2. p. 203. A. " thing of it in Euſebius •, who gives a large ac-
" count of Origen in his 6th book. You charge me
" alſo, but not more juſtly, with knowing that *his*
" *mother* kiſſed his breaſt, when he was aſleep. I
" have read indeed in Euſebius, that his father Leo-
" nidas careſſed him thus ſometimes when he was a
" child, kiſſing his breaſt reſpectfully as a Sanctuary,
" within which the holy Ghoſt was conſecrated, and
" that he proclaimed himſelf happy for having ſo
" admirable a child. I do not queſtion but you met
" with thoſe ſtories, as you relate them, in the ſame
" author who told you that Athanaſius had been for-
" merly very much commended and eſteemed by the
" Arians. But the moſt cruel injury you do me is
" this; that you may have an opportunity to expa-
" tiate on thoſe common place topicks, and to relate
† Ad. p. 267. " thoſe ſtories, you charge me † with believing, and
" aſſerting as a matter of fact, that Origen is damn-
§ Ad. p. 269. " ed. *You make his very perſon* (ſay you § to me) *an-*
" *ſwerable for the errors of his opinions, ſpeaking even of*
" *his damnation, as though you had been already before-*
" *hand in hell, and had met with Origen there*; and
‖ p. 271. " two pages lower ‖, *I cannot bear*, ſay you, *that*
" *you ſhould ſide with thoſe, who aſſert that Origen is*
" *damned*; and towards the end of the chapter;
" *you have admitted*, ſay you, *the Opinion of thoſe,*
" *who hold that Origen is damned.* . . . . . But laying
" aſide thoſe extravagances of your paſſion, who told
" you that I maintain *Origen is damned?* Where have
" I declared this to be my opinion? God forbid
" that ſuch a preſumptuous and impious thought
" ſhould ever enter into my head. I leave the
" ſecrets of the Lord to himſelf; and am not ſo
" bold as to determine what no man living can
" know with any certainty. But upon the whole,
" if we may judge from outward appearances, I be-
" lieve of Origen what I hope of him, that God,
" whoſe mercy is infinite, has forgiven him his er-
" rors, and would not ſuffer a veſſel to periſh with
" the unbelievers, which he had adorned with ſo
" many admirable gifts, and whoſe genuine works,
" as many as there are extant, do all breathe nothing
" but a ſingular faith and piety; and wherein the
" very errors, with which they are ſometimes tainted
" (as it cannot be denied) are always attended with a
" raviſhing modeſty and humanity: not to mention
" his virtues and his holy life. Such is my opinion;
" I never had any other; they who have been par-
" ticularly acquainted with me know how much I
" always admired that great and incomparable ge-
" nius, and what I have wrote of him in ſome places
" my inconſiderable works may witneſs it. If I
" have quoted • what the Count of Mirandula writes, • *L. à M. de la Tal.* p. 70, 71.
" that the Roman Divines could not bear he ſhould
" call Origen's damnation into queſtion, I did it, as
" appears, only to ſhew how much theſe maſter
" Doctors, whoſe religion Monſieur Cottibi has em-
" braced, are far from uſing that ſtile, in which
" the title of Saint is given to Origen; but not that
" I in the leaſt approve their inhuman preſumption.
" If I cenſured the title of Saint, which Monſieur
" Cottibi beſtowed upon him, I cenſured it as a proof
" of his ignorance in matters of antiquity, and in the
" ſtile uſed by thoſe who are acquainted with thoſe
" matters. I did not charge him with committing
" herein a ſin againſt faith or morality. The being
" unacquainted with antiquity is not inconſiſtent
" with either: I give him leave with all my heart
" to think as favourably of Origen as he pleaſes.
" But as the laws of your Church, the rules of her
" ſtile, the common and publick practice of all the
" learned, that is to ſay, the ſupreme law of their
" language, do not ſuffer him to ſay *Saint Origen,*
" whatever opinion he has of his perſon, he could
" not ſpeak thus without betraying the ignorance I
" have charged him with."

We meet with a thouſand inſtances of that kind in the polemical writings; and, as I have already more than once obſerved, it would be proper to make a collection of them. This would be of ſome uſe to reſtrain the unbounded liberty, which ſome authors take to deviate far and wide from the queſtion. I queſtion whether the other inſtances would come up to this with reſpect to the many obſervations foreign to the purpoſe.

[*B*] *A Miniſter . . . . made lately a very juſt obſervation concerning one of Origen's tenets.*] Before I tranſcribe that Miniſter's words, I ſhall ſet down thoſe of his adverſary, which occaſioned his reflection. *It is a very conſiderable miſtake, to compare Origen's opinion of the hell-torments not being eternal, with the doctrine of the Socinians upon the ſame ſubject. Origen did not deny the immortality of the ſoul; and he never taught that the wicked periſhed ſoul and body together. Origen's opinion is indeed dangerous, but then it is not at all impious; whereas the Socinian opinion is the very ſame with the Epicurean impiety* (8). Here follows the criticiſm upon that paſſage. " (9) It is more dangerous with regard
" to morality, to aſſert that *the reprobates will be one*
" *day ſaved*, than to ſay, that they *will be annihilated.*
" Origen put the devils and the damned almoſt in
" the ſame rank, in which the Papiſts place the faith-
" ful and the believers, who die loaded with a great
" number of venial ſins, and who have not wherewith-
" al to get maſſes ſaid to ſhorten or leſſen their ſuffer-
" ings in purgatory, the fire of which does not differ
" from that of hell, but in the duration. So that
" the wicked, who continue in their wickedneſs and
" ſins till they die, may, according to Origen's doc-
" trine, entertain almoſt the ſame fears, and the ſame
" hopes, which the beſt Roman Catholicks have ac-
" cording to the doctrine of their Prieſts and Monks.
" Time is nothing, in compariſon to eternity.
" A temporal Hell cannot be compared with an e-
" ternal Paradiſe. It is true, that the preſent evils
" eraſe out of the mind of the worldlings, the no-
" tion of a future bliſs: and that the ſenſe of a pre-
" ſent happineſs is, generally ſpeaking more lively
" and ſtrong, than the deſire and hope of that which
" is to come. But this is owing only to the folly
" and corruption of men, and not to the nature of
" the objects themſelves. Further, it muſt be ob-
" ſerved, that a future evil is not much more con-
" ſidered than a future good: I mean, that ſilly and

(8) Jurieu, quoted by Saurin, *Examin de la Theologie de Mr. Jurieu.* p. 688.

(9) Saurin, ibidem.

obſervation [C], he would have added new ſtrength to one of his objections. IV. That there

" inconſiderate men are not much affected with ei-
" ther. But wiſe and conſiderate perſons care-
" fully reflect on the pains and pleaſures of another
" life, and form to themſelves a true notion of them.
" Whence it follows, that they of the firſt kind will
" not be more afraid of the Hell, or of the Purgato-
" ry, with which Origen threatens them, than they
" will be encouraged and comforted by the end of
" their ſufferings, and by the enjoyment of an ever-
" laſting happineſs, which this Doctor gives them
" room to hope for: on the contrary, they who re-
" flect more ſeriouſly, and with more attention, will
" judge of the future goods and evils by their du-
" ration, and will eaſily be determined to paſs thro'
" ſome ages of wretched days, if they be but certain,
" at the end, they will meet with an eternal happi-
" neſs, and infinite joy. As for the doctrine of the
" Socinians, it affords the obdurate ſinners no other
" comfort, but their annihilation. Now ſuch is the
" frame of men's nature, that they chooſe rather to be
" happy and miſerable ſucceſſively, than not to be at
" all. And according to right reaſon, it is infinite-
" ly more advantageous to be for ever perfectly hap-
" py, after one has ſuffered for ſome time, than to
" return into nothing, and to find one's ſelf thus
" eternally deprived of an infinite bleſſing, the poſ-
" ſeſſion of which one might have ſecured, and
" which one loſes only through one's own negli-
" gence . . . (10). Origen's error may make ſome
" perſons neglect and deſpiſe repentance; and that
" of Socinus may keep ſome men in their wicked
" courſes. Yet they are both moſt pernicious; and
" it is having a double weight and a double mea-
" ſure, it is a too viſible reſpect of perſons, to ſay,
" that Origen's error, though dangerous, is not at all
" impious, but that the Socinian opinion is the
" very Epicurean impiety. If Origen had ſuppoſed
" that the reprobates will be annihilated, after ha-
" ving ſuffered a long time in purgatory, his doctrine
" would be leſs favourable to the impenitent ſinners,
" than that of the Socinians, who annihilate them,
" without making them ſuffer any conſiderable pain
" (11). But the Paradiſe he promiſes them at the
" end of their Hell, and which is to make them for
" ever like to the Apoſtles, to the Martyrs, and to
" the greateſt Saints, conſiderably leſſens the ter-
" ror of a Puniſhment, which is to make room
" for an everlaſting joy and happineſs."

(10) Saurin, *Examen de la Theologie de Mr. Jurieu*, p. 696.

(11) One would think Monſieur Saurin grants here his antagoniſt's aſſertion, namely, that the Socinians maintain, the ſoul of the wicked is annihilated the moment they die. The opinion of that Sect is not thus ſet down here under quotation (18). But the truth is, Monſieur Saurin expreſſes himſelf ſo, as that his words may hint, he does not charge that Sect with that error.

If you have a mind to know the cauſe of that *reſpect of perſons*, do but read the following paſſage from the ſame Author (12). *The charity men have for* thoſe, who have been dead ſeveral ages ago, *does not coſt much, becauſe their merit does not raiſe our jealouſy nor our envy, and we do not look upon them as our competitors. But in order to judge charitably of our adverſary, who ſpeaks and writes againſt us, whoſe reputation drowns our own fame, we muſt a little mortify our pride, and conquer our ſelf-love; which is not an eaſy ſacrifice. As Monſieur Jurieu had no quarrel with Origen, and has no perſonal enemies but amongſt the Socinians, and in their party, it is no wonder that he can eaſier bear with the former than with the latter.* This thought has been often made uſe of, in order to account for the conduct of thoſe, who have aſſerted, that Sophocles, Euripides, Ariſtophanes, Ariſtotle, *&c.* as much ſuperior to Corneille, Racine, Moliere, Des Cartes, *&c.*

(12) Saurin, *Examen de la Theologie de Mr. Jurieu*, p. 688.

[C] *If the Author of the* Janua cœlorum reſerata *had made uſe of that obſervation.*] That Author * ſhews by ſeveral arguments, that Monſieur Jurieu, if he argues coherently, muſt maintain, that the Socinian hereſies will not damn the profeſſors of them. One of his arguments is taken from that Miniſter's confeſſing, that the Arians did once belong to the church, in which ſalvation may be had. That argument would be but weak, if the Doctrines peculiar to the Socinians, and which have not been taught by the Arians, were deadly errors. Wherefore the Author of the *Janua cœlorum* propoſes that objection to himſelf, and he ſhews, that in caſe the doctrines common both to the Arians and to the Socinians be not deadly, it cannot be reaſonably maintained, that the doctrines peculiar to the Socinians deſerve eternal damnation. Taking a view of all thoſe peculiar hereſies, he begins with their rejecting the eternity of Hell torments, and he ſets it down as a matter of fact, that no man would dare to damn Origen or Arnobius, only and directly for that error. *Quis auderet*, ſays he (13), *morti æternæ addicere Origenem, ideò præcisè quod de divina miſericordia magnificentiùs ſentire volens, crediderit tandem fore ut omnes mali, ne Diabolis quidem exceptis, ſatis pœnarum Deo dederint, & Deum placatum experiantur? At hoc multo plus videtur nocere juſtitiæ divinæ quàm dogma Socinianum de annihilatione reproborum poſt longas pœnas, nam deſtructio illa ſi minùs pœnæ genus eſt gravius, ut quidam exiſtimant, quàm æternitas infœlix, rationem tamen habet pœnæ, ideoque non officit juribus ſeveri & juſti Legiſlatoris. Quidquid id eſt nemo præjudiciis exutus, & ad rectæ rationis amuſſim rem expendens, doctrinam mortalem judicabit, ſi quis veritus lædere divinas perfectiones, malit ſibi Deum repræſentare ut judicem ultimo ſupplicio reos afficientem, quàm ut judicem vitæ reorum parcentem quò per multos annos exquiſitis cruciatibus & perpetuis eos torquendo, longiore alieni doloris ſpectaculo fruatur: nemo, inquam, ſolidè raciocinatus talem opinionem mortalem crediderit, qui ſemel agnoverit Arrianam hæreſim non eſſe mortalem. Quis auderet Arnobium in Inferis collocare, quia crediderit animas reproborum flammis ultricibus tandem penitùs conſumi?* He obſerves, as you ſee, that the doctrine of Origen puts narrower bounds to the divine juſtice, than the doctrine of the Socinians: for the latter ſuppoſe the puniſhment to end with an act of ſeverity, namely, the ſinner's annihilation; whereas Origen ſuppoſes it to end with an act of the greateſt mercy; namely, the tranſporting of the damned ſpirits into a place of infinite bliſs: you ſee, I ſay, that he takes notice of that difference; but he does not explain it ſo clearly and accurately as Monſieur Saurin does. Further, he ſtarts an objection, which he might have ſolved by Monſieur Saurin's remark, and yet he makes quite another anſwer. He ſuppoſes (14), it will be objected to him, that the denying of the Trinity is not ſo dangerous to the ſtate, as the denying of the eternity of Hell torments; and he anſwers only, that we muſt not judge by that rule, whether an hereſy is fundamental or not; otherwiſe we ſhould be obliged to aſſert, that ſome moſt groſs and ſhameful errors are mere trifles, ſince they are very proper to keep the ſubjects in awe (15). This is the whole ſubſtance of his anſwer. He omitted the moſt effectual anſwer, that could be made to that objection. He did not obſerve that Origen's opinion is more pernicious to the Commonwealth, than of that the Socinians; the opinion of Origen, I ſay, which Monſieur Jurieu looks upon as an excuſable error (16). If Larebonius had made Monſieur Saurin's reflection, he would have given his adverſary an *home thruſt*. Let us quote another paſſage from the Paſtor of Utrecht. " Monſieur Jurieu is willing *to excuſe Ori-*
" *gen's errors, on account of his great zeal; but if any*
" *one of us ſhould at this time venture to aſſert the whims*
" *of that Ancient, Monſieur Jurieu would not think*
" *himſelf under any obligation to have the leaſt toleration*
" *for him.* If theſe whims be mere hereſies and im-
" pieties, which change Hell into a Purgatory, and
" remove thus the dread of eternal ſufferings, and
" the fear of God, why muſt they be tolerated in
" Origen? Where is this Doctor's great zeal, if he
" was an heretick, and a teacher of hereſies? If
" theſe errors were not fundamental in Origen, and
" in the third century, by what means are they be-
" come fundamental in the ſeventeenth century, and
" in the modern Doctors? We ſhall ſee by and by,
" that there is a great difference between Origen's
" opinion, and that of the Socinians, concerning
" Hell torments; and that this difference, of which
" Monſieur Jurieu pretends to take an advantage in
" Origen's favour, is entirely againſt him (17)."

If the Author of the *Janua cœlorum* did not exert his whole ſtrength, as he might have done, Monſieur Saurin on the other hand, overlooked two conſiderable blunders of his adverſary; the one, in his charging the Socinians with teaching, that the ſoul dies with the body; the other, his aſſerting that their opinion, concerning the deſtruction of the ſoul, is the Epicu-
rean

* Who is Mr. BAYLE himſelf.

(13) Carus Larebonius, in *Janua cœlorum reſerata*, p. 96, 97.

(14) Idem, ibid.

(15) *Alioquin mutatis vicibus pro innocuis deberemus habere errores non paucos craſſiſſimos atque fœdiſſimos, unde multum emolumenti capit Reſpublica, in multas perturbationes caſura per introductionem quarumdam veritatum.* Ibidem.

(16) See Saurin, *Exam. de la Doctrine de Mr. Jurieu*, p. 682.

(17) Saurin, ibid. P. 683, 684.

there are a great many Divines in the Church of Rome, who believe that this father is in Hell [*D*].

Since the first edition of this Dictionary there have been published two works, which give me an opportunity to make some additions to this article. The one intitled *Parrhasiana*,

rean impiety. The 1st of these blunders is an untruth, or rather a calumny (18) : the second is an inexcusable ignorance. The Socinians do not assert, that the wicked will suffer nothing after this life ; they maintain only, that their misery will cease at last by the annihilation of their soul. And though there were a Socinian Writer or two (19), who should maintain that their soul is annihilated the moment it leaves the body, his opinion would not be the same with that of Epicurus : for that Philosopher taught on the one hand, that the Gods do not in the least concern themselves about the life or death of men ; and on the other, that the soul dies with the body, because the soul consists only in a certain mixture of atoms. On the contrary, the Socinian we speak of would maintain, that the souls of the wicked are of such a nature, as to continue for ever after this life, and that they cease to be, only because God annihilates them, to punish their crimes. The Divines, who are the most orthodox, with regard to the nature of the soul, agree that God can annihilate it whenever he pleases. Observe, that nothing can exempt us from following that rule of natural equity, *not to charge an whole sect with the opinions of some private persons who belong to it.*

(18) That Author had notice of it given him in the year 1690, in the *Avis sur la Tableau du Socinianisme*, p. 44.

(19) There are indeed some.

[*D*] *There are a great many Divines in the Church of Rome, who believe that this Father is in Hell.*] We have seen already the complaints that were made against Picus of Mirandula, who held the contrary opinion : the Jesuit Stephen Binet, who published a book at Paris, in the year 1629, concerning Origen's salvation, did not dare to take the affirmative side of the question, but with fear. He wrote his work in the form of a trial ; he introduced witnesses, who deposed ; he had the cause pleaded *pro* and *con* ; he brings in the Attorney and Sollicitor-Generals of Heaven to give in their opinions ; and lastly, he got the following sentence passed. CONSIDERING *all that has been said on both sides, and the opinions of the Attorney and Sollicitor-Generals of Heaven, it has been ordered, that the cause shall be referred to the secret Council of God, to be finally determined by him alone : nevertheless, it is provisionally resolved, in behalf of Origen, that all things being duly weighed, and considered, the proofs for his salvation, are stronger than those for his damnation ; and therefore it is more reasonable to think him saved than damned* (20). The witnesses he brings in for Origen, are James Merlin (21) and Erasmus (22). The Lawyers he makes to plead for the same father, are Genebrard (23), and John Picus of Mirandula (24). After this, *the great Cardinal Baronius* (25), *in the name of Cardinal Bellarmine, and of all those who are against Origen*, makes a speech to demand the condemnation of the accused, on whose heresies and crimes he expatiates. Here follow some of the heresies : 1. That the souls had sinned before they came into the bodies (26). 2. That after the resurrection, the bodies of the saints will be round and bright like the sun (27). 3. That the sun, moon, and stars have life in them. 4. *That on the day of judgment the Guardian Angels will be chastised, if they have not well acquitted themselves of their duty, in guarding the men committed to their charitable cares* (28). 5. *That there have been several other worlds before the creation of this, and that when this shall be reduced to ashes, there will be many others created successively* (29). 6. That the stars are books which contain *men's destiny ; that the Angels draw up from thence mens horoscopes, and learn their good fortune ; and that they have taught men part of this judicial astrology, that they might cast up a man's nativity, without destroying his liberty, or forcing his will* (30). 7. *That the earth is a large animal capable of good and evil* (31), *and afterwards worthy of reward and punishment ; and hence it is, that God blesses or curses it, according as it behaves well or ill, as it renders itself worthy of either* (32). 8. " That after the day of judgment, the " women will be transformed into men, and the hu- " man bodies into most pure souls ; so that there " will no longer be men made up of glorious flesh " and bones ; but that all will be nothing but mere " and pure spirits, like the Angels in Heaven." The chief argument Baronius insists upon is this : " (33) The general Council was not content to con- " demn only his doctrine, as it is usual, but went " even so far as to condemn his very person ; and " thundered out an Excommunication against him " personally, and condemned him in his own " proper name * : here follow the words of the " holy Council. The Emperor having required, *that with the errors, the Author himself, Origen, be also condemned, ut cum erroribus suis autor ipse Origenes damnaretur.* The holy Council † having mature- " ly considered the affair, and called upon the Holy " Ghost for his assistance, pronounced at last these " words, or rather hurled these thunder-bolts. In " the first place then, the Council ** pronounced ten " anathema's against the envenomed doctrine of Ori- " gen ; then going farther, *Anathema etiam ipsi Origeni qui dicitur Adamantius*, they anathematized " Origen himself, who is called Adamantius. This " last name was added on purpose, that people " might not think the other Origen was meant, " but that they should know the true Origen was " anathematized, as a man ruined, sentenced " and damned." Let us give an instance of the eloquence of that time. Binet supposes, that Baronius taking an advantage of a vision, which is related in the *Pratum Spirituale*, or, *The Spiritual Meadow*, spoke after this manner (34) ; *Must I at last be reduced to such an extremity, as to be obliged to open the gates of Hell, in order to shew that Origen is there ? otherwise men will not believe it. Would it not be enough to have laid before you his crime, his unfortunate end, the sentence of his condemnation delivered by the Emperors, by the Popes, by the Saints, and by the fifth general Council, (not to mention the others) almost by the mouth of God himself ? But since there is no other method left but descending into Hell, and shewing there that reprobate, that damned Origen, come, Gentlemen, I am determined to do it, in order to carry this matter to the highest degree of evidence : let us, in God's name, go down into Hell, to see whether he be there or not, and to decide the question at once. The seventh general Council * has quoted a book, and by quoting it, has declared it to be of a sufficient authority, to furnish us with good and lawful proofs, to support the determination of the Council, with regard to images. Why should we not, after the example of that Council, make use of the same book to determine this controversy, which besides is already but too much cleared up and decided ? It is said there, that a man being in a great perplexity about the salvation of Origen's soul, after the fervent prayers of an holy old man, saw plainly as it were a kind of Hell open ; there he observed the heresiarchs, who were all named to him, one after another, by their own names, and in the midst of them, he saw Origen, who was there damned among the others, being loaded with horror, flames and confusion.* Let us relate some part of the answer, that was made to the objection we have just now described. " Does the " Church ground her Canons on the visions of an " hermit, she who teaches that no man is ever under " an obligation to believe the vision of a private per- " son, and since no article of faith is ever grounded " on such a vision. Granting, therefore, that it is report- " ed in the *Spiritual Meadow*, that an honest Abbot " saw Origen in Hell, is he the first that has been mis- " taken ? And of which Origen does he speak, of ours, " or of him who was infamous ? And of what au- " thority in that book of the *Spiritual Meadow* ? " Suppose the seventh general Council quoted it " for something, as for instance, with regard to " images, does it follow from thence, that the " Council pretended to canonize that book in every " respect ? How many silly and idle things does not " that little book contain, which the wise can hard- " ly believe (35) ?" One little passage more and I have done. *They object to us the vision of a simple Abbot, and I shall quote to you, the vision of a great Saint, named Mechtilda* **, *to whom God revealed, that he would*

(20) Etienne Binet, *du Salut d'Origene*, p. 468.

(21) *Præfat. ad Origenem, ann.* 1512.

(22) In *Vita Origenis.*

(23) In *Origen.*

(24) *Apolog.* Q. VII. *de Salute Origenis.*

(25) Binet, p. 155, quotes him, Annal. Tom. 3. ann. 533, &c.

(26) Binet, p. 158. *ex S. Leone, Epist. decret.* 11.

(27) Ibid. p. 160, &c. *ex Nicepb.* l. 17. c. 27. *in Conc.* 5. *Constantinop.*

(28) *Orig. Hom.* 20. *in Num. apud Binet*, p. 166.

(29) *Orig. in c.* 1. *Eccl. ex Methodio & Genebr. apud Binet*, p. 168.

(30) *Orig. in Genes. Philocal. c.* 25. *apud Binet*, p. 168.

(31) Compare this with what is observed above, remark [*D*] of the article KEPLER.

(32) *Orig. Hom.* 4. *in Ezech. apud Binet*, ibid.

(33) Binet, p. 191.

* Baron. ann. 400. ann. 538. ann. 553.

† 5. Synod.

** *Nicepb. lib.* 17. *c.* 27, 28. *Sur.* 11. *Janu. Cedren. in Annal. Cassiod.* 1. *div. inst. Prat. spirit. c.* 26. *Baron. ann.* 532.

(34) Binet, p. 195, &c.

* *Baron. ann.* 532. *Mosch. in Prat. c.* 26.

(35) Binet, p. 129.

* *Lib. vitæ S. Mech. edit. ann.* 1627.

† The celebrated Monſieur Le Clerc. See his article.

rhaſiana, was publiſhed at Amſterdam in the year 1699 by a learned man †, who concealed his own name under that of *Theodore Parrhaſe*. The other was printed at Paris in the year 1700, and is intitled, *Hiſtoire des Mouvemens arrivez dans l'Egliſe au ſujet d'Origene & de ſa Doctrine*, i. e. "An account of the troubles, which have happened in the "Church about Origen and his opinions." Father Doucin a Jeſuit is the author of this laſt work. We meet in the *Parrhaſiana* with ſome reflections upon the controverſy between the Manicheans and the orthodox. There is prefixed to them as fair an obſervation as could be expected from a very honeſt man (*c*). There is, I ſay, prefixed to them an obſervation in every reſpect agreeable to the ſtricteſt rules of juſtice, truth, and reaſon, concerning the views I had, when I took the liberty to urge the objections of the Manicheans, and to acknowledge that natural reaſon does not afford the Chriſtians ſufficient arguments to ſolve thoſe objections, whether they follow St. Auguſtin's ſyſtem, or that of Molina, and of the Remonſtrants, or even that of the Socinians. Theodore Parrhaſe maintains the contrary, and pretends (*d*) that an Origeniſt *can ſilence the Manicheans. . . . . And if ſuch a man*, continues he, *can put a Manichean to a nonplus, what would not thoſe do who ſhould argue infinitely better than Origen's followers do?* We ſhall examine hereunder what he ſuppoſes *an Origeniſt might ſay, after having read all the objections of the Manicheans* [*E*]. As for father Doucin's work, I ſhall only obſerve that it contains a large, curious,

(1) Parrhaſiana, p. 302.

(d) Ibid. p. 304.

would not have men know the fate of Sampſon, Solomon, and Origen, to ſtrike the mightieſt, the wiſeſt, and the moſt learned of this world with terror, and keep them in ſuſpenſe by that uncertainty (36).

(36) Binet, p. 219.

Obſerve that Robert de Corceone an Engliſh Cardinal, who flouriſhed in the beginning of the 13th Century wrote a book on this queſtion, *Whether or not Origen be damned?* Bale mentions it.

[*E*] *We ſhall examine . . . . what he ſuppoſes an Origeniſt might ſay after reading all the objections of the Manicheans.*] Though he makes his Origeniſt argue in a very cloſe and conciſe manner, yet I think I ſhall be able to preſerve the whole ſtrength of his arguments by reducing them to theſe three propoſitions. I. "God made us free, that there "might be room for virtue and vice, commendati-"ons and blame, rewards and puniſhments (37)." II. *He damns no man merely for his ſins, but for his want of repentance* (38). III. *The nature and moral evils*, which mankind is liable to, are of ſo ſmall a continuance if compared with eternity, that notwithſtanding theſe evils God cannot but be eſteemed *a benevolent Being and a lover of virtue* (39). In this laſt propoſition lies the whole ſtrength of the Origeniſt; the reaſon of it is, that he ſuppoſes that hell torments will not continue for ever, and that when God ſhall have judged that his *free* creatures have ſuffered enough, he ſhall make them eternally bleſſed (40). The everlaſting happineſs, which they ſhall be made to enjoy, fully anſwers the notion of an infinite mercy, though it had been preceded by many ages of pain. For many ages are nothing when compared with an infinite duration, and *there is an infinitely leſs proportion between* the time this earth is to continue *and eternity, than there is between one minute and an hundred millions of years* (41). . . . "Amongſt men, they who have a child under their "own care, and preſcribe it ſome bitter medicine, "only laugh at the child's complaints againſt that "bitterneſs, becauſe they know very well that the "taſte of it will be ſoon forgot, and that the medi-"cine will do him good. There is an infinitely "greater diſproportion between God, and the moſt "underſtanding men, than there is between them "and the moſt ſimple children. We cannot there-"fore reaſonably wonder, that God ſhould look "upon the evils we ſuffer as mere trifles, he who "alone has an adequate idea of eternity, and who "looks upon the beginning and end of our ſuffer-"ings as being infinitely nearer to each other, than "the beginning and end of a minute are. The "ſame argument holds good as to vices, and wicked "actions, which with regard to God do not laſt "long, and which after all make not the leaſt alte-"ration in the univerſe. If a clock-maker ſhould "make a clock, which being once wound up, con-"tinued going very regularly for an whole year to-"gether, except only that two or three ſeconds were "not equal juſt when it began to go, could any man "ſay, that the workman had no value for the repu-"tation of an able artiſt, and did not care to make "his works exact? Thus if God reforms one day, "for ever, the diſorders which a bad uſe of free-"will occaſioned among men, ſhall we have reaſon "to wonder that he did not put a ſtop to them, dur-"ing that ſhort moment we continued upon this "earth (42)?"

(37) Parrhaſiana, p. 306.

(38) Ibid. p. 307.

(39) Ibid. p. 308.

(40) Ibid. p. 312.

(41) Ibid. p. 309.

(42) Ibid. p. 310, 311.

Let us ſee what a Manichean might anſwer to that diſcourſe of an Origeniſt.

I. The firſt thing he might ſay, is, that we do not find in our mind the ideas of two kinds of goodneſs, the one conſiſting in making a preſent, the bad conſequences of which are foreſeen, without being prevented, though it could be done; the other, in doing a favour, ſo circumſtantiated, as always to turn to the advantage of him to whom it is granted. I need not obſerve, that by the idea of goodneſs is not meant here an imperfect goodneſs, ſuch as it is to be met with in the hearts of ſinful men, but ſuch a goodneſs as by logical abſtractions is conceived to be free from all defects. This ideal goodneſs is not a genus, under which are the two kinds I have deſcribed. His eſſential and diſtinctive attribute is the diſpoſing the ſubject, in which it reſides, to beſtow ſuch favours, as by the ſhorteſt way and moſt effectual means render the condition of him, on whom they are beſtowed, happy. This ideal notion of goodneſs does eſſentially and unavoidably exclude all that can belong to a malevolent Being. Now it is certain that a malevolent Being would eaſily be determined to beſtow favours, the uſe of which he knew would prove fatal to thoſe who received them. They mention a certain Roman, who made preſents of fine cloth to thoſe, to whom he bore them ill will.

Eutrapelus, cuicunque nocere volebat,
Veſtimenta dabat pretioſa: beatus enim jam
Cum pulchris tunicis ſumet nova conſilia & ſpes:
Dormiet in lucem: ſcorto poſtponet honeſtum
Officium: nummos alienos paſcet: ad imum
Thrax erit, aut olitoris aget mercede caballum (43).

(43) Horat. Epiſtola 18. lib. 1. verſ. 31.

i. e. "The man, *Eutrapelus* would have undone
"He ſtreight preſented with a gaudy gown,
"That he, grown happy in his fine attire,
"Might take new hopes, and raiſe his wiſhes higher,
"Forego his honeſt trade for eaſy vice,
"Sleep on till noon, and follow whores and dice,
"Take money up, till he has ſpent his all,
"And drives a cart for bread, or rots in jail (44)."

CREECH.

(44) Mr. Bayle quotes Monſieur Dacier's French tranſlation.

Bad Princes, who would find means artfully to gratify their paſſion of ruining a great Lord, would with all their heart make him Governor of a Province, if they knew that by abuſing his authority in that poſt, he would make himſelf the moſt odious of all men, and worthy an exemplary puniſhment. But the hero of a romance framed to be a pattern of all royal perfections; and a Prince, I ſay, drawn after the very notions of the mind more exactly than the

curious, and particular account relating to the ſubjects mentioned in the title, and beſides this, a compendious life of Origen. One cannot read it without lamenting the ſad fate of human underſtanding. Origen was without blemiſh with regard to his morals; he had a very great zeal for the Goſpel; he ruined his conſtitution by his frequent faſtings, and unin-

the Cyrus of Xenophon (45), will never make a ſnare of his favours. When he deſigns to give an employment, he chooſes that which is the moſt proper for the perſon he has a mind to gratify; and does not give him that, which he judges he would acquit himſelf very ill of. He gives quickly; for this is a character of goodneſs which multiplies the favour (46). He does not oblige the petitioner to long and tedious ſollicitations; this deſtroys the merit of the favour (47), and becomes only an indifferent goodneſs, which does hardly deſerve to be diſtinguiſhed from hardneſs of heart. They who have given us the character of Cardinal Mazarin obſerve as a great fault in him the habit he had contracted of making people wait ſo long for the effect of his promiſes, that all the pleaſure of it was ſpent in expectations, and that all his favours were ſpoiled by the pains it coſt to force them from him. *Promiſſis largus, quibus multoties non ſtetit; aut ſi implevit, faſtidio & mora diu libratum beneficium improbe extortum elumbavit, longo voto conſumens gaudia* (48). If a man had had a mind to make a panegyrick upon him, and by adulation to extol his perfect liberality, he would have ſaid, that by obliging people readily he even prevented their petitions, and ſpared his friends the ſhame of a requeſt. *Illud atque in vulgus, Principem obiiſſe . . . . liberalem in primis, & qui raro exemplo hujus ævi preces anteverteret, ut conſuleret accipientium pudori* (49), i. e. "It was alſo the publick "opinion, that the Prince who died . . . was above "all things generous, and, which is very uncom-"mon at this time, prevented men's petitions, out of "a regard for their baſhfulneſs." A Panegyriſt who would conſult the abſtract idea of perfection, in order to aſcribe it to his hero, would not fail to ſuppoſe in the deſcription he ſhould make of his generoſity, an indiſſoluble connection between giving the power of making a good uſe of a preſent, and the preſent itſelf.

Hence you may ſee, what are the properties of the ideal or abſtract goodneſs, what is eſſential to, and what is conſiſtent with it. Now if we conſult that notion of goodneſs, we do not find that God, who muſt be a Being infinitely good, could delay the happineſs of his creatures, till after ſeveral ages of miſery (50), nor give them a free-will, of which it was certain they would make ſuch an uſe as would ruin them. If they had aſked him ſuch a preſent, he could not have granted it, without acting againſt his own nature. Much leſs could he give it them without being aſked for it. Would they have taken it, if they had been aſked their advice? And if they had known the fatal conſequences of it, would they not rather have cried out (51),

Let ſuch a preſent be my en'my's lot!

But ſuppoſe it were conſiſtent with the infinite goodneſs of the Creator, to give his creatures a liberty, of which they could as well make a bad as a good uſe, it muſt be ſaid at leaſt, that his goodneſs would engage him to watch their conduct ſo narrowly, as not to ſuffer them to ſin actually. His infinite love for virtue, his infinite abhorrence of vice, in a word, his Holineſs would connect his own intereſt with what his goodneſs required of him, and by the concurrence of theſe two divine Attributes, the bad uſe of free-will would be prevented as often as it was ready to be made. A father, who cannot refuſe his child the liberty to walk alone, or to mount a ladder, or to go on horſe-back, though it be plain he will fall, if he be not well minded, will give ſuch orders, that on which ſide ſoever the child happens to ſtagger, he may meet with ſomething to ſupport him. If the limited goodneſs of a man, who cannot by inviſible means proportionate his aſſiſtance to the ſtrength or weakneſs of his child, engages him always, when it is in his power, to prevent him from falling, or cutting himſelf with a knife, which he was obliged to give him, in order to pacify him; how much more ſhould we be perſuaded, that God would have prevented the ill uſe of free-will; ſince he is immenſely good, of infinite holineſs, and can infallibly incline his creature towards what is good, without infringing in the leaſt the privileges of free-will (52)? Thus a Manichean might anſwer an Origeniſt, on the firſt of the three propoſitions ſet down above. I need not obſerve, that he would ſometimes make uſe of thoſe arguments, which are called *ad hominem*.

As for the reaſon alledged by the Origeniſt, that it was neceſſary to give the creature Free-will, that *there might be room for virtue and vice, for commendation and blame, for rewards and puniſhments*, it can be very eaſily and effectually anſwered. Let it only be obſerved, that it is ſo far from being true, that ſuch a reaſon ought to have determined a Being of infinite holineſs, and immenſely good, to give his creatures a free-will, that it ought rather to have determined him not to give it them. Vice and blame ought not to take place in the works of a cauſe infinitely holy; they muſt find all the inlets into it ſhut; every thing muſt be praiſe-worthy there; virtue muſt fill up every poſt, ſo that there be not the leaſt hole for vice to creep in. And as all muſt be happy under the government of a Being, whoſe goodneſs is infinite, and power boundleſs, ſo there muſt be no room for puniſhments. If one travels over that immenſe empire, one muſt not meet any where with a vale of tears, nor with a *gate*, or entry like that, which a great Poet deſcribes thus:

Veſtibulum ante ipſum, primiſque in faucibus Orci,
Luctus, & ultrices poſuere cubilia curæ:
Pallenteſque habitant morbi, triſtiſque ſenectus:
Et Metus, & maleſuada Fames, & turpis Egeſtas,
(Terribiles viſu formæ) Lethumque, Laborque;
Tum conſanguineus Lethi Sopor: & mala mentis
Gaudia, mortiferumque adverſo in limine Bellum:
Ferreique Eumenidum thalami; & Diſcordia demens,
Vipereum crinem vittis innexa cruentis (53).

i. e. "Juſt in the gate, and in the jaws of hell,
"Revengeful cares, and ſullen ſorrows dwell;
"And pale diſeaſes, and repining age;
"Want, fear, and famine's unreſiſted rage;
"Here toils, and death, and death's half-brother
"ſleep,
"(Forms terrible to view) their country keep:
"With anxious pleaſures of a guilty mind,
"Deep frauds before, and open force behind:
"The furies iron beds, and ſtrife that ſhakes
"Her hiſſing treſſes, and unfolds her ſnakes.

DRYDEN.

Without going through places full of horror, one ought to meet immediately the ſeats of happineſs and bliſs.

Devenêre locos lætos, & amœna vireta
Fortunatorum nemorum, ſedeſque beatas.
Largior hîc campos æther, & lumine veſtit
Purpureo: ſolemque ſuum, ſidera norunt (54).

i. e. ——————— "They took their way,
"Where long extended plains of pleaſure lay.
"The verdant fields with thoſe of heav'n may vie;
"With *Æther* veſted, and a purple ſky:
"The bliſsful ſeats of happy ſouls below:
"Stars of their own, and their own ſuns they
"know.

DRYDEN.

Virtue, praiſe, favours may very well exiſt, though vice, blame and puniſhments have no other exiſtence, but what is called ideal and objective. The Origeniſt cannot deny it, ſince he ſuppoſes that an everlaſting happineſs of all the free Beings is to ſucceed after ſome ages of ſufferings. Virtue, praiſe and favours, will take place in an infinite duration of happineſs; but vice, blame and puniſhments, will then have no real

(45) *Cyrus ille a Xenophonte non ad biſtoriæ fidem ſcriptus, ſed ad effigiem juſti imperii; i. e.* "The Cyrus of "Xenophon is "not written "according to "the truth of "hiſtory, but "after the no-"tion of a juſt "government." Cicero, ad Q. Fratrem, Epiſt. 1. lib. 1. folio m. 98. *D.*

(46) *Bis dat qui cito dat.* He who gives quickly, gives twice.

(47) *Gratia quæ tarda eſt, ingrata eſt, gratia namque*
Cum fieri properat, gratia grata magis. Auſonius, Epigr. 82. "A "favour long "expected is an "unkindneſs; "the quicker it "is granted, the "more accepta-"ble it is." See alſo the Epigr. 83, and the Authors quoted in the Commentary on Auſonius, of the Amſterdam edition, 1671.

(48) Priolus de Rebus Gallicis, lib. 11. *ſub fin.* p. m. 392.

(49) Famian. Strada, Proluſ. 2. lib. 3. p. m. 255. He ſpeaks of Pope Leo X.

(50) We ſhall ſpeak of this in the 4th paragraph.

(51) *Hoſtibus eveniant talia dona meis.*

(52) See above, remark [G] of the article MANICHEANS.

(53) Virg. Æn. lib. 6. verſ. 273.

(54) Idem, ibid. ver. 638.

(e) See above, remark [A], at the firſt break.

uninterrupted lucubrations: longing after the Martyrdom (e) he underwent with an incredible

exiſtence out of the mind. If the Origeniſt ſhould anſwer that that happineſs would not be a reward, in caſe the creatures had not been endowed with liberty, we ſhould reply, that there is not the leaſt proportion between an everlaſting happineſs, and the good uſe man makes of his free-will; and therefore the everlaſting happineſs, which God beſtows on an honeſt man, cannot, with any propriety of ſpeech, be conſidered as a reward, it is a favour, it is a free-gift. One cannot therefore pretend, taking the words in their ſtrict ſenſe, that men ought to have been endowed with free-will, to make them capable of deſerving heaven, that they might obtain it as a reward. That ſtile might be equally uſed, though there were only a mere ſubordination between virtue and an eternal happineſs; that is to ſay, a neceſſary connection of virtuous thoughts, in which virtue would precede, and happineſs follow conſequentially. One might even aſſert, that the more the everlaſting happineſs were remote from the notion of a reward, the more it would be a proof of an infinite goodneſs.

II. The anſwer to the ſecond propoſition will not keep us long. The Manichean would be ſure to obſerve, that impenitence being nothing but an ill uſe of liberty, it comes all to the ſame, whether we ſay, that God damns men only becauſe they do not repent, or whether we aſſert, that he damns them merely becauſe they have ſinned. I confeſs, that generally ſpeaking, the being diſpoſed to acquit thoſe from puniſhment who repent of their ſins, is a proof of mercy; but when a Being promiſes to pardon a ſinner, on condition that he will repent, though he be ſure that that ſinner will not repent, he promiſes nothing, properly ſpeaking, and he is as fully determined to puniſh that ſinner, as though he had made him no offers of mercy: if you deſigned in earneſt to free him from puniſhment, you would prevent his being impenitent; which is an eaſy matter for him who is maſter of men's hearts. Theſe are again arguments *ad hominem*.

III. With regard to the third propoſition, and the proofs of it, the Manichean might aſk immediately, whether the Origeniſt ſhould dare to determine the duration of thoſe ſufferings, which are to precede an everlaſting happineſs. No man would dare to determine it; not only becauſe it is unknown, but alſo becauſe he would fear to make it either too ſhort, or too long. If he made it too ſhort, as for inſtance, of an hundred years, he would be afraid of being charged with indulging the ſinners in their wickedneſs; and if he ſuppoſed it of a million of years, he would fear leſt this ſhould not give a true notion of God's mercy, nor remove all the offence that is taken at the pretended cruelty of the doctrine of hell. Whence it appears, that men do not lay much ſtreſs on that ſuppoſition, that there is no proportion between the duration of a million of ages, and an infinite duration; nor do I ſee that the difficulty is ſolved by obſerving, that *there is an infinitely leſs proportion between the duration* of the earth, and *eternity, than there is between one minute, and an hundred millions of years*. The ſame may alſo be aſſerted of as many millions of ages, as there are drops of water in the ſea. That number of ages, though never ſo much multiplied, is finite, and there is no manner of proportion between what is finite, and infinite; there is therefore none between any number of ages whatſoever, and eternity: and yet no man can help judging, that the juſtice of God would be leſs ſevere, if he cauſed the ſufferings of the reprobates to ceaſe after an hundred years, bringing them then into paradiſe, than if he made that change in their condition only after an hundred thouſand ages. Let us endeavour never ſo much to ſtrain our wits, we ſhall never give a ſatisfactory account of this matter, by ſaying, that God will indeed be reconciled at laſt; but that it will be only after the hell torments, ſuch as they are uſually deſcribed, ſhall have laſted as many millions of years, as there are drops of water in the ſea. That number of years, which is nothing, if compared with eternity, ſeems yet extremely large, when it is conſidered in itſelf, and with regard to the perſon that ſuffers. Whether it be that our reaſon is too ſtrong to be impoſed upon, or that there is really ſomething that miſleads, as in our notion of time and duration: whatever it be, I ſay, it is certain, that you cannot put it out of a Philoſopher's head, arguing as a Philoſopher, that the puniſhment of a creature being continued for an hundred thouſand millions of ages ſucceſſively, is inconſiſtent with the infinite goodneſs of the Creator. It muſt be ſuppoſed, that the Origeniſt is ſenſible of this, and that this is the reaſon why he dares not to maintain that the purgatory of the damned will continue ſo long. Now a Manichean might argue thus. You would judge ſo long a puniſhment to be cruel: take then but half the duration, and if you pretend to find any thing elſe therein, but a diminution of ſeverity, you are much miſtaken; for fifty-thouſand millions of years differ from an hundred-thouſand millions, only as more differs from leſs; and it is impoſſible to paſs from cruelty to the utmoſt goodneſs, only by a bare diminution of cruelty. The qualities *in ſummo gradu* (55) *in the higheſt degree*, exclude all the contraries: heat, for inſtance, excludes abſolutely all the degrees of cold; whence it follows, that goodneſs *in ſummo gradu* excludes all the degrees whatſoever of the oppoſite quality. You cannot therefore arrive at the perfect goodneſs of God, but by ſuppreſſing even the very firſt minute of hell torments. For what God can be one moment, that he can be two hours, and two ages, and during the whole eternity; but what would be inconſiſtent with his nature eternally, muſt be ſo in every moment of the duration of things. The qualities of the creatures are capable of more or leſs, and are never perfect; but we ſtile them perfect, when what they want is hardly perceivable. We commend the ability of a Clock-maker, when his clock gets or loſes but two or three ſeconds in an whole year. But the ability of an infinitely perfect artificer, excludes abſolutely every defect. His holineſs, wiſdom, *&c.* are abſolutely ſimple, without the leaſt mixture of the oppoſite qualities; I ſay, without the ſmalleſt mixture conceiveable, or that can be in the nature of things.

(55) I ſhall ſpeak again of this here under num. (60).

IV. The idea of that goodneſs excludes all the defects that are almoſt always obſervable in the manner in which men do good to each other. Some take a pleaſure in delays (56); others cannot make themſelves uſeful, but by ſide-ways, and are forced, even againſt their will; to make them paſs through evils, whom they would lead to happineſs. Fathers, who cannot reform the wicked inclinations of their children but by blows, are forced to whip them: but they would be ſure not to do it, if they were perſuaded that a boundleſs complaiſance would more effectually reclaim them. A father forces his child to ſwallow a medicine, which will give him the gripes, and the bitterneſs of which will be inſufferable to him; but he would not act thus, if he knew of another method to cure him. He would give him ſugar-plumbs, and all that the child likes beſt, if he imagined it were a better remedy for him. As he cannot avoid giving him a diſagreeable potion, he ſweetens the bitterneſs of it as well as he can by all the little artifices he can invent (57); and though he looks upon the child's complaints of the ill taſte of the phyſick, as a ridiculous weakneſs, being perſuaded that in a little time he will loſe the taſte of it, and that the medicine will prove uſeful to him; notwithſtanding all this, I ſay, he would with all his heart ſpare him that trouble, and cure him by the moſt palatable liquors in the world, if it were in his power. One need not be a father to experience ſuch a diſpoſition in one's breaſt. There is no phyſician nor apothecary but will beg a patient's pardon for preſcribing him ſuch bitter remedies, and proteſt that if it were poſſible to give them the taſte of the moſt excellent ſauces the beſt cooks can make, they would not ſpare their ſkill and induſtry; but a neceſſity, which all the art of men cannot overcome, obliges them to preſcribe ſuch diſagreeable medicines. Such a diſcourſe comes certainly from the heart, even when it is uſed to a patient one never ſaw before. Aſk a Chirurgeon, who ſets an arm for an unknown perſon, *if you could perform that operation without making the patient ſuffer, would you not do it?* he will anſwer that ſuch a queſtion is uſeleſs; and that

(56) See above, quotation (48). Theſe delays are ſometimes ſo tireſome, that at laſt one begs for a quick refuſal as a favour. *Jam, ſatis eſt, ſinem ô Cæſar pro munere poſco*
Remque meam ſeu das, perfice, ſive negas.
See Balzac, *Entret.* 27. p. m. 276.

(57) *Pueris abſinthia tetra medentes*
Cùm dare conantur, prius oras pocula circùm
Contingunt, mellis dulci flavoque liquore,
Ut puerorum ætas improvida ludificetur
Labrorum tenùs, interea perpotet amarum
Abſinthi laticem, deceptaque non capiatur;
Sed potiùs tali facto recreata valeſcat. Lucret. lib. 1. ver. 953, and lib. 4. ver. 11.

dible conſtancy the torments, which the perſecutors of the Chriſtian Faith made him ſuffer [*F*] ; torments ſo much the more inſufferable as they were continued and prolonged

that it muſt be taken for an unqueſtionable truth, that a man of his profeſſion, who ſhould know two different ways of dreſſing a wound, both equally good, but the one painful and the other delightful, and who preferred the former before the latter, muſt be a monſter in cruelty, a tyger, a canibal, who ought to be immediately broke on the wheel (58). Schoolmaſters do not generally abound with good ſenſe, and good humour ; yet I queſtion whether there be any of ſuch a ſavage temper, as to chooſe to make uſe of blows rather than of fair words, even if they knew that their ſcholar would improve as much by a mild and complaiſant treatment, as by chaſtiſements. Do not they uſe to give dainties to little ſchoolboys in order to conquer their reluctancy (59) ? To chide and beat without neceſſity, I mean when careſſes and preſents would be as uſeful, is brutiſh.

(58) Compare this with what I quote from Seneca, in the art. CALLISTRATUS, quotation (7) and (8).

(59) *Ut pueris olim dant cruſtula blandi Doctores, elementa velint ut diſcere prima.* Horat. Sat. 1. lib. 1.

One might enlarge this *Induction* much farther ; and from thence would follow a conſequence, which would extremely puzzle an Origeniſt : for one might infer from thence, that the notions grounded on experience, and the metaphyſical or abſtract ideas concur in teaching us, that to make a perſon ſuffer, even though it be only for a little while, and with a view to procure him a great good, is a thing inconſiſtent with goodneſs, unleſs it be impoſſible to find a ſtrait way, by which that perſon may be led directly from good to good conſtantly and unchangeably. In vain then it is ſaid, that after the ſufferings of the damned ſhall have laſted ſome time, which will be very ſhort if compared with eternity ; they will be ſucçeeded by an happineſs, which will never end ; this appears yet ſo much the more inconſiſtent with the goodneſs of God, as it is an infinite goodneſs, and abſolutely perfect, which cannot ſuffer the leaſt diminution nor the leaſt interruption without ceaſing to be perfect. Let us call to mind the doctrine of the ſchoolmen concerning the nature of the firſt qualities. Heat *in ſummo gradu* (60) in the higheſt degree, *ut octo*, as eight (for thus they expreſs themſelves) is no longer a firſt, ſimple and perfect quality, as ſoon as it mixed with the leaſt degree of cold, that is poſſible to exiſt : from that moment it becomes one of the ſecond or mixed qualities ; eſſences conſiſt *in indiviſible*, in an indiviſible point : if you take but the leaſt thing from them, you deſtroy them entirely. All or nothing : ſo that how ſmall ſoever a potion of the malevolent quality be mixed with goodneſs, the latter loſes the eſſence of a perfect goodneſs ; it changes its kind, and happens to belong to the kind of imperfect qualities. I put in the margin the philoſophical Axiom which proves this (61). If therefore the Origeniſts have a mind to diſentangle themſelves, they muſt add a new hereſy to their former ones ; they muſt aſſert that it was impoſſible for God to lead free creatures to an everlaſting happineſs, without making them ſuffer beforeh and the miſeries of this life, and afterwards hell torments for a certain time. They might urge, that as fiſhes cannot live in the air, nor men under water, ſo ſpirits cannot live in paradiſe, as long as they are loaded with the ruſt which they contract by their union with the elementary matter ; that they muſt be purified of it in the infernal furnace, after which they are in a condition to live happy in the moſt celeſtial abodes. According to this ſuppoſition, the goodneſs of God is perfectly conſiſtent with the ſufferings of his creatures, juſt as a Chirurgeon's friendſhip for the perſon he cuts for the ſtone continues entire, though he makes that perſon ſuffer the moſt cruel pains, which it is not in his power to prevent. But if we had recourſe to that hypotheſis, it would be only admitting a part of the errors of the Manicheans ; it would be declaring the goodneſs of God at the expence of his power : it would be admitting matter as an uncreated principle, and ſo eſſentially evil, that God himſelf could not rectify the defects of it : which therefore would not be anſwering the Manicheans, but making them triumph. The obſervation we have made on natural evil with regard to the goodneſs of God, may be eaſily applied to moral evil, with regard to his holineſs.

(60) Compare this with what is obſerved above, num. (55).

(61) *Bonum ex integra cauſa, malum ex quocunque defectu*, i. e. "Good is from "a perfect cauſe, "evil from any "defect whatſoever."

V. It muſt be obſerved, that ſuppoſing Origen could anſwer the objections of the Manicheans, it does not follow from thence, that therefore they could much eaſier be ſolved, by principles much more reaſonable and orthodox, than his were. For all the advantage that is to be got in this controverſy is owing to the errors which are peculiar to him, who on the one hand gives a free ſcope to the power of free will ; and on the other, ſuppoſes an everlaſting happineſs in the room of an eternal miſery, which he explodes. The ſtrongeſt argument of the Manicheans is grounded upon this ſuppoſition, that all men except a few will be damned for ever.

VI. There is no ſect now-a-days leſs expoſed to the attacks of the Manicheans, than the Socinians : but it is only becauſe they receded farther than the others from the ſyſtem of the Particulariſts (62). Now as long as they ſhall not go farther ſtill, they will not ſucceed better in this controverſy than the Origeniſt : they will certainly have the worſt in this conteſt, if they do not add to all their other impieties, that of ſaying, that matter is a principle of which God cannot diſpoſe but to a certain degree, beyond which he is forced to yield to its reſiſtance, and make the beſt of the incorrigible defects he meets with in it. If the Socinians do not take upon them to aſſert this new blaſphemy, they will ſoon find themſelves reduced to abſurdities ; I mean, to deny truths grounded on experience. They deny the eternity of hell torments, becauſe they do not comprehend how it agrees with the infinite goodneſs of God : they do not conceive how that goodneſs can be conſiſtent with an hell, that ſhould continue an hundred times an hundred thouſand millions of years : ſo many ages of miſery ſeem to them a moſt horrid cruelty. But as that cruelty will never become an infinite goodneſs, by cutting off a thouſand ages of pain ; and then a thouſand again, *&c.* as long as there remain ſome years of pain (63), they will be obliged to ſay, if they will avoid all incoherencies, that there can be no hell under a God immenſely good. This proves too much ; and ſuch a theſis being once ſet down, one does not conceive how theſe can be diſeaſes and vexations among men. You therefore ſet down ſuch principles, from whence it follows that ſuch things are falſe and even impoſſible, which really exiſt, and the exiſtence of which we are but too ſenſible of from a ſad experience. If you ſay, that under the beſt Kings there are priſons, racks, gallows, and executioners ? it will be replied, that none of theſe things would exiſt, if theſe Kings had the power to inſpire all the world with a firm reſolution to behave as they ought. How will you extricate yourſelves out of this Labyrinth, if God diſpoſes of matter as he thinks fit, and if he is the free author of thoſe laws, which ſubject men to diſeaſes and vexations ? To vindicate him therefore, you will be obliged to ſay, that he does not do all that he would, and that matter contains in it the ſeeds of evil, which ſpring out one way or another, whether he will or not, and whatſoever combination or contexture of corpuſcles he may contrive.

(62) They who urge moſt ſtrictly the literal ſenſe of St. Paul's words concerning the doctrines of abſolute predeſtination, of the neceſſity of grace, and of the loſs of free-will.

VII. Thus we muſt teach thoſe their duty, who would pretend to ſubject divinity to philoſophy. They muſt be ſhewed the abſurd conſequences of their method, that they may be thus brought back to this maxim of Chriſtian Humility, namely, that the metaphyſical notions ought not to be our rule to judge God's conduct by ; but that we muſt regulate ourſelves according to the oracles of Scripture. As for thoſe, who might fear ſome danger to the true faith, from our ſhewing that by natural reaſon and philoſophical maxims we cannot ſtand the objections of the Manicheans, I refer them to the explanation, which I am to add at the end of this work.

[*F*] *The torments which the perſecutors of the Chriſtian Faith made him ſuffer.*] Of all the illuſtrious Martyrs who periſhed in the ſeventh perſecution (64). *None were attacked with more obſtinacy than Origen . . . He was caſt into a dark dungeon * being tied by the neck with a large iron collar, ſtretched for ſeveral days following on a kind of a wooden horſe, which by forcing his*

(63) See the proofs of it above, remark [*E*], paragr. 3.

(64) That of the Emperor Decius, in the year 204.

* Euſeb. lib. 6. c. 39. Niceph. lib. 5 c. 32.

longed a great while ; for a particular care was taken that he might not expire in the midſt of his ſufferings (*f*). His genius was great and elevated, and his wit ſublime ; his learning and reading were immenſe ; and yet he fell into a *prodigious number of Hereſies, of which there was not one but was monſtrous* (*g*). It is probable that he fell only, becauſe he had endeavoured to ſecure the truths of the Chriſtian Religion againſt the objections of the Heathens, and even to render them more *credible to the Philoſophers* ; *this was his moſt ardent wiſh* ; *for he did not queſtion, but if he had once the philoſophers on his ſide, he ſhould eaſily by their means convert the whole world* (*h*). So many virtues, ſo many noble talents, ſuch worthy and zealous motives, all this put together could not prevent him from dying an Heretick, nor his memory from being odious and abominable to an infinite number of Chriſtians. There are few perſons in the Church of Rome, who dare to doubt of his eternal damnation. Now how many Doctors are there, who are voluptuous, worldly-minded, lazy, and loaded with vices, but at the ſame time moſt orthodox, who receive daily a thouſand bleſſings for their unſhaken conſtancy in the true Faith ? So unfathomable are the judgments of God ! Men do not imagine generally that Origen's errors are any ways connected together ; they ſeem to be the product of a wild and unſettled mind : but we ſhould rather ſay that they all flow from the ſame ſpring [*G*], that they are ſyſtematical falſities, which all together form a connected chain of conſequences. Some of

(*f*) Doucin, *Hiſtoire de l'Origeniſme*, p. 81.

(*g*) Ibid. p. 36.

(*h*) Ibid. p. 37.

his legs aſunder, did ſo diſlocate his members, that he lived the remainder of his days in continual pains. He was at that time threeſcore and ſeven years old . . . . Every day they invented a new kind of cruelty ; which he himſelf has given an account of in his letters, to which the antients refer us, but which are loſt ſince. They often threatened to burn him little by little, and at ſeveral times : and during that long and cruel martyrdom, which as far as we can gueſs laſted till the death of Decius, he never ſaid or did the leaſt thing unbecoming a ſoldier of Jeſus Chriſt. Happy had it been for him, if giving up the ghoſt in ſo glorious a ſtrife, he might have waſhed away with his own blood the errors of his doctrine. But God would not permit it. He ſuffered very much, *ſays St. Epiphanius* †, and yet he did not arrive at the end to which a martyrdom leads. *He touched the Crown with his hand, without being able to put it on his head, and he, who to be a Martyr wanted nothing but to expire in the midſt of thoſe torments, the marks of which he bore till his death, is an hereſiarch, expelled and abhorred by the Church, becauſe he did not believe as ſhe does. But we ought not to wonder at it ; when we read in the acts of the holy Prieſt Pionius, who ſuffered about that time at Smyrna, that next to him was burnt a Marcionite, whoſe ſect, though it inſpired its followers with a deſire for martyrdom, was nevertheleſs heretical for it, becauſe theſe falſe Martyrs died being addicted to their errors. It was not the ſufferings, ſays admirably well St. Auguſtin, that make a martyr, but the faith which makes a man undergo thoſe ſufferings. Now there is no longer any faith in him who riſes up againſt the doctrine of the Church. Where are thoſe of that character, whom ſome men would paſs upon us for ſaints, though one cannot perceive the leaſt thing in their lives that is any ways like the virtues or the ſufferings of the Martyrs, but only a mere obſtinacy much leſs doubtful than that of the antient Hereſiarchs* (65).

† *L. de Ponderib. & Menſuris.*

(65) Doucin, *Hiſtoire de l'Origeniſme*, p. 81, &c.

I have tranſcribed that long paſſage from father Doucin, without omitting his reflection ; for I imagined it might ſerve as a ſupplement to what I have related above (66), concerning the objections that were raiſed againſt Monſieur Maimbourg with regard to the Marcionites. I conſidered alſo that this would afford me an opportunity to obſerve, that the moſt eaſy methods to find out the right cauſe fail us ſoon or late. It would be much better ſuited to the mean capacity of the multitude, if they could diſtinguiſh by ſome exterior but infallible marks, which is the true religion, rather than be obliged to enter into a ſtrict examination of the doctrine itſelf. Now among all the exterior marks, the conſtancy of the martyrs is the moſt proper to make a deep impreſſion on the mind ; it was of an infinite ſervice for the propagation of the Chriſtian Faith : their aſhes were the ſeed of the faithful, and raiſed numberleſs Diſciples to the Goſpel. But that proof became equivocal after Chriſtianity was divided into ſeveral communions : they had all their Martyrs, ſo that to avoid being miſled, a man was obliged to examine the doctrine itſelf, and to give up that ſhort method of diſcovering the truth ; ſuch a communion has Martyrs, therefore truth is on its ſide.

(66) In the remark [*E*] of the article MARCIONITES.

[*G*] *We ſhould rather ſay that all* Origen's errors *flow from the ſame ſpring.*] *He has explained and eſtabliſhed them* in his three books of Principles (67), *where he has ſo well connected them together, that you ſee them all follow from one ſingle principle* (68). " It " is eaſy to demonſtrate ; firſt, that what is heretical " and cenſurable in the books of principles, is not " one or two ſingle propoſitions, foreign to the ſub- " ject matter ; it is the whole body of the doctrine, " the very ſubſtance of the whole work : they are " fundamental propoſitions on which the whole ſyſ- " tem is built, and which cannot be removed with- " out overthrowing the noble edifice. It can be de- " monſtrated in the ſecond place, that the ſame er- " rors, which infect the books of principles, run " through all the other works of the ſame author : " ſo that the ſame genius prevails every where, the " ſame ideas appear throughout the whole. To re- " move his errors you muſt deſtroy the very firſt ele- " ments of his doctrine (69). . . . . Such is the fate " of whoever dares to walk in a new road in mat- " ters of religion. Innumerable abyſſes and fright- " ful precipices open on every ſide before him. The " more wit he has, the more abſurdities will his en- " deavours to argue coherently make him ſwallow : " and what at firſt ſeemed only an inconſiderable " piece of ſingularity, hardly worth notice, proves " at laſt the general overthrow of all the orthodox doc- " trines. So fatal is it to invent, when we ſhould " only believe (70)." The author from whom I have borrowed theſe words has the following paſſages in another place. " What deſerves chiefly to be " taken notice of is the imperceptible, but nevertheleſs " real connection there is between all his errors, the " one of which led its author to another, and oblig- " ed him at the ſame time to invent that frightful " multitude of novelties, of which his ſyſtem is " made up. For, as St. Jerom very well obſerves " where he treats of this ſubject, we muſt not imagine " that Origen was a madman or a weak genius § : " moſt of thoſe who read his works would not meet " in them with thoſe frequent contradictions they " charge him with, if they had taken more pains " to ſtudy him. It is true that the book of princi- " ples, ſuch as we have it at preſent, does not al- " ways agree with the reſt of his works : but he is " not anſwerable for it : * all the world knows what " pains Rufinus took to alter or ſuppreſs in his tranſ- " lation all that he thought might make the book be " condemned in the Weſt. Thus and thus only it " is that Origen ſometimes refutes in Latin the ſame " errors, which he aſſerts in Greek in his other " works. But upon the whole, you will not find " him inconſiſtent with himſelf, if you but fetch his " notions from their very ſpring, and if you endea- " vour to find out, as it were, the key to his works : " for there muſt certainly be one ; and we ought " not to imagine that ſo many different hereſies " were any thing elſe but the conſequences of a firſt " error, which it does not appear the learned have " yet ſufficiently endeavoured to find out (71.)" Father Doucin propoſes afterwards his conjectures, and how

(67) He compoſed them in the year 217. See Father Doucin, *ubi infra.*

(68) Doucin, *Hiſtoire d' l'Origeniſme*, p. 31.

(69) Ibid. p. 36.

(70) Ibid. p. 37.

§ *Non eſt fatuus Origenes. Et ego novi. Contraria ſibi loqui non poteſt.* Hier. Apol. l. 2.

* *Quæ cùm legiſſem contuliſſemque cum Græco, illico animadverti quæ Origenes de Patre & Filio & Spiritu ſancto impie dixerat, & quæ Romanæ aures ferre non poterant, in meliorem partem ab interprete commutata.* Hier. Apol. l. 1. *Si ideo interpretaris ut eum hæreticum arguas, nihil de Græco mutes.* Ibid. lib. 2.

(71) Doucin, *Hiſt. de l'Origeniſme*, p. 323, &c.

of his followers carried them ſo far as to indulge themſelves in thoſe ſenſual pleaſures, which have been ſince taken notice of amongſt the Moliniſts * [*H*]; but that carnal Origeniſm did not continue long, and could be much eaſier deſtroyed than the ſpiritual Origeniſm, which was a kind of Quietiſm [*I*]. We muſt not forget to obſerve, that one of the reaſons, which chiefly promoted the ſucceſs of Origen's Sect, was that his errors ſeemed proper to refute the Manicheans [*K*], who very much perplexed the Orthodox with their objections. One of this author's beſt works is his anſwer to the Philoſopher Celſus:

* The followers of Molinos.

how he conceives the opinions of Origen were connected together. This deſerves to be read in the original.

[*H*] *Some of his followers carried them ſo far as to indulge themſelves in thoſe ſenſual pleaſures, which have been ſince taken notice of amongſt the Moliniſts.*] I ſhall tranſcribe again father Doucin's own words: they hint a great many reflections to us, and give us to underſtand what uſe might be made of them with regard to this preſent time. "Whilſt the unlearned "contemplatives inconſiderably admitted all Ori-"gen's fancies, others more knowing, but alſo more "corrupted, took notice that one might draw from "thence ſome conſequences very favourable to this "diſſoluteneſs: and as the fleſh was now looked "upon only as the priſon of the ſpirit, and not at "all as a part of ourſelves, which was ſanctified by "its union with Jeſus Chriſt, and appointed to reign "with him in his glory; they inferred from thence "that the uncleanneſs of the fleſh was not capable "to defile the Spirit, nor to make it loſe the grace "of its Creator. It is eaſy to gueſs to what abomi-"nations that horrid principle leads; it raiſed in "the Eaſt a new Sect of Origeniſts, ſo odious on ac-"count of their diſorders, that they were ſurnamed "*the infamous*, and *the diſſolute* *. That twofold "Origeniſm, the one carnal, the other ſpiritual, "has for its voucher St. Epiphanius. It will not "therefore be taken for a mere invention of an hiſ-"torian, who dives into the moſt remoteſt ages to "find out deſcriptions anſwerable to what happens in "our days. Much leſs ought it to be conſidered as an "opportunity, which is taken hold of on purpoſe to "debate one's mind on the affairs of this time. . . . "If the execrable Molinos, how much ſoever his "character differed from that of the chaſte Origen, "did yet become like him the author of a ſpiritual "hereſy, and of a carnal hereſy, we ought not to "wonder at it †. The moſt ſpiritual Hereſy, if it be "ever ſo little connected with morality, and the rules "of men's conduct, will lead them to the moſt "monſtrous diſſoluteneſs. This man ſighs, and ac-"cuſes himſelf, after he has committed a wicked "action, which however, ſays he, I could not avoid, "ſince God refuſed me grace. Another infers, that "an action cannot be criminal, ſince God put it out "of his power to avoid it, and ſo he commits it "without bluſhing. There is often no other diffe-"rence between them both but only in the manner "of expreſſing themſelves. The latter ſpeaks as he "thinks; the former as he would have others think "of him (72)."

* Hæreſ. 63, 64. *Horum vero bæreſis ad Epiphanis dogma conformata videtur de quo in Gnoſticorum ſecta ſermonem antea fecimus . . nuptias repudiant neque tamen obſcœnis libidinibus modum ullis adhibent, adeoque omni genere ſpurcitiæ & corpus ſuum, & mentem animumque contaminant.* Ibid.

† See what Huetius obſerves, in order to prove, that there has been but one Origen.

(72) Doucin, *Hiſtoire de l'Origeniſme*, p. 139.

[*I*] *That carnal Origeniſm . . . . could be much eaſier deſtroyed, than the ſpiritual Origeniſm, which was a kind of Quietiſm.*] "What will be thought incredi-"ble, and yet is worthy to be carefully obſerved is, "that a carnal Hereſy is leſs dangerous to the "Church (73), than thoſe Hereſies, which are not "attended with the leaſt immorality. We want no "other proof of this, but the twofold Origeniſm. "The carnal Origeniſm laſted but a very little time, "and was abhorred by all the world: even they, "who were tainted with it, did not dare to expoſe "ſuch an execrable doctrine to open view; whereas "the ſpiritual Origeniſm, the followers of which, "according to St. Epiphanius § himſelf, were un-"blameable with regard to their innocence, could "not be extinguiſhed till after two centuries and "more: ſo much obſtinacy and pride did the profeſ-"ſors of it conceal under the fair ſhew of an exem-"plary piety (74)."

(73) See the *Penſees diverſes ſur les Cometes*, ſect. 89, 90.

§ *Nam licet nullum ſectatoribus ſuis uſum turpitudinis imponat.* Hæreſ. 64.

(74) Doucin, *Hiſtoire de l'Origeniſme*, 141.

I muſt alſo quote the following paſſage from father Doucin. *Evagrius . . . . . Deacon of the Church of Conſtantinople . . . was gone to Jeruſalem, and from thence into Egypt, in order to retire into a ſolitary place . . . . he thought of nothing but Origeniſm. . . . He was hardly ſettled in his deſart, but the Origeniſt Monks, being acquainted with his merit, put him at their head, which is the reaſon why the Church has ſince condemned him as one of the ringleaders of that ſect. He ſpent his time in writing ſpiritual books, which were greatly eſteemed, and of which the fragments, that are ſtill extant, are indeed very beautiful. By that means the erroneous doctrine was wonderfully propagated. St. Epiphanius ſoon took notice of it; and St. Jerom on his part, warned the faithful to be upon their guard.* "*Evagrius, ſaid he, that man who came from the* "*North, who from his retirement writes letters to the* "*whole world, who ſends inſtructions to the Virgins,* "*inſtructions to the Monks, inſtructions to her, whoſe very* "*name ſeems to expreſs the darkneſs and blackneſs of* "*Hereſy (he means Melania *) put it into his head, to* "*publiſh a book of maxims, by which he pretends to di-veſt* "*man of all paſſions.*" *This is exactly the pretended perfection of the Quietiſt.* "*That is to ſay, adds St.* "*Jerom, that of his perfect man Evagrius will make* "*either a God or a ſtone* (75)."

* Μέλας (*melas*) in Greec, ſignifies *black.*

(75) Ibid. p. 177, &c.

[*K*] Origen's *errors ſeemed proper to refute the Manicheans.*] It is chiefly here that I muſt borrow another writer's words. Palladius was *Evagrius's pupil in the monaſtick life. He knew how to ſucceed as well at leaſt as his maſter*, in the ſupporting and improving of a Sect. "The women, and chiefly they who had ſome read-"ing, loved to diſcourſe with him, and reſiſted leſs "than others his artful language. He uſed to "begin with raiſing ſuſpicions in their minds againſt "the Orthodox Faith, by repreſenting it as abound-"ing with abſurdities, which could not be avoided "but by following Origen's principles. He aſked "them, for inſtance; ** what ill has ſuch a child "done, which you ſee is tormented and poſſeſſed by "the Devil? At what age ſhall we riſe from the "dead? Will it be with the ſame body with which "we dye (76)? . . . . Thus Palladius gave people a "taſte for Origeniſm, by repreſenting it as a ſyſtem "neceſſary to explain in an eaſy and clear manner "thoſe articles, which till then had been looked upon "as the rock on which our Religion was loſt. Was "it poſſible that a doctrine thus explained by the "moſt eminent men of that time, ſhould not have "great ſucceſs, eſpecially conſidering the diſpoſi-"tion of mind in which people were then in? They "endeavoured only to anſwer the Manicheans, whoſe "Sect was become more large and flouriſhing, than "it had ever been before. If there be but one God, "ſaid thoſe Hereticks, who is infinitely powerful "and good, how can he ſuffer that flood of evils "which happen in the world? How can he permit, "that ſo many perſons ſhould be oppreſſed by them "from their infancy, whilſt others are born in proſpe-"rity, and in a plenty of all manner of bleſſings? "How abſurd ſoever the doctrine of two principles "appeared, the one good, the other bad, both equally "powerful, and independent of each other, yet it "had a numberleſs multitude of followers, who ima-"gined that it was not poſſible to account otherwiſe "for the evils which happen in this life. It is well "known how much St. Auguſtin laboured to ſatisfy "them upon that ſubject. It is known alſo that "Pelagius, who came afterwards, and whoſe ſyſ-"tem was at firſt very well liked, endeavoured "particularly to remove that Stumbling-block, and "to anſwer that queſtion ſo often diſputed upon at "that time: *Whence comes evil? What is the origin* "*of it?* Now none gave a more probable account "of that origin of our ſufferings, and of the diffe-"rent ſhare of them allotted to each of us, than "the Origeniſts (77)."

** Hier. Ep. 27.

(76) Doucin, *Hiſtoire de l'Origeniſme*, p. 180.

(77) Doucin, Ibid. p. 182.

Obſerve that the Origeniſt in the *Parrhaſiana* ſuppoſes that an everlaſting happineſs is to ſucceed the ſufferings which the damned are to undergo during ſome ages (78). This removes the moſt terrible difficulty of the Manicheans, namely, the eternity of moral and natural evil in Hell. But father Dou-"cin repreſents us Origen's doctrine otherwiſe: he does

(78) See the remark [*E*] quotation (**).

Celſus : it has been publiſhed in French in the year 1700 [*L*]. I have mentioned ſome other editions in the remark [*A*] of the article Perſona. See the margin (*i*).

(*i*) His treatiſe on Prayer, which had never been publiſhed, was printed at Oxford in Greek and Latin, in the year 1686. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for June 1686, article 8. It is aſſerted there, from the preface, that Iſaac Voſſius had bought the manuſcript of it at Stockholm : but the truth of the matter is, as I have learnt ſince that time from a Letter of Mr. Huet, which was ſhewed me, that Voſſius carried it to Stockholm, having bought it about the year 1636 of Mr. Rums, Phyſician to the Queen of Bohemia, who had bought it of the ſoldiers who plundered the Library of Worms. That manuſcript having paſſed from Iſaac Voſſius's hands, into thoſe of Herbert Thorndike's, came at laſt into Dr. Gale's hands, who put it in the Library of Trinity College at Cambridge. See Dr. Cave, de ſcript. eccleſ. part. 2. p. 30. edit. Genev. 1699.

does not ſuppoſe it ſo proper to anſwer thoſe Hereticks ; for he aſſerts that the Origeniſts denied alſo the eternity of happineſs. Beſides that, " Origen " judged it was cruel to make the ſufferings of the " damned laſt for ever ; the eternity of torments " ſeemed to him inconſiſtent with the eſſential pro- " priety of all that is created, namely, inſtability. He " aſſerted therefore, that as much as God is uncapa- " ble of any change, ſo the creature muſt be unca- " pable of being fixed to any permanent and eter- " nal State, either with regard to good or evil. He " maintained therefore, that when all the ſpirits, " being purified of their ſpots, ſhould have been again " united to the divine nature ††, of which they are " emanations, according to him, they would again " be ſeparated from it, like ſparks of fire which fly " from a furnace ; and as a puniſhment for this in- " conſtancy §§ . . . . they would be condemned to " enter into new bodies ; for which purpoſe it would " be neceſſary to create new worlds, and that thus " there would be during the whole eternity con- " tinual and periodical revolutions like that of the " ſeaſons (79)." Father Doucin's marginal note deſerves to be tranſcribed : for it acquaints us that there was a branch of Spinoziſm in the ſyſtem of Origen, " namely, the identity of all the ſpirits with the " divine nature, that is to ſay, that all the ſpirits " are the ſame with God." Here follows then what that author obſerves, after quoting St. Jerom's words. " Obſerve that Rufinus has omitted that " paſſage in his tranſlation. Read the laſt chapter " of the third book, where theſe words, *Et erit* " *Deus in omnibus*, *God will be all in all*, are explain- " ed at length. St. Jerom continues thus : *Ne par-* " *vam eſſe putaremus impietatem eorum quæ promiſerat* " *in ejuſdem voluminis (quarti) fine conjungit omnes ra-* " *tionabiles naturas, id eſt, Patrem & Filium & Spiri-* " *tum Sanctum, Angelos, Dominationes, cæteraſque Vir-* " *tutes, ipſum quoque ſecundum animæ dignitatem unius* " *eſſe ſubſtantiæ . . . . Et qui in alio loco Filium & Spi-* " *ritum non vult de Patris eſſe ſubſtantia, ne divinita-* " *tem in partes ſecare videatur, naturam omnipotentis* " *Dei Angelis hominibuſque largitur. Ex quo concludi-* " *tur (inquit) Deum & hæc quodammodo unius eſſe ſub-* " *ſtantiæ. Unum addit verbum, quodammodo, ut tanti* " *ſacrilegii crimen effugeret.*" See l. 3. c. 16. (10), *i. e.* " That we might not think that what he had " obſerved before, is but little impious, at the end " of that ſame (fourth) volume, he joins together in " one all the reaſonable natures, that is to ſay, (he " aſſerts) that the Father, the Son, and the Holy " Ghoſt, the Angels, the Dominions,, and the " other Powers, and even man himſelf with reſpect " to the dignity of his Soul, are of one and the " ſame ſubſtance. . . . . He who in another place " will not acknowledge that the Son and the Holy " Ghoſt are of the ſame ſubſtance with the Father, " leſt he ſhould ſeparate the divine nature into parts, " gives here the nature of God Almighty to the " Angels, and to the men. Whence it muſt be in- " ferred, ſays he, that God and theſe are *in ſome* " *manner*, only to clear himſelf of the crime of ſo " great an impiety."

†† *In libro quoque tertio περὶ ἀρχῶν & poſt diſputationem longiſſimam ad extremum intulit, &* Deus omnia in omnibus, *ut univerſa natura corporea in eam redigatur ſubſtantiam quæ omnibus melior eſt, in divinam ſcilicet, quâ nulla eſt melior.* Origen. apud Hier. Ep. ad Avit.

§§ *Hier. ep. ad Avitum, & Apol.* 2.

(79) Doucin, *Hiſtoire de l'Origenijme*, p. 338.

* I ſuppoſe the word *hominem* is here omitted by miſtake.

(80) Doucin, ib. p. 339.

[*L*] Origen's anſwer to Celſus *has been publiſhed in French.*] Monſieur Bohéreau (81), who is ſo well known by the learned letters which Monſieur le Févre of Saumur wrote to him, is the author of that tranſlation. Our Journaliſts (82) having ſufficiently acquainted the publick with the merit of that work, I need not give an account of it. I ſhall only ſay one thing which will confirm an obſervation I have made ſeveral times, and which is, that we muſt not give much credit to what is ſaid in converſation. I had heard many perſons aſſert, that ſome men of weight in the Reformed Church of Paris, and particularly Monſieur Claude, had endeavoured to diſſuade Monſieur Bohéreau from tranſlating that book into French, becauſe it was not proper all the world ſhould ſee the objections of the Heathen Philoſopher, and compare them with Origen's anſwers. But Monſieur Bohéreau does not ſpeak of it thus : He obſerves (83) *that ſome perſons of an eminent merit, and* amongſt others *the celebrated Monſieur Claude, imagined* (84) *it was dangerous to put Origen into the hands of all the Chriſtians, becauſe of ſome erroneous opinions peculiar to him, with which he has always been charged.* There is, you ſee, a great difference, between what I had heard ſo often, and what Monſieur Bohéreau tells us, who was better acquainted with the truth of the matter than any man elſe. But though he does not mention that pretended reaſon urged by Monſieur Claude, it is nevertheleſs certain that our Journaliſts have mentioned it, and condemned it (85). They had, no doubt, been told the ſame thing with me. I had alſo been told that the tranſlator was of opinion, the whole book of Celſus might be reſtored, if all the paſſages of it, quoted by Origen, were connected together. But ſince he obſerves nothing like this, neither in his Preface, nor in the Remarks, I muſt miſtruſt thoſe who told me that ſtory. There could not be a ſtronger proof than that of Origen's fair dealing ; why then was he not commended upon that account in the Preface to the tranſlation ?

(81) He is of Rochelle ; he is called Elias Bohereilus, in the Letters of Tanaquil le Fevre, (Tanaquillus Faber.)

(82) See *Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Savans*, for December 1699. p. 519, and the *Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres*, for Jan. 1700. p. 3.

(83) In his Pref.

(84) See what has been obſerved againſt ſuch a thought, in the *Nouv. de la Rep des Lettres*, for June 1686. p. 691.

(85) *Hiſt. des Ouvr. des Savans*, for Dec. 1699, p. 522, and *Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres*, for Jan. 1700, p. 11.

OROBIO (ISAAC), a Jewiſh Phyſician, died at Amſterdam in the year 1687. See the Bibliotheque Univerſelle (*a*).

(*a*) Tom. 7. p. 289, &c.

OROSIUS (PAUL) a Spaniſh Prieſt, flouriſhed in the beginning of the 6th Century. Conſult Moreri ; for as I do not deſign to repeat what he has obſerved, I ſhall give no account of that author : I ſhall only correct ſome miſtakes which relate to him. They who ſuppoſed he was a Monk, and who placed his death under the year 471 [*A*], were ſtill

[*A*] *They who ſuppoſed he was a Monk, and who place his death under the year* 471.] You will meet with their names in Philip Elſſius, whoſe credulity well deſerved the following cenſure from father Labbe : *Ut omittam fabuloſos quoſdam Hiſpanos ſcriptores, quos citat ſequiturque Philippus Elſſius, qui Auguſtinianis ſuis Eremitis accenſet, vitamque ejus prorogat uſque ad annum* 471, *quo centenario majorem in Carthagine Spartaria in Hiſpaniis obiiſſe contendit, atque inde Romam aſportatum & in Eccleſia S. Euſebii, ubi patruus ejus jacebat, ſepultum. Sed hæc penitus incerta dubiæque fidei. Quid quod & nonnulli Legionenſem Epiſcopum fuiſſe putent* (1) ? *i. e.* " Not to mention ſome fabulous Spaniſh wri- " ters, whom Philip Elſſius quotes and follows ; who " reckons Oroſius amongſt his Auſtin-Friars, and " makes him live till the year 471, when he aſſerts, " that he died, being above an hundred years old, " at Cartagena, in Spain, whence he was, accord- " ing to him, carried to Rome, and buried in the " church of St. Euſebius, where his uncle lay. But " all this is uncertain and dubious. But what ſhall " we ſay of ſome, who imagine that he was Biſhop " of Leon ? "

(1) *Philippus Labbe, Diſſert. de Script. Eccleſ.* Tom. 2. p. 175.

[*B*] *They*

ſtill more miſtaken than they who made him a Heathen [*B*], and as much as thoſe who ſuppoſe he was a Biſhop. It is not true that St. Auguſtin deſired him *to write the hiſtory of the moſt conſiderable events which happened ſince* JESUS CHRIST [*C*]; and that Oroſius which

[*B*] *They who made him a heathen.*] Father Garaſſe has been guilty of that blunder, and even in a work in which he endeavours to convince the Atheiſts by the teſtimony of the unbelievers. *The ſecond wonder of this nature*, ſays he (2), *which I bring in as a teſtimony, are the aſhy apples of Gomorrha, and the pillar of ſalt, two authentick monuments, which have for their vouchers, not only the ſacred hiſtorians, and the fathers who wrote upon the 19th chapter of Geneſis, but alſo all the prophane hiſtorians, who mention the Lake Aſphaltites, as Joſephus, Solinus, Oroſius, Pliny and Tacitus.* Obſerve another blunder of Garaſſe; he aſſerts falſely, that Solinus, Pliny and Tacitus have mentioned the pillar of ſalt.

(2) Garaſſe, *Somme Theologique*, p. 192.

[*C*] *It is not true, that St. Auguſtin deſired him to write the hiſtory of the moſt conſiderable events . . . . ſince* JESUS CHRIST.] "The city of Rome being "taken in the year 410 by Alaric King of the Goths, "the Heathens, with a deſign to render the Chriſtians odious, charged them with being the cauſe "of that misfortune, and of all the other calamities, "under which the Roman Empire groaned. In order to clear the Chriſtians of that imputation Oroſius undertook, at St. Auguſtin's requeſt, to write "the hiſtory of the moſt conſiderable events, which "happened ſince JESUS CHRIST to his own time, in "order to ſhew that there had always happened from "time to time great misfortunes in the world, and that "the Roman Empire had never been more free from "them than the birth of JESUS CHRIST (3)." I have tranſcribed at length Monſieur Du Pin's words, becauſe they are proper to acquaint the reader with the occaſion and deſign of that work of Oroſius: but I muſt beg leave to obſerve, that St. Auguſtin in his requeſt did not confine himſelf to the events which happened after the birth of CHRIST: he aſked for a general collection of the greateſt misfortunes, the memory of which was preſerved in hiſtory. *Præceperas mihi*, ſays Oroſius to him (4), *uti adverſus vaniloquam pravitatem eorum, qui alieni à civitate dei, ex locorum agreſtium compitis & pagis pagani vocantur, ſive gentiles, quia terrena ſapiunt: qui cum futura non quærant, præterita autem aut obliviſcantur, aut neſciant, præſentia tantum tempora veluti malis extra ſolitum infeſtiſſima, ob hoc ſolum, quòd creditur CHRISTUS, & colitur deus, idola autem minus coluntur, infamant: præceperas ergo, ut ex omnibus, qui haberi ad præſens poſſunt, hiſtoriarum atque annalium factis, quæcunque aut bellis gravia, aut corrupta morbis, aut * ſanè triſtia, aut terrarum motibus terribilia, aut inundationibus aquarum inſolita, aut eruptionibus ignium metuenda, aut ictibus fulminum plagiſque grandinum ſæva, vel etiam parricidiis flagitiiſque miſera, per tranſacta retrò ſæcula reperiſſem, ordinato breviter voluminis textu explicarem*, i. e. "You deſired me to anſwer the vain and idle "objections of thoſe who are called Pagans from "their living in villages †, or Gentiles, becauſe "they mind only earthly § things; men who do "not reflect on futurity, who forget or do not know "what is paſt, and cry down the preſent time as being more unhappy than the former ages, becauſe ', men believe in Chriſt, worſhip God, and neglect "the idols: you deſired me therefore to collect from "all the hiſtories and annals that can be found as "preſent, the account of wars, plagues, earthquakes, "floods, conflagrations, thunder and lightning, "murders, and other crimes, which have rendered "former ages unfortunate, and to write an abridgment "of all this in a ſmall volume." Of the ſeven books which make up Oroſius's work, the laſt only treats of the events which happened after Jeſus Chriſt. Farther, I am not fully perſuaded that the author undertook to ſhew, that the Roman Empire was never more free from great misfortunes than ſince the eſtabliſhment of the Chriſtian Religion. He would have had a hard taſk upon his hands. I think that Gennadius gives us a better account of the hiſtorian's deſign. He ſhews, ſays he, it is owing to the Chriſtian Religion, that the Roman Commonwealth, which did not deſerve to continue, is nevertheleſs ſtill ſubſiſting (5). I know that Oroſius challenges the unbelievers to ſhew that at any time the State had proſpered ſo wonderfully as it did under Honorius; but this does not prove the truth of the aſſertion which I pretend to find fault with here. *Ex quo utcunque conceſſerim, ut licenter Chriſtiana tempora reprehendantur, ſi quid à conditione mundi uſque ad nunc ſimili factum felicitate doceatur. Manifeſtavimus, ut arbitror, atque oſtendimus non magis verbo pene quàm digito innumera bella ſopita, plurimos extinctos tyrannos, compreſſas, coanguſtatas, addictas, exinanitaſque immaniſſimas gentes minimo ſanguine, nullo certamine, ac pene ſine cæde* (6), i. e. "I will allow theſe reproaches, "which are ſo freely caſt upon the times of Chriſtianity, if it can be proved from the creation of "the world to this time there ever was ſo happy a "ſucceſs as this. We have ſhewed, I think, and "proved, that by the lifting up of a finger only, "rather than by a word of command, numberleſs "wars have been ended, tyrants extinct, whole nations quieted, ſubdued, and weakened with a very "little effuſion of blood, without a battle, and al"moſt without ſlaughter." Monſieur Du Pin, when he mentioned Oroſius's ſcheme, remembered perhaps a paſſage from another Father, but not ſo diſtinctly as not to imagine it was from Oroſius. It is ſet down as a matter of fact in that paſſage, that the Goſpel had very much abated the fury of the wars, which had occaſioned ſo much havock in the world before the time of the Apoſtles. *Quanquam iſta quæ dicitis bella Religionis noſtræ ob invidiam commoveri, non ſit difficile comprobare, poſt auditum Chriſtum in mundo non tantum non aucta, verum etiam majore ex parte furiarum compreſſionibus imminuta. Nam cum hominum vis tantæ magiſteriis ejus acceperimus legibus, malum malo rependi non oportere; injuriam perpeti quam irrogare eſſe præſtantius; ſuum potius fundere, quam alieno polluere manus & conſcientiam cruore: habet à Chriſto beneficium jamdudum orbis ingratus, per quem feritatis mollita eſt rabies, atque hoſtiles manus cohibere à ſanguine cognati animantis occæpit* (7), i. e. "Though it be not difficult to prove, "that thoſe very wars, which you ſay are raiſed "out of hatred againſt our religion, are not only "not encreaſed ſince the coming of Chriſt; but are "even carried on with much leſs fury than before. "For ſince ſuch a vaſt number of men, as we are, "have learnt from Chriſt's laws, that we muſt not "return evil for evil; that it is more noble to ſuffer "an injury, than to do one; that we ought rather to "ſpill our own blood, than to defile our hands and "conſciences with the blood of another: the ungrateful world has now long ago enjoyed that bleſſing "from Chriſt, by which men's rage is mollified, and "by which they have learnt to abſtain from ſhedding "with an hoſtile hand the blood of their fellow"creatures." This argument of Arnobius comes to this. They who have embraced the Goſpel have learnt to ſuffer injuries, and not to repel force by force; they have diveſted themſelves of all reſentment, they are become meek and peaceful: ſo that ſince the propagation of the Goſpel, the ſhedding of human blood, and the furies of the wars are become ſo much the leſs, as a great number of perſons have embraced the Chriſtian Faith. Arnobius adds, that if the wars are not entirely ſuppreſſed, it is becauſe all men have not followed the laws of Chriſt. *Quod ſi omnes omnino, qui homines ſe eſſe non ſpecie corporum, ſed rationis intelligunt poteſtate, ſalutaribus ejus pacificiſque decretis aurem vellent commodare pauliſper, & non faſtu & ſupercilio luminis, ſuis potius ſenſibus, quam illius commonitionibus crederent: univerſus jam dudum orbis mitiora in opera converſis uſibus ferri, tranquillitate in molliſſima degeret, & in concordiam ſalutarum incorruptis fœderum ſanctionibus conveniret* (8), i. e. "If all "they, who underſtand they are men, not by the "outward ſhape of their body, but by their reaſon, "and mind, would a little hearken to his wholeſome and peaceable laws, and inſtead of being "ſwayed by the haughty opinion of their own "wiſdom, and following their own ſenſes, if they "would be adviſed by him; the whole world, having turned iron to ſome more profitable and gentle

(3) Du Pin, *Nouv. Bibliotb.* Tom. 3. p. 156, of the Amſterdam edition.

(4) In Proœmio lib. 1. See alſo the concluſion of the work.

* It ſhould perhaps be *fame*.

† Called *Pagi* in Latin.

§ Oroſius ſeems to have thought that *Gens*, from which comes *Gentiles*, is derived from the Greek word γῆ, *the earth*.

(5) *Oſtendit magis Chriſtianæ obſervantiæ eſſe quod contra meritum ſuum Reſp. Romana adhuc duraret, & pace culturæ Dei pacatum retineret imperium.* Gennadius *in* Vita Oroſii.

(6) Oroſius, lib. 6.

(7) Arnobius, lib. 1. p. 5.

(8) Ibid. p. 6.

wrote that hiſtory after St. Auguſtin's death [*D*]. One cannot reaſonably cenſure Iſaac Caſaubon for his contempt for that work [*E*]; which is nevertheleſs pretty uſeful, and of which there are ſeveral editions [*F*]. I make uſe of the Cologne edition 1572, which does not contain ſo many notes of Francis Fabricius as I could wiſh.

It is thought Oroſius intitled his work *De Miſeria Humana*, of the miſery of men. It was a very proper title, which well becomes hiſtory in general, as a judicious author has very

" uſe, would live in a delicious tranquillity, and a-
" gree a bleſſed union eſtabliſhed by the moſt ho-
" ly and inviolable covenant." An author, miſta-king here one writer for another, I mean, who ſhould aſcribe to Oroſius, what belongs to Arnobius, might very eaſily aſſert that Oroſius ſhews, *the Roman Empire was never more free from* great misfortunes, *than ſince the birth of* Jesus Christ. But it is proper to obſerve, that Arnobius does by no means prove this: for beſides that, a bare argument, without any enumeration of facts, is not ſufficient to anſwer the complaints which the Heathens made at that time, it muſt be confeſſed, that Arnobius gives us here a very ſlight proof. Suppoſe that ſome of the inhabitants of a great empire give up all revenge, and carefully cheriſh the meek ſpirit of the Goſpel; can this prevent ſtrangers from laying waſte that Empire, and from bringing into it diſorders and misfortunes, which were not felt before? Now this was the complaint which Arnobius pretends to anſwer (9). He urges other arguments very concluſive againſt that ſame charge of the Heathens, and againſt that which they grounded on the plagues and famines, to which the Roman Empire was expoſed: but let us alſo confeſs, that he urges ſome arguments ſo ſcandalous, that I do not believe Epicurus or Lucretius could have attacked Providence ſo ſtrongly as he does, or more ſmartly bantered thoſe, who aſcribe to God's anger, the misfortunes of mankind.

(9) *Nam quod nobis objectare conſueſtis bellorum frequentium cauſas, waſtationes urbium, Germanorum & Scythicas irruptiones, cum pace hoc veſtra, & cum bona venia dixerim, quale ſit iſtud quod dicitur, calumniarum libidine non videtis.* Idem, ibid. p. 5.

(10) *Bibliotheca Hiſpan.* p. 206.

[*D*] . . . . *and that Oroſius wrote that hiſtory after St. Auguſtin's death.*] The Jeſuit, Andrew Schot, has been guilty of that miſtake. *Defuncto*, ſays he (10), *hac mortali vita S. Auguſtino Romæ degebat, ubi* ſeptem contra Gentes Libris *res Græcorum Romanorumque domi militiæque geſtas fideliter eo potiſſimum conſilio contexuit, quo ethnicorum calumniam, quæ Chriſtianis mala calamitateſque temere imputabat, refelleret . . . . floruit autem anno a nato Chriſto* 440. *i. e.* " After St. Auſtin's " death, Oroſius lived at Rome, where he wrote his " ſeven books againſt the Heathens, which contain " the hiſtory of the Greeks and the Romans: he com-" poſed it with a deſign to refute the calumny of the " Heathens, who unfairly imputed to the Chriſtians " all the evils and misfortunes which befel the Em-" pire. . . . He flouriſhed in the year 440, ſince " the birth of Chriſt." St. Auguſtin died in the year 430. Now it is certain, that Oroſius put the finiſhing hand to his work (11), when Vallia, King of the Goths, was juſt going to make a treaty of peace with the Emperor Honorius, that is to ſay, in the year 416. The laſt words of his hiſtory are directed to St. Auguſtin, as to a man then ſtill living; and we learn from another paſſage (12), that St. Auguſtin had publiſhed only the ten firſt books of the *City of God*, when Oroſius was about compoſing his work according to the ſcheme, which that Saint had furniſhed him with.

(11) See the concluſion of his hiſtory.

(12) Oroſius, in *Proœmio Hiſtor.*

[*E*] *Caſaubon's contempt for that work.*] He ſhewed his contempt in very civil expreſſions, and with many commendations of Oroſius's zeal. *Oroſium, ex quo multa in hoc ſermone deſcribit, ſcriptorem alioquin optimum & zelo domus Dei plenum, ſi nimiæ facilitatis in talibus credendis poſtulaverimus, non deerunt viri præſtantiſſimi, quorum exemplo factum tueamur: non rationes validiſſimæ, quibus ſanctum virum ταχυπειθίας, & nimiæ credulitatis, reum peragamus. Taceo rerum Romanarum ignorationem aliquando mirificam: etiam Baronio teſte non ſemel* (13). *i. e.* " If I have charged Oroſius, from " whom he has tranſcribed many things in this diſ-" courſe, and who was otherwiſe a very good man, " and very zealous for the houſe of God, if I have " charged him, I ſay, with too eaſy a belief in " theſe matters, I may quote many eminent " men, whoſe example juſtifies me; and I have ve-" ry ſtrong arguments to prove that holy man guilty " of too eaſy a belief, and too great a credulity: not " to mention his ignorance in the Roman Hiſtory, " which Baronius himſelf more than once confeſſes." Lipſius had not the ſame regard for Oroſius; for having obſerved, that that Author imagined Tiberius put Druſus in priſon, he adds, *At me non valde movent ejuſmodi ſcriptores, legitimæ hiſtoriæ (dicam iratis quorundam auribus) dehoneſtamenta* (14), *i. e.* " But " I do not much mind ſuch writers, whoſe works " (I muſt ſay it, though ſome men will be angry at it) " are a diſgrace to true hiſtory." In another place, after lamenting the loſs of ſome books of Tacitus, he cries out to him, *Adeo bonis illis patribus cura otiumque fuit deſcribere Oroſios & Vopiſcos & hujuſmodi quiſquilias præ tuo auro* (15), *i. e.* " Thus theſe good Fa-" thers choſe to employ their pains and leiſure in " tranſcribing ſuch writers as Oroſius, Vopiſcus, and " ſuch other traſh, rather than your gold." I do not like this flight of Lipſius, ſo well as I do the moderate cenſure of Caſaubon and Voſſius. The latter tells us only, that Oroſius was unacquainted with the Greek tongue, that he blunders often againſt chronology, and that he gives too much credit to common reports. *Eſt Oroſius ſcriptor planè utilis; ſed qui ſcriptores Græcos non legerit: imo Græcarum literarum expers fuerit. In temporibus etiam crebrò fallitur. Ut vel illa oſtendunt, quæ in eo caſtigavit Scaliger in Animadverſionibus Euſebianis. Sæpius etiam vulgares ſectatur opiniones, quam hiſtoricum* (16). *Perquirat, cujus eſt omnia ad veritatis trutinam expendere* (17).

(13) Caſaubon. *Exercitat.* 1. *in Baronium*, num. 12. p. m. 85.

(14) Lipſ. in *Tacit. Annal.* lib. 4. p. m. 193.

(15) Idem, in lib. 5. *Annal. Tacit.* p. 232.

(16) There is here an enormous error of the preſs. Voſſius wrote, no doubt, *quam Hiſtorici officium requirat*, or ſomething like it. A little lower there is another error of the ſame kind. *Haut inutilis Oroſius. Sed Tranquillus ad Tacitum?*

[*F*] . . . *There are ſeveral editions of it.*] Paul Oroſius's hiſtory was printed at Paris in the year 1506 for Petit; Monſieur Du Pin aſſerts it (18). Geſner (19) does not mention that edition; the moſt antient he ſpeaks of is that of Paris, 1524, *apud Joan. Parvum aut Petrum Vidovæum in folio.* I add, that they printed a more correct edition of it at Cologne, in the year 1536, *apud Cervicornum*, in 8vo, and afterwards another in the ſame city, in the year 1542, *apud Jaſparem Genepæum*, in 8vo. I have ſeen this laſt edition: John Cæſarius wrote the dedication of it; and corrected ſome paſſages in the Text. Francis Fabricius, of Duren, who publiſhed that book at Cologne in the year 1561, *apud Maternum Cholinum*, in 8vo, mentions two former editions, which were full of errors: one of theſe two editions muſt be that of the year 1526 (20); for Fabricius ſpeaks thus (21): *Hoc dico, dolendum fuiſſe, tanti viri tam fructuoſam Hiſtoriam adeo mendoſe hactenus in manibus verſari. Contulerat eam cum aliquot manuſcriptis exemplaribus ante annos* 25 *Gerardus Bolſuinge: laboravit deinde in eadem emendanda doctiſſ. vir Johannes Cæſarius: ſed profecto neceſſe eſt, ut vel eorum exemplaria non fuerint diligenter ſatis deſcripta, vel ipſi parum accurate opus perſpexerint. Tot menda relicta ab illis deprehendi, poſtquam eorum libros cum tribus manuſcriptis conferre cœpi*; *i. e.* " It was a pity, that the uſeful hiſtory of ſo " great a man continued ſo long full of errors. Ge-" rard Bolſwing compared it 25 years ago with ſome " Manuſcripts; afterwards, the learned John Cæſa-" rius laboured to correct it: but, either their work " was not correctly printed from their manuſcripts, " or they did not examine it accurately; conſidering " the many errors I found they left in it, when I " came to compare their editions with three manu-" ſcripts." The edition Fabricius gave, was reprinted at Cologne, in the year 1572, in 8vo, by the ſame printer, who added to it the Apology *de Arbitrii libertate* (22). Father Labbe (23) mentions this laſt edition, as though it had been publiſhed in the year 1574. I have a copy which bears that date. Monſieur Du Pin (24) places it under the year 1582. Father Labbe (25) mentions an edition of Paris 1526, and another of Mentz 1615, *cum notis Latii & Schotte* (26), *quam nondum vidi*, (which I have not yet ſeen) adds he. I am apt to think that there are ſome errors in the numbers, whence it comes to paſs, that inſtead of one edition, they mention two or

(17) Voſſius *de Hiſtor. Latinis*, p. 217.

(18) Du Pin, *Nouvelle Bibliotheq.* Tom. 3. p. 156.

(19) In Biblioth. folio 539 *verſo.*

(20) It is that indeed, for I have ſeen it. It is printed at Cologne, *apud Eucherium Cervicornum*, in folio.

(21) Franciſcus Fabricius Marcoduranus, *in Epiſtola nuncupatoria* Oſorii.

(22) See Voſſius *de Hiſt. Latin.* p. 218.

(23) *De Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.* Tom. 2. p. 176.

(24) *Nouv. Bibl.* Tom. 3. p. 156.

(25) *De Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.* Tom. 2. p. 175.

(26) He ought to have ſaid *Ludovici Lautii & Andreæ Schotti.*

very well obſerved [*G*].

or three to us. For inſtance, Monſieur du Pin's edition of 1506, and that of Father Labbe, of 1526, ſeem to me to differ only through an error of the preſs. I leave the judgment of it to thoſe, who can meet with all ſorts of editions, and compare them together.

Mr. Van Dale, a Phyſician of Haerlem, and famous for his treatiſe *de Oraculis*, has been ſo kind as to let me know, there is an edition of Oroſius printed at Venice *opera & expenſis Bernardini Veneti de Vitalibus anno ab incarnatione Domini MD, die* 12 *menſis Octobris regnante Domino Auguſtino Barbadico.*

[*G*] De miſeria humana . . . . *was a very proper title, which well becomes hiſtory in general, as a judicious author has very well obſerved.*] That author is James Bongars: ſee the preface he put to the edition he publiſhed of ſeveral hiſtorians of the holy wars. He warns his Readers, that none but impious and wicked men can urge the ſuperſtitions, wickedneſſes, and profanations, which are to be met with in theſe writers, as ſo many arguments againſt virtue. For, adds he, the hiſtorians do not relate what men ſhould do, but what they actually have done. *Annalium conſcriptores*, ſays one of them (27), *non qualia optant ipſi, ſed qualia miniſtrant tempora, mandare ſolent literis ex officio.* Hiſtory is a repreſentation of human life. Now ſuch being the condition of human life, that the number of the wicked and of the impious, as well as of the ſilly, is infinite, hiſtory can be nothing elſe but a deſcription of man's miſery. *Eſt humanæ vitæ ſpeculum, hiſtoria: humanæ verò vitæ ea ratio, ut non ſtultorum tantum, ſed improborum etiam atque impiorum infinitus ſit numerus. Itaque rectè omninò ſuam Paulus Oroſius de* miſeria hominum *inſcripſit* *. *Etenim quid aliud hiſtoria? cujus in ipſo limine, primi parentis ſtultum cupidinem, impium animum horreas: mox madefactam ſanguine fraterno magnam Matrem: inde in omne ſcelus præcipitatum genus humanum. . . . Itaque, ex uſu & multitudine qui patrocinium vitiis quærit, is omnium ætatum, omniumque gentium hiſtoriographos, is hodie hominum univerſitatem, à ſe habeat. Idem verò ſciat: cum de Veritate: cum de Virtute quæritur, illud diſceſſionum locum non habere:* Hæc pars major eſſe videtur; *ideo enim pejor, qui major* (28); *i. e.* " . . . With very much " reaſon therefore did Paul Oroſius give his hiſtory this " title, *Of the Miſery of Men* †: for what elſe is hiſto- " ry? the very beginning of which, ſhews us the " fooliſh deſires and wicked heart of our firſt parents: " next we ſee the mother-earth wet with the " blood of a brother ſlain by his brother; then the " whole race of men abandoned to all manner of " crimes. . . . He therefore who would juſtify his vi- " ces by the common practice of the multitude, may " have the hiſtorians of all ages and nations, and " now-a-days the whole world on his ſide. But let " him know, that when the queſtion is about truth, " and about virtue, it is not to be determined " by a majority. *The majority ſeems to be on that* " *ſide:* for that very reaſon it is the worſt, becauſe " the majority is on that ſide." Take notice of what Bongars obſerves: in the very entrance of hiſtory, we meet with the folly and wickedneſs of the firſt man: this is the very firſt ſtep the Reader makes; next he walks on an earth tainted with the blood which a brother makes to flow with life itſelf from the body of his brother. How like is the foundation of the univerſe to the building of Rome (29)! I have given in another place (30) Malherbe's reflection on Cain's action.

(27) William of Tyre.

* *Ita in antiquiſſimo libro inſcriptam Oroſii hiſtoriam vidimus.*

(28) Bongarſius, *Præfatione ad* Geſta Dei per Francos, *in fine.*

† Thus it is intitled in a very ancient Manuſcript.

(29) *Fraterno primi maduerunt ſanguine muri.* Lucanum Pharſ. lib. 1. ver. 95. *i. e.* " Were not " our walls firſt " built in bro- " ther's blood?" Rowe.

(30) In the remark [*E*] of the article CAIN.

☞ OSBORN (FRANCIS), an eminent Engliſh writer in the 17th Century, was youngeſt ſon of Sir John Oſborn of Chickſand near Shefford in Bedfordſhire, and brother of Sir Peter Oſborn; and was born about the year 1590. He was educated in a private manner, without ever having the advantage of being brought up in an Univerſity [*A*]; and at ripe years frequented the court, and was retained in the ſervice of the Pembroke family, and was at length maſter of the horſe to William Earl of Pembroke. Upon the breaking out of the civil wars he adhered to the Parliament party, and had ſeveral publick employments then and under Cromwell conferred upon him. In the latter part of his life he lived at Oxford, in order to print ſeveral books, which he had written [*B*], and to have an eye upon his ſon, whom he procured by the favour of the Parliament-Viſitors to be appointed Fellow of All-Souls College in 1648. His *Advice to a Son*, ſoon after the publication of it, being publickly complained of to Dr. John Conant, Vice-

[*A*] *He was educated in a private manner, without ever having the advantage of being brought up in an univerſity.*] In the firſt part of his *Advice to a Son* (1), he writes thus: " Tho' I can never pay enough to " your grandfather's memory, for his tender care of " my education; yet I muſt obſerve in it this miſ- " take, that by keeping me at home, where I was " one of *my young maſters*, I loſt the advantage of my " moſt docile time. For not to undergo the ſame " diſcipline, I muſt needs come ſhort of their expe- " rience, that are bred in free-ſchools, who by plot- " ting to rob an orchard, *&c.* run thro' all the ſub- " tilties required in taking of a town; being made " by uſe familiar to ſecrecy and compliance with op- " portunity, qualities never after to be attained at " cheaper rates than the hazard of all. Whereas " theſe ſee the danger of truſting others, and the " rocks they fall upon by a too obſtinate adhering to " their own imprudent reſolutions; and all this un- " der no higher a penalty than a whipping. And " 'tis poſſible this indulgence of my father might be " the cauſe I afforded him ſo poor a return for all " his coſt."

(1) Sect. 1. No. 1.

[*B*] *Several books, which he had written.*] They are as follow: 1. *A ſeaſonable expoſtulation with the* Netherlands, *declaring their ingratitude to, and the neceſſity of their agreement with, the Commonwealth of England*, Oxford 1652, in two ſheets and an half in 4to. 2. *Perſuaſive to mutual compliance under the preſent Government*, Oxford, 1652, in two ſheets in 4to. 3. *Plea for a Free State, compared with a Monarchy*; printed with the preceding, in four ſheets in 4to. 4. *The private Chriſtian's* non ultra: *Or, a Plea for the Layman's interpreting the Scriptures*, Oxford 1656, in three ſheets and an half in 4to. There is no name to this; but it is ſuppoſed to be written by our Author. 5. *Advice to a Son*, in two parts. The *firſt part* was printed at Oxford 1656, in 8vo, and within two years after, were five more impreſſions of it. The *ſecond part* was printed at Oxford, in 1658. 6. *Political Reflections upon the Government of the Turks.* 7. *A Diſcourſe upon* Nicholas Machiavel: *Or, an impartial Examination of the juſtneſs of the Cenſure commonly laid upon him.* 8. *Obſervations upon the King of Sweden's Deſcent into Germany.* 9. *A Diſcourſe upon* Piſo *and* Vindex, *who both conſpired the death of* Nero, *though with a contrary ſucceſs.* 10. *A Diſcourſe upon the Greatneſs and Corruption of the Court of Rome.* 11. *A Diſcourſe upon the Election of Pope Leo* XI. 12. *Political Occaſions of the Defection from the Church of Rome.* 13. *A Diſcourſe in Vindication of* Martin Luther. Theſe eight laſt pieces were printed together ſeveral times at Oxford in 8vo. 14. *Traditional Memorials of the Reign of Queen* Elizabeth, London 1658, in 8vo. 15. *Traditional Memoirs on the Reign of King* James, London 1658, in 8vo. 16. *A Miſcellany of ſundry Eſſays, Paradoxes, and problematical Diſcourſes, Letters and Characters*, London 1659, in 8vo. 17. *Deductions from the Hiſtory of the Earl of Eſſex, who was executed for Treaſon under the Reign of Queen* Elizabeth, London 1659, in 8vo. There is a *Dialogue of Polygamy* tranſlated from Italian into Engliſh by a Perſon

Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, as of irreligious tendency [*C*]; there was a propoſal made to have it publickly burnt; but that taking no effect, it was ordered July 27, 1658, that no bookſellers nor any other perſons ſhould ſell it. He died February 11, 1659, aged about 70, at Nether-worton near Dodington in Oxfordſhire, in the houſe of William Draper, Eſq; whoſe ſiſter he had married, and was interred in the church there, where a monument was erected to his memory (*a*). Mr. Edmund Sawyer in his *Preface* to Sir *Ralph Winwood's Memorials of Affairs of State* (*b*), quoting a paſſage out of Mr. Oſborne concerning the Earl of Saliſbury, Lord Treaſurer in the reign of King James I. ſtiles *him an Author of more Malice than Learning*.

(*a*) Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. 1. col. 308, 309. 2d edit.

(*b*) Edit. Lond. 1725, in folio, three Volumes.

ſon of Quality, and dedicated to *the Author of that well known Treatiſe, called*, Advice to a Son. Mr. Wood tells us (2), that Dr. Barlow ſaid, "That it "was ſuſpected, that Francis Oſborn, Author of "*Advice to a Son*, an old atheiſtical Courtier then "(1657) living in Oxford, did tranſlate the ſaid book "into Engliſh, and dedicate it to himſelf." This tranſlation was publiſhed at Oxford, 1657, in 8vo. After our Author's death, there was printed a book, intitled, *A Modeſt Plea for an equal Commonwealth againſt Monarchy*, &c. with other things added to it, as *An Apology for younger Brothers*, and *A Lift at Tithes*, &c. all which were printed twice in 1659, in 4to and 8vo. "Theſe three Treatiſes, *ſays Mr.* Wood "(3), tho' they were publiſhed by another perſon as "his, yet ſome ſcholars, more envious than prudent, "did not ſtick to ſay, that the Publiſher found them "among the papers of *Fr. Oſborn* (with whom he had "intimate acquaintance) after his death, and diſ-"guiſing the language, or making ſome alterations "in it, publiſhed them as his own. However, all "that knew him well, and were intimate with him "(as the Writer of theſe matters was) knew him to "be able to write ſuch a book as that was."

(2) *Athen.* Oxon. vol. 1. col. 309.

(3) Ibid.

[*C*] *His* Advice to a Son, *ſoon after the publication of it, being complained of . . . . as of irreligious tendency.*] Mr. Wood tells us (4), that *it was then noted among the* godly Miniſters *that this piece did inſtil principles of atheiſm into* Students at Oxford. But this imputation of Atheiſm, ſeems to be extremely groundleſs, and is abſolutely contradicted by the concluſion of the *Second Part* of the *Advice to a Son*, in which our author explodes Atheiſm, writing as follows: "I hold in charity no leſs than commerce "with all ſorts of people, that do acknowledge a "divine and univerſal providence; but abominate "thoſe, that have the impudence no leſs than "the indiſcretion to deny it openly in their words "or tacitly in their actions, as ſuch cannot but be "thought to do, that deſtroy others under a pretence "of ſanctity, merely to enrich themſelves; who "deny God no leſs in his juſtice than the other in "his power, ſince without a creator, man muſt be "the product of a contingency, together with all "things extant, if not the maker of himſelf; or, "which is as prodigious an abſurdity, nothing out "of its own ſtrength muſt have produced all things. "Nor could ſo many deſcend into this low and "damnable error, were they not led by that com-"mon calculation incident to the creature, through "which each in its reſpective gradation is rendered "out of ignorance unable, or out of pride unwil-"ling to find a ſublimer excellency than his own; "the cauſe, not only that the virtues, but the Gods "themſelves were by the Heathens repreſented in "human ſhapes, and their inclinations confined to "the ſame ſins and paſſions Mortals are found "ſubject to: it exceeding the largeſt extent in na-"ture to comprehend a higher wiſdom than his "own, or to aſſign it to a more noble aſpect, or fur-"niſh it with richer endowments, than her ſenſes "and experience hath adorned fancy withal; the "Devil being painted as white among the Negroes, "as he is black here. Wherefore knowledge being "at a *non-plus* (a thing ſhe doth naturally abhor) "many, becauſe they cannot decipher a reaſon, "why providence in this world appears ſo oft in "the favour (to our ſeeming) of wicked and unjuſt "deſigns, and ſo far diſcourages the good, as to "leave them in the hands of their oppreſſors; they, "like inconſiderate ſeamen, cut the cable of "hope, and forſaking the anchor of providence, "reſign the conduct of all things to fortune, who "is yet ſo conſtant in her viciſſitudes (familiar to "gameſters) that in a ſhort time ſhe doth not only "take away, but returns to every man his money "again. And if the world hath, for ought we "know to the contrary, been till this age igno-"rant in the circulation of the blood, though the "principal engine of life, and ſuch a neceſſary one, "as every creature moves not without; why ſhould "we rob ourſelves of the comfort, and God of the "honour of managing whatſoever happens, though "yet ignorant of the manner and reaſon of his do-"ing it, which hereafter we ſhall ſee revealed; the "age of man being too ſhort to diſcover every ſpoke "in this wheel, that may within a ſpan or two be "twiſting the deſtruction of thoſe that are now at "the top? Nor can any man gueſs how another "fares by an outward aſpect taken from his move-"able; but muſt ſleep with him, and enter into "his boſom, which God doth, and can no doubt "by ſlacking of grief in one, and winding up "tears and jealouſies in another, make the world "even; it being the ſpring and intrinſic part of the "watch, that the workman looks after, and not the "caſe, though it may poſſibly be gold, or ſome "richer materials, which the rabble do uſually caſt "their eyes upon, as children do on the Lord "Mayor's Pageants, admiring the ſplendor of thoſe, "that ride in them, who conſidered in their own "nature are but mean men's iſſue, and thus adorned "at the city coſt, yet their external varniſh doth ſo "obſtruct the organs of ſenſe, as they do not per-"ceive the pooreſt of the people, that bear them "up, no more than how long they may be able or "found willing to do it." *And if men cannot, by a ſerious reflection upon their own affairs, diſtinguiſh the operations of providence from thoſe of contingency; yet ſince it is the moſt univerſal opinion, and for ought ever I could hear objected to the contrary, the leaſt obſtructed from reaſon or conſent, that every creature holds its production no leſs than preſervation at the will of an Omnipotency, by us ſtiled God, though the ways how he operates be beyond our fathom and paſt finding out; why ſhould not credulity reſt at the brink of this abyſs (by all acknowledged the leaſt dangerous) rather than hazard all hope of future beatitude in the uncomfortable gulf of a wretchleſs atheiſm; there remaining as little viſible loſs to ſuch as award all honour to our Maker, as gain for thoſe that deny him quite? Nor are we bereaved totally of the ſhadow of Omniſcience, ſince from a far lower ſituation than Heaven we are able at one glance to overlook a whole city, and by a ſingle trumpet to alarum an army. Yet our ſenſes are capable to receive no ſmall augmentation from the aſſiſtance of art; an infallible argument, that the perfection of theſe qualities doth not determine in the perſon of any creature, but ſomething paramount to all that hath yet riſen within the compaſs of our experience, it being impoſſible but a ſuperlative perfection ſhould reſt ſomewhere. Nor can we be competent judges of the motions of God, that have nothing to meaſure by but ſenſe, much too weak to diſcern the motion of a ſhadow, or the growth of a plant, till time hath rendered them apparent; wherefore far unable to comprehend the lines of providence, imperceptible to every intelligence but his, who hath the ſole diſpoſure of all things; it not being probable man ſhould comprehend the out-goings of God, whilſt he is not able to give any reaſon for his own.* T.

(4) Col. 308.

OSMAN, Emperor of the Turks, was not ſuffered to ſucceed his father Achmet, becauſe he was under age: but as his uncle Muſtapha, who was raiſed to the throne after Sultan

Sultan Achmet's death, in November 1617 (*a*), ſoon ſhewed himſelf unworthy of that high rank, he was ſoon put again into his cell, and Oſman was choſen in his ſtead. He would make his reign famous by a conſiderable expedition againſt Poland, but he met with a very unfortunate ſucceſs. This gave him an averſion for the Janizaries, and it is thought that under colour of a pilgrimage, he endeavoured to find an opportunity to diſband that Militia. They prevented him: for they roſe againſt him with ſo much fury in the year 1622, that they dethroned him [*A*], *Non ſine Theſeo*, I mean that religion was made one of the ſecret ſprings of his downfal (*b*). Muſtapha, who was reſtored, put him to death, and governed with ſo much weakneſs, that he was a ſecond time depoſed (*c*). This

(*a*) See the *Mercure Francois*, Tom. 5. p. m. 185, for the year 1617, and p. 211, for the year 1618.

(*b*) See the remark [*A*].

(*c*) Obſerve, that at his firſt depoſition, they forced him to declare, that he willingly reſigned the crown. Oſman ſays, in the letter which he wrote to Lewis XIII, that Muſtapha had, of his own accord, diveſted himſelf of his dignity, and deſpiſed it. That letter is inſerted in the *Mercure Francois*, under the year 1618, p. 208, 209.

[*A*] *The Janizaries . . . . roſe againſt him with ſo much fury, that they dethroned him.*] The particular account we meet with of this affair in the Cavalier Nani, is not too prolix to be inſerted here. "The "Turks know of no moderation, no medium in their "paſſions; they either adore their Princes like Gods, "or put them to death like Tyrants. The Emperor "Oſman, who reigned over ſuch an immenſe tract "of land, was in the prime of his age: he did not "meet in Poland with the happy ſucceſs he expected, "nor with the glory his army was made to hope "for: as he hated the Janizaries exceedingly, he "aſcribed his ill ſucceſs to them, and charged "them with being as timorous in the camp, as "they were haughty at Conſtantinople. After he "had concluded a treaty of peace upon diſadvanta-"geous terms, he declared, that from a principle of "devotion, he would take a journey to Mecca: "ſome looked upon it as a frivolous diſcourſe, and "as mere pretence to continue longer in idleneſs in "the Seraglio: others imagined that he deſigned "thereby to conceal the deſign he had to re-"move the Janizaries far from Conſtantinople, to "lead them into Aſia, and to deliver them up in-"to the hands of the Spahis, who are their compe-"titors and their enemies, to diſband them, and to "form a new militia. Men began already to em-"bark the luggage on board the gallies; already "they carried thither tents and pavilions, with large "treaſures to ſerve during that voyage, and to adorn "with rich preſents their Prophet's tomb; when "the Janizaries began to repreſent to one another "in their conferences the inconveniencies of ſuch a "voyage, and the conveniencies which they would "leave behind. What exaſperated them moſt was, "that they imagined, that being thus at a great diſ-"tance of the capital city, they ſhould be ſo much "the more expoſed to the hatred and cruelty of Oſ-"man. In their quarters they came in a moment "from complaints to an open ſedition. Few began, "but all followed. They aſſembled to the number "of thirty-thouſand, in the ſquare called the Hippo-"dromus. Thence ſome went to the houſe of the "Coza, (thus the Sultan's Tutor is called) whom "they imagined to be the inſtigator of that voyage: "and as they did not meet him at home, they vented "their anger on his houſe, which they plundered. "Others making great ſhouts, went to the Seraglio, "and demanded the heads of the Viſir, of the Chiſ-"lar Aga, and of the Coza. They who were in "the Seraglio, were not only deſtitute of forces, "but alſo of council, and advice; and they, who "by their authority might have headed the rebels, "were the objects of their fury, and the ſame whom "they demanded to tear them in pieces. The Em-"peror, to appeaſe them, ſent them word that he "deſiſted from his intended journey: but this would "not have been ſufficient to diſperſe the rebel Jani-"zaries, who are not uſed to be appeaſed even when "thoſe things are granted them, which they make "the pretence of their mutiny; had it not been for "a heavy rain which fell on a ſudden, and which "that ſuperſtitious nation took for an ill omen. "That ſedition would perhaps have vaniſhed away "towards night, had not ſome interpreters of the "law, who are extremely revered by the ignorant "multitude, ſtirred up again the Janizaries, and de-"clared that Oſman had forfeited his Crown, becauſe "he had tranſgreſſed the Alcoran by ſacrilegious "actions. The Janizaries hearing this loſt all man-"ner of reſpect for their Prince, threw ſtones at "their Aga, who called to mind their oath of alle-"giance; they refuſed three hundred thouſand Ze-"chins, which Cuſſain Baſſa offered them, if they "would be quiet. Though the Seraglio had been "very much fortified in the night time, yet they "maſtered it. They killed firſt ſome Eunuchs with "their leader Chiſlar Aga; they ſearched after-"wards for Muſtapha, who formerly had been rather "like the ſhadow of a Prince, than the true head of "the Empire; they cut off the heads of all thoſe "who did not tell them where he was, without "minding whether they knew it, or not. Laſtly, "having conjectured by ſome hints, that he might "be in a ſubterraneous cave, they went to look for "him there; they found him half dead, for it was "two days ſince he had received any nouriſhment; "when they acquainted him, that they came to make "him Emperor, he aſked that firſt of all they would "give him a few drops of water: but he was hardly "ſeated on the throne, but he ſhewed that his thirſt "was not entirely quenched, and that it could not "be quenched but with his Nephew's blood. Oſman "hid himſelf: but being found out towards even-"ing, he was guarded by the Baſtingi Baſſa, and "brought to the houſe of the Aga of the Janizaries. "Pity began to take the place of anger in the hearts "of ſome, they beheld that young Prince, who "from the higheſt dignity was fallen to the loweſt "degree of misfortune. Oſman, deſigning to win "them entirely, offered fifty Zechins to every "Janizary. Several of them conſented to that pro-"poſal, and their chiefs were already conſulting "together by what means they could ſave him, and "raiſe him again to the throne, when a raging "multitude ſnatched him out of their hands, and "preſented him to Muſtapha. Oſman, with tears "in his eyes, begged hard for his life, repreſenting "to Muſtapha with what kindneſs he had treated "him, having ſpared his life, and preſerved him "for the throne, againſt the cuſtom of the Ottomans. "But as it is uſual with the Barbarians to make fate "the author of all their crimes, Muſtapha would "not be perſuaded: he ſaid he knew very well that "Oſman had ſeveral times given orders to put him "to death; but that God had never ſuffered his "orders to be obeyed. Thus Oſman was delivered "up to the Janizaries, and carried to the ſeven "towers amidſt the execrations of the people, who "having felt under his reign the dreadful effects "of the famine, the plague, and the war, ab-"horred him as the cauſe of all thoſe evils. No "ſooner was he arrived at that priſon, but they cut "off his head (1)." We meet in the *Mercure Francois* (2) with an account of Oſman's death, which is much fuller than this, and which does not agree in every reſpect with the Cavalier Nani's. I ſhall extract but two particulars from it: the one is, that the interpreters of the law and the militia let Oſman know, that he could not go to Mecca without tranſgreſſing the law of Mahomet (3). They had prevailed upon the Mufti to give them that declaration in writing: Oſman had no regard for it, and tore the paper in pieces. The other, that after Muſtapha's election, ſome perſons cried through the city, *Long live Muſtapha, Sultan of the Turks*, and read from a ſheet of paper the cauſes of Sultan Oſman's deprivation, *ſaying it was done becauſe he was an infidel, and becauſe he deſigned to deliver up the Empire of the Turks into the hands of thoſe dogs the Chriſtians*; *al*

(1) Nani, *Hiſt. de Venice*, Liv. 4. p. 126, of the 2d vol. of the Dutch edition, according to Tallemant's French tranſlation.

(2) Tom. 8. p. 357, *&c.* under the year 1622.

(3) *Mercure Francois*, Tom. 8. p. 360.

This ſecond depoſition muſt be placed to the Alcoran's account [*B*], for it was brought about by virtue of a decree of the Pope of the Turks: for thus we may juſtly ſtile their Mufti.

all this they ſaid with a deſign to render him more odious to the people (4).

(4) Ibid. p. 366.

[*B*] *To the Alcoran's account.*] Muſtapha was a ſilly Prince. The Prime Viſier and the other favourites gave a very beautiful name to that weakneſs: they called it holineſs, devotion, reſignation to the will of God. They obliged Muſtapha to lift up his eyes towards Heaven when he appeared in publick, and they ſuppoſed miracles. But the Mufti was not to be impoſed upon. He had it publiſhed abroad that the Alcoran forbad to obey a madman, and that under the reign of ſuch a Prince, all the prayers proved unſucceſsful, and all marriages were null and void. They were therefore obliged to dethrone Muſtapha; and Amurath, Oſman's brother, was put in his ſtead. *Il qual* (Muſtafa) *era huomo ſtolido, e la ſtolidezza di lui ſi ſpacciava per ſantità, e raſſegnatione in Dio da Daret Primo Viſir, e da gli altri corteggiani, facendolo ſemper guardar in cielo, quando uſciva in publico, e fingendo miracoli: fu depoſto, havendo il Mufti promulgato, che l'Alcorano vietava l'obbedienza ad un Re inſenſato, durante il quale erano inefficaci l'orationi, e invalidi i matrimonii* (5). There is no nation upon Earth that ſpeaks more advantageouſly of their Monarchs, and of the obedience which is due to them, than the Turks: they are unacquainted with all the great controverſies of the Politicians in the Weſt concerning the origin of ſovereign power; they knew nothing of the original contract between the King and the people: they do not examine whether the right of commanding proceeds from the people or not, nor how far it is communicated. According to them the beſt form of government is the abſolute and deſpotick power of the Prince; to die in obedience to the Sultan is a ſtep to arrive at the higheſt dignities in Heaven (6). Who would not believe then, that the Grand Seignior's throne is eſtabliſhed on the moſt ſtrong and laſting foundations? And yet if we conſult hiſtory, we ſhall find, that there is no Monarch in the world, whoſe authority is more weak and uncertain than that of the Ottoman Emperors. Their ſubjects do not only riſe againſt them, they not only dethrone and ſtrangle them before the ſedition be ſuppreſſed; but they alſo know perfectly well how to depoſe them by judicial proceedings: they conſult peaceably and gravely about their fate; they gather the votes, and condemn them to a perpetual impriſonment. Thus they uſed Mahomet IV. in the year 1687, and we have ſeen that in the year 1622 they came to the ſame reſolution againſt Muſtapha. The Alcoran is conſulted on theſe occaſions, as the books of the Sibyls were formerly at Rome: and if one party can get the Chief Prieſt on their ſide, they may be ſure to ſucceed. If the Mufti declares that the law of God does not ſuffer them to acknowledge for their lawful Sovereign a Prince, who is ſickly, ſilly, unfortunate, or in Priſon (7), it is as much, or even more, than if the Pope had excommunicated a Chriſtian Prince.

(5) *Giornale de Letterati*, for January the 28th, 1675, p. 3. In the extract from the *Memorie de Iſtoriche Monarchi Ottomani di Giovanni Sagredo Cavaliere*, printed at Venice in the year 1673, in 4to.

(6) See Sir Paul Ricaut's *Preſent State of the Ottoman Empire*, book 1. chap. 1 and 2.

(7) *Ne' libri di Mahometto ſi vieta l'obbedienza à Re fatti prigioni per obligarli à difenderſi. Giornale de Letterati*, for January the 28th, 1675. p. 4.

OSORIO or OSORIUS (JEROM) . . . . . .

. . . . . .

His Treatiſes *De Gloria*, and *De Nobilitate Civili et Chriſtiana* are eſteemed [*A*].

[*A*] *His treatiſes* de Gloria, *and* de Nobilitate Civili & Chriſtiana, *are eſteemed.*] Each is divided into five books, and have borne ſeveral impreſſions In the Cologn edition of 1577, is a dedication of Bartholomew Bodegemius, to *Matalius Metellus Sequanus*, wherein mention is made of a Florence edition, and another of Germany. This dedication is inſerted in the Baſil edition, *ex officina Pernea*, 1584, in 8vo, but not in the Antwerp edition, *apud Henricum Aertſſens*, 1635, 12mo; but on the other hand, there is inſerted in the latter the life of Jerom Oſorio, written by his nephew (1).

(1) See the remark [*G*], which belongs to this article.

☞ Bayle knowing little or nothing of this author, here follows a very neceſſary Supplement.

OSORIO (JEROM) was born in Liſbon in 1506 [*A*]. From his childhood he diſcovered a ſingular propenſion for learning, and applied himſelf to it with prodigious ſucceſs. At thirteen years of age he was ſent to the univerſity of Salamanca, where he acquired the Latin and Greek tongues, and there applied himſelf ſome time to the ſtudy of the law. At nineteen he came to Paris to learn Ariſtotle's philoſophy, which only was taught in that age: after ſtaying ſome time in that city, he went to Bologna in Italy, where he devoted himſelf to the ſtudy of the ſacred writings of the Hebrew tongue. At his return to Portugal, he taught, by order of King John, the Scriptures in Coimbra [*B*]. He afterwards was made Pariſh-Prieſt of Tavara [*C*], then Deacon [*D*], and at laſt Biſhop of Sylves [*E*]. He did all that lay in his power to diſſuade King Sebaſtian from going into Africa [*F*]. He went to Rome, where Pope Gregory XIII. gave him many teſtimonies of his eſteem. But the King recalling him, in a year, he was obliged to return to Portugal, a little after which advice was brought of the fatal death of Don Sebaſtian, Auguſt 4, 1578, in the battle of Alcazer fought againſt the Moors. His principal care, after this ſaid event, was to employ his utmoſt credit with the people of his Dioceſe, to prevent their joining in the tumults which at that time divided the Kingdom. But the grief he himſelf was ſeized with on that occaſion, brought him inſenſibly to his grave. He died at Tavila, in his Dioceſe, Auguſt 1580 (*a*), aged 74 years. His piety and charity are greatly applauded: he entertaining, in his palace, ſeveral learned and virtuous men.

(*a*) 'Tis 1680 (an error in the preſs) in Tom. 11. p. 204. of Father Niceron's *Hommes Illuſtres*, Paris 1730. 12mo.

[*A*] *In* 1506.] He was ſon of John Oſorio de Fonſeca, and of Frances Gil de Govea, both of an illuſtrious family (1),

(1) Niceron, *Hommes illuſtres*, Tom. 11. p. 202. Paris 1730, 12mo.

]*B*] *He taught the ſcriptures in Coimbra.*] He there explained, with great applauſe, the prophet Iſaiah and St. Paul's epiſtle to the Romans (2).

(2) Ibid. p 203.

[*C*] *Was made pariſh-prieſt of Tavara.*] He was preſented to this benefice, as ſoon as he was ordained prieſt, by Don Lewis, Infanta of Portugal, but he did not long continue in it, as may be ſeen in the next remark (3).

(3) Idem, ibid.

[*D*] . . . *then Arch-deacon.*] Cardinal Henry, brother of King John, and Arch-biſhop of Evora, eſteeming his virtue and capacity, appointed him Arch-deacon of his church a little after (4).

(4) Idem, ibid.

[*E*] . . . *Biſhop of Sylves.*] He was nominated to it by Catherine of Auſtria, widow of King John III. ſhe being Regent of the kingdom, during the minority of Sebaſtian her grandſon (5).

(5) Idem, ibid.

[*F*] *He did all that lay in his power to diſſuade King Sebaſtian*

men. At meals, ſome parts from St. Bernard were always read to him, and when the reader had done, he allowed any of the auditors to ſtart whatſoever difficulties might have occurred to him in what had been read. His works were printed in a body, by the direction of Jerom Oſorio, his Nephew, at Rome, *Anno* 1592, in four volumes in folio, the contents of which we ſhall give hereunder [*G*]. Here follows his character according to Dupin [*H*]. We muſt take ſome notice of Jerom Oſorio, Nephew to him whoſe article we have here given [*I*] (*b*). I.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 202 & *ſeq.*

Sebaſtian from going into Africa.] Oſorio foreſeeing the fatal conſequences with which his enterprize might be attended, uſed his utmoſt endeavours to divert him from it; but finding all his exhortations to no purpoſe, he was reſolved, if poſſible, not to be an eye-witneſs of the calamities he dreaded, and therefore went to Rome upon various pretences (6).

(6) Idem, p. 203, 204.

[*G*] *The contents of his works.*] The 1ſt volume contains; 1. *De Nobilitate Civili, Libri* II, *& de Nobilitate Chriſtiana, Libri* III. *Olyſſipone* 1542, 4to. Item, *Florentiæ* 1552, 4to, with the treatiſe *de Gloria*, with which this work has been frequently printed ſince. 2. *De Gloria, Libri* V, with the foregoing work, *Florentiæ* 1552, 4to. To this work, which is eſteemed, as alſo that *de Nobilitate*, is an excellent preface, addreſſed to John III. King of Portugal, containing very good inſtructions for Princes. Item *Baſileæ*, 1556 and 1571, 8vo, and at many other places. In the edition of Antwerp, *anno* 1635, 8vo, is Oſorio's life, written by his nephew. Some have falſely imagined, that the treatiſe *de Gloria* was that of Cicero, which Oſorio had found, and publiſhed as his own work. 3. *De Regis inſtitutione & diſciplina, Libri* VIII, Coloniæ 1574, and 1582, 8vo. Item, *Pariſiis*, 1583, folio. This Paris edition was made by the care of Barnabas Briſſon. 4. *De Rebus Emmanuelis Regis invictiſſimi virtute & auſpicio geſtis, Libri* XII. *Olyſſipone* 1571, folio. Item, *Cum præfatione & Commentario Joannis Matalii Metelli de reperta India. Coloniæ* 1574, 1580, 1597, 8vo. *Item*, tranſlated into French with ſome other hiſtories of Portugal, printed in 1581, folio, and Paris 1587, 8vo. The hiſtory Oſorio has given us, is rendered valuable, on account of the great care he took to enquire into the truth of the particulars related by him, and his relating them without diſguiſe. His diction is conciſe and clear. He enquires into the counſels and foundations of the ſeveral things debated on; gives his judgment on the actions of great Men and Kings, and cenſures their faults with freedom, without ſparing thoſe of the Princes his own countrymen. 5. *Defenſio ſui nominis.* Oſorio publiſhed this work to defend himſelf againſt his enemies, who imputed it to him for a crime, his ſeeming to favour the King of Spain, and aſſert his right to the Crown of Portugal, after King Sebaſtian's death. 6. *Epiſtolæ quædam. Hanoviæ*, in 12mo.

The 2d Volume includes,

7. *Admonitio in Epiſtolam ad Elizabetham Reginam Angliæ.* This letter, which Oſorio wrote to Queen Elizabeth, to exhort her to return to the Romiſh Communion, by repreſenting to her the errors * of the Church of England, has been tranſlated into French and Engliſh. W. Haddon wrote an anſwer to this the ſame year, and Oſorio made the following reply. 9. *In Gualterum Haddonum Elizabethæ reginæ Magiſtrum Libellorum ſupplicum de vera religione, Libri* III. *Oliſſipone*, 1567, 4to, and in other cities. 10. *De Juſtitia Cœleſti, Libri* X. *ad Reginaldum Polum Cardinalem. Coloniæ* 1574, and 1581, 8vo. 11. *De vera ſapientia, Libri* V. *ad Gregorium* XIII. P. M. Olyſſipone 1578, and in other places. 12. *In Epiſtolam B. Pauli ad Romanos, Libri* IV.

* The Reader will obſerve that 'tis a Papiſt ſpeaks.

In the 3d Volume are the following.

13. *Paraphraſis in Job, Libri* III. 14. *Paraphraſis in Pſalmos.* 15. *Commentaria in Parabolas Solomonis.* 16. *Paraphraſis in Solomonis ſapientiam.*

The 4th Volume contains,

17. *Paraphraſis in Iſaïam, Libri* V. *Bononiæ* 1577, 4to, and elſewhere. 18. *Commentarius in Oſeam Prophetam.* 19. *Commentarius in Zachariam.* 20. *In laudem Divæ Catharinæ oratio.* 21. *In Evangelium Joannis Orationes* XXI (7). 'Tis to be obſerved, that Andrew Schottus, in his Bibliotheque of Spain, erroneouſly aſcribes the pieces contained in this fourth volume, and the two laſt pieces in the third, to Jerom Oſorio, our Author's nephew (8).

(7) Niceron's *Hommes illuſtres*, Tom. 11. p. 206 *& ſeq.*

(8) Ibid. p. 210.

[*H*] *Here follows his character, according to Dupin.*] " His diction was eaſy and eloquent, for which reaſon he has been called the Cicero of Portugal, he " being one of the greateſt imitators of Cicero, " with regard to the ſtyle, his choice of ſubjects, and " his manner of treating them. His compoſitions " are not intermixed with citations, but conſiſt of " connected argumentations. He does not endeavour, " in his Commentaries and Paraphraſes, to explain " the terms of the text, but to extend the ſenſe of " it, and ſhew its order and ſeries. Young Divines, " by ſtudying Oſorio's works, may improve their " diction, and learn to write eloquently, whether as " Chriſtian Philoſophers, Orators, or Divines (9)."

(9) Ibid. p. 205. cited from Dupin.

[*I*] *We muſt take ſome notice of Jerom Oſorio.*] He was our Author's nephew, and Canon of Evora. Having been educated by his uncle, he endeavoured to imitate his ſtyle; but he is not ſo fine a writer, tho' he ſeems to have more erudition. He wrote the following works. 1. The Life of Jerom Oſorio, his uncle, prefixed to the edition publiſhed by him of his works. 2. *Notationes in Hieronymi Oſorii Paraphraſim Pſalmorum.* Theſe remarks, printed in the third volume of his uncle's works, after his paraphraſe, are, according to Dupin, valuable, and filled with critical obſervations on the Hebrew language. 3. *Paraphraſis & Commentaria in Eccleſiaſten nunc primùm edita; & Paraphraſis in Canticum Canticorum & in ipſam recens auctæ notationes. Lugdini* 1611, 4to (10).

(10) Ibid. p. 211.

" OSSAT (ARNAULD OF) was fatherleſs, motherleſs, and in poor circumſtan- " ces, at nine years of age. Some years after he was put in the ſervice of a Nobleman " of Caſtelnau de Magnoac, in the Dioceſe of Auchi; he being alſo an orphan; and " he accompanied him in his ſtudies, but ſoon got the ſtart of him. After compleating " their ſtudies, this young Nobleman's Governor [*A*] was deſirous of ſending him to " Paris; and thought he could not do any thing more for his advantage, than to put him " under the care and direction of *Mr. Arnauld d'Oſſat, his preceptor and maſter*, as is " expreſſed in the account which the Governor in queſtion gave to his Nephew. Thus " he became his maſter's maſter. They arrived in Paris on Friday May 5, 1559. Af- " terwards two other children, Couſin-Germans to this young Nobleman, were ſent to " him

[*A*] *This young Nobleman's Governor.*] The name of this pupil of our d'Oſſat, was John de Marca, deſcended from the houſe of Marca, in Bearn, by John de Marca, ſon of Peter de Marca, and of Margaret d'Andoins. Jerom was Captain of fifty croſs-bow men, and Governor of Furnes in Flanders, as is evident from his contract of marriage with Dame Ameline de Riviere, Lady of Doublet and Plaiſſe, and of ſeveral other eſtates or lands in the neighbourhood of Caſtelnau de Magnoac. This contract was ſigned at Cominge the 12th of February, 1341, by which it is agreed, among other particulars, that the ſaid Jerom ſhall uſually reſide on the eſtate of the ſaid Lady. From this marriage ſprung a ſon, called Peter de Marca, who was contracted in marriage with Dame Catharine de Mun, daughter of Bernard de Mun and

" him for education [*B*]. They continued at Paris, under Mr. d'Oſſat, till the month " of May 1562 ; at which time our d'Oſſat ſending them into Gaſcony, wrote their " uncle a letter, in which he employed ſuch expreſſions as deſerve to be known [*C*]. " D'Oſſat applying himſelf to the law, was known and eſteemed by many perſons of " diſtinction ; and among others by Meſſire Paul de Foix, at that time Counſellor in " the Parliament of Paris. He procured himſelf, by his merit and friends, the employ- " ment in the Preſidial of Melun, with which he was again inveſted in 1588, as appears " by a Letter of Attorney ſent by him to Paris, to take poſſeſſion of a donation made " him by the King. In the King's warrant granted for that purpoſe, he is ſtiled Abbot " of our Lady of Varennes, an Abbey in the Dioceſe of Bourges. Hence it is manifeſt " that thoſe are miſtaken, who relate that he was Dean of Varennes in the Dioceſe of " Rhodez [*D*], at the time of his being promoted to the See of Rennes. The remain- " ing part of his life is well enough known (*a*). There are ſeveral original letters of " Mr. d'Oſſat. written at the cloſe of the year 1584, in Mr. Colbert's Library ; which " letters are ſtill in manuſcript. They are addreſſed to the King, the Queen, and other " perſons (*b*)."

(*a*) This article, and the remarks which relate to it, were communicated by the illuſtrious Mr. BALUZE, and are inſerted without the leaſt alteration.

(*b*) Ibid.

The beſt edition of this Cardinal's letters § (*α*), is that of Paris in 1698, 4to (*d*). Amelot de la Houſſaye has illuſtrated it with notes, and a very accurate life of our Author, drawn up with great judgment. We ought to think ourſelves obliged to him, for not following the bad counſel of thoſe, who adviſed him to modernize d'Oſſat's ſtyle [*E*]. It is a ſhame

(*c*) Compare this with the remark [*D*] of the article ESPAGNET.

(1) Mr. Baluze. Apply this note wherever it may be neceſſary in this article.

Paula de Sariac, the 7th of May, 1398. I don't know the ſequel of this genealogy : but I (1) copied all the abovementioned particulars from the original.

De Marca, which is the true name of this family, was changed into that of la Marque, by the authority of d'Oſſat, and on the following occaſion. In the ſuperſcription of the firſt letter which he wrote from Paris to the Governor of his pupil, who, by thoſe letters, appears to have been a very conſiderable man, he directed, *To Mr. Thomas Marca* ; but thinking this too much in the peaſant-ſtrain, he changed it, and afterwards called him *Monſieur la Marca*, and at laſt, *Monſieur de la Marque :* by which name the family goes now. But the late Madame de la Marque, Margaret d'Eſpenan, called one of her ſons, who was deſigned for the church, the *Prior de Marca*. I am poſſeſſed of a letter which that Lady wrote to her ſon the Prior, the 12th of December, 1659 ; wherein ſhe informs him, that the late Mr. de la Marque, her huſband, had frequently given her a very exact account of the genealogy of the houſe of Marca, in Bearn ; in what manner the family of Caſtelnau ſprung from them ; and that he had been told all theſe particulars by his father, who died at upwards of a hundred years of age. Mr. d'Oſſat being a Cardinal, ſent his picture, from Rome, to Marca, where it is ſtill preſerved.

[*B*] *Afterwards two other children . . . were ſent to him for education.*] D'Oſſat being at that time twenty years of age, writes as follows concerning him, in a letter to their uncle, dated the 27th of December, 1559. *With regard to myſelf, I promiſe to inſtil good learning into them, and ſet them a good example, and to do all that lies in my power to ſerve them, to the laſt moment of my life, which I will loſe, rather than let them want the leaſt thing I think can be of any advantage to them.*

[*C*] *He employed ſuch expreſſions as deſerve to be known.*] They are as follow. " To conclude, Sir, " as to your thanking me for the pains I have taken " in educating your nephews, I look upon this as the " effect of your wonted goodneſs ; the reflection of " which, makes me think all the pains and labour " I have beſtowed upon them, well employed ; aſ- " ſuring you, Sir, that my conſcience will never re- " proach me with being wanting in any thing which " might be of benefit to them." Here we have an inſtance of d'Oſſat's probity and good ſenſe, which were then ſeen in affairs of no great importance.

(2) Cardinal d'Oſſat's life, prefix'd to the edition of his letters, publiſhed by Amelot de la Houſſaye, anno 1698.

(3) Amelot de la Houſſaye's *Life of Cardinal d'Oſſat*, p. 5.

[*D*] *Thoſe are miſtaken, who relate, that he was Dean of Varennes, in the dioceſe of Rhodez.*] In this part of Baluze's memoir, ſomething wants to be rectified, as I find by a book (2) publiſhed ſince the firſt edition of this Dictionary. Amelot de la Houſſaye obſerves (3), that the firſt benefice Oſſat *ever poſſeſt*, was *the Priory of St. Martyn du Vieux-Belleſme*, which was given him by Cardinal de Joyeuſe, *in January or February, anno* 1588 ; and that as to the Abbey of our Lady of Varennes, he was never in poſſeſſion of it, *tho', indeed, Henry* III. *had nominated him to it.* The proofs on which Amelot de Houſſaye grounds his aſſertions, are, in my opinion, ſtrong. The laſt is grounded on an aſſertion we find in this Cardinal's funeral oration, viz. *that having accepted with a good intention, a conſiderable benefice given him by Henry* III. *and ſome difference ariſing with regard to the poſſeſſion, he reſigned it immediately, firmly determined not to have the leaſt conteſt with any perſon. Probably this Abbey of Varennes is hinted at in the funeral oration in queſtion* (4), *and conſequently*, adds Amelot, *thoſe perſons are themſelves miſtaken, who affirm, that thoſe err, who ſay, that d'Oſſat was Dean of Varen in the Dioceſe of Rhodez, as he ſtiles himſelf in the petition* which he preſented to the Pope, in the name of Henry IV. *as his eſpecial proxy and deputy in the affair of his abſolution* (5).

(4) Ibid. p. 6.

(5) Ibid. p. 5.

§ (*α*) However, the Editors have not reſtored a certain paſſage in a letter dated the 10th of February 1603, in which this Prelate ſaid to the King, that *he did not think it proper, for the Monarch in queſtion, to procure his exaltation* (to the purple) ; *becauſe, as he would thereby become one of the Pope's agents, it might be doubted it would not, from that time, be in his power to ſerve his Majeſty ſo faithfully in Rome, as he had before done.* This Author, who, in 1664, diſcovered and pointed out this *caſtration* *, does not think it probable that this was done undeſignedly ; and I am of opinion, that it might be owing to Cardinal de Richelieu. The caſtration in queſtion, relates to the year 1624. The public knows very well, what the Cardinal's views were at that time, and how great an authority he enjoy'd. With regard to the letter, as publiſhed by Amelot de la Houſſaye, from the caſtrated editions, 'tis barely but a complaint, and that too a very moderate one, addreſſed to the King, *viz.* that a penſion of 4000 crowns, granted the Cardinal out of the treaſury, was ill paid, eſpecially for two years laſt paſt ; and this complaint is levelled at Duke de Sully, Lord High Treaſurer, againſt whom the Editor has inſerted a note, importing that the Duke in queſtion had, from an unparallel'd barbarity, checked the progreſs of the King's favours, towards ſo faithful a ſervant as Cardinal d'Oſſat. But who can ſay, whether Duke de Sully was as firmly perſuaded of this Cardinal's fidelity, ſince his exaltation to the purple, as the Author of the note ? Perhaps he was not ; and that the Cardinal, to perſuade him of the contrary, inſinuated that, at leaſt with regard to himſelf, it would be doing him juſtice to ſuppoſe, that his being one of the Pope's Agents, had prevented his ſerving the King with as much fidelity as ever. REM. CRIT.]

* *Traité des Legats à latere*, p. 52, of the ſecond figure or number of *Traité de l'origine des Cardinaux.* Colen edit. 1665.

[*E*] *We ought to think ourſelves obliged to* Amelot de la Houſſaye, *for not following the bad counſel of thoſe who adviſed him to modernize d'Oſſat's ſtyle.*] *He writes as follows in his advertiſement to the reader.* " The diction has not been altered in any manner ; " and thoſe who publickly gave out the contrary, " are the very perſons who would have had it chang- " ed ; and, who, vexed becauſe their advice was not " followed,

ſhame to the nation, that ſo many perſons ſhould be found in France who cannot bear with the diction of the 16th Century. But yet this depraved taſte is not ſo general, but that there are ſtill many readers who will not allow the diction of the writers of that age to be retouched. This is manifeſt from the apprehenſions which the Paris bookſellers had, of not finding their account in printing, in modern French, the Memoirs of Philip de Comines, as will be ſeen in the remark [*E*]. I even wiſh that Amelot de la Houſſaie had not made any alterations in the Orthography uſed in the original; it not being in any manner probable that our d'Oſſat had employed ſo many circumflex accents, and omitted the letter *S* in ſo many places (*c*); this fault, with regard to probability, not pleaſing a reader who loves accuracy. I muſt not omit Wicquefort's opinion of d'Oſſat's merit [*F*]. See

(*d*) Page 12 & *ſeq.* of the Dutch edition.

" followed, maliciouſly ſpread this report, in order " to depreciate this edition, in the minds of thoſe " whom they know to be admirers of Cardinal " d'Oſſat, as all Stateſmen are in particular. And I " oppoſed this ill advice the more ſtrenuouſly, as I " always imagined that this would be maiming and " disfiguring the nervous ſtyle of a perſon formed by " nature for negotiations, and whoſe diction is wholly " conſecrated to the uſe of the cabinet; to make " him ſpeak differently from what he wrote and " ſpoke. Not to mention that the publick would " not have paid as much regard to my diction, as to " that of this famous Cardinal: which aſſertion " may be corroborated by what Mr. Boileau obſerved " concerning a Member of the French Academy, " who had retouched ſome of Plutarch's lives, tranſ- " lated into French by Amyot: and may alſo be " confirmed, by the refuſal (to my knowledge) of " ſeveral of the moſt experienced bookſellers in Pa- " ris, twelve years ago, to print the Memoirs of " Philip de Comines, which a Lady of genius had " rendered into better French: ſo true it is that the " publick are firmly perſuaded, that ſome books " cannot be retouched without being ſpoilt; and " which reſemble thoſe natural, unaffected beauties, " who are never more charming than in their " diſhabille. But I have ſaid enough. *Verbum non* " *amplius addam.*" I am of opinion that Philip de Comines, Montagne, and ſome other writers, whoſe chief beauties are inſeparable from their ſtyle, will be proofs againſt the attempts of reviſers. I alſo think that the tranſlation, into modern French, of the Heptameron of the Queen of Navarre, will be rejected by perſons of taſte (6): but I believe, at the ſame time, that the bookſellers will take greater liberty with many other books: theſe will publiſh editions of thoſe I hint at, reviſed and corrected, with regard to ſuch phraſes as may have grown obſolete; by which means they will encourage ſtill more the falſe delicacy and indolence of great numbers of people; for it is a ſhame that thoſe who ſet up for readers, ſhould not be deſirous of knowing what kind of language their anceſtors ſpeak. This abuſe increaſes and ſpreads daily; and multitudes do not care to read the compoſitions written under Lewis XIII. The bookſellers, in order to get cuſtomers, are obliged to have the diction of the works written in that age retouched or modernized. In this manner they ſerved, *Anno* 1699, the hiſtory of the laſt Duke of Montmorenci, written by the Sieur du Cros (7). This practice is of long ſtanding. I have ſeen an edition of Joſephus tranſlated into French by Genebrard, which the Paris bookſellers had got retouched, that is, had cauſed many words and antiquated expreſſions to be changed in it; and yet I believe Genebrard had not been dead thirty years. They have taken the ſame liberty with Amyot's Plutarch, which the Sieur Sorel condemns very juſtly. *It is enough,* ſays he (8), *to know, that* Amyot's *diction was eſteemed by the greateſt genius's of his time. They do him great injury in imagining they can correct his works, by retrenching ſome obſolete words, and ſubſtituting others in their room, for this is taking away all his ſtrength and ſimplicity. Nevertheleſs ſome bookſellers at Paris reprinted, not many years ſince, this old tranſlation in a large folio, many antiquated words having been ſuppreſſed in different parts of it. Some perſons were of opinion, that this would make the work in queſtion read more agreeably, and that theſe alterations were laudable. But others think that valuable old books ought to be had in greater veneration; and that it was a ſacrilegious action to have made ſuch alterations in the book we are ſpeaking of; eſpecially when we conſider that thoſe who were employed in that taſk had not abilities for it. They think either that the old tranſlation ought to be left untouched; or an entire new one be made, if any perſon pretends to give a better, according to the genius and mode of the preſent age.* He even does not approve of the alterations made in Joinville's original. Here follow his words (9). " We find in Joinville's hiſtory, mani- " feſt characteriſticks of the ſimplicity of the age " he lived in; and perceive that perſons in his ſta- " tion were very little acquainted with the rules of " exact writing. Nevertheleſs, I am of opinion, " that the editors have done us an injury, by their " changing a great number of obſolete words found " in his book, as has been done in ſeveral impreſ- " ſions; becauſe it is no longer the ſame work, but " an entire tranſlation of old French into new. By " this means we, at laſt, may loſe the original; ſo " that we ſhall not be able to have any tolerable idea " of the language ſpoke in the time it was writ. " It were much better the whole had been left as " written originally: and in caſe any paſſages had " been now unintelligible, they might have been " explained in the margin, or by notes annexed; " and all this would have made an agreeable va- " riety." He had ſpoke to much the like purpoſe in *p.* 252; and it is to be obſerved that he ſays there, that *Comines's hiſtory*, as well as *that of Joinville*, have been *printed different ways; and that ſome words, which it is thought uſe had aboliſhed, were changed in them.* The reader will find by a paſſage of Stephen Paſquier, how antient this practice is among the French. *The like imperfection we find in the old manuſcripts of our* Romance of the Roſe; *in each of which the French diction is the ſame as was ſpoke at the times when they were copied, except only in the rhime, where they could not make any alteration. You will find I know not what Jargon ſpoke by thoſe who copied it, I mean words uſed by the people of Picardy, Normandy, and Champagne; which are things to which a reader ought to have a great regard, before he interpoſes his judgment* (10).

(6) See the 1ſt article of NAVARRE, rem. [*N*].

(7) See *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, Dec. 1699, p. 670 & *ſeq.*

(8) Sorel, *Bibl. Francoiſe*, p. 220, Paris edit. 1667.

(9) Ibid. p. 321, 322.

(10) Paſquier, *Recherches de la France*, lib. 8. c. 44 p. 756, of the Paris edition of 1621, in folio.

[*F*] *I muſt not omit Wicquefort's opinion of d'Oſſat's merit.*] He has done great honour to his judgment on this occaſion. His words are theſe (11). *I have nothing to ſay concerning* Arnauld, Cardinal d'Oſſat, *becauſe no writer can ſpeak of him without doing him injuſtice, ſince Anthony Muretus, the moſt eloquent author of his age, falls ſhort, in endeavouring to draw his panegyric, in his funeral oration. I ſhall ſay this only of him, that no Miniſter ever diſcharged his truſt with ſo much affection, zeal, application, and fidelity in his maſter's ſervice, as this prelate; with regard to his abilities, we may judge of him from his negotiations extant; for which the publick are obliged, as alſo for ſeveral other excellent books, to the late Meſſieurs de Puy, the honour and ornament of our age: he has given proofs of his ſkill in negotiations, in that he tranſacted with the Grand Duke of Tuſcany, for the reſtitution of the Iſland of If; in that with Pope Clement* VIII. *in order to reconcile Henry* IV. *to the Church of Rome; in that of the invalidity of the abovementioned King's marriage, with Queen Margaret of Valois, which had been valid near thirty years; in that of the diſpenſation with regard to the marriage between Catharine of Bourbon, ſiſter to Henry, with the Duke de Bar; and in ſeveral other very important and delicate affairs. His diſpatches are as uſeful to an Embaſſador who hopes to ſucceed in his employment, as the Bible and the Corpus Juris to ſuch Lawyers and Divines as would ſucceed in their reſpective profeſſions.* This is the judgment of a great maſter; for de Wicquefort was perfectly well ſkilled in theſe matters; and he quotes d'Oſſat's letters ſo often, that

(11) Wicquefort, *de l'Ambaſſadeur*, lib. 2 § 17. p. m. 423, 424. See alſo ſect. 10. of the ſame book, p. 173.

See also Perrault's *Hommes illuſtres du* XVII. *Siecle*, Part II. (*d*).

(*d*) Page 12, &c. of the Dutch edition.

that he ſeems to have ſtudied them with great care. We muſt pardon the miſtake he fell into, in ſaying that Muretus made this Cardinal's funeral elogium; that Orator having been dead many years, when Gallutius the Jeſuit delivered at Rome, in 1604, Arnauld d'Oſſat's funeral oration. I am to obſerve that Naudé earneſtly exhorted all Politicians, to read thoſe very letters which de Wicquefort applauded ſo highly. *Omnium meritò cenſentur utiliſſimæ digniſſimæque, quæ Politicorum mentibus atque oculis perpetuò obverſentur*, Cardinalis Oſſati *Epiſtolæ: utpote quæ graviſſimò ac planè ſenili cultu exaratæ ſunt, feraciſſimoque graviſſimarum rerum ac ſententiarum ingeniò, nuſquam laxæ, nuſquam molles, ſemper æquales, ſemper lectoris animum demulcentes, detinenteſque jucundiſſimâ rerum ac rationum varietate* (12), i. e. "The letters of "Cardinal d'Oſſat, are deſervedly looked upon to "be more uſeful than any other, and worthy of "being perpetually read and meditated upon by "Politicians: they being written with the utmoſt "dignity, and with the ſeveral advantages of old "age, and a moſt copious acquaintance with impor-"tant affairs and ſentiments: never flat or effemi-"nate, but always of a piece; and perpetually en-"tertaining the reader's mind, with the moſt de-"lightful variety of incidents and arguments."

(12) Naudeus, *Bibliogr. Politica*, p. 558. Edit. Crenii, 1692.

We ſhall give ſome neceſſary additions to this article.

☞ OSSAT (ARNAULD OF) was born in Caſſagnabere, a village in the Dioceſe of Auch, Auguſt 23, 1536. His father was in ſo very low a ſtation, that the publick have not yet been able to find out exactly who he was [*A*]; but it is certain that he was very poor [*B*]. However, young d'Oſſat being born with a genius which ſeemed capable of great improvement, a Gentleman, named Thomas de Marca, in the Dioceſe of Auch, took an affection for him; and made him ſtudy in concert with the young Lord of Caſtelnau de Magnoac, his Nephew and ward [*C*]. D'Oſſat having left off teaching, went to Bourges, where he ſtudied the law under the famous Cujas. After receiving his Diploma there, he returned to Paris, and applied himſelf to the Bar, in hopes of making his fortune by his great aſſiduity [*D*] (*a*). In 1568 he was looked upon at Paris, as a young man very well ſkilled in the Mathematicks (*b*). After being Secretary in Rome to Mr. de Foix, Archbiſhop of Toulouſe, and to Cardinal d'Eſte, he exerciſed the ſame employment under Cardinal de Joyeuſe [*E*]. In 1588 Henry III. would have recalled him from Rome, in order to make him one of the Secretaries of State, but he excuſed himſelf [*F*]. Henry IV. coming to the Crown, d'Oſſat was employed to obtain the papal abſolution for that Prince; and at laſt ſucceeded in it; for which he was rewarded with the Biſhoprick of Rennes in 1596 [*G*]. In 1597 he was appointed Counſellour of State in his abſence (*c*). The Duke of Luxemburg, Embaſſador at Rome, from the French King, having leave in 1598 to return to his native country, d'Oſſat was ordered to ſuperintend the affairs of France, till another Embaſſador ſhould be appointed (*d*) In 1599 he was raiſed to the Purple [*H*]. Some time after the Pope, to the great ſatisfaction of King Henry, created our Cardinal, Abbot of Nant in Rouerge (*e*). Cardinal de Joyeuſe returning to France, d'Oſſat was appointed Vice-

(*a*) Perrault's *Hommes illuſtres*, Tom. 2. p. 12, 13. Paris 1701. 12mo.

(*b*) From the remarks, to the Paris edition of Bayle's Dict. vol. 4. p. 969. col. 2.

(*c*) Perrault, p. 15.

(*d*) Niceron, *Hommes illuſtres*, Tom. 34. p. 35, 36.

(*e*) Ibid. p. 36.

[*A*] *The publick have not yet been able to find out who he was.*] The uncertainty on this head has made ſome ſay, that d'Oſſat was natural ſon to the Lord of Caſſagnabere; whilſt others affirm that his father was a Quack-doctor; but it is looked upon as certain, throughout the whole Dioceſe of Auch, that his father was a farrier (1).

(1) Perrault's *Hommes illuſtres*, Tom. 2. p. 12. Paris 1701. 12mo. and Niceron, *Hommes illuſtres*, Tom. 34. p. 31. Paris 1736, 12mo.

[*B*] *'Tis certain* his father *was very poor.*] He died in ſuch unhappy circumſtances that he did not leave money enough to bury him. Our Arnauld was then nine years old; and quite abandoned, without friends or money, and in ſuch a ſtation of life as could not give him the leaſt hopes of ever bettering his fortune (2).

(2) Idem ibid.

[*C*] *Made him ſtudy . . . . . with his Nephew and ward.*] The reader may ſee above (3) the ſucceſs which d'Oſſat had with his young Lord.

(3) In the text of Bayle's article of OSSAT (ARNAUD D') above.

[*D*] *He applied himſelf to the Bar.*] Getting acquainted with Mr. Paul de Foix, he went to Rome with that Gentleman in 1574. He returned thither in 1580 with Mr. de Foix, who was ſent to Rome in 1580 by Henry III. and was afterwards appointed his Embaſſador in ordinary at that Court. D'Oſſat lived then with Mr. de Foix, in quality of his Secretary. That Gentleman dying at Rome, towards the cloſe of the year 1582, Cardinal d'Eſte, protector of the affairs of France, appointed him his Secretary; and d'Oſſat living four years in his family, it was then he began to diſplay his abilities for negotiations, and to learn all the intrigues of the Court of Rome (4).

(4) Perrault's *Hommes illuſtres*, Tom. 2. p. 13.

[*E*] *D'Oſſat* was Secretary *to Cardinal de Joyeuſe.*] Cardinal d'Eſte, protector of the French Nation, dying in 1586, d'Oſſat was continued in the Secretaryſhip under Cardinal de Joyeuſe, by the King's expreſs command; who knowing his capacity, was deſirous that he ſhould ſerve as a guide to this Cardinal, who being at that time but 26 years of age, had not gained ſufficient experience. Although Cardinal de Joyeuſe had not himſelf appointed d'Oſſat, he yet had an affection for him; and preſented him, in 1588, to the Priory of St. Martin du Vieux Belleſme. Mention was made above, of his employment in the Preſidial Court of Melun; and of his being appointed Abbot of Notre-Dame de Varennes (5).

(5) In the text of Bayle's article of OSSAT (ARNAULD D') above.

[*F*] *He excuſed himſelf.*] He thought this employment incompatible with the prieſtly Office, and that it would be too laborious. His refuſal on this occaſion proved his exaltation; for had he returned to France, he would have been involved in the calamities of his country; or been prevented from performing thoſe great ſervices he afterwards did his native country (6). Another very honourable motive is aſcribed to his refuſal, *viz.* becauſe Mr. de Villeroy, who was d'Oſſat's benefactorr muſt have been removed, in order to make room for him (7).

(6) Perrault, *ubi ſupra.*

(7) Niceron's *Hommes illuſtres*, Tom. 34. p. 35. Paris 1736, 12mo.

[*G*] *To obtain the papal abſolution for* Henry IV.] This affair ſeemed to be embarraſſed with almoſt inſurmountable difficulties, ariſing either from the Spaniards, the Princes of the houſe of Lorrain, or the Huguenots, who indeed had a great affection for Henry IV. but could not bear the thoughts of his being reconciled to the See of Rome. However, d'Oſſat managed this negotiation ſo artfully; and ſo happily removed all the ſcruples of the Pope who was extremely diffident, that it was at laſt terminated very happily (8).

(8) Perrault's *Hommes illuſtres*, p. 14.

[*H*] *He was raiſed to the Purple.*] That King had ſolicited this favour of the Pope for ſome time, which was refuſed on account of d'Oſſat's low extraction; but at laſt he was included in the promotion of the thirteen Cardinals, created by Pope Clement VIII. May 3, 1599 (9). On this occaſion, d'Oſſat refuſed to accept of the coach and horſes and the red damaſk bed which Cardinal de Joyeuſe ſent him three

(9) Niceron's *Hommes illuſtres*, p. 36.

Vice-protector of the French Nation; in which employment he did all the ſervice imaginable to thoſe who wanted his aſſiſtance (*f*). In 1600 the King nominated him Biſhop of Bayeux, the revenues of which were more conſiderable than thoſe of Rennes; but finding the affairs of his Sovereign would not allow him to reſide in his Dioceſe, he deſired leave to reſign, which he obtained with great difficulty. He died about the 13th of March 1604, in the 68th year of his age; and was buried in St. Lewis's Church, belonging to the French Nation, in Rome, where the underwritten epitaph was inſcribed to his memory [*I*]. The laſt important negotiation he tranſacted with the Pope, was for the obtaining a diſpenſation for the marriage of Duke de Bar, with the King's ſiſter, then a Proteſtant (*g*). Here follows his character [*K*]. An inſtance is related of his great diſintereſtedneſs [*L*]. We ſhall give a liſt of his works [*M*].

(*f*) Perrault, p. 15.

(*g*) Ibid. p. 16.

three weeks after; for ſays he, in a letter to Mr. de Villeroy, *though I have not every thing neceſſary for me to ſupport the ſplendor of my preſent dignity; I yet will not lay aſide the modeſty and temperance I have hitherto obſerved; nor receive ſo noble a gift from any other Nobleman or Prince but my Sovereign* (10).

(10) Perrault, p. 15.

[*I*] *The under-written epitaph was inſcribed to his memory.*]

D. O. M.

Arnaldo Oſſato, Gallo, S. Euſebii Preſbytero Cardinali, Epiſcopo Baiocenſi, qui omnium per multos annos Gallicanorum in Urbe negotiorum, conſiliorumque particeps, & adminiſter, rariſſimæ in Reges ſuos fidei, egregiorumque meritorum teſtimonio, ſacrâ purpurâ ornatus, ampliſſimi ordinis dignitatem eâ ſapientiæ, integritatiſque famâ, eâque officiorum in omnes propenſione cumulavit, ut ſui deſiderium exteris quoque nationibus cum admiratione reliquerit.

Vixit annos 67; *menſes* 6; *dies* 2.

Deceſſit pridie Idus Martii 1604.

Petrus Boſſu, Lugdunenſis, cubiculi Præfectus à ſecretis, & Renatus Cortin, Andegavenſis, à cubiculo, item & Secretarius ex trientibus hæredes Patrono optimo atque indulgentiſſimo S. P. P. C. (11).

(11) Niceron, *Hommes illuſtres*, p. 37, 38.

[*K*] *Here follows his character.*] He was a man of prodigious penetration; applied himſelf ſo cloſely to affairs, and eſpecially, was ſo judicious in forming his reſolutions, that it is almoſt impoſſible to find out one falſe ſtep in the many negotiations in which he was concerned (12).

(12) Perrault, p. 16.

[*L*] *An inſtance is related of his diſintereſtedneſs.*] Cardinal d'Eſte bequeathed d'Oſſat four thouſand Crowns, and offered him a diamond worth twenty thouſand, deſiring him to keep it till his executors ſhould have paid him the abovementioned ſum. However, the earneſt entreaties employed by the Cardinal, could not prevail with him to keep that pledge; and when the legacy was paid him thirteen years after, he received it as though it had been a gift from the executors. This money indeed came very ſeaſonably the firſt year after his acceſſion to the Purple; for otherwiſe, as he himſelf declares, he would have been almoſt ruined (13).

(13) Ibid. p. 14.

[*M*] *We ſhall give a liſt of his works.*] 1. *Expoſitio in diſputationem Jacobi Carpentarii de Methodo. Pariſ. Wechel.* 1564. 8vo. This is a defence of the Logic of Peter Ramus, (under whom he had learnt philoſophy in the college of Preſle) in oppoſition to James Charpentier, who had attacked him. The latter anſwered only by injurious expreſſions, as uſual with thoſe who have nothing better to offer (14). Perrault mentions this work (15), but does not ſeem to know that it was printed, he ſaying, that "of the curi- "ous works written by d'Oſſat, only his letters are "extant (16). 2. *Lettres du Cardinal d'Oſſat*, Paris 1624, folio." The firſt Editor of theſe letters, altered ſome paſſages in them, and ſuppreſſed whole pieces, in order not to offend certain perſons then living, whoſe reſentment he perhaps dreaded. Item, *The ſecond edition reviſed and enlarged*, Paris 1624, folio and quarto. In this edition, ſome things which had been retrenched in the other, were added; but it may ſtill be looked upon as imperfect, in compariſon of thoſe publiſhed by Amelot de la Houſſaye. Item, *The third edition, enlarged*, Paris 1627, folio and octavo. *Item*, Paris 1641, folio. *Item*, Roan 1643, 4to. Item, *A new edition, corrected from the original manuſcript, and very much enlarged by letters written ſince* 1596, *and other pieces never publiſhed before, with the Cardinal's life, and notes hiſtorical and political, by Amelot de la Houſſaye*, Paris 1697, 4to. Two volumes. Item, *Enlarged with two notes of M. de la Houſſaye, not inſerted in the Paris edition of* 1697. Amſterdam 1708, 12mo, five volumes. This is the beſt edition, as being the moſt ample. Jerom Carini tranſlated theſe letters into Italian, from the firſt editions, and his tranſlation was printed at Venice, in 1629, 4to. The various editions which have been made of theſe letters, are a proof how greatly they were eſteemed by the public. And indeed, tho' the affairs they treat of, are not of ſo much concern at this time, as in the age when they were writ, they may ſtill be of great ſervice to politicians, as teach the art of negotiating, they particularly with the court of Rome. Amelot de la Houſſaye's notes not only illuſtrate them, but alſo inform the reader of many hiſtorical facts and political maxims (17). Another Author obſerves, that d'Oſſat's letters are ſo finely written, ſo judicious, and abound with ſuch excellent maxims, that we cannot form to ourſelves too advantageous an idea of them (17).

(14) Niceron, 38.

(15) Perrault, p. 13.

(16) Ibid. p. 16.

(17) Niceron, p. 38 *& ſeq.*

(17) Perrault, p. 16.

I

OTHO III. ſucceeded his father, who died in 983, at about twelve years of age. On this account, the beginning of his reign was not free from commotions; however, they were all ſuppreſſed very happily; and when his years permitted him to aſſume the reins of Empire, he ſhewed himſelf highly worthy to take them in hand. His preceptor was the famous Gerbert, a native of Auvergne (*a*), whom he raiſed to the Archiepiſcopal See of Ravenna, and afterwards Pope, by the name of Sylveſter II. The affair that gave him moſt trouble, was that at Rome, where Creſcentius would fain have kept the Sovereign Power in his own hands, and whence he drove Pope Gregory V. the Emperor's relation [*A*]. He was prepared for a vigorous defence, when advice was brought that this Prince was marching towards Rome to chaſtiſe him; but he made very little reſiſtance; and was obliged, in a few days, to ſurrender himſelf, with the Anti-Pope he had created. The latter was ſcourged, had his eyes put out, and was at laſt killed by the populace,

(*a*) Du Cheſne, *Vie des Papes.*

[*A*] *Pope Gregory* V. *the Emperor's near relation.*] His name was Bruno, and he was ſon to Otho of Saxony, Duke of Franconia and Suabia; which Otho was the ſon of Ludolphus, and grandſon of Otho I. ſo that Bruno was great grandſon of Otho, grandſon of Otho III. Thoſe who declared him preceptor to Otho I, have been ſtrangely cenſured for it (1). Some may doubt whether the Critic be in the right, in making Otho, the ſon of Ludolphus, Duke of Bavaria; for 'tis certain on the one hand, that Bavaria being given by Otho I. to his brother Henry, continued in the poſſeſſion of the deſcendents of this Henry; and on the other, that Otho the Son of Ludolphus was Duke of Suabia after his

(1) *Vide Specimen Errorum, &* Perizonio *vulgatum, anno* 1693, p. 119.

populace, before the Emperor had time to pronounce ſentence of condemnation on him [*B*]. Hereunder is the puniſhment inflicted on Creſcentius [*C*], which was in 998. Pope Gregory V. reſtored at the ſame time, died ſome months after; and it was then Otho raiſed Sylveſter II. to the Pontificate. The people of Rome, emboldned by the Emperor's abſence, who was returned to Germany, made a freſh commotion; they not liking to be dependent on the Germans. Otho was therefore obliged to attempt once again to reſtore the city of Rome to tranquillity; but he took a wrong courſe; he flattering himſelf that if he did but once appear *ſolâ Majeſtate ornatus*, armed ſingly with his Majeſty, the factions would immediately lay down their arms; but the contrary happened, and ſerved as an example to ſhow, that a Prince ſhould never expoſe his Majeſty unarmed, to the mercy of a rebellious populace. The inhabitants of Rome took ſuch great advantage of Otho's appearing with few or no troops, that they confined him in his Palace; ſo that it is not known what might have befallen the Emperor in his captivity, which was inevitable, had not Hugh Marquis of Tuſcany, and Henry Duke of Bavaria, poſted to Rome, and amuſed the common people, by offering ſeveral propoſals for an accommodation, till ſuch time as they had furniſhed the Emperor an opportunity to make his eſcape. This was in 1001. Now as this Prince had good troops in Italy, whither he was returned only to drive the Saracens out of it, from whom he had recovered Capua; it was not long before he returned to Rome [*D*] with ſo powerful a body of troops, that he chaſtiſed the inhabitants at pleaſure. He ſet out for Germany in the beginning of the year 1002; but he died in Paterno, the 28th of January of the ſame year, before he was got out of Italy. He is thought to have died by poiſoned gloves, which Creſcentius's widow, one of the moſt handſome women of her time, gave him, out of revenge for the forfeiting the word he had given; he having promiſed to marry her, merely to enjoy her; and afterwards, when he had ſatiated his deſires, laughed at the promiſe (*b*). He had been unhappy in his wives [*E*]; ſhe whom he had married (*c*) was not only leud, but likewiſe guilty of another crime for which he burnt her; and ſhe whom he did not marry

(*b*) Extracted from Maimbourg, *Décadence de l'Empire*, Liv. 2.

(*c*) Mary of Arragon. See her article.

his father; but 'tis equally certain, that Otho II. being at war with Henry II. Duke of Bavaria, gave Bavaria to Otho, ſon of Ludolphus (2).

(2) See the hiſtory of Bavaria, by Blanc, Tom. 2. p. 138.

[*B*] *The Anti-pope . . . was killed by the populace, before the Emperor had time to pronounce ſentence of condemnation on him.*] Some ſay (3) that the populace ſeized the Anti-pope, before Otho had been admitted into Rome; that they pulled out his eyes; cut off his ears and noſe; ſet him on an Aſs, his face turned towards the tail; and that *Otho, to whom they afterwards opened the gates, baniſhed him to the moſt remote part of Germany, and that he died there of grief ſoon after*. Here ſome Writers affirm particulars concerning the Anti-pope, which others relate of Creſcentius. Some relate (4) that it was Otho who cauſed the Anti-pope's noſe to be cut off; his eyes to be put out; and afterwards had him flung headlong from the top of the caſtle St. Angelo. Theſe claſhings give people a great diſtaſte for the ſtudy of hiſtory, and are a diſhonour to mankind; for if men were good for any thing, Hiſtorians would agree exactly in incidents ſo remarkable as the abovementioned. But how ſhould many Hiſtorians agree, ſince often a ſingle one is not conſiſtent with himſelf. Conſult Mathias's *Theatrum* (5), and it will appear, *that the Anti-pope was whipt, and his eyes put out, and was, at laſt, killed by the populace, before Otho had condemned him. Antipapa à vulgo virgis cæſus, oculis privatus, & demum confoſſus, priuſquam de eo Otto ſententiam tulit.* And 'tis related in page 889, "that the Emperor "having cauſed the Anti-pope's noſe to be cut off, "and his eyes pulled out, threw him headlong from "the ſummit of the capitol." *Imperator anno Chriſti* 998 *Romam profectus eſt, Antipapam naſis & oculis privavit, & de Capitolio præcipitem dedit, uti ſupra prolixius diximus.* Theſe laſt words are very odd; the Author quotes himſelf falſely; he having given an account quite different from what he relates in this place.

(3) *Petr. Damian. Ep.* 2. *ad Cad. Ciaconius, Sigonius*, cited by Maimbourg, *Décadence de l'Empire*, Liv. 2.

(4) Heiſs, *Hiſt. de l'Empire*, Tom. 1. p. m. 122.

(5) Mathias, *Theatr.* p. 888.

[*C*] *Hereunder is the puniſhment inflicted on Creſcentius.*] He was ſet on an Aſs, his head being turned toward the tail, and in this poſture, was carried up and down the whole city; after which, ſeveral of his limbs being cut off, he was hanged. His accomplices were puniſhed differently (6). Some Writers give the following account of this affair (7). Creſcentius, after having made the moſt vigorous defence poſſible in the fortreſs of Rome, endeavoured to prevent his deſtruction, by throwing himſelf at Otho's feet; but this Prince had him carried back to the caſtle, in order that he might take him by force. Creſcentius made a moſt deſperate defence there; when, at laſt, the caſtle was ſtormed, and all were put to the ſword, *except Creſcentius, who, being covered with wounds, was taken priſoner, and immediately thrown headlong from the ſummit of the fortreſs, dragged through the dirt, and afterwards hung upon ſo high a gallows* (8), *that he was ſeen by the whole city* (9). According to Moreri, he was only beheaded; but Heiſs (10) ſays, that himſelf, and twelve of his accomplices, were hanged up on the higheſt tree that could be found.

(6) *Ex Sethe Caliſio.*

(7) Glaber. lib. 1. and Dithmar, lib. 4. cited by Maimbourg, *Décadence de l'Empire*, p. m. Liv. 2.

(8) See article BARELOT, remark [*B*].

(9) Maimbourg, *Décadence de l'Empire*, p. m. 123.

(10) *Hiſt. de l'Empire*, Tom. 1. p. m. 122.

[*D*] *It was not long before he returned to Rome.*] After examining ſtrictly the account given by ſeveral Hiſtorians, it appears to me plain, that Mathias is miſtaken, when he relates that Otho intended to march into Germany, there to raiſe an army, which might enable him to puniſh the Romans for their rebellion, but that he died on the road. According to this account, he muſt have died unrevenged, the contrary of which is aſſerted by good Authors (11). However, it would be very raſh in any perſon, to rank this in the claſs of errors; for the hiſtory of the middle age is ſo much confuſed, and has paſt through ſo many bad hands, that we find authorities *pro* and *con*, and numberleſs variations. This deprives me of a great number of materials; for ſhould I venture to condemn thoſe who relate an incident after a certain manner, authorities would not be wanting which aſſert the direct contrary. 'Tis ſcarce poſſible to frame a falſhood (12) for thoſe ages; for let a Writer relate, merely from his own fancy, and at random, the circumſtances of any action, it is a thouſand to one but ſome Author or other will confirm his wild aſſertions.

(11) See Dithmar. *apud* Calviſium, ad ann. 1001, 1002.

(12) *i. e.* to aſſert any particulars without any proof or teſtimony.

[*E*] *He had been unhappy in his wives.*] The fair ſex ſeem, in general, to have been impropitious to Otho; for, beſides what I related concerning his wife, and his miſtreſs, I have read ſomewhere, (13), that it was merely for the ſake of that miſtreſs (Creſcentius's widow,) that he entered Rome with ſo ſmall a guard, that it had like to have proved a perpetual priſon to him. Add, that Theophania his mother, daughter of an Emperor of Conſtantinople, made him incur the hatred of a great many Nobles (14); and that after his mother's death (15), being brought up by Adelai de or Alice, his grandmother, he thought himſelf obliged to ſend her from court. 'Tis probable, that the wiſeſt of his courtiers did not give him this advice; however, he thought it neceſſary that this ſhould be done. Notwithſtanding this, he yet entruſted women with governments; for during his journey

(13) Huber. *Hiſt. Civil.* Tom. 1.

(14) See Joan. Cluver. *Hiſtoria Univerſalis*, in Othone III.

(15) Which, according to Cluverius, happened in 989; or, according to Calviſius, Mathias, &c. in 991.

marry [F], brought him to his end. Thoſe who affirm that the College of the ſeven Electors was eſtabliſhed in his reign are miſtaken (d), whether they aſcribe the eſtabliſhment of it to Otho himſelf, or to Pope Gregory V. It is more juſt to ſay, that Poland was made a Kingdom by that Emperor, as I obſerved in the article of BOLESLAS I. Wonders have been related concerning Otho's penitence [G]. His devotion was ſo great that he undertook pilgrimages (e); and it is even ſaid, that he had made a promiſe to turn Monk (f). I would not cite, as an indication of his devotion, the cloths in which he had cauſed the whole book of the Revelations to be exhibited in embroidery (g).

(d) See the proofs of this in Maimbourg, *Décadence de l'Empire*, book 2.

(e) See the article BOLESLAS I.

(f) Calviſius, ad ann. 1001. Chriſti.

(g) Matthias, *Theatr. Hiſt.* p. m. 886.

journey to Rome, in 996, he gave that of Saxony to Mathilda or Maud, his aunt by the mother's ſide; and, after her death, to his ſiſter Alice.

[F] *She whom he did not marry.*] One Glaber, an Hiſtorian, ſays, that Otho married her. A certain circumſtance is, that after taking her to his bed, he contracted an averſion for, and abandoned her.

[G] *Wonders have been related concerning Otho's penitence.*] 'Tis related, that he ſometimes uſed to faſt a whole week, thurſdays excepted; that he beſtowed alms with a very liberal hand, and would ſhed floods of tears to expiate his ſins. But the Latin deſcribes this better; *Plurima ingemiſcens facinora noctis ſilentio, vigiliis & orationibus intentus, lacrimarum quoque rivis abluere non deſtitit, ſæpenumero omnem hebdomadam excepta quinta feria jejunium producens, in eleemoſynis valdè largus* (16). To this, add what I have related elſewhere (17) concerning his pilgrimages.

(16) Dithmar. lib. 4. cited by Maimbourg, *Décadence de l'Empire*, p. 128.

(17) Article BOLESLAS I. remark [A].

OTTOBONI (PETER) a Venetian, was Pope in the 17th Century, under the name of Alexander VIII. Mark Ottoboni his father, high Chancellor of Venice, purchaſed Patents of Nobility, which coſt him an hundred thouſand Ducats in 1646. Peter Ottoboni having gone through a courſe of ſtudies, firſt at Venice, and afterwards in Padua, and taken his Doctor of Law's degree in the laſt of thoſe two cities, went to Rome at twenty years of age. Under Pope Urban VIII. he had the Governments of Terni, Rietti, Citta, Caſtellana, and the employment of Auditor of the Rota. In 1652 he was raiſed to the Purple by Innocent X. and two years after was made Biſhop of Breſcia. He was Datary under Alexander VII. and at laſt elected Pope, October 6, 1689, in the room of Innocent XI. (a). The war, which was lighted up with great fury between the houſes of Auſtria and France, contributed very much to the election of Ottoboni; becauſe thoſe Cardinals who were neuter, too juſtly feared to endanger the Romiſh Religion, in caſe they ſhould chuſe as Pope a perſon who was born a ſubject of the King of Spain, as the late Pope was, whoſe partiality againſt France had done infinite ſervice to the Proteſtants. They therefore imagined that Ottoboni, who was a perſon qualified for the papal throne, would ſuit the then preſent juncture of affairs better than any other perſon, becauſe he was a Venetian. The only advantage France gained by this election was, Pope Alexander VIII. ſollicited the Venetians ſo ſtrongly to engage in war with the Turks; and aſſured to procure them ſuch mighty ſuccours, that he quite put a ſtop to the peace which the Emperor would fain have concluded with the Port, in order to have an opportunity of employing all his troops againſt the French. In other reſpects, Alexander VIII. devoted his whole thoughts to the aggrandizing of his family [A]. He was

(a) *Mercure Galant*, for Octo- 1689.

[A] *Alexander devoted his whole thoughts to the aggrandizing of his family.*] What is ſaid of beaſts; that no bites are more dangerous than thoſe when they are dying, may very juſtly be ſaid of Nepotiſm. *Ut quam maxime mortiferi eſſe morſus ſolent morientium beſtiarum ſic plus negotii fuit cum ſemiruta Carthagine quam integra* (1), i. e. "As beaſts, when dying, "uſe to give the moſt deadly bites; ſo Carthage, "when half deſtroyed, gave more trouble than "when in its flouriſhing State." To which I may add the following words of Seneca *. *In gladiatoribus quoque conditio dura victoris eſt cum moriente pugnantis. Nullum magis adverſarium timeas quam qui vivere non poteſt occidere poteſt. Concitatiſſima eſt rabies in deſperatione, & morte ultima in furorem animus impellitur*, i. e. "It is a hard condition, in the combats "of the gladiators, that the victor ſhould be obliged "to fight with a dying man. No adverſary ought "to be dreaded more than a man who cannot live, "but may kill. Deſpair inſpires the moſt furious "rage; and the ſoul when expiring, is roufed to "madneſs." Nepotiſm being brought very low under Pope Alexander VIII. it collected all its ſtrength, in order to be the more capable of devouring. It might be ſaid of the uncle; he is old, and makes haſte, becauſe he knows his time to be ſhort. Menage uſed to tell a ſtory that will come very apropos here. Alexander VIII. (ſaid he) *being elected Pope at ſeventy nine years of age, and having preferred all his Nephews in three weeks time, aſked one of his principal Domeſticks what the world ſaid of him. He replied, that he did not loſe any time in advancing his family.* Says the Pope, oh! oh! ſono vinti tre hore e mezza, *'tis half an hour after three and twenty* (2) †. To act in the manner he did, with regard to an abuſe which his ſucceſſor was to aboliſh, was beſtowing an honourable funeral on it. Perhaps Pope Ottoboni's very advanced age, was not the only motive which prompted him to make ſuch diſpatch in enriching his whole family. He conſidered, perhaps, that length of time had made the people of Rome forget, in ſome meaſure, the wild diſorders that flowed from Nepotiſm, they not having appeared during the long reign of Innocent XI. Conſequently, the murmurs of the people might be very much leſſened in that reſpect; and he was to govern ſubjects who had enjoyed an interval of repoſe and tranquility after their former fatigues. This calls to my memory the knaviſh arts of flatterers; and the great dexterity with which, like true jugglers, they whirl about the moſt ſacred things. But in order that this criticiſm, which is not my own, may have greater weight and authority, I have copied it from a book printed at Paris, and allowed of by the licenſer (3). "Among "the applauſes (4) which he beſtows on Innocent XI. that on which he expatiates the moſt, is, his "keeping his Nephews in a private ſtation, in imi- "tation of our Saviour, who knew no other relations "than thoſe who did his father's will. Alexander "VIII. having had views quite contrary to thoſe "of his predeceſſor, Palatius found out a way to "juſtify the ſollicitous care with which he heaped "up wealth and honours on his relations; and aſ- "ſerts, that in this point alſo the Pope in queſtion "had followed our Saviour's example, who honoured "his relations, according to the fleſh, with the par- "ticipation of his Prieſthood, and intruſted them "with the diſpenſation of his Goſpel: ſo fruitful is "eloquence in inventions, when the paſſions of per- "ſons in power are to be flattered, or the greateſt "irregularities in their conduct to be excuſed."

(1) Florus, lib. 2. c. 15.

* Seneca, *controv. epiſt.* 9.

(2) See the *Menagiana*, p. 208. Dutch edit.

† The Italians count the whole twenty-four hours of the natural day, round; and do not divide it, as we do, into twice twelve hours. Rem. by the Tranſlator.

(3) *Journ. des Savans*, for Decemb. 15, 1692. p. 731. Dutch edit.

(4) *i. e.* John Palatius, Author of a work, in 5 vols folio, printed at Venice, anno 1691, and entitled, *Geſta Pontificum Romanorum.*

very little affected with the diviſions which prevailed between the Courts of Rome and France [*B*]. He did but amuſe the Miniſters of Lewis XIV. and ſhewed on a ſudden, by the promulgation of a Bull, little before his death [*C*], that he had only laughed at them. The French, in hopes of gaining his favour, changed their note: they had ſaid few advantageous things, for ſome time, of Innocent XI. and afterwards had ſpoke a great many very ill things of him; but the Poets and Orators began to reſume their panegyrical vein in favour of his ſucceſſor. But they found that, to proceed on ſurer grounds, it would be neceſſary for them to ſquare their conduct, in the article of applauding, according to the maxim which Solon adviſed mankind to obſerve, in order to pronounce or determine with reſpect to the felicity of a perſon [*D*]. Cardinal Peter Ottoboni was ſo far advanced in years, at the time of his being advanced to the Papal Chair, that it is no wonder he enjoyed but a ſhort reign, it being but of fifteen or ſixteen months, this Pontif dying the firſt day of February 1691. A prediction, which has very much the air of an impoſture, was ſpread concerning his death [*E*].

[*B*] *He was very little affected with the diviſions which prevailed between the Courts of Rome and France.*] And yet the affair in queſtion was of ſo much importance, as to require a ſpeedy concluſion: and had Alexander VIII. been as zealous for the intereſt of St. Peter's chair, as for thoſe of his family, his reflection on the ſhort time he had to live, would have prompted him to put an end as ſoon as poſſible to the diviſions with regard to France, rather than make a quick diſpatch in enriching his family. By delaying this, he left his ſucceſſor the glory of re-eſtabliſhing in France the Pope's authority on its antient foot; which would have been impoſſible, had he ſtayed till the King of France was at peace with his neighbours. True policy required, that the Court of Rome ſhould take advantage of the tickliſh State of the affairs in France; and this Innocent did with great ſkill. Certain Fanaticks, who had declared, that the league formed againſt France in 1688 would be fatal to the Papal throne; and that the approaching deſtruction of Popery would begin by the reformation of the French Court, are very much out, ſince France, by that league, is become more popiſh than it was in 1682 and 1688; and conſequently Popery has repaired one of its breaches. Fooliſh are they who give credit to ſuch creatures. See the article of BRAUNBOM, remark [*C*].

[*C*] *By the promulgation of a Bull a little before his death.*] This bull was ready the fourth of Auguſt 1690, it being dated that day; but it was not publiſhed till the 30th of January 1691. It fulminates whatever was tranſacted in prejudice to the Pope's authority, in the aſſembly of the Clergy of France, *Anno* 1682. The reaſon of that Bull's not being publiſhed ſooner, was, the Pope was deſirous of amuſing Lewis XIV. of gaining ſome advantages by him; but when he found he had one foot in the grave, he obſerved no farther meaſures, and let fly his Bull. This was of great benefit to the expounders of St. Malachi: they did not know how to apply to Peter Ottoboni the ſymbol *pœnitentia glorioſa*, which concerns him in the predictions of that pretended Prophet. They were not content with ſaying, that this Pope had been elected on St. Bruno's day; or that his name was Peter, though the pretence of thoſe two Saints was very glorious; this, I ſay, they looked upon as too forced and far fetched: but the Bull gave occaſion to ſay, that Alexander VIII. had at laſt glorioufly repented of the indulgence he had ſhown to the Court and Clergy of France (5). I obſerve here, that the decree of the inquiſition dated December 7, 1690, againſt thirty one propoſitions, vexed the Divines of the Gallican Church. See the letter written by an Abbot to a Prelate of the Court of Rome (6).

(5) See *Acta Eruditor.* 1691, p. 151.

(6) It contains 66 pages, 12mo, in my edition, which is the 2d. The title bears, according to the edition printed in Thouloufe, 1691.

[*D*] *This maxim, which Solon adviſed mankind to obſerve, in order to pronounce or determine with regard to the felicity of a perſon.*] This maxim is, that we cannot judge of a man's happineſs, till after his death; for thoſe who appear to us happy, ſhall perhaps be reduced to the extreams of miſery before they leave the world. Ovid has finely expreſſed this thought of Solon.

Sed ſcilicet ultima ſemper
Exſpectanda dies homini: dicique beatus
Ante obitum nemo, ſupremaque funera debet (7).

(7) Ovid. *Metamorp.* lib. 3. v. 135.

That is,

" But no frail man, however great or high,
" Can be concluded bleſt before he die.

ADDISON.

The fickleneſs or depravity of the human heart, ſhould induce us not to praiſe a man till after his death. By this caution we ſhall ſave ourſelves the inconveniency of changing our note, and many other things. Salvian was not ignorant of this maxim; he obſerving, that wiſdom is applauded in the iſſue of things; and that it cannot be praiſed in childhood, in youth, or in proſperity, becauſe in thoſe circumſtances, all is applauded that is dubious. That whatever is liable to change, cannot be ſafely commended, *&c.* That a thing, whoſe condition is no longer doubtful, will deſerve a true applauſe; encomiums being then durable, when the merits of the thing applauded cannot be loſt. Sapientia (8), *inquit ſermo divinus*, in exitu canitur. *Cur eam non dixit cani in pueritia, non in juventute, non in ſtatu rerum incolumium, non in proſperitatibus ſecundorum? Scilicet quia in his omnibus quicquid laudatur incertum eſt. Quàm diu enim quis ſubjacet mutationi, non poteſt cum ſecuritate laudari. Et ideo, ut ait,* ſapientia in exitu canitur. *Exiens enim quis de incertis periculorum, certum merebitur evaſa omni rerum varietate ſuffragium: quia tunc ſtabilis & firma laus eſt, quando meritum non poterit jam perire laudati.* Sapientia, *inquit*, in exitu canitur.

(8) Salvian. *contra Avaritiam*, lib. 4. p. m. 145.

[*E*] *A prediction, which has very much the air of impoſture, was ſpread concerning his death.*] A Frenchman, whoſe name I conceal, had written, from Geneva, to his friends in Holland, about the beginning of the winter, in the year 1690, that a man in Milan went to his Confeſſor, and told him, *that he found himſelf near his end; that he ſhould die in two days, his brother in four, the Pope at Chriſtmas, and the King of France at Eaſter.* The Writer of this news added, that the two brothers died at the time ſpecified. The inſtant they knew that the Pope was not dead at Chriſtmas, the news was dropt; but it was revived during the ſiege of Mons (9); and, to give it the more weight, Chriſtmas day was no longer ſaid to be the time in which the Pope would die; but it was given out, that the man at Milan ſaid only that the Pope would die in a few weeks. It were to be wiſhed that ſome perſon had taken the pains to keep an exact account of this kind of predictions. Had they been ſet down annually, in our chronicles, we perhaps ſhould not be ſo liable, at this time, to be impoſed upon by them.

(9) In March, 1691.

☞ OTWAY (THOMAS), an eminent tragick writer, was ſon of Mr. Humphrey Otway, Rector of Wolbeding in Suſſex, and was born at Trottin in that County, on the 3d of March 1651. He was educated in Wykeham's ſchool near Wincheſter, and became a Commoner of Chriſt Church in Oxford in the beginning of the year 1669. He left the Univerſity without a degree, and retired to London, where he not only applied himſelf

himſelf to poetry, but ſometimes acted in plays, whereby he ſupported himſelf, and gained the favour of Charles Fitz-Charles, Earl of Plymouth, one of the natural ſons of King Charles II. In 1677 he went in the quality of a Cornet with the new-raiſed Engliſh forces deſigned for Flanders. But he returned from thence in very neceſſitous circumſtances [*A*], and applied himſelf again to the writing of plays, and other poems [*B*]. He died at the ſign of the bull on Tower-Hill, April 14, 1685; and was interred in a vault under the Church of St. Clement Danes (*a*) He tranſlated out of French into Engliſh, *The Hiſtory of Triumvirates; the firſt part of* Julius Cæſar, Pompey, *and* Craſſius; *the ſecond part of* Auguſtus, Anthony, *and* Lepidus. *Being a faithful Collection from the beſt Hiſtorians and other Authors, concerning that Revolution of the Roman Government which happened under their Authority.* London 1686 in 8vo. Mr. Longbaine (*b*) tells us, that "his genius in Comedy lay a little too much to Libertiniſm; but "in Tragedy he made it is buſineſs for the moſt part to obſerve the decorum of the Stage. "He was a man of excellent parts, and daily improved in his writing; but yet ſome-"times fell into plagiariſm as well as his contemporaries, and made uſe of *Shakeſpear*, to "the advantage of his purſe at leaſt, if not his reputation." Mr. Addiſon (*c*) obſerves, that our Author *has followed nature in the Language of his Tragedy, and therefore ſhines in the paſſionate Parts more than any of our Engliſh Poets. As there is ſomething familiar and domeſtick in the Fable of his Tragedy, more than in thoſe of any other Poet, he has little pomp, but great force in his expreſſions. For which reaſon, though he has admirably ſucceeded in the tender and melting part of his Tragedies, he ſometimes falls into too great a familiarity of phraſe in thoſe, which, by* Ariſtotle's *rule, ought to have been raiſed and ſupported by the dignity of expreſſion. It has been obſerved by others, that this Poet has founded his Tragedy of* Venice Preſerved *on ſo wrong a Plot, that the greateſt characters in it are thoſe of Rebels and Traitors. Had the Hero of his Play diſcovered the ſame good qualities in the defence of his country, that he ſhewed for its ruin and ſubverſion, the audience could not enough pity and admire him. But as he is now repreſented, we can only ſay of him what the Roman Hiſtorian ſays of* Catiline, *that his fall would have been glorious,* (ſi pro patria ſic concidiſſet) *had he ſo fallen in the ſervice of his country.* Mr. Charles Gildon (*d*) ſtiles Mr. Otway a *Poet of the firſt magnitude*, and tells us (*e*), that "he "was a perfect maſter of the Tragick Paſſions, and draws them every where with a juſt "and natural ſimplicity, and therefore never fails to raiſe ſtrong emotions in the ſoul. "But that Mr. Dryden, who affects a quite different ſtyle, and ſeldom or never touches "the paſſions, for moſt part of his time he commonly expreſſed a very mean, if not "a contemptible opinion of OTWAY, though at laſt, eſpecially in his *Preface* to *du "Freſnoy*, he declared in his favour; and yet even here he could not but throw in ſome "exceptions againſt his diction." The paſſage of Mr. *Dryden* is as follows: "To "expreſs the paſſions, which are ſeated on the heart by outward ſigns, is one great "precept of the painters, and very difficult to perform. In poetry, the very ſame "paſſions and motions of the mind are to be expreſſed; and in this conſiſts the principal "difficulty, as well as the excellency of that art. This (ſays my Author) is the gift of "*Jupiter*; and to ſpeak in the ſame heathen language, we call it the gift of our *Apollo*, "not to be obtained by pains or ſtudy, if we are not born to it. For the motions, "which are ſtudied, are never ſo natural, as thoſe, which break out in the height of a "real

(*a*) Wood, *Athen.* Oxon. vol. 2. col. 781, 782. 2d edit.

(*b*) Account of the Engliſh dramatick Poets, p. 395, 396. edit. Oxford, 1691.

(*c*) *Spectator*, No. 39. vol. 1.

(*d*) *Laws of Poetry explained and illuſtrated*, p. 201. edit. Lond. 1721.

(*e*) Ibid. p. 211.

[*A*] *Returned from thence in very neceſſitous circumſtances.*] The Earl of Rocheſter, in his *Seſſion of the Poets* (1), repreſents his diſtreſſed condition in the following lines.

(1) See the *Poems of John, Earl of Rocheſter*, p. 113. edit. 1680.

Tom Otway *came next*, Tom Shadwell's *dear Zany,*
And ſwears for heroics he writes beſt of any:
Don Carlos *his pockets ſo amply had fill'd,*
That his mange was quite cur'd, and his lice were all kill'd.
But Apollo *had ſeen his face on the ſtage,*
And prudently did not think fit to engage
The ſcum of a play-houſe, for the prop of an age.

[*B*] *His plays and other poems.*] His plays are as follow. 1. *Alcibiades*, a tragedy, acted at the Duke's theatre. London 1675, in 4to, dedicated to Charles, Earl of Middleſex. 2. *Don Carlos, Prince of Spain*, a tragedy, acted at the Duke's theatre. Printed at London 1676, in 4to, and dedicated to the Duke of York. 3. *Titus and Berenice*, a tragedy, acted at the Duke's theatre. Printed at London, 1677, in 4to. It conſiſts of three acts. 4. *Cheats of Scapin*, a farce, acted at the Duke's theatre, and printed with *Titus & Berenice*, and dedicated to John, Earl of Rocheſter. This farce is tranſlated from Moliere. 5. *Friendſhip in Faſhion*, a comedy, acted at the Duke's theatre. Printed at London, 1678, in 4to, and dedicated to Charles, Earl of Dorſet and Middleſex. 6. *The Hiſtory and Fall of Caius Marius*, a tragedy, acted at the Duke's theatre. Printed at London, 1680, in 4to, and dedicated to the Lord Viſcount Falkland. A great part of this tragedy is borrowed from Shakeſpear's *Romeo and Juliet*. 7. *The Orphan; or, The unhappy Marriage*, a tragedy, acted at the Duke's theatre. Printed at London, 1680, in 4to, and dedicated to her Royal Highneſs the Ducheſs of York. This tragedy is founded on a novel, called, *Engliſh Adventures:* ſee the hiſtory of *Brandon*, p. 17 (2). 8. *The Soldier's Fortune*, a comedy, acted at the Duke's theatre. Printed at London, 1681, in 4to. It is dedicated to Mr. Bentley, the Bookſeller, and is, as he ſays, a ſort of acquittance for the money he received for the copy. Mr. Langbaine obſerves (3), that *there are ſeveral paſſages in this play, that have been touched before by others*; of which that Writer gives inſtances. 9. *Venice preſerved; or, A Plot diſcovered*, a tragedy, acted at the Duke's theatre. Printed at London, 1682, in 4to, and dedicated to the Ducheſs of Portſmouth. 10. *The Atheiſt; or, The ſecond part of the Soldier's Fortune*, a comedy, acted at the Duke's theatre. Printed at London, 1684, in 4to, and dedicated to the Lord Eland, eldeſt ſon to the Marquis of Halifax. Beſides theſe plays, he wrote ſeveral poems, *viz. The Poet's Complaint to his Muſe; or, A Satyr againſt Libels.* London, 1680, in 4to. *Windſor-Caſtle; or, A Monument to our late Sovereign King Charles* II. *of ever bleſſed Memory.* London, 1685, in 4to. *An Epiſtle to* R. D. printed in the *Miſcellany Poems, containing a new tranſlation of Virgil's Eclogues, Ovid's*

(2) Langbaine, *Account of the Engliſh dramatic Poets*, p. 398, 399. edit. Oxford, 1691.

(3) Ibid. p. 399.

" real paſſion. Mr. *Otway* poſſeſſed this part as thoroughly as any of the antients or " moderns. I will not defend every thing in his *Venice Preſerv'd*; but I muſt bear " this teſtimony to his memory, that the paſſions are truly touched in it, though perhaps " there is ſomewhat to be deſired both in the grounds of them, and in the height and " elegance of expreſſion. But nature is there, which is the greateſt beauty." Mrs. Barry, the celebrated actreſs, uſed to ſay, that in her part of *Monimia* in the *Orphan*, ſhe never ſpoke theſe three words, *Ah! poor* Caſtalio! without tears: upon which occaſion Mr. Gildon obſerves (*f*), that *all that pathetick force had been loſt, if any more words had been added, and the Poet would have ſtriven in vain to heighten them, by the addition of figures of ſpeech; ſince the beauty of thoſe three plain ſimple words is ſo great by the force of Nature, that they muſt have been weakened and obſcured by the moſt ſhining flowers of Rhetorick.*

(*f*) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 201, 211.

Ovid's Elegies, Odes of Horace, &c. London, 1684, in 8vo, in which is inſerted our Author's tranſlation of the 16th Ode of Horace. He tranſlated likewiſe from Latin into Engliſh, *The Epiſtle of Phœdra to Hippolytus*, printed in the *Tranſlation of Ovid's Epiſtles, by ſeveral hands*. London, 1681, in 8vo. He wrote the Prologue to Mrs. Behn's *City Heireſs; or, Sir Timothy Treat-All*, printed at London, 1682, in 4to. T

☞ OVERBURY (THOMAS), ſon of Nicholas Overbury of Bourton on the Hill near Morton in Marſh in Glouceſterſhire, Eſq; by Mary his wife, daughter of Giles Palmer of Compton-Scorfen in the pariſh of Ilmington in Warwickſhire (*a*), was born at Compton-Scorfen in the houſe of his grandfather by the mother's ſide, about the year 1581. In Michaelmas Term 1595 he became a Gentleman Commoner of Queen's College in Oxfordſhire, where he made a great progreſs in logick and philoſophy (*b*), and November 15, 1598, took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts (*c*); which being compleated by determination in the Lent following, he left the Univerſity, and ſettled for a time in the Middle-Temple, where he had been before entered in order to ſtudy the Municipal Law. He afterwards travelled for ſome time, and returned a moſt accompliſhed perſon (*d*). About the time of the Coronation of King James I. he contracted an intimate acquaintance with Sir *Robert Carr*, Knight of the Bath; who ſoon after being taken into great favour with his Majeſty, he not only procured Mr. Overbury to be knighted at Greenwich June 19, 1608, but likewiſe his father to be made one of the Judges in Wales (*e*). Sir Thomas perceiving the great familiarity between his patron *Carr*, now made Viſcount Rocheſter, and the Lady Frances, daughter of Thomas Earl of Suffolk, and wife of Robert Earl of Eſſex, was ſo much diſpleaſed at it, knowing the Lady to be a woman of no clear character, that he endeavoured to diſſuade the Viſcount from keeping her company, or entertaining any thoughts of marrying her [*A*]. The Viſcount reſenting this advice, diſcovered what he had ſaid to the Lady, who reſolved upon his deſtruction, and conſulted with her uncle the Earl of Northampton, who was privy to the intrigue between her and the Viſcount. It was at laſt determined to diſpatch Sir Thomas with poiſon, which not being ſo convenient to be done in a publick place, the Viſcount and Earl contrived to exaſperate the King againſt him, that when he was impriſoned, they might have the better opportunity of executing their deſign (*f*). It happened about this time, that the King wanting to ſend an Embaſſador to Flanders, according to ſome, to France or Ruſſia, according to others, the Viſcount recommended to him Sir Thomas Overbury; and his Majeſty immediately agreed to the choice of him. The Viſcount, under ſhew of friendſhip, imparted the King's intentions to Sir Thomas, but diſuaded him from accepting of that employment, ſince it might hinder him from a better way of advancement, promiſing him to ſoften his Majeſty, if he ſhould be diſpleaſed with his refuſal of that poſt. He then went to the King, and artfully incenſed him againſt Sir Thomas for his refuſing to obey his Majeſty's command; and that Gentleman was for his contempt committed to the Tower, April 21, 1613 (*g*) [*B*]. Here he lay in cloſe confinement, till he was

(*a*) Wood, *Athen.* Oxon. vol. 1. col. 388. 2d edition. Lloyd in his *State Worthies*, p. 769. 2d edit. ſays, that ſhe was born at Burton on the Hill in Glouceſterſhire.

(*b*) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(*c*) Ibid. *Faſti*, Oxon. vol. 1. col. 154.

(*d*) Idem, *Athen.* Oxon. *ubi ſupra.*

(*e*) Idem, ibid.

(*f*) Arthur Wilſon's *Life of King James* I. p. 66, 67. edit. London, 1653. Sir Fulk Grevill's *Five Years of King James*, p. 17 & *ſeqq.* edit. Lond. 1643. and Sir Anthony Weldon's *Court and Character of King James*, p. 60 & *ſeqq.* edition London, 1651.

(*g*) Camden, *Annales Regis Jacobi* I. erroneouſly ſays, 1612.

[*A*] *Endeavoured to diſſuade the Viſcount from keeping her company, or entertaining any thoughts of marrying her.*] Sir Laurence Hyde, the King's Council, at the arraignment of Richard Weſton at Guildhall, London, November 19, 1615, obſerved (1), that " Sir " Thomas Overbury having divers times diſſuaded " the Earl, then Viſcount Rocheſter, from ſeeking " by any means to procure marrying with the Counteſs of Eſſex, to which he ſaw the Earl too much " inclined; having very earneſt conference with the " Earl one night in private in the gallery at Whitehall concerning his intendments, perceiving the " Earl that time too much to deſire that unlawful " conjunction, in the ardency of his fervent affection " unto the Earl, and the great preſcience of future " miſery it would inevitably bring unto him (his " well-beloved Lord and Friend) uſed ſpeeches to " to this effect: *Well, my Lord, if you marry that filthy " baſe woman, you will utterly ruin your honour and your- " ſelf. You ſhall never do it by mine advice or conſent, " and if you do, you had beſt look to ſtand faſt.* My " Lord reply'd, (bewitched with the love of the " Counteſs, and moved with the words of Sir Thomas Overbury for ſlighting her) *My own legs are " ſtreight and ſtrong enough to bear me up: but in faith, " I will be even with you for this*; and ſo parted " from him in a great rage. This conference was " overheard by ſome in an adjoining room, and their " depoſitions for the truth hereof were read in court. " Although this conference moved the Earl to ſuch " a ſudden choler, yet it ſeemed Sir Thomas Overbury conceited it not to be otherwiſe than a ſudden " extreme diſtemperature or paſſion, and not a final " concluſion of their boſom friendſhip, in which " the Earl ſeemed as reciprocal as before, howſoever " in his double dealing it ſeemed to be clearly otherwiſe."

(1) True and hiſtorical relation of the poyſoning of Sir Thomas Overbury; with the ſeveral arguments and ſpeeches of thoſe that were executed thereupon, &c. collected out of the Papers of Sir Francis Bacon, the King's Attorney General, p. 20, 21. edit. Lond. 1651.

[*B*] *Committed to the Tower, April* 21, 1613.] Sir Henry Wotton, in a letter of his to Sir Edmund Bacon, dated Thurſday, St. George's Eve, 1613 (2), writes thus: " The Count was full of diſcourſe and " expectation, that the King being now diſincum- " bered

(2) *Reliquiæ Wottonianæ*, p. 408, 409, 410. ral, p. 20, 21. edit. Lond. 1651.

was diſpatched by poiſon September the 15th following, and his body was interred in the Town-

" bered of the care of his daughter, would towards " this feaſt of St. George, fill up either all, or ſome " at leaſt of thoſe places, that had laid vacant ſo " long, and had been in this time of their emptineſs, " a ſubject of notorious oppoſition between our great (3) Rocheſter. " Viſcount (3), and the houſe of Suffolk. Thus, I " ſay, ran the opinion, when yeſterday, about ſix a " clock at evening, Sir Thomas Overbury, was " from the Council-chamber, conveyed by a Clerk " of the Council, and two of the guard, to the " Tower, and there, by warrant conſigned to the " Lieutenant, as cloſe priſoner. Which both by " the ſuddenneſs, like a ſtroke of thunder, and more " by the quality and relation of the perſon, breed- " ing in the beholders (whereof by chance I was " one) very much amazement, and being likely in " ſome proportion, to breed the like in the hearers, " I will adventure, for the ſatisfying of your thoughts " about it, to ſet down the forerunning and leading " cauſes of this accident, as far as in ſo ſhort a time " I have been able to wade in ſo deep a water. It is " conceived, that the King hath a good while been " much diſtaſted with the ſaid Gentleman, even in " his own nature, for too ſtiff a carriage of his for- " tune; beſides that ſcandalous offence of the Queen " at Greenwich, which was never but a palliated " cure. Upon which conſiderations, his Majeſty " reſolving to ſever him from my Lord of Rocheſter, " and to do it not diſgracefully or violently, but in " ſome honourable faſhion, he commanded, not long " ſince, the Archbiſhop, by way of familiar diſ- " courſe, to propound unto him the Ambaſſage of " France, or of the Arch-duke's court, whereof the " one was ſhortly to be changed, and the other at " the preſent vacant. In which propoſition, it ſeem- " eth, though ſhadowed under the Archbiſhop's " good-will, that the King was alſo contented ſome " little light ſhould be given him of his Majeſty's in- " clination unto it, grounded upon his merit. At " this the fiſh did not bite; whereupon the King " took a rounder way, commanding my Lord Chan- " cellor, and the Earl of Pembroke, to propound " jointly the ſame unto him, (which the Archbiſhop " had before moved) as immediately from the King; " and to ſweeten it the more, he had (as I hear) an " offer made him of aſſurance, before his going, of " the place of Treaſurer of the Chamber, which he " expecteth after the death of the Lord Stanhope, " whom belike the King would have drawn to ſome " reaſonable compoſition. Notwithſtanding all which " motives and impulſives, Sir Thomas Overbury re- " fuſed to be ſent abroad, with ſuch terms, as were " by the Council interpreted pregnant of contempt, " in a caſe where the King had opened his will; " which refuſal of his, I ſhould, for my part, eſteem " an eternal diſgrace to our occupation, if withal, I " did not conſider how hard it is to pull one from the " boſom of a favourite. Thus you ſee the point, " upon which one hath been committed, ſtanding " in the ſecond degree of power in the Court, and " conceiving (as himſelf told me but two hours be- " fore) never better than at that preſent of his own " fortunes and ends. Now in this whole matter, " there is one main and principal doubt, whether " this were done without the participation of my " Lord of Rocheſter; a point neceſſarily infolding " two different conſequences; for were it done with- " out his knowledge, we muſt expect of himſelf " either a decadence or a ruin; if not, we muſt " then expect a reparation by ſome other great pub- " lick ſatisfaction, whereof the world may take as " much notice. Theſe clouds a few days will clear. " In the mean while I dare pronounce of Sir Tho- " mas Overbury, that he ſhall return no more to " his ſtage, unleſs Courts be governed every year by " a new philoſophy, for our old principles will not " bear it." Mr. John Packer, in a letter to Sir Ralph Winwood, then Embaſſador in Holland, dated at London, April 22, 1613, and printed in Winwood's *Memorials of State* (4), writes thus: " Ye- (4) Vol. 3. p. 447. edit. Lond. 1725, in folio. " ſterday about ſix of the clock, my Lord Chancel- " lor, and my Lord of Pembroke, were employed by " the King to ſpeak with Sir Thomas Overbury, and " to make him an offer of an Ambaſſage into the " Low Countries or France, which he would. " Whereto he made anſwer, that he was not capa- " ble of ſuch employment for want of language, " nor able to undergoe it by reaſon of his weakneſs, " being ſo exceedingly troubled with the ſpleen, " that if he had a long letter to write, he was feign " to give over. Therefore he ſhould not be fit to " attend any buſyneſs, as in accepting this offer he " muſt be forced to do. And whereas it was al- " leadged, that his Majeſty intended this for his good " and preferment, he would not leave his country " for any preferment in the world. Some ſay, he " added ſome other ſpeech, which was very ill " taken; but what it ſhould be I cannot yet learn. " But not to trouble your Lordſhip with length, this " report being made to the King, he ſent my Lord " of Pembroke for the Lords, who were in Councill, " (my Lord Chancellor ſtaying ſtill with his Majeſty,) " to whom he declared, when they were come, that " he could not obtaine ſo much of a Gentleman, and " one of his ſervants, as to accept an honorable " imployment from him. In concluſion he gave them " order to ſend for him, and to ſend him to the " Tower, where he is cloſe priſoner. I leave all " circumſtances and preambles to your Lordſhip. " Now for my Lord of Rocheſter, who had but new " ly begun to leave his chamber, he knew nothing till " all was done and he gone; which your Lordſhip " may imagine did much perplex him. But that " evening my Lord of Pembroke and Sir Henry " Nevill were with him, and ſo were againe " morning, who have given him ſo good advice, " that if he follows it, as I hope he will, all this " will be well with him, and no hurt to his friend. " Thus in haſt I have but only given your Lordſhip " a taſte of this buſyneſs, which your Lordſhip ſhall " hear more particularly by the report of others." Mr. John Chamberlaine likewiſe in a letter to Sir Ralph Winwood, dated at London May 6, 1613 (5), (5) Ibid. p. 453. writes as follows: *The true cauſe of Sir* Thomas Overbury's *committing to the Tower, was a contemptuous anſwer, and refuſing of forreign imployments offered him in the King's name; and eſpecially that he inſiſted, that the King could not in law nor juſtice force him to forſake his country. But ſome ſay, he was moſt urged to that of Muſcovy, which drave him to that peremptory and unmannerly anſwer. Indeed we have great doings in hand, and ſtrange projects for that place, which I doubt will all prove diſcourſes in the air, for they be grounded upon certaine ſpeeches of ſome oft he Nobility to an Engliſh Merchant about two years ſince; but* tempora mutantur, *and the caſe is much altered there ſince that time. Yet the King apprehends the buſyneſs very earneſtly, and hath cauſed Sir* Henry Nevill *to confer with ſome of the Councill about it diverſe times; wherein they ſay he hath ſhewed great ſufficiency, and diſcourſed at large what commodity might ariſe by bringing the whole trade of Perſia and the inland parts of the Eaſt Indies up the river Hydaſpes, and ſo with a ſhort cut down the river Oxus into the Caſpian Sea, and then up the river Volga to a ſtraight of land, that will carry all into the river Dwina, that runs down to St. Nicholas and the town of Archangell, the ordinary port and ſtation of our ſhipping in thoſe parts. Theſe are goodly ſpecious diſcourſes of things not ſo eaſily done as ſpoken. For my part, I can never believe, that people will put themſelves ſo under the King's protection, as to be governed by a deputy; and we can afford them no other. And if the matter ſhould come to any paſs, what a buſyneſs and charge it would be to tranſport thither twelve or fifteen thouſand men (which are the numbers ſpoken of) you may judge. Some ſay, my Lord* Rocheſter *took Sir* Thomas Overbury's *committing to heart. Others talk as if it were a great diminution of his favour and credit; which the King doubting would not have it ſo conſtrued; but the next day told the Council, that he meant him daily more grace and favour, as ſhould be ſeen in ſhort time; and that he took more delight and contentment in his company and converſation than in any man's living. . . . There was a ſpeech of a divorce to be proſecuted this term betwixt the Earl of* Eſſex *and his Lady; and to that end he was content to confeſs (whether true or faigned) inſufficiency in himſelf. But there happened an accident, that hath altered the caſe; for ſhe having ſought out a certain*

(b) Camden, *ubi ſupra*. Wood is miſtaken in ſaying, that it was within two months.

Town-Chapel the ſame day [C]. About two years after (b) the whole contrivance of his death was diſcovered, and ſeveral perſons being found guilty of, or conſenting to it, were afterwards executed, *viz.* Sir *Jervas Elways*, Lieutenant of the Tower, *Richard Weſton* and

tain wiſe woman had much conference with her; and ſhe (after the nature of ſuch creatures) drawing much money from her, at laſt couſened her of a Jewell of great value; for which being apprehended and clapt up, ſhe accuſed the Lady of diverſe ſtrange queſtions and projects; and in concluſion, that ſhe dealt with her for the making away of her Lord, as aiming at another mark. Upon which ſcandal and ſlander, the Lord Chamberlaine and his friends think it not fit to proceed in the divorce. The ſame Gentleman in another letter to Sir Ralph Winwood, dated at London June 10, 1613 (7), writes thus: "Sir Thomas Overbury lyes ſtill by it, and "for ought I hear is like ſo to do..... The divorce "between the Earle of Eſſex and his Lady is on foot, "and hath been argued twice or thrice at Lambeth "before certain Commiſſioners, but *à huis clos*. The "greateſt difficulty is, that though he be willing to "confeſs his inſufficiency towards her, yet he would "have liberty to marry with any other, as being "*maleficiatus* only *ad illam*. Yet ſome Lawyers are "of opinion, that if ſhe will take her oath, that "he is impotent towards her, it will ſerve the turn; "whereof it is thought ſhe will make no bones, as "preſuming that ſhe is provided of a ſecond: which "I ſhould never have ſuſpected, but that I know "he was with her three hours together within theſe "two days; which makes me ſomewhat to ſtagger, "and to think that great folks, to compaſs their "own ends, have neither reſpect to friends or fol-"lowers." The Earl of Southampton in a letter to Sir Ralph Winwood, dated Auguſt 6, 1613 (8), writes thus. *I perceive by your laſt letter that you have been of late particularly advertiſed of the proceedings in England, and how the buſyneſs, of which we deſire ſo much to hear the concluſion, is ſtill in ſuſpence. The difficulty alledged is the not having as then accommodated the matter of Sir* Thomas Overbury, *which many times bred diſturbance, and hindred the performance of the reſolution taken; and it is in vain to hope for any good iſſue of the other untill that be ſettled, which I thinke to be done long ere this after this manner; that upon his ſubmiſſion he ſhall have leave to travail, with a private intimation not to return until his Majeſtie's pleaſure be further known. And much adoe there hath been to keepe him from a publique cenſure of baniſhment and loſs of office; ſuch a rooted hatred lyeth in the King's heart towards him. And that Blocke being now removed, I find the ſame confidence, that I left touching Sir* Henry Neville; *which I ſhall be as glad of as any, but (as I wrote before) this often deferring hath made me doubtfull. Of the* Nullity (8) *I ſee you have heard as much as I can write; by which you may diſcern the power of a King with Judges; for of thoſe, which are now for it, I know ſome of them, when I was in England, were vehemently againſt, as the Biſhop of* Ely (9) *and* Coventry (10). *For the buiſneſs itſelf, I proteſt I ſhall be glad, if it may lawfully, that it may go forward; though of late I have been fearful of the conſequence, and have had my fears encreaſed by the laſt letters, which came to me. But howſoever the manner of interpoſing gives me no cauſe of contentment.*

(7) Ibid. p. 460.

(8) Ibid. p. 475.

(8) Of the marriage of the Earl of Eſſex and his Lady.

(9) Dr. Lancelot Andrews.

(10) Dr. Richard Neile.

[C] *Here he lay in cloſe confinement till he was diſpatched by poiſon, September the 15th following, and his body was interred in the Tower-chapel the ſame day.*] In the *true and hiſtorical Relation of the poyſoning of Sir* Thomas Overbury, cited in the Remark [A], we are informed (11), that Weſton was recommended by Sir Thomas Monſon, at the deſire of the Counteſs of Eſſex, to Sir Jervas Elways, Lieutenant of the Tower, to be the keeper of Overbury. This Weſton confeſſed, that he had been a procurer and pander to that Lady, while ſhe was Counteſs of Eſſex, and the Viſcount Rocheſter. He being appointed Sir Thomas Overbury's keeper on the 6th of May 1613, would not ſuffer that Gentleman's Father, Brother, or any of his relations or friends to ſee him during his confinement, and agreed with Mrs. Turner, an agent of the Counteſs's, to adminiſter to Sir Thomas whatever ſhe ſhould ſend him. Accordingly having received from Mrs. Turner the ſame day a yellow poiſon called *Roſacar* in a viol, and carrying Sir Thomas's ſupper in one hand, and the viol in the other, and meeting the Lieutenant of the Tower, he ſaid, *Sir, ſhall I give it him now?* The Lieutenant anſwered, *What ſhall you give him?* Weſton replied, *As if you did not know, Sir.* The Lieutenant blaming him, he carries the poiſon into an inner room, which Weſton adminiſtered to Sir Thomas Overbury the 9th of May in broth. This was proved by the confeſſion of Weſton and the Lieutenant. Weſton having given him this poiſon, which worked violently by vomits and purging; he demanded his reward of Mrs. Turner, who replied, *The man is not yet dead; perfect your work, and you ſhall have your hire.* Sir Thomas Overbury by his cloſe impriſonment and poiſoning grew ſick, and having no friends ſuffered to viſit him, wrote to the Viſcount to procure his releaſement; who anſwered, that the time would not permit, but as ſoon as poſſible he would haſten his delivery. On the 5th of June the Viſcount wrote to him a letter, in which he ſent him a white powder, deſiring him to take it: *It will make you*, ſays he, *more ſick; but fear not, I will make this a means for your delivery and for the recovery of your health.* Sir Thomas took the powder, which worked upon him extremely, whereupon his ſickneſs grew more violent, this powder being poiſon, as Weſton confeſſed. Sir Thomas Overbury thus languiſhing, and being ſurprized, that he could not in two months after taking this powder be releaſed, wrote to the Viſcount, repreſenting his diſtreſſed condition, and reproaching his Lordſhip with forgetfulneſs; and his letter was to this purpoſe, as St. Thomas's ſervants, who ſaw it, depoſed: *Sir, I wonder you have not yet found means to effect my delivery; but I remember you ſaid you would be even with me, and ſo you are indeed. But aſſure yourſelf, my Lord, if you do not releaſe me, but ſuffer me thus to die, my blood will be required at your hands.* The Viſcount wrote to comfort him, and excuſed himſelf for not being able yet to procure his delivery. Sir Thomas after taking the powder languiſhed more and more; and to comfort him, ſome followers of the Viſcount were ſent to him daily in the name of his Lordſhip, and by the appointment of the Lady Eſſex, who told him, that if he deſired any meats, which might be better provided for him than thoſe in the Tower, he ſhould have them. This was three months after his impriſonment. He, according to the cuſtom of ſick perſons, deſired luſcious meats, tarts, and jellies; which were provided by Mrs. Turner, with the knowledge of the Counteſs, and ſent to him, poiſoned with Mercury Sublimate, and Sir Thomas eat of them, which increaſed his ſickneſs (2). After he had been five months in priſon, he wrote a letter to the Viſcount, a copy of which is in the Cotton Library. *Titus* B. VII. On the back of it the following words are written in the Lord Chief Juſtice Coke's own hand, *Cop. Overb. letter to Ro.* And indeed, both the ſubject matter and the ſtyle ſufficiently evidence its Author, though it is plain, that the copier was not very correct in the tranſcribing it, there being ſeveral palpable miſtakes in it. As there is no date to it, it is pretty difficult to adjuſt the preciſe time when it was written, tho' one paſſage in it, where he mentions his being *five months a priſoner*, makes it clear, that it was not long before his unhappy end, which it is not improbable this very letter might haſten. The letter is as follows. "This "paper comes under ſeales, and therefore ſhall "be bold to ſpeake to you, as I uſed to do myſelf. "I underſtand, that you told my brother, that my "unreverent ſtile ſhould make an alienation betwixt "you and me hereafter, at leaſt ſuch a one, as we "ſhould never be as we had been. With what face "could you tell him, that you would be leſſe to "me, to whome you owe more than to any ſoul "liveing, both for your fortune, underſtanding, and "reputation? One who loſt his fortune with *Ignati*, "entered into a quarrel with *Niger*, ſuffered five "months baniſhment, and now five months miſera-"ble impriſonment; and now to make ſo poor a "pretence, to ſay you will alter toward me for the "ſtyle

(11) p. 22.

(12) Ibid. p. 22——25.

and *James Franklin*, who attended Sir *Thomas Overbury* in his chamber, and gave him meats and broths, wherein the poiſon was mingled; and *Anne Turner*, a phyſician's widow, who prepared the poiſon. In May 1616, Carr, Earl of Somerſet, and the Lady Frances his Counteſs, were condemned to death for contriving the murder, and hiring the perſons

" ſtyle of my letters? Alas! this ſhift will not ſerve " to cover your vow, your ſacrificeing me to your " woman, your holding a firm friendſhip with thoſe " that brought me hither, and keepe me heare, and " not make it your firſt act of any good termes with " them to ſet me free, and reſtore me to yourſelf " againe. And you bid my brother keep your intent " ſecret, that you might ſteale away with your " wickedneſs. But that ſhall not be; you and I " will come to a public tryal before all the friends I " have. They ſhall know what words have paſt " betwixt us heretofore of another nature then theſe; " and I pray you, keep you my letters, that they may " ſee how much I forgot your Lordſhip in my ſtyle. " I ſhall be upon the racke, you at your eaſe negli- " gent of me, and I muſt ſpeak calmly. Yf *Hector* " of the *Harlaw* be ſo infamous for betraying a " ſtranger, your ſtorie ſhall be put down to betray, " and ſo quit a friend. But now I will confeſs you, " ſo ſoon as I perceived how little (never name love) " human affection, how little compaſſion, (no, not " ſo much as the colt in Enfield Chace) when I heard " how, notwithſtanding my miſerie, you viſited your " woman, frizled your head never more curiouſly, " took care for hangings, and dayly were ſolicitous " about your cloaths; officious in waighting, could " preſerve your cozen and Gibbe; held day-traffique " of letters with my enemies, without any turning " it to my good; ſent me nineteen projects and " promiſes for my libertie, then at the beginning of " the next week, ſent me ſome frivolous account of " the miſcarriage of them, and ſo ſlip out of towne; " and all this ill nature ſhewed by the man, whoſe " conſcience tells him, that truſting to him brought " me hither, and by him that conveighed all my " ſervice to *Julius*, and made himſelf valued by " his maiſter for it, and my ſhare to be a priſon " upon ſuch tearmes that never man ſuffered yet, nay " knoweth, that what he ſpeakes and writes howerly, " is mine, and yet forget him that ſowed that " in him, and upon whoſe ſtocke he ſpendes; nay, " forget him, betwixt whom was nine years love, " and ſuch ſecrets of all kinds have paſſed, and in " the noyance, my father and mother languiſhing " for me. My ſoul wiſheth ſhe might but lye upon " the boards to bear me compány. My brother Lyd " overthrown by it, his aunt diſcharging him from " her houſe, which ſaved 300 l. a yeare. And he " that is the Author of all, and that hath more " cauſe to love, yet periſh for me, rather than ſee " me periſh, to ſtand ſtupid, and leeſe a jot of any " thing that concerns himſelf, go on and make " much of one; nay, let my enemies play upon me, " ſend for tickets under my hand; ſo that, by God, " ſince I came in, I have not found the advantage " of a ſtrawe, by not ſo much as a ſervant in my " extream ſickneſs, nor my friends free to ſpeake " my laſt wordes to. When I had obſerved this, the " bitterneſs of my ſoul cannot conceal itſelf in let- " ters; and that his wickedneſs may never die, I " have all this vacation wrote the ſtory betwixt you " and me, from the firſt hower to this day; what I " found you at firſt; what I found you when I came; " how I loſt all the great ones of my countrye for " ſtudying your fortune, reputation, and underſtand- " ing; how many hazards I have runn for you; how " many Gentlemen, for giving themſelves to you, " a ſtranger, are now left to the oppreſſion of their " enemies; what ſecrets have paſt betwixt you and " me; and then for the laſt part, how when you fell " in love with that woman, as ſoon as you had " wonne her by my letters, and after all the difficul- " ties being paſt, then uſed your own for common " paſſages; then you uſed your own, and never af- " ter, but denied, concealed, and jugled betwixt " your man and yourſelf; and upon that cauſe there " came many breaches at Huntington and New-Mar- " ket, and after at Whitehall. Thereupon you " made your vow, that I ſhould live in the Court, " was my friend, and many oaths, which are now " fulfilled; ſtayed me here when I would have been " gone, and ſent for me twice that daythat I was caught " in the trap; and long intending in your thoughts " long agoe a marriage with that woman, deny'd " ſince me to enquire of her; would ſpeak ill of " her yourſelf; and having been now two months " reconciled to a league, not to have firſt, upon thoſe " of theirs, made ſure my liberty and return; and " now at laſt, when we may eaſily live the reſt of " our life in peace, and enjoy the remembrance of " troubles, now you leave me out, and take occaſion " upon unreſpective language, to ſay, *you will never be " to me as you have bin.* All theſe particulars I have " ſet down in a large diſcourſe, and on Tueſday I " made an end of wrighting it fair, and on Fryday " I have ſealed it up under eight ſeales, and ſent it " by a friend of myne whome I dare truſt, takeing " his oath not to open it. I ſend to him, and then " to all my friends Noble, and Gentlemen, and " Women, and then to read it to them, and take " copies of it; and vowde to have wrote the truthe. " This, I thinke, you will not deny a worde. So " thus, if you will deal thus wickedly with me, I " have provided that, whether I die or live, your " nature ſhall never die, nor leave to be the moſt " odious man alive."

Sir Thomas languiſhed till September 6. when Mrs. Turner procured an Apothecary's boy, for 20 l. to poiſon a glyſter, which was adminiſtred by the boy and Weſton to Sir Thomas upon the 7th of September; who after that fell into a great extremity of vomiting and purging till he expired. At his death, his body appeared to be covered with blains and bliſters, which the Viſcount reported to be occaſioned by the pox, though that imputation was fully removed by Sir Thomas's ſervants, and other perſons, who depoſed, that before his impriſonment, he was of a clear and ſound body, and only had an iſſue in his left arm, in order to draw off the rheum and humours, which his continually ſitting at his ſtudy ſubjected him to. None of his friends or relations were permitted to ſee his body, nor was it view'd by the Coroner, which is uſual when any private priſoner dies in the Tower; but it was immediately buried in a pit digged in a very mean place (13).

(13) *True and hiſtorical Relation*, p. 26.

In the *Cotton* Library, *Titus*, *B.* VII. *fol.* 464, *&c.* are the two following Letters of the Earl of Northampton to Sir Jervas Elways or Helwiſe, the Lieutenant of the Tower.

" *Worthy Mr. Lieutenant*,

" My Lord of *Rocheſter* deſiring to do the laſt " honour to his deceaſed friend, requires me to de- " ſire you to deliver the body of Sir *Thomas Over- " bury* to any friend of his, that deſires it, to do " him honour at his funeral. Herein my Lord " declares the conſtancy of his affection to the dead, " and the meaning that he had in my knowledge to " have given his ſtrongeſt ſtraine at this time of " the King's being at Tiballes, for his delivery. I " fear no impediment to this honourable deſire of " my Lord's but the unſweetneſs of the body, be- " cauſe it was reported, that he had ſome iſſues, and " in that caſe the keeping of him above muſt needs " give more offence than it can do honour. My " fear is alſo, that the body is already buried upon " that cauſe whereof I write; which being ſo, it is " too late to ſet out ſolemnity. Which with my " kind commendations I ende, and reſte,

" *Your affectionate and aſſured friend*,

" H. Northampton."

P. S. " You ſee my Lord's earneſt deſire with my " concurring care, that all reſpect be had to him, " that may be for the credit of his memory; but yet " I wiſh withall, that you do very diſcreetly enforme " yourſelf, whether this grace hath been afforded

" formerly

perſons concerned in it; but were afterwards pardoned by the King, and only baniſhed the Court. Sir Thomas Overbury was a man of admirable wit and learning, as appears from his writings [*D*]. He had a Nephew of both his names, who was a Knight, and Juſtice of Peace for the County of Glouceſter, and enjoyed the eſtate of the Overbury's at Bourton on the Hill in that County; which he ſold about the year 1680 to Alexander Popham, Eſq; and afterwards retired to an eſtate of his at Adminton in Queinton Pariſh in Glouceſterſhire, where he died February 28, 1680, and was interred in Queinton Church,

" formerly to cloſe priſoners; or whether you may " grant my requeſt in this caſe, who ſpeak out of " the ſenſe of my Lord's affection, though I be a " Counſellor, without offence or prejudice. For I " would be loath to draw either you or myſelf into " cenſure, now I have well thought of the matter, " though it be a work of charity."

Upon the back of this letter are the following words, Sir *Gervaiſe Helwiſe*'s own hand:

So ſoon as Sir Thomas Overbury *was departed, I writ unto my Lord of* Northampton; *and becauſe my experience could not direct me, I deſired to know what I ſhould do with the body, acquainting his Lordſhip with his iſſues, as* Weſton *had informed me, and other fowlneſs of his body, which then was accounted the pox. My Lord writ unto me, that I ſhould firſt have his body viewed by a jewry; and I well remember his Lordſhip adviſed me to ſend for Sir* John Lidcote *to ſee the body, and to ſuffer as many els of his friends to ſee it as would, and preſently to bury it in the body of the Quire, for the body could not keep. Notwithſtanding Sir* Thomas Overbury *dying about five in the morning, I kept his body unburied until three or four o'clock in the afternoon. The next day Sir* John Lidcote *came thither; I could not get him to beſtow a coffin nor a winding-ſheet upon him. The coffin I beſtowed; but who did winde him, I know not. For indeed the body was very noyſome; ſo that notwithſtanding my Lord's direction, by reaſon of the danger of keeping the body, I kept it overlong, as we all felt.*

GER. HELWYSSE.

The other letter of the Earl of *Northampton* is as follows.

" *Worthy Mr. Lieutenant,*

" Let me intreat you to call *Lidcote* and three or " four of his friends, if ſo many come, to view " the body, if they have not already done it; " and ſo ſoon as it is viewed, without ſtaying the " coming of a meſſenger from the Court, in any " caſe ſee it enterred in the body of the Chappel " within the Tower inſtantly. If they have viewed, " then bury it by and by; for it is time, conſider- " ing the humours of that damn'd crew, that only " deſire means to move pity, and raiſe ſcandals. " Let no man's inſtance move you to make ſtay in " any caſe, and bring me theſe Letters, when I next " ſee you. Fail not a jote herein, as you love your " friends; nor after *Lidcote* and his friends have " viewed, ſtay one minute, but let the Prieſt be " ready; and if *Lidcote* be not there, ſend for him " ſpeedily, pretending that the body will not tarry. " In poſte haſte at 12.

" *Yours ever.*"

[*D*] *His writings.*] His Poem intitled, *The Wife*, was printed ſeveral times at London during his life. In 1614 it was reprinted at London in 4to, with the following title: *A Wife, now the Widow of Sir* Thomas Overburye. Being a moſt exquiſite and ſingular *Poem of the choice of a Wife. Whereunto are added many witty Characters and conceited Newes, written by himſelfe and other learned Gentlemen his friends.* To this edition is prefixed the following advertiſement of the printer to the reader, dated May 16, 1614, omitted in the following ſubſequent editions. " Thy ignorance may challenge libertie " enough not to reliſh the deepe arte of poetry, be- " cauſe opinion makes thee obſtinate, and rude tra- " dition hath taught thee nothing but an abuſe of " knowledge. For when thou readeſt a quaffing fel- " lowes Barbariſme, a worthy-written ſtile in Tra- " gedies, and a colluſive flouriſh onely fronted with " the name of excellent, thou over-lookſt them all " with the uſual contempt or aſperſion of frivolous " and fantaſticke labours; putting no difference be- " twixt the horſe pictured on a ſigne-poſt, and the " curious limb'd Pegaſus. But the Age gives one " comfort in extremitie, that as there is a Lizard, " which aſſailes, ſo there is one, which wonders at " the majeſtie of man. Sure I am, if any ſhall " neglect, nay not commend the worth of this " ſo generally approved Poem, he may (if it pro- " ceeds from nice criticiſme) bee well concluded " as a churliſh retainer to the Muſes; if from a di- " rect plaine dealing, he muſt be degraded for in- " ſufficiencie. For had ſuch a Volume been extant " among the antient Romanes, though they wanted " our eaſie converſations of wit by printing; yet " would they rather and more eaſily have committed " the ſenſe hereof to braſſe and cedar leaves, then let " ſuch an author have left his due eternitie. If to con- " verſe with a creature ſo amiable here deſcribed be " thought more than difficult, let then the contem- " plation of it be admirable, which hath expreſſed " the Soule in ſo compact a forme of body. The " ſurpluſage, that now exceeds the laſt edition was " (that I may bee honeſtly impartiall) in ſome things " only to be challenged by the firſt author, but others " now added, (little inferior to the reſidue) being in " nature anſwerable, and firſt tranſcribed by Gentle- " men of the ſame Qualitie, I have upon good in- " ducements made publicke with warrantie of their " and my own credit. Not doubting therefore to " be doubly diſcharged both by the verdict of " conſcience and the well-deſerved thankes of all ju- " dicious readers, I bid you every one farewell." The Argument or Method, as it is called, of this Poem, is as follows. *Firſt of Marriage, and the Effects thereof Children. Then of his contrarie, Luſt; then for his Choice. Firſt his opinion negatively, what ſhould not be: the firſt cauſes of it, that is,* neither Beauty, Birth, nor Portion. *Then affirmatively, what ſhould be, of which kind there are fower;* Goodneſs, Knowledge, Diſcretion, *and as a ſecond thing,* Beauty. *The firſt onely is abſolutely good; the other, being built upon the firſt, doe likewiſe become ſo. Then the application of that woman by love to himſelf, which makes her a wife. And laſtly, the only condition of a wife,* Fitneſſe. In this Poem our Author writes thus:

For wandring Luſt, I know 'tis infinite;
It ſtill begins, and addes not more to more;
The guilt is everlaſting, the delight
This inſtant doth not feele of that before:
The taſte of it is only in the ſenſe,
The operation in the conſcience.
Woman is not luſt's bounds, but womankind:
One is love's number; who from that doth fall,
Hath loſt his hold, and no new reſt ſhall find:
Vice hath no meane, but not to be at all:
A wife, is that enough, luſt cannot find,
For luſt is ſtill with want, or too much pinde.
Bate luſt the ſin, my ſhare is ev'n with his;
For not to luſt, and to enjoy, is one:
And more or leſſe paſt, equall nothing is;
I ſtill have one, luſt one at once alone;
And though the woman often changed be,
Yet hee's the ſame without varietie.
Marriage our luſt (as 'twere with fuell fire)
Doth, with a medicine of the ſame, allay;
And not forbid, but rectifie deſire.
Myſelf I cannot chuſe, my wife I may:
And in the choice of her it much doth lye,
To mend myſelfe in my poſteritie.
O rather let me love, *than* be in love!
So let me chuſe, as wife and friend to find:
Let me forget her ſex, when I approve.
Beaſts likeneſſe lyes in ſhape, but ours in minde:
Our ſoules no ſexes have, their love is cleane,
No ſex, both in the better part are men.

and *James Franklin*, who attended Sir *Thomas Overbury* in his chamber, and gave him meats and broths, wherein the poiſon was mingled; and *Anne Turner*, a phyſician's widow, who prepared the poiſon. In May 1616, Carr, Earl of Somerſet, and the Lady Frances his Counteſs, were condemned to death for contriving the murder, and hiring the perſons

" ſtyle of my letters? Alas! this ſhift will not ſerve " to cover your vow, your ſacrificeing me to your " woman, your holding a firm friendſhip with thoſe " that brought me hither, and keepe me heare, and " not make it your firſt act of any good termes with " them to ſet me free, and reſtore me to yourſelf " againe. And you bid my brother keep your intent " ſecret, that you might ſteale away with your " wickedneſs. But that ſhall not be; you and I " will come to a public tryal before all the friends I " have. They ſhall know what words have paſt " betwixt us heretofore of another nature then theſe; " and I pray you, keep you my letters, that they may " ſee how much I forgot your Lordſhip in my ſtyle. " I ſhall be upon the racke, you at your eaſe negli- " gent of me, and I muſt ſpeak calmly. Yf *Hector* " of the *Harlaw* be ſo infamous for betraying a " ſtranger, your ſtorie ſhall be put down to betray, " and ſo quit a friend. But now I will confeſs you, " ſo ſoon as I perceived how little (never name love) " human affection, how little compaſſion, (no, not " ſo much as the colt in Enfield Chace) when I heard " how, notwithſtanding my miſerie, you viſited your " woman, frizled your head never more curiouſly, " took care for hangings, and dayly were ſolicitous " about your cloaths; officious in waighting, could " preſerve your cozen and Gibbe; held day-traffique " of letters with my enemies, without any turning " it to my good; ſent me nineteen projects and " promiſes for my libertie, then at the beginning of " the next week, ſent me ſome frivolous account of " the miſcarriage of them, and ſo ſlip out of towne; " and all this ill nature ſhewed by the man, whoſe " conſcience tells him, that truſting to him brought " me hither, and by him that conveighed all my " ſervice to *Julius*, and made himſelf valued by " his maiſter for it, and my ſhare to be a priſon " upon ſuch tearmes that never man ſuffered yet, nay " knoweth, that what he ſpeakes and writes howerly, " is mine, and yet forget him that ſowed that " in him, and upon whoſe ſtocke he ſpendes; nay, " forget him, betwixt whom was nine years love, " and ſuch ſecrets of all kinds have paſſed, and in " the noyance, my father and mother languiſhing " for me. My ſoul wiſheth ſhe might but lye upon " the boards to bear me company. My brother Lyd " overthrown by it, his aunt diſcharging him from " her houſe, which ſaved 300 l. a yeare. And he " that is the Author of all, and that hath more " cauſe to love, yet periſh for me, rather than ſee " me periſh, to ſtand ſtupid, and leeſe a jot of any " thing that concerns himſelf, go on and make " much of one; nay, let my enemies play upon me, " ſend for tickets under my hand; ſo that, by God, " ſince I came in, I have not found the advantage " of a ſtrawe, by not ſo much as a ſervant in my " extream ſickneſs, nor my friends free to ſpeake " my laſt wordes to. When I had obſerved this, the " bitterneſs of my ſoul cannot conceal itſelf in let- " ters; and that his wickedneſs may never die, I " have all this vacation wrote the ſtory betwixt you " and me, from the firſt hower to this day; what I " found you at firſt; what I found you when I came; " how I loſt all the great ones of my countrye for " ſtudying your fortune, reputation, and underſtand- " ing; how many hazards I have runn for you; how " many Gentlemen, for giving themſelves to you, " a ſtranger, are now left to the oppreſſion of their " enemies; what ſecrets have paſt betwixt you and " me; and then for the laſt part, how when you fell " in love with that woman, as ſoon as you had " wonne her by my letters, and after all the difficul- " ties being paſt, then uſed your own for common " paſſages; then you uſed your own, and never af- " ter, but denied, concealed, and jugled betwixt " your man and yourſelf; and upon that cauſe there " came many breaches at Huntington and New-Mar- " ket, and after at Whitehall. Thereupon you " made your vow, that I ſhould live in the Court, " was my friend, and many oaths, which are now " fulfilled; ſtayed me here when I would have been " gone, and ſent for me twice that daythat I was caught " in the trap; and long intending in your thoughts " long agoe a marriage with that woman, deny'd " ſince me to enquire of her; would ſpeak ill of " her yourſelf; and having been now two months " reconciled to a league, not to have firſt, upon thoſe " of theirs, made ſure my liberty and return; and " now at laſt, when we may eaſily live the reſt of " our life in peace, and enjoy the remembrance of " troubles, now you leave me out, and take occaſion " upon unreſpective language, to ſay, *you will never be " to me as you have bin.* All theſe particulars I have " ſet down in a large diſcourſe, and on Tueſday I " made an end of wrighting it fair, and on Fryday " I have ſealed it up under eight ſeales, and ſent it " by a friend of myne whome I dare truſt, takeing " his oath not to open it. I ſend to him, and then " to all my friends Noble, and Gentlemen, and " Women, and then to read it to them, and take " copies of it; and vowde to have wrote the truthe. " This, I thinke, you will not deny a worde. So " thus, if you will deal thus wickedly with me, I " have provided that, whether I die or live, your " nature ſhall never die, nor leave to be the moſt " odious man alive."

Sir Thomas languiſhed till September 6. when Mrs. Turner procured an Apothecary's boy, for 20 l. to poiſon a glyſter, which was adminiſtred by the boy and Weſton to Sir Thomas upon the 7th of September; who after that fell into a great extremity of vomiting and purging till he expired. At his death, his body appeared to be covered with blains and bliſters, which the Viſcount reported to be occaſioned by the pox, though that imputation was fully removed by Sir Thomas's ſervants, and other perſons, who depoſed, that before his impriſonment, he was of a clear and ſound body, and only had an iſſue in his left arm, in order to draw off the rheum and humours, which his continually ſitting at his ſtudy ſubjected him to. None of his friends or relations were permitted to ſee his body, nor was it view'd by the Coroner, which is uſual when any private priſoner dies in the Tower; but it was immediately buried in a pit digged in a very mean place (13).

(13) *True and hiſtorical Relation*, p. 26.

In the *Cotton* Library, *Titus*, *B.* VII. *fol.* 464, *&c.* are the two following Letters of the Earl of Northampton to Sir Jervas Elways or Helwiſe, the Lieutenant of the Tower.

" *Worthy Mr. Lieutenant*,

" My Lord of *Rocheſter* deſiring to do the laſt " honour to his deceaſed friend, requires me to de- " ſire you to deliver the body of Sir *Thomas Over- " bury* to any friend of his, that deſires it, to do " him honour at his funeral. Herein my Lord " declares the conſtancy of his affection to the dead, " and the meaning that he had in my knowledge to " have given his ſtrongeſt ſtraine at this time of " the King's being at Tiballes, for his delivery. I " fear no impediment to this honourable deſire of " my Lord's but the unſweetneſs of the body, be- " cauſe it was reported, that he had ſome iſſues, and " in that caſe the keeping of him above muſt needs " give more offence than it can do honour. My " fear is alſo, that the body is already buried upon " that cauſe whereof I write; which being ſo, it is " too late to ſet out ſolemnity. Which with my " kind commendations I ende, and reſte,

" *Your affectionate and aſſured friend*,

" H. Northampton."

P. S. " You ſee my Lord's earneſt deſire with my " concurring care, that all reſpect be had to him, " that may be for the credit of his memory; but yet " I wiſh withall, that you do very diſcreetly enforme " yourſelf, whether this grace hath been afforded

" formerly

perſons concerned in it; but were afterwards pardoned by the King, and only baniſhed the Court. Sir Thomas Overbury was a man of admirable wit and learning, as appears from his writings [*D*]. He had a Nephew of both his names, who was a Knight, and Juſtice of Peace for the County of Glouceſter, and enjoyed the eſtate of the Overbury's at Bourton on the Hill in that County; which he ſold about the year 1680 to Alexander Popham, Eſq; and afterwards retired to an eſtate of his at Adminton in Queinton Pariſh in Glouceſterſhire, where he died February 28, 1680, and was interred in Queinton Church,

" formerly to cloſe priſoners; or whether you may " grant my requeſt in this caſe, who ſpeak out of " the ſenſe of my Lord's affection, though I be a " Counſellor, without offence or prejudice. For I " would be loath to draw either you or myſelf into " cenſure, now I have well thought of the matter, " though it be a work of charity."

Upon the back of this letter are the following words, Sir *Gervaiſe Helwiſe*'s own hand:

So ſoon as Sir Thomas Overbury *was departed, I writ unto my Lord of* Northampton; *and becauſe my experience could not direct me, I deſired to know what I ſhould do with the body, acquainting his Lordſhip with his iſſues, as* Weſton *had informed me, and other foulneſs of his body, which then was accounted the pox. My Lord writ unto me, that I ſhould firſt have his body viewed by a jewry; and I well remember his Lordſhip adviſed me to ſend for Sir* John Lidcote *to ſee the body, and to ſuffer as many els of his friends to ſee it as would, and preſently to bury it in the body of the Quire, for the body could not keep. Notwithſtanding Sir* Thomas Overbury *dying about five in the morning, I kept his body unburied until three or four o'clock in the afternoon. The next day Sir* John Lidcote *came thither; I could not get him to beſtow a coffin nor a winding-ſheet upon him. The coffin I beſtowed; but who did winde him, I know not. For indeed the body was very noyſome; ſo that notwithſtanding my Lord's direction, by reaſon of the danger of keeping the body, I kept it overlong, as we all felt.*

GER. HELWYSSE.

The other letter of the Earl of *Northampton* is as follows.

" *Worthy Mr. Lieutenant,*

" Let me intreat you to call *Lidcote* and three or " four of his friends, if ſo many come, to view " the body, if they have not already done it; " and ſo ſoon as it is viewed, without ſtaying the " coming of a meſſenger from the Court, in any " caſe ſee it enterred in the body of the Chappel " within the Tower inſtantly. If they have viewed, " then bury it by and by; for it is time, conſider- " ing the humours of that damn'd crew, that only " deſire means to move pity, and raiſe ſcandals. " Let no man's inſtance move you to make ſtay in " any caſe, and bring me theſe Letters, when I next " ſee you. Fail not a jote herein, as you love your " friends; nor after *Lidcote* and his friends have " viewed, ſtay one minute, but let the Prieſt be " ready; and if *Lidcote* be not there, ſend for him " ſpeedily, pretending that the body will not tarry. " In poſte haſte at 12.

" *Yours ever.*"

[*D*] *His writings.*] His Poem intitled, *The Wife*, was printed ſeveral times at London during his life. In 1614 it was reprinted at London in 4to, with the following title: *A Wife, now the Widow of Sir* Thomas Overburye. Being a moſt exquiſite and ſingular *Poem of the choice of a Wife. Whereunto are added many witty Characters and conceited Newes, written by himſelfe and other learned Gentlemen his friends.* To this edition is prefixed the following advertiſement of the printer to the reader, dated May 16, 1614, omitted in the following ſubſequent editions. " Thy ignorance may challenge libertie " enough not to reliſh the deepe arte of poetry, be- " cauſe opinion makes thee obſtinate, and rude tra- " dition hath taught thee nothing but an abuſe of " knowledge. For when thou readeſt a quaffing fel- " lowes Barbariſme, a worthy-written ſtile in Tra- " gedies, and a colluſive flouriſh onely fronted with " the name of excellent, thou over-lookſt them all " with the uſual contempt or aſperſion of frivolous " and fantaſticke labours; putting no difference be- " twixt the horſe pictured on a ſigne-poſt, and the " curious limb'd Pegaſus. But the Age gives one " comfort in extremitie, that as there is a Lizard, " which aſſailes, ſo there is one, which wonders at " the majeſtie of man. Sure I am, if any ſhall " neglect, nay not commend the worth of this " ſo generally approved Poem, he may (if it pro- " ceeds from nice criticiſme) bee well concluded " as a churliſh retainer to the Muſes; if from a di- " rect plaine dealing, he muſt be degraded for in- " ſufficiencie. For had ſuch a Volume been extant " among the antient Romanes, though they wanted " our eaſie converſations of wit by printing; yet " would they rather and more eaſily have committed " the ſenſe hereof to braſſe and cedar leaves, then let " ſuch an author have left his due eternitie. If to con- " verſe with a creature ſo amiable here deſcribed be " thought more than difficult, let then the contem- " plation of it be admirable, which hath expreſſed " the Soule in ſo compact a forme of body. The " ſurpluſage, that now exceeds the laſt edition was " (that I may bee honeſtly impartiall) in ſome things " only to be challenged by the firſt author, but others " now added, (little inferior to the reſidue) being in " nature anſwerable, and firſt tranſcribed by Gentle- " men of the ſame Qualitie, I have upon good in- " ducements made publicke with warrantie of their " and my own credit. Not doubting therefore to " be doubly diſcharged both by the verdict of " conſcience and the well-deſerved thankes of all ju- " dicious readers, I bid you every one farewell." The Argument or Method, as it is called, of this Poem, is as follows. *Firſt of Marriage, and the Effects thereof Children. Then of his contrarie, Luſt; then for his Choice. Firſt his opinion negatively, what ſhould not be: the firſt cauſes of it, that is,* neither Beauty, Birth, nor Portion. *Then affirmatively, what ſhould be, of which kind there are fower;* Goodneſs, Knowledge, Diſcretion, *and as a ſecond thing,* Beauty. *The firſt onely is abſolutely good; the other, being built upon the firſt, doe likewiſe become ſo. Then the application of that woman by love to himſelf, which makes her a wife. And laſtly, the only condition of a wife,* Fitneſſe. In this Poem our Author writes thus:

For wandring Luſt, I know 'tis infinite;
It ſtill begins, and addes not more to more;
The guilt is everlaſting, the delight
This inſtant doth not feele of that before:
The taſte of it is only in the ſenſe,
The operation in the conſcience.
Woman is not luſt's bounds, but womankind:
One is love's number; who from that doth fall,
Hath loſt his hold, and no new reſt ſhall find:
Vice hath no meane, but not to be at all:
A wife, is that enough, luſt cannot find,
For luſt is ſtill with want, or too much pinde.
Bate luſt the ſin, my ſhare is ev'n with his;
For not to luſt, and to enjoy, is one:
And more or leſſe paſt, equall nothing is;
I ſtill have one, luſt one at once alone;
And though the woman often changed be,
Yet hee's the ſame without varietie.
Marriage our luſt (as 'twere with fuell fire)
Doth, with a medicine of the ſame, allay;
And not forbid, but rectifie deſire.
Myſelf I cannot chuſe, my wife I may:
And in the choice of her it much doth lye,
To mend myſelfe in my poſteritie.
O rather let me love, *than* be in love!
So let me chuſe, as wife and friend to find:
Let me forget her ſex, when I approve.
Beaſts likeneſſe lyes in ſhape, but ours in minde:
Our ſoules no ſexes have, their love is cleane,
No ſex, both in the better part are men.

Church. He wrote, 1. *A true and perfect Account of the Examination, Trial, Condemnation, and Execution of* Joan Perry *and her two ſons,* John *and* Richard Perry, *for the ſuppoſed murder of* William Harriſon, *Gent*, &c. London 1676 in 4to, written by way of Letter to Thomas Shirley, Doctor of Phyſick, in London. 2. *Queries propoſed to the ſerious Conſideration of thoſe, who impoſe upon others in things of divine and ſupernatural Revelation, and proſecute any upon the account of Religion; with a deſire of their candid and Chriſtian Reſolution thereof.* Printed in 1677. In anſwer to this Mr. *George Vernon*, Rector of Bourton on the Water, publiſhed the ſame year at London in 8vo, Ataxiæ Obſtaculum; *an Anſwer to certain Queries intitled*, Queries propoſed, *&c.* Upon this Sir Thomas Overbury wrote a Reply, entitled, Ratiocinium Vernaculum: *Or, A Reply to*

But phyſicke for our luſt their bodies be,
But matter fit to ſhew our love upon,
But only ſhells for our poſteritie:
Their ſouls were giv'n leſt man ſhould be alone;
For but the ſoule's interpreters words be,
Without which bodies are no companie.
That goodly frame we ſee of fleſh and blood,
Their faſhion is, not weight; it is, I ſay,
But their laye part, but well digeſted food:
'Tis but 'twixt duſt and duſt life's middle way:
The worth of it is nothing that is ſeene,
But only that it holds a ſoule within.
And all the carnal beautie of my wife
Is but ſkin-deep, but to two ſenſes knowne;
Short even of pictures, ſhorter-liv'd then life,
And yet the love ſurvives, that's built thereon:
For our imagination is too high,
For bodies, when they meet, to ſatisfie.
All ſhapes, all colours, are alike in night;
Nor doth our touch diſtinguiſh ſoule or faire;
But man's imagination and his ſight;
And thoſe, but the firſt weeke, by cuſtome are
Both made alike, which diffred at firſt view;
Nor can that diffrence abſence much renew.
Nor can that beauty lying in the face,
But merely by imagination be
Enjoy'd by us in an inferior place:
Nor can that beauty be enjoying we
Make ours become; ſo our deſire growes tame;
We changed are, but it remaines the ſame.

He afterwards tells us, that goodneſs ſhould be one of the chief objects in his choice of a wife.

" Good is a fairer attribute than white:
" 'Tis the mind's beauty, keepes the other ſweet:
" That's not ſtill one, nor mortall with the light;
" Nor glaſſe nor painting can it counterfet.
" Shee's truly faire, whoſe beauty is unſeen
" Like Heav'n faire ſight-ward, but more fair within.
" By good, I would have holy underſtood:
" So God ſhe cannot love, but alſo mee:
" The law requires our words and deeds be good:
" Religion ev'n the thoughts doth ſanctifie:
" And ſhee is more a maide, which raviſh't is,
" Than ſhee which only doth but wiſh amiſſe.
" Luſt only by Religion is withſtood:
" Luſt's object is alive, his ſtrength within;
" Moralitie reſiſts but in cold blood;
" Reſpect of credit feareth ſhame, not ſin:
" But no place dark enough for ſuch offence
" She findes that's watch't by her owne conſcience.
" Then may I truſt her body with her mind,
" And thereupon ſecure need never know
" The pangs of jealouſie; and love doth find
" More paine to *doubt* her falſe, then *know* her ſo;
" For patience is of evills, that are known,
" The certaine remedie; but doubt hath none.
" And be the thought once ſtirr'd, 'twill never die;
" Nor will the griefe more mild by cuſtome prove;
" Nor yet amendment can it ſatisfie:
" The anguiſh more or leſſe is as our love:
" This miſerie doth jealouſie enſue,
" That we may prove her falſe, but cannot true.
" Suſpicion may the will of luſt reſtraine,
" But *good* prevents from having ſuch a will:
" A wife that's *good* doth *chaſte* and more containe;
" For *chaſte* is but an abſtinence from ill;
" And in a wife that's *bad* although the beſt
" Qualities, yet in a *good*, the leaſt."

. . . . . .

" Give me next *good*, an *underſtanding* wife,
" By nature wiſe, not learned by much art:
" Some knowledge on her ſide will all my life
" More ſcope of converſation impart;
" Beſides her in-born vertue fortifie:
" They are moſt firmely good, that beſt know why.
" A paſſive underſtanding to conceive,
" And judgment to diſcerne, I wiſh to find:
" Beyond that all as hazardous I leave.
" Learning and pregnant wit in womankind,
" What it findes malleable, maketh fraile,
" And doth not adde more ballaſte, but more faile.
" Bookes are a part of man's prerogative;
" In formall inck they thoughts and voyces hold,
" That we to them our ſolitude may give,
" And make time preſent travaile that of old.
" Our life Fame peeceth longer at the end,
" And bookes it farther backward do extend.
" Domeſticke charge doth beſt that ſex befit,
" Contiguous buiſnes, ſo to fixe the mind,
" That leaſure ſpace for fancies not admit:
" Their leaſure 'tis corrupteth womankind.
" Elſe being plac'd from many vices free,
" They had to heav'n a ſhorter cut than we."

To this poem are ſubjoin'd *Characters, or witty Deſcriptions of the Properties of ſundry Perſons; and Newes from any whence, or old truthes under a ſuppoſall of Noveltie: Occaſioned by divers Eſſayes and private Paſſages of Wit between ſundry Gentlemen upon that Subject.* To the fifteenth edition are prefixed, *Elegies of ſeveral Authors on the untimely Death of Sir* Thomas Overbury, *poyſoned in the Tower.* In this edition are added many new *Characters*; *Certaine Edicts from a Parliament in Eutopia, written by the Lady Southwell*; *Paradoxes, as they were preſented before his Majeſty at Whitehall*, &c. *The Mountebankes Receipts and Songs.* We ſhall give a Specimen of his characters in that of *A meer Scholar*, which is as follows. " A meer Scho-
" lar is an intelligible aſs, or a ſilly fellow in blacke,
" that ſpeaks ſentences more familiarly than ſenſe.
" The antiquity of his Univerſity is his creed, and
" the excellency of his colledge, though but for a
" match of foot-ball, an article of his faith. He
" ſpeaks Latine better then his mother-tongue; and
" is a ſtranger in no part of the world but his owne
" country. He do's uſually tell great ſtories of him-
" ſelfe to ſmall purpoſe, for they are commonly ri-
" diculous, be they true or falſe. His ambition is,
" that he either is or ſhall be a Graduate. But if
" ever he get a Fellowſhip, he has then no fellow.
" In ſpight of all Logike he dares ſweare and main-
" taine it, that a cuckold and a townſman are *termi-*
" *ni convertibiles*, though his mother's huſband bee
" an Alderman. Hee was never begotten, as it
" ſeems, without much wrangling; for his whole
" life is ſpent in *pro & contra*. His tongue goes al-
" waies before his wit, like a Gentleman-uſher, but
" ſomewhat faſter. That hee is a compleat Gentle-
" man in all points *cap á pe*, witneſſe his horſeman-
" ſhip and the wearing of his weapons. Hee is com-
" monly long-winded, able to ſpeake more with
" eaſe, than any man can endure to heare with pa-
" tience.

to Ataxiæ Obſtaculum : *Being a pretended Anſwer to certain Queries diſperſed in ſome parts in Glouceſterſhire.* London 1678, in 8vo. T.

" tience. Univerſity-jeſts are his univerſal diſcourſe, " and his newes the demeanour of the Proctors. His " phraſe, the apparell of his minde, is made of di- " vers ſhreds like a cuſhion ; and when he goes " plaineſt, it hath a raſh outſide and fuſtian linings. " The current of his ſpeech is cloſed with an *Ergo*; " and whatever be the queſtion, the truth is on his " ſide. 'Tis a wrong to his reputation to be igno- " rant of any thing ; and yet he knowes not that " he knowes nothing. Hee gives directions for " huſbandry from *Virgil's Georgicks*, for cattell from " his *Bucolicks*, for warlike ſtratagems from his *Æne- " ids* or *Cæſar's Commentaries*. He orders all things, " and thrives in none ; ſkillfull in all trades, and " thrives in none. He is led more by his ears than " his underſtanding, taking the ſound of words for " their true ſenſe ; and dos therefore confidently be- " lieve, that *Erra Pater* was the father of Here- " tiques ; *Rodulphus Agricola*, a ſubſtantial farmer ; " and will not ſticke to averre, that *Syſtemo's Logicke* " doth excell *Keckerman's*. His ill lucke is not ſo " much in being a foole, as in being put to ſuch " paines to expreſſe it to the world ; for what in " others is naturall, in him, with much adoe, is " artificiall. His povertie is his happineſſe, for it " makes ſome men believe, that he is none of For- " tune's favourites. That learning, which hee hath, " was in non-age put in backeward like a gliſter, and " it's now like ware miſlaid in a Pedler's packe ; " he has it, but knowes not where it is. In a word, " hee is the index of a man, and the title-page of a " ſcholar, or a puritane in morality ; much in pro- " feſſion, nothing in practice." Beſides theſe pieces, he wrote, *Of the Remedy of Love, in two Parts : A Poem.* London 1620, in 8vo. There are aſcribed two pieces, viz. *Obſervations upon the Provinces United, and on the Preſent State of France.* London 1651, in 8vo, with his picture before it ; and *The Arraign- ment and Conviction of Sir* Walter Raleigh *at the King's Bench-Bar at Weſtminſter*, 17 *Novemb.* 1603, &c. London 1648, in 4to, ſaid to be copied by our Author. T.

☞ OUGHTRED (WILLIAM), an eminent Engliſh Mathematician in the 17th Century, was born at Eaton about the year 1573, as appears from a picture of his by Hollar, where he is ſaid to be *Anno Ætatis* 73, 1646 ; and educated in the ſchool there ; whence he was elected to King's College in Cambridge in 1592 (*a*), where he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1596, and of maſter in 1599. He was Fellow of that College ; and in this Society continued about eleven or twelve years The time, which could be ſpared there from his academical ſtudies, he employed upon the Mathematical Sciences ; and by inciting, aſſiſting, and inſtructing others, he brought many to reliſh that noble and uſeful part of learning (*b*). He received holy Orders from Dr. Thomas Bilſon, Biſhop of Wincheſter (*c*). About the year 1603 he left the Univerſity, and was preſented to the Rectory of Aldbury near Guildford in Surrey, where he lived ſo retired and ſtudious a life, that he ſeldom travelled ſo far as London once in a year ; his recrea- tions being diverſity of ſtudies ; " and as oft, *ſays he* (*d*), as I was toyled with the labours " of my own profeſſion, I have allayed that tedioufneſs by walking in the pleaſant and " more than Elyſian fields of the diverſe and various parts of human learning, and not " of the Mathematicks only." About the year 1628 the Earl of Arundel, who then lived at Weſt-Horſely, though he afterwards bought an houſe at Aldbury, ſent for him, and afterwards at London appointed him a chamber in his own houſe (*e*), where he in- ſtructed his Lordſhip's Son William in the Mathematicks (*f*). In 1631 he publiſhed at London in a ſmall octavo, *Arithmeticæ in numero & ſpeciebus Inſtitutio : quæ tum Logiſ- ticæ, tum Analyticæ, atque adeo totius Mathematicæ quaſi Clavis eſt. Ad nobiliſſimum ſpec- tatiſſimumque Juvenem Dn.* Gulielmum Howard, *Ordinis, qui dicitur, Balnei Equitem, honoratiſſimi Dn.* Thomæ, *Comitis Arundelliæ & Surriæ, Comitis Mareſchalli Angliæ, &c. filium* [*A*]. This book was reprinted with conſiderable alterations and additions in the year 1648, under this title ; *Gulielmi Oughtredi Ætonenſis, quondam Collegii Regalis in Cantabrigiâ Socii, Clavis Mathematice denuo limata ſive potius fabricata.* And in 1647 it was publiſhed in Engliſh in 8vo, with the title of *The Key of the Mathematicks new forged and filed ; together with a Treatiſe of the Reſolution of all kinde of affected Æquations in numbers. With the Rule of compound Uſury ; and a Demonſtration of the Rule of falſe Po- ſition ; and a moſt eaſie Art of delineating all manner of plaine Sun-dyalls, geometrically taught by William Oughtred* [*B*]. The third edition of his *Clavis* was printed at Oxon 1652 in

(*a*) From the Regiſter of King's College, Cambridge.

(*b*) See his *Apologetical Epiſtle*, ſubjoined to his *Circles of Proportion*, London 1633, in 4to.

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) Ibid.

(*e*) Ibid.

(*f*) See the Dedication to our Author's *Clavis Mathematicæ.*

[*A*] *In* 1631 *he publiſhed at London in a ſmall* 8*vo*, Arithmeticæ in numeris & ſpeciebus Inſtitutio, *&c.*] There is a copy of this book in the hands of William Jones, Eſq; F. R. S. with notes throughout in the hand-writing of Mr. *John Greaves*, Profeſſor of Aſtronomy in the Univerſity of Oxford. The Dedication to Sir William Howard, Knight of the Bath, and ſon of Thomas Earl of Arundel, is dated at Arundel-houſe January 1, 1631. Dr. John Wallis in his *Hiſtory of Algebra*, in the chapter concerning Mr. *Oughtred* and his *Clavis*, ſays, that " though " when *Vieta* firſt introduced this way of ſpecious " Arithmetick, it was then more neceſſary (the " thing being new) to expreſs the terms made uſe of " in words at length ; yet when the thing was once " received in practiſe, Mr. *Oughtred*, (who affected " brevity, and to deliver what he taught as briefly as " might be, and reduce all to a ſhort view) contented " himſelf with ſingle letters inſtead of thoſe words. " And by this means he hath in his *Clavis* a great " deal of very good Geometry brought into a very " narrow room ; and you ſhall hardly find in any, " who have written before, ſo much of it delivered " with ſo much clearneſs in ſo few words. I know " there are, who find fault with his *Clavis*, as too " obſcure, becauſe ſo ſhort, but without cauſe ; for " his words are always full, but not redundant, and " need only a little attention in the reader to weigh " the force of every word, and the ſyntax of it ; " and he will then find as much ſaid in a few words, " as others are uſed to expreſs in a large diſcourſe. " And this, when once apprehended, is much more " eaſily retained, than if it were expreſſed with the " prolixity of ſome other writers, where the reader " muſt firſt be at the pains to weed out a great deal " of ſuperfluous language, that he may have a ſhort " proſpect of what is material ; which is here con- " tracted for him in a ſhort ſynopſis."

[*B*] The Key of the Mathematicks new forged and filed, *&c.*] This is dedicated by our author to *Sir* Richard Onſlow, *Knight, one of the Knights of the Parliament for the County of Surrey, and to* Arthur Onſlow,

in 8vo; to which were added the following pieces. I. *Æquationum affectarum Resolutio: ubi etiam multa de Logarithmorum usu interseruntur.* II. *Elementi decimi Euclidis Declaratio.* III. *De Solidis Regularibus Tractatus.* IV. *De Anatocismo sive Usurâ compositâ.* V. *Regula falsæ Positionis demonstrata.* VI. *Theorematum in Libris Archimedis de Sphærâ & Cylindro Declaratio.* VII. *Horologiorum Sciotericorum in plano, Geometricè solum, sine Calculo Trigonometrico, delineandorum modus facillimus; per quem Meridiana, Substylaris, & Stylus ipse, non investigantur modo, sed etiam, in cujus vis generis Plano, situ proprio inscribuntur, omniaque perspicuè demonstrantur. Inventore* Gulielmo Oughtredo, *23m. Ætatis annum agente.* His *Circles of Proportion, and the Horizontal Instrument*, were published at London 1633 in 4to, by his scholar, Mr. *William Forster* [C]; to which is added in some

Onslow, *Esq; one of the Burgesses of the Parliament, eldest son of the said Sir* Richard Onslow. In the Preface to the Reader he observes, that "many years "since he being employed by the late illustrious "Earl of Arundel to instruct one of his sons in the "Mathematicks, penned, for his use, in Latine, a "method of precepts, for the more ready attaining, "not a superficial notion, but a well-grounded un-"derstanding of those mysterious sciences, and of "the antient writers thereof. This afterwards, says "he, at the request of divers learned and judicious "men, I published under the name of *Clavis Ma-"thematicæ*. Which treatise being not written in "the usuall synthetical manner, nor with verbous "expressions, but in the inventive way of *Analytice*, "and with symboles or notes of things instead of "words, seemed unto many very hard, though in-"deed it was but their own diffidence, being scared "by the newnesse of the delivery, and not any dif-"ficulty in the thing itselfe. For the specious and "symbolical manner neither reacheth the memory "with multiplicity of words, nor chargeth the "phantasie with comparing and laying together; "but plainly presenteth to the eye the whole course "and processe of every operation and augmentation. "Now my scope and intent in the first edition of "that my Keye was, and in this new filing, or ra-"ther forging of it, is to reach out to the ingenious "lovers of these sciences, as it were *Ariadne*'s "thread, to guide them through the intricate laby-"rinth of these studies, and to direct them for the "more easy and full understanding of the best and "antienteſt author; such as are *Euclides*, *Archimedes*, "*Apollonius Pergæus*, that great Geometer, *Diophantus*, "*Ptolemæus*, and the rest: that they may not only learn "their propositions, which is the higheſt point of art, "that most students aime at; but also may perceive "with what solertiousnesse, by what engines of æqua-"tions, interpretations, comparations, reductions, and "disquisitions, those antient worthies have beautified, "enlarged, and first found out this most excellent "science. Truly, when I was conversant in read-"ing their bokes, and with wonder observed their "most witty demonstrations, so skilfully framed out "of principles, as one would little expect or thinke, "but laid together with divine artifice; I was even "amazed, whence possibly any power of imagina-"tion should be able to sustaine so immense a pile of "consequences, and cause that so many things, so "far asunder distant, could be at once present to "the minde, and as with one consent joyne and lay "themselves together for the structure of one argu-"ment. Wherefore that I might more clearly be-"hold the things themselves, I uncasing the propo-"sitions and demonstrations out of their covert "of words, designed them in notes and species ap-"pearing to the very eye. After that, by compa-"ring the divers affections of Theoremes in equality, "proportion, affinity, and dependence, I tryed to "educe new out of them. Lastly, by framing like "questions problematically, and in way of analysis, "as if they were already done, resolving them into "their principles, I sought out reasons and means, "whereby they might be effected. And by this "course of practice, not without long time and "much industry, I found out this way for the helpe "and facilitation of art. Hereunto also is added, a "short tract concerning the resolution of adfected "æquations proposed in numbers; whereof mention "is made in the end of the former booke. And by "the way is inserted so much as is needfull for the "use both of decimall parts and of logarithmes. "And last of all, a most natural and easie geome-"tricall way of delineating sun-dyals upon any plaine "howsoever situated." The tract concerning Geometrical Dialling was invented by our Author between 22 and 23 years of age. There is a copy of his *Key of the Mathematicks*, with a great many additions and corrections in his own hand-writing, in the possession of William Jones, Esq; F. R. S.

[C] *His* Circles of Proportion, and the Horizontal Instrument, *was published at London* 1633, *in* 4to, *by his scholar, Mr.* William Forster.] The title is as follows: *The Circles of Proportion, and the Horizontal Instrument. The former shewing the manner how to work Proportions both simple and compound, and the ready and easy resolving of Quæstions both in Arithmetic, Geometrie, and Astronomie; and is newly increased with an Additament for Navigation. All which rules may also be wrought with the penne by arithmetic, and the canon of triangles. The later teaching how to work most Quæstions, which may be performed by the globe: and to delineat dialls upon any kind of plaine. Hereunto is annexed the excellent use of two rulers for calculation. Invented and written in Latine by* W. O. *Translated into English, and set out for the public benefit, by* William Forster. The Dedication of Mr. *Forster* to Sir *Kenelm Digby* is dated May 1. 1632. and in it he writes thus: "Being in the time of the long vaca-"tion, 1630, in the country of the reverend, and "my most worthy friend and teacher, Mr. *William* "*Oughtred* (to whose instruction I owe both my Ini-"tiation, and whole progress in these sciences,) I, "upon occasion of speech, told him of *a Ruler of* "*Numbers, Sines and Tangents*, which one had bespo-"ken to be made (such as is usually called Mr. *Gun-"ter's Ruler*) six feet long, to be used with a payre "of beame compasses. He answered, *That was a* "*poore invention, and the performance very troublesome.* "*But*, said he, *seeing you are taken with such mecha-"chanicall wayes of instruments, I will shew you what "devises I have had by mee these many years.* And first, "he brought to me two *Rulers* of that sort, to be "used by applying one to the other, without any "compasses. And after that, he shewed mee those "*Lines* cast into a *Circle* or *Ring*, with another *move-"able Circle* upon it. I seeing the great expedite-"nesse of both these wayes, but especially of the "latter, wherein it farre excelleth any other instru-"ment, which hath been knowne, told him, I "wondered that he could so many years conceale "such usefull inventions, not onely from the world, "but from myselfe, to whom in other parts and "mysteries of art, he had been so liberall. He "answered, that *the true way of art is not by instru-"ments, but by demonstrations; and that it is a pre-"posterous course of vulgar teachers to begin with in-"struments, and not with the sciences; and so instead of "artists, to make their schollers only doers of tricks, "and as it were juglers, to the despite of art, losse of "precious time, and betraying of willing and industrious "wits upon ignorance and idlenesse. That the use of "instruments is indeed excellent, if a man be an ar-"tist; but contemptible, being set and opposed to art.* "*And lastly, that he meant to commend to me the skill "of instruments, but first he would have me well in-"structed in the sciences.* He also shewed me many "notes and rules for the use of those circles, and of "his *Horizontal Instrument*, (which he had projected "about 30 years before) the most part written in "Latine. All which I obtained of him leave to "translate into English, and make publike, for the "use and benefit of such as were studious and lovers "of these excellent sciences. Which thing, while "I with

ſome Editions Mr. Oughtred's *Apologetical Epiſtle to the Engliſh Gentry* againſt Mr. Richard Delamain [*D*]. In 1636 was printed at London in 8vo, our Author's *Deſcription and*

" I with mature and diligent care (as my occaſions " would give me leave) went about to doe; another, " to whom the Author, in a long conference, diſ- " covered his intent, uſing more haſt than good " ſpeed, went about to preoccupate; of which un- " timely birth, and preventing (if not circumventing) " forwardneſſe, I ſay no more, but adviſe the ſtu- " dious Reader, only ſo farre to truſt, as he ſhall be " ſure doth agree to truth and art." This Mr. *Forſter* appears to have been a Teacher of the Mathematics, in London, from the following note at the bottom of the *Circles of Proportion*; *Thoſe, that deſire further inſtructions in the uſe of theſe inſtruments, or other parts of the mathematiques, may repaire to* W. Forſter, *at the Red-Bull, over-againſt St. Clement's Church-yard, without Temple-Bar.*

[*D*] *To which is added, in ſome editions, Mr.* Oughtred's Apologeticall Epiſtle to the Engliſh Gentry, *againſt Mr.* Richard Delamain.] This Epiſtle is entitled, *To the Engliſh Gentry, and all others ſtudious of the Mathematics, which ſhall bee Readers hereof; the juſt Apologie of* Wil. Oughtred, *againſt the ſlaunderous Inſimulations of* Richard Delamain, *in a Pamphlet, called,* Grammelogia; *or,* The Mathematicall Ring; *or,* Mirifica Logarithmorum projectio circularis. In this epiſtle he obſerves, that *it is not without impiety to be affirmed, that any part of good literature is alien and abhorrent from the calling of a Divine; but that in all ages, many of the moſt eminent in the ſublimity of Theologie, have beene alſo converſant in the ſtudy of the Mathematicks, moſt profitably making them to ſerve and ancillate to their higheſt contemplations. And they that have wanted ſuch helpe, have heartily wiſhed for it, and found in themſelves the defect. And that in no other thing, after his ſacred word, Almighty God (who creating all things in number, weight, and meaſure, doth moſt exactly geometrize) hath left more expreſſe prints of his heavenly and infallible truth, then in theſe ſciences; in which onely the mind and underſtanding of a man can find ſecure reſt and ſure footing, all other knowledges being involved with a thicke miſt of ignorance and obſcurity. Beſides, that the exerciſe of theſe arts accuſtomed to the certainty of demonſtration, quickeneth the underſtanding, rouſing it up from a laſie and drowſie indormition and ſervile aſſent to dialecticall and conjecturall probabilities, and ſpurring it forward, and ſupplying it with means, unto the accurate inveſtigation of true and undeceivable principles.* With regard to the *Horizontal Inſtrument*, he tells us, that long ago, when he was a young ſtudent of the Mathematical Sciences, he tried many ways and devices to fit himſelf with ſome good dial or inſtrument portable for his pocket, to find the hour, and try other concluſions by; and accordingly framed for that purpoſe both quadrants, and rings, and cylinders, and many other compoſures; yet not to his full content and ſatisfaction; for either they performed but little, or elſe were patched up with a diverſity of lines by an unnatural and forced contexture. And at laſt conſidering, that all manner of queſtions concerning the firſt motions were performed moſt properly by the Globe itſelf, rectified to the preſent elevation by the help of a moveable Azimuth; he projected the Globe upon the plane of the Horizon, and applied to it at the center, which was therein the Zenith, an Index with projected degrees, for the moveable Azimuth; in which projection he firſt found, what he had before with much ſtudy and pains in vain ſought for. And becauſe he ſeldom went to London, where he might have the help of large compaſſes and other inſtruments for drawing the arches of very big circles, he was forced to betake himſelf to ſuch ſhift as art would afford him, and invented many theorems, problems, and practices, (ſuch as no man before, that ever he could find, had delivered) for the finding out of the interſections, and all and every points of all thoſe circles, by which he might draw the ſame, and divide them being drawn. " About thirty years ſince, *ſays he*, I preſented one " of them drawne with my own hand to the truely " Reverend Prelate, Doctour *Byliſon*, Biſhop of Win- " cheſter, by whom I was made Preſbyter. About " five and twenty years agoe I beſtowed one upon a " noble Ladie, the wife of a worthy and learned " Knight, then abiding neere the place where I " live, but ſince dwelling in Worceſterſhire; which " Lady with ingeniouſneſſe and ſolertie more than " ſœminine, tooke delight in the ſpeculation and uſe " of the Globe. And for her I writ many notes " upon my inſtrument, the very ſame almoſt word " for word, which many years after I ſent in a let- " ter to *Elias Allen*, and are they, which *Delamain* " acknowledgeth to have ſeene, but ſlighteth. . . . . " In the ſpring 1618, I being at London, went to " ſee my honoured friend Maſter *Henry Briggs* at " Greſham College; who then brought me acquaint- " ed with Maſter *Gunter*, lately choſen aſtronomie " reader there, and was at that time in Dr. *Brooks* " his chamber; with whom falling into ſpeech " about his Quadrant, I ſhewed him my Horizontal " Inſtrument. He viewed it very heedfully, and " queſtioned about the projecture and uſe thereof, " often ſaying theſe words, *It is a very good one.* " And not long after he delivered to Maſter *Briggs*, " to be ſent to me, mine owne inſtrument printed " off from one cut in braſſe, which afterwards I un- " derſtood he preſented to the Right Honourable the " Earle of Bridgwater. And in his booke of the " *Sector* printed ſix years after, among other projec- " tions ſetteth down this; herein ingenuous, that " he did not challenge it to himſelf (as our chal- " lenger doth) but not ingenuouſly enough acknow- " ledging from whom he had it. But ſuch is the pro- " vidence of God, I kept that very letter of Maſter " *Briggs*, wherein he ſent me that print from Maſter " *Gunter*, dated from Greſham College *June* 2; " 1618, and the Poſtſcript *June* 4, and which came " to my hands *June* 10. In which letter are theſe " words; *Maſter* Gunter *doth here ſend you the print of* " *a Horizontal Diall of his drawing after your inſtru-* " *ment.* This very letter hath beene left by me in " the hands of *Elias Allen* above theſe two years, " to be ſeene of any one, that will require it. . . . " About two yeares after I had ſhewed that my in- " ſtrument to Maſter *Gunter*, I beſtowed the very " ſame individual one upon a young Gentleman, " now a Baron, my very honourable and moſt intire " friend, a man full of vertue, full of learning, " full of all goodneſs and true nobility, whoſe onely " defect and fault is an unquenchable thirſt after " knowledge and good literature; who hath yet the " very ſame in his cuſtody, and is at this preſent in " London; whoſe honourable word and teſtimony " will confirme, that he himſelfe ſo many years " agoe knew the uſes of that inſtrument. And yet " our challenger never *unvayled* it to him, nor dareth " preſcribe for ſo long time. In Michaelmas " Term 1627 I came to London, and *Elias Allen* " having beene ſworne his Majeſtie's ſervant, had a " purpoſe to preſent his Majeſtie with ſome New- " yeares gift, and requeſted me to deviſe ſome pretty " inſtrument for him. I anſwered, that I have " heard his Majeſty delighted much in the great " concave dyall at Whitehall: and what fitter in- " ſtrument could hee have than my horizontall, " which was the very ſame repreſented in flat? and " that I would upon the backeſide ſet the theories " of the ſun and moone, and ſo by helpe of both " ſides, eclipſes might be calculated with great fa- " cility. He liked it well. The horizontall ſide " was begunne by my direction. I was not long at " home, but Maſter *Allen* being at a ſtand in his " worke, ſent to me for helpe. I writ him a large " letter two ſheets of paper long; wherein I taught " him the uſes of the inſtrument, eſpecially the ho- " rizontall, and afterward the fabric or delineation of " it, and how to find the ſemidiameters and centers " of the ſeverall circles both great and leſſer, and " the way to divide them: which letter Maſter *Al-* " *len* yet keepeth, and is the ſame I ſpake of before, " and which Delamain confeſſeth he ſaw." With regard to the *Circles of Proportion*, Mr. Oughtred confeſſes, that he had not ſo good a claim againſt all men, as for his horizontall inſtrument, tho' againſt Mr. *Delamain* he had. *The honour of the invention,* ſays he, *next to the Lord of* Merchiſton, *and our Maſter*

and Uſe of the double Horizontall Diall. In 1652 at the end of the Engliſh Edition of H. Van Etten's *Mathematical Recreations*, printed at London, there was publiſhed a Tract of Mr. Oughtred, intitled, *The Deſcription of the double Horizontall Diall, whereby not only the Hour of the day is ſhewn, but alſo the Meridian Line is found: and moſt Aſtronomical Queſtions, which may be done by the Globe, are reſolved. Invented and written by* William Oughtred. In 1657 was printed his *Trigonometria; hoc eſt, modus computandi Triangulorum Latera & Angulos, ex Canone Mathematico traditus & demonſtratus. Una cum Tabulis Sinuum Tangent. & Secant. &c.* And likewiſe a tranſlation of it printed at London the ſame year in 4to, under this title; *Trigonometrie: Or, The manner of calculating the Sides and Angles of Triangles by the Mathematical Canon, demonſtrated by* William Oughtred, *Etonenſ.* He kept a correſpondence by letters with ſome of the moſt eminent ſcholars of his time upon mathematical ſubjects, ſome of which letters we ſhall preſent to the Reader in the Note [*E*], the originals being communicated to us by the learned William Jones, Eſq; F. R. S. Mr. David Lloyd (*g*) tells us, that our Author "having

(*g*) *Memoirs*, p. 608. edit. Lond. 1668.

Briggs, *belongeth (if I have not been wrongly informed) to Maſter* Gunter, *who expoſed their numbers upon a ſtreight line; which being once done, was there any ſuch maſterie to bring the ſame line about a circle? And what doth this new inſtrument (call it the* Circles of Proportion, *or call it the* Ring, *or what other name you liſt) ought elſe, but only bowe and inflect Maſter* Gunter's Line *or* Ruler? *The manner how I fell upon it, was thus: I have in my ſtudie and practice of the mathematics been not a little converſant in calculation. And that I might both facilitate the labour, and try the worke, I invented many ſolerties and compendiations in logiſtica, for the one, and framed diverſe kinds of inſtruments, and mechanicall practices for the other; that when I ſhould find the performance in both wayes not to diſagree, I might be aſſured of my juſt diligence in numerary computation. Among other inſtruments, I much liked the ſame Line or Ruler; only this defect I found, that it required many times too great a paire of compaſſes, which would be hard to open, apt to ſlip, and troubleſome for uſe. I therefore firſt deviſed to have another Ruler with the former; and ſo by ſetting and applying one to the other, I did not only take away the uſe of compaſſes, but alſo made the worke much more eaſy and expedite, when I ſhould not at all need the motion of my hand, but onely the glancing of my ſight, and with one poſition of the Rulers, and view of mine eye, ſee not one onely, but the manifold proportions incident unto the queſtion intended. But yet this facility alſo wanted not ſome difficulty, eſpecially in the line of tangents, when one arch was in the former mediety of the quadrant, and the other in the latter; for in this caſe it was needfull, that either one ruler muſt bee as long againe as the other; or elſe that I muſt uſe an inverſion of the ruler, a regreſſion. By this conſideration, I firſt of all ſaw, that if thoſe lines upon both rulers were inflected into circles, that of the tangents being in both doubled, and that theſe two circles ſhould move one upon another, they with a ſmall thread in the center to direct the ſight, would bee ſufficient with incredible and wonderfull facility to worke all queſtions of Trigonometry, both right-lined and ſphericall. And according to this my ſpeculation, above twelve years agoe, I with mine owne hand made me two ſuch circles, which I have uſed ever ſince, as my occaſions required.* "In the long vacation 1630, I ſhew-
" ed both the rulers and the circle to *William Forſter*,
" (ſomewhat præmaturely then for the deſire I had
" to leade him on the right way of art I intended)
" at my Parſonage-houſe, as in his epiſtle before his
' tranſlation he doth himſelf teſtify. To whom,
" exhorting me to publiſh them, I ſaid, I would not
" appear to the world in ſuch toyes; but if hee
" would take the paines to tranſlate ſome rules I had
" written, into Engliſh, we would beſtow upon *Elias*
" *Allen* (if he ſhall thinke they may bee beneficiall
" to him) both theſe circles of proportion, and alſo
" another inſtrument, conſiſting of two halfe circles,
" moſt plainely and eaſily giving the proſthaphæreſes
" of the planets according to the theory of *Coper-*
" *nicus* (which I have had fairly drawn with mine
" owne hand above theſe twenty years) which might
" be ſet upon the other ſide of the plate, and
" would together make up the moſt compleat inſtru-
" ment for all Aſtronomie, that ever yet to my know-
" ledge came forth. And of this intire inſtrument,
" at my comming up to London in Michaelmas
" Term following, to attend my ſervice, I did ac-
" cordingly make a moſt free donation to *Elias Al-*
" *len*, by the engagement of my promiſe."

[*E*] *Some of which letters we ſhall preſent to the Reader in the note.*]

" To the wor:ll my very lovinge friende, Mr.
" Owtreade.

" *Salutem in Chriſto.*

" Worthy Sir,

" If yow be at leaſure from your harveſt affaires,
" I would once moore deſier your helpe in trying the
" concluſion of the quadrature of the circle. By deepe
" conſideration of the 4th chapter of Ezechiel, I doe
" finde a maniſeſt figure of declaring of the quadrate
" thereof, with all the circumſtances. The Pro-
" phet is willed to take a tile, or (as the word in the
" Hebrew beareth) *Album*, a whight-table, *Abacum*,
" or paper; and to wright theron the name
" of the Citty *Hieruſalem*, which ſignifieth the
" doctrine or viſion of Concorde: and it fitteth to
" the purpoſe, of a circle made to accorde with a
" right line, betweene whom ther hath alwaies
" ben unreconcileable warr. The name *Hieruſalem*
" ירושלם containeth, according to the common
" wrighting, 1146; but I finde alſo a ſecrett wri-
" ting therof in this manner, רושקם, that
" is 80 moore added, and maketh the whole num-
" ber 1226. And the wordes, which followe, *dabis*
" *ſuper eam* OBSIDIONEM, *ædificabis* TURRIM, *fundes*
" AGGEREM, *dabis* EXERCITUS, *pones* ARIETES IN
" CIRCUITU, written in the Hebrew, and the
" whole number of conſonants and vowells put to-
" gether of theſe words, maketh the ſame number
" 1226. And according to the common ſenſe of
" thee words, it ſignifieth manifeſtly, a ſtudy of
" attaining the knowledge of the ſecrett thereof.
" He is bidden firſt to ſleepe uppon his left ſide 390
" dayes, and to beare the iniquity of Iſrael; which
" ſignifieth the ſuppoſing of the quadrature to be
" the triple of that number, which is a figure of
" the iniquity of Iſrael, as that number is unequall
" to the circle. Then he is willed to ſleep on his
" right ſide fourty dayes, and to beare the iniquity
" of Juda. The wordes *quadraginta dies*, in the He-
" brewe (detracting the number of the vowells from
" conſonants) make 2479, which is the diameter
" given by the firſt operation, and is notwithſtand-
" ing unequall, though leſſe than the former. He
" is alſo bidden to take an yron grate to putt be-
" tweene him and the citty; that is, the ſquare of
" ſeavens made in the manner of a grate, as a me-
" ſolabium betweene the circle, which is beſieged,
" and the right line, which is brought unto it. Then
" he is commaunded to goe about the ſiege, and not
" to ſtirr to the examining of the fraction, before he
" hath perfected and gon over the 390 partes.
" Alſo he is willed to take certaine puls, and to
" make a breade of them for the number of the
" dayes 390. By which is meant the compoſiti-
" on of all thoſe wordes together into one ſen-
" tens, which ſignify in the Hebrew the drawing of
" a line of ſyphers; and the number of the line is
" expreſſed by the weight of the water, which he is
" to drinke, that is, the 6 part of an Hin, which is
" 12, the Hin containing 72. Afterward he is will-
" ed to cutt the hayre of his head and bearde: the

" having a ſtrong perſuaſion upon principles of Art (much confirmed by the ſcheme of " his Majeſty's return in 1660, ſent his Majeſty ſome years before by the Biſhop of " Avignon) that he ſhould ſee the King reſtored, he ſaw it to his incredible joy, and had " his *dimittis* a month after, June 30, 1660, and the 86th (*b*) year of his age." But in *Collier's Dictionary* (*i*) it is aſſerted, that *he died about the beginning of May* 1660; *for upon hearing the news of the Vote at Weſtminſter, which paſſed May 1ſt, for the Reſtoration of King Charles* II. *he expired in a ſudden extaſy of joy.* Mr. Aubrey tells us (*k*), that he was interred in the Chancel of the Church of Aldbury, *June* 15, 1660, Anno Ætatis 88, *and odd days.* Mr. Lloyd obſerves (*l*), that " the choiceſt Mathematicians of that " age owe much of their ſkill to him, whoſe houſe was full of young Gentlemen (*m*), " that came from all parts to be inſtructed by him. He was much requeſted to have " lived

(*b*) This is a miſtake; for Mr. *Oughtred* was 87 years of age when he died.

(*i*) Vol. 2.

(*k*) *Natural Hiſtory and Antiquities of Surrey*, vol. 4. p. 70, 71. edit. London 1718.

(*l*) *Ubi ſupra.*

(*m*) As Sir William Backhouſe, Mr. Stokes, Dr. William Lloyd, Mr. Arthur Haughton, who had much ado to prevail with his modeſty to publiſh his *Trigonometrie.*

" two wordes containe the beginning of the fraction " of 653, after the 6 place 3⌊141592⌊653. " He is alſo to divide them into three equall parts, " and to caſt all of them away, ſave only a litle " part, that is, one unitt; and yet of that to caſt " away ſomewhat. That little reſidew, which muſt " ſtand in the 7 place, is ſignified by an inward read- " ing to be $\frac{20}{30}$, for the unities are ſuppoſed to be 30 " a peece. So that in the 7 place, it ſeemeth the " ſtay ſhould be of fractions to come to an ende, " that the whole proportion of this diameter 390, " to the circle 1226, ſhould be 3⌊141592$\frac{20}{30}$, " which cutteth between $\frac{7 \text{ minus}}{6 \text{ plus}}$ in the ſeventh " place. Now the reaſon, which moveth me to " hoape for ſomewhat out of this place is, that it is " evident, that the way of *Archimedes* and *Ceulin*, can " never poſſibly come to an ende in the operation, to " make a certaine ſtay. For ther grownde being " the multiplication of an inſcript figure, by his " polygones to come to the nature of a circle, it " can never be effected. For the laſt polygon figure, " which can be imagined, muſt be compounded of " right lines, which part two angles. Therefore " thoſe lines may be againe divided into leſſer with- " out ende, according to the rules of philoſophy: " therefore they muſt always ende between *plus* and " *minus*. Mooreover, ſuppoſe the trew proportion of " the circle weare propounded by God, it muſt of ne- " ceſſity be either leſſe than *Ceulin*'s, or equal, or " moore. If it be leſſe, or equall, it cannot be, " becauſe theſe proportions are defective from the " periphery, as may be proved demonſtratively. A- " gaine, if it exceed an unite, it cannot be by the " ſame demonſtration. Therefore of neceſſity it muſt " exceede *Ceulin*, wherſoever it ſhould chance to fall, " and yett not an unite. Therefore this is my de- " ſire, that you would take ſo much paynes for me, " as to trye whether by algebra it be poſſible to " overthrowe this ſuppoſition of the perfect propor- " tion abovenamed. For wheras *Ceulin* hath $\frac{7 \text{ minus}}{6 \text{ plus}}$ " in the 7 place, the unite being ſuppoſed to be a " denary, this diviſion of the unite into thirty cut- " teth a middle betweene 18, which is as 6, and " 21, which is as 7. And wheras mention was " made of a meſolabium in the ſquare of ſeavens, I " finde this uſe thereof, that the ſquare of ſevens con- " taining ⌊6 latera 175 a part, and in all in the 49 " places, 1225; ther is but one unite differens from " the circle 1226, which is reconciled by adding of " 20 days to every one of the 16 ſides of the ſquar, " being ſuppoſed to conſiſt of yeares; which fracti- " on making 320 dayes, is in groſſe taken for a " year; ſo that although every ſide conſiſting of 175 " years and 20 dayes be heterogeneall in things from " the ſemidiameter of 390 years, it is homogeneall " in number. And I finde that the life of Abra- " ham, which was 175 whole years, contayned 20 " dayes over, as I can demonſtrate by a ſecrett read- " ing. So that this formall reconciliation, not reall, " of the ſquare of ſevens unto the circle of 1226, is " made by adding of a 20 to the making of a juſt " proportion, to become thereby a figure of the " quadrature of 390 to 1226, by adding the fraction " of 20 in the 7 place. But to leave all queſtions, " which may ariſe about the premiſſes, I only deſire " you would try, if by algebra you may diſprove this " determinate fraction of $\frac{20}{30}$ in the ſeaventh place, " for the juſt proportion of the diameter 390 unto " 1226. For *Ceulin*'s operation doeth not infringe it, " for all his ſubalterne fractions added to the 6 place " in the ſcale, doth not amount to another unite, that " it ſhould exceed $\frac{20}{30}$; and his operation onely pro- " ceedeth by proportion, that as 390⌊2479, maketh " the proportion 3⌊141592, ſo 390⌊247921 " maketh the proportion 3⌊14159265, and ſo pro- " ceedeth by the way of proportion continually to " come to a leſſer fraction.

" I entreat you moſt earneſtly, that ſo ſoone as " your leiſure will ſerve, you will take pains heerin, " and ſend me the operation which you make. For " although it ſeemeth to me, that ther being noe " meſolabium known, which may be as a logicall me- " dium to prove or diſprove this propoſition, ſa- " ving only the method of *Ceulin*, which cannot doe " it; yet I deſire to be ſatisfied by your experiens, " not by my owne gueſſe. And ſo wiſhing you all " happines, I reſt

Goldſmithes Alley in Red-Croſſe-Street, the 27th of Auguſt 1633.

" Your moſt loving friend,

" *Wm. Alabaſter.*"

" To my worthie friend Mr. William Oughtred.

" Worthie Sir,

" I thanke you for your little booke, but eſpeci- " allie for the waie of callculating the diviſions of " your guaging Rod. I wiſh both for theyr owne " ſakes and yours, that the citizens were as capable " of the acutenes of this invention, as they are com- " monly greedie of gaine; and then I doubte not " but they would give you a better recompence than " I doubt now they will. I deferred to write to you " untill I heard from Mr. *Derand*, which I have " nowe done, and ſend you heer incloſed his letter to " you, wherein I perceive he is nowe fullie ſatisfied " of the perfection of your demonſtration. I alſo " received a letter from him, in which he highlie " commends the ſharpneſs of your invention in that " demonſtration. He writes alſo, that your *Clavis* " is in greate eſtimation amongſt the Mathematicians " at Paris. I have no more to trouble you with at " this time; and ſo wiſhing you all happineſs, I reſt,

" Your aſſured Friend,

Wellbeck, Feb. 11, 1635.

" *Charles Cavendyſſhe.*"

Eruditiſſimo Domino, Domino Oughtred.

Eruditiſſime Domine,

Recepi Dominationis veſtræ Literas ſimulque dubiorum ſolutionem, quæ mihi veſter in ſolvendis mathematicis problematibus agendi modus, doctiſſimus ille quidem, ſed apud nos non ita receptus, procreaverat. Ubi enim Hypotheſim ſemel aliquam ad propoſitam quamlibet demonſtrationem aſſumpſimus, illam non patimur quamdiu probationum diffluit ſeries immutari. Et ſiquando contingat eam facilitatis majoris gratiâ, aliaſve ob cauſas, variari, id admittimus quidem, at ita tamen ut ſimul etiam Lectorem, ne tantæ mutationis inſcius deludatur, ut nobis dum veſtras rimaremur demonſtrationes contigit, admonemus. Et certè ſi Dominatio veſtra prioribus ſuis in literis de variatâ nos demonſtrationum ſuarum ratione feciſſet certiores, haud dubium eſt, ni fallor, quod illarum ſecreta omnia primis conatibus, ut & ſecundis fecimus, mutatis ad mentem veſtram ideis, penetraſſemus. Cæte-

" lived in Italy, France, and Holland, when he was little obſerved in England; as face-
" tious in Greek and Latin, as ſolid in Arithmetick, Aſtronomy, and the Sphere of all
" Meaſures, Muſick, &c. exact in his ſtyle as in his judgment, handling his tube and
" other inſtruments at eighty as ſteadily as others did at thirty; owing this, as he ſaid,
" to temperance and archery; principling his people with plain and ſolid truths, as he
" did the World with great and uſeful arts; advancing new inventions in all things but
" Religion; which in its old order and decency he maintained ſecure in his privacy, pru-
" dence, meekneſs, ſimplicity, reſolution, patience, and contentment." After his death ſeveral tracts of his were publiſhed. For in the year 1660 Sir Jonas Moore annexed to his *Arithmetic*, then printed at London in 8vo, a Treatiſe, intitled, *Conical Sections: Or, The ſeveral Sections of a Cone: being an Analyſis, or methodical Contraction of the two firſt*

rum gratias agimus Dominationi veſtræ immortales, quod quemadmodum ſuo illo labore ac ſtudii nobiliſſimi Domini de Cavendiſh votis plenius ſatisfecit, ſic noſtra etiam cumulatiſſimè adimplerit. Vale.

Pariſiis, 8 *Jan.* 1635. *Dominationis veſtræ obſequentiſſimus in Chriſto Servus,*

Franc. Derand.

" To his honoured friend Mr. Oughtred.

Reverend Sir,

" *** I will once againe earneſtly intreat you, that " you bee rather diffuſe in the ſettinge forthe of your " Engliſh *Mathematical Clavis*, than conciſe, conſi- " deringe that the wiſeſt of men noted of olde, and " ſaid, *Stultorum infinitus eſt numerus*. Thoſe arts " cannot be made too eaſy, they are ſo abſtruſe of " themſelves, and men either ſo lazye or dull, that " theire faſtidious wits will take a loathinge at the " very entrance of theeſe ſtudyes, unleſs it bee ſweeten- " ed with plaineſſe and facilitye. Brevitye maye " well argue a learned author, that without any ex- " ceſſe or redundance, either of matters or wordes, " can give the very ſubſtance and eſſence of the " thinge treated of; but it ſeldome makes ſcholler; " and if one be capable, twenty are not; and if " the maſter ſumme up in brife the parts of his " owne longe labours and travailes, it is not eaſy to " imagine the ſcholars can with leſs laboure than it " coſt their maiſter dive into the depth thereof. I " am not of their opinion, that would have myſte- " ries in the world, (divine myſteries, which God " himſelf hath locked from us, excepted,) for if ig- " norance is the puniſhment and conſequence of " ſinne, and it behoves us to take away from others " this vaile, which ſinne hath drawne betweene our " eyes and the truth of things, ſo ſhall men imitate " Angells, every ſuperior illuminatinge and per- " fecting his inferior, which redoundeth to the ho- " nour and dignity of them both, but more of the " giver than receiver. The abyſſe of theſe ſciences " is inexhauſtible, and much is loſt, that our aunceſ- " tors knewe, much yett unknowne to either; and " therefore all the helpe that humane wit or induſ- " trye can afford us, all little enough; and when all " is done, there will be a *Terra incognita* for Mathe- " maticians of after-ages to faile unto. Thus, Sir, " you ſee I am free and bold, becauſe lovinge and " confident, and that you will be pleaſed ſo to take " it, I will count it pardon ſufficient; and whatſo- " ever iſſues from you as a child of your braine, I " deſire it may lodge with mee, wheare it ſhall have " the beſt wellcome that affection can give it.

" Your loving and true Friende,

Lincolne, July 2, 1636. " *William Robinſon.*"

In another letter to Mr. *Oughtred* dated June 11, Mr. Robinſon writes thus:

" *Reverend Sir,*

" But that your letter came upon the very point of " my departure out of towne (when commonly buſi- " neſſes come faſteſt on, and myſelfe indeede not " very well) I had returned you anſwere, whilſt I " was there; but for theſe reaſons and ſome others " I preſumed to defer a little, till both myne owne " occcaſions and a fit meſſenger, as now it happens, " bringe it up unto you. As for the booke I ſent " you, which I ingeniouſly confeſſed was out of my " true love unto you, I give you thanks for your per- " uſal thereof, for your judgment, and plaine deal- " inge therein; and that being all I requeſted at " your hands, I reſt ſatisfied, and concerning it there " ſhall not neede to paſſe any more betwixt us. I am " gladd alſo you have peruſed *Snellius*, who indeed " pleaſed me exceedingly; and I thought in the " readinge of him, a more exact way (if inſtruments " and artiſt bee both exact) could not poſſibly bee " taken, than by angles taken with a very lardge " Quadrant, and ſo good an artiſt and logiſticke " as *Snellius* was. Upon your letter I borrowed " your newe booke (but I intend to take your cour- " teouſe offer of one of them from Mr. *Allen*,) and " finde your way, *p.* 23, to be exceedinge good (and " indeed a curious good waye,) but why in your let- " ter you ſhould rather wiſhe the plaine table, I doe " not ſee; yett I confeſſe my ignorance therein, " being only a book ſpeculator (ſuch is the condition " of my life,) and no practicioner, becauſe I am re- " ſtrained, may well hide the reaſon from me, and " therefore do ſubmitt. In aſſigninge of a degree I " find this difference betwixt you and *Snellius*, that " he makes a degree to contain 353305 $\frac{785}{1000}$ En- " gliſh feete, you only 351120. The difference is " 2185 $\frac{785}{1000}$, which though not much in a whole " degree, yet I marvaile how it ſhould happen be- " twixt ſuch two good artiſts. The way by the " height of a hill and a tangent, which is *Maurolycus*'s way, I did not propoſe as to relye upon it in " practice; but ſuppoſinge *Snellius* his obſervations " to be exact, I thought to try, the Earth's diame- " ter, being already given, and the height of a hill " alſo, ſuppoſe to bee 7920 feet, that is, a mile and " $\frac{1}{2}$ in the perpendicular (a height heigh enough) yett " it will not hitt, but either varyeth the Angle at " the center, or the diameter given by *Snellius*; yet " I dare not diſtruſt *Snellius* his way, it is ſo demon- " ſtrative. Your booke of navigation delighteth " mee exceedingly, and I doubt not but to finde in " it (for my time of peruſal hath yett beene but " ſhorte) the way of the ſhipp exactly taught, and " ſome things extraordinary, ſeeing (as I perceive) " you have reade *Snellius* his *Typhus Batavus*, which " was the beſt that I had reade before I reade yours; " and ſeeinge you have layd open ſo much of the " arte alreadye, I could wiſh wee might ſee a *Typhus* " *Aldeburienſis* come from the *Archimedes* thereof, for " verily, I thinke, *omne Bonum Mathematicum*, may " come from thence, if ſo you pleaſe. And I pro- " teſt unto you ſincerely, wear I able as ſome, at " whoſe handes you have merited exceedingly, or (to " ſpeake more abſolutely,) as able as willing, I " would as freely give you 500 l. *per ann.* as 500 " pence. And I cannot but be aſtoniſhed at this our " age, wherein pelfe and droſs is made their *ſummum* " *bonum*, and the beſt parte of man, with the true or- " naments thereof, ſcience and knowledge, are ſo " ſleighted. I would, I ſay, it weare in my power as " efficaciouſly as it is in my will, and there ſhould " not paſſe many dayes ere it weare donne. I make " no queſtion but my Lord Marſhiall (1) is very no- " ble, and intended really to you; but meethinkes " there was ſome neglect that ſo poore a favour had " ſo badd ſucceſſe. Had I intereſt about London " (for I ſee, and indeed is moſt convenient, you " would not bee far from thence) I would do my " beſt, which I will doe notwithſtandinge, though I " can promiſſe nothing but my good will, which " ſhall

(1) The Earl of Arundel.

firſt Books of Mydorgius; and whereby the Nature of the Parabola, Hyperbola, and Ellipſis, are very plainly laid down. Tranſlated from the Papers of the learned William Oughtred. In 1675 there was printed at London in 8vo, in Mr. John Smith's *Horological Dialogues*, printed in 8vo, a Tract, intitled, *An Appendix, wherein is contained a method of calculating all numbers for Watches; written originally by that famous Mathematitian Mr.* William Oughtred, *and now made publick by* J. S. *of London Clock-maker.* Mr. *Smith* in the *Preface* to his *Appendix*, ſays, "The method following was many "years ſince compiled by Mr. *Oughtred*, for the uſe of ſome ingenious Gentlemen, his "friends,

"ſhall not be wantinge to the utmoſt. I ſhall longe "exceedinglye till I ſee your *Clavis* turned into a "pick-locke; and I beſeech you inlardg it, and "explaine it what you can, for we ſhall not neede "to feare either tautology or ſuperfluity: you are "naturally conciſe, and your cleare judgment makes "you both methodicall and pithye; and your ana-"lyticall way is indeed the only way. And if could "ſpeake a worde in your eare (for I would not "hinder Mr. *Allen*'s profitt) I could wiſh your bookes "might be abſolute of themſelves, without any de-"pendance of inſtruments, which are either litle, "and ſo of no uſe, or if lardge, very coſtlye, and at "the beſt (to uſe Mr. *Forſter*'s words, or rather your "owne by his pen) [*they make ſcholers only doers of "tricks, or as it weare juglers*, &c.] *revera præſtigiis "inſtrumentorum quaſi in cortice, magna artis jactura, "imò contemptu, detinentur*, yourſelfe truly averreth in "your epiſtle, which I ſpeake not as fearinge that "your *Clavis* ſhall be accommodated to any inſtru-"ment, but to prevent any other future worke of "yours, unleſſe withall it be abſolute of itſelfe, that "a man may chuſe whether he will buy the inſtru-"ment or no.

"As you have brought in a ſymbolicall kinde of "expreſſion (which is verye neate and good) and "wiſhe alſo that the decimall fraction weare com-"mon, (and if the decimall integer weare brought "in alſo, but that it would make ſhrewde havock "amongſt the tables extant, to divide a whole cir-"cle into ten,) it would be eaſye; but if diviſion re-"maining, which is now currant, I would have "*Snellius* his names of *Complementum & Reſiduum* "brought in; the one beinge, *data Peripheriæ ad "Quadrantem differentia*; the other, *Exceſſus ſemi-"circuli ad datam peripheriam*; ſmall things, I con-"feſſe, yett proper and diſtinct; whereas *Comple-"mentum ad Semicirculum* is a circumlocution, and it "is better, that diſtinct thinges have diſtinct names. "I am not ignorant, that yourſelfe hath given a "touch of this, pag. 94. ch. 13. of your Trigonome-"trye; but the word *Exceſs* you ſeem to uſe in a "different ſenſe. . . . . Thus, dear Sir, my beſt love "remembered to you, I ſhall ever be ready with my "beſt indeavours to doe you ſervice, and remain,

June 11th. "Your much obliged friende,
"*W. Robinſon.*"

"To my very worthy and much reſpected freend,
"Mr. William Oughtred.

"*Salutem a Salutis Datore.*

"My very worthy and loving friend,
"To a Gentleman in the Citie of London, a friend "of his beyond ſea hath ſent lately a tractat in Na-"tural Philoſophye, in Germane language. This "Gentleman intretinge me to tranſlate it into Latine, "becauſe he underſtands not theGerman language, and "values the tractat much; at his intreatinge, I have "tranſlated it into Latine. I knowing that you are "a lover of all good ſciences, I beſtow this copy on "you. No man hath any of this copy in Latine, "nor was it ever printed in Latin; but only the "Gentleman himſelfe, who hath paid for the tran-"ſlation thereof, hath the firſt copie, and this is the "ſecond that I ſend unto you. *Accipito ergo eo ani-"mo, quo tibi miſſum eſt. Confiteor eſſe exiguum munuſ-"culum.*

"*Tibi ad omnia officiorum genera*
This 15 of Decemb. 1637. "*longe paratiſſimus,*

"*Johannes Huniades Ungaro-*
"*Tranſilvanus.*"

"Mr. *Foſter*, our Lecturer in Aſtronomy in Gre-"ſham College, is put out, becauſe he wil not kneel "downe at the Communion Table, when he takes "the Communion. A Schotſman, one that is *Verbi "Dei Miniſter*, is now Lecturer in Mr. *Foſter*'s place."

"To Mr. Oughtred.

"Sir,

"Amongſt the mathematicall rarities theſe times "have afforded, there are none of that ſmall num-"ber I (a late intruder into theſe ſtudies) have "yet viewed, which ſo fully demonſtrates their Au-"thors great abilities, as your *Clavis*, not richer in "augmentations, than valuable for contraction. That "forceth me to cenſure myſelf preſumptuous in "this action; and this tedious, that I have not all-"ready related the occaſion. The choiſeſt forreigne "wits within theſe 30 years, as *Galileus*, *Scheinar*, "*Keplar*, *Hortenſius*, and Monſieur *de Cartas*, have "ſo diligently pried into perſpectives, that it may "credibly be thought that their rareſt uſe is allready "known; yet ſo it is, I have eyther found out, or "ſtumbled at, a moſt certaine and eaſy way, wher-"by the diſtance between any the leaſt ſtars, viſible "only by a perſpective glaſſe, may be readily given, "I ſuppoſe, to a ſecond, affording the diminutions "and augmentations of the planets ſtrangely preciſe, "as alſo their centers, ſtretchable to the invention of "the moone's true parallex of altitude by its owne "body, and of the inclination of one ſtar to another "of a well knowne ſcite, and able to bring ſufficient "aid to your aged eyes, to finde all requiſits (accord-"ing to yours of navigation) at a large diſtance for "ſearching the earth's Diameter. It is a novelty ca-"pable of ſuch frequent uſe, that before it travell to "other able Judges, may I receive that favour it "ſhall undergo your experiment and cenſure. I "beſtow onely part of that time in thoſe ſtudies, "which other Gentlemen our neighbours ſpend in "hunting, and want that great help an able artiſt "might afford; and believe that you will find thoſe "errors I ſee not. If you pleaſe to grant my requeſt, "I may be readily enformed by a letter ſent by the "northern poſt, or left at the Beare in Baſing-hall-"ſtreet, with the Wakefield Cariers, directed to my "Father's houſe in Middleton, neare Leedes, where "remains, Sir,

Decemb. 2d. 1640. "Your troubleſome unknown friend,
"*Will. Gaſcoigne.*"

"To his worthy and much reſpected friend, Mr.
"William Oughtred.

"Sir,

"Though I am a ſtranger to your perſon, yet I "am well acquainted with the fame of your ſingular "ſkill in the mathematicks; and hereupon have ſo "farr preſumed as to entreat your aſſiſtance for the "geometricall ſolution of the incloſed diagram, "which to you, that have attained the perfection of "the analyticall art, perhaps will not appeare diffi-"cult. But whether all that may be performed by "algebraicall equations, may likewiſe be wrought "geometrically, according to a linearye operation, "I am not able to reſolve, and therefore intreate to "be inſtructed from you. The preſent propoſition "will happely conduce to the invention of that ſo "much deſired and long ſought for probleme for the "finding of two meane proportionalls betweene two "extreames given, which having hitherto exerciſed "the witte and endeavours of the moſt famous geo-"metricians, I preſume would not prove unworthy "your paines, who by the general ſuffrages of all

" friends, who, for recreation at the Univerſity, ſtudied to find out the reaſon and " knowledge of watch-work; which ſeemed alſo to be a thing, with which Mr. " *Oughtred* himſelf was much affected, as may, in ſome part, appear by his putting out " his ſon to the ſame trade, for whoſe uſe (as I am informed) he did compile a larger " Tract. In 1676 ſome of our Author's Tracts were printed at Oxford in 8vo, under this title: *Guilelmi Oughtred Ætonenſis, quondam Collegii Regalis in Cantabrigiâ Socii, Opuſcula Mathematica hactenus inedita.* This Collection contains the following Pieces; I. *Inſtitutiones Mechanicæ.* II. *De variis corporum generibus, gravitate, & magnitudine comparatis.* III. *Automata.* IV. *Quæſtiones Diophanti Alexandrini Libri* III. V. *De Triangulis planis rectangulis.* VI. *De diviſione ſuperficierum.* VII. *Muſicæ Elementa.* VIII. *De Propugnaculorum Munitionibus.* IX. *Sectiones Angulares.* He left behind him a great number of papers upon mathematical ſubjects, in his own hand-writing; as alſo moſt of the Greek and Latin mathematical Books, illuſtrated with his own Notes, and

" men, are deſervedly reported the ableſt mathema- " ticians, that our age knows. Sir, I have beene be- " holding to Mr. *Elias Allen* for the conveyance of " this letter; and if you will vouchſafe me the fa- " vour at your beſt leaſure to returne me two or " three lines in anſwere, and cauſe it to be left at " Mr *Allen* for me, I ſhall reſt very thankfull for " the courteſye, and ever remaine,

London, this preſent 20 of June, 1642.

" Yours to be commanded in what " I am able,

" *Will. Price.*

Mr. Oughtred's anſwer.

" *S I R,* June 6. 1642.

" It is true, that I have beſtowed ſuch vacant " time as I could gaine from the ſtudy of divinitie, " which is my calling, upon humane knowledges, " and amongſt other upon the Mathematics; where- " in the little ſkill I have attained being compared " with others of my profeſſion, who for the moſt " part contenting themſelves only with their own " way, refuſe to tread theſe ſalebrous and uneaſy " pathes, maye peradventure ſeme the more. But " now being in yeares, and mindfull of mine end, " and having payed dearly for my former delights " both in my health and ſtate, beſides the prejudice " of ſuch, who not conſidering what inceſſant la- " bour may produce, recon ſoe much wanting unto " me in my proper calling, as they think I have " acquired in other ſciences: by which opinion (not of " the vulgar only) I have ſuffered both diſreſpect and " alſo hinderance in ſome ſmall preferments I have " aimed at. I have therefore now learned to ſpare " myſelf, and am not willing to deſcend againe *in* " *Arenam*, and to ſerve ſuch ungratefull muſes. " Yet, Sir, at your requeſt, I have peruſed your " Problem, the effect whereof is this: *Datis, &c.*"

" To the Reverend and much honoured friend Mr. Outredd.

" *S I R,*

" By the ſmall, yet favourable converſation you " have been pleaſed ſometymes heretofore to beſtow " uppon mee, I am encouraged to requeſt as much " more thereof as your other occaſions and ſtudyes of " greater moment may (att leaſt miſſively, if not " perſonally) permitt. And for an entrance into " ſuch intercourſe, I make myſelfe an object to your " further courteſie, intreating that your exchange of " a paper may returne mee a relation of the moſt " materiall uſes, whereunto an exact quadrature of " a circle is appliable, therewithall to refreſh my " late hard ſtudy and labour to attayne an ability to " expoſe before the authority of your judgment an " infallible demonſtration thereof, when with con- " venience and privacy your deſirable preſence I " ſhall comfort and honour.

" Your friend in aſſured affection,
London, Octob. " and in ſubmiſſive
26, 1645. " reverence ſervant,

" *Robert Keyhway.*"

Mr. Oughtred's anſwer.

" *Worthy Sir,*

" There was indeed left at my houſe a leter di- " vers dayes after the date thereof, but I neither " knew by whom it was brought, neither was there " any direction whether I ſhould returne my anſwere. " Beſides, I have had ſhewed unto me divers over- " tures, of ſuch as have attempted that myſtery of " art, that have in tryal failed. And we know " that *Orontius*, and *Joſeph Scaliger*, and *Longomontanus*, " great maſters in that ſcience, have rather made " demonſtration of their heroical endeavours, then " of the conqueſt they propoſed. And to ſay the " truth, I have held the diſquiſition is infeaſible, " becauſe although noe doubt there may be a right " line equal to a circulare, yet they being heteroge- " neous, ther cannot in art be any due compariſon " betweene them; for *comparatio* is *homogeneorum*. " We have out of *Archimedes's* grounds both by *Van* " *Ceulen* and his follower *Willebrode Snellius*, ſoe nere " an equation of a right line to a nicete, that if the " whole Univerſe were ſand, there would not be the " difference of one graine; and yet we cannot ſay " the exact quadrature is by them delivered. Ney- " ther will it ſerve to thoſe yet undiſcovered uſes, " which the proper and genuine equation (ſuch as " I conceive, it muſt be) will noe doubt afford; as " namely the menſuration of ſegments of circles, " ſphæres, cylinders, and cones, with the *fruſtra* " thereof; the ſolution of the problemes in the ſe- " cond booke of Archimedes *de Sphærâ & Cylindro*, " which now are only ſoluble by cubical æquations; " the meaſuring of *meniſci* and *arbeli*, and other " figures compoſed eyther of right lines and circles, " or of different circles: all which would be moſt " excellent diſcoveries and *plus ultra's* in art. And I " ſhould alſo thence expect a facile and ready way for " the proportion of ſubtenſæ in a circle to their cir- " cumferences. Theſe and many other abſtruſe *Adyta*, " hitherto almoſt deſpaired of, may, I ſuppoſe, by " your magiſterial invention, *tanquam Mercurii Ca-* " *duceo*, be ſet open. Sir, this is the effect of all I " am able to anſwer to your deſire, unleſs I more " fully knew the manner of your way. I ſpeake " this the rather, and am induced to a better confi- " dence of your performance, by reaſon of a new " Geometric-analytical art or practiſe found out by " one *Cavallieri* an Italian, of which above three " years ſince I receaved information by a letter from " Paris, wherein was prælibated only a ſmall taſt " thereof, yet ſo that I divine great enlargement " of the bounds of the mathematical Empire will " enſue. I was then very deſirous to ſee the author's " owne book, while my ſpirits were more free and " lightſome, but I could not gett it in France. Since " being more ſtept into yeares, daunted and broken " with the ſufferings of theſe diſaſtrous times, I muſt " content myſelf to keep home and not put out to " any foraine diſcoveries. Thus with thankfull ac- " knowledgment of your ſo noble favour to deigne " me worthy the communication of ſuch a ſecret, " I reſt ready to doe you all ſervice, which may be " within the power of

" Your humbleſt ſervant,
" the true honorer of your worth,
" *W. O.*"

and with an abridgement of almoſt every propoſition and demonſtration thereof in the margin. Theſe Books and Manuſcripts came into the hands of his friend Sir Charles Scarburgh

" To Mr. Oughtred.

" *Worthy Mr. Oughtred,*

" The profit I formerly received by the firſt edition " of your *Clavis Mathematica*, as alſo by your other " workes, made me not ignorant what might be ex- " pected from your pen; which, with the character " I received from yours and my noble friend Sir " *Charles Cavendiſh*, then at Paris, of your ſecond " edition of the ſame piece, made me at my return " into England ſpeedily to get and diligently peruſe " the ſame. Neither truely did I find my expecta- " tion deceived, having with admiration often con- " ſidered how it was poſſible (even in the hardeſt " things of Geometry) to deliver ſo much matter in " ſo few words, yet with ſuch demonſtrative " clearneſſe and perſpicuity; and hath often put " me in mind of learned *Merſennus* his judgment " (ſince dead) of it, that there was more matter " comprehended in that little book then in *Dio-* " *phantus* and all the antients. Sir, as I hold it be- " low an ingenuous ſpirit to flatter where worth is " not, ſo do I think it little leſſe then robbery to " keep back from you the knowledge of that eſti- " mation is put upon your perſon and book in forrain " parts; which I wiſh heartily might ſerve as an " encouragement to ſet you forward in the publica- " tion of other things of the like nature; of which " (as I heare) you are not unfurniſhed; that putting " together all done by you both in the Latine and " Engliſh tongue, the two moſt famous ſciences of " Geometry and Aſtronomy, both for ſolid precept, " and inſtrumental practiſe, might receive (for the " honour of our Nation) from yours more advance- " ment then from any one hand whatſoever. And " amongſt inſtruments (which are good helps, but ill " maſters) why might you not be perſuaded to pub- " liſh the deſcription of that mentioned by you elſe- " where, for the ready ſupputation of the places of " the planets as a backſide to your double Horizontall, " which, though particular, might in its chiefeſt uſe " of finding the Meridian Line be made (as I think) " generall by fixing it on a moveable foot, and then " being elevated or depreſſed according to the diffe- " rent elevation of the pole, and turned about at " the ſame angle, till the double ſhadow point out " the ſame hour, ſtanding thus in the meridian, be " made uſe of for the protraction of the houre-lines " upon any plaine without reſpect had to its ſituation, " by a thread paſſing from the center of the Hori- " zontal Dial through the interſection of the houre- " ſpaces continued to any plain whatſoever. But to " return whence I have digreſſed; amongſt many " other excellent rules in your *Clavis*, I caſt my eye " upon that example of the firſt rule of doubling, " *&c.* the angle of a rectangle triangle oppoſite to " the baſe; but muſt confeſſe could never performe by " it what I ſought; as by the ſecond I ever did. The " reſult of my work acording to both your rules, " you will find hereto annexed, in which I am bold " to begge your judgment, where my fault may be, " or a farther explication of the ſame, being aſſur- " ed of your civility and goodneſſe, and glad alſo " to ſnatch any occaſion to renew that little acquain- " tance I formerly have had of you by our caſuall " meeting at Mr. *Allen's* in the Strand, by whoſe " meanes I ſend this, and who will do me the fa- " vour to return your anſwer hereunto, if you ſhall " pleaſe to ſend it him directed to Sir *Roger Twyſden's* " hous at Eaſt-Peckham in Kent for me, that am,

" S I R,

" Your moſt affectionate friend

Eaſt-Peckham, Feb. 18, $16\frac{4}{5}\frac{2}{8}$. " to ſerve you, " *John Twyſden.*"

" To my ever honoured Tutor, Mr. William " Oughtred.

" *Honoured Sir,*

" Since I left you, I have recollected, as much " as my journeys before, and neceſſary exerciſes af- " ter my return to Cambridge, would permit me, " thoſe notions I receaved from you. The firſt thing " I did was to follow your counſel, in perfecting " myſelfe in the projection and trigonometrie, which, " I thinke, Sir, I doe now fully underſtand. Some " other things alſo I have reviewed, but find more " occaſion to acknowledge my engagements to you " for your cleare inſtructions, then to trouble you " with many doubts. Yet ſome things there are, Sir, " which preſuming upon your goodneſſe, and the " encouragement you gave me, I ſhall deſire to be " ſatisfied in: as *Clavis*, p. 100. *Quare theorema* " *primum de menſurando fruſtro Coni ſit* $\frac{3}{4}\frac{1}{5}\frac{1}{2}$Aq⌊ $+\frac{3}{4}\frac{1}{5}\frac{1}{2}$ " AqT$-\frac{3}{4}\frac{1}{5}\frac{1}{2}EqT=$ *triplo fruſtro.* I doe not un- " derſtand, Sir, why you ſay $\frac{3}{4}\frac{1}{5}\frac{1}{2}$ not $\frac{3}{1}\frac{1}{1}\frac{1}{3}$, when I " ſuppoſe you meane the area multiplied in the " height, and as before 'tis, ſay $\frac{3}{1}\frac{1}{1}\frac{1}{3}Rq=$area cir- " culi. Pray, Sir, ſhew me what I have miſappre- " hended, and wherein my error lyes. In p. 1. " *Archimed. de Sph. & Cylind.* § 11. $\frac{\pi}{\delta}$Mq is proved " $=\cap$ coni, becauſe it is $=\frac{\pi}{\delta}$AO in KO; but " that the ſemipher: into the ſide of a cone is $=\cap$, " I know not how to demonſtrate. Another thing " which troubles me is in p. 37 *de ſol. reg.* where " the ſuperficies (4) is 4<613628 the ſoliditie, but " 0<513216, which ſeemes leſſe then the ſuperficies. " I muſt humbly crave your aſſiſtance, Sir, to be in " theſe, and, if I treſpaſſe not too much upon you, " how in *Clavis*, p. 108, the duplication of an an- " gle differs from the biſection, ſince the radius alters " nothing. I have procured your *Trigonometrie* to be " written over in a faire hand, which when finiſhed, " I will ſend to you, to know if it be according to " your mind; for I intend (ſince you were pleaſed " to give your aſſent) to endeavour to print it with " Mr. *Briggs* his *tables*, and ſo ſoone as I can gett " the *Prutenick Tables*, I will turne thoſe of the ſunne " and moone, and ſend them to you. Sir, my ac- " knowledgment of what I owe to you, is all I ſhall " further adde; onlie I muſt deſire your acceptance " of an *Hierocles* upon *Pythagoras*, (which I have ſent " with this letter) from him, who ſhall alwayes, as " his dutie binds, pray for you, and remaine,

Coll. Regal. Cantabrig. Febr. 6th, 1654-5. " Sir, your obliged honourer

" *Richard Stokes.*"

" Sir, I, as you commanded, communicated your " commendations to our Provoſt, who deſires his may " be returned to you."

There is a draught of Mr. *Oughtred's* anſwer to this letter among his papers, which is as follows:

" Your firſt quæſite is, why (in pag. 100. *de men-* " *ſurando fruſtra Coni*) I ſay not $\frac{3}{1}\frac{1}{1}\frac{1}{3}$ Rq, but $\frac{3}{4}\frac{1}{5}\frac{1}{2}$ " Dq? The reaſon is, becauſe in the ſcheme, the " lines A and E (ſides of the quadrate baſes) are the " diameters of inſcribed circles, which are the co- " nic baſes, and not the radii or ſemidiameters. " Nowe becauſe Dq=4Rq, the area of the circle " ſhall be $\frac{3}{1}\frac{1}{1}\frac{1}{3}+\frac{\text{Dq}}{4}$, that is, $\frac{3}{4}\frac{1}{5}\frac{1}{2}$ Dq.

" Your ſecond quæſite is, why (in p. 1. *Archim.* " *de Sph. & Cyl.*) ſemiperiphoria baſis coni in latus æ- " quetur ſuperficiei conicæ; that is $\frac{\pi}{\delta}$ AO + KO " $=\cap$? The reaſon is evident; becauſe the ſuper- " ficies of an æquilateral cone is a ſector of a circle " inflected round, the center being the vertex. But " the area of the whole circle is æqual to the half " ambite multiplied by the radius (nempe $\frac{\pi}{\delta}$Rm R): " wherefore the area of a ſector ſhall be æqual to half " the arch cut out multiplied by the radius.

" Your third quæſite is, why (in pag. 37, *de ſolid.* " *reg.*) the number of the ſuperficial meaſure is ſtill " greater then the number of the ſolide content? " The reaſon is moſt perſpicuous, becauſe the one is " reconed *in unciis quadratis*, the other, *in cubicis.*

" Your fourth quæſite is, why (in *Anguli tum du-* " *plicatione tum ſubduplicatione*, p. 100.) the æquation " wherby

Scarburgh the Phyſician; and the Manuſcripts, with many of the Books, are now in the Muſæum of William Jones, Eſq; abovementioned.

" wherby it is ſolved, is the very ſame in both? But " in the numerous reſolution you will find a maine " difference, according to that, which is ſought in " both, noted with a ſtrait line over the head.

" But let this be remembred, that whoever will " rightly ſtudy my book, that it may be a *Clavis* to " him, he muſt be *attentus, operans, conſtanterque per* " *ipſa veſtigia inſequens; non enim oſcitantibus ſcripſi,* " *ſed verè matheſeos candidatis. Preſſa ſunt magis* " *quam brevia.*

" To my much honoured friend, Mr. William " Oughtred.

" Sir,

" I have herewith ſent you a trifle of my own, (an " obſervation of a ſolar eclipſe of laſt year) not wor- " thy your acceptance; yet ſuch as the reſpect, which " I ow you, commands me to preſent unto you, ha- " ving nothing better to tender; and to aſſure you " that I am,

Oxford, Febr. 5th, 165⅗. " S I R,

" Yours in all obſervance,

" *John Wallis.*

" S I R,

" If your occaſions may permit you, I ſhould moſt " earneſtly deſire your help in the ſolution of the " problem inſuing; which, if not from yourſelf, I " know not whence to expect. The uſe, which I " ſhall be able to make of it, will bee well worth ſome " pains; which makes me the more bold to trouble " you with it, and crave your pardon for that pre- " ſumption.

" *Expoſitis quantitatibus* A . B . C . D . E . F . *&c.*

" *Quarum rectangula ſint* AB ‖ 1, BC ‖ 2, CD ‖ 3, DE ‖ 4, EF ‖ 5 *&c.*

" *Quæritur quanta ſit* A . B . C . D . E . F . *&c.*

Mr. Oughtred's ſolution, which we find ſet down at the bottom of this letter, is as follows: " Eſto A " numerus aliquis, five integer, five fractus; puta 3 " rectangula ſunt 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. *&c.* Dividatur u- " numquodq; per unum ex lateribus ſuis, ut habea-

3/1	1/1	(1/3	1/3	2/1	(6/1	6/1	3/1	(1/2	1/2	4/1	(8/1	8/1	1/1	(2/5	2/5	6/1	(48/8	48/8	7/1	(24/8				
A	×	B	B	×	C	C	×	D	D	×	E	E	×	F	F	×	G	G	×	H				*&c.*
	1			2			3			4			5			6			7					

" tur latus alterum. Latera autem ſunt A . B. C . D . *&c.*

" To my worthy and much eſteemed friend, Mr. " William Oughtred.

" S I R,

" In that of mine to you, ſent together with an " account of an eclipſe obſerved at Oxford laſt ſum- " mer, (which, I hope, is come to your hands) I made " bold to propoſe a problem, which then came new- " ly to mind, (though that, in order to which I pro- " poſed it, had been longer thought of,) which, as " I remember, was to this purpoſe. . . . . Wherein " if you can do mee the favour to help mee out, it " will be a very great ſatisfaction to mee, and (if I " do not delude myſelf) of more uſe than at firſt view " it may ſeem to bee. Sir, I doubt, I preſume too " much upon your goodneſſe, in offering you this " trouble; wherein I muſt crave your pardon. If " your occaſions will permit you to beſtow ſome " thoughts thereon, you will thereby very much " oblige,

" S I R,

Excester Coll. in Oxford, Febr. 28th, 1654-5.

" Your very affectionate friend, " and humble ſervant,

" *John Wallis.*"

The following letter was written to Mr. John Wallis, upon the occaſion of his dedication to our Author, of his *Arithmetica Infinitorum*, dated July 19th, 1655.

" To Mr. Wallis.

" Moſt honored Sir,

" I have with unſpeakable delight, ſoe farr as my " neceſſary buſineſſes, the infirmneſſe of my health, " and the greatneſs of my age (approching nowe to " an end) would permitt, peruſed your moſt learn- " ed papers, of ſeveral choice arguments, which you " ſent me, wherein I doe firſt with thankfullnes ac- " knowledg to God, the Father of lightes, the great " light he hath given you, and next gratulate you, " even with admiration, the cleerneſſe and perſpi- " cuitie of your underſtanding and genius, who " have not only gone, but alſo opened a way into " thoſe profoundeſt myſteries of art, unknown, and " not thought of by the antients. With which your " myſterious inventions I am the more affected, be- " cauſe full 20 years agoe the learned patrone of " learning, Sir *Charles Cavendiſh*, ſhewed me a pa- " per written, wherin were ſome few excellent new " theoremes, wrought by the way, as I ſuppoſe, of " *Cavallerio*; which I wrought over againe more " agreably to my way. The paper, wherein I " wrought it, I ſhewed to many, wherof ſome took " copies; but my owne I cannot find. I mention " it for this, becauſe I ſawe therin a light breaking " out for the diſcovery of wonders to be revealed to " mankind in this laſt age of the world; which " light I did ſalute as afarre off, and nowe at a nerer " diſtance embrace in your proſperous beginings. Sir, " that you are pleaſed to mention my name in your " never-dying papers, that is your noble favour to " me, who can adde nothing to your glory, but on- " ly my applauſe, and prayer that God by you will " perfect theſe happy beginings, ſoe propitiouſly ad- " vanced to his glory; which is the harty deſire of

" Your very loving friend,

" *W. O.*"

T.

OVIDIUS NASO (PUBLIUS) a Roman Knight, was one of the beſt Poets of the Auguſtan Age. I have a great number of Collections for this article, but cannot digeſt them at preſent, and therefore ſhall give only a ſmall part of them. Nature had inſpired him with ſo ſtrong a propenſion to verſification, that he laid aſide, for the love of the Muſes, all that care which muſt neceſſarily be taken, by thoſe perſons who are deſirous of attaining to exalted poſts. But if his inclination to poetry quite extinguiſhed the fire of ambition in his mind, it fomented and increaſed that of the paſſion of love. He was diſtractedly fond of the pleaſures of Venus [*A*], and this was almoſt the only vice with which

[*A*] *He was diſtractedly fond of the pleaſures of Venus.*] He himſelf informs us of the qualifications, with which nature had endued him for that exerciſe, and the uſe he had made of them.

Exigere à nobis anguſta nocte Corinnam,
Me memini numeros ſuſtinuiſſe novem (1).

He found himſelf lively and gay, in the morning, after

(1) Ovid. *Amor.* lib. 3. eleg. 7. ver. 25.

which he was tainted. He was not ſatisfied with loving, and of making conqueſts in an amorous way; he alſo taught the publick the art of loving, and the art of making love; that is, he reduced, into a ſyſtem, a pernicious ſcience, for which nature gives but too many inſtructions, and whoſe only aim is the diſhonour of families, but chiefly of hapleſs huſbands. He was baniſhed for writing ſuch books; but this, in all probability, was a pretence, rather than the true cauſe of his being ſent into exile [*B*]. He employed, but

after having paſſed a whole night in the pleaſures of love; and wiſhed to die in the actual fruition of that pleaſure. Nothing ſeemed to him more ſuitable to the way of life he had led, than to end it in ſuch an exerciſe.

Sæpe ego, laſcivæ conſumto tempore noctis,
Utilis & forti corpore mane fui.
Fœlix, quem Veneris certamina mutua perdunt!
Di faciant, leti cauſa ſit iſta mei!
Induat adverſis contraria pectora telis
Miles, & æternum ſanguine nomen emat.
Quærat avarus opes; & quæ laſſarit arando
Æquora, perjuro naufragus ore bibat.
At mihi contingat Veneris langueſcere motu;
Cùm moriar, medium ſolvar & inter opus:
Atque aliquis noſtro lacrymans in funere dicat,
Conveniens vitæ mors fuit iſta ſuæ (2).

(2) Idem, ibid. lib. 2. eleg. 10. ver. 27.

What can be ſaid, or conceived more proper to expreſs the frantic tranſports of a diſpoſition of mind that is laſcivious to the higheſt degree? 'Tis my opinion that Lais the Curtezan (3), who died in the manner which Ovid thought ſo happy, would have wiſhed for that fate. The love compoſitions of this Poet are the moſt obſcene of all thoſe of the antients now extant. 'Tis not that we therein find the looſe expreſſions, which are in Catullus, Horace, and Martial; nor the infamous practices of the unnatural ſin which thoſe three Poets mention ſo openly; but the delicacy and choice of the terms, in which Ovid prided himſelf, make his works ſtill more dangerous, ſince, by that means, they repreſent in a very plain and moſt elegant manner, all the artifices and moſt laſcivious impurities of love. He does not ſpeak on the teſtimonies of others, but from his own experience and practice. 'Tis true indeed that in the apology he drew up for himſelf in the place of his baniſhment, he proteſted that he had not done the actions deſcribed by him, and that his head had a much greater ſhare in his compoſitions than his heart. He boaſts that he had not been engaged in any intrigues which gave the leaſt handle for ſcandal; and that even, among people of the lower claſs, he had not given any of them the leaſt room to doubt, whether they were the fathers of their children their wives brought them.

(3) See the article LAIS, citation 60.

Sed neque me nuptæ didicerunt furta magiſtro:
Quodque parùm novit, nemo docere poteſt.
Sic ego delicias, & mollia carmina feci,
Strinxerit ut nomen fabula nulla meum.
Nec quiſquam eſt adeo mediâ de plebe maritus,
Ut dubius vitio ſit pater ille meo.
Crede mihi; mores diſtant à carmine noſtro.
Vita verecunda eſt, Muſa jocoſa mihi.
Magnaque pars operum mendax & ficta meorum
Plus ſibi permiſit compoſitore ſuo.
Nec liber indicium eſt animi, ſed honeſta voluptas,
Plurima mulcendis auribus apta ferens (4).

(4) Ovid *Triſtium*, lib. 2. ver. 347.

The Senſe is,

" But wives were never taught intrigues by me;
" No man can teach what he not underſtands.
" I, ſo in love's ſoft genial joys indulg'd,
" That common fame ne'er ventur'd to accuſe me.
" Not a Plebeian huſband once can think
" His children ſpurious, and that I'm their father.
" Believe my conduct differs from my verſe:
" My life is virtuous, tho' my Muſe be wanton.
" Moſt of my Poems are mere airy fictions,
" That treat of joys their author never practis'd.
" Nor is my book the picture of my mind;
" No, it deſcribes ſoft ſcenes of honeſt joys
" Fit to delight the ear and charm the ſoul."

To reconcile this with the 19th Elogy of book II. *De Amoribus*, we muſt ſuppoſe that what he ſays there concerning himſelf is a mere fiction. He exhorts his fair-one's huſband to be jealous; and not to deprive him, by his indolence, of the moſt delicious ſweets which might accrue from his intrigue. He wants this man to be a rival, and not an eaſy, complaiſant huſband.

Quid mihi cum facili, quid cum lenone marito?
Corrumpis vitio gaudia noſtra tuo.
Quin alium, quem tanta juvet patientia, quæris?
Me tibi rivalem ſi juvat eſſe, veta (5).

(5) Idem, *Amor.* lib. 2. eleg. 19, *in fine.*

'Tis certain that many Poets have given us, as their ſucceſſes in gallantry, many incidents which were ſo many fictions of their own invention; but it cannot be ſaid whether this be Ovid's caſe: we live at too remote a diſtance from his age; and it cannot be doubted but that ſome perſons, after being called in queſtion (6), boaſt of their innocence, though they are really guilty.

(6) *i. e.* When their own poems are brought in evidence againſt them.

[*B*] His books . . . . *in all probability, was a pretence, rather than the true cauſe of his being ſent into baniſhment.*] He acknowledges in ſeveral places in his works, that the two cauſes of his misfortunes were, his having writ books on the art of loving, and that he had been a ſpectator of ſomething. He does not explain what that was; but he hints that it was more the cauſe of his calamities than his compoſitions; for he ſuppoſes, upon his complaining to Cupid, that after having employed his endeavours to extend his Empire, he had obtained no other recompence than to be baniſhed among Barbarians; Cupid anſwered, you know very well that I was not the chief cauſe of your wrongs.

Utque hæc, ſic utinam defendere cætera poſſes,
Scis aliud quod te læſerit, eſſe magis (7).

(7) Ovid. *de Ponto*, lib. 3. epiſt. 3. ver. 71.

The Senſe is,

" You cannot plead for others as for theſe.
" Alas! a greater crime brought on your ruin."

He compares himſelf to unhappy Actæon.

Cur aliquid vidi? cur noxia lumina feci?
Cur imprudenti cognita culpa mihi eſt?
Inſcius Actæon vidit ſine veſte Dianam,
Præda fuit canibus non minus ille ſuis (8).

(8) Idem, lib. 2. *Triſt.* ver. 103.

The Senſe is,

" Why ſaw I aught? My eyes, why rendred guilty?
" Why was the crime to me, imprudent, known?
" Heedleſs Actæon ſaw Diana naked;
" Nor was he leſs a prey to his own hounds."

He repeats the ſame complaint in many places, *viz.* of having been an undeſigned ſpectator of the guilt of others.

Inſcia quod crimen viderunt lumina, plector:
Peccatumque oculos eſt habuiſſe meum (9).

(9) Idem, ibid. lib. 3. eleg. 5. ver. 49.

The Senſe is,

" I ſuffer for a crime I'd not have ſeen;
" And all my guilt, is, being bleſt with ſight."

And declares that he dares not reveal that myſtery.

Perdiderint cum me duo crimina, carmen & error,
Alterius facti culpa ſilenda mihi eſt (10).

(10) Idem, ibid. lib. 2. ver. 207.

The

but to no purpoſe, the utmoſt efforts of his genius in addreſſing the Emperor, with the view of ſoftening him. He died among the Getæ, to whoſe country he had been exiled. He married three wives, and divorced the two firſt (*a*), but highly applauded the third (*b*). Some criticks have exclaimed againſt his diction [*C*]; in which they would have

(*a*) Ovid. *Triſt.* lib. 3. eleg. 10.

(*b*) Idem, ibid. lib. 1. eleg. 3. & *alibi*.

The Senſe is,

" My verſe and my imprudence prov'd my ruin.
" Another's guilt I ever muſt conceal."

And elſewhere:

Et quid præterea peccarim quærere noli,
Ut pateat ſola culpa ſub arte mea *.

(*) Idem, lib. 2. *de Ponto*, epiſt. 9. ver. 75.

The Senſe is,

" Aſk me no more, in what I have offended,
" My crime's from my profeſſion——"

Attempts have been made to gueſs what this myſtery was; and the more ſilent he is, the more the curioſity of people has been excited to find out this ſecret. Some are perſuaded, that he had come unawares upon Auguſtus and his daughter Julia, when they were in their amorous dalliances; and they confirm this, by a paſſage of Suetonius, from which they pretend to gather, that Caligula deſpiſed his mother, becauſe he imagined that ſhe ſprung from the inceſtuous commerce of Auguſtus and Julia. *Alteram ſubjiciunt alii, nempe eum vidiſſe Auguſtum turpiter cum Juliâ filiâ jacentem. . . . Cui opinioni favere viſus eſt Caligula, dum matrem ſuam ſpernebat, quaſi ex inceſto concubitu Auguſti, cum filia ſua Julia, prognatam* (11). 'Tis certain Suetonius (12) relates, that Caligula would not own Agrippa for his grandfather by the mother's ſide. He thought him of too mean an extraction, and affirmed that his mother was the daughter of the Emperor Auguſtus and Julia; but this conſideration did not make him have the leaſt diſregard for Agrippina his mother; ſo far from it, he would have deſpiſed her, had he thought that ſhe was born in a lawful way. Abbot de Marolles (13) having related that Ovid *catched Auguſtus, engaged in too great a familiarity with his daughter Julia*, adds, on Suetonius's teſtimony, that it was thought Caligula's mother ſprung from the inceſtuous embraces of Julia and Auguſtus. But Suetonius does not ſay this; he only informs us, that Caligula ſpread ſuch a report. The Abbot (14) in queſtion relates, that Ovid was baniſhed for having read to Julia, Auguſtus's grand-daughter, the laſt verſes of his book *de Arte Amandi*; and for having *catched* Auguſtus *in too great a familiarity* with that young Princeſs. The truth of all theſe conjectures may juſtly be doubted; for Ovid not omitting any kind of ſubmiſſion and adulation, in the verſes written by him during his exile, and which he ſent to Rome; not having, I ſay, omitted any of thoſe expreſſions and particulars which he thought could any way contribute to mollify Auguſtus, we cannot ſuppoſe that he would ſtudiouſly introduce in his verſes ſuch particulars, as might contribute moſt to foment that Emperor's reſentment. Now if it be ſuppoſed that Auguſtus's indignation was grounded on our Poet's having been a ſpectator of ſome infamous actions; it muſt be ſuppoſed that Ovid muſt neceſſarily diſpleaſe him in a prodigious degree, by ſtudiouſly ſaying, that his eyes having ſeen a ſecret which he dared not to reveal, were the cauſe of his being ſent into baniſhment. However, I own that this is not a convincing reaſon. See the note [*K*] below.

(11) Brietius, *de Poetis Latinis*.

(12) Suetonius, *in* Caligula, cap. 23.

(13) In Ovid's Life.

(14) In his notes of book 3. *de Arte Amandi*, which were ſo very obſcene, that he did not attempt to tranſlate them.

[*C*] *Some criticks have exclaimed againſt his diction.*] Paſſerat owns that he had been Profeſſor of the *Belles Letttres* a long time, without having once explained any of Ovid's works, becauſe he found that a ſtrong prejudice prevailed againſt that Poet; *Inveteravit enim opinio, vulgique fama percrebuit, eum Poëtam eſſe non multæ doctrinæ, humiliſque & nimium luxuriantis ſtyli; atque etiam, ſi diis placet, Latinæ linguæ elegantiam nitoremque in eo requiri: adeò ut Italus quidam vel hac re inprimis nobilis, cum humanioribus literis unicum gnatum imbueret, illa miro artificio contexta mutatæ ter quinque volumina formæ in patrium ſermonem converterit, ne, ſi Latinè legeret, ex Ovidii ſcriptis ſordes & barbariem colligeret beata pueri vena, quæ jam tum ad exemplum Maronis properabat* (15). i. e. " An opinion had long " prevailed, and was univerſally ſpread, that the " poet in queſtion was a man of no great learning, " and that his diction was too low and over-luxuriant; " likewiſe (God bleſs them) that his ſtyle was not po- " lite and elegant enough: ſo that a certain Italian " Gentleman, who was greatly ſkilled in theſe " things, and was inſtructing his only ſon in claſſi- " cal learning, made a verſion, into his native " tongue, of the fifteen books of the Metamorpho- " ſes, which are ſo wonderfully contrived; for fear " leſt his pupil, by reading theſe books in the origi- " nal, ſhould corrupt his beautiful diction, which " imitated that of Virgil, by ſtudying Ovid's barba- " rous, incorrect compoſitions." Balzac had heard of the whimſical taſte of the abovementioned Italian. *I know*, ſays he (16), *that under the pontificate of Leo* X. *a Gentleman of Venice* (17), *highly eſteemed by Fracaſtorius, from whoſe name he entitled his dialogue on poetry, was accuſtomed to burn in a ſolemn manner, on the anniverſary of his birth day, the works of Martial; and to make a ſacrifice of them annually to the manes and memory of Catullus. And I alſo knew that another delicate contemporary of his, uſed to aſſert, that the corruption of the Latin tongue began in Ovid, whoſe Metamorphoſes he tranſlated for the uſe of his ſon; in order that he might learn the mythology, without running the hazard of corrupting his diction; and that, at the ſame time that he was ſtudying the valuable knowledge of poetry, he might not run the hazard of vitiating his ſtyle by Ovid's vicious expreſſion.* Scaliger obſerves, that Peter Victorius, and Lambinus, had a great contempt for Ovid (18). *Petrus Victorius de Ovidio non veritus fit dicere, cum ut oratione & verſibus, ita vita & moribus enervatum. . . . Non longe ab hac temeraria ſententia diſcedit Dionyſius Lambinus, qui imperitiſſime eum malum Latinitatis auctorem vocat*; *i. e.* " Petrus Victori- " us did not ſcruple to ſay of Ovid, that his diction " and poetry were as depraved as his life and morals; " Dionyſius Lambinus is almoſt as raſh and ſilly in " the judgment he pronounces, he calling him the " author of bad Latin." Another learned critic (19) complains of the ſame taſte, but without mentioning any perſon.

(15) Paſſerat. *Orat. & Præfat.* p. m. 218, 219.

(16) *Oeuvr. diverſes*, p. m. 406.

(17) His name was *Andrew Navagerio*. See *Strad. Proluſ.* 5. lib. 2. p. m. 334, 335. & *Paul. Jov.* in elog. cap. 78. p. m. 181.

(18) Scalig. *in Confutat. Fabulæ Burdonum*, p. 217.

(19) Muret. on Senec. *Quæſt. Nat.* lib. 3. cap. 27.

[*] *If the imitation of nature be the buſineſs of a poet, I know no Author who can juſtly be compared with Ovid, eſpecially in the deſcription of the paſſions. And to prove this, I ſhall need no other judges, than the generality of his readers; for all paſſions being inborn with us, we are almoſt equally judges, when we are concerned in the repreſentation of them: now I will appeal to any man who has read this poet, whether he finds not the natural emotion of the ſame paſſion in himſelf, which the poet deſcribes in his feigned perſons? His thoughts, which are the pictures and reſults of thoſe paſſions, are generally ſuch as naturally ariſe from thoſe diſorderly motions of our ſpirits. Yet, not to ſpeak too partially in his behalf, I will confeſs, that the copiouſneſs of his wit was ſuch, that he often writ too pointedly for his ſubject, and made his perſons ſpeak more eloquently than the violence of their paſſion would admit: ſo that he is frequently witty out of ſeaſon; leaving the imitation of nature, and the cooler dictates of his judgment, for the applauſe of fancy. Yet he ſeems to have found out this imperfection in his riper age; for why elſe ſhould he complain that his Metamorphoſes was left unfiniſhed? Nothing ſure can be added to the wit of that poem, or of the reſt: But many things ought to have been retrenched; which I ſuppoſe would have been the buſineſs of his age, if his misfortunes had not come too faſt upon him. But take him uncorrected as he has been tranſmitted to us, and it muſt be acknowledged, in ſpight of his Dutch friends, the commentators, even of Julius Scaliger himſelf, that Seneca's cenſure will ſtand good againſt him,*

Neſcivit quod bene ceſſit relinquere;

have greatly diſpleaſed Alphonſo King of Naples [*D*]. I refer ſeveral particulars to the place where I cenſure Moreri [*E*].

The

He never knew how to give over, when he had done well; but continually varying the ſame ſenſe an hundred ways, and taking up in another place, what he had more than enough inculcated before, he ſometimes cloys his readers, inſtead of ſatisfying them: and gives occaſion to his tranſlators, who dare not cover him, to bluſh at the nakedneſs of their father. This then is the allay of Ovid's writing, which is ſufficiently recompenſed by his other excellencies; nay, this very fault is not without its beauties; for the moſt ſevere cenſor cannot but be pleaſed with the prodigality of his wit, tho' at the ſame time he could have wiſhed, that the maſter of it had been a better manager, every thing which he does, becomes him; and if ſometimes he appears too gay, yet there is a ſecret gracefulneſs of youth, which accompanies his writings, tho' the ſtaidneſs and ſobriety of age be wanting. In the moſt material part, which is the conduct, 'tis certain that he ſeldom has miſcarried; for if his elegies be compared with thoſe of Tibullus and Propertius, his contemporaries, it will be found that thoſe Poets ſeldom deſigned before they writ: and tho' the language of Tibullus be more poliſhed; and the learning of Propertius, eſpecially in his fourth book, more ſet out to oſtentation; yet their common practice was to look no farther before them, than the next line; whence it will inevitably follow, that they can drive to no certain point, but ramble from one ſubject to another, and conclude with ſomething which is not of a piece with their beginning;

Purpureus late qui ſplendeat unus & alter
Aſſuitur pannus, *as* Horace *ſays;*

though the verſes are golden, they are but patched into the garment. But our Poet has always the goal in his eye, which directs him in his race; ſome beautiful deſign, which he firſt eſtabliſhes, and then contrives the means which will naturally conduct him to his end. This is evident to judicious Readers in the work of his (Ovid's) Epiſtles *.

* Dryden's preface to the tranſlation of Ovid's *Epiſtles*, London, 1736, 12mo.

The late Dr. Sewell thinks that Ovid did not always lay down a Scheme before he wrote, he ſaying, *Mr. Dryden ſeems to have taken this reaſon from the conduct of Mr. Waller, and ſome of his contemporaries, rather than from the practice of the antients, of whom none but Ovid, and he very ſeldom, obſerved that rule. I don't affirm, but that an inſtance or two may be given from many of them, ſuch as the* Sulpitia *of Tibullus, and others; yet, in moſt the tranſitions are ſo frequent, that they remain glaring inſtances againſt this aſſertion. Indeed the nature of the ſubject is ſuch, as not to be treated of without it: for I can't ſuppoſe theſe Poets ſat down to ſtudy fine things, like our Cowley; but that they writ from the heart, and if ſo, their pens muſt be under the guidance of their paſſions, not of their wit. Wantonneſs of imagination is fit for deſcription, turns of thought and images, which the heart is not at leiſure to think of, much leſs to affect, when the paſſions are ſincere, and the whole man in earneſt* †. "Ovid's Epiſtles, *ſays Mr. Dryden*, are generally granted to be "his moſt perfect pieces; the ſtyle of them is thought "to be tenderly paſſionate and courtly, two properties well agreeing with the perſons, who were heroines and lovers. Yet where the characters were "lower, as in Oenone and Hero, he has kept cloſe "to nature, in drawing his images after a country "life, tho' perhaps he has romaniz'd his Grecian "Dames too much, and made them ſpeak ſometimes "as if they had been born in the city of Rome, "and under the Empire of Auguſtus. There ſeems "to be no great variety in the particular ſubjects "which he has choſen; moſt of the epiſtles being "written from Ladies who were forſaken by their "lovers: which is the reaſon that many of the ſame "thoughts come back upon us in divers letters: but "of the general character of women, which is mo-"deſty, he has taken a moſt becoming care; for his "amorous expreſſions go no further than virtue "may allow; and therefore may be read, as he in-"tended them, by Matrons without a bluſh ‖." *In all Ovid's works*, ſays an ingenious writer **, *his wit is allowed to be luxuriant, which his riper age would have corrected in his Metamorphoſes: but he ſhews how difficult it would have been to him, by the letters which he continued to write in his exile, with the utmoſt exuberance of thought and expreſſion. Scaliger and Mr. Dryden differ upon the point, whether Ovid knew how to leave off when he had well begun. . . . In Ovid's ſtyle is a native ſimplicity, which whoever goes about to mend, will find he corrupts it. He ſays more by nature than art can come up to. What he does, ſeems produced without pain; but it would be in vain for the greateſt labour to attempt it. . . . Some have thought that Ovid had too much compaſſion for his own failings, and that he rather loved, than would any way correct them. . . Ovid has had the greateſt character among the learned in all ages: for . . . . . Velleius Paterculus, a curious judge, joins him with Tibullus, as the two perſons who had brought their poems to perfection. By Martial, and others, he is placed with Virgil, as being both conſummate in their way. The fathers Lactantius, St. Jerom, and St. Auſtin, have not denied his Metamorphoſes its juſt commendation. Planudes tranſlated it into Greek, to reſtore that learning, part of which had been brought from thence, back again to his own country. Stephens moſt juſtly eſteems him the beſt painter among the Poets. Heinſius thought, that whoever would be drawn to the life, muſt ſit to him. And Raphael Regius ſays, that his commanders, their ſtratagems, and their battles, are ſo touched by his pencil, that whoever views them attentively, will imagine himſelf ſo engaged, as to take part in their conflicts. And then no Poet has more naturally deſcribed the manners of the perſons he mentions, nor is more ſententious, nor better expatiates upon the common places of morality; as temperance, friendſhip, love of his country, labour, valour, learning, honeſty,* &c. Addit. by the Tranſl.]

† Preface to Dart's tranſlation of *Tibullus*, p. 13, 14. London, 1720. 8vo.

‖ Dryden's preface, *ubi ſupra.*

** Dr. William King, in the preface, p. 31, to his *Imitation of Ovid's Art of Love*, London, printed (no date) 8vo.

[*D*] *. . . . they would have greatly diſpleaſed Alphonſo King of Naples.*] This Prince being at the head of his army in the neighbourhood of Sulmo, aſked whether Ovid was a native of that town; and being anſwered that he certainly was, he ſaluted Sulmo, and paid his acknowledgments to the genius of that country, for giving birth to ſo great a Poet. He added, that he would willingly give up part of his dominions, to recal Ovid to life, his memory being more dear to him, than the poſſeſſion of Abruzzo. *Urbem ſalutavit, gratiaſque genio loci egit, in quo tantus olim poeta genitus eſſet, de cujus laudibus cum non pauca diſſeruiſſet, tandem famæ ejus magnitudine commotus. Ego inquit huic regioni quæ non parva regni Neapolitani, nec contemnenda pars eſt, libenter ceſſerim, ſi temporibus meis datum eſſet hunc poetam ut haberent, quem mortuum pluris ipſe faciam, quam omnis Aprutii dominatum* (20).

(20) Jovianus Pontanus, *de Principe*, folio 54 *verſo*, Oper. Tom. 1. edit. Florent. 1520, in 8vo.

[*E*] *I refer ſeveral particulars to the place where I cenſure Moreri.*] His firſt error is in miſquoting the diſtich, in which our Poet declares that he will be an honour to his country (21).

Mantua Virgilio gaudet, Verona Catullo,
Pelignæ (22) *dicar gloria gentis ego* (23).

(21) Ovid. *Amor.* lib. 3. Eleg. 15. ver. 7.

(22) Ovid was a native of Sulmo, in the county of the Beligni.

(23) 'Tis *ero*, inſtead of *ego*, in Moreri.

The ſenſe is,

"Mantua in Virgil boaſts, and old Verona
"Prides in Catullus: I myſelf ſhall be
"Sulmo's chief glory."

Secondly, 'tis a terrible barbariſm to ſay that he *was of an equeſtrian family* (24). Thirdly; 'tis falſe to aſſert, that Ovid ſays, Book I. Eleg. 2. of his *Triſtium*, *that, in his younger days, he carried arms, under Marcus Varro, in his expedition to Aſia.* The two verſes cited by Moreri do not ſay this. They are theſe:

(24) This has been corrected in the Dutch edit.

Non peto quas quondam petii ſtudioſus Athenas,
Oppida non Aſiæ, non mihi viſa prius.

The ſenſe is,

"I ſeek not Athens to improve my ſtudies,
"As formerly; nor Aſia's ſplendid cities,
"Nor places ſeen before."

The

The nobleſt compoſition that came from Ovid's pen is his Metamorphoſis. Our Author himſelf formed this judgment of it, and this was the chief foundation on which he grounded the immortality of his name. He propheſies, that this work will reſiſt the moſt powerful

The beſt editions have it *non loca viſa prius*, inſtead of *non mihi viſa prius*: theſe two readings are much the ſame; ſo that I cannot ſee how Ciofanus, who followed the ſecond, could find in this diſtich, a proof that Ovid bore arms under Marcus Varro, whom he accompanied into Aſia; and that, at his return, he went to Athens to ſtudy in that city. *Sub M. Varrone, qui cum Aſiam petiit militavit, inde reverſus ſtudii cauſa Athenas ſe contulit. Qua de re ſic lib. 1. Triſt.* Non peto quas quondam, &c (25). 'Tis very plain this diſtich cannot prove, either that Ovid carried arms under Marcus Varro, or that he went into Aſia with him; nor that he travelled to Aſia before he was in Athens. The Poet, beſeeching the Gods to quell the ſtorm, repreſents to them, among other particulars, that he is expoſed to the ſea on a calamitous account, viz. in order to ſail into Scythia; and not to go to Greece, or to any country he had ſeen before. Fourthly, 'Tis falſe to aſſert, that *Seneca is of opinion, he had pleaded ſome cauſes* at the Bar. When Seneca is quoted without any addition, 'tis ſuppoſed to be the Philoſopher, and doubtleſs Moreri meant it ſo; nevertheleſs we do not find any thing in Seneca the Philoſopher, which ſhews that Ovid pleaded. We might rather expect to find this in Seneca's father, but neither is it there; all we read is, that our Poet ſtudied the art of oratory under Arellius Fuſcus, and declaimed very ſucceſsfully in his ſchool. *Hanc controverſiam memini me videre* Naſonem *declamare apud Rhetorem Arellium Fuſcum cujus auditor fuit. . . . Oratio ejus jam tum nihil aliud poterat videri quam ſolutum carmen. Adeo autem ſtudioſe Latronem audivit, ut multas ejus ſententias in verſus ſuos tranſtulerit. . . . Tunc autem cum ſtuderet, habebatur bonus declamator. Hanc certe controverſiam ante Arellium Fuſcum declamavit, ut mihi videbatur longe ingenioſius, excepto eo quod ſine certo ordine per locos diſcurreret* (26). *i. e.* "I remember to have heard Ovid declaim, upon this ſubject, in preſence of Arellius Fuſcus, the rhetorician, whoſe diſciple he was. . . . At that time his diction could be conſidered only as poetical proſe. He was ſo attentive an auditor of Latro, that he tranſplanted a great many of his maxims or ſentences into his poems. He was looked upon, at the time when he was purſuing his ſtudies, as one who declaimed well. When he ſpoke on this ſubject before Arellius Fuſcus, I thought he acquitted himſelf much the moſt ingeniouſly, except that he was a little apt to digreſs from his theme." Probably Moreri was led into this error by Abbot de Marolles (27), who cited Seneca to prove that Ovid pleaded at the bar. This is undoubtedly true; but inſtead of having recourſe to the pretended teſtimony of Seneca, he ſhould have cited Ovid himſelf, who affirms that he had pleaded the cauſes of ſome perſons impeached before the tribunal of the *Centumviri*; and that having been choſe Umpire in ſome law-ſuits, he had ended them as became a man of probity and honour.

(25) Herculus, Ciofanus, *in Vita Ovidii.*

(26) Seneca, *pater, Controverſ.* 10. *ſive* 2. lib. 2. p. m. 153.

(27) In Ovid's life.

Nec male commiſſa eſt nobis fortuna reorum
Uſque decem decies inſpicienda viris.
Res quoque privatas ſtatui ſine crimine judex;
Deque mea faſſa eſt pars quoque victa fide (28).

(28) Ovid. *Triſt.* lib. 2. ver. 93.

The ſenſe is,

"Oft for the guilty with ſucceſs I've pleaded,
"(Before ſtern Judges) fearleſs and unaw'd.
"I frequent Umpire was in private matters,
"Nor could the vanquiſh'd party once accuſe me."

Fifthly, Moreri ſhould not have ſaid that, *after his father's death he devoted himſelf entirely to poetry*; he not obſerving this circumſtance in the detail he gives us of his conduct. He only ſays, that he is ſuppreſſed, in compliance with his father's remonſtrances, the ſtrong propenſion he had for writing verſes; and applied himſelf to ſuch things as ſuited young perſons of his rank.

Sæpe pater dixit, ſtudium quid inutile tentas?
Mæonides nullas ipſe reliquit opes.
Motus eram dictis: totoque Helicone relicto,
Scribere conabar verba ſoluta modis.
Sponte ſuâ carmen numeros veniebat ad aptos.
Et, quod tentabam ſcribere, verſus erat.

(29) Ovid. *Triſt.* lib. 4. eleg. 10. ver. 21.

The ſenſe is,

"Oft would my father ſay, why, Ovid, why,
"Spend you your moments in theſe fruitleſs ſtudies?
"Homer himſelf left not a groat behind.
"Struck with th' advice, I threw aſide my lyre;
"And ſtrove, induſtriouſly, to write in proſe.
"But oh! harmonious all my periods fell;
"And all I wrote was flowing, tuneful verſe.

He even takes notice of (30) his elder brother's death, as a circumſtance which preceded his return to Parnaſſus; but he does not ſay any ſuch thing, with reſpect to his father's death. And indeed, how could he have ſaid any ſuch thing, ſince he owns that he ſoon reſumed his poetical amuſements, and that his father lived fourſcore and ten years (31)? Sixthly, The Emperor did not *baniſh him to the Province of Pontus in Aſia*; *but* to Tomos, an European town, ſtanding on the Euxine Sea, near the mouth of the Danube. Seventhly, He ſhould not have related, without a cenſure, the opinion of thoſe who declare, that he was ſent into exile *for having made love to Julia, Auguſtus's daughter, for whom he had a paſſion under the name of Corinna.* This opinion is very antient, it being approved by Sidonius Apollinaris.

(30) Idem, ibid.

(31) Idem, ibid.

Et te carmina per libidinoſa
Notum Naſo tenet, Tomoſque miſſum,
Quondam Cæſareæ nimis puellæ
Falſo nomine ſubditum Corinnæ (32).

(32) Carm. 23. ver. 157. Savaro approves this opinion, Not. ib. and in Epiſt. 10. lib. 2.

The ſenſe is,

"And Ovid, famous for his wanton ſtrains,
"In exile ſent to Tomos' baleful clime;
"Who Cæſar's Julia claſp'd in fond embrace;
"Calling his noble fair-one, bright Corinna..

But Aldus Manutius (33) had given three reaſons to refute this. The firſt is, Ovid's ſaying on all occaſions, that his exile was owing to two cauſes, viz. to his writing amorous verſes; and to a fault he does not mention, and which was accidental and involuntary (34). But this cannot be ſaid of an intrigue carried on to enjoyment, with Auguſtus's daughter. Now our Poet went far with Corinna, he himſelf informs us (35).

(33) *In Vita Ovidii.*

(34) See the remark [B], citat. (7) and (8).

(35) He flattered himſelf with being the father of the child ſhe was going with. *Et tamen aut ex me conceperat, aut ego credo,*
Eſt mihi pro facto ſæpe, quod eſſe poteſt. Ovid. Amor. lib. 2. eleg. 13. ver. 5.

. . . . . .
Singula quid referam? nihil non laudabile vidi:
Et nudam preſſi corpus ad uſque meum.
Cætera quis neſcit? laſſi requievimus ambo.
Proveniant medii ſic mihi ſæpe dies (36).

Aldus Manutius's ſecond reaſon is grounded upon Ovid's being very young, when he devoted himſelf to Corinna.

(36) Ovid. *in Amor.* lib. 1 eleg. 5. ver. 25.

Carmina cum primùm populo juvenilia legi;
Barba reſecta mihi biſve ſemelve fuit.
Moverat ingenium totam cantata per Urbem
Nomine non vero dicta Corinna mihi (37).

(37) Idem, lib. 4. *Triſt.* eleg. 10. ver. 57.

The ſenſe is,

"When firſt I publiſh'd youthful, amorous verſes,
"My chin had felt but once or twice the razor.
"I ſtrung my lyre for fam'd Corinna's beauty,
"And ſung it loud, but in a borrow'd name.

Theſe verſes imply, that Ovid was but about twenty

powerful efforts of ſwords, fire, thunder, and the iron teeth of time [*F*]. This prediction has not yet been found falſe. One of the fineſt paſſages in this poem, is the Exordium. 'Tis a deſcription of the Chaos, and the manner in which the univerſe was drawn from it. Nothing can be clearer and more intelligible than this beautiful deſcription, if we conſider only the phraſeology of the Poet; but if we examine his tenets, they appear ill connected and contradictory; and the whole is a greater Chaos than that deſcribed by him. This gives me an opportunity of acquitting myſelf of a promiſe I had made (*c*). I will examine whether the ideas of ſuch ancient Authors as have ſpoke of the Chaos were

(*c*) In the remark [*H*] of the article ANAXAGORAS.

when he ſung his amours for the pretended Corinna. Now he was fifty when Auguſtus ſent him into baniſhment. Is it any ways probable that this Emperor ſhould have been ſo long in diſcovering and puniſhing an intrigue carried on between his daughter and a Poet? In fine, Manutius obſerves, that Ovid would not have ſpoke ſo affectionately of his Corinna in the verſes juſt cited, had ſhe been the cauſe of his misfortune and diſgrace, he ſo mournfully deplores. Eightly, I do not know of any Author who ſays, that Ovid *made his addreſſes to Livia*, Auguſtus's wife; and that he *compoſed his books* de Arte Amandi, for her. Theſe would deſerve to be refuted in a yet ſtronger manner than Sidonius Apollinaris. Ninthly, Thoſe who ſay that *the city called Tomos*, near which he was *buried*, is now called Kiour (38), are no leſs miſtaken than ſuch as ſay it is called Tomiſuar; and therefore Moreri ought not to have related thoſe things, without informing his readers at the ſame time, that they are falſe. The city of Tomos whither Ovid was baniſhed, was on this ſide the Danube, with regard to Italy.

(38) He ſhould have ſaid *Kiow*, or *Kiovia*. Hofman alſo ſays *Kiour*. Marolles, in *Ovid's Life*, ſays *Xiovie*.

(39) Ovid. *Triſt.* lib. 2. ver. 203. See alſo lib. 3. eleg. 10.

Ne timeam gentes quas non bene ſubmovet Iſter (39).

The ſenſe is,

" That I may'nt dread the nations which the Danube,
" Not well retains———

Now this does not agree, either with Kiow ſituated on the Boryſthenes, nor with Temiſwaer, a city of Tranſilvania. Tenthly, What Moreri relates concerning Ovid's tomb, found at *Sabaria or Stain in Auſtria on the river Save*, is full of errors, as I'll one day ſhew. Eleventhly, 'Twas in 1540, and not in 1548, that the Queen of Hungary ſhewed our Poet's pen. *Iſabella Pannoniæ Regina circiter annum* M. D. 40. *Ovidii calamum ex argento Tauruni, quæ eſt urbs inferioris Pannoniæ, oſtendit Petro Angelio Bargæo, qui hoc ipſum mihi narravit, cum hac inſcriptione* OVIDII NASONIS CALAMUS; *qui non multo ante id tempus ſub quibuſdam antiquis ruinis fuerat repertus. Eum Regina ipſa plurimi faciebat, & veluti rem ſacram, carum habebat* (40). *i. e.* " About the year 1540, Iſabella, " Queen of Hungary, ſhewed to Peter Angelus Bar- " gæus, (a circumſtance he himſelf told me) Ovid's " ſilver pen in Belgrade, a city of lower Hungary, " with the following inſcription, OVID'S PEN; which " had been found ſome time before under ſome an- " tient ruins. The Queen herſelf ſet a high value " upon it, as tho' it had been ſome ſacred relick." I obſerved that this Queen was a woman of learning, in the article I gave of her.

(40) Hercules Ciofanus, in *Vita Ovidii*, p. m. 29.

[*F*] *He propheſies* that his Metamorphoſes *will reſiſt the moſt powerful efforts of ſword, fire, thunder, and the iron teeth of Time.*] Here follow the nine verſes which conclude his Metamorphoſes.

Jamque opus exegi, quod nec Jovis ira, nec ignes,
Nec poterit ferrum, nec edax abolere vetuſtas.
Cùm volet illa dies, quæ nil niſi corporis hujus
Jus habet, incerti ſpatium mihi finiat ævi:
Parte tamen meliore mei ſuper alta perennis
Aſtra ferar, nomenque erit indelebile noſtrum.
Quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris,
Ore legar populi: perque omnia ſecula famâ,
Si quid habent veri vatum præſagia, vivam (40).

(41) *Ovid. Metamorph.* lib. 15. *in fine.*

The ſenſe is.

" The work is finiſh'd, which nor dreads the rage
" Of tempeſts, fire, or war, or waſting age:
" Come, ſoon or late, Death's undetermin'd day,
" This mortal Being only can decay;
" My nobler part, my fame, ſhall reach the ſkies,
" And to late times with blooming honours riſe:
" Whate'er th' unbounded Roman power obeys,
" All climes and nations ſhall record my praiſe:
" If, 'tis allowed to Poets to divine,
" One half of round Eternity is mine.

WELSTED.

[The late Sir Samuel Garth has made a great many fine remarks on Ovid's Metamorphoſes, with regard to the propriety of his ſimiles and epithets; the perſpicuity of his allegories; the inſtructive excellency of the morals; and the peculiar happy turn of his fancy. He begins with the elegance of his deſcriptions, which he exemplifies in that fine one of the ſouth-wind, and afterwards in part of that of the golden age, which he contraſts to that given by Virgil, at the end of the ſecond Georgick. He next compares Virgil's deſcription (in Æneid 7th) of a ſtag, which gave the firſt occaſion to the war betwixt the Trojans and Rutulians, with the image which Ovid gives of the favourite ſtag ſlain accidentally by Cypariſſus, and affirms it to be equal to that of Virgil. Sir Samuel would have the watry court of the river Peneus, contraſted with Virgil's ſubterranean Grot of Cyrene the Naiad, mother to Miſtæus. He obſerves farther, that the divine Poet, Virgil, goes on in pomp of numbers, and eaſy magnificence of words, till he introduces the ſtory of Orpheus and Eurydice; in the narration of which, he is as much ſuperior to Ovid, as the reeds of his own Mantuan ſhepherds are leſs muſical than the lyre of Orpheus. After pointing out ſome other examples, he concludes this head with ſaying, There are many other deſcriptions ſcattered in the Metamorphoſes, which for juſt expreſſion of nature, and majeſtic modulation of words, are only inferior to thoſe tranſcribed, as they are ſhorter; which makes the objection, that his diction is commonly loitering into proſe, a great deal too ſevere: for the Metamorphoſes muſt be conſidered as very incorrect, and Virgil's works as finiſhed. Sir Samuel proceeds to the ſimilitudes of Ovid, which (he obſerves) are always remarkably ſhort, and convey ſome pleaſing idea to the imagination. 'Tis in this branch of the poem, that he has diſcovered as juſt a judgment, as any of the claſſicks whatever. Poets, to give a looſe to a warm fancy, are generally too apt, not only to expatiate in their ſimiles, but introduce them too frequently: by doing the firſt, they detain the attention too long from the principal narration; and by the latter, they make too frequent breaches in the unity of the poem. Thoſe two errors Ovid has moſt diſcerningly avoided. How ſhort and ſignificant are generally his compariſons! he fails not in theſe to keep a ſtiff rein on the high-mettled Pegaſus; and takes care not to ſurfeit here, as he has done on other heads, by an erroneous abundance. Sir Samuel, after giving ſome examples. . . . The objection (ſays he) to Ovid, that he never knows when to give over, is too manifeſt. Tho' he frequently expatiates on the ſame thought, in different words; yet in his ſimiles, that exuberance is avoided. There is in them all a ſimplicity, and a confinement to the preſent object; always a fecundity of fancy, but rarely an intemperance: nor do I remember he has erred above once by an ill-judged ſuperfluity, which is, where he brings in the ſimile, after deſcribing the Labyrinth built by Dædalus, in book 8. of his Metamorphoſes. The reader may take notice, how unforced Ovid's compliments, and how natural his tranſitions generally are. With how much eaſe does he ſlide into ſome new circumſtance, without any variation of the unity of the ſtory? The texture is ſo artful, that it may be compared to the work of his own Arachne, where the

were juſt; and if they could truly affirm, that this ſtate of confuſion ſubſiſted no longer [G]. I will ſhew that the ſtruggle between the four elements, did not ceaſe, as they

the ſhade dies ſo gradually, and the light revives ſo imperceptibly, that it is hard to tell where the one ceaſes, and the other begins. When he is going off from the ſtory of Apollo and Daphne, (book 1. of the Metamorph.) how happily does he introduce a compliment to the Roman Conquerors? The compliments to Auguſtus are very frequent in the laſt book of the Metamorphoſes; as thoſe to the ſame Emperor are in the Georgicks of Virgil, which alſo ſtrike the imagination by their agreeable flattery. The compliments have a great ſublimity, and are worthy the grandeur of the heroes, and the wit of the poet. . . . Ovid deſerves as much praiſe, for ſaying a great deal in a little, as cenſure for ſaying a little in a great deal. None of the claſſick Poets had the talent of expreſſing himſelf with more force and perſpicuity. Sir Samuel gives ſome inſtances of this, and goes on. Ovid never excells himſelf ſo much, as when he takes occaſion to touch upon the paſſion of love; all hearts are in a manner ſenſible of the ſame emotions; and, like inſtruments tun'd uniſons, if a ſtring of any one of them be ſtruck, the reſt, by conſent, vibrate. The fable of Biblis ſhews how touchingly the Poet argues in love affairs, as well as thoſe of Medea and Scylla. The two laſt are left by their heroes, and their reflections are very natural and affecting. Ovid ſeemed here to have had Virgil's paſſion of Dido in his eye, but with this difference; the one had converſed much with Ladies, and knew they loved to talk a great deal: the other conſidered no leſs, what was natural for them to ſay, than what became them to ſay. Virgil has, through the whole management of this rencounter, diſcovered a moſt finiſhed judgment. Æneas, like other men, likes for convenience, and leaves for greater. Dido, like other Ladies, reſents the neglect, enumerates the obligations the lover is under, upbraids him with ingratitude, threatens him with revenge, then by and by ſubmits, begs for compaſſion, and has recourſe to tears. Nor does the genius of Ovid more exert on the ſubject of love, than on all others. In the contention of Ajax, Ulyſſes's elocution is moſt nervous and perſuading. Where he endeavours to diſſuade mankind (book 15. of his Metamorphoſes) from indulging carnivorous appetites in his Pythagorean philoſophy, how emphatical is his reaſoning! Thro' the whole texture of this work, Ovid diſcovers the higheſt humanity, and a moſt exceeding good nature. The virtuous in diſtreſs are always his concern; and his wit contrives to give them an immortality with himſelf. He ſeems to have taken the moſt pains in the firſt and ſecond book of the Metamorphoſes, tho' the thirteenth abounds with ſentiments moſt moving, and with calamitous ſentiments introduced with great art. The animated thoughts and lively images of this poem are numerous. None ever painted more to the life than our Author, tho' ſeveral groteſque figures are now and then ſeen in the ſame groop. The moſt plentiful ſeaſon that gives birth to the fineſt flowers, produces alſo the rankeſt weeds. Ovid has ſhewn in one line, the brighteſt fancy ſometimes; and in the next, the pooreſt affectation. Ovid was much too fond of . . . . . witticiſms, which are more to be wondered at, becauſe they were not the faſhion of that age, as punns and quibbles are of this. Virgil, as I remember, is not found trifling in this manner above once or twice. With regard to Ovid's diction, Sir Samuel obſerves, that a great many of his lines *end with monoſyllables*; and more indeed than ſeems conſiſtent with the majeſty of heroick verſe. When lines (continues he) are deſigned to be *ſermoni propiores*, this liberty may be allowable, but not ſo when the ſubject requires more ſonorous numbers. Virgil ſeems to endeavour to keep up his verſification to an harmonious dignity; and therefore, when fit words do not offer with ſome eaſe, he'll rather break off in an hemiſtick, than that the line ſhould be lazy and languid. He well knew, how eſſential it was in poetry to flatter the ear; and at the ſame time was ſenſible, that this organ grows tired by a conſtant attention to the ſame harmony; and therefore he endeavoured now and then to relieve it by a cadence of pauſes, and a variation of meaſures. Thoſe that are moſt converſant in claſſick poetry, muſt be ſenſible, that Virgil has been much more ſollicitous, than Ovid, to keep up his lines to an eaſy and muſical flow; but tho' the criticks charge the latter with breaking through Proſody and Grammar, and allowing himſelf too often the licence of Græciſms; I take this cenſure to be only an arrogant pedantry in the Grammarians, and groundleſs in itſelf; but tho' it were true, I dare be confident it is full as juſt upon Virgil. Certainly no body can imagine, but that theſe two celebrated Authors underſtood their own tongue better, than the ſcrupulous Grammarians of after-ages, who are too dogmatical and ſelf-ſufficient, when they preſume to cenſure either of them, for not attending ſtrictly enough to Syntax, and the meaſure of verſe. The Latin tongue is a dead language, and none can decide with confidence on the harmony or diſſonance of the number of theſe lines, unleſs they were thoroughly acquainted with their pauſes and cadence. They may indeed pronounce with much more aſſurance on their diction; and diſtinguiſh where they have been negligent, and where not finiſhed. There are certainly many lines in Ovid, where he has been downright lazy, and where he might have avoided the appearance of being obviouſly ſo, by a very little application. Ovid's allegories are either phyſical or natural; moral or hiſtorical. Of the firſt kind is the fable of Apollo and Python: in the explanation of this, all the Mythologiſts agree; exhalations and miſts being the conſtant effects of inundations, are here diſſipated by the rays of the ſun. Of the ſecond kind, are Acteon torn to pieces by his own pack of dogs, and Eriſichton ſtarved by the diſeaſe of hunger. Theſe two allegories ſeem to ſignify, that extravagance and luxury end in want. Of the third, is the ſtory of the rape of Europa. Hiſtory ſays, ſhe was daughter to Agenor, and carried by the Candians in a galley, bearing a bull in the ſtern, in order to be married to one of their Kings, named Jupiter. As to Ovid's being cenſured for being too free with the characters of his Gods, it muſt be conſidered, that what appeared an abſurdity in one Poet, is not ſo much his own fault, as that of the times before him. The characters of the Gods in the old heroic age, repreſented them unjuſt in their actions; mutable in their deſigns; partial in their favours; ignorant of events; ſcurrilous in their language; ſome of the ſuperior hierarchy treating one another with injurious brutalities, and are often guilty of ſuch indecencies and miſbehaviour, as the loweſt of mortals would bluſh to own. The commentators may endeavour to hide ſome abſurdities in the *Iliad*, under the veil of allegories; but the reader that conſiders the whole texture of that poem, will find, that the Author's meaning, and their interpretation, are often as unlike, as the imaginary heroes of his time, are to the real ones of ours. Ovid was ſo far from paying a blind deference to the venerable name of his Grecian predeceſſor, in the character of his Gods; that when Jupiter puniſhes Andromeda for the crimes of her mother, he calls him *injuſtus Ammon*, (Metamorph. book 4.) and takes commonly an honourable care of the decorum of the Godhead, when their actions are conſiſtent with the divinity of their character. His allegories include ſome religious or inſtructive moral, wrapt up in a familiar perſpicuity; and the reader cannot fail of obſerving, how many excellent leſſons of morality Ovid has given us in the courſe of his fables. To conclude, the poem of the Metamorphoſes has been the great magazine which has furniſhed the greateſt Poets of the following ages with fancy and alluſions; and the moſt celebrated Painters with ſubjects and deſigns. See Sir Samuel's preface to the tranſlation of Ovid's Metamorphoſes. London, 1719. 12mo. *Addit. by the Tranſl.*]

[G] *I will examine whether the ideas of ſuch ancient Authors as have ſpoke of the Chaos were juſt; and if they*

they ſuppoſe, at the time when the world was created; and I will ſhew that, (be this how

they could truly affirm, that this ſtate of confuſion ſubſiſted no longer.] To proceed methodically, I muſt firſt give Ovid's deſcription of the Chaos; which is only an imitation or paraphraſe of what he had met with in antient Greek Authors.

Ante mare & terras, & quod tegit omnia cælum,
Unus erat toto naturæ vultus in orbe,
Quem dixêre Chaos; rudis indigeſtaque moles:
Nec quicquam, niſi pondus iners, congeſtaque eodem
Non bene junctarum diſcordia ſemina rerum.
Nullus adhuc mundo præbebat lumina Titan,
Nec nova creſcendo reparabat cornua Phœbe,
Nec circumfuſo pendebat in aëre tellus,
Ponderibus librata ſuis: nec brachia longo
Margine terrarum porrexerat Amphitrite.
Quâque erat & tellus, illic & pontus, & aër.
Sic erat inſtabilis tellus, innabilis unda,
Lucis egens aër: nulli ſua forma manebat.
Obſtabatque aliis aliud: quia corpore in uno
(42) Ibid. lib. 1. ver. 5. *Frigida pugnabant calidis, humentia ſiccis,*
Mollia cum duris, ſine pondere habentia pondus (42).

That is,

" Before the ſeas, and this terreſtrial ball,
" And heav'n's high canopy, that covers all,
" One was the face of Nature; if a face,
" Rather a rude and indigeſted maſs:
" A lifeleſs lump, unfaſhion'd and unfram'd,
" Of jarring ſeeds; and juſtly Chaos nam'd.
" No ſun was lighted up, the world to view;
" No moon did yet her blunted horns renew:
" Nor yet was earth ſuſpended in the ſky;
" Nor pois'd, did on her own foundations lye:
" Nor ſeas about the ſhores their arms had thrown;
" But earth, and air, and water were in one.
" Thus air was void of light, and earth unſtable,
" And waters dark abyſs unnavigable.
" No certain form on any was impreſt;
" All were confus'd, and each diſturb'd the reſt.
" For hot and cold were in one body fixt;
" And ſoft with hard, and light with heavy mixt.
DRYDEN.

Thus we find that, by the Chaos, was meant a formleſs maſs of matter, in which the ſeeds of all particular bodies were mixed indiſcriminately with the utmoſt confuſion. The air, the water, and the earth, were every where confounded; all things were at war one with the other, and each part was oppoſed to each; heat and cold, moiſture and dryneſs, levity and gravity, were at variance, in one and the ſame body, throughout the whole vaſt extent of matter. Now Ovid ſuppoſes that this confuſed ſtate of things was diſintangled in manner following.

Hanc DEUS, *& melior litem natura diremit.*
Nam cælo terras, & terris abſcidit undas,
Et liquidum ſpiſſo ſecrevit ab aëre cælum.
Quæ poſtquam evolvit, cæcoque exemit acervo,
Diſſociata locis concordi pace ligavit.
Ignea convexi vis & ſine pondere cæli
Emicuit, ſummâque locum ſibi legit in arce:
Proximus eſt aër illi levitate, locoque.
Denſior his tellus, elementaque grandia traxit,
Et preſſa eſt gravitate ſui. Circumfluus humor,
Ultima poſſedit, ſolidumque coërcuit orbem.
Sic ubi diſpoſitam, quiſquis fuit ille DEORUM;
Congeriem ſecuit, ſectamque in membra redegit:
(43) Idem, ibid. *Principio terram, &c.* (43).

That is,

" But God, or Nature, while they thus contend,
" To theſe contending diſcords put an end:
" Then earth from air, and ſeas from earth were driv'n,
" And groſſer air ſunk from ætherial heav'n.
" Thus diſembroil'd, they take their proper place;
" The next of kin contiguouſly embrace;
" And foes are ſunder'd, by a larger ſpace.
" The force of fire aſcended firſt on high,
" And took its dwelling in the vaulted ſky:
" Then air ſucceeds, in lightneſs next to fire,
" Whoſe atoms from unactive earth retire.
" Earth ſinks beneath, and draws a numerous throng
" Of pond'rous, thick, unweildy ſeeds along.
" About her coaſts, unweildy waters roar,
" And, riſing on a ridge, inſult the ſhore.
" Thus when the God, whatever God was he,
" Had form'd the whole, and made the parts agree,
" That no unequal portions might be found,
" He moulded earth into a ſpacious round, *&c.*
DRYDEN.

We are here told, that this war of the elements blended and intangled together, was terminated by the authority of a God who ſeparated them, and aſſigned each their place; placing the fire in the higheſt region, the earth in the loweſt, the air immediately below the fire, and the water immediately below the air; and afterwards forming a band of friendſhip and concord between theſe four elements thus ſettled in ſeparate Places. Conſequently our Poet's ſyſtem may be reduced to the ſix propoſitions following.

I. Before there was a heaven, an earth, and a ſea, nature was one homogeneous whole (44).

(44) *Unus erat toto naturæ vultus in orbe.*

II. This whole was but an unweildy maſs (45), in which the principles of things were huddled together indiſcriminately and without ſymmetry, and after a diſcordant manner.

(45) *Nec quicquam niſi pondus iners &c.*

III. Heat ſtruggled in the ſame body with cold; dryneſs and moiſture did the ſame; as alſo levity and gravity.

IV. God put an end to this war, by ſeparating the combatants.

V. He aſſigned them diſtinct habitations, according to the levity or gravity proper to each.

VI. He formed a ſtrict alliance between them.

Here follow, in general, the defects in this doctrine of Ovid. I know not whether it was ever criticiſed, or whether the Commentators have ever examined, philoſophically, this part of the Metamorphoſes; but methinks they might eaſily have perceived,

I. That the firſt propoſition is not very conſiſtent with the ſecond; for if the parts of a whole are compoſed of heterogeneous or contrary ſeeds or principles, that whole cannot be looked upon as homogeneous.

II. That the ſecond propoſition is not conſiſtent with the third; for it cannot be ſaid that a whole, in which there is equal levity and gravity, is merely a heavy maſs.

III. That this heavy maſs cannot be looked upon as inactive, *pondus iners*, ſince contrary principles are blended in it without ſymmetry; whence it follows, that their actual combat ſhould be followed by the victory of one or of the other.

IV. That the three firſt propoſitions being once true, the fourth and fifth are ſuperfluous; for the elementary qualities are a principle ſufficient to diſintangle or clear up a Chaos, without the intervention of another cauſe; and to fix the parts either near to the center, or far from it, in proportion to their levity or gravity.

V. That the fourth propoſition is falſe, on another account; for, ſince the time that the heavens, the air, the water and earth were produced; the combat or ſtruggle betwixt cold and heat, moiſture and dryneſs, levity and gravity, is as ſtrong in the ſame body as it could ever have been before.

VI. That, for the reaſon juſt now given, the ſixth propoſition muſt be falſe. Whence it is manifeſt, that the deſcription of the Chaos and its extrication, is compoſed of propoſitions more oppoſite to one another, than the elements were during the Chaos.

I need not enlarge on each of thoſe falſe doctrines of Ovid; but ſome of them require a pretty long illuſtration.

REFUTATION of the doctrine of the Chaos, upon the ſuppoſition of its having been homogeneous.

I. I ſay nothing can be more abſurd, than to ſuppoſe a Chaos homogeneous during a whole eternity, tho' it poſſeſs'd the elementary qualities, both thoſe called *Alteratrices*, viz. heat, cold, moiſture, and dryneſs; as thoſe called *Motrices*, viz. levity and gravity;

how it will) they ought to have excepted man out of their general rule, ſince he is ſubject

vity; the former cauſing motion upward, and the latter motion downward. A maſs of this kind cannot be homogeneous; and muſt neceſſarily contain all ſorts of heterogeneity. Heat and cold, moiſture and dryneſs, cannot be together, but that their action and reaction muſt temper them, and change them into other qualities, which make that form of mixt bodies: and as this temperament may be made in proportion to the numberleſs diverſities of combinations, the Chaos muſt have contained a numberleſs multitude of ſpecies of compounds. The only way to conceive an homogeneous Chaos, would be to ſay, that the qualities called *Alteratrices of the Elements* modified themſelves, in the ſame degree, in all the particles of matter; ſo that there was, every where, exactly the ſame lukewarmneſs, the ſame ſoftneſs, the ſame ſmell, the ſame taſte, &c. but this would be deſtroying with one hand, what is built with the other; 'twould be a contradiction in terms, to call a Chaos a work the moſt regular, the moſt wonderful in ſymmetry, the moſt admirable with regard to proportion, that can poſſibly be conceived. I confeſs, that the mind of man is better pleaſed with a work that is diverſified, than with one that is uniform; but yet our ideas inform us, that the harmony of contrary qualities, preſerved with uniformity throughout the whole univerſe, would be as wonderful a perfection, as the unequal partition which ſucceeded the Chaos. What knowledge, what power, would not this uniform harmony, diffus'd over all nature, require? It would not ſuffice, to throw, into every mixt body, an equal quantity of each of the four ingredients; but ſome would require more, ſome leſs, according as the force or power of ſome is greater or leſs for acting than for reſiſting; it being well known, that the Philoſophers diſtribute to elementary qualities, action and re-action in a different degree. *Calor, qui maximè eſt activus, minimus eſt in reſiſtentia; è contrario autem ſiccitas minor in activitate, major in reſiſtentia; frigus, quod ſecundo loco eſt activum, tertio eſt reſiſtivum: humor denique penultimo loco activus, ſecundo reſiſtivus* (46). Upon the whole, it would be found, that the cauſe which metamorphoſed the Chaos, would have taken it, not out of a ſtate of confuſion and war, as is ſuppoſed, but from a ſtate of regularity, which, of all things, was the moſt accompliſhed; and which, by reducing contrary force to an equilibrium, kept them in ſuch a repoſe or reſt, as was equivalent to peace. 'Tis therefore certain, that if the Poets would ſave the homogeneouſneſs of the Chaos, they muſt ſtrike out all they add concerning that fantaſtical confuſion of contrary ſeeds, as well as that indigeſted mixture and perpetual combat between jarring principles.

(46) Arriaga, Diſput. 3. *de Generat.* ſect. 11. n. 178. p. m. 500.

REFUTATION of the Chaos, upon the ſuppoſition of its having continued an infinite ſpace of time.

II. But to overlook this contradiction, we ſhall find ſubject enough to attack them on other points. Let us begin by attacking them on the article of eternity. Nothing can be more abſurd than to admit, during an infinite ſpace of time, the mixture of the inſenſible parts of the four elements; for inſtance we ſuppoſe, in thoſe parts, the activity of heat, the action and re-action of the four firſt qualities; and beſides this, the motion of the particles of the earth and water towards the center; and the motion towards the circumference, of thoſe of fire and air, we eſtabliſh a principle which will neceſſarily ſeparate thoſe four kinds of bodies one from the other; and which, to effect this, will only require a certain limited time. Let the reader reflect a little on what is called the phial of the four Elements. Into that phial ſome metallick particles are put, and afterwards three liquors much lighter than one another. Let all theſe be ſhaken together, and we ſhall not diſcern any of thoſe four ingredients, the parts of each blending with the parts of the other: but then let the phial ſtand ſtill, and every ingredient will reſume its former place. All the metallick particles will aſſemble at the bottom of the phial; thoſe of the liquor whoſe levity is greateſt at the top; thoſe of the liquor of leſs levity than that, and of leſs gravity than this, will fix themſelves in the third; thoſe of the liquor of greater gravity than theſe two, but of leſs gravity than the metallick particles, fix themſelves in the ſecond place; and, in this manner, we recover the diſtinct ſituations, which had been blended and confounded by ſhaking the phial. No great patience is required to effect this; a very ſhort ſpace of time being ſufficient to give a freſh view of the ſituation, which nature has given in the univerſe, to the four elements. We may conclude, by comparing the univerſe to this phial; that had the earth, reduced to duſt, been mixt with the matter of which the ſtars, the air, and water, are compoſed, in ſuch a manner that even the inſenſible particles of each of theſe elements had been blended together; the whole would inſtantly have endeavoured to ſeparate or diſingage itſelf; and, at the end of a prefixed time, the particles or parts of the earth would have formed one maſs, thoſe of five another, and ſo of the reſt, in proportion to the levity and gravity of each kind of body.

We may employ another compariſon, and imagine the Chaos to be like new wine fermenting. This is a ſtate of confuſion; the ſpirituous and terreſtrial particles blend themſelves together, and we cannot diſcover, either by the ſight or taſte, what is properly wine, and what tartar or lees. This confuſion or blending occaſions a furious battle between theſe different particles of matter. The ſtruggle is ſo violent, that it ſometimes burſts the veſſel; but in two or three days an end is put to this inteſtine war. The groſs particles diſingage themſelves, and ſink by virtue of their own gravity. The lighteſt diſingage themſelves alſo, and evaporate (47) by their levity; and, by this means, the wine recovers its natural ſtate. This very thing would have happened in the Chaos of the Poets. The contrariety of the principles blended together indiſcriminately would have produced a violent fermentation, which yet, at the end of a certain time, would have made the terreſtrial particles deſcend, and the ſpirituous parts mount upwards; and, in a word, would have made each body go to its proper ſituation, according to its gravity or levity. Nothing therefore can be more repugnant to reaſon and experience, than to ſuppoſe a Chaos of eternal duration, though it ſhould contain all the ſtrength or power which has appeared in nature ſince the creation of the world. For it muſt be well obſerved, that whatever we call general laws of nature, laws of motion, mechanical principles, is the ſame with what Ovid and the Peripateticks call heat, cold, moiſture, dryneſs, levity, and gravity. They affirmed, that the whole force and activity of nature, all the principles of the generation and alteration or change of bodies were comprehended in the ſphere of theſe ſix qualities. Since therefore they admitted them in the Chaos, they neceſſarily acknowledged in it the ſame virtue or power which occaſions or forms in the univerſe, generations, corruptions, winds, rain, *&c.*

(47) There is always found a void in the veſſel, after that the wine has done fomenting; which is an evident proof that ſeveral particles muſt have evaporated or broke through the pores or crannies of the veſſel.

III. Thence ariſes another objection, which is of almoſt as much weight as the preceding ones. Ovid, and thoſe whoſe opinions he paraphraſed, had recourſe, but without any neceſſity for their ſo doing, to the intervention of a God, for clearing up the Chaos; for they acknowledged that it included all the internal force or power, capable of ſeparating the particles of it, and of giving to each element its proper place or ſituation: but after this was done, why did they call for the intervention of an external cauſe? Did not they, in this, imitate thoſe bad Poets who, in a play, brought God upon the ſtage, to remove a trifling obſtacle? To reaſon juſtly on the creation of the world, we ought to conſider God as the author of matter, and the firſt and ſole principle of motion. If we cannot raiſe ourſelves to all the idea of a creation properly ſo called, we ſhall never get clear of the difficulties; and ſhall be forced, which way ſoever we turn, to advance things which our reaſon cannot reconcile to itſelf; for if matter is ſelf-exiſtent, we cannot very well conceive that God could, or ſhould give it motion. It would be independent of any other thing with regard to the reality of its exiſtence: why therefore ſhould it not have the power to exiſt always in the ſame place, with regard to each of its parts? Why ſhould it be forced

Whether it be a conſiſtent way of reaſoning to have recourſe to God for diſentangling or clearing up the Chaos.

ject to the moſt dreadful confuſions and contrarieties that could have deformed the Chaos.

forced to change its ſituation at the will and pleaſure of another ſubſtance? Add to this, that had matter been moved by an external principle, it would intimate that its neceſſary and independent exiſtence are ſeparate and diſtinct from motion; the reſult of which is, that its natural ſtate is that of reſt; and therefore that God could not give motion to it, without diſordering the nature of things; nothing being more ſuitable to order, than to follow the eternal and neceſſary inſtitution of nature. Of this I ſhall ſpeak more at large in other places (48). But of all the errors which reſult from our rejecting the creation, there is none, in my opinion, more inconſiderable, than the ſuppoſing that if God is not the cauſe of the exiſtence of matter; he is, at leaſt, the firſt mover of bodies; and, in that quality, the author of elementary Properties, and of the diſpoſition and form we ſee in nature. The ſuppoſition of his being the firſt mover of matter, is a principle from which the following conſequence reſults naturally, *viz.* that he formed the heavens and the earth, the air, and the ſea; and is the mighty architect of this great, this wonderful edifice called the world. But if we diveſt him of this quality of firſt mover; if we affirm that matter moves independently of him, and had the diverſity of forms in itſelf; that, with reſpect to ſome of its parts, its motion tended towards the center; and, with regard to others, tended towards the circumference; that it contained particles of fire, water, air, and earth; if, I ſay, we affirm all this with Ovid, we ſhall employ God needleſly and improperly to the formation of the world. Nature could have done very well without the intervention or aſſiſtance of a God; it had ſtrength and power ſufficient to ſeparate the particles of the elements, and to aſſemble together thoſe of the ſame rank or claſs (49). Ariſtotle had a clear idea of this truth, and a much better one than Plato, who admitted, before the creation of the univerſe, an irregular motion in diſorderly matter. Ariſtotle ſhows, that this ſuppoſition deſtroyed itſelf, ſince, unleſs we have recourſe to a progreſs *in infinitum*, the elements muſt have been endued with a natural motion. It was natural, ſome directed themſelves towards the center, and others towards the circumference: and conſequently they diſpoſed themſelves in a manner neceſſary for forming the world or univerſe as we now ſee it; ſo that there was a world, at the time of this pretended irregular motion, and antecedent to the world, which is a contradiction. Here follow his words, which it is proper I ſhould quote, to give the reader the eaſier opportunity of examining whether or no I have exhibited their true ſenſe. Τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο συμβαίνειν ἀναγκαῖον· κἂν εἰ καθάπερ ἐν τῷ Τιμαίῳ γέγραπται, πρὶν γενέσθαι τὸν κόσμον, ἐκινεῖτο τὰ στοιχεῖα ἀλόγως· ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἢ βίαιον εἶναι τὴν κίνησιν, ἢ κατὰ φύσιν. εἰ δὲ κατὰ φύσιν ἐκινεῖτο, ἀνάγκη κόσμον εἶναι, ἐάν τις βούληται θεωρεῖν ἐπιστήσας. τό, τε γὰρ πρῶτον κινοῦν ἀνάγκη κινεῖν αὐτὸ, κινούμενον κατὰ φύσιν· καὶ τὰ κινούμενα μὴ βίᾳ, ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις ἠρεμοῦντα τόποις, ποιεῖν ἥπερ ἔχουσι νῦν τάξιν· τὰ μὲν βάρη ἔχοντα, ἐπὶ τὸ μέσον, τὰ δὲ κουφότητα, ἀπὸ τοῦ μέσου· ταύτην δ' ὁ κόσμος ἔχει τὴν διάταξιν, i. e. "'Tis neceſſary that the ſame "thing ſhould happen, even though, as Timæus "writes, the elements had been moved in an irregular manner, before the formation of the world; "for motion muſt neceſſarily be violent or natural. "But if they were moved according to nature, 'twill "appear to any ſtudious enquirer, that there muſt "neceſſarily be a world. For the firſt mover muſt, "itſelf, neceſſarily move; its motion being given "according to nature; and thoſe things which "moved without any force or impulſe, reſting in "their proper places compoſed the order they now "are in: thoſe which have gravity being ſelf directed towards the center, but thoſe which have "levity being directed from the center. Such is "the preſent order of the world." He obſerves, in conſequence of this, and very juſtly, that Anaxagoras who admitted no motion (50) antecedent to the firſt formation of the world, had a clearer idea of this matter than the reſt (51).

Such modern Peripateticks or Ariſtotelians as are moſt zealous for ſincere orthodoxy, cannot find any fault in this diſcourſe of Ariſtotle; they owning that the qualities *Alteratrices* and *Motrices* of the four elements, are ſufficient to produce all the effects of nature. They only bring in God as the preſerver of thoſe elementary faculties of which he is the firſt cauſe, or elſe make him interpoſe only his general concurrence; and they acknowledge, that excepting this, they perform all things; and, in quality of a ſecond cauſe, are the perfect and complete principle of all generations (52). A ſchool divine would therefore readily own, that if the four elements had exiſted independently of God, with all the faculties they now poſſeſs, they themſelves would have formed the machine called the world, and have maintained it in the ſtate in which we now ſee it. He therefore ſhould own two great defects in the doctrine of the Chaos; the firſt and principal is, its taking from God the creation of matter, and the production of the qualities peculiar to fire, air, earth, and ſea: the other is, that after taking this from him, it brings him unneceſſarily on the ſtage of the world, to ſettle the four elements in their proper places. Our new Philoſophers, who have rejected the qualities and faculties of the Ariſtotelian philoſophy, would find the ſame imperfections in the deſcription of Ovid's Chaos; for what they call general laws of motion, principles of mechanicks, modifications of matter, figure, ſituation and diſpoſition of the atoms, imports only that active and paſſive virtue of nature which the Ariſtotelians underſtand, under the terms, qualities, *Alteratrices* and *Motrices* of the four elements. Since therefore, according to the doctrine of the Ariſtotelians, theſe four bodies placed according to their natural levity and gravity, are a principle ſufficient for all generations; the Carteſians, the Gaſſendiſts, and the reſt of the modern Philoſophers, ought to aſſert that motion, ſituation, and configuration of the parts of matter, are ſufficient to produce all natural effects, without excepting even the general diſpoſition which placed the earth, the air, the water, and ſtars, where we ſee them. Thus the true cauſe of the world, and of the effects produced in it, is not different from the cauſe which gave motion to the parts of matter, whether it aſſigned at the ſame time to every atom its determinate figure, as the Gaſſendiſts pretend; or whether it only gave to parts, which were entirely cubical, an impulſe, which, by the duration of motion reduced under certain laws, would afterwards make them aſſume all kinds of figures. This is the hypotheſis of the Carteſians. Both the one and the other ought conſequently to acknowledge, that had matter been ſuch, before the creation of the world, as Ovid declared it to be, it would have been able to draw or diſingage itſelf from the Chaos by its own power; and to aſſume the form of the world without the aſſiſtance of God. They therefore ought to charge Ovid with two miſtakes: the one, in his ſuppoſing that matter, without the aſſiſtance of the Deity, contained the ſeeds of all mixt bodies, heat, motion, &c. the other is his aſſerting, that it would not have drawn its ſelf from a ſtate of confuſion without the aſſiſtance of God. This is giving too much and too little on theſe two occaſions reſpectively; 'tis neglecting aſſiſtance in the greateſt neceſſity, and ſuing for it when it is not neceſſary.

I know there are ſome people who do not approve of this fiction advanced by Des Cartes, with regard to the manner in which the world might have been formed (53). Some laugh at it, and look upon it as injurious to God; whilſt others charge it either with falſities or impoſſibilities. To the former it may be anſwered, that they don't underſtand this ſubject; and that were it known to them, they would own that nothing is more proper to give an exalted idea of the infinite wiſdom of God, than to aſſert that out of matter which had no form, he could make this world in a certain time, by barely preſerving the motion once given, and reduced to a ſmall number of ſimple and general laws. As to thoſe, who combat the particulars of Des Cartes's ſyſtem, as containing things contrary to the laws of mechanicks, and to the real ſtate which Aſtronomers have diſcovered in the Vortices, I ſhall content myſelf with

(48) See the remark [S] of the article EPICURUS; and alſo remark [A] of the article HIEROCLES the Philoſopher.

(49) Compare what was ſaid above, remark [G], num. 8. of the article ANAXAGORAS.

(50) Ariſtoteles, *de Cælo*, lib. 3. cap. 2. p. m. 370, [G].

(51) I cited Ariſtotle's words, citat. (161) of the article EPICURUS.

(52) We muſt except the ſoul of man.

REFLECTION on a notion of Des Cartes, concerning the manner, in which the world might have been formed.

(53) See Des Cartes's principles, part 3. n. 46 *& ſeq.*

anſwering them, that this does prevent the main part of his hypotheſis from being juſt; and I am fully perſuaded that Mr. Newton (*), the moſt formidable of all thoſe who have criticiſed Des Cartes, does not doubt but that the actual ſyſtem of the world might be the production of a few mechanical laws, eſtabliſhed by the Author of all things; for if we ſuppoſe that bodies determined to move in ſtrait lines, and to tend, either towards the center or the circumference, as often as the reſiſtance of other bodies ſhall oblige them to move in a circular manner, we eſtabliſh a principle which will neceſſarily produce great varieties in matter; and if it does not form this ſyſtem, 'twill form another.

* Sir ISAAC NEWTON. An OBSERVATION on the Epicurean hypotheſis.

The hypotheſis of the Epicureans, though ſo ridiculous and extravagant, affords wherewith to form a certain world. Do but once allow them the different figures of atoms, with the inalienable power of moving themſelves according to the laws of gravity; of mutually repelling one another, and of reflecting in ſuch and ſuch a manner, according as they ſtrike one another in a perpendicular or oblique direction; if this is but once granted, it cannot be denied but that the fortuitous concourſe of theſe atoms may form mighty bodies, which contain hard and fluid bodies, heat and cold, denſity and tranſparency, vortices, *&c.* All that can be denied them is, the poſſibility that chance ſhould produce ſuch a ſyſtem of bodies as our world; wherein ſo many things perſevere ſo long in their regularity, and ſo many animal machines a thouſand times more ingenious than thoſe of the art of man, which neceſſarily require an intelligent direction.

I will occaſionally examine a notion of Lami, a Member of the faculty in Paris, who is as great a ſtickler for atoms, as an oppoſer to Ariſtotle and Des Cartes; as is manifeſt from his work *De Principiis rerum* (54). Now this is the anſwer he makes to an objection commonly raiſed againſt the Epicurean Hypotheſis. The argument is built on the following compariſon: by throwing together letters at random, we ſhould never compoſe the Iliad of Homer; conſequently the fortuitous concourſe of atoms could never produce a world. Lami anſwers, that there is a wide difference between theſe two things. The Iliad cannot be formed but by the exact and determinate joyning of a certain number of letters; the method of compoſing it is therefore but one, amid the numberleſs multitude of ways in which letters may be diſpoſed: we therefore ought not to wonder, that chance ſhould never hit upon that only way, among a numberleſs multitude of others. But to make a world in general (this or another) it is not neceſſary that atoms ſhould meet and combine in a certain and exact, ſingle and determinate manner; for, in what manner ſoever they fix or lay hold one on the other, they will neceſſarily form aſſemblages of bodies, and conſequently a world. He does not ſtop here, but gives the compariſon another turn. How fortuitous ſoever, ſays he, the joyning of ſeveral letters may be, they neceſſarily form ſyllables and words; and conſequently the caſual concourſe of atoms will neceſſarily form bodies. If we object to him, that theſe words formed at random have no ſignification, he anſwers, it is becauſe words have only ſuch a ſignification as men thought proper to give them; and that thence it comes, that in order for their being ſignificative, they muſt be diſpoſed agreeably to the inſtitution of man; but that the virtue and power of atoms being independent of man, they produce conſiderable effects, ſuch as may raiſe his admiration, in what manner ſoever they may be diſpoſed (55). It will not be very neceſſary for us to examine all this; we may allow part of his pretenſions, and at the ſame time deny that our world, in which there are ſo many regular things, and theſe directed to certain ends, can be by the effect of chance. I muſt obſerve that Epicurus was obliged to acknowledge one inſtance of chance, as wonderful at leaſt as the Iliad would be, if compoſed by the fortuitous concourſe of certain letters. He ſuppoſed the Gods to have a human form, and thought them eternal. He therefore was forced to acknowledge that the fortuitous concourſe of atoms, of which the firſt men were made, had exactly and faithfully copied a certain determinate and ſingle original, *viz.* the form or figure of the Gods. We muſt hear Cicero on this ſubject. *Hoc dico, non ab hominibus formæ figuram perveniſſe ad Deos: Dii enim ſemper fuerunt, & nati nunquam ſunt, ſiquidem æterni ſunt futuri. At homines nati: antè igitur humana forma, quàm homines eâ quâ erant formâ Dii immortales. Non ergo illorum humana forma, ſed noſtra divina dicenda eſt. Verùm hoc quidem, ut voletis: illud quæro, quæ fuerit tanta fortuna, (nihil enim ratione in rerum naturâ factum eſſe vultis) ſed tamen quis iſte tantus caſus, unde tam felix concurſus atomorum, ut repentè homines Deorum formâ naſcerentur? Semina Deorum decidiſſe de cælo putamus in terras, & ſic homines patrum ſimiles extitiſſe? vellem diceretis: Deorum cognationem agnoſcerem non invitus. Nihil tale dicitis: ſed caſu eſſe factum ut Deorum ſimiles eſſemus* (56), i. e. "I aſſert as follows, *viz.* that the "Gods could not receive their form or figure from "men; for the Gods exiſted from all times, and "were never born, they being eternal. But men "are born; conſequently before men had their "human form, the immortals muſt have had theirs, "ſuppoſing them to be the ſame. Our form ſhould "therefore be called divine, and not theirs human. "But let this be as you will: I would make the fol-"lowing query; by what particular fortune was it, "(for you don't allow reaſon to be any ways con-"cerned in the creation of the univerſe) from what "ſtrange chance, and happy concourſe of atoms "could it come to paſs, that men ſhould be born, "on a ſudden, with the form or figure of the Gods? "Muſt we ſuppoſe that the ſeed of the Gods fell "from heaven upon the earth, and that this made "men reſemble their fathers? I would have you "aſſert this: I would willingly acknowledge a kin-"dred or relation with the Gods: but you do not "ſay any thing like this; but that it was by mere "chance we were formed like the Gods." This reſemblance between the Gods and men, formed by mere chance, is more aſtoniſhing than it would be to ſee a child, by taking up a pencil, and running it over a piece of paper as his infantine fancy might direct, draw as juſt and exact a reſemblance of Cæſar, as Michael Angelo could have done of that Hero.

(54) In the *Acta Eruditor.* 1682, p. 155, is an extract of it; which ſays that it was printed at Paris in 1680; but that was only a new title; I myſelf reading that book in 1678, at which time it was not a new book.

(55) Taken from chap. 39, book 3, of William Lami, *de rerum principiis.*

(56) Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*, lib. 1. cap. 32.

IV. The laſt obſervation I am to make is, relates to Ovid's aſſerting, that the war between the four elements, which, during the Chaos had been perpetual, was terminated by the authority of the God who formed the world. Is not this intimating that the elements, ever ſince that time, have been in profound peace? And is not ſuch an intimation very ill grounded and contradicted by experience? Has the war ever ceaſed between heat and cold, moiſture and dryneſs, levity and gravity, fire and water, &c.? Since Ovid complied with the hypotheſis of the four elements, he ought to have known, that the antipathy between their qualities ſtill exiſts; and that there is never any peace or truce between them, not even when they compoſe the temperament of mixt bodies? They do not return to ſuch a peace or compoſition till they have reciprocally annoyed one another; and if during any moments their combat is interrupted, it is becauſe the reſiſtance of one party is exactly equal to the activity of the other: When quite ſpent, they take breath; ever prepared to haraſs and deſtroy one another, the inſtant their ſtrength will give them leave. The equilibrium cannot laſt long; for each party is perpetually receiving ſuccour; and one party muſt loſe what the other gains. Accordingly Ovid ſaw that ſtill, as at the time of the Chaos, their combat prevailed univerſally, and even to the little receſſes of the ſame mixt body.

REFUTATION of Ovid's doctrine, on its ſuppoſing that the war between the elements ceaſed, when the Chaos was diſembroiled.

Corpore in uno
Frigida pugnabant calidis, humentia ſiccis,
Mollia cum duris, ſine pondere habentia pondus (57).

(57) Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 1. ver. 18.

That is,

"All were confus'd, and each diſturb'd the reſt,
"For hot and cold were in one body fixt;
"And ſoft with hard, and light with heavy mixt.
DRYDEN.

The laws of this combat are, that the weakeſt muſt be entirely ruined, proportionable to the whole extent of the power of the ſtrongeſt. Mercy and pity have no room here; and no propoſals of an accommodation are liſtened to. This inteſtine war makes way for

for the diſſolution of the compound, and compaſſes that end one time or other. Living bodies are more expoſed to it than others, and would ſoon ſink, if nature did not recruit them; but at laſt the ſtruggle between the natural heat and the radical moiſture proves mortal to them. The power of time, which conſumes all things, and which Ovid deſcribes ſo happily in the 15th book of the Metamorphoſes, is founded only on the conflict of bodies.

Tempus edax rerum, tuque invidioſa vetuſtas,
Omnia deſtruitis, vitiataque dentibus ævi
Paulatim lenta conſumitis omnia morte (58).

(58) Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 15. ver. 234.

That is,

" Thy teeth, devouring Time, thine, envious age,
" On things below ſtill exerciſe your rage:
" With venom'd grinders you corrupt our meat;
" And then, at lingring meals, the mortals eat.
DRYDEN.

Our Poet, when he wrote this deſcription, forgot what he had related in the chapter of the Chaos: ſo that we need but compare the beginning of his book with the end, to prove him guilty of contradiction. He aſſerts in the firſt book, that an end was put to the ſtruggle between the elements; and declares in the 15th book, that they deſtroy one another reciprocally, and that nothing perſeveres in the ſame ſtate.

(59) Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 15. ver. 237.

Hæc quoque non perſtant, quæ nos elementa vocamus (59).
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
Omnia fiunt
Ex ipſis, & in ipſa cadunt: reſolutaque tellus
In liquidas rareſcit aquas; tenuatus in auras
Aëraque humor abit; dempto quoque pondere rurſus
In ſuperos aër tenuiſſimus emicat ignes.
Inde retro redeunt, idemque retexitur ordo:
Ignis enim denſum ſpiſſatus in aëra tranſit;
Hic in aquas; tellus glomerata cogitur undâ.
Nec ſpecies ſua cuique manet: rerumque novatrix
Ex aliis alias reparat natura figuras (60).

(60) Ibid. ver. 244.

That is,

" Not thoſe which elements we call, abide.
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
" All things are mix'd of thoſe, which all contain,
" And into theſe are all reſolv'd again:
" Earth rarifies to dew; expanded more
" The ſubtil dew in air begins to ſoar;
" Spreads, as ſhe flies, and weary of her name,
" Extenuates ſtill, and changes into flame;
" Thus having by degrees perfection won,
" Reſtleſs they ſoon untwiſt the web they ſpun;
" And fire begins to loſe her radiant hew,
" Mix'd with groſs air, and air deſcends to dew;
" And dew condenſing, does her form forego,
" And ſinks, a heavy lump of earth, below.
" Thus are their figures never at a ſtand,
" But chang'd by nature's innovating hand;
" All things are alter'd, nothing is deſtroy'd,
" The ſhifted ſcene for ſome new ſhew employ'd."
DRYDEN.

(61) Let it not be objected, to excuſe him of falling into a contradiction, that he introduces Pythagoras the Philoſopher ſpeaking in this place; for moſt of the things he puts into his mouth, are either narrations or opinions conformable to the notions of thoſe, who explained generation and corruption by the qualities of the elements.

He afterwards gives ſeveral inſtances of conqueſts which the waters make over the earth, and the earth over the waters, *&c.* Where then is the pacification ſo much boaſted by him in his firſt book? See the margin (61).

Though he had not contradicted himſelf, we yet might cenſure him very juſtly; for as the world was to be a theatre of viciſſitudes, nothing could have been more improper than to ſuppoſe the four elements in peace; and the ceaſing of the Chaos, ſo far from putting an end to their conteſts, ſhould have begun to ſet them at variance, had there been a good harmony between them during the Chaos. 'Tis their combat that renders nature fruitful: their concord would make it barren; and was it not for the implacable war waged by them wherever they meet, there would be no generation. The production of one thing is always the deſtruction of another.

Nam quodcunque ſuis mutatum finibus exit,
Continuo hoc mors eſt illius quod fuit ante (62).

(61) Lucret. lib. 1. ver. 671.

The Senſe is,

" When things are ſhifted, and their form abandon,
" This is the death of that which was before."

Generatio unius eſt corruptio alterius. This is an axiom in philoſophy. Ovid therefore ſhould have preſuppoſed, that the God who aſſigned diſtinct places to the elements, commanded them to fight, and not give the leaſt quarter; and to act like very ambitious conquerors, who ſhould employ every method poſſible to invade the neighbouring States. Dido's wiſh ſhould have been like the orders given them.

Nunc, olim, quocunque dabunt ſe tempore vires,
Littora littoribus contraria, fluctibus undas
Imprecor, arma armis, pugnent ipſique nepotes (63).

(63) Virgil. *Æn.* lib. 4. ver. 627.

That is,

" Our arms, our ſeas, our ſhores, oppos'd to theirs,
" And the ſame hate deſcend on all our heirs".
DRYDEN.

They indeed act as if they had received ſuch an injunction, and that their ſtrongeſt paſſion was, to put it duly in execution. Cold extends its ſphere as far as poſſible, and there deſtroys its enemy. Heat acts the like part, and theſe two qualities alternately become maſters of the field of battle, the one in winter, the other in ſummer; and imitate thoſe victorious armies, which, after winning a deciſive battle, forces their enemy to fly for refuge to his citadels, purſue him thither, beſiege, and reduce him to the utmoſt extremities. Cold, during the ſummer, flies for refuge to caves and ſubterraneous places; and, to prevent its being entirely conquered, redoubles the efforts of its reſiſtance, and fortifies it as ſtrongly as poſſible, by the virtue or power called Antiperiſtaſis; and this the heat does in the winter. The elementary philoſophers, who thus explain the effects of nature, ſay, that every quality endeavours to ſubdue, in ſuch a manner, the things it attacks; that not contented with reducing them to a ſtate of vaſſallage, and to make them fight under their ſtandard, it endeavours to tranſmute them into its own ſtate, *omne agens*, ſay they, *intendit ſibi aſſimilare paſſum*, i. e. " Every agent ſtrives to aſſimilate to itſelf whatever " it works upon." Now can we meet with a more hoſtile and more ambitious animoſity than this?

Empedocles was miſtaken, in aſſociating with the four elements, friendſhip and enmity; the former for union, and the latter for diſunion (64). We allow that the union and diſunion of parts are extremely neceſſary for the productions of nature; but it is certain that friendſhip has no ſhare in this: the ſole diſcord, the ſole antipathy of elements, aſſembles bodies in one part, and diſperſes them in another. We muſt aſcribe theſe two qualities of Empedocles at moſt to living bodies only: but air and fire, water and earth, have no other aſſociates but enmity.

(64) See Ariſtotle's *Phyſicks*, lib. 8. chap. 1. and Diogn. Laert. lib. 8. num. 76, *& ibi* Aldobrandinus *&* Menagius.

Living bodies act very conformably to the order, which Ovid muſt ſuppoſe was given them, by the author of the diſembroiling of the Chaos, *viz.* an order for them to deſtroy one another; for it is literally true, that they ſubſiſt only by deſtruction: whatever contributes to the ſupport of their life loſes its form, and changes its ſtate and ſpecies. Vegetables deſtroy the conſtitution and qualities of all the juices they can attract. Animals exerciſe the ſame havock on all things, which ſerve them for food. They eat one another; and ſeveral ſpecies of beaſts make war upon the other, in no other view but to devour ſuch of their enemies as they ſhall kill. In ſome countries men act the ſame part, and they are great deſtroyers every where. I do not here hint at the havock, which proceeds from ambition, avarice, cruelty, or from ſuch other paſſions as give riſe to wars; I ſpeak only of the effects of the care we take to feed and nouriſh our bodies. Man, in this reſpect, is a principle ſo ruinous and deſtructive, that were all

Chaos [*H*]. A man muſt ſhew a moſt depraved taſte to imagine that a certain Poem entitled

all the reſt of the animals as much ſo in proportion, it would be impoſſible for the earth to furniſh them with proviſions ſufficient. When we caſt our eyes in the ſtreets and markets of great cities, on the prodigious multitude of herbs, roots, and fruits, and a numberleſs multitude of other things which are for food to the inhabitants, would one not imagine that all this was proviſion for a whole week? Would one ſuppoſe that this ſhew is to be renewed daily? Would one think that ſo ſmall an aperture as the human mouth was a gulph, an abyſs, which ſwallows up all we have been ſpeaking of in a little time? Experience only could perſuade us of the truth of this. In the Saintevremoniana lately publiſhed are the following words (65). *'Tis ſaid that there are four thouſand people in Paris who ſell oyſters; and that fifteen hundred large oxen, and upwards of ſixteen thouſand ſheep, calves or hogs, beſides a prodigious quantity of poultry and game of all kinds are daily eat there.* Hence the reader may judge how great the conſumption muſt be in thoſe countries, where the inhabitants are greater eaters and feed more upon fleſh.

(65) Page 293, Dutch edit. 1701.

The condition of nature being therefore ſuch, that beings are produced and preſerved by the deſtruction of one another, Ovid ought not to have affirmed, that the war between the elements was put an end to when the world began, and the Chaos ended (66). It would have been enough to ſay, that the ſituation and force of the combatants were regulated and balanced in ſuch a manner, that their uninterrupted hoſtilities ſhould not bring about the deſtruction of the work, but only agreeable viciſſitudes: *Per queſto variar natura è bella*, (this variety gives a beauty to nature) as the Italians ſay. Some will perhaps imagine, that the war not ceaſing upon the orderly diſpoſition of theſe principles, was not ſo much a ceſſation of the Chaos, as the rough draught or ſketch of a diſembroiling; and that after this diſembroiled compoſition, that is our world, ſhall have laſted a certain number of ages, it will be ſucceeded by a much more beautiful world whence diſcord will be baniſhed. And they will pretend, perhaps, that St. Paul (67) confirms their opinion, when he ſays that all creatures wait earneſtly to be delivered from their ſtate of vanity and corruption. But they may ſay what they pleaſe; I will not loſe my time in examining their notions.

(66) See in Tom. 18, of the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*, p. 23, a remark in oppoſition to an aſſertion of Gregory Nazianzen, in his 12th oration, viz. *That the world is ſupported and kept together by peace.*

(67) Chap. 8. ver. 19 *&* *ſeq.* of the Romans. This paſſage greatly puzzles the Commentators.

'Tis to obſerved that, according to the mechanical principles by which the new Philoſophers endeavour to explain the effects of nature, 'tis eaſier to comprehend the perpetual war between bodies, than by the philoſophy of the four elements. For all the action of the ſix elementary qualities being, according to the new philoſophy, nothing but local motion; 'tis plain that every body oppoſes and combats whatever it meets with; and that the particles of matter tend only to claſh, break and repreſs one another, in the utmoſt rigour of the laws of the ſtrongeſt power.

[Sir Samuel Garth makes ſome remarks on this ſubject. After quoting the following lines, *Nec circumfuſo pendebat in aere tellus, Ponderibus librata ſuis*, he adds, *Thus was the ſtate of nature before the creation: and here it is obvious, that Ovid had a diſcerning notion of the gravitation of bodies. 'Tis now demonſtrated, that every part of matter tends to every part of matter with a force, which is always in a direct ſimple proportion of the quantity of the matter, and an inverſe duplicate proportion of the diſtance; which tending or gravitating is conſtant, and univerſal. This power, whatever it be, acting always proportionably to the ſolid content of bodies, and never in any proportion to their ſuperficies, cannot be explained by any material impulſe. For the laws of impulſe are phyſically neceſſary: there can be no* αὐτεξούσιον *or arbitrary principle in meer matter; its parts cannot move, unleſs they be moved; and cannot do otherwiſe, when preſſed on by other parts in motion; and therefore 'tis evident from the following lines, that Ovid ſtrictly adhered to the opinion of the moſt diſcerning Philoſophers, who taught that all things were formed by a wiſe and intelligent mind.* Juſſit & extendi campos, ſubſidere valles, Fronde tegi Sylvas. *The Fiat of the Hebrew Law-giver is not more ſublime, than the* juſſit *of the Latin Poet, who goes on in the ſame elevated and philoſophical ſtyle.* His ſuper impoſuit Liquidum, & gravitate carentem Æthera. *Here the Author ſpreads a thin veil of æther over his infant creation; and though his aſſerting the upper region to be void of gravitation, may not, in a mathematical rigour, be true; yet 'tis found from the natural enquiries made ſince, and eſpecially from the learned Dr. Halley's diſcourſe on the Barometer, that if, on the ſurface of the earth, an inch of quickſilver in the tube be equal to a cylinder of air of 300 foot, it will be at a mile's height equal to a cylinder of air of 2700000; and therefore the air at ſo great a diſtance from the earth, muſt be rarified to ſo great a degree, that the ſpace it fills up, muſt be a very ſmall proportion to that which is entirely void of matter.*

I think we may be confident, from what already appears, as well as from what our Author has writ on the Roman feaſts, that he could not be totally ignorant of aſtronomy. Some of the criticks would inſinuate from the following lines, that he miſtook the annual motion of the ſun for the diurnal. Sectus in obliquum.——*Tho' the ſun be always in one or other of the zodiack, and never goes by either motion more northward or ſouthward, than is here deſcribed; yet Phaeton being deſigned to drive the chariot but one day, ought to have been directed in the æquator, or a circle parallel to it, and not round the other oblique one of the ecliptick; a degree of which, and that by motion contrary to the diurnal, he was obliged to go in that length of time. I am inclined to think that Ovid had ſo great an attention to poetical embelliſhments, that he voluntarily declined a ſtrict obſervance of any aſtronomical ſyſtem. For though that ſcience was far from being neglected in former ages; yet the progreſs which was made in it, by no means equalled that of our preſent time. Lucretius, though in other things moſt penetrating, deſcribes the ſun ſcarce bigger than he appears to the eye.*

Nec nimio ſolis major rota, nec major ardor
Eſſe poteſt, noſtris quam ſenſibus eſſe videtur.

And Homer, imagining the ſeats of the Gods above the fixed ſtars, repreſents the falling of Vulcan from thence to the iſle of Lemnos, to continue during a whole day.

Πᾶν δ'ἦμαρ φερόμην, ἅμα δ'ηελίῳ καταδύντι]
Κάππεσον ἰν Λήμνω.

The Greek Poet aims here to give a ſurpriſing idea of the height of the celeſtial manſions; but if the computation of a modern Aſtronomer be true, they are at ſo much a greater diſtance, that Vulcan would have been more years in falling, than he was minutes. Preface by Sir Samuel Garth to the tranſlation of Ovid's Metamorphoſes, p. 4 *&* *ſeq.* London 1719, 12mo. *Addit. by the Tranſl.*]

[*H*] *They ought to have excepted man out of their general rule, ſince he is ſubject to the moſt dreadful confuſions and contrarieties that could have deformed the Chaos.*] But if we ſet aſide the reaſons or arguments given in the preceding remark, and grant that Ovid might have aſſerted, in general, that the creatures were drawn from the Chaos; we yet may be permitted to ſay, that he could not affirm in particular, that this favour was extended to man. I only conſider the views we may have, when deſtitute of the light of revelation. In this ſtate, is it poſſible for us not to conclude, that the horrors of the Chaos ſtill ſubſiſt, with reſpect to man? For, to wave the perpetual ſtruggle between the elementary qualities, which prevail ſomething more in this frame, than in moſt other material Beings, is there not a furious war between his body and ſoul, his reaſon and his ſenſes, his ſenſitive and reaſonable ſoul? Reaſon ought to ſuppreſs and calm this diſorder, and pacify theſe inteſtine ſtruggles; but it is both Judge and Party; its decrees are not executed, and only increaſe the evil (68). This obliged one of the juſteſt and moſt ſhining Genius's of the 17th century, to prefer the condition of ſheep to that of man. Peruſe the following paſſage.

Cependant nous avons la raiſon pour partage,
Et vous en ignorez l'uſage.
Innocens animaux n'en ſoiez point jaloux
Ce n'eſt pas un grand avantage.
Cette fiere raiſon dont on fait tant de bruit
Contre les paſſions n'eſt pas un ſeur remede,

(68) With regard to the complaints brought againſt reaſon, ſee the *Nouvelles Lettres contre* Maimbourg, p. 755 *&* *ſeq.* and ſome paſſages from Cicero, in the remark [*E*] of the article PAULICIANS.

Un peu de vin la trouble, un enfant la ſeduit,
Et dechirer un cœur qui l'apelle à ſon aide,
Eſt tout l'effet qu'elle produit.
Toûjours impuiſſante & ſevere
Elle s'opoſe à tout, & ne ſurmonte rien.
Sous la garde de votre chien
Vous devez beaucoup moins redouter la colere
Des loups cruels & raviſſans,
Que ſous l'autorité d'une telle chimere
Nous ne devons craindre nos ſens (69).

(69) Madame Des Houlieres, Idylle des Moutons, p. 32, 33. Amſterdam edit. 1694.

The ſenſe is,

" Tho' reaſon is our lot, and you're denied it,
" Yet (harmleſs lambs) this ſhou'd not make you jealous,
" For, tho' extoll'd, its benefit is ſmall.
" This haughty reaſon, ſo much prais'd by men,
" Is not a ſure defence againſt the paſſions.
" Wine ruffles it, a child can quite miſlead it.
" Th' effect produc'd by it is only this,
" The heart which ſeeks its aid is ſurely broke.
" For ever impotent, for ever churliſh,
" All things it combats, and is ſtill defeated.
" Leſs formidable are rapacious wolves
" To you, fond lambkins, than our boaſted reaſon,
" Which o'er our ſenſes bears deſpotic ſway".

Theſe lines are found in Madame des Houlieres. We alſo find that ſhe looks upon the condition of inanimate creatures to be preferable to ours. Here follow her reflections, addreſſed to a ſtream or rivulet (70).

(70) Ibid. In l'Idylle du Ruiſſeau, p. 119, 220.

Avec tant de bonheur d'où vient votre murmure ?
Helas votre ſort eſt ſi doux !
Taiſez-vous ruiſſeau, c'eſt à nous
A nous plaindre de la nature.
De tant de paſſions que nourrit notre cœur
Aprennez qu'il n'en eſt pas une
Qui ne traine après ſoi le trouble, la douleur,
Le repentir, ou l'infortune.
Elles dechirent nuit & jour
Les cœurs dont elles ſont maîtreſſes.
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
De toutes ſortes d'unions
Que notre vie eſt éloignée !
De trahiſons, d'horreurs, & de diſſenſions
Elle eſt toûjours accompagnée.
Qu'avez-vous merité, ruiſſeau tranquille & doux,
Pour être mieux traité que nous ?
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
Enfin dans cet horrible gouffre
De miſere & de vanité
Je me perds ; & plus j'enviſage
La foibleſſe de l'homme & ſa malignité,
Et moins de la divinité
En lui je reconnois l'image.

The ſenſe is,

" Since you're ſo happy, whence ariſe theſe murmurs ?
" Delightful brooks ! thrice happy is your lot.
" With juſtice we, not you, exclaim at Nature.
" The various paſſions which our heart foments,
" Are all attended with a baleful train,
" Repentance, anguiſh, terrors and misfortunes.
" Inceſſant, theſe, that hapleſs heart conſume,
" O'er which their ever-fatal power extends.
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
" Unbleſs'd is human life with chearful union.
" Its ſole attendants are a cruel band ;
" Dark treaſons, horrors, plagues and dire diſcuſſions.
" Ye gently-flowing brooks, whence comes this favour ?
" Why are you us'd ſo kindly ; men ſo ill ?
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
" In this dread gulph of vanity and woe
" So long I wander, darkling, that I'm loſt.
" The more I view man's frailty and his guilt,
" The leſs God's image ſeems on him impreſt.

The lines I ſhall quote hereunder, are a freſh proof of the Chaos, in which mankind were left. Things of the moſt oppoſite kind, light and darkneſs, are ever inſeparable in man ; they follow one another reciprocally in him ; they tread upon one another's heels : the leſs a man knows, the more he imagines he does ; the more he knows, the more ſenſible he is of his ignorance, and the more liable he is to deviate from the right path. Is it poſſible for a Being to be the ſubject of a more capricious conflict ?

Que l'eſprit de l'homme eſt borné !
Quelque tems qu'il donne à l'étude,
Quelque penetrant qu'il ſoit né,
Il ne ſait rien à fond, rien avec certitude :
De tenebres pour lui tout eſt environné ;
La lumiere qui vient du ſavoir le plus rare
N'eſt qu'un fatal éclair, qu'un ardent qui l'égare.
Bien plus que l'ignorance elle eſt à redouter.
Longues erreurs qu'elle a fait naitre
Vous ne prouvez que trop que chercher à connoître
N'eſt ſouvent qu'aprendre à douter (71).

(71) Madame Des Houlieres, in the *Reflexions diverſes*, p. 94, 95.

The ſenſe is,

" What narrow limits bound the life of man !
" However bright his genius, tho' he ſpend
" His years in painful ſtudy, ſtill his mind
" Knows nought with certainty, or in perfection.
" All things, to him, are wrapt in ſhades and darkneſs.
" Learning's moſt ſhining light's a fatal meteor,
" An *Ignis fatuus*, glimmering and miſguiding,
" And ignorance leſs fruitful is of dangers.
" The errors which from learning's light ariſe,
" Too plainly prove, that ſearching after knowledge
" Often produces nought but endleſs doubts.

[Had Bayle been acquainted with the following beautiful lines of the Earl of Rocheſter, he doubtleſs would have quoted them, preferable to any other, on this occaſion. My Lord obſerves, That man,

" before certain inſtinct will prefer
" Reaſon, which fifty times for one does err.
" Reaſon, that *Ignis fatuus* in the mind,
" Which leaving light of nature (ſenſe) behind ;
" Pathleſs and dang'rous wand'ring ways it takes
" Thro' errors, fenny bogs and thorny brakes ;
" Whilſt the miſguided follower climbs with pain
" Mountains of whimſies, heap'd in his own brain :
" Stumbling from thought to thought, falls headlong down
" Into doubt's boundleſs ſea, where like to drown,
" Books bear him up a while, and make him try
" To ſwim with bladders of philoſophy :
" In hopes ſtill to o'ertake the ſkipping light,
" The vapour dances in his dazling ſight,
" Till ſpent, it leaves him to eternal night.
" Then old age and experience hand in hand,
" Lead him to death, and make him underſtand,
" After a ſearch ſo painful and ſo long,
" That all his life he has been in the wrong.
" Huddled in dirt, the reaſ'ning engine lies,
" Who was ſo proud, ſo witty, and ſo wiſe.
" Pride drew him in, as cheats their bubbles catch,
" And makes him venture to be made a wretch.
" His wiſdom did his happineſs deſtroy,
" Aiming to know what world he ſhould enjoy ;
" And wit was his vain frivolous prepence,
" Of pleaſing others at his own expence. *]

* Addit. of the Tranſl. from *Rocheſter's Poems*, p. 7. London, 1712. 12mo.

I ſhould never have done, did I go about to collect all the good things which have been writ, concerning the contrariety of the ingredients of which man is compoſed. Count de Buſſy Rabutin, tells us, " That he ſhall never forget what father Senault " ſaid to him on this ſubject : that there was a very " cloſe connection between the ſoul and the body, " and yet, that they were always claſhing ; and, in " a word, that they were two enemies, who can ne- " ver part, and two friends who can never agree. " Nothing was ever truer, or better ſaid (72)." There

(72) Buſſi Rabutin, letter 21, part 4. p. 53. Dutch edit.

There appears to me greater freedom, or greater vivacity, but not more judgment, (tho' I think there's a great deal in it) in this paſſage of Balzac. *But who do you think, reverend father*, wrote the following words? "We are compoſed of two enemies who are "ever at variance: the ſublime part of the human "ſoul is ever at war with the inferior part of it. "We will go farther: MAN IS COMPOSED OF A "GOD AND OF A BEAST, FASTENED TOGETHER. "*If you gueſs the Author of theſe four lines, I will "think you as great a magician as thoſe who foretold "the birth of King Sapores* (73).

(73) Balzac, in a diſſertation addreſſed to the reverend father, Andrew de St. Denys, a divine of the congregation of the Feuillants; at the end of his *Socrate Chretien*, p. m. 193, 194.

There are excellent reflections on this ſubject, in the two orations of Gregory Palamas, Archbiſhop of Theſſalonica, in the 14th Century. They are written by *way of dialogue, pleadings, and definitive ſentence: the Soul accuſing the Body, and the Body defending itſelf; not merely by denying, but by colouring the Fact, with the Sentence pronounced by the Judges.* I borrow the words of Claudius Eſpencæus, who tranſlated the two declamations in queſtion into French, and publiſhed his Verſion at Paris in 1570, 8vo. Du Verdier Vau-Privas quotes ſome ſtrokes from it (74). I will now tranſcribe a long paſſage which contains ſome very excellent particulars, and at the ſame time ſome faults. "The Philoſophers .... did not know the "diſpoſition of the ſprings, which give motion to the "human heart; and had not any notion or ſuſpi-"cion of the ſtrange change which had been "wrought in it, by which reaſon was become the "ſlave of the paſſions..... They indeed are par-"donable for not having known the cauſe of the "change which had been wrought in man; but "they are no ways ſo, for not having perceived this "change; for it is pardonable in perſons, who paſs "their lives without reflection, not to know what "paſſes within themſelves; but that the curious "obſervers of nature, that men, whoſe chief appli-"cation was to ſtudy and know themſelves, ſhould "not have obſerved, that men were no longer guid-"ed and governed by reaſon, this is comprehenſible. "And indeed, how can we conceive that it was poſ-"ſible for perſons of diſcernment, not to have diſ-"covered by their knowledge and their own expe-"rience, that it is not in the power of reaſon, tho' it "exert all its ſtrength and applications, to deſtroy a "paſſion which has been once rooted in the human "heart, neither by the help of years, nor by the in-"fluence of any example, nor yet the fear of any "evil; and yet they ſhould not have perceived what "is ſeen and felt by the dulleſt and moſt ignorant "perſons. A little reflection therefore on what they "experience in themſelves, was therefore capable "of making them acquainted with the ſtate of rea-"ſon, and of convincing them of their own weak-"neſs; and of making them conceive, that man, "who was once in the moſt elevated part of the ſoul, "who inhabited that calm, luminous region, whence "he ſaw and regulated himſelf internally and exter-"nally, is now plunged or immerſed in the ſenſes, "where he gratifies and indulges himſelf in plea-"ſures, as though he were born for them. They alſo "would have perceived, that although reaſon has "loſt the power it once had in man, yet its light is "not ſo totally extinguiſhed, but that he has ſtill "glimmerings enough ſufficient for him to perceive "his duty (75)." Theſe are Mr. Eſprit's words, in a work publiſhed by him in 1678. All he obſerves with regard to the weakneſs and ſlavery of reaſon is very true; but he is in the wrong for accuſing the Philoſophers in general of not knowing this ſervitude, nor having had the leaſt ſuſpicion of the cauſe which produced it; for it is certain that ſeveral Heathens had a knowledge in this particular, which he ſuppoſes they had not. I am ſenſible that the Stoicks ſpoke in too pompous a ſtrain of the empire of reaſon; and that the idea they formed to themſelves of their wiſe man heated their imaginations to ſuch a degree, that they let dropt ſome particulars which had the air of madneſs; not in their ſuppoſing that, if freed from the paſſions, he would conſtantly and inviolably obey the laws of order and virtue; but in their ſuppoſing that it was in the power of man to root out every vicious paſſion. This was their capital error; in this they diſcovered their ignorance with regard to the ſtate and condition of man. The other part of their doctrine was judicious, *viz.* that if man could conquer or root out his paſſions, he might without difficulty practiſe virtue, and arrive at perfection (76). However, Mr. Eſprit ought to have confined his cenſures to them, and not extend them ſo far as he has done; who told him that the Philoſophers did not know that the ſoul of man is immerſed in the ſenſes? Was Cicero a ſtranger to this when he wrote the following paſſage in Book III. of the Republick, which St. Auſtin preſerved, and wherein we have ſo lively a deſcription of the captivity of the ſoul, and the empire of the paſſions. *Homo non ut à matre, ſed ut à noverca natura editus eſt in vitam, corpore nudo, & fragili, & infirmo, animo autem anxio ad moleſtias, humili ad timores, molli ad labores, prono ad libidines, in quo tamen ineſſet tamquam* OBRUTUS *quidam divinus ignis ingenii, & mentis* (77), i. e. "Man is brought into life, not as "by a mother but by a ſtep-mother; his body being "naked, weak and infirm; his mind affected by "uneaſineſſes, humbled by fears, averſe to labour, "and prone to luſt; in which there yet appears a "divine ſpark of reaſon and underſtanding, but "STIFLED as it were." Had Cicero *no knowledge, no ſuſpicion of the odd change that had been wrought in man, whereby reaſon had become the ſlave of the paſſions?* What then can thoſe words mean, which St. Auſtin has alſo preſerved, whereby Cicero ſeems to approve of thoſe antient Heathen Prophets, who thought that the birth of man was a puniſhment for ſome ſin committed in another life (78)? Does he not approve a reflection he had read in Ariſtotle, *viz.* that the union of the ſoul and body was a puniſhment like to that inflicted by ſome antient robbers; of faſtning living bodies to dead carcaſſes, mouth to mouth, belly againſt belly, and ſo of the other parts (79)? Was not this owning that the ſoul is, by ſin, reduced to the miſerable condition it ſuffers in the body? Was it not conſidering ſin, as the cauſe, which had diveſted it of its natural ſtate and its primitive nobility. Here follows this beautiful paſſage in queſtion of Cicero. *Ex quibus humanæ vitæ erroribus, & ærumnis fit, ut interdum veteres illi ſive vates, ſive in ſacris, initiiſque tradendis divinæ mentis interpretes, qui nos ob aliqua ſcelera ſuſcepta in vita ſuperiore, pœnarum luendarum cauſſa natos eſſe dixerunt, aliquid vidiſſe videantur; verumque ſit illud, quod eſt apud Ariſtotelem, ſimili nos affectos eſſe ſupplicio, atque eos, qui quondam, cum in prædonum Etruſcorum manus incidiſſent, crudelitate excogitata necabantur: quorum corpora viva cum mortuis, adverſa adverſis accommodata, quam aptiſſime colligabantur: ita noſtros animos cum corporibus copulatos, ut vivos cum mortuis eſſe conjunctos* (80). To conclude; I know not why Mr. Eſprit affirms, that the Philoſophers did not know that the power of reaſon is loſt, and yet its light is preſerved. Did not Euripides the Dramatic Philoſopher ſay, that after having long meditated on the depravity and corruption of mankind; he found, that their committing ſin was not owing to the diſpoſition of the underſtanding; but to their deviating from virtue though they knew her; ſome through indolence, and others from a love of voluptuous pleaſures. He puts the beautiful reflections following into Phædras's mouth.

(74) See page 175 & *ſeq.* of the *Bibliotheque Françoiſe.*

(75) Eſprit, preface to *la Fauſſeté des vertus humaines.*

(76) See *Nouvelles Lettres contre* Maimbourg, p. 758.

(77) See the fragments of Cicero, collected by Andrew Patricius, p. m. 70. He cites this as extracted from St. Auſtin, lib. 4. *contra Pelagium.*

(78) See remark [R] of the article TULLIA.

(79) Compare the citation of the article LEO X, in which I quote a paſſage from Virgil.

(80) Cicero, *in* Hortenſio, *apud* Auguſtin. lib. 4. *contra Pelagium.* See the fragments collected by Andrew Patricius, p. m. 102, 103.

Ἤδη ποτ' ἄλλως νυκτὸς ἐν μακρῷ χρόνῳ
Θνητῶν, ἐφρόντισ', ἡ διέφθαρται βίος.
Καί μοι δοκοῦσιν οὐ κατὰ γνώμης φύσιν
Πράσσειν κάκιον. Ἔστι γὰρ τόγ' ἐν φρονεῖν
Πολλοῖσιν, ἀλλὰ τῇδ' ἀθρεῖν ταῦτ'.
Τὰ χρηστ' ἐπισκάμμεσθα, κοὐ γιγνώσκομεν,
Οὐκ ἐκπονοῦμεν δ'. οἱ μὲν ἀργίας ὕπο,
Οἳδ' ἡδονὴν προθέντες ἀντὶ τοῦ καλοῦ
Ἄλλην τιν'

Jam ſæpe mecum *aliàs noctis in longo tempore*
Cogitavi, quomodo corrupta ſit hominum vita.
Et mihi videntur non ſecundum animi naturam: at præter eam
Deterius facere. eſt enim recta rerum *cognitio*
Multis. Sed ſic ſpectanda ſunt hæc.
Bona quidem *tenemus, & novimus:*
Sed non facimus: alii quidem propter ignaviam,
Alii vero anteponentes voluptatem honeſto,
Aliam aliquam (81).

(81) Euripides, *in* Hippolyto, ver. 375, p. m. 349. Obſerve that Farnaby, in *Ovid. Metam.* lib. 7. ver. 11. aſcribes this falſity to the Medæa of Euripides.

titled *De Vetula*, was written by Ovid [*I*]. I will quote ſome verſes from it (*d*) to give thoſe, who have not this author's Poem, an opportunity of judging of the Writer.

(*d*) In the citation 90.

I will

The ſenſe is,

" Frequent, Iv'e paſt the lonely, tedious night,
" In meditation on man's ſad corruption.
" From my reflections this reſult ariſes;
" 'Tis not, from nature, man is prone to vice.
" From nature he receiv'd true reaſon's light.—
" The genuine ſtate of the affair is this;
" Virtue we know, but follow not her precepts;
" Betray'd by indolence, or love of pleaſure.

Is it poſſible to deſcribe better than theſe words of Ovid do, the inability of reaſon, with regard to the making us do what ſhe approves?

Concipit interea validos Ætias ignes,
Et luctata diu, poſtquam ratione furorem
Vincere non poterat; Fruſtra Medea repugnas,
Neſcio quis deus obſtat, ait (82).
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
Excute (83) *virgineo conceptas pectore flammas,*
Si potes, infelix. Si poſſem, ſanior eſſem;
Sed trahit invitam nova vis: aliudque Cupido,
Mens aliud ſuadet. Video meliora, proboque,
Deteriora ſequor (84).

(82) Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 7. ver. 9.

(83) Idem, ibid. ver. 17.

(84) She owns, in Euripides, that ſhe knows, or is ſenſible of the crimes ſhe will commit; but that her paſſion prevails over her knowledge. Καὶ μανθάνω μὲν οἷα τολμήσω κακὰ, Θυμὸς δὲ κρείσσων τῶν ἐμῶν βουλευμάτων. *Et intelligo quidem qualia* ſint ea *mala*, quæ *ſum auſura. Sed ira eſt potentior meis conſiliis.* Euripid. *in* Medea, ver. 1078, p. 319.

That is,

" Mean while Medea, ſeiz'd with fierce deſire,
" By reaſon ſtrives to quench the raging fire;
" But ſtrives in vain!——Some God (ſhe ſaid) withſtands,
" And reaſon's baffled council countermands.
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
" Wretch, from thy virgin-breaſt this flame expel,
" And ſoon—Oh cou'd I, all would then be well!
" But love, reſiſtleſs love, my ſoul invades;
" Diſcretion this, affection that perſuades,
" I ſee the right, and I approve it too;
" Condemn the wrong, . . . and yet the wrong purſue. TATE, *&c.*

The Reader will take notice in particular, that Medea aſcribes this irreſiſtible impulſe to ſome God. This was the uſual refuge of the Heathens, in accounting for ſuch paſſions as draw men away, in ſpight of the light of his mind, and the knowledge of his true intereſt (85). They always diſcovered ſomething divine in this, and commonly the puniſhment of ſome ſin antecedent to it. This ſhews they were not ſo ignorant as Mr. Eſprit ſuppoſes; but that they had ſome idea of what divines teach us, with regard to the loſs of free-will by means of ſin; and concerning the abandoned ſtate of thoſe who abuſe the favour of God.

(85) See remark [*Y*] of the article HELENA.

I could have cited, inſtead of Ovid, a great number of Writers who were profeſſed Philoſophers; but thought it would be much better to point out Mr. Eſprit's miſtake; for 'tis leſs excuſable not to be acquainted with the writings of ſuch a Poet, than not to have read the Greek Authors. I alſo would have collected a great number of teſtimonies of ſufficient credit to convince us, that the antients knew very well that the ſtate of mankind is ſtill a Chaos. But the ſtrongeſt deſcriptions of the Orators, Poets, or heathen Philoſophers, cannot exhibit to us ſo lively an idea of this, as that given by St. Paul. We therefore need but caſt an eye on the picture which this great Apoſtle, directed by eternal truth, preſents us with, in his epiſtle to the Romans. *That which I do, I allow not* (86); *for what I would, that I do not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I* CONSENT *unto the law, that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but ſin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me (that is, in my fleſh) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is preſent with me, but how to perform that which is good, I find not. For the good that I would, I do not: but the will which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but ſin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that when I would do good,* EVIL IS PRESENT *with me. For I delight in the law of God, after the inward man. But I ſee another law in my members, warring againſt the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of ſin, which is in my members. O wretched man that I am, who ſhall deliver me from the body of this death!*

(86) *Epiſtle to the Romans*, chap. 7. ver. 15 & *ſeq.*

Obſerve, that I have conſidered the Chaos with regard to man, only with regard to the inteſtine war, which every man feels individually in himſelf. Had I conſidered the diſſenſions, which reign between one nation and another, and even between neighbours, with all the hypocritical, fraudful and forcible things, *&c.* practis'd among them, I ſhould have a very extenſive, and moſt fruitful field to confirm what I propoſed to prove.

[*I*] *A man muſt ſhew a moſt depraved taſte, to imagine that a certain poem, entitled,* de Vetula, *was written by Ovid.*] 'Tis ſaid that this Poet, deſpairing to be recalled from his exile, wrote the book in queſtion, and ordered it to be buried with him (87). 'Tis added (88), that this poem having been found in a publick burying-ground, in the ſuburbs of the city of Dioſcuries, was carried to Conſtantinople by the King of Cholcis's order, and publiſhed by Leo, Prothonotary of the ſacred palace, and Secretary to the Emperor Vaſtaſius (89). 'Tis divided into three books; and is ſaid to have been entitled *De Vetula*, from the adventure related by the Author of the ſecond. He was diſtractedly fond of a young girl who was exquiſitely beautiful; and had prevailed, by gifts, with an old woman to aſſiſt him in his amours. This old woman had been the fair-one's nurſe; and after having repreſented ſeveral times the difficulties of the enterprize, ſhe at laſt had aſſured the ſpark, that at ſuch an hour, and in ſuch a place, he would find his miſtreſs in bed; but that he muſt ſtep into it very ſoftly and without a candle. Ovid, fired with the ſtrongeſt paſſion that ever man felt, ſtole into the bed in queſtion. But in all his Metamorphoſes, he had not wrote of any transformation ſo extraordinary as that he then found; for inſtead of finding that aſſemblage of charms, which his fancy was ſo filled with, he met with nothing but the deformities of old age, no one being in the bed but the old nurſe in queſtion. This inſpired him with the ſtrongeſt fury and rage. But we muſt hear the Poet.

(87) Leo Protonotarius, *in Præfatione Librorum* de Vetula.

(88) Gloſſator *ejuſdem Operis* de Vetula.

(89) Or John Ducas. He was Emperor from the year 1222, to 1255.

Heu mihi! tanta meis regnans dulcedo medullis
Quàm modicum manſit! Reperi contraria votis.
Vertitur in luctum cytharæ ſonus, inque ſtuporem
Deliciarum ſpes, moritur fax ignis amoris.
Si quid erat, quod epar, ventoſo turbine miſſo,
Fecerat arrectum, ſubitò languetque caditque:
Sopitur virtus, frigeſcunt omnia membra.
Credere quis poſſet, quod virgo, quattuor implens
Nuper olympiades, adeò citò conſenuiſſet?
Nunquam tam modico Roſa marcuit. In nova formas
Corpora mutatas cecini, mirabiliorque
Non reperitur ibi mutatio, quàm fuit iſta:
Scilicet, ut fuerit tam parvo tempore talis,
Taliter, in talem vetulam mutata puella!
Heu quàm diſſimiles ſunt, Virginis artubus, artus!
Accuſant Vetulam, membrorum turba ſenilis,
Collum nervoſum, ſcapularum cuſpis acuta,
Saxoſum pectus, laxatum pellibus uber,
Non uber, ſed tam vacuum, quàm molle, velut ſunt
Burſæ paſtorum: venter ſulcatus aratro,
Arentes clunes macredine, crudaque crura,
Inflatumque genu, vincens adamanta rigore.
Accuſant Vetulam membrorum marcida turba.
Concitus exurgo, cœpi firmare, quod illam
Appeterem ferro: ſed mens ad ſe revocavit
Virgineam famam, quæ ſcandala ne pateretur,
Continui; quamvis omnis ſpes ejus habendæ
Jam diſceſſiſſet. Sic dextra quievit, amorque
Extinctus, vivum potuit ſuperare dolorem (90).

(90) Ovid. *de Vetula*, lib. 2. cap. 30 & 31. p. m. 48.

The young Lady married, and after living twenty years with her, and having had a great number of lyings-in, which had made a ſtrange havock in her beauty, her huſband died (91). She then diſcovered a ſtrong deſire to become the wife of Ovid, who acquieſced

(91) *Poſtquam viginti circiter annos cum ſponſo fuerat, partuque effœta frequenti & ſua jam facies diſpendia parturiendi ſenſerat.* Idem, ibid. cap. 34. p. 50.

I will begin my ſupplement, with the illuſtration of what I ſaid in oppoſition to thoſe, who imagine that the cauſe of his exile was his having ſurprized Auguſtus in a moſt horrid inceſtuous commerce [K]; and will ſhew that their conjectures, with regard to Julia, daughter

quieſced with her wiſhes; but, in the whole, he did not find that what he had obtained was really a favour; the woman he had married being now an old woman. This made Ovid reſolve to change his way of life, and to devote himſelf to ſtudies of a ſolid kind.

This Poem, and another entitled *Brunellus Vigelli*, ſeu *Speculum ſtultorum*, were printed at Wolfembuttle in 1662. The Editor affirms in his Preface dated the 13th of December 1661, that the Poems in queſtion had been printed near two hundred years before in the city of Colen. Naudé did not know this firſt edition, he ſaying that this pretended Poem of Ovid *had been printed twice; firſt ſeparately, and without the printer's name or the place where printed, in* 1534; *and a ſecond time*, inter Ovidii erotica & amatoria opuſcula, *publiſhed at Francfort in* 1610, *with a pretty good Preface* (92). He obſerves (93), that Robert Holcot *quoted ſeveral verſes of* that work, *in his Commentary on the Book of Wiſdom, Lecture* 60 *of the old Venice Edition, Lecture* 61 *of that of Baſil* (94), without denying or affirming that Ovid was the true Author of it. *An ſit liber Ovidii, Deus novit, quamvis à Leone Protonotario Sacri Palatii Vaſtaſii Principis, referatur liber ille extractus de ſepulchro Ovidii, unde teſtamentum Ovidii nuncupatur; dicit enim quod inventus fuit in cœmiterio Publico, in quodam ſepulchro, in ſuburbano Dioſcori Civitatis, quæ eſt caput Regni Colchorum; & quia ibi non erat copia Latinorum, eo quod Armenici linguam Latinam non intelligunt, Rex Colchorum miſit illum librum Conſtantinopolim, ubi erat copia Latinorum. Refert etiam quod inter antiquorum ſepulchra unum inventum eſt, in quo epigramma fuit ſcriptum litteris Armenicis, cujus inſcriptio ſic ſonabat, Hic jacet Ovidius, ingenioſiſſimus Poëtarum, obiit autem anno Chriſti* XVIII. *ſicut refert Guillelmus de Euange in Chronico ſuo, tertio anno, unde conſtat quòd ſi veraciter liber ſuus erat, fuit pulcherrima prophetia de Chriſto*, i. e. "Heaven knows whether this Poem was really "writ by Ovid, though Leo, prothonotary of the "ſacred palace to the Emperor Vaſtaſius, relates, "that it was taken out of Ovid's tomb, whence it "is called Ovid's will. He ſays that it was found in "a publick burying place, in a certain ſepulchre, in "the ſuburbs of the city of Dioſcurias, the chief "city of the Kindom of Colchis. And as few peo"ple there underſtood Latin, the Armenians not un"derſtanding that language, the King of Colchis "ſent the book in queſtion to Conſtantinople, where "great numbers underſtood Latin. He likewiſe in"forms us, that, among the antient Sepulchres, one "was found, in which was an inſcription in Arme"nian characters, to the following effect. *Here lies* "*Ovid, a moſt ingenious Poet, who died the* 17*th year* "*of Chriſt*, as William de Evange relates, under the "third year of his Chronicle: whence it is manifeſt, "that if that book was really writ by him, it was a "moſt noble prophecy of Chriſt." A man who is no great ſcholar, might ſwear, without being thought raſh in any manner, that Ovid never wrote ſo barbarous a Poem as the above-mentioned; and that it was compoſed by a Chriſtian of the lower Empire.

(92) Naude, *Dialogue de Maſcurat*, p. 226.

(93) Ibid. p 225.

(94) Note that Naude cenſures Selden, who, in his treatiſe *de Diis Syris*, p. m. 31, quotes, for this, Holcot's *21ſt Lecture on the Book of Wiſdom.*

[K] *I will illuſtrate what I ſaid* (95), *in oppoſition to thoſe who imagine, that the cauſe of* Ovid's *exile was his having ſurpriſed Auguſtus in a moſt horrid, inceſtuous commerce.*] I have cited Father Briet, who ſays that ſome perſons imagine, that Ovid catched Auguſtus and his daughter Julia in the amorous congreſs; and I did not refute this, as I now do, by a demonſtrative argument, *viz.* that when our Poet was diſgraced, Julia had been ſeveral years out of Rome, as well as become the object of her father's indignation (96). Inſtead of alledging this demonſtrative argument, I only objected a probable circumſtance to that opinion, *viz.* that it is no ways likely that, had Ovid been baniſhed for the cauſe ſuppoſed by them, he would have ſo often declared, that his diſgrace was owing to ſomething he had ſeen. Nothing would have been more likely to heighten Auguſtus's affliction; whereas our Poet employed all the turns of wit he was maſter of, to ſooth and ſoften him. But this objection, how ſpecious ſoever, is not unanſwerable; for it cannot be denied but that the object which Ovid had ſeen concerned Auguſtus ſo far, that the recalling it to his memory, muſt neceſſarily revive his grief, and make his wounds bleed afreſh. Ovid himſelf confeſſes this in the following lines addreſſed to the Emperor.

(95) In the remark [B].

(96) See the remark of the article JULIA, daughter of Auguſtus.

Perdiderint cum me duo crimina, carmen & error,
Alterius facti culpa ſilenda mihi.
Nam non ſum tanti, ut RENOVEM TUA VULNERA, *Cæſar,*
Quem nimio plus eſt INDOLUISSE *ſemel* (97).

(97) Ovid. *Triſt.* lib. 2. ver. 207.

The Senſe is,

"My verſe and my imprudence prov'd my ruin.
"Another's heavy guilt I muſt conceal:
"Myſelf too worthleſs to recal your woes;
"For oh! to grieve you once, is once too much."

He here gives two cauſes for the ruin of his fortune; the one for having writ verſes in an amorous ſtrain; and the other, for having been accidentally a ſpectator of certain things. He juſtifies himſelf as well as he can, and is very particular with reſpect to the former (98); but he is ſilent on the latter, for fear of reviving Auguſtus's ſorrow. He therefore was ſenſible, that the revival of this remembrance of this incident grieved and exaſperated him, and yet he mentioned it on all occaſions in his Poems: he therefore was not ſo prudent as I ſuppoſed him to be; and conſequently I employed an argument which proves too much, it proving that he avoided to recal ſorrowful ideas, and it is certain that he did not avoid this.

(98) Idem, ibid.

This objection is ſtronger againſt Aldus Manutius than againſt me; for the reaſon I employed affects thoſe, only who are of opinion that Ovid catched Auguſtus either with his daughter or grand-daughter; but Aldus Manutius employs it, in general, againſt thoſe who conjecture, that this Emperor was catched in an indecent action. *Ubique exilii cauſſam tum libros de Arte, tum errorem fuiſſe commemorat* (Ovidius): *quis verò ille error fuerit, nunquam aperuit, ne magis Auguſtus ſibi iraſceretur, verùm quia, ut ipſa ait,*

Nitimur in vetitum ſemper, cupimuſque negata;

quidnam id fuerit, plurimi ſcire conati ſunt, & conatur ſemper aliquis; quapropter ſuſpicati ſunt quidam turpe aliquod Auguſti ſecretum caſu vidiſſe Ovidium, quod non placet, quia toties objiciendo ſcelus, immitiorem reddidiſſet Cæſarem, quem lenire & placare ſtudebat (99), i. e. "Ovid aſſigns, in every part of his writings, two "cauſes for his being ſent into baniſhment, *viz.* his "Book on the Art of Love, and ſome fault com"mitted through inadvertency; what this inadver"tent fault was, never before appeared, for fear of "exaſperating Auguſtus ſtill more. But, as he him"ſelf obſerves,

(99) Aldus Manutius, *in Vita Ovidii, apud* Ciofan. *Obſervat. in Ovid.* p. m. 20.

"We even fly to things forbid, and covet
"What is denied.

"Many have endeavoured (and ever will) to diſcover "it. Hence ſome have ſuſpected, that Ovid had "accidentally been an eye-witneſs to ſome indecent "action in Auguſtus; but this is not likely; ſince, "by ſo often ſpeaking of Cæſar's crime, he muſt "naturally have diſpleaſed him the more; whereas "he did all that lay in his power to ſooth and ap"peaſe." I might be in the right, though this Aldus Manutius were in the wrong. Ovid might have recalled to the memory of Auguſtus, ſome indecent action, without our allowing a poſſibility of its being inferred from thence, that he was ſo imprudent as to revive the idea of a horrid inceſt. This remembrance muſt be infinitely more likely to vex and exaſperate, than would be the recalling a mere intrigue, in which he might have been catched with a magiſ-

daughter to that Emperor, are falſe; and that, with reſpect to Julia his grand-daughter, they are highly improbable. I ſtill perſiſt in thinking, that the love-verſes were not ſo much the true cauſe of Ovid's baniſhment, as the pretence for it; and of this I can give a good proof, viz. that his books concerning *The Art of loving*, were chiefly complained againſt, and they had been made public many years at the time of his baniſhment; he compoſing them about the year of Rome 752 (*e*), and being ſent into exile

(*e*) He ſays, lib. 1. *Art. Amat.* ver. 171, that the the ſpectacle of the ſea-fight had been lately given, and that young Cæſar was preparing for his expedition into the eaſt. Now this correſponds with the year 752.

trate's wife or daughter; and yet Auguſtus might have been diſpleaſed at ſuch a diſcovery, and been exaſperated at Ovid in the manner we find it related. As the Emperor in queſtion was ſeventy years of age, this circumſtance, with many others that might be ſuppoſed, might naturally prompt him to be offended at a man who had been a ſpectator of this Love-myſtery. Ciofanius paid no regard to the reflection of Aldus Manutius; but, on the contrary, declared for the opinion I juſt now eſpouſed. *Ejus exilii, ſive potius relegationis cauſam longè veriorem eam eſſe puto, viſum à ſe fortè fortuna Auguſtum Cæſarem in re quadam turpi atque obſcæna. Teſtatur enim Ariſtot. lib.* 11. *De Arte dicendi, nullum eſſe tam magnum, tamque vehemens odium, quàm illud. quod ex eo naſcitur, cum quis in ejuſmodi re turpi deprehenditur* (100), i. e. "In my opinion, it is much more probable that he "was diſgraced, or rather ſent into baniſhment, on "account of his having accidentally ſeen Auguſtus "Cæſar in ſome ſhameful indecent action. For we "are told by Ariſtotle, in the ſecond Chapter of "his Rhetoric, that no hatred is ſo violent, as that "which ariſes from the being catched in an immo-"deſt action." Obſerve that neither of theſe two Authors make the leaſt inſinuation of an inceſtuous commerce; and remember, that if the argument I employed is liable to objection, it muſt nevertheleſs be owned, that the conjecture of the inceſt is neceſſarily falſe with regard to Julia, Auguſtus's daughter, ſhe having been ſent into baniſhment long before Ovid had offended that Emperor; and take notice that he was already forbid the Court when he wrote his book *De Arte Amandi*; and that there was an interval of eight or nine years, between his compoſing thoſe books and his being ſent into baniſhment. This refutes Abbot de Marolles, who affirmed that one of the two reaſons of Ovid's diſgrace was, for *his having mentioned, in his Art of Love, a particular which had diſpleaſed the Emperor, where he ſpeaks of his daughter under the name of* Corinna (101). See above (102) the arguments of Aldus Manutius, in oppoſition to thoſe who declare that the Corinna in queſtion was Auguſtus's daughter (103).

Let us examine the conjectures with reſpect to Julia the grand-daughter. They cannot be inforced from the paſſage of Suetonius (104); for if any ſtreſs were to be laid on Caligula's extravagance, this could only affect Julia the daughter of Auguſtus; and obſerve, that Suetonius, in relating this extravagance, does not ſay any thing that ſeems to hint, that reports had been ſpread concerning Auguſtus's falling in love with his daughter or grand-daughter. Here he, nevertheleſs, had a very fair opportunity of juſt mentioning this; but ſince Seutonius has not ſaid any thing about it (105), either in this place, or when he ſpoke of Auguſtus's leudneſs, and of his behaviour with regard to the two Julias, it is an indication that there was not any tradition with regard to the inceſt in queſtion; for had there been any, the hiſtorian in queſtion would not have been ignorant of it, and would certainly have mentioned it. His caſt of mind prompted him to diſcover ſuch anecdotes, and inſert them boldly in his book, of which a thouſand inſtances might be given. But be this as it will, chronology does not give me ſo much aſſiſtance here, as againſt the other conjectures; for Ovid, and Julia grand-daughter of Auguſtus, were baniſhed the Court much about the ſame time.

This Julia died the year of Rome 781, after an exile of twenty years. *Per idem tempus Julia mortem obiit quam neptem Auguſtus convictam adulterii damnaverat projeceratque in inſulam Trimetum . . . . illic viginti annis exilium toleravit* (106). She therefore was baniſhed in 761. Ovid was fifty years old when baniſhed (107), and conſequently this was in 761, he being born *anno* 711 (108). He obſerves, in an epiſtle wherein he mentions Auguſtus's death, that he had then lived ſix years among the Getæ (109), which confirms my aſſertion, ſince it is certain that Auguſtus died in 767. Now as we don't know the day when our Poet's diſgrace began, though we know that he croſſed the Adriatic in December, to go into the country of the Getæ (110); and as we are equally ignorant of the day and month in which Julia incurred her grandfather's indignation; we cannot refute, from chronological arguments, thoſe who ſhould aſſert, that theſe two perſons were ſent into exile, becauſe of the anger with which Auguſtus was fired, to find his inceſtuous commerce was diſcovered. Ovid, who had been a ſpectator of this, grew odious; and, on the other hand, Julia herſelf became odious alſo; the Emperor being determined to rid himſelf of two objects, which might revive the ignominy of this diſcovery. Accordingly they were both baniſhed from Rome; and to have the better handle for doing this, Julia was convicted of defiling the nuptial bed (111); and Ovid was charged with publiſhing verſes of a ſcandalous nature. Theſe are circumſtances, that perhaps might be refuted in an unanſwerable manner, did we know the exact dates; but till this, we ſhall not be able to refute them by chronological arguments. Scaliger would be of great ſervice on this occaſion (112), had he not miſtook, when he ſuppoſes that Ovid was full fifty two years old at his leaving Rome. This would prove that he was not baniſhed till about the end of March 763.

However, if we were at a loſs for arguments drawn from chronology, there are others, which we may oppoſe to the conjecture with regard to the inceſtuous commerce between this Emperor and his grand-daughter.

I. I ſhall draw the firſt from the ſilence of Suetonius (113.)

II. Secondly, from Ovid's declaring perpetually, that one of the cauſes of his misfortunes was his having inadvertently been a ſpectator of I know not what. He does not deny, but that he was ſenſible that his being a ſpectator on this occaſion had exaſperated the Emperor, and that the bare mention of it made his wound bleed afreſh; but ſince, notwithſtanding this, he mentions it ſo often, we muſt naturally ſuppoſe that the thing he ſaw was not highly infamous, nor of ſuch a nature as to draw down on Auguſtus the curſes of the Romans, who had the utmoſt love, reſpect, and veneration for him. Ovid had too much ſenſe and judgment, not to be ſenſible that, with regard to ſuch a ſecret as this, thoſe who have the misfortune to be privy to it, cannot act more prudently than to endeavour to have it believed, that they have entirely obliterated the remembrance of it. The moſt general and indeterminate expreſſions that could be employed, would always ſeem a little too ſignificative to the Monarch concerned in the affair hinted at; and might make him afraid, that after a writer had ſo often hinted in general, that his misfortunes were owing to his having ſeen certain things which he did not dare to reveal, he at laſt would blab the ſecret. Such a fear may prompt a Monarch to make away with thoſe perſons, who are acquainted with the ſecret. It is not neceſſary that a man ſhould be endued with great penetration to form ſuch reflections, and to draw from them a leſſon of ſilence. But if the ſecret a man had been a ſpectator of was of ſuch a nature, that it might be made publick, without throwing a ſhade over the Monarch's reputation; if it was a particular he was deſirous of concealing, either from caprice, or from ſome reaſon of ſtate, and not on account of its being infamous; a man, I ſay, on ſuch an occaſion, is not ſo cautious; and will not ſcruple to complain, in general, that his misfortunes are owing to his having ſeen ſomething, which he is afraid of telling.

He

(100) Ciofanius, *in Vita Ovidii, ubi ſupra*, p. 27.

(101) Abbé de Marolles, in his life of Ovid, prefixed to the French tranſlation of the poem againſt *Ibis*, p. 4.

(102) Rem. [*E*], num. 7.

(103) This was alſo affirmed in a book printed anno 1697. *Soli Imp. Aug. invi-ſius* (Ovidius) *qui de ſollicitata ſub Corrinnæ nomine Julia ſua ſuſpectum Tomos in exilium miſit.* Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Latina*, p. 35, 36.

(104) Which I cited in the remark [*B*].

(105) This will be my firſt reaſon hereafter.

(106) *Tacit. Ann.* lib. 4 cap. 71.

(107) Ovid. *Triſt.* lib. 4. eleg. *ult.* But obſerve that he erroneouſly aſcribes five years to each Olympiad.

(108) Idem, ibid.

(109) Idem, *de Ponto*, l.b. 4. epiſt. 13.

(110) Idem, *Triſt.* lib. 1. eleg. 10.

(111) *Tacit. Ann.* lib. 4. cap. 71.

(112) Scalig. *Animadv. in Euſeb.* p. m. 182. See father Noris, *Cenotaph. Piſana*, p. 202.

(113) To know the ſtrength of this, ſee citat. 105, above.

exile about 671 (*f*): accordingly it has been obſerved, that the puniſhment was inflicted a

(*f*) See remark [*K*] citat. (108).

He is ſenſible that the Prince is very ſure, that let what will happen, his glory cannot ſuffer by the indiſcretion of ſuch a perſon as we are now ſpeaking of.

III. My third reaſon is taken from Ovid's inſinuating, that he would ſpeak out, and juſtify himſelf, did not his ſtation of life appear ſo inconſiderable, as not to merit his reviving the Emperor's affliction.

Alerius facti culpa ſilenda mihi.
NAM NON SUM TANTI, *ut renovem tua vulnera, Cæſar,*
Quem nimio plus eſt indoluiſſe ſemel (114).

(114) Ovid. *Triſt.* lib. 2. ver. 208.

The ſenſe is,

" Another's heavy guilt I muſt conceal;
" My ſelf too worthleſs to recal your woes,
" For Oh! to grieve you once, is once too much.

Now would Ovid have expreſſed himſelf in this manner, had he hinted at an inceſtuous commerce, and his catching Julia with her grandfather, who was ſeventy years of age? Is this a circumſtance that might be revealed in certain caſes, I mean by a perſon who might fancy himſelf to be of conſequence? Is not this a crime of ſuch a nature, as ought abſolutely and unreſervedly to be buried in eternal oblivion?

IV. My fourth argument is drawn from Auguſtus's not getting Ovid inſtantly and ſecretly diſpatched, which he might very eaſily have done. Could he poſſibly have enjoy'd eaſe of mind, had he certainly have known that, with regard to ſo horrid a ſecret, as that in queſtion, he was at the mercy of an amorous, ſparkiſh Poet? Had he not endeavoured to put it out of his power to be indiſcreet, by putting him to death, he at leaſt would have tried to win him over to his intereſt by liberality. Now Auguſtus did not take either of theſe courſes; he baniſhed him to Tomos, and there left him a prey to complaints and ſighs; without once fearing that the inclemency of the climate he was in, and the deſpair of his ever being delivered from it, would at laſt extort the ſecret from him. Let it not be objected, that the Emperor ſoftned the decree of baniſhment with ſome circumſtances of indulgence; and that this ſhew'd he was tender of Ovid, to keep him from telling tales. Such a reflection would not be juſt; for tho' he permitted our Poet to enjoy his Poſſeſſions; did not ſentence him by a decree of the Senate, and employed the word *relegatus*, which was leſs harſh than that of *exulatus*, he nevertheleſs puniſhed him in a very ſevere manner.

Cujus in eventu pœnæ clementia tanta eſt,
Ut fuerit noſtro lenior ira metu.
Vita data eſt, citraque necem tua conſtitit ira,
O princeps parce viribus uſe tuis.
Inſuper accedunt, te non adimente, paternæ,
Tanquam vita parum muneris eſſet, opes.
Nec mea decreto damnaſti facta Senatus,
Nec mea ſelecto judice juſſa fuga eſt.
Triſtibus invectus verbis (ita principe dignum)
Ultus es offenſas, ut decet, ipſe tuas.
Adde quod edictum quamvis immite, minaxque,
Attamen in pœnæ nomine lene fuit.
Quippe relegatus, non exſul dicor in illo:
Parcaque fortunæ ſunt ibi verba meæ (115).

(115) Ovid. *Triſt.* lib. 2. ver. 125. See alſo *Triſt.* lib. 5. eleg. 9. & *de Ponto*, lib. 1. epiſt. 7.

The ſenſe is,

" So mild your puniſhment for all my crimes,
" Your anger was far lighter than my fears.
" To your auſpicious ſmile I owe my life;
" O Prince, with mildneſs you your power employ.
" My patrimony, too, you let enjoy,
" As tho' beſtowing life was no great boon.
" Nor did th' aſſembled Senate ſign my doom;
" Nor ſolemn Judge to baniſhment condemn.
" You in a ſpeech of juſt ſeverity
" Reveng'd the injury as became a Prince.
" Farther, tho' the decree was too too harſh,
" Yet, gentle words my puniſhment declar'd.
" Since, relegation, and not exile's us'd;
" And in ſoft words my wayward fate's expreſt.

He baniſhed Ovid to a country which was a kind of hell to that unhappy man (116.) Can any thing be more deplorable than the condition he was in, at his leaving Rome (117)?

(116) Read the Poems which Ovid wrote during his exile.

Some perhaps may think it a ſtronger objection, to ſay, that ſince Auguſtus was unmov'd at all the pathetic adulating ſupplications which Ovid cauſed to be preſented to him; his anger muſt neceſſarily have been grounded on the ſhame of his having been catched in ſome very obſcene action. To this I anſwer: Firſt, that it is pretended Auguſtus was at laſt wrought upon; and that he would have re-called Ovid from his baniſhment, had he not been ſnatched away by death.

(117) See Ovid. *de Triſt.* lib. 1. eleg. 3.

Cæperat Auguſtus deceptæ ignoſcere culpæ,
Spem noſtram terras deſeruitque ſimul (118).

(118) Ovid. *de Ponto*, lib. 4. epiſt. 6. ver. 15.

The ſenſe is,

" Auguſtus now felt pity for my fault,
" When he was ſnatch'd from earth and from my hopes."

Secondly: That as the Emperor declared, that one of the reaſons why he baniſhed this Poet was, the ſcandalous verſes he had written, he found his account in not recalling him. He hereby made a merit with regard to the Senate, and with all perſons of a grave character, and zealous for the reformation of manners. He would have overlooked this conſideration, had he wanted Ovid either for the cabinet, or the head of his troops: but having no occaſion for him on thoſe accounts, he was very glad to ſhew, that he would not treat thoſe who corrupted the morals of the people with the leaſt indulgence. I know not whether Tiberius, who let Ovid die in baniſhment, had not the ſame political views. The Poet did not neglect to make his court after Auguſtus's death; he invoked the new God (119), and endeavoured to make the moſt of the worſhip he paid the new Emperor.

(119) See remark [*M*] citation (125).

It would be very difficult to ſatisfy thoſe who ſhould deſire to know the reaſon wherefore Auguſtus was ſo highly exaſperated againſt Ovid, that he ſought for ſevere terms, in order to expreſs, in the decree of baniſhment, his indignation, and reſentment for the offence he imagined had been done him.

Triſtibus invectus verbis (ita principe dignum)
Ultus es offenſas, ut decet, ipſe tuas (120).

(120) Idem, *Triſt.* lib. 2. ver. 133.

The ſenſe is,

" You in a ſpeech of juſt ſeverity
" Reveng'd the injury as became a Prince."

But it would not be difficult to ſuppoſe incidents, without including any diſcovery of an inceſtuous commerce, or even a ſcene of mere gallantry, which might exaſperate him highly againſt the unexpected ſpectator. Suppoſe that, Auguſtus having diſcovered a diſagreeable intrigue in his family, had retired to ſome ſolitary apartment to grieve and weep in ſecret; or to queſtion his grand-daughter, to chide, threaten, or even correct her, if it were neceſſary. Suppoſe that having taken a female confident apart, he was endeavouring to extort the truth from her either by threats or blows. Suppoſe that one of his free men or ſlaves had been under the ſame circumſtances; or even that Auguſtus would have had been put to the torture ſecretly; we here have three or four caſes, in which Ovid might have catched the Emperor, without exaſperating him in the higheſt degree. Was it poſſible for a Monarch, who had long attained the moſt exalted pitch of human grandeur, not to be extremely delicate or capricious on the article of injuries?

a long courſe of years after the commiſſion of the crime [*L*], and that he paid for the ſins of his youth in his old age: but this aſſertion does not ſuit exactly with the *Art of Loving*, he writing theſe pieces at the age of forty one. He was in the fifty firſt year of his age (*g*) when he ſet out from Rome to go to Tomos whither he was ſent away. Auguſtus employed that expreſſion in his ſentence, and not the words exile or baniſhment; this regard was accompanied by another which was more real, ſince Ovid was permitted to continue in the enjoyment of his eſtate (*h*). Although he could not prevail ſo far as to get himſelf recalled, nor the place of his baniſhment changed (*i*), he yet had always the higheſt regard for the Emperor, and continued invariably in applauding him to ſuch an exceſs as amounted almoſt to idolatry; and he even idolized him literally when advice was brought him of the Emperor's death. He not only wrote a Poem in his praiſe in the language of the Getæ, but he likewiſe invoked him, and conſecrated to him a chapel, in which he offered him incenſe, and paid him worſhip every morning [*M*]. This Prince's ſucceſſor and family ſhared in all this worſhip, and probably were the real cauſe of

(g) See the ſame remark, citation (107).

(h) See the proof of all this in the ſame remark, citation (115.)

(i) He at laſt requeſted no other favour. See book 1. *de Ponto*, epiſt. 2. and book 2. *de Triſt.* towards the end.

injuries? If there were occaſions in which the leaſt want of reſpect might diſpleaſe him, this doubtleſs was when any perſon preſumed to pry into his family concerns, and really diſcovered what he wiſhed to conceal. Anger, on ſuch an occaſion, would not permit him to diſtinguiſh, whether chance, or deſign, and a bold and ambitious curioſity had cauſed the diſcovery:

(121) Juvenal, 3. ver. 113.

Scire volunt ſecreta domus atque inde timeri (121).

The ſenſe is,

"Your family concerns they'd fain diſcover;
"In hopes thereby to gain an empire o'er you."

He was too much offended at the unlucky diſcovery in queſtion, not to look upon it as an offence that deſerved puniſhment.

By the way, our modern authors are not the only ones who declare, that Ovid ruined his fortune, by his having been the ſpectator of an inceſtuous commerce; Cœlius Rhodiginus has quoted ſome fragments of one Cæcilius Minutianus Apuleius, in which this circumſtance is mentioned. *Pulſum quoque in exilium* (Ovidium) *quod Auguſti inceſtum vidiſſet* (122), i. e. "Ovid was ſent into baniſhment, for having been "the ſpectator of Auguſtus's inceſtuous commerce."

(122) Cæl. Rhodigin. *Antq. Lect.* lib. 13. cap. 1. p. m. 659.

[*L*] *It has been obſerved, that the puniſhment was inflicted very long after the commiſſion of the crime.*] Here follows the manner, in which he deſcribes the long time he had been permitted to go unpuniſhed, in an addreſs to Auguſtus himſelf; and after having given a long catalogue of authors of laſcivious books, who had not been puniſhed.

Nos quoque jam pridem ſcripto peccavimus iſto,
Supplicium patitur non nova culpa novum.
Carminaque edideram, cum te delicta notantem
Præterii toties irrequietus eques.
Ergo quæ juveni mihi non nocitura putavi
Scripta parum prudens, nunc nocuere ſeni.
Sera redundavit veteris vindicta libelli,
Diſtat & à meriti tempore pœna ſui (123).

(123) Ovid. *Triſt.* lib. 2. ver. 539.

The ſenſe is,

"Long ſince by melting, amorous verſe, I ſinn'd;
"The puniſhment is new, though old the crime.
"I publiſh'd verſes (when a Roman Knight)
"Which you diſprov'd, and yet I ſcribbled on.
"Thoſe bold looſe lines I wrote in blooming youth,
"And wrote uninjur'd, hurt me now I'm old.
"I'm puniſh'd now, for works I've wrote long ſince,
"And the chaſtiſement follow'd at a diſtance
"The crime, which I committed."

[*The cauſe of Ovid's baniſhment is unknown; becauſe he was himſelf unwilling further to provok the Emperor, by aſcribing it to any other reaſon, than what was pretended by Auguſtus, which was the laſciviouſneſs of his Elogies, and his Art of Love. 'Tis true, they are not to be excuſed in the ſeverity of manners, as being able to corrupt a larger Empire, if there were any, than that of Rome; yet this may be ſaid in behalf of Ovid, that no man has ever treated the paſſion of love with ſo much delicacy of thought and of expreſſion, or ſearched into the nature of it more philoſophically than he. And the Emperor who condemned him, had as little reaſon as another man to puniſh that fault with ſo much ſeverity. . . . . There is another gueſs of the Grammarians, as far from truth as the firſt from reaſon; they will have him baniſhed for ſome favours, which they ſay he received from Julia the daughter of Auguſtus, whom they think he celebrates under the name of Corinna in his Elegies: but he who will obſerve the verſes, which are made to that Miſtreſs, may gather from the whole contexture of them, that Corinna was not a woman of the higheſt quality: if Julia were then married to Agrippa, why ſhould our Poet make his petition to Iſis, for her ſafe delivery, and afterwards condole her miſcarriage; which, for ought he knew, might be by her own huſband? Or indeed how durſt he be ſo bold to make the leaſt diſcovery of ſuch a crime, which was no leſs than capital, eſpecially as committed againſt a perſon of Agrippa's rank? Or if it were before her marriage, he would ſure have been more diſcreet, than to have publiſhed an accident, which muſt have been fatal to them both. But what moſt confirms me againſt this opinion is, that Ovid himſelf complains that the true perſon of Corinna was found out by the fame of his verſes to her: which, if it had been Julia, he durſt not have owned; and beſide, an immediate puniſhment muſt have followed. He ſeems himſelf more truly to have touched at the cauſe of his exile in thoſe obſcure verſes;*

Cur aliquid vidi, cur noxia lumina feci? &c.

Namely, That he had either ſeen, or was conſcious to, ſomewhat, which had procured him his diſgrace. But neither am I ſatisfied that this was the inceſt of the Emperor with his own daughter: for Auguſtus was of a nature too vindictive to have contented himſelf with ſo ſmall a revenge, or ſo unſafe to himſelf, as that of ſimple baniſhment; but would certainly have ſecured his crimes from publick notice, by the death of him who was witneſs to them. Neither have hiſtories given us any ſight into ſuch an action of this Emperor: Nor would he (the greateſt politician of his time) in all probability, have managed his crimes with ſo little ſecrecy, as not to ſhun the obſervation of any man. It ſeems more probable, that Ovid was either the confident of ſome other paſſion, or that he had ſtumbled by ſome inadvertency upon the privacies of Livia, and ſeen her in a bath; for theſe words,

Sine veſte Dianam,

agree better with Livia, who had the fame of chaſtity, than with either of the Julias, who were both noted for continency. The firſt verſes which were made by him in his youth, and recited publickly, acccording to the cuſtom, were, as he himſelf aſſures us, to Corinna: his baniſhment happened not till the age of fifty, from which it may be deduced, with probability enough, that the love of Corinna did not occaſion it: nay, he tells us plainly, that his offence was that of error only, not of wickedneſs: and in the ſame paper of verſes alſo, that the cauſe was notoriouſly known at Rome, though it be left ſo obſcure to after-ages *. Addit. by the Tranſl.]

* Dryden's preface to the tranſlation of Ovid's *Epiſtles*. London 1736, 12mo.

[*M*] *He not only wrote a Poem in* Auguſtus's *praiſe, in the language of the Getæ, but he likewiſe invoked him, and conſecrated to him a chapel, in which he offered him incenſe, and paid him worſhip every morning.*] Here follows what he wrote to his friend Carus.

Nec

of it (*k*) ; yet this was of no ſervice to Ovid, the Court being as inexorable under Tiberius as before, ſo that he died in baniſhment in the fourth year of that Emperor's reign, or the year of Rome 771, being about threeſcore years of age [*N*]. He had writ his Metamorphoſes before his misfortunes ; but when he ſaw himſelf condemned to baniſhment,

(*k*) See the remark [*M*].

Nec te mirari, ſi ſunt vitioſa, decebit
Carmina, quæ faciam pæne pœta Getes.
Ah pudet, & Getico ſcripſi ſermone libellum,
Structaque ſunt noſtris barbara verba modis.
Et placui (gratare mihi) cœpique pœtæ
Inter inhumanos nomen habere Getas.
Materiam quæris ? laudes de Cæſare dixi.
Adjuta eſt novitas numine noſtra Dei.
Nam patris Auguſti docui mortale fuiſſe
Corpus ; in ætherias numen abiſſe domos (124).

(124) Ovid. *de Ponto*, lib. 4. epiſt. 13. ver. 17.

The ſenſe is,

" Since I am almoſt grown a Getic Poet,
" You muſt not wonder if my verſe is rude.
" I bluſh to own that I've a book compos'd
" In this harſh language ; that I tun'd my lyre
" To barbarous ſounds, which ſhock a Roman ear.
" My verſe yet pleas'd, and ev'n the barbarous Getæ
" Gave high encomiums, and the name of Poet.
" You aſk the ſubject ? 'Twas fam'd Cæſar's praiſe ;
" His mighty Godhead aiding the new lays.
" I taught that Rome's great ſire, indeed, was mortal,
" But that his ſoul to heavenly regions flew.

He deſcribes, in another Epiſtle, his devotion to Auguſtus, and employs the following words (125) :

(125) Idem, ibid. epiſt. 9. *ad Græcinum*, ver. 105.

Nec pietas ignota mea eſt : videt hoſpita terra
In noſtra ſacrum Cæſaris eſſe domo.
Stant pariter natuſque pius, conjuxque ſacerdos,
Numina jam facto non leviora Deo.
Neu deſit pars ulla domus ; ſtat uterque nepotum :
Hic aviæ lateri proximus, ille patris.
His ego do toties cum thure precantia verba,
Eoo quoties ſurgit ab orbe dies.
Tota, licet quæras, hoc me non fingere dicet,
Officii teſtis Pontica terra mei.
Pontica me tellus quantis hac poſſumus ora,
Natalem ludis ſcit celebrare Dei.
Nec minus hoſpitibus pietas eſt cognita talis,
Miſit in has ſi quos longa Propontis aquas.
Is quoque, quo levior fuerat ſub Præſide Pontus,
Audierit frater (126) *forſitan iſta tuus,*
Fortuna eſt impar animo, talique libenter
Exiguas carpo munere pauper opes.
Nec veſtris damus hæc oculis, procul urbe remoti :
Contenti tacita ſed pietate ſumus.
Et tamen hæc tangent aliquando Cæſaris aures.
Nil illum toto quod ſit in orbe latet.
Tu certe ſcis hæc ſuperis adſcite, videſque
Cæſar, & eſt oculis ſubdita terra tuis.
Tu noſtras audis inter convexa locatus
Sidera, ſollicito quas damus ore preces.
Pervenient iſluc & carmina forſitan illa,
Quæ de te miſi cælite facta novo.
Auguror his igitur flecti tua numina, nec tu
Immerito nomen mite parentis habes.

(126) That is, Lucius Pomponius Flaccus, who was Conſul the year of Rome 770. See Ovid. *de Ponto*, lib. 4. epiſt. 9. ver. 60.

The Senſe is,

" My piety is known, this foreign land
" Sees Cæſar's temple here, beneath my roof.
" Alſo his pious ſon, his ſacred conſort,
" Claim equal homage and devotion from me,
" To fill my noble choir, I add his grandſons ;
" One next his grandmother, and one his father.
" To theſe I offer, each returning morn,
" The tribute due of incenſe and of prayer.
" All Pontus is a witneſs to the truth
" Of theſe aſſertions, and will vouch for Ovid.
" Pontus well knows her ſtores, I all collect,
" To ſolemnize his natal day, with games.
" Nor is my piety leſs known to thoſe
" Who thither come from long Propontis' ſhores.
" Theſe things, perhaps, have reach'd your brother's ear ;
" He, who rules Pontus with ſo mild a ſway.
" Fortune's unequal to my tow'ring mind,
" But what I offer is ſincere, though little.
" All theſe I dedicate remote from Rome,
" Content to pay my ſacred vows in ſilence.
" And yet at laſt they'll come to Cæſar's ear ;
" Nought, in the univerſe, from him's conceal'd.
" Cæſar, theſe things are ſurely known to thee ;
" Thou, whoſe far-ſeeing eyes ſurvey'ſt the world.
" High ſeated mid the ſtars, with Gods ſurrounded,
" With kind regard thou hear'ſt our humble prayers.
" Perhaps the heavenly bands will hear this verſe,
" Which on thy Apotheſis I've made.
" I fondly hope that theſe will move thy Godhead,
" And that thou'lt prove, to me, a gentle Parent."

We here find, that he hopes his prayers and praiſes will reach the ear of Cæſar deified, and that they will meet with a reward ; but we alſo find that he extends his worſhip to the living, and flatters himſelf with the hopes that Tiberius will know it. This was his chief aim ; and to this were owing thoſe artful turns, which are obſerved in that paſſage where he ſpeaks of his Getic verſes. He feigns that one of the Getæ, who heard them repeated, was of opinion that the elogiums of Tiberius, with which the verſes in queſtion are interſperſed, would procure the Author's return from baniſhment.

Eſſe parem virtute patri, qui fræna rogatus
Sæpe recuſati ceperit imperii.
Eſſe pudicarum te Veſtam, Livia, matrum,
Ambiguum nato dignior, anne viro.
Eſſe duos juvenes firma adjumenta parentis,
Qui dederint animi pignora certe ſui.
Hæc ubi non patria perlegi ſcripta Camæna,
Venit & ad digitos ultima charta meos ;
Et caput & plenas omnes movere pharetras,
Et longum Getico murmur in ore fuit,
Atque aliquis, Scribas hæc cum de Cæſare, dixit,
Cæſaris imperio reſtituendus eras.
Ille quidem dixit, ſed me jam, Care, nivali
Sexta relegatum bruma ſub axe videt.
Carmina nil profunt (127).

(127) Idem, ibid. epiſt. 13. ver. 27.

The Senſe is,

" His virtues emulate thoſe of his father,
" Who often call'd to empire, oft' declin'd it.
" Livia's a ſhining pattern to all matrons,
" Worthy of ſuch a ſon, of ſuch a huſband.
" His two deſcendants well ſupport his name,
" And give great tokens of their future worth.----
" Whilſt theſe I read, writ in a foreign tongue,
" And my laſt letters bring ungrateful news ;
" The circling natives ſhake their heads and quivers,
" And Getic murmurs echo all around.
" Even ſome one ſaid ; *Since thus you Cæſar praiſe,*
" *He ſurely will reſtore you to his favour.*
" Ah no ! dear friend, for ſix dark freezing winters
" Have o'er ſad Ovid ſhed their baleful influence.
" Verſe nought avails.——"

[*N*] *He died . . . . under Tiberius . . . . being about threeſcore years of age.*] This is the date we meet with in Euſebius's chronicle, with Scaliger's approbation (128). Since therefore Ovid was ſent into baniſhment, at a little more than fifty years of age, anno Romæ 761 (129), he muſt have died at about ſixty, and have been about nine or ten years in baniſhment, in caſe he lived till the fourth year of Tiberius's reign ; for this fourth year anſwers to the year of Rome 771 ; and it is to be obſerved, that ſome ſay Ovid

(128) Scalig. *in* Euſeb. p. 182, ad num. 2033.

(129) See remark [*K*], citation 108.

ment, he threw them into the fire, either out of indignation, or becauſe he had not finiſhed them [O]. Some copies which had before been taken of it prevented poſterity from being deprived of that noble compoſition (l). He deſired, in caſe he ſhould die among the Getæ, to have his aſhes carried to Rome, and the epitaph he wrote for himſelf

(l) *Lactant. Inſt. Divin.* lib. 1. cap. 5. p. m. 13, calls it *præclarum opus.*

Ovid died the firſt of January (130). Aldus Manutius (131) ſuppoſes that he was ſent into baniſhment about the 52d year of Auguſtus; that he died the 5th year of Tiberius, and conſequently that his exile laſted eight years and ſome months. But this calculation is not exact. Auguſtus died in the fifty-eighth year of his reign; and therefore he muſt have lived above five years after Ovid's diſgrace, in caſe that happened about the 52d year of his reign. As therefore our Poet, according to Aldus Manutius, lived till the fifth year of Tiberius, it follows that his exile continued about ten years. Ciofanius (132) goes upon another ſuppoſition. He declares that Ovid left Rome the 10th of December, being aged fifty years, ſeven months, and twenty-one days. He died (adds Ciofanius) the firſt of January, aged fifty-ſeven years, nine months and eleven days; having been in exile ſeven years and twenty-one days. To rectify the miſtakes in this account, we need only put eight months inſtead of ſeven, after Ovid's fifty years. This doubtleſs was Ciofanius's deſign, who ſuppoſed, with Manutius (133), that Ovid was born the 19th of March 711. He ought to have reckoned from this day to the 10th of December, eight months and twenty-one days; but he ought to have counted from the 19th of December, to the 1ſt of January, thirteen days, and not eleven. However this be, he imagined that Ovid died the 1ſt of January 769, at which time Tiberius had reigned but a little more than 14 months, which is a ſuppoſition very different from that I followed. De Tillemont ſuppoſes that our Poet continued but ſeven years in baniſhment (134); and theſe he fixes from the 54th of Auguſtus, to the 4th of Tiberius (135). According to this calculation, Ovid would have been ſent into exile at fifty-three years of age; and not, as he himſelf affirms (136), at fifty, employing the round number, and omitting the months over and above it. But he would not have omitted two or three years in this manner, had he really been ſo much older than fifty. Scaliger, who declares him guilty of this omiſſion (137), is leſs exact in ſo doing, than in making him die the ninth year of his exile. The calculation of Abbe de Villeloin (138) is quite erroneous. He declares that Ovid, baniſhed the 52d year of Auguſtus, and living in exile ſeven years and twenty-one days, and dying the 4th year of Tiberius, lived fifty-ſeven years, nine months and eleven days. I muſt not omit Moreri, who ſays, that Ovid died *the 1ſt of January, in the 199th Olympiad*, as if a period of four years had but one *1ſt of January*. Seth Calviſius ſpeaks of this Poet's death, a little before he mentions the 199th Olympiad, which is fixing it about the cloſe of the 198th Olympiad. He gives us to underſtand, that Ovid died in the beginning of the year of Rome 769, and of the conſulate of Cælius Rufus and Pomponius Flaccus; but the reaſon he gives for this is a very bad one. *Ovidius circa hæc tempora mortuus eſt, meminit* ENIM in penultima Elegia de Ponto (139) *hujus Flacci futuri conſulis in calendis Januarii* (140). *i. e.* "About this time Ovid left the "world; he obſerving in the laſt elegy but one de "Ponto, that the Flaccus in queſtion was to be "Conſul in the calends of January." How! becauſe Ovid obſerves, that this Flaccus ſhould enter upon the conſulſhip the 1ſt day of January following, muſt it be concluded that he died the beginning of this conſulſhip? What a way of arguing is this! I fancy that Calviſius had another meaning; he intended to ſay, in my opinion, that ſince Ovid's verſes contained nothing of a later date, than this nomination of the conſulate of Pomponius Flaccus; we therefore ought to conclude, that his death happened a little after. This argumentation, tho' much better than the former, is yet not very juſt; for a long fit of ſickneſs, or the indignation to ſee that he had employed ſo many verſes to no purpoſe, might have ſilenced Ovid's muſe.

It would be almoſt endleſs to give a liſt of all thoſe Writers, who affirm that he died the ſame day with Livy, and that this was on New-year's day. I don't know what they ground their aſſertion upon; for it is true indeed, that Euſebius's chronicle makes this great Poet, and the great Hiſtorian in queſtion, die the ſame year; but the day is not mentioned. The date we are ſpeaking of was, in all probability, borrowed from the Cœcilius Minutianus Apuleius of Cœlius Rhodiginus; for he ſays that Ovid died the 1ſt day of January, after ſpending ſeven years in baniſhment, and that Livy died the ſame day (141).

(130) Ciofanius, in *vita Ovidii.*

(131) In *vita Ovidii.*

(132) Idem, ibid.

(133) Aldus Manutius, in *vita Ovidii*, p. 16.

(134) Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* Tom. 1. p. m. 111.

(135) Ibid. p. 66 & 111.

(136) See remark [K], citation (107).

(137) Scalig. *in* Euſeb. p. 182. num. 2033.

(138) *Ovid's Life*, by Abbot de Marolles.

(139) He ſhould have ſaid in *nona Elegia*, lib. 4. 'Tis not the laſt but one, this book containing but 16.

(140) Sethus Calviſius, *ad ann. Mundi* 3966. p. m. 414.

(141) See Cœlius Rhodiginus, lib. 13. *Antiq. Lect.* cap. 1. p. m. 659.

[O] *He threw his* Metamorphoſes *into the fire, either out of indignation, or becauſe he had not finiſhed them.*] He himſelf informs us of this circumſtance; and the account he gives, will not, I flatter myſelf, be judged diſagreeable in my Commentary.

Carmina mutatas hominum dicentia formas:
Infelix domini quod fuga rupit opus.
Hæc ego diſcedens, ſicut bona multa meorum,
Ipſe mea poſui mœſtus in igne manu.
Utque cremaſſe ſuum fertur ſub ſtipite natum
Theſtias, & melior matre fuiſſe ſoror;
Sic ego non meritos mecum peritura libellos
Impoſui rapidis viſcera noſtra rogis.
Vel quod eram Muſas, ut crimina noſtra, peroſus:
Vel quod adhuc creſcens, & rude carmen erat.
Quæ quoniam non ſunt penitus ſublata, ſed exſtant;
(Pluribus exemplis ſcripta fuiſſe reor)
Nunc precor ut vivant, & non ignava legentem
Otia delectent, admoneantque mei.
Non tamen illa legi poterunt patienter ab ullo:
Neſciat his ſummam ſi quis abeſſe manum.
Ablatum mediis opus eſt incudibus illud:
Defuit & ſcriptis ultima lima meis.
Et veniam pro laude peto, laudatus abunde
Non faſtiditus ſi tibi lector ero.
Hos quoque ſex verſus, in prima fronte libelli.
Si præponendos eſſe putabis, habe:
Orba parente ſuo quicunque volumina tangis,
His ſaltem veſtra detur in urbe locus.
Quoque magis faveas, non hæc ſunt edita ab illo,
Sed quaſi de domini funere rapta ſui.
Quicquid in his igitur vitii rude carmen habebit,
Emendaturus, ſi licuiſſet, erat (142).

(142) Ovid. *Triſt.* lib. 1. eleg. 6. ver. 13. See alſo ibid. lib. 3. eleg. 14. ver. 20.

The ſenſe is,

" My poem, which of transformations treats,
" (By its ſo ſad Author, when diſgrac'd, abandon'd;)
" Was at his leaving Rome, with other things,
" With this right hand committed to the flames.
" And as Althæa's log her ſon conſum'd,
" (A cruel mother ſhe, but better ſiſter)
" So I, the guiltleſs offspring of my brain,
" Threw on the flaming pile, and burnt to aſhes;
" Either becauſe my muſe was odious to me
" (My guilty muſe) or was but newly ſketch'd.
" As this exiſts, in ſpite of all my care,
" (For many copies were in private hands)
" E'en let it live; delight the attentive reader;
" And to his memory, recal its parent.
" But none will e'er have patience to peruſe it,
" Who knows not, that my laſt hand it ne'er receiv'd,
" My work was ſnatch'd, unfiniſh'd, from the anvil,
" And wants the file to give the perfect form.
" Forgiveneſs is the only praiſe I ſeek;
" Enough commended if I'm not deſpis'd.
" The ſix ſucceeding lines, if you think proper,
" May in the front be plac'd, to grace my writings.
" Whoever ſhall this orphan-work peruſe,
" (This ſurely cannot be forbid your city)
" Shall know (to gain good will) that 'twas as ſnatch'd,
" From the wide-flaming pile that burnt its author.
" If then theſe verſes ſhall unpoliſh'd ſeem,
" Excuſe the writer, 'cauſe he wanted leiſure.

The reader may alſo conſult the paſſage (143), where he beſeeches the Emperor to hear ſome parts of that work.

(143) Idem, lib. 2. *Triſt.* ver. 555.

ſelf engraved on his tomb [P]. He met not only with great humanity from thoſe Barbarians, but likewiſe great civility. They loved Ovid; paid him ſingular honour, and iſſued publick decrees as a teſtimony of their eſteem. However, they were not pleaſed with the dreadful deſcription he gave of their country, and therefore complained to him about it, and he endeavoured to excuſe himſelf [Q]. He boaſts of a thing, which would prove that he had quite left off all commerce with the fair during his exile; he affirming, that no perſon, of either ſex, or of any age, had the leaſt cauſe to complain of him (m). This ſhews that he did not ſpend his time in making love; and that even after he had learnt

(m) See, towards the beginning, of the remark [Q].

[P] *He deſired . . . . . to have his aſhes carried to Rome; and the epitaph he wrote for himſelf engraved on his tomb.*] He dreaded the immortality of the ſoul, and wiſhed for its mortality; for he was not willing to have his ſhade wander among thoſe of the Sarmatians; therefore he was deſirous of having, at all events, a ſepulchre in Rome. Here follows what he wrote to his dearly beloved wife on this occaſion.

Atque utinam pereant animæ cum corpore noſtræ,
Effugiatque avidos pars mea nulla rogos.
Nam ſi morte carens vacuas volat altus in auras
Spiritus, & Samii ſunt rata dicta ſenis;
Inter Sarmaticas Romana vagabitur umbras,
Perque feros Manes hoſpita ſemper erit.
Oſſa tamen facito parva referantur in urna.
Sic ego non etiam mortuus exſul ero,
Non vetat hoc quiſquam: fratrem Thebana peremptum
Suppoſuit tumulo rege vetante ſoror.
Atque ea cum foliis & amoni pulvere miſce:
Inque ſuburbano condita pone loco.
Quoſque legat verſus oculo properante viator,
Grandibus in tumuli marmore cæde notis:
Hic ego qui jaceo tenerorum luſor amorum,
Ingenio perii Naſo poëta meo.
At tibi qui tranſis, ne ſit grave, quiſquis amaſti,
Dicere, Naſonis molliter oſſa cubent (144).

(144) Idem, lib. 3. *Triſt.* eleg. 3. ver. 59.

The Senſe is,

" I wiſh the ſoul could with the body die,
" And every atom be a prey to flames.
" For if Pythagoras's doctrine's true,
" Immortal, ſhe aloft will wing her flight.
" Thus mine muſt wander in Sarmatian climes,
" And be a ſtranger amid ſavage ghoſts.
" But let the peaceful urn bring back my aſhes,
" That I, when dead, may ceaſe to be an exile.
" This none prohibits: the fam'd Theban ſiſter,
" Her brother buried, ſpite of Creon's fury.
" Let leaves and ſpices mix with my remains,
" And lay them in ſome peaceful, rural ſeat:
" And, on the marble, let theſe words be grav'd,
" To ſtrike each paſſenger's admiring eye.
" Here Ovid lies, a Poet form'd by love,
" Who died a victim to his tow'ring wit.
" Let every gazer, who has felt love's pangs,
" Wiſh that my aſhes may lie unmoleſted."

He there mentioned the opinion of Pythagoras very improperly; it being contrary to the doctrine he ſuppoſes, that ghoſts flit and wander about graves.

[Q] Theſe Barbarians *loved Ovid, and paid him ſingular honour . . . he endeavoured to excuſe himſelf . . . for the dreadful deſcription he gave of their country.*] Here follows a paſſage from one of his epiſtles.

Nec ſumus hic odio, nec ſcilicet eſſe meremur,
Nec cum fortuna mens quoque verſa mea eſt.
Illa quies animi eſt, quam tu laudare ſolebas,
Ille vetus ſolito perſtat in ore pudor.
Sic ego ſum longe, ſic hic, ubi barbarus hoſtis,
Ut fera plus valeant legibus arma, facit.
Rem queat ut nullum tot jam Græcine per annos
Fœmina de nobis virve puerve queri.
Hoc facit, ut miſero faveant adſintque Tomitæ,
Hæc quoniam tellus teſtificanda mihi eſt.
Illi me, quia velle vident, diſcedere malunt:
Reſpectu cupiunt hic tamen eſſe ſui.
Nec mihi credideris: exſtant decreta, quibus nos
Laudat, & immunes publica cera facit.
Conveniens miſeris & quamquam gloria non eſt,
Proxima dant nobis oppida munus idem (145).

(145) Idem, *de Ponto*, lib. 4. epiſt. 9. ver. 89.

The Senſe is,

" Hatred I find not here, nor once deſerve it,
" Nor has my evil fortune chang'd my mind.
" That calm you prais'd in me, I ſtill enjoy,
" And all my words their wonted chaſtneſs boaſt.
" Here, far remote, I waſte the tedious hours,
" Begirt with hoſtile foes who laws contemn.
" So harmleſs I theſe tedious years have paſt,
" That not one Tomian can complain of me.
" To this is owing the kind aid they give,
" Of which the whole inhabitants are witneſs.
" They wiſh me gone, becauſe myſelf I wiſh it;
" And yet, ſo well they love me, urge my ſtay.
" You'll ſcarce believe that they have paſt decrees,
" Which praiſes and immunities indulge.
" Though fame and glory ſuit not wretched me,
" The towns adjacent join in theſe high honours."

Thus the reader ſees that they granted him exemptions; and here follows another paſſage which ſhews that this, among them, was an extraordinary favour, and that they crowned him publickly."

Adde quod Illyrica ſi jam pice nigrior eſſem,
Non mordenda mihi turba fidelis erat.
Molliter à vobis mea ſors excepta, Tomitæ,
Tam metes Grajos indicat eſſe viros.
Gens mea Peligni, regioque domeſtica Sulmo,
Non potuit noſtris lenior eſſe malis.
Quem vix incolumi cuiquam ſalvoque daretis,
Is datus à vobis eſt mihi nuper honor.
Solus adhuc ego ſum veſtris immunis in oris;
Exceptis, ſi qui munera legis habent.
Tempora ſacrata mea ſunt velata coronâ,
Publicus invito quam favor impoſuit.
Quam grata eſt igitur Latonæ Delia tellus,
Erranti tutum quæ dedit una locum;
Tam mihi cara Tomis, patria quæ ſede fugatis,
Tempus ad hoc nobis hoſpita ſida manet.
Di modo feciſſent placidæ ſpem poſſet habere
Pacis, & a gelido longius axe foret (146).

(146) Ovid. *de Ponto*, lib. 4. epiſt. 14. ver. 45.

The Senſe is,

" Add, though I blacker were than blackeſt pitch,
" I ne'er cou'd ſatyrize this courteous people.
" O Tomians, you ſo kindly ſooth my ſorrows,
" You ſeem not ſavages but gentle Greeks.
" Not Sulmo, when I firſt drew vital air,
" Cou'd pour more healing balms into my wounds.
" Lately, ſuch honours you on me beſtow'd,
" As happieſt Tomians are thought to merit.
" Solely, I bleſt immunities enjoy,
" Which are to Magiſtrates indulg'd.
" My temples with a ſacred crown you bind,
" Though often I the glorious gift refus'd.
" Grateful as Delos was to fam'd Latona,
" Where the ſad wandring fair found an aſylum,
" To me is Tomos, where, a hapleſs exile,
" I meet with friendly treatment that conſoles me.
" Ye Gods! cou'd Tomians laſting peace enjoy,
" And ſee the pole from far, I ſhould be happy."

Theſe laſt words point out what things were diſagreeable to him in the place of his exile: he there was expoſed to the rigours of cold, and near a nation who were making incurſions perpetually (147). This could not ſuit very well with an Italian, thin, and of a delicate conſtitution.

(147) See epiſt. 3. lib. 1. *de Ponto, & paſſim alibi.*

Sufficiunt: graciles ſed non ſine viribus artus:
Pondere, non nervis, corpora noſtra carent (148).

(148) Ovid. *Amor.* lib. 2. eleg. 10. ver. 23. See hereunder the paſſage of epiſt. 10. in lib. 1. *de Ponto*, ver. 21.

learnt the Getic language, he did not make love to the daughters or wives of the Tomians, for had he done this, their fathers and husbands would certainly have exclaimed againſt him. But as to his coldneſs and indifference, if it was not agreeable to them, they yet were forced to ſtifle their complaints. This part of his conduct is the more worthy of praiſe, as it muſt have been extremely difficult for one of his complexion to be regular in that reſpect, ſince he had, for a long time, led a quite different way of life (*n*). Some Chriſtian Poets (*o*) have reſembled him in other reſpects, but who, being baniſhed on account of their religion, did not diſcontinue their lewd practices. He wrote a great many Poems in his exile, a circumſtance we are not to wonder at, for the Muſes, who are naturally very talkative, are particularly ſo in adverſity; and as he was in want of proper perſons to converſe with, and was not a lover of the bottle or of gaming [*R*], the Muſes muſt have been his only conſolation. Had he met with perſons, to whom he could have read his poetical compoſitions, he would have indulged his vein with greater ſatisfaction

(*n*) *Molle cupidineis nec inexpugnabile telis,*
Cor mihi, quodque levis cauſſa moveret, erat.
Cum tamen hoc eſſem, minimoque accenderer igni.
Ovid. *Triſt.* lib. 4. eleg. 10. ver. 65.

(*o*) Clement Marot, for inſtance.

an Italian who had ſpent his life in delicacy and pleaſure (149).

(149) See eleg. 10. of lib. 4. *de Triſt.*

We will alſo ſee the anſwer he made to the complaints of the inhabitants of Tomos. He proteſted that he had never ſlandered them (150), and had inveighed only againſt their climate.

(150) 'Twill be difficult to reconcile this with elegy 7 and 10, of lib. 5. *de Triſt.*

In medias Syrtes, mediam mea vela Charybdin
Mittite, præſenti dum careamus humo.
Styx quoque, ſi quid ea eſt, bene commutabitur Iſtro:
Si quid & inferius, quam Styga, mundus habet.
Gramina cultus ager, frigus minus odit hirundo;
Proxima Marticolis quam loca Naſo Getis.
Talia ſuccenſent propter mihi verba Tomitæ,
Iraque carminibus publica mota meis.
Ergo ego ceſſabo nunquam per carmina lædi?
Plectar & incauto ſemper ab ingenio?
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
Sed nihil admiſi: nulla eſt mea culpa Tomitæ,
Quos ego, cum loca ſim veſtra perorſus, amo.
Quilibet excutiat noſtri monumenta laboris;
Littera de vobis eſt mea queſta nihil.
Frigus & incurſus omni de parte timendos,
Et quod pulſetur murus ab hoſte, queror.
In loca, non homines, veriſſima crimina dixi.
Culpatis veſtrum vos quoque ſæpe ſolum.
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
At malus interpres populi mihi concitat iram,
Inque novum crimen carmina noſtra vocat.
Tam felix utinam, quam pectore candidus eſſem.
Exſtat adhuc nemo ſaucius ore meo (151).

(151) Ovid. epiſt. 14. lib. 4. *de Ponto*, ver. 9.

The Senſe is,

" On Lybia's ſands, or fierce Charybdis' gulph
" I'd rather be than in this horrid region.
" I'd change the Danube for the Styx, if real;
" Or any lower place, however dreadful.
" The plough-ſhare hates the graſs, the ſwallows cold,
" But Ovid's hate for the curſt land is greater.
" The friendly Tomians take ſuch words unkindly,
" And, one and all, expreſs their high diſpleaſure.
" What, muſt the Muſe be ever fatal to me?
" Still muſt I ſuffer from unguarded wit.
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
" But, Tomians, I am innocent and clear;
" I hate your clime, but ſtill I love your perſons.
" Search all my works, examine every line,
" And you'll not find a word that ſtrikes at you.
" Oft of the cold, indeed, I have complain'd,
" And of the enemies who hem you round.
" The climate I've accus'd, but not the people;
" And this, O Tomians, you yourſelves have done.
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
" But ſome curſt wretch interprets wrong my verſe,
" And ſpies out malice where no ill's intended.
" Would I were happy as I'm free from guilt:
" No line envenom'd ſtains my guiltleſs page.

[" Ovid had a ſhip of his own in the Bay of Co-
" rinth, on which he made his voyage to the Euxine,
" and then performed the reſt of his journey on
" foot, to a place the utmoſt and moſt inhoſpitable
" of any that a Roman had ever been confined to.
" He complains of the dangers and miſeries of
" his paſſage; and the injuſtice of his companions
" and ſervants: but reſolved that his ſpirit ſhould
" not ſink under his misfortunes, he made uſe of his
" reſolution to overcome them, and prevailed ſo far
" as to conquer his temper that had been too much
" given up to eaſe; and began to paſs his days in
" ſome content by means of thoſe verſes which he
" made for his own ſatisfaction, without any hopes
" of their coming to the peruſal of others. And in
" this adverſity of the Poet his character appears
" with the greateſt luſtre: here he ſhews a courage
" undaunted, a ſpirit not to be caſt down, a con-
" ſtancy of love to the partner of his bed, and a
" friendſhip inviolable to thoſe perſons of honour he
" had confided in, many of whom were the conſu-
" lar dignity *. *Addit. by the Tranſl.*]

* Preface to Dr. King's *Art of Love*, ubi ſupr.

[*R*] *He wrote a great many Poems in his exile* (152), *a circumſtance we are not to wonder at . . . . he was in want of proper perſons to converſe with, and was not a lover of the bottle or of gaming.*] Here are many cauſes why his Muſe ſhould be prolifick, but the principal one is not ſet down, which was, that his Muſe brought forth without labour, and never troubled herſelf any farther about bringing up the offſpring; ſhe being very little ſolicitous about correcting her productions (153). Her caſe muſt therefore have been like that of moſt married women who never nurſe their children; they breeding ſooner than ſuch as do. Here follows ſome paſſages which ſhew that Ovid's Muſe was every thing to him.

(152) Beſides the 5 books *de Triſt.* and the 4 *de Ponto*, now extant, he wrote many verſes in that country, which he committed to the flames. See his 12th eleg. of lib. 5. *de Triſt.*

(153) See the cloſe of this remark.

Hic ego finitimis quamvis circumſonor armis,
Triſtia, quo poſſum, carmine fata levo.
Quod quamvis nemo eſt, cujus referatur ad aures;
Sic tamen abſumo decipioque diem.
Ergo quod vivo, duriſque laboribus obſto,
Nec me ſollicitæ tædia lucis habent;
Gratia Muſa tibi, nam tu ſolatia præbes,
Tu curæ requies, tu medicina venis:
Tu dux & comes es: tu nos abducis ab Iſtro,
In medioque mihi das Helicone locum (154).

(154) Ovid. *Triſt.* lib 4. eleg. 10. ver. 3. See alſo lib. 5. eleg. 7.

The ſenſe is,

" Here, though ſurrounded with war's dreadful ſound,
" My cares I ſoften with the tuneful lyre.
" And though no auditor applauds my verſe,
" Yet thus I while my tedious hours away.
" Therefore to thee, kind Muſe, I owe my life;
" To thee I owe my firm, unſhaken mind,
" And every hour of comfort I enjoy.
" By thee my cares are ſooth'd, my wounds are heal'd;
" Thou, ſhining guide, who lead'ſt me from the Danube
" To Helicon, amid the Muſes choir.

He complains of his having neither books nor auditors.

Non hic librorum, per quos inviter alarque,
Copia: pro libris arcus & arma ſonant.
Nullus in hac terra, recitem ſi carmina, cujus
Intellecturis auribus utar, adeſt (155).

(155) Idem, il id. lib. 3. eleg. 14. ver. 37.

The

faction to himſelf; he owning that it is the ſame thing to walk in the dark, as to write verſes that are to be read by nobody (*p*). Among other good qualities he poſſeſt, one was, his not having the leaſt propenſion to ſatyr; and yet he was very able to write ſatyrical

(*p*) See the rem. [*R*], citat. 151.

The Senſe is,

" No books are here, to ſooth and feed my fancy,
" All places echoing with war's dreadful ſound.
" And ſhould I verſe compoſe, no man I meet with
" Can underſtand it, and give due applauſe."

And he deſires that this may plead his apology, in caſe his verſes are not found good. His genius, enfeebled by adverſity, is not fir'd by the hopes of applauſe.

Contudit ingenium patientia longa laboris,
Et pars antiqui magna vigoris abeſt.
Sæpe tamen nobis, ut nunc quoque ſumpta tabella eſt,
Inque ſuos volui cogere verba pedes:
Carmina ſcripta mihi ſunt nulla, aut qualia cernis,
Digna ſui domini tempore, digna loco.
Denique non parvas animo dat gloria vires,
Et fœcunda facit pectora laudis amor.
Nominis & famæ quondam fulgore trahebar,
Dum tulit antennas aura ſecunda meas.
Non adeo eſt bene nunc, ut ſit mihi gloria curæ:
Si liceat, nulli cognitus eſſe velim.
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
At puto, ſi demens ſtudium fatale retentem.
Hic mihi præbebit carminis arma locus.
Non liber hic ullus, non qui mihi commodet aurem,
Verbaque ſignificent quid mea norit, adeſt.
Omnia barbariæ loca ſunt, vociſque ferinæ:
Omnia ſunt Getici plena timore ſoni (156).

(156) Ovid. *Triſt.* lib. 5. eleg. 12. ver. 29.

The Senſe is,

" My countleſs evils have depreſs'd my genius,
" And all my former fire is quite extinguiſh'd.
" Yet oft, (as now) the pen I reaſſume,
" And ſtrive to place each foot in its due order,
" Such verſe I only write as thoſe you ſee;
" Verſes that ſuit their author and the place.
" Glory adds ſtrength to the luxuriant fancy,
" And a fond love of praiſe, exalts it high.
" Fame's dazling ſplendors once my eye attracted,
" Whilſt ſmiling fortune ſwell'd the ſpreading ſails;
" But now, alas! fair fame no more invites,
" And all I pant for is to be forgot.
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
" Yet, ſhould I now reſume theſe fatal ſtudies,
" Say, can this place afford materials for them?
" Books I have none, nor can I find a man
" Who underſtands the language which I write in.
" All places here with barbariſm abound,
" And every Getic ſound ſtrikes inward horror".

He repeats the ſame reflection, and extends it in another place, where he declares that he is diſcouraged from writing verſes; and that he would have quite left off this employ, had he not been deprived of every other kind of amuſement.

Da veniam faſſo, ſtudiis quoque frena remiſi,
Ducitur & digitis littera rara meis.
Impetus ille ſacer, qui vatum pectora nutrit,
Qui prius in nobis eſſe ſolebat, abeſt.
Vix venit ad partes, vix ſumptæ Muſa tabellæ
Imponit pigras pæne coacta manus:
Parvaque, ne dicam, ſcribendi nulla voluptas
Eſt mihi: nec numeris nectere verba juvat.
Sive quod hinc fructus adeo non cepimus ullos,
Principium noſtri res ſit ut iſta mali:
Sive quod in tenebris numeroſos ponere geſtus,
Quodque legas nulli, ſcribere carmen, idem eſt,
Excitat auditor ſtudium, laudataque virtus
Creſcit, & immenſum gloria calcar habet.
Hic mea cui recitem, niſi flavis ſcripta Corallis,
Quaſque alias gentes barbarus Iſter habet?
Sed quid ſolus agam? quaque infelicia perdam
Otia materia, ſurripiamque diem?
Nam neque me vinum, nec me tenet alea fallax,
Per quæ clam tacitum tempus abire ſolet.
Nec me, quod cuperem, ſi per fera bella liceret,
Oblectat cultu terra novata ſuo.
Quid, niſi Pierides, ſolatia frigida reſtant,
Non bene de nobis quæ meruere, deæ (157).

(157) Idem, *de Ponto*, lib. 4. epiſt. 2. ver. 23. See alſo lib. 1. epiſt. 5. ver. 10.

The ſenſe is,

" I'm tir'd, and therefore would I plead excuſe,
" If I no more my wonted toils purſue.
" The ſacred fire which warms the Poet's breaſt,
" (Once felt by me) is now extinct and gone,
" Deaf to my call, the Muſe, but rarely comes;
" And with regret ſhe ſtrikes the mournful ſtrings.
" To mould the numbers, and the verſe refine,
" (Once ſo delightful) now no pleaſure gives.
" Whether, becauſe it no advantage brought,
" And was the ſource of all my dire misfortunes;
" Or, 'cauſe to write, what no one ever reads,
" Is juſt as vain as writing in the dark.
" An Auditor excites; applauſes fire;
" And glory is the mind's moſt noble ſpur.
" The only Auditors I meet with here,
" Are barbarous nations near the Danube ſeated.
" But loneſome as I am, this dull employment
" Beſt ſooths my widow'd hours, and calms my ſoul.
" Gaming and wine, which charm the thoughtleſs herd,
" To me are taſteleſs, and no joys diſpenſe.
" Nor me (which yet, would furious wars allow,
" I'd try) the pleaſures of the plough delight.
" The Muſes therefore, now, are all my comfort;
" And ſtill I love 'em, tho' by them undone.

I will cite one paſſage more, in which he declares that his thin complection was not owing to any rioteous exceſs, ſince he ſcarce drank any thing but water; and that his circumſtances did not make him liable to any danger from the paſſion of love.

Is quoque, qui gracili cibus eſt in corpore, ſomnus,
Non alit officio corpus inane ſuo.
Sed vigilo, vigilantque mei ſine fine dolores,
Quorum materiam dat locus ipſe mihi.
Vix igitur poſſis viſos agnoſcere vultus,
Quoque ierit, quæras, qui fuit ante, color.
Parvus in exiles ſuccus mihi pervenit artus,
Membraque ſunt cera pallidiora nova.
Non hæc immodico contraxi damna Lyæo:
Scis, mihi quam ſolæ pæne bibantur aquæ.
Non epulis oneror, quarum ſi tangar amore,
Eſt tamen in Geticis copia nulla locis.
Nec vires adimit Veneris damnoſa voluptas,
Non ſolet in mæſtos illa venire thoros.
Unda locuſque nocent, & cauſſa valentior iſtis
Anxietas animi, quæ mihi ſemper adeſt (158).

(158) Idem, lib. 1. *de Ponto*, epiſt. 11. ver. 21.

The ſenſe is,

" Sheep, the beſt food to thin, enfeebled bodies,
" To me no wholeſome nouriſhment affords.
" My woes ſtill keep my weeping eyes awake,
" And every object here foments my ſorrow.
" You'd ſcarcely know my face, 'tis ſo much chang'd,
" For long the roſes have forſook my cheek.
" Life's ſprightly tide has left my ſhrivel'd nerves;
" More pallid, now, my hue, than virgin-wax.
" Not wine, you're ſenſible, produc'd theſe ills;
" My thirſt unquench'd but at the flowing brook.
" Banquets I've none; nor was I fond of dainties,
" Wou'd theſe dark regions once indulge my wiſhes.
" Nor is my ſtrength by luſtful joys enfeebled,
" For Venus comes not to the mourner's bed.
" The ſoil, the water's noxious; and my grief
" (More noxious ſtill) fits ever brooding o'er me.

I will ſpeak a word or two with regard to the manner

tyrical verſes, as is manifeſt from his Poem againſt Ibis [S]; no gaul being ever more bitter than what he threw out on that occaſion, nor more grievous curſes or execrations. He wrote it a little after his baniſhment.

manner, in which he ſays he uſed to correct his works. He confeſſes himſelf very negligent and idle on thoſe occaſions; and confeſſed that the people in Rome had juſt reaſon to criticize him, for repeating continually the ſame things, in the poems written by him during his baniſhment (159). He was ſenſible of his committing that fault, and he endeavoured to avoid it; but the fire which animated him in his firſt compoſition, failing when he came to reviſe his poems, he found it too painful a taſk to correct, and accordingly abandoned it. This is but one of his excuſes. This is certainly the caſe with many Authors. They compoſe with pleaſure and fire, and by that means diſplay all their ſtrength; but they flag in the reviſal of their work; their firſt fire does not return; and a certain calm ariſing in their imagination, their pen moves extremely ſlow: 'tis a boat that will not go forward without being rowed. If the Reader is deſirous of knowing what Ovid obſerves concerning the correcting of his writings, he may peruſe the following lines.

(159) Idem, *de Ponto*, lib. 3. epiſt. 9. ver. 39.

Judicium tamen hic noſtrum non decipit error,
Nec quicquid genui, protinus illud amo,
Cur igitur ſi me video delinquere, peccem;
Et patiar ſcripto crimen ineſſe, rogas?
Non eadem ratio eſt, ſentire, & demere morbos.
Senſus ineſt cunctis, tollitur arte malum,
Sæpe aliquod verbum cupiens mutare relinquo:
Judicium vires deſtituuntque meum.
Sæpe piget (quid enim dubitem tibi vera fateri?)
Corrigere, & longi ferre laboris onus:
Scribentem juvat ipſe favor, minuitque laborem,
Cumque ſuo creſcens pectore fervet opus:
Corrigere at res eſt tanto magis ardua, quanto
Magnus Ariſtarcho major Homerus erat.
Sic animum lento curarum frigore lædit,
Ut cupidi ſi quis fræna retentat equi (160).

(160) Idem, ibid. ver. 9.

The Senſe is,

" No partial fondneſs e'er miſled my judgment,
" And made me idolize whate'er I write.
" Why then (will you object) do you offend,
" And not correct thoſe errors you perceive?
" To feel and cure an ill are different things;
" All can perceive, but all cannot refine.
" Oft when I'd change ſome weak or trifling word,
" My judgment fails me, and I'm quite bewilder'd.
" Frequent (from you I'll not conceal my failings)
" I dread the labour; flag, and can't go on.
" Compoſing pleaſes, and beguiles the toil;
" Gay fancy brightning with the riſing lines.
" Correcting, is a more laborious taſk;
" And claims a Homer, not an Ariſtarchus.
" This tedious toil quite checks th' uneaſy mind,
" As when the courſer feels the wounding curb.

[S] *Among other good qualities he poſſeſt, one was, his not having the leaſt propenſion to ſatyr . . . . no gall was ever more bitter than what he threw out . . . in his Poem againſt Ibis.*] He boaſts that he had never attacked any perſon in ſatyrical lines; and repreſents this to the Emperoor, that if his Muſe had offended him in other reſpects, it yet deſerved encouragement for having ever been exempt from a ſpirit of ill nature.

Non ego mordaci diſtrinxi carmine quemquam,
Nec meus ullius crimina verſus habet,
Candidus à ſalibus ſuffuſis felle refugi:
Nulla venenato littera miſta joco eſt.
Inter tot populi, tot ſcripti millia noſtri,
Quem mea Calliope læſerit, unus ero (161).

(161) Ovid. *Triſt.* lib. 2. ver. 563.

The Senſe is,

" I ne'er took up ſharp ſatyr's furious pen,
" Nor one foul crime to open day reveal'd.
" Candid, my wit was ever free from gall;
" My lines with baſe, envenom'd jokes unmix'd.
" In all my works, ſo various and diffus'd,
" Me only they ſhall hurt, me only wound.

Thus he ſpeaks in a Poem written by him ſince his baniſhment. I yet am of opinion that his ſatyr againſt Ibis was written then; for ſince he declares himſelf to be but fifty in the beginning of the Poem in queſtion, he doubtleſs compoſed it a little after his arrival in Tomos; and upon his receiving the firſt news that a certain perſon had declared himſelf his enemy.

Tempus ad hoc, luſtris mihi jam bis quinque peractis
Omne fuit Muſæ carmen inerme meæ:
Nullaque, quæ poſſit, ſcriptis tot millibus, exſtat,
Littera Naſonis ſanguinolenta legi.
Nec quemquam noſtri, niſi me, læſere libelli:
Artificis periit cum caput arte ſua.
Unus (& hoc ipſum eſt injuria magna,) perennem
Candoris titulum non ſinit eſſe mei.
Quiſquis is eſt (nam nomen adhuc utcumque tacebo)
Cogit inaſſuetas ſumere tela manus.
Ille relegatum gelidos Aquilonis ad ortus,
Non ſinit exſilio delituiſſe meo:
Vulneraque immitis requiem quærentia vexat:
Jactat & in toto nomina noſtra foro:
Perpetuoque mihi ſociatam fœdere lecti
Non patitur miſeri funera flere viri (162).

(162) Ovid. *in Ibin. init.*

The Senſe is,

" The ſun has run full fifty times his courſe,
" And free from ſatyr has my verſes found.
" Among the many thouſand I've compos'd,
" Not one is ſeen, of a ſatyric caſt.
" My works hurt no man but their hapleſs author,
" Whoſe art has brought deſtruction on himſelf.
" But now the treatment of a worthleſs wretch
" Will force me to take up the ſharpeſt pen.
" This wretch (for ſtill I ſhall ſuppreſs his name)
" Obliges me to wield unuſual weapons.
" Though ſent to climes where froſt eternal reigns,
" Yet thither his fell malice ſtill purſues me.
" Barbarous, the wound I'd heal, he opens wider;
" And makes my griefs the jeſt of all the world;
" Nor will he let the partner of my bed,
" Bewail my fate, and ſhare my endleſs ſorrows.

Had he been fifty two years of age, or upwards, he would have taken notice of this circumſtance, in order to magnify his merit, for not having writ any thing of a ſatyrical caſt during ſo long a courſe of years. This eſſay was a maſter-piece in that kind. Ovid there (163) *collects all the torments which are found in hiſtory or fable, to wiſh them as ſo many curſes to his treacherous enemy, which he takes from two hundred and thirty nine examples. A learned profeſſor (Stephanus Richardus Nivernenſis) in the univerſity of Paris, who lived about a hundred years ago* (164), *digeſted them under forty two kinds, of which he intended to make ſo many chapters* (165). The beſt Commentary on this Satyr is that of Mr. de Boſſieu (166); which was printed at Lyons, *Sumptibus Antonii Pillehotte*, anno 1633, 4to (167). Abbé de Marolles, who firſt tranſlated this Poem of Ovid's into French, added to it ſome very large notes, the beſt of which are extracted from Mr. de Boiſſieu's Commentary. This tranſlation was printed at Paris in 1661, 8vo.

[*After his (Ovid's) diſmiſſion from court, he had occaſion to make uſe of a ſatyrical ſtyle, which he always before had induſtriouſly avoided; but it was upon high provocation; and yet he does it under the concealed name of Ibis. He is ſuppoſed to have wrote it in full paſſion, either in his voyage, or as ſoon as he came to the Euxine ſhore, againſt a perſon that took occaſion from his misfortunes to ſcandalize and reproach him; to make his wife uneaſy; to endeavour to reduce him to the utmoſt poverty by depriving him of his eſtate, which Auguſtus had entirely left him; for which clemency in many excellent verſes the Poet is not ungrateful. He profeſſes to have imitated Callimachus, who falls upon Apothonius Rhodius, in a Poem under the ſame title. There can nothing include more of the antient fable and hiſtory than this ſmall work, eſpecially of ſuch as have come to any fatal miſchance* *. Addit. by the Tranſl.]

(163) Abbé de Marolles, in the argument to the French tranſlation of the poem againſt *Ibis*.

(164) This *Abbé* wrote thus in 1661.

(165) This Abbé gives the titles of theſe chapters.

(166) Dionyſius Salvagnius Boeſſius.

(167) The Abbé de Marolles did not know this; he ſaying, p. 67, that this work of Meſſire Denys de Salvaing, Lord of Boiſſieu, was printed at Lyons in 1638.

* Preface to Dr. King's *Art of Love*, *ubi ſupr.* p. 27, 28.

OWEN

☞ OWEN (JOHN), an eminent Engliſh Epigrammatiſt in the 17th Century, was born at Armon in Caernarvonſhire (*a*), and educated at Wykeham's ſchool near Wincheſter, under Dr. Thomas Bilſon, afterwards Biſhop of Wincheſter. In 1584, after two years probation, he was admitted perpetual Fellow of New College in Oxford (*b*); and May 2, 1590, he took the Degree of Bachelor of Civil Law (*c*); and the year following leaving his Fellowſhip, taught ſchool at Trylegh near Monmouth; and afterwards, about the year 1594, ſucceeded Mr. Thomas Hall in the maſterſhip of the ſchool at Warwick, founded by King Henry VIII. He generally laboured under very neceſſitous circumſtances; but was ſupported for ſeveral years by his countryman and kinſman Dr. John Williams, Biſhop of Lincoln, and Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of England (*d*). His *Epigrams* [*A*] gained him a very conſiderable reputation; but were put in the *Index Expurgatorius* by the order of the Romiſh Inquiſitors, on account of ſome paſſages in them, eſpecially the two following Verſes:

An Petrus fuerit Romæ, ſub judice lis eſt:
Simonem *Romæ nemo fuiſſe negat.*

For which Verſes, and others of the ſame kind, our Author's uncle, who was a Papiſt, ſtruck his name out of his laſt Will and Teſtament. He died in 1622 (*e*), and not in 1623, as was ſaid in Mr. Wood's *Hiſtoria & Antiquitates Univerſitatis Oxonienſis*; and he was interred in the cathedral of St. Paul's at London, at the expence of Biſhop Williams, who erected a monument to his memory on a pillar next to the conſiſtory ſtairs, with his Buſt in braſs, crowned with laurel, and ſix Latin Verſes under it [*B*]. Borrichius (*f*) highly commends his Epigrams, but cenſures the obſcenity of ſome of them, and tells us that he would have been ſuperior to Martial, if he had not reſembled him in that point; but that he is ſometimes miſtaken in the quantity of his ſyllables and the purity of his ſtyle; though he ſufficiently atones for theſe defects by his great excellencies. Caſpar Barlæus (*g*) ſays, that many of his Epigrams are ingenious, but ſome of an inferior ſtamp. Lorenzo Craſſo (*h*) ſtyles him one of the moſt eminent Latin Epigrammatiſts of his age, but he repreſents him as ſometimes faulty with regard to his diction. And Monſieur Baillet (*i*) ſpeaks of him to the ſame purpoſe. We have an Epigram to our Author among *John Stradling's Epigrams* (*k*); and another among thoſe of John Dunbar (*l*).

(*a*) Moreri erroneouſly aſſerts that he was born at Oxford.

(*b*) Wood, *Hiſt. & Antiq. Univ. Oxon.* lib. 1. p. 143. & *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 470, 471. 2d edit.

(*c*) Ibid. *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 139.

(*d*) Ibid. *Athen. Oxon. ubi ſupra.*

(*e*) Idem, ibid.

(*f*) *De Poetis*, p. 55.

(*g*) Epiſt. 888.

(*h*) *Elogii d'Huomini Letterati.*

(*i*) In his *Jugemens des Savans.*

(*k*) Lib. 4. p. 159.

(*l*) Cent. 4. n. 66. edit. Lond. 1616.

[*A*] *His Epigrams.*] He publiſhed at firſt but three books under the following title: *Epigrammatum Libri tres ad Mariam Neville, Comit Dorceſtriæ filiam.* London 1606, in 8vo. Re-printed the ſame year. He afterwards publiſhed *Epigrammatum liber unus, ad doctiſſimam Heroinam, D. Arabellam Stuart. Epigrammatum libri tres; ad Henricum Principem Cambriæ duo; ad Carolum Eboracenſem unus. Epigrammatum ad tres Mecænates libri tres: ad Carolum Noel Equitem & Baronettum unus: ad Gulialmum Sedley Equitem & Baronettum alter: ad Rogerum Owen Equitem auratum tertius. Monaſticha quædam Ethica & Politica veterum ſapientum.* All theſe came out as ſucceſſive additions to the ſeveral Editions of the three firſt books of Epigrams, and were at laſt publiſhed in one volume in 8vo, and 12mo, both in England, and beyond the ſeas. In 1619, Mr. *John Vicars*, Uſher of the ſchool of Chriſt's Hoſpital in London, publiſhed at London in 8vo, an Engliſh Tranſlation of ſelect Epigrams out of this collection. Mr. *Thomas Pecke*, of the Inner-Temple, likewiſe tranſlated ſix hundred of theſe Epigrams into Engliſh verſe, which were printed with *Martial de Spectaculis, or of the Rarities to be ſeen in Rome, and with the moſt ſelect Epigrams of Sir* Thomas More; to which is annexed, a *Century of Heroic Epigrams.* &c, all printed under the general Title of *Parnaſſi Puerperium*, at London 1659, in 8vo. And laſtly, Mr. Thomas Harvey tranſlated moſt or all of our Author's Epigrams into Engliſh; but of his performance can give no account. There was a French tranſlation printed at Paris in 1709, in 12mo, under this Title, *Les Epigrammes d'Owen, traduites en Francois, par M. le B.* [Brun]. This Title ſeems to promiſe a tranſlation of the whole collection, but actually contains only a ſelect number. There is a Spaniſh tranſlation of Owen's Epigrams, printed under the following title, *Agudezas de Juan Owen traduzidas par Fr. de la Torre.* Madrid 1674 and 1682, in 4to, two volumes.

[*B*] *Six Latin verſes under it,*] They are as follow:

Parva tibi ſtatua eſt, quia parva ſtatura, ſupellex
Parva, volat parvus magna per ora liber.
Sed non parvus Honos, non parva eſt gloria, quippe
Ingenio haud quicquam eſt majus in orbe tuo.
Parva domus texit, Templum ſed grande: Poetæ
Tum verè Vitam, cum moriuntur, agunt. H.

☞ OZANAM (JAMES), an eminent French Mathematician [*A*], was born in 1640 in the ſovereignty of Dombes (*a*). His father was in very opulent circumſtances, and poſſeſſed of ſeveral eſtates. His family was of Jewiſh extract, but had been long converted to the Chriſtian Religion, and profeſſed the Roman Catholick Faith, and was likewiſe diſtinguiſhed for ſeveral offices, which it had held in the Parliaments of Provence. Our Author was the youngeſt ſon; and by the laws of that country the eſtate belonged to the eldeſt; and therefore his father reſolved to repair this diſadvantage by giving him an excellent education. He deſigned him for the Church, in order that he might enjoy ſome ſmall benefices, which belonged to the family. But our author found no inclination to the eccleſiaſtical State; and ſome mathematical books, which fell into his hands, inſpired him with a love for that ſcience. Though he had no maſter to inſtruct him, he made ſo great a progreſs in it, that at the age of fifteen years, he wrote a piece in mathematicks, which

(*a*) Fontenelle, *Elege de M. Ozanam*, printed in the *Hiſt. de l'Academie de Sciences, ann.* 1717, *& Europe Savante*, Tom. 2. p. 275.

[*A*] *An eminent French Mathematician.*] This appears ſufficiently from his writings, which are as follow: I. *La Geometrie-pratique, contenant la Trigonometrie theorique & pratique, la Longimetrie, la Planimetrie, & la Stereometrie.* Paris 1684, in 12mo. II. *Tables des Sinus, Tangentes, & Secantes, & des Logarithmes des Sinus & des Tangentes, & des nombres depuis l'unité juſqu' à dix mille, avec un traité de Trigonometrie,*

which was never printed, but contained things which he thought proper to inſert in the works which he afterwards publiſhed. He ſtudied divinity four years, rather out of obedience than inclination; but upon his father's death he quitted that ſtudy, and applied himſelf wholly to the mathematicks. He afterwards went to Lyons, where he taught that ſcience for a ſupport, and though this was no very conſiderable one, he gave himſelf up for ſome time to a paſſion for gaming, and acted upon occaſion in a very generous manner. Two Foreigners, whom he taught the mathematicks at Lyons, having expreſſed to him their uneaſineſs at not receiving the Bills of Exchange, which they expected, in order that they might go to Paris, he aſked them what money they wanted, and being told fifty Piſtoles, he lent them the ſum immediately without accepting a note. Theſe Foreigners, when they came to Paris, giving an account of this to Monſieur Dagueſſeau, father of the Chancellor, that Magiſtrate being touched with ſo generous an action, engaged them to ſend for Mr. Ozanam to Paris, with a promiſe to aſſiſt him to the utmoſt of his power. Ozanam determined therefore to leave Lyons. Upon the road thither, a perſon unknown told him, that if he would renounce play, he might raiſe himſelf a fortune at Paris, gain a great reputation, and marry at thirty five years of age, with ſome other particulars, which were juſtified by the event. He was ſcarce arrived at Paris, when his mother falling ſick deſired to ſee him; upon which he haſtened to her, but found her dead. She had deſigned to make him her heir, but his elder brother prevented her intentions. Our Author returned therefore to Paris, and broke off all correſpondence with a family, of which he enjoyed nothing but the name. He abandoned his inclination to gaming, and devoted himſelf intirely to the Mathematicks. He was young, handſome, and ſprightly, and this expoſed him to ſome affairs of gallantry. A woman, who pretended to be a perſon of condition, and who lodged in the ſame houſe with him, ſtrongly tempted his virtue. He aſked her, whether ſhe had occaſion for money, which ſhe aſſenting to, he gave her ſeveral Louis D'or's. This adventure engaged him to think of matrimony, and accordingly he married a woman with almoſt no fortune, who had inſpired him with a paſſion for her by her good nature, modeſty, and virtue; and he was not deceived in theſe appearances. He had twelve children by her, the greateſt part of whom died young. In the time of peace, when Paris is full of ſtrangers, his teaching of mathematicks was a good income to him; but it was greatly diminiſhed during the war; for the French gave him but little aſſiſtance, becauſe he had diſguſted them by preferring Foreigners. In 1701, at the age of 61 years, he loſt his wife, and with her all the repoſe and ſatisfaction of life. The war, which was occaſioned ſoon after by the Spaniſh ſucceſſion, deprived him of all his ſcholars, and reduced him to a very melancholy ſtate. It was at that time he was admitted in the Royal Academy of Sciences in quality of an *Eleve*; a quality, which it was proper to do honour to by giving it a perſon of his age and merit. He had ſuch a preſentiment of his death, though without any ſickneſs, that he refuſed to accept of ſome foreign Noblemen for his ſcholars, alledging, that he ſhould ſoon die; as he actually did April 3, 1717, of an apoplexy in leſs than two hours, being then 77 years old. He knew too much of aſtronomy to give into judicial aſtrology; and obſtinately refuſed all that was offered him to engage him to calculate nativities. Once indeed he ſubmitted to the importunity of a Count of the Empire, whom he had ſufficiently warned not to believe him. He drew up by aſtronomy the ſcheme of his nativity, and then without employing the rules of aſtrology foretold him all the inſtances of good fortune, which came into his head. The Count at the ſame time procured his horoſcope to be taken by a phyſician, who was greatly infatuated with aſtrology, and who followed exactly all the rules of that art. Twenty years after the Count informed Mr. Ozanam, that all his predictions were come to paſs, and that none of the Phyſician's had their effect. This account gave him a very different ſatisfaction from what was intended. The Count thought to compliment him upon his ſkill in aſtrology, and he was confirmed by it in his perſuaſion of the falſity of that pretended ſcience. He was of a chearful temper amidſt his

metrie, par de nouvelles demonſtrationes & des pratiques tres faciles. Paris 1685, in 8vo. There was a new Edition with Additions, in 1710. III. *Traitè des 'Lignes du premier genre, de la conſtruction des équations, & des lieux Geometriques, expliquées par une Methode nouvelle & facile.* Paris 1687, in 4to. IV. *L'uſage du Compas de proportion expliqué & demontré d'une maniere courte & facile, & augmenté d'un Traité de la diviſion des champs.* Paris 1688, in 8vo, pagg. 138. There was a new edition in 1700. V. *Uſage de l'inſtrument univerſel pour reſoudre promptement & tres-exactement tous les problémes de la Geometrie-pratique ſans aucun calcul.* Paris 1688, in 12mo. Reprinted in 1700. VI. *Dictionaire Mathematique, ou Idée generale des Mathematiques.* Paris 1690, in 4to. VII. *Methode Generale pour tracer des Cadrans ſur toutes ſortes de plus.* Paris 1685, in 12mo. This book has been printed ſeveral times. This edition, which is the ſecond, is larger than the firſt, printed in 1673, in 12mo. VIII. *Cours de Mathematiques, qui comprend toutes les parties de cette ſcience les plus utiles & les plus neceſſaires.* Paris 1693, five volumes in 8vo. IX. *Traité de la Fortifications, contenant les methodes anciennes & modernes pour la conſtruction & défenſe des Places, & la maniere de les attaquer, expliquées plus au long qu'elles n'on juſqu' à preſent.* Paris 1694, in 4to. X. *Recreations Mathematiques & Phyſiques, qui contiennent pluſieurs problémes utiles & agréables de l'Arithmetique, de Geometrie, d'Optique, de Gnomonique, de Coſmographie, de Mechanique, de Pyrotecnie, & de Phyſique, avec un Traité des Horloges élementaires.* Paris 1694, in 8vo, two Tomes. There was a new edition with additions, at Paris 1724, in 8vo, four Tomes. XI. *Nouvelle Trigonometrie, où l'on trouve la maniere de calculer toutes ſortes de Triangles rectilignes, ſans les tables des Sinus, & auſſi par les Tables des Sinus, avec un Application de la Trigonometrie a la meſure de Lignes droites acceſſibles & inacceſſibles ſur la terre,* Paris 1699, in 12mo. XII. *Methode facile pour arpenter ou meſurer toutes ſortes de ſuperficies, & pour*

his greateſt diſtreſſes; of a very generous diſpoſition, great ſimplicity of manners, irreproachable conduct, and the moſt ſtrict and exemplary devotion. He would not allow himſelf to know more of religion than the common people. He uſed to ſay, that "it "was the buſineſs of the doctors of Sorbonne to diſpute, of the Pope to decide, and of "a Mathematician to go to Heaven in a perpendicular line."

pour toiſer exactement la Maçonnerie, les Vuidanges des terres, & tous les autres Corps, avec le toiſé du bois de charpente & un traité de la Separation des Terres. Paris 1699, in 12mo. There was a new edition with corrections in 1725. XIII. *Nouveaux Elemens d'Algebre, ou Principes generaux pour reſoudre toutes ſortes de problêmes de Mathematiques.* Amſterdam 1702, in 8vo. Mr. Leibnitz in the *Journal des Savans*, of the year 1703, ſpeaks thus of this work of our Author: "Monſieur *Ozanam*'s Al-"gebra, ſeems to me greatly preferable to moſt of "thoſe, which have been publiſhed a long time, and "are only copies from Des Cartes, and his Commen-"tators. I am well pleaſed, that he has revived part "of Vieta's precepts, which deſerve not to be for-"gotten." XIV. *Les Elemens d'Euclide, par le P. Dechales. Nouvelle Edition corrigée & augmentée.* Paris 1709, in 12mo, and re-printed in 1720. XV. *Geometrie-Pratique du Pieur Boulanger, augmentée de pluſieurs notes & d'un Traité de l'Arithmetique par Geometrie, par M. Ozanam.* Paris 1691, in 12mo. XVI. *Traité de la Sphere du Monde, par Boulanger, revû, corrigé, & augmenté, par M. Ozanam.* Paris in 12mo. XVII. *La Perſpective Theorique & Pratique, ou l'on enſeigne la maniere de mettre toutes ſortes d'objets en perſpective, & d'en repreſenter les ombres cauſées par le Soleil, ou par une petite Lumiere.* Paris 1711, in 8vo. XVIII. *Le Geographie & Coſmographie, qui traite de la Sphere, des Corps celeſtes, des differens Syſtêmes du Monde, du Globe, & de ſes uſages.* Paris 1711, in 8vo. XIX. In the *Journal des Sçavans*, our Author has the following pieces; 1. *Démonſtration de ce Theoreme; que la ſomme ou la difference de deux quarré-quarrez ne peut être un quarré-quarré.* Journal of May 20, 1680. 2. *Réponſe à un probleme propoſé par M. Comiers.* Journal of Novemb. 17, 1681. 3. *Démonſtration d'un problême touchant les racines fauſſes imaginaires.* Journal of the 2d and 9th of April 1685. 4. *Methode pour trouver en nombres la racine cubique, & la racine ſurſolide d'un binome, quand il y en a une.* Journal of April 9th, 1691. XX. In the *Memoires de Trevoux*, he has this piece: *Réponſe aux principaux Articles, qui ſont dans le 23 Journal de Paris de l'an 1703, touchant la premiere partie de ſon Algebre:* inſerted in the *Memoires* of December 1703, p. 2214. H.

P.

P.

PACARD (GEORGE) took the ſurname of *Soguſian* in the title of one of his books, which makes me believe that he was born in the Lyonois or in that neighbourhood. He lived in the 16th Century. He was, I think, Miniſter at La Rochefoucaut in the year 1574, when he dedicated his natural Theology to Count de la Rochefoucaut. We read in Du Verdier Vauprivas's Bibliotheque, that this book, which contains *ſeveral Arguments drawn from the Contemplation of Nature againſt the Epicureans and the Atheiſts*, was printed at Rochelle in 1579, in 8vo. There is a ſecond edition of it reviſed by the Author and with additions [*A*]. It was printed at Niort 1606, in 8vo. The Manuſcript of this work did George Pacard a great ſervice on a certain occaſion [*B*].

[*A*] *A ſecond Addition reviſed by the Author and with additions.*] The Author left out of it a chapter concerning Antichriſt, which was in the former edition. He had publiſhed a Treatiſe on purpoſe upon that ſubject at Niort two years before (1).

(1) See the Advertiſement to the Reader, prefixed to the 4th book.

[*B*] *The Manuſcript of this work did George Pacard a great ſervice on a certain occaſion.*] Here follows what he obſerves in his dedication concerning this particular. *Being got out of priſon, where I had been kept about a year at Grenoble, I was told by a Gentleman, the Sieur de Bonpar, who had procured my liberty, that I had been preſerved and ſaved from death, which eight perſons of our party ſuffered, by the means of a copy of this collection, which I had by me, when I was taken priſoner, and which had been peruſed by ſeveral Members of the Parliament of that city.*

PACHECO (ALVAREZ), a Spaniſh Colonel, related to the Duke of Alva (*a*), ſerved under him in the Low Countries, and was ſent to Fluſhing, both to command in the place, and to forward the building of a fort there in the year 1571; but before he could get on ſhore, the Spaniſh Garriſon had already been driven out of the city. He was therefore in a maze when he found himſelf in the enemy's power. They hanged him without mercy, and without hearkening to the remonſtrance he made them, that conſidering he was a Nobleman, they ſhould behead him, ſince they would not grant him his life for the price he offered. Treſlon, who was exaſperated againſt the Duke of Alva (*b*), would come to no terms; Pacheco was forced to make his exit with two other Spaniards. Meurſius has given a pretty full account of this ſtory, but he miſtakes our Pacheco for a famous Engineer (*c*), whom the Duke of Alva had brought with him from Italy, and whoſe name was Paciotti: he ſuppoſes that the perſon who was hanged was call'd *Paciottus*. Monſieur du Maurier takes notice of ſome other miſtakes concerning our Spaniard [*A*], who was probably of the ſame family with the Cardinals Pacheco, mentioned by Moreri.

(a) Strada, Dec. 1. lib 7. ad ann. 1572.

(b) Becauſe the Duke had put to death this Treſlon's brother, in the year 1568.

(c) *Se maxime Albanum lædere exiſtimabat, ſi munitionum artificem tam inſignem, belli egregium miniſtrum & propinquo ſanguinis nexu, tempore tam alieno eriperet.* i. e. "He imagined "he ſhould "greatly vex the "Duke of Alva, by depriving him at "that juncture "of time, of a "moſt able Engineer, and "uſeful Officer, "who was alſo "related to him." Meurſ. Guil. Auriac. lib. 6.

[*A*] *Monſieur du Maurier takes notice of ſome other miſtakes concerning our Spaniard.*] He ſpeaks thus (1). "With regard to Pacheco, I cannot ſufficiently wonder at the different opinions I met with in the "moſt celebrated hiſtorians, who have given an account of the tranſactions in the Low-countries: "for Grotius aſſerts, that he was a native of Savoy, "though Bentivoglio, Strada, Meurſius, and Emmanuel van Meteren, agree that he was a Spaniard. "Cardinal Bentivoglio ſays that he was beheaded, "and the others write that he was hanged. Further, "Meurſius calls this relation of the Duke of Alva, "who was capitally puniſhed, Paciotty, though all "the other call him Pacheco: but Meurſius miſtakes "this Pacheco for Francis Paciotty of Urbino, Count "de Montefabro, who did ſo excel in the art of "fortifications, and in all warlike engines (2), that "having built the citadel of Antwerp, one of the "five baſtions of it was called by his name, at the "Duke of Alva's command, that the name of that "great man might be preſerved for ever. The other "four Baſtions were called, the Duke, Ferdinand, "Toledo, and Alva, after that Duke's different "names; and none of them were called by the name "of his maſter King Philip. Laſtly, to return to "this Pacheco, Emmanuel van Meteren, notwithſtanding he is a very accurate hiſtorian, calls him "Peter Pacheco, though Famiano Strada, who was "better informed, calls him Alvarez." To ſpeak accurately, one cannot place Grotius amongſt the hiſtorians, who aſſert that Pacheco was hanged. *Secuti Hollandiæ oppidum*, ſays he (3), *Fliſſingani quos ſurgentis arcis aſpectus & præſidium adventans commoverat; Pacieco Allobroge, operum Albanicorum peritiſſimo curatore ad ſupplicium rapto, in cauſam deſcendunt*, i. e. "Thoſe of Fluſhing, followed the example of that "city of Holland *, for being exaſperated at the "ſight of the fort that was building, and at the news "of the ſupply that was coming, they declared for "the common cauſe, having firſt put Pacieco to "death, who was come from Savoy, and who was "one of the Duke of Alva's beſt Engineers." Did not Grotius call Pacieco *Allobrox* (a man come from Savoy) becauſe he read that the Duke of Alva had obtained him from the Duke of Savoy? *Impetraverat à Duce Sabaudiæ Franciſcum Paciottum Urbinatem, Montisfabri Comitem arcium bellicarumque machinarum peritiſſimum* (4), *i. e.* "He obtained from the Duke "of Savoy Paciotti of Urbino, Count of Montefabro, "a man who excelled in the art of fortifications, and "in all warlike engines." Thuanus affords us a new variation; for he aſſerts that Peter Paciottus was killed in an inſurrection, and that his head was put on the top of a pole, and afterwards fixed on the walls of the city (5). Who knows but he imagined it was the ſame Engineer, whom he called *Paciottus Allobrox* (6), when he mentioned the citadel of Antwerp? He tells us that this Paciotus had built lately the citadel of Turin, under the direction of the Duke Emmanuel Philibert. It is perhaps from hence Grotius took the epithet of *Allobrox*, which does not belong to that famous Engineer; for he was of Urbino. One of Strada's brethren calls the perſon who built the citadel of Antwerp Iſidorus Paciottus (7), and obſerves that he left two ſons, who were excellent Engineers; the one, named Vido Ubaldus, was killed at the taking of Calais, in the year 1596: the other, named Frederic, was at Amiens the next year, when the French re-took that city (8).

(1) Du Maurier, Memoires, p. 48.

(2) Du Maurier has extracted this from Strada, Dec. 1. lib. 7.

(3) *Annal.* lib. 2. p. 50. edit. in 12mo. ann. 1658.

* Namely of Briel.

(4) Strada, Dec. 1. lib. 7.

(5) *Petro Pacioto, quem Albanus arci exſtruendæ præfecerat, in tumultu occiſo, cujus caput conto præfixum & pro mœnibus ſtatutum eſt.* Thuanus, lib. 54.

(6) Thuanus, lib. 41.

(7) Angelus Galluccius, *de Bello Belg.* part 1, lib. 8. Thuanus, lib. 116. p. 747. calls him Iſidorus.

(8) Galluc. ibid. lib. 9.

PADILLA (MARY DE), Miſtreſs to Peter the cruel King of Caſtile, was educated in Alfonſus of Albuquerque's family, and was there when the King of Caſtile fell in love with her during his expedition of Aſturias. One of the King's brothers had taken up arms againſt him in that country; as that rebellion, which was ſupported by another brother in

Arragon, might have been attended with dangerous conſequences, the Court judged it proper to put an immediate ſtop to it: The King marched in perſon with an army towards Aſturias (*a*). Don Alfonſus of Albuquerque's wife was of that journey. Mary de Padilla, one of the maidens who waited upon her, went with her, and by her beauty made a deep impreſſion of that Monarch's ſavage heart. She did not ſuffer him to languiſh long; for they lay together during that journey (*b*). John de Hiniſtroſa, the Lady's uncle by the mother's ſide, had been their mediator and confident (*c*). This happened in the year 1352. The Prince was already betrothed to Blanche of Bourbon, daughter of Peter I. of that name Duke of Bourbon (*d*), and ſiſter to the King of France's daughter-in-law (*e*). But though his bride was as beautiful as his miſtreſs, and of an infinitely more illuſtrious family [*A*], he had not the leaſt impatience to conſummate his marriage, and took it ill that Albuquerque ſhould preſs him upon that article (*f*); Albuquerque, I ſay, who feared leſt Padilla's relations ſhould riſe to the higheſt degree in the King's favour. At laſt the nuptials were celebrated in the beginning of June 1353, without any pomp (*g*). It was then ſome time ſince the miſtreſs had been delivered of a daughter (*h*). The King ſoon conceived a great diſguſt for his Conſort; for even the third day after his nuptials he reſolved to go after his miſtreſs, whom he had left in a Citadel on the banks of the Tagus. The Queen his mother, and Princeſs Eleanor his aunt, having notice of his deſign, entreated him earneſtly not to behave himſelf thus, and repreſented to him the bad conſequences ſuch a conduct might be attended with [*B*]. Their prayers and their arguments proved ineffectual; he only denied he had ſuch a deſign, and immediately ſet out ſecretly. Several Courtiers followed him, being determined to humour him in his paſſion. However, there were ſome who endeavoured ſeriouſly to perſuade him to return to his wife: they prevailed upon him: but as ſoon as he had paſt two days with her, the power of his paſſion carried him back again to his Concubine (*i*). Some thought there was witchcraft in the caſe; others imagined that he ſuſpected his wife of adultery [*C*], and that this was the reaſon why he could not bear her. He added daily ſome new affront to the ill uſage he gave her, and at laſt he came to that exceſs as to have her poiſoned in the year 1361 (*k*). All the world lamented the fate of that Princeſs, who was thus ſnatched away at the age of

(*a*) Mariana, *ubi infra.*

(*b*) *Eo in itinere Regis animus Mariæ Padilliæ, quæ in Albuquerquii familia educabatur, eximia pulchritudine captus, cum ea ad S. Facundi oppidum ſtupri conſuetudinem habere cæpit, ſponſæ immemor, novisque amoribus amens.* Mariana, *de Rebus Hiſpaniæ*, lib. 16. p. m. 80. ad ann. 1352.

(*c*) *Internuncius, pravæque conſuetudinis conciliator.* Mariana, lib. 16. cap. 17. p. 80.

(*d*) Father Anſelme, *Hiſt. Geneal.* p. 260.

(*e*) She had married King John's ſon, who was afterwards Charles V.

(*f*) Mariana, ib. cap. 17. p. 81.

(*g*) Idem, ibid.

(*h*) Idem, ibid. p. 80.

(*i*) Mariana, lib. 16. cap. 18.

(*k*) Idem, ibid. lib. 17. cap. 4.

[*A*] *Though his bride was as beautiful . . . and of a more illuſtrious family.*] Here follow Mariana's words: *Vix Caſtellæ Rex nuptiarum celebritate peracta, novam nuptam faſtidivit, in Padillæ amorem effuſus, ſi regiæ ſtirpi compararetur, ignobilis, neque majori formæ pulchritudine. Tanti plerumque eſt præpoſteræ animum libidini mancipari* (1). He obſerves in another place, that ſhe was very beautiful, and very virtuous and modeſt (2), and that the King's Embaſſadors choſe her amongſt ſix daughters of the Duke of Bourbon, as the moſt worthy to be his wife: *E ſex quas habebat, eam expetituri quam regio toro idoneam fore maximè judicarent, Blanca concedente patre delecta* (3). Obſerve, that this Duke of Bourbon had ſeven daughters: but as the eldeſt was already married (4), Mariana is not to blame for mentioning but ſix: nor ought we to cavil at him, becauſe all the other ſiſters of Blanch were not marriageable (5): for this reaſon would not have prevented the Embaſſadors from chuſing one of the youngeſt before all the reſt, had they thought her more handſome and beautiful.

(1) Mariana, *de Rebus Hiſpaniæ*, lib. 16. cap. 18. *init.* p. m. 81.

(2) *Lectiſſima forma, ſanctiſſimis moribus, prudentiaque.* Idem, ib. lib. 17. cap. 4. p. 100.

(3) Mariana, *de Rebus Hiſpaniæ*, lib. 16. cap. 17. p. 79.

(4) She was married in the year 1337 with Charles of France, afterwards King Charles V. See Father Anſelme, *Hiſt. Geneal.* p. 260.

(5) Mariana, lib. 17. cap 4. obſerves that Blanche was poiſoned in the year 1361, at the age of 25. She was therefore but 16, when the Embaſſadors of Don Pedro King of Caſtile choſe her in the year 1352, whence it follows, that ſome of her younger ſiſters were not yet marriageable at that time.

(6) Mariana, lib. 17. cap. 18. p. 81.

[*B*] *His mother, and . . . his aunt . . . repreſented to him the bad conſequences of ſuch a conduct.*] They told him that he run the danger of loſing, not only his reputation, but even all his dominions; that the French would declare war againſt him, to revenge the injury done to his conſort; that this would give the Caſtilians an opportunity to revolt; and that men do not ſcruple to attack thoſe, whom they imagine heaven forſakes, becauſe of the crimes they have commited. This is but a faint repreſentation of Mariana's thoughts; let us therefore tranſcribe his own expreſſions. *Regina mater, Eleonora amita, regis conſilio indicato, eum remotis arbitris per omnia numina & quidquid in terris ſanctum eſt, ne ſe, regnum, fortunas, nominis exiſtimationem præcipiti temeritate perditum eat, profuſis lacrimis obteſtantur. Quid orbi ſermonem, Gallis arma injuriam non laturis, civibus diſſidiorum materiam daret? Ignorare videlicet integra probitatis fama humana imperia conſtare, quos deſtitui à numine, quibus infenſum cælum eſſe, ſemel fuerit perſuaſum, in eos homines mala omnia quaſi facto agmine impetum dare* (6).

[*C*] *Some thought there was witchcraft in the caſe, others imagined that he ſuſpected his wife of adultery.*] It was ſpread abroad, that Don Pedro had been bewitched, and that a girdle enchanted by the magical arts of a Jew appeared to that Prince under the figure of a dragon. *Non amplius biduo apud eam* (Blancam) *ſubſtitit, tanto impudici amoris impatientia væſaniaque ut injectam carminibus amentiam fama vulgaverit: zona Judæi cujuſdam arte medicata draconis ſpecie regiis oculis objecta* (7). Some ſuſpected that the King did not conceive an averſion for his wife, without a juſt cauſe; ſince ſhe had ſuffered herſelf to be debauched by Frederic, Don Pedro's brother, by whom ſhe got a ſon, who became the ſtock of the family of the Henriques. Mariana explodes theſe two opinions, and looks upon the ſecond as a moſt raſh and impudent aſſertion (8). *Neutrum nobis veriſimile viſum eſt; ac credam potius ubi tetri amoris flamma pectori inſederit, non alia philtra amatoria quærenda, neque alias offenſionis cauſſas præpoſtere excogitandas, ut juvenis animus in furorem agi & de poteſtate mentis exiiſſe videretur* (9). He is in the right to obſerve that this Prince's love for Padilla was ſufficient to turn his brains, and ſo inſpired him with hatred for his Conſort, without having recourſe to love potions, or to any other fictitious cauſe. Such a diſorder as his love for Padilla was a fruitful ſpring, from which a thouſand other irregularities could ariſe. I wonder Mariana forgot to mention what has been obſerved concerning that girdle. The King *abuſed* Blanche *a thouſand ways, at the inſtigation of a Lady he kept, whoſe name was Padilla. She made him believe that the Queen, out of ſpite againſt her, had cauſed a Jew, who was a Magician, to make a girdle adorned with gold buttons, but ſo enchanted, that as ſoon as he ſhould have it about his waiſte, he ſhould loſe all his ſtrength and his underſtanding: that falling thus into his wife's power ſhe might for the future govern him, and the whole kingdom after her own fancy* (13). The author of the hiſtory of the *Favorites* (11, or miſtreſſes of Princes, has taken great liberties in paraphraſing that fine ſtory. He aſſerts, that the next day after the nuptials, the Queen gave the King *a girdle ſet with jewels of a great price, and of a curious workmanſhip* (12), that Mary de Padilla *knowing from whom Don Pedro had it, aſked for it in order to have another made after that model*; that *to ſecure herſelf* againſt the King's inconſtancy, *ſhe practiſed upon a Jew, who was a notorious magician, and who by his black and abominable art committed crimes as horrid as his own ſoul. To this ſcholar of the devil's*, continues that Author, *ſhe committed Don Pedro's girdle, who ſo bewitched it, that when the King would put it on, he imagined he was*

(7) Mariana, lib. 16. cap. 18. p. 82.

(8) *Quibuſdam ſuſpicio fuit temeraria ſane & impudens regem non ſine cauſſa à Blanca uxore repente alienatum: vitiumque illi à Friderico fratre illatum.* Idem, ibid.

(9) Idem, ibid.

(10) Paul. Emilius, Lib. 9. in the *Life of Charles* V. p. m. 548. of John Regnart's French tranſlation.

(11) Printed at Amſterdam 1697.

(12) *Hiſtoire des Favorites*, p. 8.

of twenty five years (*l*). The Miſtreſs died ſoon after at Seville (*m*), and was buried in a Monaſtery which ſhe had built (*n*). Her obſequies were celebrated throughout the whole Kingdom, as though ſhe had been a lawful Queen, and her children were educated as heirs apparent to the Crown (*o*) [*D*]. She had enjoyed a full power during her favour [*E*]. Her brother Diego de Padilla was promoted to the poſt of Lord Chamberlain in the year 1353, and the next year to the dignity of Grand Maſter of the Order of the Calatrava (*p*). John de Padilla, another of her brothers, was made Grand Maſter of the Order of San Jago in the year 1354, in the room of Don Frederic the King's brother (*q*). His marriage did not prevent his being promoted to that maſterſhip, though there was no inſtance of its having ever been given to a married man. However, let us not imagine, that Padilla enjoyed the King's favour without the leaſt mixture of grief; let us remember that in the year 1357 another Miſtreſs appeared more lovely than ſhe in the eyes of Don Pedro the cruel. That Prince conceived ſuch a paſſion for Alfonſa Coronella (*r*), that he quite forgot our Mary de Padilla (*s*). It is eaſy to imagine what a grief this was for the firſt Miſtreſs. What ſhall one ſay of the uneaſineſs ſhe muſt have been under whilſt Don Pedro was ſo deeply in love with a beautiful widow, that he made her believe he was a ſingle man, and could marry her: and indeed he married her [*F*], and if he forſook her ſoon after, it was not without having filled the heart of his Concubine with the greateſt uneaſineſs. I do not refer my reader to the hiſtory of the *Favourites* (*t*) printed in the year 1697, for the account which is given there of our Padilla is adulterated with a thouſand romantick ſtories. It is not in ſuch works we ought to look for truth, but in ſuch Authors as Mariana. Obſerve that he owns, Padilla wanted nothing but chaſtity to deſerve a Crown. *Fœminæ*, ſays he (*u*), *præter injuriam pellicatus magnis animi et corporis dotibus, dignæque imperio*, i. e. "A woman, who excepting the diſgrace of her proſtitution, was "adorned with all the good qualities of body and mind, and deſerved to be a Queen."

(*l*) Idem, ibid.

(*m*) Idem, ibid. cap. 5.

(*n*) *In Studilli Monaſterio.* Idem, ibid.

(*o*) Idem, ibid.

(*p*) Idem, lib. 16. cap. 18.

(*q*) Idem, ibid. cap. 20. p. 86.

(*r*) Mariana, lib. 17. cap. 1. p. 94.

(*s*) *In ea Urbe* (Hiſpali) *Alfonſæ Coroneliæ amoribus ita indulſit ut præ illa Padillia contemptui eſſet.* Idem, ibid.

(*t*) At Amſterdam, for Paul Marret.

(*u*) Mariana, lib. 17. cap. 5. p. 101.

girt about and ſtung by a ſerpent, which made him ſhriek in the moſt frighful manner. There was no occaſion for ſuch wicked artifices to ruin a Queen, who was already ſo unfortunate. Mary de Padilla and all her creatures told the King, that this preſent of his wife was a deadly favour, which ſhe had not poiſoned in one day only. This diſcourſe, and the dreadful effect of the girdle, encreaſed his averſion for the Queen to ſuch a degree, that he reſolved to avoid her company for ever (13). I would not have tranſcribed ſo long a paſſage from the hiſtory of the Favourites, had I not known that the ſame ſtory is related in a mere hiſtory, I mean in a work, the author of which does only tranſcribe the hiſtorians, without pretending to adorn their account with the flouriſhes of his imagination. Read the following paſſage. "Diego de Valera writes, that among "ſeveral jewels, which Queen Blanche had brought "with her from France, there was a rich girdle, of "which ſhe made her huſband a preſent, and that "Mary de Padilla having got it into her own hands, "ſent for a Jew, who being a magician, enchanted it "ſo, that when the King would put it on, he imagined "he had an adder about his waſte, and that having "complained of it to his favourites, moſt of whom "were Mary de Padilla's relations, they made him "believe it was a pernicious preſent from the Queen, "which encreaſed his averſion for her, and raiſed "his contempt to the higheſt degree (14)."

(13) Ibid. p. 9.

(14) *Hiſt. Genealogique d'Eſpagne, par Made.* *** Tom. 2. p. 272, 273, of the Rotterdam edit. 1694.

[*D*] *Her children were educated as heirs apparent to the crown.*] This is what Mariana relates. *Filii regio cultu et in ſpem paterni regni educati* (15). She had, I think, but one ſon and three daughters. The ſon was called Alfonſus, and was born at Tordeſilla, in the year 1359. The King extremely rejoyced at his birth, but his joy was ſoon changed into grief, for the child did not live long. Garſias of Toledo, grand maſter of the Order of San Jago, was to have educated that ſon (16). Beatrix, the eldeſt of the children, was born at Corduba in the year 1353 (17). Conſtance the ſecond daughter was born the next year, and married the Duke of Lancaſter, the King of England's ſon (18). The third daughter was named Iſabella, and was born at Tordeſilla in the year 1355 (19).

(15) Mariana, lib. 17. cap. 5.

(16) Idem, ibid. cap. 3.

(17) Idem, ibid. lib. 16. cap. 17.

(18) Idem, ibid. cap. 18. p. 84.

(19) Idem, ibid. cap. 21. p. 90.

[*E*] *She had enjoyed a full power during her favour.*] Her brothers and her relations were raiſed to high dignities, and had very great credit at Court (20). Nothing was done in the whole Kingdom but according to their ſchemes. The Grandees, and even the King's own brothers, endeavoured to inſinuate themſelves into the Miſtreſs's favour, and for that purpoſe they ſpared neither preſents nor humble addreſſes. *Omnino ſe Rex & rempublicam Mariæ propinquis gubernandum tradiderat: eorum arbitratu belli & pacis conſilia gerebantur: proceres ipſique Regis fratres tempori ſervire, atque ad fortunæ motum ſe movere: ad Mariæ gratiam donis, officiis, aſſentatione aditum certatim captare* (21). In this woman's behalf the moſt antient cuſtoms were broken through and trod under foot, even when they were nearly connected with the principles of Religion. Was it not for her ſake that the poſt of Grand Maſter of the Order of San Jago was made conſiſtent with a married life (22)? This was indeed a great diſorder, and could not but give offence to the people, and create a great diſcontent amongſt them. They who read ſuch particulars are leſs offended at them, than moſt of thoſe who are eye-witneſſes to them. But take notice, that I make an oppoſition here between thoſe who read much, and thoſe who read almoſt nothing. The latter imagine that the corruption of their times is ſomething extraordinary: and it is this, that makes them murmur moſt: whereas the former, who know from hiſtory that the diſorders of their time are more or leſs common to all ages and nations; the latter, I ſay, are patient, they are uſed to ſuch diſorders, and hardened againſt all ſubjects of offence. The Government of the Concubines of Princes does not raiſe their indignation, becauſe they know many inſtances of it. But they, who do not uſe to read much, are terribly offended, when they ſee that a proſtitute miſtreſs becomes the idol of the Courtiers, becauſe ſhe is the diſpoſer of all favours. See the article of Diana of POITIERS (23).

(20) See Mariana, lib. 16. cap. 18.

(21) Idem, ibid. p. 82, 83.

(22) *Joannem Padillum Villageræ regulum in Friderici locum D. Jacobi Magiſtrum ſubſtituendum curavit, & quidem conjugem, contra ſuperioris temporis exempla. Novum exemplum legibus moribuſque validius fuit: ab eo quoque initium ſuſceptum at conjuges iidem & Magiſtri eſſent. Mariæ ingratiam, quæ novi magiſtri ſoror erat, majorum inſtituta violata.* Mariana, lib. 16. cap. 20. p. 86.

(23) In the remark [*N*].

[*F*] *Don Pedro was ſo deeply in love with a beautiful widow, that . . . . he married her.*] Her name was Joan de Caſtro; ſhe had been married with Don Diego de Haro (24). Her beauty and her chaſtity were uncommon (25). The King fell in love with her, and as he had no hopes to gratify his paſſion but under the title of an huſband, he pretended he was not married, and alledged ſeveral proofs of the reluctancy with which he had married Blanche of Bourbon. Two Biſhops were conſulted, and declared that marriage void. After which ſentence Don Pedro made haſte to marry the widow; he was ſoon tired of his new wife; and continued but a few days with her: ſome even ſay that he left her the very next day after the nuptials (26). And yet ſhe proved with child, and had a ſon, who was her comfort, but who met with a very unſettled fate. *Copia faſtidium ut antea faciente, paucis apud novam nuptam diebus moratus, ſunt qui una tantum nocte dicant. . . . . Joannes filius ex iis nuptiis procreatus eſt, matri ſolamen, fortunæ ludibrium futurus* (27).

(24) Mariana, *de Rebus Hiſpaniæ*, lib. 16. cap. 18.

(25) *Viduæ cui forma comparari nulla poterat, inſigni pudicitiæ laude viduitatis incommoda ſuſtentabat.* Idem, ibid.

(26) Idem, ibid.

(27) Idem, ibid.

PADILLA (JOHN DE) one of the ringleaders of the ſedition which aroſe in Caſtile in the year 1520. His wife is ſaid to have engaged him in that rebellion, in which ſhe had engaged herſelf, becauſe in a dream ſhe had ſeen him raiſed to the dignity of Grand Maſter of San Jago [*A*]: it is added that ſhe had a maid ſervant, who pretended to witchcraft [*B*], and foretold her that ſhe ſhould be raiſed to great honours. However it be, there was no Lord in that confederacy, who ſhewed more zeal than his Lady, to deprive Charles V. of the Crown [*C*]. She plundered the Churches, that ſhe might have money enough to keep up the Rebellion: but ſhe committed that ſacrilege very devoutly [*D*]. The

[*A*] *His wife is ſaid to have engaged him in that rebellion, . . . becauſe in a dream ſhe had ſeen him raiſed to the dignity of Grand-maſter of San-Jago.*] Let us ſee what Anthony de Guevara wrote to her. *I know very well that the firſt aſſembly met at your houſe, where that fire was kindled, which you have always blowed and kept in ever ſince. Wherefore I have often enquired, what might be your reaſon for thus diſturbing the whole Kingdom; to which I was anſwered by your relations and friends, that it was your dreaming and imagining, that you ſaw your huſband Grand-maſter of the Order of San-Jago: which if true, was a great folly in you, and no leſs an impertinence, for perhaps, inſtead of giving him that Commandry, or the Order, which is a Croſs, we ſhall lay another croſs upon him* (1). Is it not a deplorable thing, that a woman's dream ſhould have been capable to occaſion ſo many diſorders, and ſuch ſacking and plundering throughout an whole Kingdom? The firſt who began that great rebellion, was Don Ferdinand d'Avalos: he gain'd the Lady we ſpeak of; ſhe engaged her huſband, who having prevailed upon Don Pedro Giron to join with them, carried things to ſuch a height, that men talked already of erecting every conſiderable city in Caſtile, into a particular Commonwealth (2). *Ferdinand d'Avalos was the firſt Author of the rebellion; and I am well informed that it was promoted at your houſe; ſo that he piled up the wood, but you ſet fire to it* (3). This civil war was therefore one of thoſe which have but trifling cauſes.

(1) *Epiſtres dorées*, Liv. 1. p. m. 186. That letter is dated March the 10th, 1522. The ſame thing is to be met with in a letter of the 3d book, p. m. 21. dated January the 15th 1522.

(2) Brantome, *Capitaines Etrangers*, Tom. 1. p. 173. He has extracted this from Guevara's letter, p. m. 172. Liv. 1.

(3) Guevara, Liv. 3. p. 21.

[*B*] *. . . that ſhe had a maid, who pretended to witchcraft.*] This is what Guevara charges her with (4). *We have been told in theſe quarters, that you have a ſlave who is a great witch, and who told you for certain, that you would ſoon be a Queen, and your huſband a King; that you would ſucceed to Don Charles and Donna Iſabella, King and Queen of Spain. If it be ſo, that you really give credit to ſuch idle fancies, which I cannot believe, beware of the Devil, and of his artifices and cunning devices.* In another letter he ſpeaks to her thus (5). *It is ſaid further, that you have a white ſlave, or a mad ſlave, who is a great witch; and that ſhe told you for certain, that within a little time people would call you* your Excellency, *like a Princeſs, and that your huſband would be ſtiled* his Highneſs. *So that you pretend to ſucceed our Sovereign Lady the Queen, and your huſband hopes to be raiſed to Charles the Fifth's dignity.*

(4) Ibid. Liv. 1. p. 187.

(5) Ibid. Liv. 3. p. 28.

[*C*] *None . . . . ſhewed more zeal than that Lady, to deprive Charles* V. *of the crown.*] This is ſaying a great deal; for Don Antonio de Acugna, Biſhop of Zamora, was ſo ardent in that rebellion, that at the age of threeſcore and ten, he acted as the youngeſt and moſt reſolute Brigadier in the army could have done. Don Antonio de Guevara wrote him a letter, of which the Reader will not be diſpleaſed to find ſome extracts here. *To make ſoldiers turn prieſts,* ſays he (6), *is a thing that may be ſuffered; but to make prieſts turn ſoldiers, is a moſt ſcandalous action, which I ſhall not ſay you ſuffered, my Lord, but you committed yourſelf; ſince you took with you above three hundred prieſts from Zamora, to fight at Tordaſillas: and like a good Prelate you led them thither in Lent, to begin that war at a time when they ſhould have been employed in hearing people's confeſſions. In the attack which the Knights and Governors of the Kingdom made againſt your party, I ſaw with my own eyes a prieſt, who being hid behind a battlement, ſhot eleven of our men dead on the ſpot with an Arquebuſs; but the cream of the ſtory is, that whilſt he was levelling his piece at them, he croſſed and bleſſed them with the barrel, and then diſpatched them with the bullet. I ſaw alſo, that before the battle was finiſhed, this honeſt prieſt was ſhot through the head, ſo that his death was ſo ſudden, that he had not time to confeſs his ſins, much leſs to croſs himſelf . . .* (7). *I have often ſeen you with an halberd on your ſhoulder, but never with a book in your hand, nor with a ſtole about your neck: but I muſt not forget to obſerve, that you uſed to ſay to the ſoldiers, who were ſtorming the fort of Ampudia, and tumbled down, Courage, my friends, courage, up, up again, mount, mount, fight bravely, like ſtout fellows; if you dye in the engagement, let my ſoul be lodged with yours, ſince your cauſe is ſo juſt, and your undertaking ſo holy. Now, you know very well, my Lord Biſhop, that the ſoldiers who died there, were excommunicated by the Pope, traitors to the King, diſturbers of the Kingdom, guilty of ſacrilege, robbers, enemies to the Commonwealth, and the abettors of rebellion. Whence it is plain that the Biſhop, who held ſuch diſcourſes, had not a very tender conſcience, and was not much concerned for the loſs of his ſoul, ſince he choſe to dye like a ſoldier; nor do I wonder that a man ſhould chuſe to dye like a deſperate ſoldier, who had not the leaſt value for his character.* The Lady Mary de Padilla (8) muſt have been prodigiouſly paſſionate in this cauſe, if her fury came up to that of this Prelate. There were ſome other women who joined with this faction, *and who were the moſt eager in it,* ſays Brantomè (9), *as we have alſo ſeen in our civil wars of the League; nor can one give any reaſon for it, unleſs it be that they were deceived by the ſermons and perſuaſions of ſome preachers and ſeducers.* Mind theſe laſt words, and obſerve that the Biſhop of Zamora was at laſt taken and ſtrangled (10).

(6) Ibid. Liv. 1. p. 170.

(7) Ibid. p. 171.

(8) Thus Guevara calls her. Others name her Donna Maria Pedrecco, as we learn from Brantome, *Capitaines Etrangers*, Tom. 1. p. 174. Guevara called her probably after her husband's name. Count de la Roca, *Hiſt. de Charles-Quint*, p. 55. calls her Mary Pacheco, and to that name we ought to keep.

(9) Brantome, *Capitaines Etrangers*, Tom. 1. p. 174.

(10) Count de la Roca, *Hiſt. de Charles-Quint*, p. 56.

[*D*] *. . . ſhe committed that ſacrilege very devoutly.*] Let us ſee how Brantome relates this. "There is "ſuch another, and even a more pleaſant ſtory told "of Donna Maria de Padilla, one of the genteeleſt "Ladies in Spain, and who was very zealouſly affect-"ed for the rebellion which aroſe in Spain in the "beginning of the Emperor Charles's reign, as Don "Anthony Guevara relates. That Lady wanting mo-"ney to pay her ſoldiers, took all the gold and ſil-"ver of the relicks at Toledo: but ſhe did it with "a holy and pleaſant ceremony: ſhe entered the "church on her knees, her hands joined, covered "with a black veil, or rather, with a wet ſack, as "Rabelais calls it, grieving, whining, beating her "breaſt, ſighing, and crying, having two large "lighted torches before her: after ſhe had cleverly "finiſhed her plunder, ſhe went back with the ſame "ceremony, thinking, and firmly believing, that "this ſad ceremony, or rather hypocriſy, would "ſcreen her againſt God's anger and reſentment. "It would make a man laugh heartily, to ſee the "ſame ſcene acted over again. But the cream of "the jeſt is, (as the ſtory goes) that whereas rob-"bers, when they ſteal any thing, do it with great "joy and cheerfulneſs, and cry when they are pu-"niſhed; this Lady, on the contrary, cried whilſt "ſhe robbed, and if ſhe had been puniſhed, ſhe ought "conſequently to have laughed, contrary to what "is cuſtomary with other robbers (11)." It appears from the firſt words of this paſſage, that the Author had been ſpeaking of another ſtory of the ſame kind. Every curious Reader will be deſirous to know what that ſtory is; I ſhall therefore relate it here, in behalf of thoſe who may not have an opportunity to conſult Brantome immediately. Anthony de Leve being at the ſiege of Pavia, *and wanting money to ſatisfy and pay his ſoldiers, the Lanſquenets having already mutinied, he bethought himſelf of an artifice, which the Hiſtorians mention, though I do not relate it yet; but what was moſt comical is, (as the Spaniards relate)* que tomò toda la plata conſagrada de los Templos, prometiendo todas vezes con voto ſolemne à los ſantos, que ſi quedava vencedor, coſas harto majores que las que tomava, de hizo batir dinero groſamente. *That is to ſay, he took the conſecrated plate from the churches, promiſing, however, with a ſolemn vow to the ſaints, that he would give more conſiderable things than thoſe he took, if he ſhould return conqueror: and then he cauſed*

(11) Brantome, *Capitaines Etrangers*, Tom. 1. p. 127, 128. He extracted this from a letter which Don Antonio de Guevara wrote to that Lady. It is in the firſt book of that Author's *Epiſtres Dorées*, p. 184 of the French tranſlation, printed at Antwerp, in the year 1591.

The behaviour of a Curate towards Padilla deſerves to be related [*E*]. This man's Rebellion and his wife's got more ground at Toledo than any where elſe (*a*). They were both of a very illuſtrious family. The huſband had but very little merit: nor was the wife a very deſerving woman, though ſhe valued herſelf very highly; for ſhe was extremely proud and arrogant (*b*). Padilla was routed near Villalar *, and fell into the Conqueror's hands. He was beheaded two days after (*c*). His wife made her eſcape into Portugal (*d*). Her maiden name was Mary Pacheco; ſhe was Tendillos de Mendoza's daughter, if we may believe Paul Jovius, who obſerves alſo that ſhe was learned (*e*).

(*a*) Count de la Roca, *Hiſt. de Charles-Quint*, p. m. 40.

(*b*) Idem.

* It ſhould be perhaps *Villa-Real.*

(*c*) Count de la Roca, *Hiſt. de Charles-Quint*, p. 54.

(*d*) Ibid. p. 56.

(*e*) *Quum Maria Paceca Tendilii Mendocii filia eruditi ingenii & virilis animi mulier Padillæ conjugis vexillum ne concitatæ multitudini deeſſet dux gerendo bello ſuſtuliſſet.* Paul. Jovius, *Hiſt.* lib. 19. folio m. 7 *verſo.*

that plate to be rudely coined. But he practiſed ſoon after that proverb, paſſato il pericolo, gabbato il ſanto, *when the danger was over, the Saint is laughed at; for he never reſtored a peny of it. A fine pay-maſter indeed! It was ſtill ſaid in my younger days at Pavia, that he left it to the Emperor to pay the debt and to accompliſh the vow, ſince it was for his ſervice the plate had been borrowed, and the vow made* (12).

(12) Brantome, ibid. p. 126.

[*E*] *The behaviour of a Curate towards Padilla deſerves to be related.*] Let us again tranſcribe Brantome's words. "A Curate of Mediana . . . had ſo great an "affection for Don Juan de Padilla, one of the ring-"leaders of the rebellion, that he never failed every "Sunday after ſermon to ſay a Pater-noſter, and an "Ave-Mary for him, and for the holy ſedition, for "which he was very zealous: he continued theſe "prayers a whole month, after which it happened "that Padilla's troops paſſed through the Curate's "village; they devoured all his poultry and his ba-"con, drank his wine, and what was worſe, took "away with them his chamber-maid. The next "Sunday he made his complaint in his ſermon, re-"lated what damage they had done him, and parti-"cularly their carrying off his maid Katy, whom "he named by her own name; he warned the peo-"ple not to follow any longer Padilla's party, but "the King's; ſending Padilla and all his followers "to the Devil, and entreating his audience to cry, "long live the King, and down with Padilla, which "was done accordingly, all the reſt being ſent to "ten thouſand Devils. We have been witneſſes to "many ſuch ſtories, during our wars with the "Leaguers, when the reſentment and ſpite of thoſe "who had been plundered, made them curſe that "holy League and ſacred confederacy like the de-"vil (13)." That the Reader may judge whether or not Brantome took too much liberty, either when he abridged or enlarged the accounts he tranſcribed, I ſhall ſet down here Guevara's account word for word, according to the tranſlation of Guttery the Phyſician. "A Curate of Biſcay, "half mad, had ſo great an affection for John de "Padilla, that every Sunday in his ſermon, he uſed "to ſpeak thus: Brethren, I charge you to ſay a "*Pater-noſter*, and an *Ave-Mary*, for the holy ſediti-"on, and popular inſurrection, that it may never "ceaſe: I deſire you to ſay another *Pater-noſter* for "his Majeſty King John de Padilla, that God may "proſper him, and another for the Queen his Con-"ſort: for to be plain with you, theſe are our true "and lawful Kings: all the others, who have reign-"ed till this time, have been Tyrants. Theſe "prayers continued very near three weeks; after "which John de Padilla happened to paſs through "that village with his troops: and as the ſoldiers, "who were lodged at the Curate's houſe, took a-"way his chamber-maid, drank his wine, and eat "all his poultry and all his bacon, he told his flock "the next Sunday, You know, brethren, how laſt "week John de Padilla paſt through this place; "and I imagine you are not ignorant how the ſol-"diers, who lodged at my houſe, left me not one "ſingle hen, eat all my bacon, and drank my four "half hogſheads of wine: but above all, theſe wick-"ed creatures took from me, as you know, my "poor Katy. I tell you this, my friends, that for "the future you may not pray for him any more, "but for the King Don Charles, and for the Queen, "Lady Jane his mother, who are our lawful Sove-"reigns (14)."

(13) Brantome, *Capitaines Etrangers*, Tom. 1. p. 175. He borrowed this from Guevara's *Epiſtres Dorées*, Liv. 1. p. m. 173.

(14) Guevara, *Epiſtres Dorées*, Liv. 1. p. 173.

PADILLA (LOUISA), Counteſs of Aranda, in the 17th Century, was extremely commended by the Spaniards, as will appear from a paſſage of Don Juan de Laſtanoſa, which I ſhall tranſcribe [*A*].

[*A*] *In a paſſage . . . which I ſhall tranſcribe.*] "I "have heard of two kinds of Readers complain of "Balthazar Gratiano's works. Some find fault with "the ſubject, others with the ſtile. The former, "becauſe they have a very great eſteem for his "works; and the latter, becauſe they wiſhed his "writings were of a little more uſe to them. The "former, amongſt whom is this Phœnix of our age, "the learned Counteſs of Aranda *, whoſe name is "wrote down for poſterity by ſix immortal pens, "takes it ill, that ſuch ſublime ſubjects, which are "proper only for hero's, ſhould be made common by "being printed; ſo that the meaneſt citizen may "have for a crown, things, which by reaſon of their "excellency, cannot be well in ſuch hands (1)." This complaint calls to my mind, thoſe who found fault with Monſieur Du Pin, for publiſhing in our language *(French)* a new Bibliotheque of Eccleſiaſtical Authors. See the laſt page of his preface, and the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (2).

(1) *Juan de Laſtanoſa*, preface to Gracian's treatiſe, entitled the *Diſcreet*. See Monſieur Amelot de la Houſſaie's preface to the *Homme de Cour*, or the Courtier.

* Donna Luiſa de Padilla.

(2) For June 1686, article 4. p. 658.

PAGEAU (N.) one of the moſt illuſtrious Advocates of Paris, died in July 1683, *being ſtill pretty young* (*a*). His Elogy, extracted from a manuſcript, intitled, *Portraits des Avocats*, i. e. *The Characters of the Advocates*, is inſerted in the *Mercure Galant* (*b*), and in a work of Father Bouhours (*c*).

(*a*) *Mercure Galant*, for July 1683, p. 128.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 128, &c.

(*c*) Intitled, *Maniere de bien penſer dans les Ouvrages d'Eſprit*, p. 395, &c. of the Dutch edit.

PALEARIUS (AONIUS), a man of the greateſt probity, and one of the good writers of the 16th Century, was born in Veroli (*a*), an Epiſcopal City in Campagna di Roma [*A*]. He acquired great knowledge in the Latin and Greek languages, and was not only well ſkilled in polite Literature, but alſo in ſound Philoſophy and Divinity; and, to improve himſelf ſtill more, he viſited the greateſt part of Italy, ſtudying under the ableſt authors he could meet with in that country. He ſpent ſix whole years in Rome, before the city was taken by the army of Charles V. and returned to it ſeveral times after it

(*a*) Hence he is named Verulanus.

[*A*] *An Epiſcopal City in Campagna di Roma.*] I do not underſtand theſe words of the Preface, which I ſhall cite hereunder: *Natus eſt Aonius Verulis (oppidum id eſt Latii Epiſcopalis)*; and I conjecture that the perſon who writes in this manner, had a book before him, in which was writ *urbs Latii Epiſcopalis*; and that having put *oppidum* inſtead of *urbs*, he forgot to write *epiſcopale* inſtead of *epiſcopalis*.

[*B*] *He*

it had suffered that calamity (*b*). He gave a publick testimony of the progress he had made, by a noble Poem he wrote on the immortality of the Soul (*c*), and gained the esteem of the men of wit and learning of that time [*B*]. Retiring to Tuscany, he made choice of the city of Sienna for his fixed abode ; and being there appointed professor of polite Literature, he got a great number of pupils. He also married at thirty four years of age, when living in that city, a young gentlewoman for whom he had a passionate affection so long as he lived, and who brought him four children (*d*). The tranquillity he enjoyed was a little disturbed by the contests he had with one of his collegues, who was exasperated to see his reputation eclipsed by the splendor of that of Palearius : but Peter Aretin soon silenced that envious man [*C*]. But a much more dreadful storm broke out soon after. Anthony Bellantes, a Nobleman of Sienna, being impeached of several misdemeanours, was cleared by the excellent defence Palearius made for him. Some time after, he accused some Monks of robbing his Grandmother ; and again employed Palearius's eloquence to assert his right. The defendants making oath that they had not defrauded the old Lady in any manner, were acquitted by the Court ; but they harboured a strong resentment against their opponent's pleader, and had recourse to their usual artifices in order to ruin him ; and accordingly they aspersed him as an impious wretch, and represented him such in their Sermons. However, Palearius defended himself with so much strength and eloquence, that the accusation was laid aside. But at last he grew tired of the vexatious prosecutions to which he saw himself exposed, and therefore left Sienna and went and settled at Lucca [*D*], whence he remov'd some years after to Milan.

(*b*) Palear. *Epist.* 4. lib. 1. p. 406.

(*c*) See the remark [*F*].

(*d*) Two boys and two girls.

He

[*B*] *He gained the esteem of the men of wit and learning of that time.*] We are told the names in the Preface to the new edition of Aonius's works, of several persons who loved and esteemed him. *Summo in honore fuit Palearius apud viros ætatis istius principes : Petrum Bembum, Jacobum Sadoletum, Franciscum Sfondratum, Ennium Philonardum, Ecclesiæ Romanæ Cardinales ; Janum Benedictum Lampridium, Marcum Antonium Flaminium, Andream Alciatum,* i. e. " Palearius was greatly respected by the most emi- " nent men of that time ; such as Peter Bembus, " James Sadoletus, Francis Sfondratus, Ennius Phi- " lonardus, Cardinals : James Benedictus Lampri- " dius, Mark Anthony Flaminius, and Andrew Al- " ciatus." Those who are desirous of knowing the names of several others of his friends, need but cast their eye on the catalogue annexed to the last edition of his letters, where the names are given of those who wrote to him, and to whom he wrote. In the edition in question, after the Preface, we meet with an excellent character which several learned men have given him ; but since the following verses of Baptist Pigna are not inserted, I thought it would not be improper to cite them here :

Aoni decus Aonum sororum,
Quos mihi dedit aureos libellos
Riccius tuus, aureos libellos
Qui desiderium omnibus relinquunt
Quo magis relegunt magis legendi,
Intentis oculis libenter hausi.
Immortalem animam probas in ipsis.
Ipsi secula sempiterna, & esse
Immortalem operam tuam probabunt (1).

(1) Jo. Baptista Pigna, Carmin. lib. 3. p. m. 81.

The Sense is,

" Aonius, glory of the tuneful nine,
" The golden volumes which thy Riccius gave me,
" Attentively I've read : and those who once
" Peruse them, can but wish to oft repeat
" The pleasing task, and read them ten times over.
" Therein you prove the soul to be immortal.
" These books eternity will fully prove,
" And that themselves shall last to endless ages."

[*C*] *Peter Aretin soon silenced that envious man.*] If I mistake not, Aretin was prompted to this in order to revenge his own cause, or to gratify his own detracting humour, and not for the sake of revenging Palearius. Senis *primum exagitari cœpit insanis contentionibus nescio cujus professoris, (ipse* Machum Blateronem *vocat) qui putabat tantum decedere de suo honore, quantum Aonii virtutibus & meritis dabatur. Quamquam hunc morionem ignobilem brevi compescuit mordax ingenium Petri Aretini, qui stolidum pecus omnium ludibriis sanniscque exposuit in fabula quadam vulgari idiomate conscripta, & Venetiis publico spectaculo exhibita* (2), i. e. " He first began to be molested in " Sienna, by the stupid contention of I know not " what professor, whom he himself calls Machus the " babbler, who fancied that his fame and reputation " were diminished in proportion, as Aonius's virtue " and merit were applauded. However, this mean " wretch was presently silenced by Peter Aretin's " sharp pen ; this writer making the silly fellow in " question a laughing-stock to the whole work, in a " Play he wrote in Italian, and which was exhibited " publickly in Venice." Palearius makes great complaints of this enemy ; and represents him as a mere ignorant wretch, who was so little skilled in the Latin tongue, that he was utterly despised by the scholars in Sienna whom he taught it. At the time that Palearius wrote this, the person in question taught in Lucca ; and endeavoured to prevent his adversary from coming to that city, by his slanderous reports (3) ; but the reader will find by the following remark, that all his efforts proved abortive. *Machus Blatero, is de quo hominibus nostris fabula data est ab Aretino, lepidè & festivè scripta, homo impudentissimus, & puræ veræque Latinitatis tàm ignarus, quàm ii qui trans Taurum incolunt : Senis quamdiu fuit, magnas mihi turbas fecit, veritus ne munus interpretationis scriptionum Latinarum mihi demandaretur : in qua cum ille infeliciter multos annos laborasset, apud eruditiores juvenes nihil aliud fuerat assequutus, quàm turpissimum infantiæ nomen : Is nunc Lucæ est : utinam tàm cognitus, quàm Venetiis, ubi & fabula acta est, & Machus ludibrio habitus* (4), i. e. " Machus " the babbler, he on whom Aretin wrote a very " witty facetious Play, is a very impudent fellow, " and as ignorant of correct, just Latin, as those na- " tions who dwell beyond mount Taurus. He mo- " lested me very much during my abode in Sienna, " being afraid lest the professorship of the Latin " tongue should be bestowed on me : in which hav- " ing toiled unsuccessfully for many years, the only " thing he acquired among the more learned scho- " lars was, the most ignominious name of babe. He " now is in Lucca ; but would to God he were as " well known in that city as in Venice, where the " Comedy is exhibited, and Machus made a laugh- " ing-stock."

(2) *Præfat. Operum Aonii Palearii*, edit. 1696.

(3) Palearius, epist. 17. lib. 3. p. 500.

(4) Ibid. p. 499.

[*D*] *He went and settled at Lucca.*] He was invited hither by the Magistrates, in order to teach polite Literature ; and he did not accept of that employment from a love for teaching, but because he had not means sufficient to defray the expences of his family. *Cum Lucenses homines honestissimi propositis præmiis invitarent me singulorum dierum unius horæ usurâ ad interpretandum, accepi conditionem duram mihi & asperam, & vero etiam odiosam* (5), i. e. " " The very " worthy Magistrates of Lucca inviting me, with " the offer of a handsome gratuity, to teach an hour " every day ; I accepted the proposal, which indeed " was harsh, grievous, and even odious to me."

(5) Ibid. epist. 4. lib. 4. p. 509.

He had been invited thither by the Magiſtrates, who gave him ſeveral marks of their eſteem, by granting him (e) ſeveral privileges, and a conſiderable ſtipend. Unhappily for him, a Cardinal, who had been a Dominican, and a ſevere inquiſitor, was raiſed to the Papal Throne (f) after the death of Pius IV. He was deſirous of ſignalizing, by the execution of ſome famous Hereticks, the beginning of his pontificate; for which reaſon he ordered the re-hearing of Palearius's cauſe. Upon this, our learned man was ſeized at Milan, and carried to Rome, where it was not found a difficult matter to convict him of having ſpoke in favour of the Lutherans and againſt the inquiſition [E]. He was condemned to be burnt, and the ſentence accordingly was put in execution in the utmoſt rigour in 1566 (g) [F]. He wrote ſeveral pieces both in proſe and verſe. The beſt

(e) Anno 1559.

(f) Under the name of Pius V.

(g) Extracted from the preface to Palearius's works. Amſterdam edit. 1696.

His wife loved parade, his children were no enemies to oſtentation; whence he was obliged to turn preceptor, though againſt his inclination; fearing, at the ſame time, that this employment would damp his genius, and leſſen the ſtrong propenſion he had for ſtudies of a more exalted nature. But he is not the only man who has been forced to undertake that province, and whom family expences have reduced to the neceſſity of groaning under the heavy burthen that is neceſſarily formed by the explaining and hearing leſſons. Here follow our Author's words, who expreſſes himſelf finely on this occaſion; he declaring, that his teaching Latin and Greek was a taſk ſo ungrateful, that he thought himſelf in a houſe of correction, to which neceſſity, and not an unadviſed conduct had driven him. That he had ever thought that ſuch genius's degraded themſelves very much, who were forced to teach, when they were capable of exerting themſelves in nobler things. But that as his circumſtances were narrow, his wife ſumptuous, and his children of a lofty diſpoſition, and he was therefore at a conſiderable expence; he was forced to make himſelf a ſlave to occupations, which he had always abhorred. *Moriar ſi non me angunt puditiſſimæ interpretationes meæ, ſive Græcæ, ſive Latinæ, in quas veluti in piſtrinum detruſi me, non tàm imprudentiâ, quam neceſſitate. Ego enim, ut ex meis ſtudiis noſſe potuiſti, ſemper judicavi obſcurum & ſordidum iis, quorum ingenio aliquid fieri poteſt illuſtrius, ſi interpretandis ſcriptis aliorum humiles ac demiſſi, quaſi ſervitia ancillentur. Sed cùm mihi res domi eſſet anguſta, uxor lauta, liberi ſplendidi, & propterea magnos ſumptus facerem, mancipavi propè me iis ſtudiis, à quibus ſemper abhorrui* (6).

(6) Ibid.

[E] He was convicted *of having ſpoke in favour of the Lutherans, and againſt the inquiſition.*] The Friars, who endeavoured to ruin him in Sienna, exclaimed againſt him as a heretick, becauſe he declared plainly enough that he diſapproved certain ſuperſtitious practices: and they alſo did not approve of the book he compoſed on Chriſt's death (7). In the apology he was obliged to make, he did not ſcruple to ſay that thoſe German Doctors, who followed Luther, deſerved commendation on certain accounts, and that the inquiſition was inſtituted to put men of learning to death. His affair was amicably concluded; and it was agreed, that all the copies of his apology ſhould be burnt (8). Nevertheleſs, three were preſerved, one of which he kept, his adverſary kept another, and the third was that which Peter Victorius had (9). The copy which remained in the accuſer's poſſeſſion was employed to convict Aonius, he there writing as follows in favour of the Proteſtants. *Germanos vocas Oecolampadium, Rotherodamum, Melanchthonem, Lutherum, Pomeranum, Bucerum, & cæteros qui in ſuſpicionem vocati ſunt? Ego verò ex Theologis noſtris tam ſtupidum arbitror eſſe neminem, qui non intelligat & fateatur, permulta eſſe in his quæ ab illis ſcripta ſunt, digna prorſus omni laude: ſunt enim graviter, accuratè & ſincerè ſcripta, repetita vel ex patribus illis primis, qui præcepta nobis ſalutaria reliquerunt: vel ex commentationibus Græcorum, & noſtrorum hominum* (10), i. e. "Do you call Oecolampadius, Eraſmus, Melancthon, Luther, Pomeranus, Bucer, and other perſons who have been ſuſpected, Germans? 'Tis really my opinion that none of our Divines are ſo ſtupid, as not to know and acknowledge, that a great many things in their compoſitions deſerve the higheſt applauſe: for they are written with gravity, accuracy, and ſincerity; being extracted either from thoſe antient fathers who have left us ſalutary precepts, or from the Commentaries of the Greeks and of our Divines." Here alſo follows what he relates concerning the Inquiſition. *Quòd niſi indicto concilio ſpes bonis injecta eſſet, negotium felix & ſalutare à Pontificibus, à Cæſare, à Regibus unà ſuſceptum iri, ut magnis concurſibus omnium gentium, omnium nationum celeberrimi conventus peragantur, deſperaremus omnino tantarum perturbationum finem ullum unquam futurum: deſperaremus poſſe fieri, ut ſica iſta diſtricta in omnes ſcriptores de manibus eorum extorqueatur, qui vel leviſſimis de cauſis crudeliſſimè ferire didicerunt: à quibus appetitus fuit aliquando vir omnium ſanctiſſimus & integerrimus, Sadoletus meus* (11), i. e. "But if men of probity had not "reaſon to hope that, by the ſummoning of a Council, "a propitious and moſt beneficial work would be undertaken, in concert, by the Pope, the Emperor, and "Kings, in order for the holding a moſt auguſt aſſembly of perſons of all nations; we might quite "deſpair that ſuch diſturbances as theſe could ever "be ſuppreſſed: we might deſpair of ever ſeeing "that poniard, which is levelled againſt all Authors, "forced out of the hands of a ſet of people, who "have learnt to wound in the moſt barbarous manner, "and that on the moſt trifling accounts: and by "whom my excellent friend Sadoletus, the moſt pi-"ous, and moſt worthy man that ever lived, was "ſome time ſince attacked." At the time that Palearius drew up this apology, Ochinus had made his eſcape but a little before (12); and conſequently we may ſuppoſe that it was writ about the year 1542 or 1543. Palearius was a good Proteſtant at that time, but did not ſay all he thought. In 1596 a book was found, in his own hand writing, entitled, *Teſtimonium ad gentes & nationes quæ invocant nomen Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti*, to which a larger treatiſe is annexed, entitled, *Actio ex declaratione teſtimonii in Pontifices Romanos & eorum Aſſeclas. Ad Principes Chriſtianos, & Præfectos Concilio, in quibus habitat Spiritus Dei.* He wrote this work a little before the opening of the Council of Trent; he intending to get the Emperor's Embaſſadors to preſent it to that aſſembly. 'Tis a regular plea in defence of the Proteſtants, and was not publiſhed till the year 1606 (13). We therein find two doctrines which are not approved by them; one, that marriage is a ſacrament; the other, that a Chriſtian ought not to ſwear, not even before a judge (14).

(7) This work, written in Italian, is loſt. See the plan of it in Palearius's 3d oration, p. 90, 91.

(8) *Præfat. Operum Palearii.*

(9) Ibid.

(10) Palearius, *Orat.* 3. p. 83.

(11) Ibid. p. 91.

(12) Ibid.

(13) Neither the year, nor the place where printed, are expreſſed in the title; but we are informed by the *Acta Eruditor* for January 1696, p. 44. that it was printed at Leipſic in 1606.

(14) See the Advertiſement to the Reader.

[F] *He was condemned to be burnt . . . (α) . . . . in 1566.*] The perſon, who publiſhed *Actio in Pontifices*, anno 1606, informs us that Palearius was burnt at Rome about the year 1558, and that he made a publick declaration of his faith. *Circiter annum Domini 1558 (ut ejus amicus quidam mihi narravit) Mediolani captus, vinctus, & Romam miſſus eſt; ubi fidei ſuæ confeſſione fortiter edita, flammis adjudicatus eſt* (15). However the editor in queſtion is miſtaken with reſpect to the time. The Author of the Preface to the new edition ſhews plainly that we muſt follow Thuanus, who ſays that this learned man was burnt in 1566 (16); by which Simler is refuted, who ſays (17), that this Martyr was beheaded in 1570, which is an error in chronology, and one alſo with regard to the kind of puniſhment. I have been told, that he was burnt on account of his book concerning the immortality of the Soul, but this is a falſity; but there is nothing in that noble Poem which the Roman Catholicks can condemn. Some perſons in a letter writ from Italy to Mark Velſerus, declared that this work was not writ by Aonius Palearius: but I don't know what anſwer was made to Velſerus, who immediately aſked what Author it ſhould therefore be aſcribed to (18). I have ſhewn above, that Pigna applauds Palearius, as Author of that Poem, and all the Bibliographers declares it to be his. I find by Geſner's epitome, that it was printed at Lyons in 1536. James Sadoletus,

(15) *Actio in Pontifices.*

(16) Thuan. *Hiſt.* lib. 39. p. m. 779.

(17) In *Epitome Biblioth. Geſneri.*

(18) See Velſerus's letters, p. 878.

best edition is that of Wetstein, at Amsterdam, *anno* 1696.

letus, Bishop of Carpentras (Carpentoralte) wrote a letter to Gryphius (19), to exhort him to print it. He also wrote a letter to the Author (20), and therein bestows high encomiums on that work. Palearius had sent him a copy of it, of an edition that was far from correct, and desired him to prevail with Gryphius to reprint it (21). It would be impossible for a work to be more strongly recommended to a printer, than Sadoletus recommends this to Sebastian Gryphius. I here transcribe only part of the Elogium. *Numerus porro carminis is est, ut videatur Lucretium velle imitari, redolet enim antiquum illud; sed ita sapore humanitatis conditus est, ut asperitate demissa, vetustatis tamen autoritas salva remaneat. Atque hæc in universum. Illa jam partium singularium propria, nihil non Latine dictum, nihil non accuratè, quove judicium & diligentiam adhibitam esse non pateat: multaque præterea ubique nitentia ingenii & venustatis luminibus, et, quod ego pluris quam reliqua omnia facio, Christiana mens, integra, castaque religio, erga Deum ipsum honos, pietas, studium; in eo libro vel maximè, non solum docere mentes errantium, sed etiam animos incendere ad amorem puræ religionis possunt* (22), i. e. "Further, he seems to have endeavoured to "imitate Lucretius in the harmony or numbers of "the verse, it resembling that antient piece; but it "is so finely seasoned with sweetness and elegance, "that it retains all the strength without the harshness "of antiquity. So much for the general character "of the work in question. With regard to particular parts, every thing is expressed in correct Latin; "with accuracy; and shews that the greatest judgment and application had been used; not to mention that several things in it shine with wit and "elegance. But the circumstance for which I chiefly "value it is, the Christian disposition, the pure, "uncorrupt Religion, the reverence, piety, and affection towards God it exhibits; all which may not "only conduce to instruct the minds of such as are "in an error, but also to inspire them with a love for "true Religion."

§ (α) He was hanged and strangled before his body was committed to the flames. See the new *Menagiana*, Paris Edit. 1715. Tom. I. p. 217, 218. REM. CRIT.

(19) His letter is inserted in the edition of Aonius Palearius, 1696, p. 564.

(20) 'Tis found, ibid. p. 562.

(21) See Letter 2. lib. 3. of Palearius, p. 434.

(22) Sadoletus, *Epist. ad Gryph.* p. 565. *Oper. Palear.* edit. 1696. It is also in Sadoletus's *Epistles*, p. 184. edit. Lugd. 1554.

Here follow some few additions to this Article.

☞ PALEARIUS (AONIUS) was baptised by the name of Anthony, but changed it afterwards for that of Aonius, pursuant to the custom of those times. The names of his father and mother, who sprung from noble and antient families, and whom he lost young, are known to us only by the epitaph hereunder [*A*]. He declares in one of his Epistles (*a*), that he would have been glad, at that time, to travel into France, Germany, and even Greece; but that the narrowness of his circumstances would not let him indulge his wishes in that particular. He was prompted to reside in Sienna, because of the pleasantness of the situation, and the sprightly and sagacious genius of the inhabitants; and accordingly he sold the possessions he had in Veroli, his native place, which he resolved to leave for ever; and that without the least regret, he himself confessing that he was not beloved there. He purchased a country-house, in the neighbourhood of Sienna, called *Ceciniano*, which he fancied had formerly belonged to Cecina, whom Cicero defended, in order to retire thither on his leisure days, and accordingly embellished it as much as possible. We have taken notice above of his being seized at Milan, carried to Rome, and executed there [*B*]. Here follows a compleat list of his works [*C*] (*b*).

(a) *Epist.* 4.

(b) From the preface to Palearius's works, &c.

[*A*] *By the epitaph hereunder.*] 'Twas written some years after by our Palearius; and, by his order, inscribed on their monument. *Matthæo Paleario, & Claræ Janarillæ, optimis parentibus; & Elysæ, Franciscæ, Janillæ Palleariis, sororibus honestissimis Aonius Palearius posuit mutato solo* (1).

(1) Niceron, *Hommes Illustres*, Tom. 16. p. 53. Paris 1731, 12mo.

[*B*] . . . . *and executed there.*] He was condemned to be burnt, and the sentence was accordingly executed in 1566, according to Thuanus. The Editor of *Actio in Pontifices* in 1606, fixes his execution about the year 1558; but this cannot be exact, since Pope Pius V. was not elected till 1566. John James Frisius, in his continuation of Gesner's epitome, is also mistaken in putting it as far back as the year 1570. Bayle, who ascribes this error to Simler, did not observe that the latter did not continue Gesner, but from the year 1545 till 1555, and consequently that he could not speak of things that happened since. Palearius was burnt, but not alive, as is inserted by Thuanus; but after having been hanged and strangled, as *Latinus Latinius*, who was in Rome at the time of his execution, affirms, in the Iambicks he wrote against him, to which he was prompted by a very odd whim. Having seen a letter of James Sadoletus, addressed to him, and directed to *Antonio Palearo Verulano*, he imagined that Palearius had, from an impious consideration, preferred the word Aonius, in which the letter T, (the figure of the cross) is not found; and imputed this to him, as a crime, as tho' he thereby gave an indication of his giving up the sign of Christianity; not foreseeing (adds this Writer) that his contempt of this cross would one day bring him to a fatal and infamous punishment. A childish thought, and unworthy of a man of sense (2)!

(2) Idem, ibid.

[*C*] *Here follows a complete list of his Works.*] 1. *De immortalitate Animorum libri tres. Lugduni.* Gryphius 1536, in 16°. Palearius was so well pleased with this edition, that he wrote a letter of thanks to Gryphius, which is inserted among his epistles. This poem has born several impressions since; and is in the collection of Palearius's works, which I shall mention hereafter. Some have imagined, but falsely, that this book brought him to the stake, since there is not one erroneous tenet in it; so far from it, that he therein very well establishes the doctrine of the soul's immortality, in opposition to Lucretius, for which reason Daniel Pareus annexed it to his edition of that Poet, published by him at Frankfort in 1631, 8vo. There are five imperfect hemisticks in the course of these three books. Palearius perhaps left them so, to imitate Virgil; but if this was his design, he imitated that famous Poet in nothing else, his versification being no ways Virgilian. 2. *Epistolarum libri* 4. *Orationes, & de Animorum immortalitate libri tres. Lugduni. Sebast. Gryphius* 1552, 8vo. *It. Basileæ.* It was printed twice in that city. *It. Bremæ* 1619, 12mo, and published by Matthias Martinius. There are 14 orations. The letters, though of no great importance, do nevertheless contain certain particulars of Palearius's life. 3. *Actio in Pontifices Romanos & eorum assectas ad imperatorem Romanum, reges & principes Christianæ reipublicæ, summos Oecumenici Consilii præsides conscripta, cum de Concilio Tridenti habendo deliberaretur.* 'Tis not known whether this piece made part of his accusation, and contributed to his condemnation. 4. *Poematia.* This consists of some poems, printed at Paris in 1576. 5. *Aonii Palearii opera. Ad illam editionem, quam ipse autor recensuerat & auxerat excusa, nunc novis accessionibus locupletata. Amstelodami* 1696, 8vo. This edition contains all the pieces abovementioned; and the editions consist only of two letters of Palearius, extracted from other collections, with five other letters written to him. The Editor has also given a preface, wherein a circumstantial account is given of the Author's life. *Ead. Opera Recensuit & Dissertationem de vita, fatis & meritis Aonii præmisit Frid. And. Halhaver.* Jenæ 1728, 8vo (3). I also meet with the following title; *Dialogo intitulato il Grammatico overo delle false Esercitazioni delle scuole (da Aonio Paleario.)* Perugia 1717 (4).

(3) From Palearius's works, and Niceron, ib.

(4) *Bibliotheca Menckeniana*, p. 750. Lipsiæ 1727, 8vo.

PALINGE-

PALINGENIUS (MARCELLUS) is very well known by a Poem divided into twelve books, and entitled *Zodiacus vitæ* [*A*]. He employed ſeveral years in compoſing it, and dedicated it to Hercules II. of Eſte, Duke of Ferrara. *Opus noſtrum . . . . . in duodecim libros digeſtum, multoſque per annos elaboratum, Celſitudini tuæ donamus* (*a*). Some ſay that he was phyſician to this Prince [*B*]. Others rank him among the learned Lutherans, to whom the Dutcheſs of Ferrara, Renata of France, gave a reception in her Court, and honoured with her protection (*b*). 'Tis certain that Palingenius ſpoke with prodigious freedom againſt the Friars, and the abuſes of the Church, which is the reaſon of his being inſerted in the *Index Librorum prohibitorum* (*c*), as a Lutheran Heretick of the firſt claſs. ['Tis expreſt as follows in the Index. *Marc. Palingenius, natione Italus, poeta Lutheranus.* Now this relates to his perſon, and not directly to his work, which abounds with reflections that ſavour much more of impiety than of hereſy. Theſe words of Bayle, *A Heretick of the firſt Claſs*, confine too much the true title of this firſt claſs, which extends to impious books, as well as thoſe of an heretical caſt. For inſtance, we therein ſee the works of Rabelais, *&c.* and the title is as follows; *Authorum damnatæ Memoriæ opera* *.] This even related that his body was dug up and burnt, upon pretence of his being a Heretick [*C*]. [Lilius Giraldus, the only eye-witneſs to the incident in queſtion, does not ſpeak of hereſy but of impiety: *Poſt ejus mortem in ejus cines ſævitum eſt ob impietatis crimen* †.] Nevertheleſs, he declared himſelf a good Catholick in the cloſe of his Dedication; he ſubmitting all his opinions to the cenſure of the Church [*D*]. They are of ſuch a nature that all of them cannot be pleaſing to the Proteſtants. He ſometimes carries too far the objections ſtarted by the ſcoffers at Religion, and exhibits them in ſuch a manner as ſhews he did not condemn them. This circumſtance excepted, his *Zodiac* contains good things; and is a truly philoſophical ſatyr againſt immorality and falſe prejudices

(*a*) *Epiſt. Dedic.*

(*b*) See Seckendorf, *Hiſt. Luther.* lib. 2. p. 122. num. 5. ad ann. 1528. He cites Schultetus's *Annals*, p. 148.

(*c*) Page 765. edit. 1667, folio.

* From the remarks to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dictionary, Tom. 4. p. 969.

† Idem, ibid.

[*A*] *He is very well known by a poem divided into twelve books, and entitled*, Zodiacus vitæ.] *Hoc eſt de hominis vita, ſtudio, ac moribus optime inſtituendis, libri* XII. Each of theſe books is intitled from one of the ſigns of the Zodiac. I doubt not but this is the reaſon why our author calls himſelf Poeta Stellatus. [This is a miſtake, Palingenius aſſuming the name of Stellatus, becauſe he was born in Stellada, in the Dukedom of Ferrara *.] The elder Scaliger (1) has ſtrongly cenſured, and, in my opinion, very juſtly, the little conformity there is between the ſubjects of each book, and the qualities of the ſigns of the Zodiac, which is the title of the work. I ſhall obſerve, by the way, that Barthius wrote a Poem (2) in imitation of that in queſtion; and he entitled it, *Zodiacus vitæ Chriſtianæ; Satyricon pleraque omnia veræ ſapientiæ myſteria ſingulari ſuavitate enarrans.* He has divided it into twelve books, each of which is entitled from one of the ſigns of the Zodiack. He did not trouble himſelf to obſerve any conformity between the ſubjects of each book, and the virtue of which is aſcribed to each of thoſe twelve conſtellations.

* From the rem. Tom. 4. p. 969. added to the Paris edition of Bayle's Dict.

(1) Julius Cæſar, *Scalig. Poet.* lib. 6. p. m. 731, 732.

(2) Printed at Franckfort, in 1623, 8vo.

[*B*] *Some ſay that he was phyſician to this Prince.*] This is affirmed by Scævola Sammarthanus (3), which I dare not deny; but ſhall content myſelf with ſaying, that our Poet was not known to the Duke of Ferrara, when he dedicated his book to him; he declaring in his Dedication, that fame informing him of this Duke's erudition, he had preſumed to wait upon him, after the hopes, which Braſavolus had given him, of meeting with a favourable reception. *Quid mihi cum principe qui alienis oculis videt? ore loquitur alieno? illum volo qui per ſe poſſit curvum diſcernere recto: cui non auſint maligni homines dicere candida de nigris, & de candentibus atra. Talem igitur cùm te eſſe omnes prædicent, Dux illuſtriſſ. audacter ad te profectus ſum: eo maximè quòd Antonius Muſa Braſavolus, vir ſingulari doctrina integritateque conſpicuus, qui excellentiam tuam fideliſſimè colit, mihi de te ſpem optimam attulit: quippe qui doctrinam, humanitatem, liberalitatemque tuam mirifice apud me commendavit. Cujus verbis tantum habeo fidei, quantum dici poſſit. Ego igitur ſuadente, &c.* (4), i. e. "Wherefore ſhould I addreſs a "Prince, who ſees with other's eyes, and ſpeaks with "other's ears? I want a Prince who is able, of himſelf, to diſtinguiſh right from wrong; and in whoſe "preſence ſpiteful men dare not call black white, "and white black. As therefore, moſt illuſtrious "Duke, you are univerſally proclaimed to be ſuch, "I have made bold to wait upon you; and was "eſpecially prompted to it, becauſe Antonius Muſa "Braſavolus, a Gentleman famous for his learning "and probity, who has the moſt faithful reſpect "for his excellency, gave me reaſon to hope that "my addreſſing you would not be diſagreeable; he "beſtowing the higheſt elogiums on that learning, "humanity, and munificence; and 'tis certain that "no one can be more fully perſuaded of the truth of "his words than I am. I therefore, *&c.*" I am to obſerve that he is not in the catalogue of phyſicians who have been Poets, compiled by Bartholinus.

(3) In the title of his French tranſlation of ſome paſſages from Palingenius, cited by Du Verdier Vau Privas, *Biblioth. Françoiſe*, p. 842.

(4) Paling. *Epiſt. Dedicat.*

[*C*] *'Tis even related that his body was dug up and burnt, upon pretence of his having been a Heretick.*] I have read this in Melchior Adamus: *Edidit præterea*, ſays he (5), ſpeaking of Chriſtopher Wirſungus, *Marcelli Palingenii Stellatenſis (cujus cadaver, propter pietatis doctrinam in Italia exhumatum concrematumque fuit) poëmata doctiſſimis adjectis commentariis*, i. e. "We likewiſe publiſhed, with very learned notes, "the Poems of Marcellus Palingenius, whoſe body, "on account of his doctrines, was dug up in Italy "and burnt."

But I have a more authentick teſtimony than this; Gyraldus, who lived in that age, and in the country where this ſcene paſſed, affirms that the aſhes of this Poet met with cruel treatment: *Poſt ejus mortem in ejus cineres ſævitum eſt, ob impietatis crimen* (6).

(5) Melchior. Adam. *in Vitis Philoſophor.* p. 253.

(6) Gyrald. *de Poet. ſuor. tempor. Dial.* 2. p. m. 569.

[*D*] *He ſubmitting all his opinions to the cenſure of the Church.*] He confeſſes that, having cited the opinion of the Philoſophers, he perhaps had exhibited falſities, but that he is not reſponſible for this. 'Twill be better to hear his own words. *Si tamen in tanto opere aliquid fortè reperitur quod à noſtra religione aliquantum diſſentire videatur, mihi minimè imputandum cenſeo. Nam dum aliquando de rebus Philoſophicis loquor, diverſorum philoſophorum opiniones refero, præſertim Platonicorum. Quæ ſi falſæ ſunt, non ego, ſed ipſi reprehendi debent: cùm mea ſit intentio, à Catholica fide nunquam declinare. Quo circa in omnibus quæ ſcripſi, orthodoxæ Eccleſiæ me humiliter ſubjicio: ejuſque cenſuram, ut virum Chriſtianum decet, libenter accipio* (7), i. e. "Nevertheleſs, if any particulars ſhould be found, "in ſo large a work, that may ſeem to differ in "ſome little meaſure from our religion, methinks "this ſhould not be imputed to me. For ſometimes, "in treating of philoſophical ſubjects, I cite the "opinions of various Philoſophers, particularly of "the Platoniſts: but if theſe are falſe, it is not I "who ought to be reproved, but they; it being my "intention, never to deviate from the Catholick "Faith. Hence I willingly ſubmit whatever I have "writ to the orthodox Church; and receive with "willingneſs, and in ſuch a manner, as becomes a "Chriſtian, its cenſure." The inquiſition, after ſuch a declaration, could not juſtly proſecute his perſon, nor declare him a Heretick: this ſtigma

(7) Paling. *Epiſt. Dedicat.*

dies (d). This Poem has born a numberleſs multitude of impreſſions [E]; but I do not find that any perſon was acquainted with that which Chriſtopher Wirſungus publiſhed, with a Commentary (e). 'Tis a little ſtrange, that a Poet of ſo much merit ſhould be ſo little mentioned in the great number of elogiums which the Italians have publiſhed on the writers of their nation; but this probably is owing to his having been thought a heretick. However this be, his life is but little known. He was Naudæu's favourite author.

(d) See Baillet, *Jugemens ſur les Poetes*, num. 1259.

(e) See the rem. [C].

A certain learned man is of opinion, that Marcellus Palingenius is a fictitious name, under which Marſillius Ficinus is diſguiſed. [" Bayle ſhould have ſaid without the leaſt " heſitation, that the learned man hinted at by him was ſtrangely miſtaken. Ficinus, " born in 1433, died 1499. Palingenius dedicated his *Zodiacus vitæ* to Hercules of " Eſte, the ſecond of that name, Duke of Ferrara, who had not that title till 1534. " Beſides, he there mentions Clement VII. *viz.* at the cloſe of the tenth Book:

..... " *Sed nunc ſummus parat arma Sacerdos*
" *Clemens, Martinum cupiens abolere Lutherum.*"] * Idem ibid.

He ſtrengthens his conjecture from a paſſage in which Ficinus declares he had two fathers, *viz.* Ficinus a phyſician, and Coſmo de Medicis, and that he ſprung from the former, and was regenerated by the latter: *Se duos habuiſſe patres, Ficinum Medicum, & Coſmum Medicen; ex illo natum, ex iſto renatum (f).* I could eaſily believe that *Palingenius* is not the name of the family of the Author of *Zodiacus vitæ*, but a name turned into Greek after the cuſtom of thoſe times. However, I cannot think that the work in queſtion was writ by Ficinus, on account of the proſecution which Gyraldus informs us was carried on againſt the aſhes of the author of this Poem (g.)

(f) Ficinus, *Epiſt. Dedicat. ad Laurent. Medicen in Libr. de Vitâ*, Tom. 1. p. m. 482.

(g) See the remark [C].

ought to have fallen, at moſt, on his doctrine; for a man is condemned for obſtinacy, not error. [" Had the " affair related only to ſome particular tenet or opi- " nion, with regard to which Palingenius had declared " before-hand, that he ſubmitted to the Church. " Bayle's reflection might be juſt: but we have rea- " ſon to conſider, as fallacious, the ſort of ſubmiſ- " ſion made by a man who teaches impiety, &c. " Bayle himſelf does not deny but that he was juſtly " ſuſpected of impiety. *He ſometimes*, (ſays he) *car- " ries too far the objections ſtarted by the ſcoffers at " Religion, and exhibits them in ſuch a light as ſhews he " did not condemn them.* To this I add, that he de- " livers, without the leaſt ſcruple, the doctrine of " Epicurus. in this third book, and elſewhere. Ni- " cholas Bourbon † the Poet, having read Palinge- " nius's Zodiac immediately after its publication, " ſoon diſcovered the impious principles of the au- " thor; and for this reaſon he ſays, in the verſes he " addreſſed to him *(ad Palingenium Poëtam:)*

" *Quid ſentiam dicam: ingenium admiror tuum,*
" *Et laudo diligentiam;*
" *Sed eſt aliquid, quod ſcire ex te, quod & tibi*
" *Dixiſſe in aurem pervelim.*"

† A Poet who lived in the 16th century.

" See Bourbon's *Nugæ*, Lib. VIII. (131. of Gry- " phius's edition of 1538.")

[E] † *This poem has born a numberleſs multitude of impreſſions.*] The Authors of *Index Librorum prohibitorum*, quote that of Baſil 1537, and obſerve that it followed that of Italy; but do not inform us either of the year, or the place where this was printed (8). I make uſe of that of 1569, 8vo, where we neither have the Printer's name, nor the name where printed. There is a large index, which had been printed before in the edition of 1537, as Geſner obſerved (9). [" Bayle wrote in too indeterminate a " manner, in ſaying, *this poem has borne a number- " leſs multitude of impreſſions.* By the way, the firſt " edition is rather of 1536; the ſecond taken notice " of by Bayle, is of 1537. The Author ſeems not " to have lived much after that date, as appears " from what Gyraldus ſays, who wrote about 1543. " (x)]" His Epitomiſer does not mention Wirſungus's Commentary, neither under the word *Palingenius*, nor *Wirſungus*. Moreri affirms, that this work *has been tranſlated into French, and other languages.* La Croix du Maine obſerves only, that Scævola Sammarthanus having publiſhed a tranſlation of part of this Author, promiſed to do the whole. His words are as follow: *As he has ſhewn by his finely poliſhed imitations of the learned Italian poet* Marcellus Palingenius, *whom he has tranſlated in ſo graceful a manner, that this has kept many from ſetting about it, who before had reſolved to give a verſion of it in our language. He promiſes to continue the whole tranſlation of Palingenius's Zodiac; but has hitherto printed only part of it, with the reſt of the French poems, which he has entitled,* His firſt Works, *containing four books of imitations and tranſlations, collected from various Greek and Latin Poets, printed in Paris by Frederick Morel, anno* 1569 (10). Du Verdier agrees with this; he ſaying, that Scævola Sammarthanus publiſhed *a collection of ſeveral diſcourſes, extracted from the* Zodiacus *of the life of Marcellus Palingenius, Phyſician to the Duke of Ferrara, and tranſlated,* by him, *into French verſe* (11). Moreri would have been a little puzzled, had any perſon aſked him which were the reſt of the poems of this Italian Author (12). [I have met with the following edition of Palingenius's poem; *Palingenii, Marcelli, Zodiacus vitæ, emendatus & auctus.* Rotterdam 1722 (†)].

(9) In *Bibliotheca*, folio 492.

(*) From the remarks Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. *ubi ſupra.*

(10) La Croix du Maine, *Bibliotheque Francoiſe*, p. 842.

(11) Du Verdier, Vau Privas, *Bibliotheque Francoiſe*, p. 453.

(12) He wrote ſome poems, and one among the reſt entitled *Zodiacus vitæ.* Moreri, under the word Palingene.

† Addition by the Tranſl.

† From the remarks to the Paris edition of Bayle's Dict.

(8) The ſame may be ſaid of Geſner and his Epitomiſers.

PALLAVICINO (FERRANTE) author of ſome ſatyrical writings, which occaſioned his loſing his head on a ſcaffold. I have nothing to add to what Moreri ſays of him, except that we find an abridgment of his life, prefixed to the new tranſlation of his *Divortio Celeſte* (a).

(a) Printed at Amſterdam 1696, and writ by a gentleman of great wit and merit (α).

(α) Mr. Brodeau d'Oyſeoille, then Counſellor in the parliament of Metz, and afterwards Lieutenant-General in the Bailiwick of Tours, grandſon of the Commentator of Louet. He undertook this tranſlation, as a ſpecimen of the progreſs he had made in the Italian, which he had been learning ſome months. REM. CRIT.

Here follows the life of this Author, extracted immediately from the Italian.

☞ PALLAVICINO (FERRANTE) a witty writer in the 17th Century, was the ſon of Marquis Pallavicino, a Nobleman of conſiderable diſtinction, and of an illuſtrious family [A] in Piacenza (a) in Italy. He gave, from his infancy, the ſtrongeſt indications of

(a) Placentia.

[A] *Whoſe family was illuſtrious.*] An Author of his life obſerves, that the family of the Pallavicini is ſo well known, that it wants no encomiums; and that, perhaps, one of its leaſt prerogatives, is, its having been

of an exalted genius. Having made a great progreſs in the elements of learning, he was ſent by his parents (more perhaps for the intereſt of his family than from his own inclination) to a Monaſtery, where he improved very much in learning and piety, and raiſed the higheſt expectations of himſelf [*B*]. But afterwards engaging, by his own inclination, and the ſollicitation of others, in compoſitions of a dangerous kind, that were unworthy of his family and profeſſion, he paved the way to vice [*C*]. The firſt cauſe of his diſgrace was an intrigue in which he was engaged with a girl in Venice [*D*]. About this time, more for the ſake of lucre, than from a love for writing, (the bookſellers paying a high price for his manuſcripts) he compoſed ſeveral works, and among others his *Corriero Svaligiato*, or the Courier robbed of his Mail [*E*]. He at laſt got an opportunity of travelling into Germany, with Duke Amalfi, under the character of his Chaplain. He lived near ſixteen months with this Duke; and imbibed by the great liberty allowed in that country, a greater freedom, both in his life and writings. Being returned to Venice, (from Germany) very much diſguiſed in his face by the Evil, contracted either by the ſtoves of that country, or his intrigues with the women, he reſolved to new model his *Corriero Svaligiato*, and enlarge it with many new letters and diſcourſes [*F*]. But, giving his manuſcript to Francis Picenini a bookſeller, he was betray'd, and ſoon thrown into priſon [*G*], where he lay ſix months; and being releaſed from it, threw off the religious habit, and ſkulked privately up and down. The Nuncio Vitelli, prompted either by revenge, or at the inſtigation of his ſuperiors, got Pallavicino to leave Italy [*H*] with one

been incorporated among the Venetian Nobility, merely on account of its merit. *Ne' ci fermeremo punto à teſſer encomii alla nobilità del ſuo naſcimento, eſſendo coſì divulgati i faſti della illuſtriſſima Caſa Pallavicina, che l'eſſere i chiariſſimi Antenati di Ferrante aſceſi per ſolo merito d'opere eccelſe all'acquiſto della Nobiltà Venetiana, e forſe una delle ſue minori eccellenze e prerogative* (1).

(1) *Opere ſcelte di Ferrante Pallavicino, Di nuovo riſtampato, &c.* In his Life prefixed, p. 1. (the pages are not marked.) *Villa franca*, 1673, 12mo.

[*B*] *Raiſed the higheſt expectations of himſelf.*] Here he paſſed his life very happily, and with great applauſe: and was thought to bid very fair for making a conſpicuous figure in eloquence (2).

(2) Ibid. p. 2.

[*C*] . . . *to devote himſelf to vice.*] Being now immerſed in the pleaſures of ſenſe, and paſſionately fond of fame, it is no wonder that the fire of his youth ſhould hurry him on to deſtruction. And being often forewarned of this by an intimate friend, he uſed to excuſe himſelf, by ſaying, that Venus had naturally a mighty aſcendant over great genius's. And with regard to the licentiouſneſs of his writings, he uſed to aſcribe it to the caſt of the age, and of his friends; as though it would not have been poſſible for him to regulate his inclinations agreeably to the dictates of reaſon; and to indulge his thirſt after fame, and pleaſe his friends, without endangering his own life (3).

(3) Idem, ibid.

[*D*] *An intrigue in which he was engaged with a girl in Venice.*] He had obtained leave, from his General, to go into France, and pretended to ſet out for that country; but ſo far from it, he did not once leave the city abovementioned (inchanted by the love of a young woman) but lived privately there; and having too ready a talent at inventing fictions, he impoſed upon his friends, to whom he often wrote letters, containing feigned relations of his travels thro' the provinces of France; informing them, at the ſame time, of the ſeveral things tranſacted in that court, which he learned from the advices of many conſiderable perſons, with whom he then correſponded. *Haveva egli ottenuto licenza dal ſuo generale di paſſare in Francia; ma come quello, che viveva incatenato dall' amor d'una giovane in Venetia, non mai partì da quella citta (nella quale ſi trattenne allora quaſi incognito) non che dall' Italia, come che eſſendo di felicisſimo ingegno nell' inventar delle favole, faceſſe trauvedere la religione, e'l mondo ſcrivendo continue lettere à diverſi Amici, co' quali s'intendeva, con la favoloſa relatione de' ſuoi finti viaggi per tutte le provincie di Francia; e con veri e certi anviſi de' ſucceſſi di quella gran Corte, chegli venivano ſuggeriti da' fogli ſegreti di Perſonnaggi qualificati, cò quali teneva allora corriſpondenza e domeſtichezza* (4).

(4) Ibid. p. 3.

[*E*] *His* Corriero Svaligiato.] This is a collection of letters, moſtly of a ſatyrical kind, the hint of which was ſuggeſted to him, and which proved the chief cauſe of his ruin. He, at firſt, gave this work ſuch a caſt, as could not give much offence, except to the Spaniards, againſt whom he was exaſperated, either from his own inclination, or the ſuggeſtions of others; or from a ſpirit of rivalſhip with Count della Rocca, Embaſſador from his Catholic Majeſty, who being a Gentleman of wit and fine parts, uſed to take a delight in engaging in literary diſputes with the learned Italians; he keeping a preſs in his own houſe, where he uſed to print both the challenges and anſwers (5). This work in queſtion was licenſed by the Inquiſitors; but falling into the hands of the Secretary of the Republic of Venice, who at that time was the Licenſer of books, he could not be prevailed upon to give his *imprimatur*, though great intereſt was employed for that purpoſe, but would never return the manuſcript; which exaſperated our Pallavicino to ſuch a degree, that he would have then ruined himſelf, by his raſh deſigns, had he not been reſtrained by his friends (6).

(5) Idem, ibid.

(6) Idem, ibid.

[*F*] . . . *to new model his* Corriero Svaligiato.] As he ſtill harboured the ſtrongeſt reſentment againſt the Secretary of the Republick, for not returning him his manuſcript; and was diſguſted at the Barbarini *, at that time all powerful in Rome, becauſe they endeavoured, at the inſtigation of the Jeſuits, to cauſe all his manuſcripts to be forbid the preſs; he took this fatal opportunity to diſcharge his rancour againſt his ſuppoſed enemies (7).

* Pope Urban VIII. and his nephews.

(7) Idem, ibid.

[*G*] . . . *giving his manuſcript to Francis Picenini.*] This Bookſeller undertook to get the manuſcript printed ſecretly, by a brother of his; but at the ſame time he was betrayed by a learned Italian who pretended to be his friend. This man, being a ſpy, informed againſt him to the Arch-biſhop Vitelli, then the Pope's Nuncio in Venice, juſt as the work was finiſhed at preſs. At the ſame time he went to the Bookſeller, to whom he repreſented the great hazard he ran in keeping thoſe books by him; and thereupon bought the whole impreſſion, which he after ſold with very great profit to himſelf. Upon the complaints made by the Nuncio abovementioned, Pallavicino was impriſoned (8).

(8) Ibid. p. 4.

[*H*] *He got Pallavicino to leave Italy.*] In the mean time, a war broke out between the Barberini and the Duke of Parma; when Pallavicino, either to recover the favour of that Prince, who was diſpleaſed at ſome things our author had publiſhed in 1636, or to revenge himſelf on thoſe whom he imagined had cauſed his impriſonment, wrote the *Bacinata per le Api Barberini*, or *tinkling inſtrument, to call together the Barbarine Bees.* This piece was written on occaſion of Pope Urban VIII. his declaring war againſt the Duke of Parma; and by the date of the Dedication appears to have been compoſed in 1642. Our author was ſo imprudent as to dedicate it, in terms of the higheſt contempt, to the Nuncio Vitelli; who finding that little notice was taken of his complaints againſt Pallavicino, employed, by means of a conſiderable bribe, one Charles Morfu, a Frenchman, of a vile character, but who pretended to paſs for a Gentleman, to inſnare him. And now the traitor uſed his utmoſt endeavours to inſinuate himſelf into Pallavicino's friendſhip, and at laſt exhorted him to go with him to France, where he declared that

one Morfu, who ſet out firſt for Geneva, to the great ſatisfaction of his deluded companion, who intended to get ſome of his works printed in that city [*I*]: but inſtead of conducting him to Paris, he went towards Avignon, where, croſſing a little river, they were ſeized by a company of *Sbirri* *, upon pretence of their carrying contraband goods, and confined: however, the traitor was diſcharged ſoon after, and rewarded in a very liberal manner. As for Pallavicino, he was thrown into priſon; and being ſtrictly examined with regard to ſome compoſitions of his found upon him, he made a very artful defence. However, neither his cunning, nor the arguments he employed could avail, the ſentence of his condemnation being already come from Rome; ſo that he was to be brought to a trial only for form-ſake. Pallavicino was confined in a dark dungeon; but he ingratiated himſelf ſo well into the goaler's favour, that he allowed him wax candles from time to time, that he might amuſe himſelf with reading. But our Author, who had another deſign in view, getting together a great many of thoſe tapers, one night ſet fire to the priſon-door, in hopes of thereby having an opportunity of eſcaping; but not ſucceeding, he was confined much cloſer than before, and treated with greater inhumanity than he deſerved. When he had been impriſoned about a year, he was brought out; and having defended himſelf with great ſtrength, imagined he ſhould be ſet at liberty, and had begun a whimſical piece on Melancholy: yet ſo unhappy was his fate, that he was ſentenced to die, and accordingly loſt his head on a ſcaffold, in the flower of his age [*K*]. Hereunder is a catalogue of his ſelect works [*L*]. He was a fine genius, and had a great facility in writing [*M*]. Notwithſtanding the fame of his works, he uſed yet to ſpeak modeſtly enough of himſelf; but could never be prevailed upon to flatter any great man, upon his compoſitions. His own works were frequently tinctured too ſtrongly with envy, malice, and gall. He made but a mean figure in converſation; and, when in company of perſons of worth and diſtinction, he often would retire to a corner of the room, and ſeem quite wrapt up in thought; he never exerting his wit and humour, after his return from Germany, but when in company with ſome mean woman. A circumſtance which ſtaggered him in his principles, was, his diſputing upon the Chriſtian Religion and Divine Providence, with a German officer who was broke upon the wheel. The author from whom theſe particulars are extracted, affirms that our Pallavicino did not write *Il Divortio Celeſte* [*N*]. We

* Officers under the Prevôt.

that his fortune would be made, by means of the uncommon encouragment which, he ſaid, Cardinal Richelieu gave to men of letters. The better to colour the deceit, he ſhewed our author feigned letters from this Cardinal; inviting him to France, and expreſſing a deſire he had to eſtabliſh in Paris, an Academy for the Italian tongue, under the direction of Pallavicino, who being at that time, as indeed he generally was by his great profuſeneſs, without money, accepted the propoſal, upon Morfu's advancing him ſome money. And now Pallavicino, faſcinated by the proſpect of future gain, ſuffered himſelf to be guided like an ox to the ſlaughter, whitherſoever the traitor thought proper. He left Venice very much againſt the advice of all his friends, and went to Bergamo, where he ſpent a few days with ſome of his relations, by way of giving ſome recreation to Morfu. *Allaciato il Pallavicino dalle funi de queſta compitezza di tratto, e liberalità di mano, ſi laſciò tranſportare, quaſi pecora al macello, dou'egli volle. Riſolvette per tanto con diſguſto di tutti i ſuoi Amici, à quali non piaceva punto queſta ſua prattica, la partenza da Venetia, & paſſato à Bergamo vi ſi trattenne qualche giorne appreſſo alcuno ſuoi parenti per dare un poco di ricreatione, e oſſervare i ſuoi audamenti à Carlo* (9).

(9) Ibid. p. 5.

[*I*] *To get ſome of his works printed at* Geneva.] He had not been permitted to print them in Italy, either from the indignation which the Eccleſiaſticks conceived againſt him, or on account of the ſubjects of them. Theſe pieces were *la Bucata, le Lettere delle beſtie, i ragionamenti dè Beati, la riſpoſta all' Antibacinata del Padre Tomaſo*, with ſome centuries of love letters, and other compoſitions; but theſe, and their author, periſhed in Avignon.

[*K*] *Loſt his head . . . . . on a ſcaffold.*] Such was his end, an end unworthy of his birth and profeſſion, which yet had always been foretold him by his intimate friends (10).

(10) Ibid. p. 7.

[*L*] *A catalogue of his works.*] They now lie before me, and conſiſt of two volumes in 12mo, printed at Villafranca in 1673. Vol. I. contains, *La Pudicitia Schernita. La rettorica delle puttane. Il Divortio Celeſte. Il Corriere ſvaligiato*, and the continuation of it. In Vol. II. are, *La Bacinata. Il Dialogo trà due ſoldati del Duca di Parma. La Diſgratia del Conte d'Olivarez. La Rete di Vulcano. L'Anima. Vigilia* I. and II^a. and a letter written by our author during his laſt impriſonment.

[*M*] *He was a fine genius, and had a great facility in writing.*] Till he corrupted himſelf by the commerce of mean, leud women, and the evil practices of wicked perſons of the other ſex, he wrote pieces worthy of immortality. Though he did not ſpend much time and pains in compoſing, or reviſing what he had writ, (he frequently ſending to preſs the firſt exertions of his fancy) yet nature had given him ſo noble a vein of eloquence, which he had greatly improved by the peruſal of the beſt authors in his juvenile ſtudies, and by converſation, that his firſt thoughts were equal to the moſt laboured compoſitions. *Era veramente Ferrante per natura, e per arte un grande ingegno, e in fino à che non ſi ſutò dietro gli amori de femine vulgari, e le cattive prattiche di perſone di poco buona conſcienza ſcriſſe opere degne dell' immortalità della fama. Che ſe bene egli non v' applicaſſe gran fatto, nè ſtudio in comporle, nè fatica in ripuliarle, mandando egli ſovente alle ſtampe i primi abbozzi della ſua fantaſia; era nondimeno così fortemente imbevato di una eloquenza naturale, accreſciuta dalle oſſervationi dè buoni Autori aſſaggiati nè primi anni dè ſuoi ſtudii, e raſſodata dalla pratica delle coſe del Mondo, che anche i ſuoi abbozzi riuſcivano pregiabili al pari delle altrui piu limate compoſitioni* (11).

(11) Idem, ibid.

[*N*] *Did not write* Il divortio celeſte.] The author in queſtion obſerves, that this work was publiſhed during Pallavicino's impriſonment in Avignon. He declares farther, that though he frequently ſatirized the actions of the eccleſiaſticks, he yet never ſpake any thing derogatory to their dignity, or the doctrines of the Church of Rome. 'Tis ſurprizing (continues he) that ſome perſons ſhould be ſo ignorant or ſo much prejudiced, as to believe it to have been written by our author, when there is as wide a difference between Pallavicino's works, and thoſe of the author in queſtion, as between a living maiden in the bloom of life, and a painted carcaſs. But the publick, who are guided by opinion rather than judgment, ſeeing this work aſcribed to him by the author of his ghoſt (*Animi di Ferrante*) greedily ſwallowed down that falſhood. Nay, ſome people have been ſo ignorant, as to believe that many mean and infamous books, publiſhed ſome years after his death, were written by him. *E veramante una maraviglia,*

We ſhall here give ſome account of this work [O]. He was of a mixed character [P]; but a favourite of the Fair, one of whom was a great friend to him, during hisi mpriſonment in Venice [Q].

viglia, che ſi trovino perſone, ò tanto ignoranti ò così male impreſſionate, che poſſano darſi ad intendere una così evidente falſità; mentre frà lo ſtile (per tacer d'altro di quello abbominato Divortio) e le opere di Ferrante ſi vede quella differenza, che ſarebbe trà una giovane Donna viva e una cadavero dipinto. Ma il mondo, che vive d'opinione più che di giudicio, veduto che l'autor dell' Anima di Ferrante, che tanto gli ſi profeſſa partiale, gli hà toſta (così trattano gli Amici moderni) una macchia sì enorme ſul volto della riputatione, ſi l'hà agevolmente bevuta queſta menzogna ſenza farvi ſopra conſideratione alcuna. Anzi è tranſcorſa tanto oltre la traſcuraggine, e la impertinenza di molti ignoranti, che d'altre opere ancora ſcandaloſiſſime, che alcuni anni dopò la ſua morte ſono ſtate compoſto e publicato, vogliono crederlo e predicarlo Autore (12).

(12) Ibid. p. 9.

[O] *Some account of this work.*] Jeſus Chriſt obſerving that the Church of Rome, his ſpouſe, was become a proſtitute to the luſts of many Roman Pontiffs, and particularly to Urban VIII. reſolves to divorce himſelf from her, and to cohabit no longer with an adultereſs. The motives which prompt him to this ſeparation are, her having leſſened his honour in the opinion of mankind; her conſuming perpetually her ſubſtance, merely to ſatiate the rapacious appetites of thoſe who commit adultery with her; and for the daily contempt brought on him, by the diſſolute actions which are committed in the moſt barefaced manner in his own family; Rome being degenerated to a publick brothel. Divine juſtice being fully perſuaded of the validity of theſe reaſons, reſolves upon the divorce. However, in order to proceed with its uſual circumſpection, and as an example to mankind, it reſolves firſt to cauſe an exact enquiry to be made into the conduct of the ſpouſe in queſtion, and thereupon commands St. Peter to deſcend upon earth. Accordingly St. Peter viſits Lucca, Parma, Venice; and laſtly, the Eccleſiaſtical State, and the city of Rome, where being an eye-witneſs to the abuſes, and hearing, by the complaints of multitudes, of the diſſoluteneſs of the Church, he returns to heaven; where the complaints of Chriſt being fully proved, the divorce is ſolemnly pronounced. From this ſeparation of Chriſt from his ſpouſe it follows, that no more lawful ſons are born, that is, men ſincerely good and holy; as, on the contrary, by the commerce in which ſhe had been engaged with adulterers, chriſtian baſtards ſprung, that is hypocrites, among whom are included the Jeſuits and others, who, under a ſpecious appearance of ſanctity, are the moſt wicked and perverſe generation upon earth. Immediately upon the publication of this divorce, Luther, Calvin, and others, go and offer their reſpective Churches to Chriſt, as a ſpouſe for him; but Chriſt, calling to mind the injuries he had received from his Romiſh ſpouſe, reſolves to lead a life of celibacy, rather than marry among perfidious mortals. The whole is divided into three parts. The firſt treats of the diſſolute practices of the adultereſs; the ſecond of the baſtards of the Church of Rome; and the third of the aſſembly of the other Churches at the Nuptials of Chriſt (13). We are to obſerve, that only the firſt book is publiſhed. Mr. de la Monnoye affirms, that thoſe who aſſert that Ferrante Pallavicino is the author of the *Divortio Celeſte*, are certainly miſtaken. See Colomeſius's Bibliotheque Choiſie. Edition of 1731. p. 364*.

(13) See *Il Divortio Celeſte*, in vol. 1. of Pallavicino's works.

* From the remarks of the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. 1734. Tom. 4. p. 969.

[P] *He was of a mixed character.*] He was of ſo careleſs and profuſe a temper, that had he poſſeſſed an immenſe eſtate, he would have ſpent it all. He was never engaged in a virtuous paſſion; being inflamed to a prodigious degree with the love of the meaneſt proſtitutes. On the other ſide, no one could be more ſincere and faithful in his friendſhips. No man was ever a greater prey to treachery: inſomuch that when, upon his releaſe out of priſon in Venice, he was told that a wretch had betrayed him, he could never be prevailed upon to believe it, but cried; "How can this be; ſince he declared himſelf my friend, and I made him privy to all my concerns? *Come può eſſer queſto, ſe mi faceva l'Amico, e io gli communicava tutti i miei intereſſi* (14)?" 'Twas his cuſtom, whilſt he wore a religious habit, to ſtudy or write two or three hours in bed every morning. The reſt of the day he uſed to ſpend either in the company of his male friends, or with ladies (15).

(14) His Life prefixed to his works, p. 9.

(15) Ibid. p. 10.

But after he had entirely left the monaſtick life, upon pretence of ſecuring himſelf from the artifices and ſnares of his enemies, he lived in a very irregular manner; he diſcovering either through neceſſity or caprice, a ſilly taciturnity or inflexibility that ſavoured more of the Stoick than the Chriſtian: whence it is difficult to determine, whether vice or virtue were moſt predominant in him: ſo true it is, that nothing is perfect in this world; it being often found, that perſons of a ſuperior genius act worſe than the reſt of mankind, to the great ſcandal of weak minds. *Così è pur vero, che non ſi trovi in queſta vita mortale coſa alcuna intieramente compita; e avenga ſovente, che quelli, che poſſiedono migliore ingegno degli altri huomini rieſcano nelle proprie attioni, con ſcandalo de' ſemplici, peggiori de gli altri huomini* (16).

(16) Ibid. p. 10.

[Q] *One of his miſtreſſes was a great friend to him during his impriſonment in Venice.*] Though his conduct was far from amiable, yet his prodigality and licentiouſneſs even won him the affection of a great number of women. The miſtreſs in queſtion, ſeeing him, when confined, abandoned by moſt of his friends and patrons, not only ſupported him; but was the firſt who found means to convey letters to him, by which ſhe gave him ſuch informations as enabled him to make a proper defence, and to recover his liberty (17).

(17) Idem, ibid.

I.

PANORMITA (ANTHONY), a native of Palermo in Sicily (*a*), and deſcended from the family of the *Beccatelli* (*b*), which had long been renowned in Bologna (*c*), was one of the moſt learned men of the 15th Century. Being a perſon valuable for his regularity and knowledge, he went and offered his ſervice to Philip Duke of Milan, who received him with great teſtimonies of friendſhip and munificence. He inſtructed him in hiſtory, and read publick Lectures, for which he had an annual ſtipend of eight hundred crowns. He afterwards was ſecretary to Alphonſo King of Naples, and his principal man of letters [A]. The literary quarrels, in which he was engaged with Laurentius Valla,

(a) Hieron. *Raguza, Elog. Siculorum*, p. 33.

(b) Jovius. *Elogior*, cap. 12. p. 33.

(c) Hence he is called by ſome writers, Antonius Bononia.

[A] *He afterwards was Secretary to Alphonſo King of Naples, and his principal man of letters.*] This we may gather from the following words of Paulus Jovius; *Panhormita Alphonſo adhæſit, ſecretioris ſcrinii magiſter, & ſtudiorum, expeditionumque omnium terra marique perpetuus comes* (1) i. e. "Panormita devoted himſelf to Alphonſo, whoſe Secretary he was, and the companion of his ſtudies; and attended him perpetually in all his expeditions both by ſea and land." See the remark [C] of the article of that Prince (2); and add to it, if you judge proper, the following paſſage of Jovianus Pontanus: *Rex Alfonſus ſtatim poſt prandium, vel Antonium Panhormitam, vel è doctis aliquem audiebat, ut qui dignum judicaret animum quoque cibo ſuo poſt paſtum corporis reficiendum eſſe* (3), i. e. "It was the cuſtom for King Alphonſo to hear immediatly after dinner, the diſcourſes of Anthony Panormita, or of ſome other learned man; he being of opinion, that the mind ought to be indulged its proper nouriſhment, after the body had been fed." I muſt obſerve, that this Prince gave Panormita letters of naturalization, and made him a denizon of Naples; he likewiſe appointed him his Counſellor, and Preſident of the Royal Chamber (4).

(1) Paulus Jov. elog. cap. 12. p. 33.

(2) Citation (24) of the article NAPLES (Alphonſo.)

(3) Jov. Pontanus, *de Conviv.* p. 143. apud Leonard Nicodemum, *Addiz. alla Bibliot. Napolet.* p. 21, 22.

(4) Nicolo Toppi, *Bibliot. Napoletana*, p. 24.

[B] *He*

Valla, drew a numberleſs multitude of injurious invectives from both parties, which gave great diverſion to their common enemies. He did not marry till he was in years [*B*], when he took to wife a beautiful maiden, for whom he had an extreme affection, and had children by her who left poſterity (*d*). He was a very good humoured man (*e*); and made the porch or piazza in Naples famous [*C*], where many perſons of wit and learning uſed to meet, in order to converſe on a numberleſs multitude of ſubjects with him. He was the beſt Poet of his time; and received, from the Emperor Sigiſmund, the poetical Crown, with the antient ceremonies [*D*]. Beſides, he was ſkilled in the Civil Law; wrote

(*d*) Jovius, *Elogior*, cap. 12. p. 33.

(*e*) *Imprimis facetus. Facius, de Rebus geſtis Alfonſi*, lib. 3. p. 103.

[*B*] *He did not marry till he was in years.*] This is obſerved by Paulus Jovius; *Senex*, ſays he (5), *uxorem duxit Arcellam ſibi magnopere dilectam, liberoſque ſuſcepit quorum honeſta ſoboles Neapoli viſitur*, i. e. "He "married in his advanced years, Arcella, whom he "tenderly loved; and had children by her, who "left a virtuous poſterity." The King being informed that Panormita was going to marry, was, at firſt, diſpleaſed with this deſign; he ſuppoſing that it would not be poſſible for his Secretary to devote himſelf, at the ſame time, to his wife and his books, and by that means would no longer delight in ſtudy; but hearing that the woman in queſtion was virtuous and handſome, he changed his opinion, imagining, that the ſweets of marriage would compenſate for thoſe of ſtudy. Panormita himſelf informs us of this particular. *Cùm audiſſet Rex me uxorem eſſe ducturum, primò improbavit, arbitratus de cætero literis ſimul & uxori me operam dare non poſſe, ac proinde vera ſolidaque literarum voluptate cariturum. Sed cum mox audiſſet, me Leonoram Aureliam virginem probam, nobilem ac formoſam duxiſſe, approbavit, literarum commoda, & honeſti conjugii ſuavitatem in æquo ponens* (6). I am of opinion that *Aureliam* is an error, either of the Tranſcriber or Printer, and that we muſt read *Arceliam*; for this woman's epitaph in Jovianus Pontanus's Poems, is preceded by the following title, *Lauræ Arceliæ uxoris Antonii Panhormitæ* (tumulus) (7). i. e. "The monument of Laura Arcelia, wife of Anthony "Panhormita." I don't know whence Varillas extracted the following particulars, *Anthony of Palermo .... had been very temperate during the firſt ſeventy years of his life; but in the ſeventy firſt, a beautiful young maiden of Naples, named Marcilla, fired him with a paſſion, and turned his thoughts to marriage. He had ſeveral children by her; and died, ten years after, with ſo little pain and diſtraction of mind, that he wrote his own epitaph a little before he died* (8). Varillas does not give us the true name of Panormita's miſtreſs; and ſpoils, by too bold an hyperbole, what Paulus Jovius ſays, with regard to the time in which Panormita wrote his own epitaph: *æger vitæque diffidens in ſupremo morbo hoc carmen compoſuit* (9). This ſignifies no more than this, that Panormita wrote it in a fit of ſickneſs, which he judged would be fatal to him, and which accordingly was ſo. If it be true, as Jovianus Pontanus ſeems to hint (10), that Panormita and Theodorus Gaza died almoſt at the ſame time, we may ſuppoſe that Varillas is not miſtaken, with regard to Panormita's age; but he would be miſtaken, with reſpect to the duration of the marriage, ſince it is certain that Panormita married in Alphonſo's life time; and that this Prince died in 1458, and Theodorus Gaza, twenty years after. [This is a miſtake, Theodorus Gaza dying in 1475 *.]

(5) Jov. *Elogior*, cap. 12. p. 34.

(6) Panormita, *de Dictis & Factis Alfonſi*, lib. 3. num. 27. p. 63. edit. Hanov. 1611.

(7) Jovian. Pontanus, *Tumulor*, lib. 2. folio m. 83 *verſo*.

(8) Varillas, *Anecdotes de Florence*, p. 165.

(9) Jovius, Elog. cap. 12. p. 34.

(10) See the laſt remark, num. 7.

* From the remarks to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. 1734. vol. 4. p. 969.

[*C*] *He was a . . . man . . . who made the porch or piazza in Naples famous.*] Jovianus Pontanus, his diſciple, introduces in one of his dialogues, a Sicilian, who aſks an inhabitant of Naples where this porch is; *quænam quæſo bone civis Antoniana eſt porticus* (11)? The other anſwers, *Antonium ne hoſpes requiris, an eam quæ ab illo porticus Antoniana dicitur? i. e.* "Stranger; do you want Anthony, or the porch "which is called from him?" Here follows the reply made by the Sicilian, in which the Reader will ſee the genius and caſt of Panormita's converſations, they reſembling thoſe of Socrates. *Et porticum ipſam noſſe, & Antonium videre cupio, audio enim pomeridianis horis illic conventum haberi literatorum hominum. Ipſum autem Antonium quanquam multa dicit, plura tamen ſciſcitari quàm docere ſolitum: nec tam probare quæ dicantur, quàm Socratico quodam more invidere differentes. Auditores verò ipſos magis voluptatis cujuſdam eorum quæ à ſe dicantur plenos domum dimittere, quàm certos verum earum quæ in quæſtione verſentur* (12). i. e. "I ſhould "be glad both to know the porch and to ſee Anthony; for I am informed, that men of learning aſſemble there every afternoon. Anthony himſelf, "though he ſays many things, it is yet his cuſtom to "aſk queſtions, rather than to teach others: and "that, after the manner of Socrates, he laughs at "thoſe who converſe, rather than approves of whatever is advanced: That the auditors return to their "houſes more pleaſed with the things ſaid, than "perſuaded of the truth of thoſe matters which are "diſputed upon." I will add to this, a fragment of the Neapolitan's reply. *Hæc, illa eſt porticus, in qua ſedere ſolebat ille ſenum omnium feſtiviſſimus. Conveniebant autem docti viri, nobileſque item homines ſanè multi. Ipſe quòd in proximo habitaret, primus hic conſpici, interim dum Senatus, ut ipſe uſurpabat, cogeretur, aut jocans cum prætereuntibus, aut ſecum aliquid ſuccinens, quod animum oblectaret* (13). *i. e.* "This is the "porch, in which that pleaſant old man uſed to ſit. "Men of learning, and likewiſe a great number of "perſons of diſtinction uſed to meet here. As he "lived near this place, he always came to it firſt; "and, till ſuch time as the aſſembly was met, he "uſed either to joke with thoſe who paſt by, or hum "over a tune, to divert himſelf." As Panormita was a facetious man, and a great lover of witty ſayings, I believe we may ſay, that had it been uſual, in this age, to make collections in *ana*, as has ſince been the cuſtom (14), we ſhould have had a book, entitled, *Panormitaniana*, which would acquaint us with a great number of particulars. The aſſemblies of this porch were doubtleſs like to thoſe of Menage. If the Reader is deſirous of having a proof, that Panormita uſed to ſay witty things, he may conſult Pontanus *de Sermone*, and he will meet with ſeveral; and, among others, one that is grown very common, viz. in order that a good harmony may be kept in a family, it is neceſſary that the wife ſhould be blind and the huſband deaf. *Antonius Panhormitæ ſuavis admodum vir interrogatus ad rem uxoriam jucunde concorditerque agendam, quibuſnam maximè opus eſſe duceret? ſumpto argumento à frequentia moleſtiarum ac magnitudine, quæ in vita contingeret conjugali: duobus tantum opus eſſe reſpondit, vir ut aurium ſurditate teneretur, uxor verò ut oculis eſſet capta: ne altera videlicet inſpiceret quæ à marito intemperanter fierent plurima, alter ne audiret obgannientem aſſiduo domi uxorem* (15). i. e. "Anthony Panormita, a man of a moſt de"lightful converſation, being aſked, what circum"ſtance was moſt neceſſary, in order for the making "the ſtate of wedlock pleaſant and eaſy; the ſub"ject of the diſcourſe being on the repeated and "great ſtrife that is found in families; anſwered, "that two things only were required, *viz.* that the "huſband ſhould be deaf, and the wife blind; in or"der that the latter might not be able to ſee her "huſband's many wild pranks, and the former "unable to hear his wife's perpetual din."

(11) Jovian. Pontanus, *in Dialogo* Antonius, *initio*.

(12) Idem, ibid. p. 1196.

(13) Idem, ibid. p. 1198. See alſo *de Sermone*, lib. 6. cap. 4. p. 1741.

(14) I write this in 1697.

(15) Jovian. Pontan. *de Sermone*, lib. 3. cap. 17. p. 1645, 1646.

[*D*] *He was the beſt Poet of his time; and received .... the poetical Crown, with the antient ceremonies.* He is conſidered as the firſt reſtorer of Latin poetry: *Obliteratam nedum langueſcentem in Italia poëticam reſtituit in antiquam pene formam* (16). And here follows the compliment which Faccius made him in the perſon of Guarini: *Quod in cæteris partibus te antecedam, in eo tibi planè non aſſentior, præſertim cum tu Juriſconſultus & Eques ſis: cumque plures Rhetores his temporibus inveniantur ſatis clari; Poëta autem illuſtris præter te nullus, qui quidem à Sigiſmundo Imperatore propter optimum de te judicium, conſenſu omnium excitatum, laurea corona more majorum donatus ſis, quæ res uſque adhuc noſtrum contigit neminì* (17), i. e. "I cannot "directly agree with you, when you affirm that I am "ſuperior to you in other reſpects, particularly as "you are a Civilian and a Knight; and notwith"ſtanding

(16) Idem, *de Sermone*, lib. 6. cap. 4. p. m. 1738.

(17) Barthol. Faccius, *de hum. vitæ Felicitate*, circa init. p. m. 108.

(f) *Facius de Rebus geſtis Alfonſi, lib. 3. p. 103.*

wrote well in proſe, and was a good orator (*f*). He was employed in State Affairs, as well becauſe of his abilities, as the great fame of his wiſdom [*E*]. King Alphonſo deputed him to the Venetians in 1451, to requeſt of him Livy's arm-bone (*g*), which was granted. Panormita ſold an eſtate to purchaſe this hiſtorian [*F*]. He wrote an epitaph for himſelf, which is, at one and the ſame time, a proof of his preſumption and orthodoxy [*G*]. He ſubmitted, with great reſolution, to the tedious pains which the ſtrangury brought upon him, and reaſoned admirably well on adverſity and proſperity [*H*]. Some of his writings have been publiſhed (*b*), but his Latin Poem entitled *Hermaphro-*

(g) See the article LIVY.

(b) There was printed at Venice in 1553, five books of his Epiſtles, two Orations, and ſome Verſes. See the laſt remark.

" ſtanding that there are many famous Rhetoricians " in this age, yet you are the only eminent Poet, " on whom Sigiſmund the Emperor, excited by the " advantageous opinion which the whole world en- " tertains of you, beſtowed the laurel crown, after " the manner of our anceſtors; an honour that has " not been ſince paid to any of our Literati." Voſſius did not rightly underſtand theſe words; he imagining they ſignified, that no man had received the poetical crown before Panormita. But this is a miſtake; and had Faccius meant this, he would have advanced an egregious falſhood; for what man is ignorant of the ſolemnity of Petarch's poetical coronation? But Guarinus's compliment was this. The Emperor has crowned you after the manner of our anceſtors, and none of us (Literati) have obtained this honour ſince that time. This ſenſe is very different from that of Voſſius, whoſe words are as follow: *Panormita hic à Bartholomæo Faccio initio lib. de humanæ vitæ felicitate* poeta atque eques præclarus *nominatur: & mox*, clarus & ſingularis poeta & juriſconſultus. *Ac paullò poſt ait Sigiſmundo Imp. laurea donatum coronâ, more majorum, quæ res uſque ad id tempus contigiſſet nemini* (18). i. e. " Bartholomew Facci- " us, in the beginning of his book *De humanæ vitæ* " *felicitate*, calls Panormita a renowned poet and " knight; and afterwards, an illuſtrious and extra- " ordinary poet and civilian. A little after this, he " relates, that the Emperor Sigiſmund, purſuant to " a cuſtom, anciently uſed, beſtowed on him the " laurel crown, which no man had been honoured " with till that time."

(18) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Latin.* lib. 3. p. 593.

[*E*] *He was employed in ſtate affairs, as well becauſe of his abilities, as the great fame of his wiſdom.*] Peruſe the following words of Faccius: *Miſit igitur Otolinus ad Alphonſum, qui peteret ad ſe mitti quempiam ex iis quibus fidelioribus uteretur, qui cum de deditione ageret, & nominatim Antonium Panhormitam, quem Poetam non inſuavem Mediolani apud Philippum in magna gratia & dignitate cognoverat: cumque non tantum propter prudentiam, ſed multo etiam magis propter æquitatis opinionem, & quod illum ab Alphonſo apprime diligi acceperat* (19). i. e. " Otolinus therefore ſent a meſſage to Al- " phonſo, deſiring that ſome truſty perſon might " come to him, to treat concerning a ſurrender; and " Anthony Panormita in particular, whom he knew " to have been a delightful Poet in Milan, and in " very great favour with Philip, not only on ac- " count of his wiſdom, but much more from the ad- " vantageous idea he entertained of his equity, and " becauſe of his being told that Alphonſo had a ve- " ry great affection for him." In the hiſtorian cited by me, is inſerted the ſpeech which Panormita made to the inhabitants of Gaeta in Alphonſo's name, and that made by him to the Venetians, to congratulate them on the peace.

(19) Faccius, *de humanæ vitæ Felicitate*, p. 102, 103, apud Leon. Nicodem. *Addiz. alla Bibliotheca Napolet.* p. 22, 23.

[*F*] *Panormita ſold an eſtate to purchaſe Livy.*] " It " is well known, that Beccatelli (called Bologna) of " Palermo, was obliged to ſell an eſtate, in order to " purchaſe a Livy, in the hand-writing of Poggius " the Florentine, who laid out the money ariſing " from the ſale of his book, in another eſtate " near Florence, about the year 1455 (20)." Theſe are Baillet's words, who quotes for it p. 154, of Gallois, *Traité des Bibliotheques* (Treatiſe of Libraries.) I have looked into this treatiſe, and found a French tranſlation of the letter, which was written on this ſubject to King Alphonſo. It is as follows; *May it pleaſe your Majeſty, you have informed me, from Florence, that Livy's works, written in a beautiful hand, are to be ſold, and that the price is an hundred and twenty crowns. I beſeech your Majeſty to let this Author, whom we commonly entitle the King of books, be ſent to me, and I will not fail to ſend the money demanded for it. I intreat you, out of your great wiſdom, to let me know, whether Pog-*

(20) Baillet, *Jugemens des Savans*, Tom. 1. ch. 14. § 1.

gius or I act the moſt prudent part; whether he who, to purchaſe a farm near Florence, diſpoſes of Livy, or I, who, to buy that Author in his hand-writing, ſell my eſtate. Your goodneſs and modeſty prompt me to aſk you this familiar queſtion. Farewel and triumph (21). If the Reader is deſirous of ſeeing Gallois's reflections, he may peruſe what follows (22): " In my opinion, " it was beneath the dignity of ſo great a King, to " let ſo worthy a man diſpoſe of his eſtate to pur- " chaſe Livy; but he ought, as became a generous " Prince, to have ſent it him by way of gift. And " I am of opinion, that Peccatel (23) ought not to " have blamed Poggius for ſelling his Livy, ſince " he might have two copies of that Author in his " poſſeſſion; or, might have read it over ſo often, " that he had not any further occaſion for it."

(21) Gallois, *traité des Bibliotheques*, p. 154, 155.

(22) Ibid. p. 155.

(23) He ſhou'd have ſaid *Beccatel.*

I ſhall make three ſhort remarks on this occaſion. 1. Panormita does not ſay that he was to purchaſe this manuſcript from Poggius; on the contrary, he intimates very evidently, that Poggius's Livy was already ſold, and that the monies ariſing from it, had been already laid out in the purchaſe of a farm. But I will tranſcribe the Latin letter, that the Reader may ſee how unfaithfully the French Tranſlator has acted on this occaſion. *Significaſti mihi nuper ex Florentia extare Titi Livii opera venalia, literis pulcherrimis, libro pretium eſſe* 120 *aureos. Quare Majeſtatem tuam oro, ut Livium, quem Regem librorum appellare conſuevimus, emi meo nomine, ac deferri ad nos facias. Interim ego pecuniam procurabo quam pro libri pretio tradam. Sed illud à prudentia tua ſcire deſidero, uter ego an Poggius melius fecerit; is ut villam Florentiæ emeret, Livium vendidit quem ſua manu pulcherrimè ſcripſerat: ego ut Livium emam fundum proſcripſi. Hæc ut familiariter à te peterem ſuaſit humanitas & modeſtia tua. Vale, & triumpha* (24). 2. It is falſe to ſay, that Panormita blames Poggius; he leaving it to the wiſdom of King Alphonſo to determine, whether it be more prudent to ſell a book to purchaſe an eſtate, than to ſell an eſtate to buy a book; but he himſelf pronounces nothing on this occaſion. 3. The excuſe that Poggius might have read Livy ſo often, *that he had occaſion for it no longer*, is altogether chimerical. A man, though he often reads ſuch a work, does not learn it by heart; and it cannot be uſeleſs to him, unleſs he knows it almoſt by heart.

(24) Anton. Panormita, *Epiſtol.* lib. 5. cited by Naudæus, *Addit à l'Hiſt. Louis* XI. p. 88.

[*G*] *He wrote an epitaph for himſelf, which is at one and the ſame time a proof of his preſumption and orthodoxy.*] It was contained in the four verſes following:

Quærite, Pierides, alium qui ploret amores,
Quærite qui regum fortia facta canat.
Me pater ille ingens, hominum ſator atque redemptor,
Evocat, & ſedes donat adire pias.

That is, O Muſes, ſeek for another Poet to write amorous verſes, and ſing the mighty acts of Kings; for I am going to Paradiſe, whither I am called by the great God, the Creator and Redeemer of Mankind. Gyraldus conſideredt his epitaph only on its unfavourable ſide; he taking notice of the Author's arrogance, and not ſeeing his orthodoxy. *Senex diem obiit, hocque ſibi moriens Epitaphium arrogantiæ plenum condidiſſe legi* (25). I am of opinion that he did not diſcover any principle of Heterodoxy in it, upon pretence that purgatory was excluded from it.

(25) Gyrald. *de Poet. ſui tempor. Dialog.* 1.

[*H*] *He ſubmitted, with great reſolution, to the tedious pains, which the ſtrangury brought upon him, and reaſoned admirably well on adverſity and proſperity.*] Jovianus Pontanus, his diſciple, ſhall be my voucher on this occaſion, he ſpeaking, as having been an eye-witneſs. *Vidimus Antonium Panhormitam multos annos tormina & urinæ difficultatem tam ſedate ferre, ut etiam diſſimulare videri poſſet ægritudinem* (26). i. e. " I " ſaw, for many years, Anthony Panormita bear the " cholic

(26) Jovian. Pontanus, *de Fortitudine*, lib. 2. folio, m. 51.

Hermaphroditus is ſtill in manuſcript. This piece is ſtuffed with ſo many obſcenities, that Poggius himſelf diſapproved it [*I*]. Moreri has not committed many conſiderable errors

" cholic and ſtrangury with ſo much patience, that " one would have judged he did not labour under a- " ny infirmity." He obſerved, in another book, that Panormita was always chearful, whether his circumſtances were happy or unhappy; it was his maxim or principle to refer all things to God; and to ſuppoſe that the cauſes of infelicity and happineſs are hid from us; and that many accidents are looked upon as unhappy, which are not ſo, ſince they are ſo many opportunities which Providence gives us to diſplay our conſtancy and reſolution. *Quid erat lætis in rebus Antonio jucundius? quid rurſus in turbatis atque aſperis gratius? Incredibilis quædam in ejus oratione vis inerat res humanas contemnendi, ferendique fortuitos caſus æquo animo, quippe cum omnia referret ad Deum, diceretque latêre nos & honorum, & malorum cauſas. Pleraque autem videri quæ non eſſent mala, ut quæ objecta nobis eſſent à Deo, quò humana in iis conſtantia fortitudoque enitesceret. Quotum enim fortem inveniri, ſi quieta & ſecura omnia nobis forent? natos eſſe homines ad comparandam virtutem, ad excolendos animos, neminem autem ſine laboribus plurimis poſſe hoc aſſequi, ſed decipi opinione, nimiſque demiſsè, ac molliter nobiſcum nos ipſos agere: quæ fluant aquas ſalubriores eſſe, magiſque probari: quæ verò reſtagnent, noxias ac peſtilentes eſſe. . . . . Optimo itaque & fortiſſimo cuique labores ac moleſtias offerri à Deo, eamque veluti materiam præberi in qua ſeſe exerceat, cum excellentia hominum cæterorum. Tum Imperatores ipſi quos præcipuè ament, & quorum virtus eſt proſpectior, iis graviſſima & periculoſiſſima quæque demandent. Atque hanc quidem ipſam, non quæ prædam quæritaret, maximè illuſtrem militiam eſſe. Et verò ignavi eſſe, imbecilli, deſidis, odiſſe labores, fugitare moleſtias, velleque in ocio, ac ſub umbra marceſcere* (27). i. e. " What man could be gayer in proſperity, " than Panormita; or, on the other ſide, more chear- " ful in adverſity? His diſcourſes were indued with " a ſurpriſing force, for exciting men to deſpiſe all " ſublunary things, and to bear misfortunes with pa- " tience and reſignation; he referring all things to " the Almighty, and ſaying that the cauſes of good " and evil are concealed from us. That many things " appear as evils in our eye, which are not ſo in " themſelves; but that they are ſo many opportu- " nities given us by God, to make our patience and " reſolution the more conſpicuous. If we were " never ruffled by adverſity, what man would be " found ſteddy and reſolute? Men came into the " world to acquire virtue, and to improve and adorn " their minds, and none can do this without great " pains and labour; but our opinions miſlead us, and " we act in too mean and effeminate a manner " with ourſelves: running ſtreams are more ſalubri- " ous and pleaſant; but ſuch as ſtagnate are noxious " and peſtiferous. . . . . The Almighty therefore of- " fers, to every good and virtuous man, toils and ca- " lamities, as ſo many opportunities for him to ex- " erciſe and diſtinguiſh himſelf above the reſt of " mankind. Generals ſend the braveſt, and thoſe " who are deareſt to them, upon the moſt difficult " and moſt hazardous attempts; and, to ſay the " truth, this is the nobleſt warfare, and not that " whoſe object is ſpoil and rapine. But it is the in- " dication of a mean and daſtardly ſoul, to hate la- " bour, to fly from trouble, and to languiſh in eaſe " and indolence." Nothing can be finer than theſe common places; and they are very juſt, according to the ſtate mankind is in; but it muſt be confeſſed at the ſame time, that they ſuppoſe it a ſtrange and odd ſtate; for what can be more aſtoniſhing and incomprehenſible, than to ſee man reduced to ſuch a condition, that, to avoid greater evils, he muſt be unhappy? Why is he not conducted from one ſtage of good or virtue to another, till he attain the ſummit of perfection? Why muſt uneaſineſs, pain, and miſery, be the leaſt diſadvantageous path he can ſtrike into? The Heathens could not make one ſolid objection to this difficulty, and were ſo ſtupid as to ſcarce think once about it; but it may be ſolved by revelation.

(27) Idem, *in Dialogo* Antoninus, *initio*, p. m. 1197.

[*I*] *His* Hermaphroditus *is ſtuffed with ſo many obſcenities, that Poggius himſelf diſapproved it.*] It was dedicated to Coſmo de Medicis, who cauſed ſeveral copies to be made of it, ſome of which are ſtill in St. Laurence's library (28). The reaſon of its being dedicated to this great man was, becauſe, regardleſs of the opinion of the vulgar, he took a pleaſure in reading this laſcivious piece. The Author himſelf makes this remark, he beginning as follows: *Hermaphroditi libellus incipit ad Coſmum Florentinum ex illuſtri progenie Medicorum virum clariſſimum. Quod ſpreto vulgo libellum æquo animo legat, quamvis laſcivum & ſecum una priſcos viros imitetur* (29). Magliabecchi has a manuſcript copy of this poem (30). Many letters were wrote, at this time, upon this poem. Guarinus of Verona (31) wrote one to John Lamola, in which he beſtows high encomiums on the Hermaphrodite, and its Author; the original letter is in Magliabecchi's poſſeſſion. Giraldi thinks it ſtrange that this poem ſhould have been applauded: *Legi*, ſays he, *ejus ætatis quorundam Epiſtolas, quibus Hermaphroditus illius multis laudibus commendatur, ſed quare neſcio. Dicam ego vobis ſanè quid ſentio, nec is mihi Poeta bonus, nec bonus Orator; quæ enim ſoluto & pedeſtri ſermone ejus ſcripta legi, luxuriantis magis quam bonæ frugis referta videntur, ut impudicas & proſtitutas ejus Muſas mittam.* i. e. " I have peruſed the letters " of ſome perſons of that age, in which high enco- " miums are beſtowed on his *Hermaphroditus*, but for " what reaſon I know not. I'll tell you my ſincere " opinion; he does not appear to me either a good " Poet or Orator. Such proſe pieces of his, as I " have read, ſeem to me of a luxuriant, rather than " of a ſolid caſt; to ſay nothing of his looſe, pro- " ſtitute muſes." By this it is plain, that he not only deteſts the laſciviouſneſs of this piece, but alſo deſpiſes the verſification. Poggius did not extend his critique ſo far. He had applauded the invention, the wit, and the embelliſhments of the work in queſtion; but he condemned the obſcene touches with which it is interſperſed; and adviſed the Author to employ himſelf, for the future, in works that were more ſuitable to a Chriſtian. *Delectatus ſum, me hercle, varietate rerum & elegantia verſuum: ſimulque admiratus ſum res adeo impudicas, adeo ineptas, tam venuſtè, tam compoſitè à te dici, atque ita multa exprimi turpiuſcula, at non enarrari ſed agi videantur: nec ficta à te jocandi cauſa, ut exiſtimo, ſed acta exiſtimari poſſint. Laudo ego doctrinam tuam, jucunditatem carminis, jocos ac ſales . . . . pro charitate tamen qua omnibus debitores ſumus, unum eſt quod te monere & debeo & volo, ut ſcilicet deinceps graviora quidem mediteris, hæc enim quæ adhuc edidiſti, vel ætati concedi poſſunt, vel licentiæ jocandi . . . . ſcis enim non licere idem nobis qui Chriſtiani ſumus, quod olim Poetis qui Deum ignorabant* (33). Panormita anſwered Poggius; and alledged a great many reaſons, to juſtify or excuſe himſelf (34). Poggius replied to him; and aſſerted, that a man ought to practiſe virtue, not only in his actions, but alſo in his writings (35): whence we may infer, that he repented his having employed his pen in laſcivious compoſitions during his youth. *Dal che comprehende ch' eſſo ſi pentiſſe delle facezie, e dell' altre coſe meno oneſte che in gioventu ſcritte avea* (36). I will conclude with the following words of a Dutch Writer, who has peruſed the obſcene poem of Panormita: *de Hermaphrodito quod dicit* (Gyraldus) *non eſt de nihilo: ego enim legi manu deſcriptum, (neque enim unquam eſt typis excuſus) adeo ſpurcum, adeo abominabilem, ut nihil ſupra. Verſus deinde ipſi vix ſunt tolerabiles, tantum abeſt ut laudem aliquam mereantur. Inſcribitur autem Hermaphroditus, eo quod utriuſque ſexus membra genitalia utriuſque libelli omnem materiam faciant. Hæc qui patienter legit, næ illum oportet eſſe hominem frugi* (37). i. e. " Gyraldus had reaſon to ſpeak as he does of " the poem called *Hermaphroditus*. I myſelf have " read it in manuſcript (it having never been print- " ed;) and it is certain that no piece was ever more " filthy and abominable. Then, as to the verſifica- " tion, it is ſo far from deſerving applauſe, that it " is ſcarce tolerable, It is entitled *Hermaphroditus*, " becauſe the privities of both ſexes form the whole " ſubject of both books. He who can read them " with any patience, muſt be a man of great temper."

(28) Leon. Nicodemo, *Addiz. alla Biblioth. Napolet.* p. 21.

(29) See Nicodemo, ibid. p. 20.

(30) Idem ibid.

(31) In this manner I correct Gravino Veroneſe, *in* Nicodemo, ibid.

(32) Lil. Gregor. Gyraldus, *de Poetis ſui tempor.* Dialogo 1. p. 385, apud Nicodemum, ibid.

(33) Pogg. Epiſt. p. 131, 132, apud Nicodem. ibid. p. 21.

(34) Nicodem. ibid.

(35) Idem, ibid.

(36) Nicodem. ibid.

(37) *Author Anonymus Notarum ad Poemata Sannazari*, p. 202, 303. edit. Amſtelod. 1689. [*N. B.* This anonymous Author was *Janas Broukuſius*. Remark by the Tranſl.]

[*K*] *Moreri*

errors [*K*] ; and thoſe of Varillas are not ſo numerous. See then in the note [*B*].

[*K*] *Moreri has not committed many conſiderable errors.*] 1. Inſtead of ſaying, as he has done, that Panormita was *a native of Bologna*, and of a family which came originally from Sicily, he ſhould have ſaid the direct contrary. Varillas alſo declares him to have been a native of Bologna (38). 2. He ſhould not have affirmed, that *Philip, Lord of Milan, prevailed with him to come to his Court :* but ought rather to have affirmed, that Panormita made an offer of his wit and talents to Philip Duke of Milan. *Quum Philippo Mediolanenſium principi fertilis ingenii induſtriam obtuliſſet, tanta liberalitate ſuſceptus eſt ut, &c.* (39). Theſe are the words of Paulus Jovius, and of the authors cited by Moreri. 3. Why does he ſay that Panormita did not devote himſelf to the King of Naples, till after the Duke of Milan's death ? Does not Paulus Jovius inſinuate the direct contrary ? *Verum eo* (Philippo) *graviſſimis bellis occupato, Panhormita Alfonſo adhæſit* (40). 4. I have ſhewn elſewhere (41) the falſity of theſe words of Moreri ; *he wrote the hiſtory of this King with care.* Now this pretended hiſtory is only a collection of apophthegms and certain memorable actions of Alfonſo, *De Dictis & Factis Alfonſi Regis Aragonum Libri quatuor* *. This Monarch gave the Author a thouſand crowns by way of recompence (42). 5. 'Tis a miſtake to aſſert, *that there are many editions* of this hiſtory, *with commentaries and remarks, by Æneas Silvius* ; for theſe pretended commentaries and remarks are only a collection of actions or ſentences like to thoſe of Alfonſo, ſpoken or performed by other Princes. I muſt take notice, by the way, of an error of Voſſius. He imagined that Panormita's piece, and that of Silvius, had been always printed ſeparately, till Marquard Freherus publiſhed them as parallels. *Utrumque opus* SEORSIM *antea excuſum παραλλήλως atque emendatius in Germania prodiit* (Hannoviæ, anno 1611) *cura Marquardi Freheri* (43). This is a miſtake which he might have avoided, by conſulting Geſner's *Bibliotheca* ; where he might have found that, in the edition of Baſil, *anno* 1538. Panormita's things are interwoven, chapter by chapter, with Æneas Silvius's collections. *Cum Æneas Silvii commentariis quæ capitatim cum Alphonſinis contendunt* (44). Paul Jovius was not ignorant of this : he ſaying, ſpeaking of Panormita's book, *quem pius Pontifex exemplis paribus* INTERTEXTIS *nobiliorem reddidiſſe videtur* (45). i. e. " Which the pious Pope ſeems to have greatly " improved, by interweaving parallel examples " I don't find fault with the word *Commentariis*, which Voſſius employs, ſpeaking of Æneas Sylvius's book ; that word, in Latin, being of a much more extenſive ſignification than the word *Commentaire*, in French. 6. Since none of the three authors cited by Moreri ſay this, he himſelf ſhould have ſaid, *viz. that it is certain* Panormita *ſurvived King Alphonſo, who died in* 1458 ; *and that it is probable he did not die till after the year* 1460. 7. This probability is not well proved, alledging a letter written to Panormita by Philephus in 1458 ; for he doubtleſs received a great many letters the ſame year that he died. Obſerve, that I do not mean to deny, but that he lived till after the year 1460 : I only condemn an author, as being too haſty and raſh, in affirming particulars which his vouchers do not. The reaſon why I think that Panormita lived after the year 1460 is this. 'Tis obſerved, in the ſame dialogue, where 'tis ſaid that he was but lately dead ; *Nuper paucos antequam morbo aggravaretur dies* † (46) ; that Theodore the Greek had not been long dead ; *Et Theodorus Græcus qui diem nuper obiit* (47.) Now I am of opinion that this Greek is the ſame perſon with Theodore Gaza, who died in 1478 (48) ; and I therefore do not alledge what we find in the ſame dialogue, that a little above an hundred years before ; *(Centum ante annis aut paulo amplius* (49) ;) a conflagration had broke out in the iſland *Ænaria* ; Pontanus's calculation not being accurate, this irruption of fire happening in 1301 (50). 8. He ſhould have cited Miræus *in Auctario* and not *in Aug.* but I aſcribe this error to the correctors of the preſs ; but that, of citing Miræus, muſt be charged to the author. 'Twas to no purpoſe to cite him, ſince the few particulars he ſays of Panormita are found in Paulus Jovius. I alſo might criticiſe the place given to our Panormita, *viz.* under the word Antonius, which is not proper.

(38) Varill. *Anecdotes de Florence*, p. 165.

(39) Jovius, *Elogior.* cap. 12. p. 34.

(40) Idem, ibid.

(41) In the text of the article NAPLES (Alphonſo King of)

* Note [*C*] in the additions to this article below.

(42) Jovianus Pontanus *de Liberalitate*, folio m. 97.

(43) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 593.

(44) Geſn. *Bibl.* folio 62 *verſo.*

(45) Jovius, *Elogior.* cap. 12. p. 34.

† See the cloſe of the Text of the additions to this article, below.

(46) Pontanus, *in Dialogo* Antonius, p. 1198.

(47) Idem, ibid. p. 1237.

(48) Geſner, *in Biblioth.* folio 611 *verſo.*

(49) J. Pontan. *in Dialogo*, Antonius, p. 1231.

(50) Scipio Mazzella, *de Balneis Puteolan*, p. m. 255.

☞ PANORMITA (ANTHONY) went commonly by the name of *Antonio Bologna Beccadelli Palermitano*, or ſimply *Panormita*. He was born in 1393, of Henry Beccadelli, ſurnamed *Bononia*, becauſe of the place of his birth ; he having been knighted by Martin King of Sicily, and ſeveral times commandant of Palermo. After going thro' his ſtudies in his native country, he went to Bologna, where he ſtudied the law, and took his Doctor's degree [*A*]. The Duke of Milan did not only procure him the profitable employment above-mentioned (*a*), but alſo permitted him to quarter the ſerpent, (the arms of Milan) with his own. He alſo was greatly eſteemed and rewarded by Alphonſo King of Naples [*B*], and no leſs by King Ferdinand his Succeſſor ; he being in very flouriſhing circumſtances till his death. He died the 6th of January 1471, aged 78 years, and was buried in St. Dominick's Church, in Naples (*b*). He was the firſt who founded the Academy of Naples, ſince ſo famous under the name of Pontanus's Academy (*c*). Here follows a complete catalogue of his works [*C*].

(*a*) In the text of the article above.

(*b*) Niceron, *Hommes illuſtres*, Tom. 9. p. 48 *& ſeq.* Paris 1729, 12mo. Remarks to the Paris edit. (1734) of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 969.

(*c*) Niceron, p. 58.

PARACLET,

[*A*] . . . . *took his Doctor's degree.*] So great were his vivacity and the compaſs of his genius, that he could not confine himſelf merely to the ſtudy of the Law, but applied himſelf to divinity, hiſtory, and poetry. Polite Literature, which was his chief delight, employed the greateſt part of his time ; and it was in the view of improving himſelf in it, that he viſited ſeveral cities of Italy, and among others Pavia, Piacenza, Padua, *&c* (1).

[*B*] . . . . *Rewarded by Alphonſo King of Naples.*] This Prince ſent him, ſeveral times, as his Embaſſador to the Emperor Frederick III. to the republicks of Venice, Florence, and Genoa, and to ſeveral Princes of Italy ; in all which he diſcharged his duty to ſo much advantage, as gained him ſtill more the favour of his Sovereign, and freſh marks of *diſtinction* ; Alphonſo permitting him to quarter his arms with thoſe of Naples ; the inſtrument of which grant is ſigned by the King's own hand, and dated the 5th of February 1450 (2).

[*C*] *Here follows a complete catalogue of his works.*] 1. *De dictis & factis Alphonſi Regis Aragonum libri quatuor Commentarii in eoſdem Æneæ Sylvii, quo capitatim cum Alphonſinis contendit. Adjecta ſunt ſingulis libris ſcholia per D. Jacobum Spiegelium Baſileæ*, 1538, in 4to. It. *Cura Davidis Chytræi Wittembergæ* 1585, 4to. and *Roſtochii* 1590, 4to. It. *Hannoviæ* 1611, 4to. It. Tranſlated into Spaniſh by John Molina, at Burgos 1553, 4to. Panormita, when he had finiſhed this piece, ſent it to Æneas Sylvius, who added to every chapter ſome action or ſentence like that of Alphonſo, ſaid or done by other Princes, and theſe were printed together in all the editions of this work. 2. *In Coronatione Frederici* III. *Imperatoris oratio, Romæ habita*, anno 1452. This ſpeech, of which there is a very antient edition in Venice, 4to, was inſerted by Marquard Freherus in the third volume of the Hiſtorians of Germany. *Hannoviæ* 1611, folio. 'Tis likewiſe a collection entitled *Principum & illuſtrium virorum Epiſtolæ*, of which there are many editions in Venice, Straſburg, and laſtly at Amſterdam, in 1644, 12mo. 3. *Ad Januenſes contra Venetos in bellum exhortatio.* He delivered this ſpeech in Genoa, whither King Alphonſo had deputed

(1) Niceron, *Hommes illuſtres*, p. 48, 49. Tom. 9. Paris 1729, 12mo.

(2) Ibid. p. 50, 51.

PARACLET, an Abbey of Maidens, the foundation of which is owing to Peter Abelard. That learned man having turned Monk in the Abbey of St. Denys, when Heloiſe's relation had cauſed him to be baſely mutilated, fell out more than once with his brethren; and at laſt he had reaſon to fear leſt they ſhould deliver him up to the Civil Power, becauſe he had aſſerted, that St. Denys the Areopagite did not convert the French nation to the Chriſtian Religion. He took ſanctuary in the territories of Theobald, Count of Champagne, and lived near Provins, in a cell depending on the Monks of Troyes. Some time after he got leave from the Abbot of St. Denys to retire into ſuch hermitage as he ſhould chooſe, provided it did not depend upon any Monaſtery; ſo that he choſe a very ſolitary retirement in the Dioceſe of Troyes [*A*]. He built there a little cottage * on a ſpot of ground that was given him, and with the Biſhop's leave, he turned that cottage into an oratory, which he conſecrated to the Trinity (*a*). His ſcholars being acquainted with it, flocked from every part to that deſert, where they built little huts, being content to live upon greens and roots, and to be in a manner reduced to bread and water, if they could but hear the lectures of that celebrated Profeſſor. He could not dig the ground, and was aſhamed to beg; he thought it therefore proper to live by his tongue, by returning to his antient profeſſion, ſince his ſcholars were willing to furniſh him with the neceſſaries of life. They did more, for they enlarged the oratory, and built it up with wood and ſtones. It was then Abelard gave it the name of Paraclet (the Comforter) to preſerve the memory of the conſolations he had met with in that deſert. Albericus of Rheims, and Ludolphus of Lombardy had a long while entertained an envious jealouſy againſt him; which revived and raged moſt furiouſly in their breaſts, when they knew how many ſcholars were gone to hear him, and ſettled about him, notwithſtanding the inconveniencies of the place, and in contempt of the other maſters they could moſt eaſily meet with in the cities. Albericus therefore and Ludolphus took hold of all the opportunities they could to vex him: nor would they let that opportunity ſlip, which the title of *Paraclet* furniſhed them with. They ſaid it was a novelty, and that it could not be more lawful to conſecrate Churches to the Holy Ghoſt, than to God the Father. This provoked a great number of people againſt him: but the perſecution proved infinitely more terrible, when theſe two perſons had won over to their party, St. Bernard and St. Norbert, who pretended to a great zeal, and to a ſpirit of reformation. It was not poſſible to hold out againſt ſuch adverſaries: Abelard was forced to give way to them; and retired into lower Britany, where the Monks of the Abbey of St. Gildys of Ruys had choſen him for their Abbot. The Paraclet continued uninhabited, till the Abbot of St. Denys had driven the Nuns of Argenteuil out of their convent. Heloiſe their Prioreſs, not knowing which way to turn herſelf, was extremely glad that her huſband was willing to yield the Paraclet to her. Pope Innocent II. confirmed that donation in the year 1131 (*b*), and this is the origin of the Abbey of the Paraclet. Heloiſe was the firſt Abbeſs of it. There were conſiderable eſtates given to it in a little time (*c*). The Abeſſes, who ſucceeded Heloiſe, were pretty often of the moſt antient families in the Kingdom. You will meet with a liſt of them in Abelard's words (*d*), from the firſt foundation, which happened in the year 1130, to the year 1615. But they did not think proper

* Or Thatch-houſe.

(*a*) *Ibi a quibuſdam terra mihi donata, aſſenſu Epiſcopi terræ Oratorium quoddam in nomine Sanctæ Trinitatis ex calamis & culmo primùm conſtruxi.* Abælard. Oper. p. 28.

(*b*) Taken from Abelard's letter, which contains an account of his misfortunes.

(*c*) *Plus ut arbitror uno anno in terrenis commodis ſunt multiplicatæ, quam ego per centum ſi ibi permanſiſſem.* Idem, p. 34. i. e. "They got "more riches in "one year, than "they would "have done, "if I had ſtaid "there an hundred years."

(*d*) *Not. Andr. du Cheſne in Hiſt. Calamit. Abelardi.*

puted him, to excite that Commonwealth to take up arms againſt the Venetians, with whom he was then engaged in war. 'Tis inſerted in the book, entitled, *Summa oratorum omnium, &c.* printed under the direction of *Albert de Eyb*, in Rome, 1475, folio. 4. *Orationes duæ ad Cætunos & ad Venetos de Pace.* Theſe two ſpeeches are in Bartholomew Facio's hiſtory *De rebus geſtis Alphonſi.* The firſt, in the third book; and the ſecond, in the ninth. 4. *Epiſtolarum Libri.* 5. *Orationes duæ & Carmina. Venetiis* 1553, 4to. The firſt four books contain the letters he wrote whilſt he was in the Duke of Milan's ſervice; and the fifth, thoſe he wrote whilſt he lived in King Alphonſo's Court. The firſt of the two ſpeeches is, *Ad Alphonſum regem*; the ſecond, entitled, *Ad Genuenſes contrà Turcas*, is the ſame, a few particulars excepted, with that cited in N°. III. above, *Ad Januenſes contrà Venetos.* The poetical pieces were wrote in his juvenile days. 6. In the book entitled, *Regis Ferdinandi & aliorum Epiſtolæ ac orationes utriuſque militia*, Viſiæquenſi 1586, 8vo; are many letters of Panormita, which are not in the collection abovementioned.

He has wrote ſome other works which were never printed; ſuch as Hermaphroditus (3). This Poem is in manuſcript in the Great Duke of Tuſcany's library. It gave, during the author's life time, ſo much offence on account of its great licentiouſneſs, ſeveral manuſcript copies of it having got abroad, that two famous preachers in that age, Bernardi di Sienna, and Robert di Lecce, (ſo well known under the name of Licio) after having inveighed againſt the Author, burnt them in the great ſquares at Bologna, Ferrara, and Milan. Poggius himſelf, who has publiſhed ſuch looſe ſtories, and was Panormita's friend, being diſpleaſed at the obſcene pieces, admoniſhed him, twice, of the injury this did to his reputation. Albert de Eyb, in his *Marguerite Poetique*, which is a collection, both in proſe and verſe, extracted from Authors antient and modern, has extracted about thirty verſes, *Ex Joanne Antonio Hermaphrodita*, as he ridicuouſly calls the author; corrupting in this manner Anthony Panormita's name and the title of his book (4).

(3) See the Note [*I*] of the preceding article.

(4) La Monnoye, Menagiana, Tom. 4. p. 329.

[*A*] *In the Dioceſe of Troyes.*] I ſhall add here, in behalf of thoſe who love to have a particular account of things, that the Paraclet was built in the pariſh of Quincey, on the banks of the little river of Arduzon, near Nogent upon the Seine. Moſt of theſe particulars are mentioned in Pope Innocent the Second's letter to Heloiſe. *Heloiſæ Abbatiſſæ cæteriſque ſororibus in Oratorio quod in pago Trecenſi, in Parrhochia Quinceii, ſupra fluvium Arduconem ſitum eſt* (1). In William de Nangis's Chronicle are theſe words, *Conſtruxerat Monaſterium in Epiſcopatu Trecenſi juxta Nogentum ſuper Sequanam, in quodam prato ubi legere ſolitus fuerat* (2). i. e. "He built a Monaſtery in "the Biſhoprick of Troyes, near Nogent upon the "Seine, in a certain field, where he uſed to read "Lectures." This laſt particular is inconſiſtent with Abelard's own account (3), according to which it is certain that he did not teach in the place where he built

(1) Du Cheſne, *Not. in Hiſt. Calamitatum, Abelardi*, p. 1177.

(2) *Apud eund.* ibid.

(3) See his letter, intitled, *Hiſtoria Calamitatum.*

proper to obſerve there, that Jane Chabot, who died June the 25th 1593, did publickly profeſs the Proteſtant religion, *but yet without marrying, and without throwing off her Nun's habit, which ſhe always wore, though they had driven her from her Abbey* (e). Let us obſerve that there is a difficulty, which is looked upon as ſomething of conſequence: namely, whether we muſt ſay *Paraclet*, or *Paraclit* [B]. The Nuns of that Convent are uſed to perform Divine Service in the Greek tongue on Whitſunday, that they may never forget, that Heloiſe was well acquainted with that language (f).

(e) Maimb. *Hiſt. du Calvin*, p. 464.

(f) Aub. Miræus, *in Scholiis ad Henr. Gandavenſ. de Script. Eccleſ.* p. 165.

built his Oratory, till after he had built it. We may, I think, reckon three ſtations of Abelard in the territories of Theobald Count of Champagne: for in the firſt place he retired thither with the Monks of St. Denys's leave, and read lectures there to a great number of ſcholars. This was interrupted by the Anathema, which the Council of Soiſſons thunder'd againſt him in the year 1121. Being ſent back to his Convent, where he brought himſelf into trouble, on account of Dionyſius the Areopagite, he made his eſcape in the night-time, and retired to Provins, where he lived in a cell, till he had made up his difference with the Monks of St. Denys: after which, having got leave to retire to ſuch deſert as he ſhould chooſe, he went to the place where he built his Oratory. It being ſoon known that he lived there very retired, the ſcholars flocked thither (4), and he began again to read lectures. It does not at all appear, that he retired to the ſame place the firſt and the third time. It may even be inferred from his own narration, that theſe two places were at ſome diſtance from each other. So that William de Nangis may have been miſtaken.

(4) *Oratorium quoddam in nomine Sanctæ Trinitatis ex calamis & culmo primum conſtruxi. Ubi cum quodam Clerico noſtro latitans, illud vere Domino poteram decantare, ecce elongavi fugiens & manſi in ſolitudine. Quod cum cognoviſſent ſcholares, cœperunt undique concurrere.* i. e. "I built an Oratory in the name of the bleſſed Trinity with ſtraw and holm; where being hid with one of our Clerks, I might very well ſing to the Lord, *I wandered far off, and remained in the wilderneſs.* Which when my ſcholars heard, they began to flock to me from all places." Abælard. Oper. p. 28.

[B] *There is a difficulty . . . . whether we muſt ſay* Paraclet, *or* Paraclit.] This queſtion would not have been much controverted, had not that word been inſerted in the divine ſervice. This has been the ground of the diſpute; ſome aſſerting that we muſt pronounce *Paracletus*, others declaring for *Paraclitus*. The latter have gained a complete victory. *Paſquier* relates a particular, which is pretty curious. *The common people, out of ignorance, called it Paraclit* (5); *as I have alſo ſeen in my younger days, that in the churches the Holy Ghoſt was called* Paraclytus, *and not* Paracletus, *two words of a quite different ſignification, for the former ſignifies a Flatterer, and the latter a Comforter. Nay, ſoon after I came to Paris, John Sabelat, Canon of Chartres, and a man well ſkilled in polite literature, pronouncing Paraclet, and not Paraclit, when he celebrated maſs, was for that reaſon ſuſpended* a divinis (from his holy functions) *by the Biſhop, from which he appealed as from an abuſive ſentence, and publiſhed in his own defenſe a very learned manifeſto or caſe, which I have had ſome time by me. The matter was afterwards made up between them by ſome of the Biſhop's friends, that he might not be a laughing-ſtock to the people* (6). There are two things to cenſure in that paſſage of Paſquier. 1. It is falſe that they, who do not pronounce *Paracletus*, pretend to pronounce *Paraclytus*. They pretend to pronounce *Paraclitus*, and mean the ſame thing with thoſe who pronounce *Paracletus*. The queſtion is only about this grammatical difficulty, whether the η of the Greeks, ought to anſwer the *e* or the *i* of the Latins. 2. Παράκλητος *(Paraclytus)* does not ſignify a *Flatterer*, but in general, *a man of an ill reputation.* Garaſſe was ſure not to ſpare Stephen Paſquier on this occaſion; he abuſed him with his wonted haughtineſs: he aſſerted againſt him, that there is no ſuch word as *Paraclytus* in the Greek tongue; *and that if that word could be compoſed by Analogy, it would not ſignify a* Flatterer, *but* an infamous Man, *or* a man honoured above his deſert (7). Paſquier's Apologiſt acted but a very indifferent part in his reply to this cenſure; for inſtead of acknowledging that his Client was miſtaken, he undertook to defend him, and could not even invent ſo much as a ſhew of argument. He aſſerted, that we find in the great Etymologicon, and in Scapula, that *Paraclytos*, with a Greek *υ* ſignifies a *Flatterrer* (8). I have by me a Scapula in folio, printed at Baſil in the year 1605. I find there Παράκλητος in page 810, which refutes father Garaſſe: but then I find there alſo, that that word ſignifies *infamis, famoſus, infamous, notorious*, which refutes Stephen Paſquier's apologiſt. But to return to the general controverſy, let us obſerve, that Monſieur Thiers wrote a treatiſe, *de retinenda in Eccleſiaſticis libris voce* PARACLITUS, (of continuing the word *Paraclitus* in the church books), in which he acquaints us with a great many curious particulars; as for inſtance, that "as early as the 9th century, that queſtion was "debated by the Biſhops of France and Germany; "the occaſion of it was, that a certain Greek, "who came to court, and heard the people ſing in "the King's chapel *Paraclitus Spiritus Sanctus*, re-"preſented that they ought to pronounce *Paracletus* "(9)." His remonſtrance proved unſucceſsful. *They did not dare to alter any thing in the pronunciation of that word, becauſe it was the cuſtom to read it thus, and one muſt not make the leaſt innovation* (10). Monſieur Thiers adds, that in the year 1526, the Faculty of Divinity at Paris, cenſuring the works of Eraſmus, condemned him, among other reaſons, for aſſerting that one ought to write *Paracletus*.

(5) He ſpeaks of Abelard's Oratory.

(6) Paſquier, *Recherches de la France*, Liv. 6. chap. 17. p. m. 511.

(7) *Recherche des Recherches*, Liv. 3. ſect. 12.

(8) *Defenſe pour Etienne Paſquier*, p. 795.

(9) See the *Journal des Savans*, for December the 16th, 1669.

(10) Ibidem, *ex Haimone Epiſcopo Alberſtad.*

PARAVICIN (VINCENT), a Miniſter of God's word in the country of the Griſons, lived in the 17th Century. He tranſlated out of the French into Italian Meſtrezat's Treatiſe of the Communion with Jeſus Chriſt in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. That tranſlation was put in the *Index expurgatorius* at Rome, in the year 1640. There is ſome probability that he was of the ſame family with Peter Paul Paravicin, a Phyſician of Como, and author of a letter printed in the year 1545, in 4to, with this title, *De Maſinenſium & Burmenſium Thermarum hactenus incognitarum ſitu, natura, & miraculis* (a), i. e. "Of the ſituation, nature, and wonders of the hot Baths, called *Maſinenſes* "and *Burmenſes*, hitherto unknown."

(a) See *Lindenius renovatus*, p. 902.

PARE' (AMBROSE), in Latin *Paræus*, was born at Laval, in the Dutchy of Maine. I ſhall add but three particulars to the article, which Moreri has given of him; namely, that he was of the Proteſtant Religion, that he was ſpared in the ſlaughter of St. Bartholomew's Day, by the particular favour of Charles IX. [A], and that he had great

[A] *He was ſpared in the ſlaughter of St. Bartholomew's day by the . . . favour of Charles* IX.] What Brantome relates concerning this particular, is too remarkable not to be inſerted here. *The King, as ſoon as it was day-light, looked out of the window, and obſerving ſome perſons in the ſuburb called St. Germain, who made haſte to run away, he took a great hunting Arquebuſs, which he had by him, and ſhot many times at them, but to no purpoſe, for his Arquebuſs did not carry ſo far: he cry'd continually, kill them, kill them; nor would he ſave one ſingle perſon, except Ambroſe Paré, his firſt Surgeon, and the moſt eminent in Chriſtendom: he ſent for him, and bid him to ſtay in his chamber and wardrobe, charging him not to ſtir out of it: he ſaid it was not reaſonable that a man, who might be uſeful to a whole little world, ſhould be thus murthered* (1).

(1) Brantome, *Memoires*, Tom. 4. *Diſcours de Charles* IX.

[B] *He*

great difficulties to overcome when he would have publiſhed his medical works [*B*]. The reaſon was that he had made uſe of too obſcene expreſſions.

A modern writer relates two particulars: the one, that Ambroſe Paré being ſurgeon to Francis II. owned as a ſecret to Admiral de Coligni, that that Prince's ear-ach was extremely dangerous (*a*); the other, that he was ſuſpected of having put poiſon into that King's ear, *when he dreſſed it* (*b*). The author who relates theſe two particulars, mentions many others; let who will believe them: for my part, I met with nothing like them in any good hiſtorian: I know only that Beaucaire mentions the ſuſpicion of the poiſon. Spondanus relates them after him (*c*), but he does not ſeem to give any credit to that report.

(*a*) *Vie de Caſpar de Coligny*, p. 220. of the edit. printed in the year 1686.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 221.

(*c*) Spond. ad ann. 1560, num. 20.

[*B*] *He had great difficulties to overcome, when he would have publiſhed his medical works.*] I do not alter a word in the expreſſions of the Author, who acquaints me with this particular. *Ambroſe Paré*, ſays he (2), *Surgeon to three Kings one after another, a learned and experienced man, who publiſhed many noble and uſeful works, was ſome time before he could get them printed, becauſe the college of the learned Phyſicians at Paris objected to them, not on account of any errors they obſerved in them, with regard to the art he treated of, but becauſe there were ſome paſſages in his book of Generation, in which, through inadvertency, he had expreſſed himſelf a little too freely: but after he had corrected them, he met no longer with any oppoſition.*

(2) Louis Guyon, *diverſes Lecons*, Tom. 2. Liv. 2. chap. 8. p. 298.

PAREUS (DAVID), a celebrated Proteſtant Divine, was born at Francoſtein in Sileſia, December 30, 1548. His father John Wængler, who was the ſon of a rich countryman (*a*), made him firſt ſtudy at Francoſtein, and then put him prentice to an Apothecary, and afterwards to a ſhoemaker. But that child was not born for ſuch mean things, and, as the author of his life obſerves, that God, who preſides over the Muſes, did not give him over to the ill homour of a ſtep-mother, who was the cauſe of that ſhameful uſage. The good old man John Wængler made him ſtudy again, in the year 1564, and ſent him to Hirſchberg in the neighbourhood, where there was a college, of which a learned man, named Chriſtopher Schilling (*b*), was principal. It was there our young ſtudent got the name of *Pareus*, taken from the Greek, by an alluſion to the name of his family [*A*]. This was pretty much the cuſtom of thoſe times, and eſpecially of Schilling. The Step-mother's ill humour was no doubt a little appeaſed, becauſe there was now no board to pay for David; for he maintained himſelf by means of a tutorſhip]*B*], and with the money he received from one of the chief inhabitants of that place (*c*), every time he preſented him with a copy of verſes. His maſter did not only change his ſurname, but made him alſo change his Religion, which was Lutheraniſm, by making him, as well as his other ſcholars, hear reaſon with regard to the *real Preſence*. This proved a great detriment both to the maſter and to the pupil; the former was driven from his College at the requeſt of the Miniſter of that place, and the latter was like to be diſinherited by his father, from whom he had all the trouble imaginable to get leave to go into the Palatinate, though he urged an argument, which ſeldom fails of being effectual; and which was, that by that means he ſhould be able to finiſh his ſtudies, without being at his family's charge. Having at laſt got that leave, he followed his maſter, who was choſen by Frederick III. Elector Palatine, to be Principal of the new College at Amberg. His father gave him ſo little money for his journey, that he was ſometimes obliged to beg on the road. Soon after his arrival at Amberg in the year 1566, he was ſent with ten of his ſchool-fellows to Heidelberg, by their common maſter, who recommended them ſo effectually, that they were all admitted into the College of Wiſdom, of which Zachary Urſinus, Profeſſor of Divinity, was Director. The Univerſity of Heidelberg was at that time in a moſt flouriſhing condition, with regard to every faculty; ſo that our Pareus wanted nothing to make a conſiderable progreſs in the languages, in Philoſophy, and in Divinity. He was admitted a Miniſter in the year 1571, and in May he was ſent into a Village named Schlettenbach, where he found himſelf in great perplexity, becauſe there was a great miſunderſtanding between the Proteſtants

(*a*) Who lived above an hundred years, and ſaw himſelf a father of 20 children all living. Philip. Pareus, *in vita* Davidis Parei.

(*b*) We ſhall give an account of him in his proper place.

(*c*) Albertus Kindler, Lord of Zackenſtein, who was afterwards Governor of Luſatia.

[*A*] *The name of* Pareus, *taken from the Greek, by an alluſion to the name of his family.*] His father's name was *Wængler*. Now *Wange* in the German tongue, ſignifies the ſame thing with παρειὰ in Greek, that is to ſay, *the cheek*. Παρειὸς therefore was formed ἀπὸ τῆς παρειᾶς, *quaſi dicas* GENIUS *Wængler*. Pareus's ſon, from whom I have extracted this remark, obſerves that his father oppoſed that alteration of his name as much he could; but at laſt he was obliged to conſent to it, when Zachary Urſinus had given his approbation to it (1). He obſerves, that moſt people write Pareus, which is wrong, becauſe the ει of the Greeks is always expreſſed by a long *e* in Latin, and not by an *æ*. *Quia*, ſays he, τὸ ει *Græcorum tranſit in ē longum apud Latinos, ut* ἠλείοις *Elei,* αἰνείας *Æneas,* ἀλφειὸς *Alphéus,* λύκειον *Lycéum,* μουσεῖον *Muſéum,* πρυτανεῖον *Prytanéum, & id genus alia non pauca.* As to the chriſtian name David, it was given to his father, ſays he, becauſe he was born December the 30th, which is a day conſecrated to David, and his parents were determined to give their children the names of the Saints, whoſe feſtival happened on the day they were born. *Penultima Decembris die quæ* DAVIDI *eſt ſacra . . . . & parentibus ſic placuiſſet liberis ſuis, quotquot illis naſcerentur ea imponere nomina quæ præ ſe ferrent ſolemnes faſti ad ipſum nativitatis diem.* All men do not know that there is a day of St. David in the Calender.

(1) Philip Pareus, *in vita* David. Parei, p. m. 5.

[*B*] *He maintained himſelf by means of a Tutorſhip.*] The Hiſtorian has not been very accurate in this part of his account. He aſſerts that David Pareus continued two years at Hirſchberg, three months at his father's charge, and the reſt of the time a Tutor in the family of an honeſt Citizen, whom he names (2). We are told afterwards, that the Lord of Zackenſtein was very generous to him, and maintained him gratis, on account of the verſes which this young man wrote on the death of that Lord's eldeſt ſon (3), and that afterwards he gave him money for every poem he charged him to write. The ſame Hiſtorian mentions a letter of that Lord, in which he deſires to know, whether the Pareus, who lodged at his houſe

(2) *In ea ſchola vixit biennium, trimeſtri ſpatio ſumptibus parentis, reliquo tempore pædagogi officio functus apud civem honeſtum Jacobum Schilderum.* Idem, ibid. p. 8. ad ann. 1564.

(3) *Convictum, quod filio defuncto epicedio carmine parentaſſet, gratuitum facile dedit.* Ibid.

tants and the Roman Catholicks [*C*]. However, he was going to be married then before the winter came on, when he was called back to Heidelberg to teach the third form there. This call made his whole project of marrying vaniſh away. He acquitted himſelf ſo well of his employment, that after two years he was promoted to the ſecond form; but he reſigned it at the end of ſix months to take again upon him the functions of a Miniſter, which he went to perform at Hemſbach, in the Dioceſe of Worms. Being tired of living in a publick houſe, he married four months after his arrival the Siſter of John Stibelius, Miniſter of Hippenheim (*d*). The nuptials were celebrated January the 5th, 1574. He loſt that living in the year 1577, becauſe, after the death of the Elector Frederick III. his ſon Lewis, who was very zealous for the Lutheran Religion, eſtabliſhed Lutheran Miniſters throughout his Dominions, in the room of the Reformed. Pareus retired into the territories of Prince John Caſimir, that Elector's Brother, and was three years Miniſter at Ogerſheim near Frankentale, and then at Winzingen near Neuſtat [*D*]. What rendered that neighbourhood moſt uſeful and acceptable to him was, that Prince Caſimir had founded an illuſtrious ſchool at Neuſtat, in the year 1578, and had ſettled there all the Profeſſors who were baniſhed from Heidelberg. The Elector Lewis dying in the year 1583, Prince Caſimir was left ſole Guardian to his Nephew Frederick IV. and Adminiſtrator of the Palatinate. The Reformed Miniſters were now reſtored, and Pareus was appointed ſecond Profeſſor in the College of Wiſdom at Heidelberg. This happened in September 1584. He began two years after to ſet up for an Author, by publiſhing his method *Ubiquitariæ Controverſiæ*. In the year 1589, he publiſhed the German Bible at Neuſtat with Notes, which occaſioned a hot controverſy between him and a Lutheran of Tubingen, named James Andreas. Pareus was appointed firſt Profeſſor in the College of Wiſdom, in January 1591, and Counſellor in the Eccleſiaſtical Senate, in November 1592. The next year he commenced Doctor of Divinity in a moſt ſolemn manner. He had already been engaged in ſeveral controverſies with the writers of the Augſburg confeſſion: but that of the year 1596 was one of the moſt conſiderable. It occaſioned a vindication of Calvin, who was charged with favouring Judaiſm in his expoſition of ſeveral paſſages of the Scripture. Two years after Pareus was honoured with the title of Divinity Profeſſor for the Old Teſtament in the ſame Univerſity: whereby he was delivered of the dreadful toil he had been obliged to undergo during fourteen years, in managing the youth who were educated in the College of Wiſdom (*e*); a toil ſo terrible, that that good man Zachary Urſinus thought himſelf happy that he was baniſhed

(*d*) See in the remark [*C*] of the article URSINUS (Zachary) a miſtake of Thuanus, concerning this Stibelius.

(*e*) *Haud omnino invitus eam in ſe ſuſcepit, pertæſus ſcilicet Siſyphiarum moleſtiarum quas in annum decimum quartum æruminabili prorſus cura in collegio volviſſet, effrenem juventutem gubernando.* Philip. Pareus, *in vita* David. Parei, p. 53. edit. in 8vo. Gen. 1641. *cum Comm. in Matthæum.*

houſe twenty five years ago, *quem ante annos 25 hoſpitem domeſticum habuiſſet* (4), was the ſame, by whoſe care the German Bible had been printed. Is not this putting a body in two different places at once? David Pareus was ſent to Hirſchberg in the year 1564, he received that Lord's letter in the year 1589, whence it follows, that he lodged at his houſe in the year 1564: he was not therefore twenty-one months a Tutor in James Schilder's family. We meet every where with ſuch blunders.

(4) Ibidem, p. 45.

[*C*] *There was a great miſunderſtanding between the Proteſtants and the Roman Catholicks.*] It had been neceſſary to uſe main force to aſſert the Elector Palatine's claim againſt the Biſhop of Spire's; the latter maintained, that the right of collating to the livings in the Corporation of Alfeſtad belonged to his Chapter: the Elector confeſſed it; but he aſſerted, that ſince he had the right of Patronage, the Collators were obliged, according to the peace of Paſſaw, to preſent ſuch Paſtors to him, whoſe religion he approved. By virtue of that right, he eſtabliſhed the reformed religion in that corporation, and ſent Pareus into the pariſh of Schlettenbach. The Roman Catholicks ſhut the church doors againſt him; but they were broke open, and the ſtatues and altars were afterwards pulled down. Pareus's next perplexity was, how to get the church cleaned: for no man would take the trouble to get the rubbiſh away, each putting off that labour to the other (5). The Rector of the Univerſity hints all this in his *Programma* for Pareus's funeral. *Ad paſtoratum*, ſays he (6), *Schlettenbacenſem . . . . miſſus, ibidem cum ſtatuis & altaribus atri duello primus conflictatus.* Pareus was alſo the firſt Paſtor at Hemſbach, but he met there with a much more tractable congregation; for when the Elector Palatine, who, as the Patron of that pariſh, reſolved to reform it, had cauſed the church doors to be broke open, Pareus took care to have all the images taken down, and had them burnt with the people's conſent (7). This is what the Rector's Program refers to in theſe words. *Hinc anno 73 Eccleſiæ Hemſbacenſis (& hic iconomachus futurus* LEO *non imperator ſed Paſtor) Miniſter præfectus* (8). i. e. "Hence he was ſent to be Miniſter of the Church "of Hemſbach, where he was alſo to be an Icono-"claſt, not like the Emperor Leo, (or like a lion,) "but like a true Paſtor." The occaſion, which mov'd the Prince to eſtabliſh the Reformation in that place, is very remarkable. The Curate, who had been drinking all the night before Eaſter, was ſleeping himſelf ſober at the time of divine ſervice. Being waked at laſt by the Sexton, he goes to church, and after ſinging, gets into the pulpit, delivers his preamble, and according to cuſtom, kneels down to ſay the Lord's prayer (9), and falls aſleep. The people imagine that his being ſo long on his knees, is owing to a very great zeal; but as it continued too long, the Sexton pulls the Prieſt by his gown. He gets up half aſleep, and cries out with a great oath, that he cannot preach: *ich kan beym Sacrament nicht predigen. Per ſacramentum non poſſum concionari* (10), i. e. "By the Sacrament (which is the common oath "of the Germans) I cannot preach." The Biſhop of Worms, having notice of this ſcandalous action, ſends the Curate to priſon, and puts another in his ſtead, who had ſeven baſtards. Pareus's nuptials, which were celebrated publickly in the church, were a ſight, which had never been beheld in the pariſh of Hemſbach; as for concubines and baſtards of the Prieſts, as many as you pleaſe; it was not a ſight, which like the other, had ſomething wonderful in it. However, the people were eaſily reconciled to that new practice, being made acquainted with what St. Paul teaches concerning the Biſhop's marriage. *Celebratæ ſunt nuptiæ d. 5. Januarii Hemſbaci: ubi antehac nullus Eccleſiæ Miniſter ſponſus vel maritus fuit. Portenti igitur ſimile habebatur matrimonium Paſtoris Eccleſiæ eo loci, ubi nunquam niſi ſacrificulorum concubinas, coquillas, & ſcortilla viderant. Verum percepta in Concionibus doctrina Apoſtoli* *: Oportet Epiſcopum eſſe unius uxoris virum: *Et* † Epiſcopus ſit unius uxoris vir, liberos habens fideles: *& vernaculis Sacramentorum liturgiis auditis, matrimonium & miniſterium novi Paſtoris cuncti approbaverunt* (11).

(9) It ſhould be the *Ave-Mary*: Pareus, the ſon, may be miſtaken in ſome other trifling particulars, for want of knowing the ceremonies of the Roman Catholick Church.

(10) Ibid. p. 26.

* 1 Tim. iii. 2.

† Tit. i. 17.

(11) P. Pareus, *in vita* D. Parei, p. 32.

[*D*] *Winzengen near Neuſtat.*] Paul Freherus aſſerts, that David Pareus was Miniſter at Neuſtat (12). But Philip Pareus, who gives him a living only in the neigbourhood of Neuſtat, deſerves more credit

(12) Paul. Freher. *in Theatro*, p. 413.

(5) *Expurgationem ruderum ab his & ab illis ſruſtra quærebat novus Paſtor.* P. Pareus, *in vita* D. Parei, p. 24.

(6) Ibid. p. 96.

(7) *Nemine refragante e plebe quæ ſeſe omnimodis docilem præbuit: idola templi conſentiente populo removit & Vulcano obtulit.* Ibid. p. 27.

(8) Ibid. p. 96.

niſhed by the Lutherans, ſince by his baniſhment he was delivered from that wretched employment [*E*]. In the year 1602 Pareus was promoted to the Profeſſorſhip of Divinity for the New Teſtament, vacant by the death of Daniel Toſſanus. His reputation encreaſed to ſuch a degree, that many ſtudents came upon his account from the remoteſt part of Hungary and Poland. He publiſhed ſeveral Commentaries on the Holy Scripture, and among others one on St. Paul's Epiſtle to the Romans, which was extremely diſliked in England]*F*], becauſe it contained ſome maxims, which were a little anti-monarchical. In the year 1617 they ſolemnized at Heidelberg the Evangelical Jubilee for three days following, during which there were continual orations, diſputations, poems, and ſermons, on the bleſſing which God had beſtowed on his Church an hundred years before, when he delivered her from the yoke of Popery. Pareus publiſhed alſo ſome writings upon that ſubject, which were cenſured by the Jeſuits of Mentz, whom he was obliged to anſwer; but this was not the moſt troubleſome of all the controverſies, in which he was engaged (*f*). The next year they would ſend him to the Synod of Dort, at the requeſt of the States General: but he deſired to be excuſed becauſe of the infirmities of old age under which he laboured (*g*), which did not ſuffer him to undertake a long journey, nor to expoſe himſelf to a new kind of nouriſhment: but he would have been otherwiſe a very proper perſon to vote in that aſſembly, for he was a great enemy to all Novelties in point of Doctrine [*G*]. After that time this venerable old man enjoyed but little tranquillity. He apprehended beforehand the fate which the Elector his maſter met with, for having accepted the Crown of Bohemia. He diſturbed himſelf with a thouſand bad omens, grounded upon ſeveral things, which he had ſeen either awake or aſleep: for he

(*f*) See the rem. [*H*].

(*g*) *Idem, ἱμπόδισμα ſenem emaciatum longinquioris itineris exoticæque diætæ impatientem D. Pareum in Academia domi ſervavit.* P. Pareus *in vita* D. Parei, p. 66.

credit than the continuator of Boiſſard quoted by Freherus; he deſerves, I ſay, more credit, both with regard to this particular, and with regard to the honours, which John Wængler, David Pareus's father, enjoyed. According to Freherus, John Wængler was Preſident or Fore-man of the Sheriffs or Aldermen in his native place. But according to Philip Pareus, he was only one of the Sheriffs or Aldermen, *aſſeſſor Scabinatus*.

[*E*] *He was delivered from that wretched employment.*] Philip Pareus makes uſe of very ſtrong and emphatical expreſſions upon this occaſion. *Quantumvis pauper & debilis ſim, & non proſpiciens ullum peregrinationis aut exilii portum, tamen gaudebo me dimitti ex meo ergaſtulo. Non poſſum amplius δυσμεταχείριτον & ἀχάλινον illam juventutem regere. Defeſſus enim ſum & infirmus factus* (13). i. e. "How poor and weak ſoever I be, "and though I know of no ſanctuary where I may "end theſe travellings and this baniſhment, yet I "ſhall rejoice to get out of my priſon. I can no "longer rule that untractable and head-ſtrong youth. "I am become quite heartleſs and infirm."

(13) P. Pareus, *in vita* D. Parei.

[*F*] *His* Commentary *on St. Paul's Epiſtle to the Romans . . . . was extremely diſliked in England.*] King James cauſed it to be burnt by the common hangman; the Univerſity of Oxford condemned it in the moſt diſgraceful manner: ſee their proceedings in a book of Grotius, intitled, *Votum pro pace Eccleſiaſtica*. Konig refers us to page 754, of an abridgment of Univerſal Hiſtory (14), in which I find but 544 pages, though my edition be the third, and printed in the year 1661. I have obſerved there an error in the index, which under the word *David Pareus* refers us to the pages 715, 745, and 755. I cannot tell whether this may not have miſled Konig. However it be, the paſſages, in which David Pareus is mentioned, and which are in the pages 509, 535, and 536, do not contain a word of the diſgracing or condemnation of his Commentary on the Epiſtle to the Romans. There was an Engliſh Divine named David Owen, who refuted it. Philip Pareus anſwered, and endeavoured to vindicate his father. See Monſieur Baillet's *Auti's* (15), and Monſieur Arnaud's Apology for the Roman Catholicks (16), in which we are told that David Pareus was vindicated, among other methods, by that which the Jeſuits make uſe of, when they are charged with corrupting the Chriſtian Morality: they ſhew that they are neither the firſt nor the only perſons, who taught ſuch or ſuch a Doctrine.

(14) That of John Lætus. He publiſhed it for the firſt time, in the year 1642. I have found upon examination, that the 1ſt edition has more pages than the 3d.

(15) Num. 128.

(16) Chapter the 4th of the 1ſt part.

[*G*] *He was a great enemy to all Novelties in point of Doctrine.*] See what we ſhall obſerve in the next remark concerning his antipathy againſt the followers of Ramus. That diſpoſition of mind engaged him in an intimate friendſhip with a Divine of Franeker, named Sibrand Lubbertus, who reſiſted vigorouſly the promoters of the new ways of ſpeaking and teaching. Pareus uſed to call him his ſoul, and did not give him a bad example (17), for he would not ſuffer any man to ſwerve a jot from the Catechiſm of his Profeſſor Urſinus, as I know not what Divines had done, who added no leſs than three ſorts of imputations to what Urſinus had ſet down concerning our juſtification before God; namely, the imputation of Jeſus Chriſt's death, the imputation of his righteouſneſs, and habitual holineſs (18). There aroſe alſo controverſies in the year 1604, about a queſtion of that ſame Catechiſm of Heidelberg: it is the 76th, which treats of the efficacy of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Pareus, like a brave Champion for the eſtabliſhed Doctrine, would not ſuffer it to be altered in the leaſt. Thoſe innovations were, according to him, a removal of the boundaries of truth, which ought to be ſacred and immoveable (19); for thoſe which ſeparate men's lands are ſo: he imagined that the alterations, which ſome would make in the Catechiſm, forebode an approaching deſolation, which he expreſſed in theſe two lines.

(17) *Animam ſuam appellavit. Amavit autem eam præcipue ob rotundum ingenium in tuenda ἐρδοδοξία: quippe qui non paſſus fuerit à ſciolis mutari terminos doctrinæ receptos, intrepidoque animo iis ſeſe oppoſuerit qui in conſueta forma loquendi ac docendi quicquam mutare præſumerent.* P. Pareus, p. 106.

(18) P. Pareus, *in vita* D. Parei, p. 102.

Aula ruit: Politia ruit: ruet & Catecheſis;
Ante fores noſtram quis jam neget eſſe ruinam (20) ?

(19) *Theologos illos qui καινοδοξίαν aut καινοτομίαν in dogmatibus vel phraſibus affectarent, nec ſervarent ex præcepto Apoſtoli ὑποτύπωσιν ὑγιαινόντων λόγων, dicere ſolebat movere veritatis terminos qui debeant eſſe immobiles atque ſacroſancti.* Ibid. p. 101.

i. e. "The Court falls to ruin, the Polity falls to "ruin, the Catechiſm will meet with the ſame fate: "who then can deny but our own ruin is near at "hand?"

In vain would one object that Pareus eſtabliſhed thereby the principle of authority, inſtead of that of examination; and that it was playing the engines of Popery againſt his own brethren, after he had cried them down as ſomething abominable: in vain would one complain that ſuch a conduct is like the ſtratagem of the Trojans:

(20) Ibid. p. 103.

Mutemus clipeos, Danaumque inſignia nobis
Aptemus. Dolus an virtus quis in hoſte requirat (21) ?

(21) Virg. Æn. lib. 2. ver. 389.

That is,

"Then change we ſhields, and their devices bear,
"Let fraud ſupply the want of force in war."
DRYDEN.

In vain, ſay I, ſhall we exclaim thus, and ground on ſuch a conduct a thouſand reproaches of inconſiſtency; they who know what powerful efficacy there is in a *diſtinguo*, they who remember the *diſtingue tempora & conciliabis ſcripturas* (diſtinguiſh the times, and you may reconcile the Scripture with itſelf;) they who have conſidered that there are ſome maxims, which may be of no uſe at a certain time, but which at laſt muſt be urged again; and that the ill uſe of a thing does not abrogate the uſe of it, will let all theſe declaimers ſtorm and bluſter as much as they pleaſe. Imagine a circle ſuſpended before an houſe, half within it and half without; make it

he had a great faith in dreams [*H*], and when he ſaw men at work to improve the fortifications of Heidelberg, he uſed to ſay, it is ſo much labour loſt. Calling to mind the books he publiſhed againſt the Pope, he looked upon it as the moſt dreadful calamity to fall into the hands of the Monks: he followed therefore the advice that was given him to provide in time for his ſecurity: he choſe for his ſanctuary the town of Anweil in the Dutchy of Qweybrak, near Landaw, and arrived there in October 1621. He left it ſome months after to go to Newſtat, and thence he would return again to Heidelberg, choſing to dye in his *Pareanum* [*I*], and to be buried near the Profeſſors of the Univerſity, rather than in any other place. He enjoyed that comfort: for he died at his houſe June the 15th 1622, at the age of near threeſcore and fourteen years, and was buried with all the funeral honours, which the Univerſities in Germany are uſed to beſtow on their Members. His *Exegetical* works have been collected in three volumes in folio. He publiſhed ſeveral treatiſes againſt Cardinal Bellarmin. He left a ſon named Philip, of whom I ſhall give an account hereafter, and who wrote the life of his father, from which I have extracted the particulars mentioned in this article. I have not met there with any thing concerning his controverſy with the Jeſuit John Magirus [*K*].

PAREUS

turn on its center, you will ſee that at the ſame time one half gets out of the houſe, the other half gets into it. So it happens with regard to ſome principles amongſt men; it is an abſolute neceſſity; and after all the greateſt intolerancy is not that of the civil Magiſtrate, but of thoſe reſtleſs and turbulent men, who untimely ſet up for reformers. Our Pareus uſed to ſay with Luther of ſuch men: *A Doctore glorioſo, & Paſtore contentioſo, & inutilibus quæſtionibus liberet Eccleſiam ſuam Dominus* (22), i. e. "From a vain-glo- "rious Doctor, from a litigious paſtor, and from "uſeleſs queſtions, deliver thy Church, good Lord."

(22) P. Pareus, *in Vita* D. Parei, p. 103.

[*H*] *He had a great faith in dreams.*] His ſon tells us that he found in his father's diary an account of ſeveral dreams, and other augural obſervations. Here follows an inſtance of them. Pareus wrote in his Diary under the 26th of December 1617, that he had dreamt a cat had ſcratched his face, and that it was certainly an ominous dream; *ſine dubio ominoſum* (23). Having received two days after the firſt ſheet of a book that was printing at Mentz, he ſaid that was the cat which ſcratched him, and ſet down that explication of his dream in his Journal. It is certain, that the Jeſuits of Mentz wrote moſt outrageouſly againſt him. But what he had to ſuffer from Scaliger was much more grievous (24). He had done much better not to try his ſtrength with ſuch a Chronologer, *impar congreſſus Achilli*, who was too ſtrong for him: but his weakneſs was, that he would meddle with too many ſubjects. However, he was a little comforted, when he ſaw his adverſary ſuffer a retaliation. This awaked his muſe, which brought forth the following epigram.

(23) Ibid. p. 65.

(24) *Eo conflictu non ſolum optimo patri ſed omnibus paſſim viris doctis, ſi palpones & canes venaticos alios excipias, nihil unquam ægrius indigniuſve accidiſſe probe recordor.* Ibidem, p. 107.

Nobiliore canum jactans ſe ſtirpe Moloſſus,
Forte viatorem dum petit ore minax,
A cane degenere incautus miſer ipſe recatur:
Hanc Nemeſin juſtam quis neget eſſe Διὸς (25)?

(25) Ibid. p. 108.

i. e. "A maſtif boaſting of his noble deſcent, was "barking at a paſſenger, when lo, he was miſera- "bly killed by a dog of a baſtard breed: who is "there but muſt acknowledge his ſentence is juſt?"

He hints here at the ill uſage Scaliger met with from the wicked Scioppirs; whereupon it is proper to hear alſo Philip Pareus. *Nactus præterea fuit*, ſays he (26), *nobilem adverſarium in ſtudiis Chronologicis, ſuperciliioſiſſimum criticum* JOSEPHUM SCALIGERUM *Julii Cæſaris a Burden filium, qui ſatyrica protervia erga* PAREUM *uſus jure ἀντιπεποθότος eo ipſo tempore infamiæ notam pene indelibilem ab Apoſtatico quodam Alaſtore coactus fuit ſubire* (27). i. e. "He met, beſides, "with a moſt noble adverſary in his chronological "labours, namely, that moſt haughty critick, Joſeph "Scaliger, ſon of Julius Cæſar Scaliger, who having "abuſed Pareus in his ſatyrical writings, met with "the retribution he deſerved, having been at that "very time branded by an indelible mark of infa- "my by a certain wicked apoſtate." We muſt not forget to obſerve, that Philip Pareus repreſents his father as a man of a very mild and moderate temper. And it muſt be confeſſed, that he was none of thoſe untractable Divines, who will not yield the leaſt thing for the ſake of peace: the *Irenicum* he publiſhed proves the contrary. But then, to pretend that he did not write on ſeveral occaſions in a paſſionate ſtyle, abounding with opprobrious language, is certainly to be deluded by a fantaſtical imagination, which is but too common. Every one fancies that there are no ſmart reproaches, but ſuch as are ſaid to himſelf or to his friends. Pareus was a great enemy to the leaſt innovations, as it has been obſerved in the preceding remark: now though to the leaſt ſwerving from the opinions commonly received, be often the cauſe of great evils in matters of religion, yet it will never be ſaid that they who are ſo extremely watchful againſt the moſt trifling errors, have a great ſtock of toleration, whatſoever elogies one may otherwiſe beſtow on the importance of their ſervices. Pareus could not bear Ramus, becauſe he had dared to remove the boundaries of our anceſtors (28), and here follows the epigram he wrote againſt him.

(26) Ibid. p. 107.

(27) See the *Nouvelles Lettres contre le Calviniſme de Maimbourg*, Tom. I. p. 182, 183.

(28) *Novellam artem quæ à Ramo ſectario nomen jactat perpetuo rejecit. Huic nimium quantum ſuccenſuit ideo quod per eam diceret antiquos artis terminos moveri, nihil ſuo loco relinqui, ingenia juventutis ad αὐθάδειαν καὶ φιλονικίαν traduci.* P. Pareus, *in Vita* D. Parei, p. 21.

Quæ mutas perdis, dixit Democritus, & quæ
Servas in phyſicis ſunt, Epicure, mea.
Nonne idem Ariſtoteles in Ramum maſtiga dicat
Quæ mutas, perdis: quæ retines mea ſunt (29)?

i. e. "What you alter in natural Philoſophy, ſaid "Democritus to Epicurus, you ſpoil; and what you "keep is mine: might not Ariſtole ſay the ſame to "that rogue Ramus; what you alter, you ſpoil, and "what you keep is mine."

(29) Ibid. p. 22.

Laſtly, Pareus had to write againſt ſo many perſons, that it was almoſt impoſſible for him not to contract a habit of uſing opprobrious language. They who know what it is to *fence* in the Republic of Letres, cannot but underſtand my meaning.

[*I*] *In his* Pareanum.] Having bought an houſe in the ſuburb of Heidelberg, in the year 1607, he built there in the garden, an apartment to lodge his library in, and to make a ſtudy of, and this he called his *Pareanum*; which was afterwards the name of the whole houſe, all the city calling it thus. The Elector would have that houſe to enjoy ſeveral privileges and immunities. Pareus cauſed two inſcriptions to be put on the frontiſpiece of it, the one in Latin, and the other in German (30). Now ſince his ſon hopes that notwithſtanding the devaſtations made in the Palatinate by the troops of the Catholick league, that houſe will ſtill keep the name of *Pareanum* (31), we ought to believe that it was left entire. I do not know what is become of it ſince; but I think it muſt be quite ruined at preſent; the poor city of Heidelberg had been laid waſte in ſuch a terrible manner by the armies of France in the years 1689 and 1693, that there is no likelihood Pareus's houſe ſhould be ſtill in being. Let us obſerve by the by, that one would think ſome cities were built under a malignant conſtellation. They are equally unfortunate, which turn ſoever the publick affairs take. Is not Heidelberg an inſtance of it, which was ruined both for declaring againſt the Emperor, and for being loyal to him?

(30) Ibid. p. 55.

(31) *Quo nomine incolis civitatis ſtatim innotuit, & à poſteris, ſi bene ominor, eam gratiam retinebit.* Ibidem. He wrote his father's life in the year 1628.

[*K*] *His controverſy with the Jeſuit John Magirus.*] Pareus delivered an oration at Heidelberg, March the

PAREUS (PHILIP) (*a*), ſon of the preceding, was born at Hemſbach in the Dioceſe of Worms, May the 24th, 1576. He was one of the moſt laborious Grammarians Germany ever produced. He began his ſtudies at Neuſtat, continued them at Heidelberg, and afterwards in foreign Univerſities, at the Elector Palatine's charge (*b*). He viſited the Univerſity of Baſil in the year 1599, whence he went to Geneva, where he continued above a year. He ſaw ſome other Univerſities in his journey, and was much conſidered every where, both on account of his own learning, and on account of the great veneration men had for his father. He was very kindly received at Paris by the celebrated Caſaubon (*c*). He was made principal of the College of Neuſtat, in the year 1610, and enjoyed that poſt, till the Spaniards, who took that city in the year 1622, commanded him to leave the country immediately (*d*). His library was plundered. He had already publiſhed ſeveral books [*A*], which are a proof of his prodigious application, and of his particular inclination for Plautus's Comedies [*B*]. But what proved a bad example, was that there aroſe a terrible quarrel between him and John Gruterus, Profeſſor at Heidelberg, with regard to Plautus [*C*]. I have already obſerved (*e*), that our Pareus took in hand the cauſe of his late father againſt David Owen, who had publiſhed an *Anti-Pareus* at Cambridge, in

(*a*) He uſed to take the name of John Philip in his firſt works.

(*b*) *Theatr.* Freheri, p. 501.

(*c*) Daniel Pareus, *Not. in Muſæum.* ver. 1.

(*d*) P. Pareus, *in Vita* D. Parei.

(*e*) In the rem. [*F*] of the preceding article.

the 23d, 1602, *De Jeſuitarum ſtrophis circa Canonem Sacræ Scripturæ*, i. e. "Of the Jeſuit's evaſions with "regard to the Canon of the Holy Scriptures." He held alſo a diſputation in the year 1603 on the Canonical authority of the Scripture, and on the Church's infallibility, and invited the Jeſuits of Spires to be preſent at that diſputation. None of them came; but Magirus having wrote a letter to Pareus September the 7th, 1603, this gave riſe to a controverſy, of which the writings on both ſides have been printed. Here follows the ſuperſcription and beginning of Magirus's Letter. *Clariſſimo viro Domino D. Pereo Doctori & Profeſſori Facultatis pro tempore Decano in Academia Heidelbergenſi. Nudius tertius venit ad Collegium noſtrum adoleſcens, ingenio præfervido, moribus linguaque protervus: is ita narrabat à te miſſum ſe eſſe ut & diſputationem primam de S. S. authoritate adverſus Jeſuitarum impoſturas quam examinandam propoſueras ad diem 26. Auguſti nobis redderet, ſimulque ad eam diſputationem nos humaniter invitaret.* i. e. "To the moſt eminent man D. Pereus, Doctor "and Profeſſor, and at this time head of the faculty "in the Univerſity of Heidelberg. The day before "yeſterday came to our College a young man, of a "very paſſionate temper, and very ſaucy both in his "manners and in his diſcourſes; who told me he was "ſent by you, to preſent us with your Diſſertation "on the authority of the Holy Scripture, againſt the "Jeſuits, upon which a publick diſputation was to "be held the 26th of Auguſt, to which he invited "us civilly in your name." He ſubſcribed his letter thus, *Salutis tuæ cupidus Joannes Magirus*, i. e. "John Magirus, who wiſhes you ſalvation." Pareus anſwered, and made uſe of the following ſuperſcription. *Clariſſimo viro Domino Joanni Magiro Societatis Jeſu dictæ Concionatori apud Spirenſes, amico ſuo in Chriſto*, i. e. "To John Magirus of the Society, "called the Society of Jeſus, preacher at Spires, his "friend in Chriſt." He complained that Magirus abuſed him in his Sermons with ill language; and he made an obſervation on that Jeſuit's naming him *Pereus* inſtead of *Pareus*. *Si amanuenſis ſphalma eſt, tranſeat: ſi ſtudium tuum ut pereundi verbo me pungeres, illiberale eſt, ac ſi quis pro Magiro Megarum dicerat.* i. e. "If it be only an error of your Amanuenſis, "or tranſcriber, let it paſs: but if you dictated it ſo "on purpoſe to vex me by hinting the likeneſs there "is between my name and the verb *to periſh*, it is "unhandſome in you; it is as though one ſhould "call you *Megarus*, alluding to the name of one of "the furies, inſtead of *Magirus*." That work of Pareus was printed in the year 1604, *Typis Voegelianis*, and contains *Diſceptatio Epiſtolaris Joannis Magiri Jeſuitæ Concionatoris, & Davidis Parei Chriſtiani Theologi, de authoritate Divina & Canonica S. S. deque abſoluta Eccleſiæ Infallibilitate. De S. S. Authoritate adverſus Jeſuitarum impoſturas. Exegeſis Diſputationis de Authoritate Divina & Canonica, &c. adverſus Jeſuitarum ſtrophas & impoſturas*, i. e. "A controverſy by "letters between John Magirus a Jeſuit, and a "preacher, and David Pareus a Chriſtian Divine, "concerning the divine and canonical authority of "the Holy Scripture, and the abſolute authority of "the Church, againſt the cavils and impoſtures of "the Jeſuits: with a diſſertation upon the ſame "ſubject." Monſieur Bachelier des Marets (32) has furniſhed me with all that I have been obſerving in this Remark.

(32) Who is alſo mentioned above, quotation (3), of the article EPPENDORF.

[*A*] *He had already publiſhed ſeveral books.*] Beſides thoſe of which I give the titles in the following remark, he had publiſhed in the year 1616, *Calligraphia Romana, ſeu Theſaurus phraſium Linguæ Latinæ*, i. e. "A collection of Latin phraſes:" and in the year 1615, *Electa Symmachiana, Lexicon Symmachianum, Calligraphia Symmachiana*, and ſome other works at ſeveral times.

[*B*] *His inclination for Plantus's Comedies.*] He did not only publiſh them with notes in the year 1609, he publiſhed alſo a *Lexicon Plautinum* in the year 1614; the *Analecta Plautina* in the year 1617, a treatiſe *De Imitatione Terentiana, ubi Plautum imitatus eſt*, i. e. "Of Terence's imitating Plautus, and where "he has imitated him;" in the year 1617: a ſecond edition of Plautus in the year 1619, and of the *Analecta Plautina*, in the year 1620. I muſt clear up what I have obſerved concerning the laſt edition of Plautus. I know that it has the year 1610 in the title page: but ſince among the thanks or elogies, which were ſent to the author for that work, there are ſome dated in the year 1609, we cannot doubt but the year 1610 is one of thoſe anticipations, which are not uncommon with booksellers. If they were confined themſelves to this only, they would not create ſo much trouble to thoſe who make collections of the ſeveral editions. But how often do they take the liberty of reprinting the title page of their books, to make them paſs for new? Nay, ſometimes they even dare to print in the title page, that it is a new edition, which prodigiouſly multiplies in people's notion, and even in the catalogues of libraries the editions of the ſame work. Pareus publiſhed the third edition of his Plautus at Franckfort, in the year 1641. The *Prolegomena*, which it contains on that Poet's life, the character of his verſification, and the nature of his railleries, have been prefixed entire to the Plautus *in uſum Delphini*.

THE DISORDERS occaſioned by the Bookſeller's reprinting the Title-Pages of books.

[*C*] *There aroſe a terrible quarrel between him and John Gruterus . . . . with regard to Plautus.*] Gruterus having attacked Pareus, the latter ſoon publiſhed his anſwer, in the year 1620, with this title; *Provocatio ad Senatum Criticum pro Plauto & Electis Plautinis*, i. e. "An Appeal to the Critical Senate, in behalf "of Plautus, and of the extracts from that Poet." They grew both more and more hot in the quarrel; nor could the conſideration of the evils, which were like to befal them by the ruin with which the whole Palatinate was threatened, inſpire them with the leaſt moderation, ſo eaſily are theſe Gentlemen Philologers and Grammarians exaſperated, and ſo difficult is it to appeaſe them. The long preface, which our Pareus prefixed to his *Analecta Plautina*, printed at Francfort in the year 1623, is dated October . . . 1621, that is to ſay, that he filled it with malice and animoſity, juſt when that deſolation was near at hand, which ruined both their Univerſities and their Libraries, and reduced their very perſons to the greateſt extremities. Their baniſhment did not abate in the leaſt that paſſionate temper: for theſe *Analecta*, which were printed ſince their diſperſion, are interſperſed every where with the moſt abuſive

language

in the year 1622. He answered him soon after in his *Anti-Owenus* (*f*). He has been Principal of several Colleges, and was still Principal of the College of Hanaw, in the year 1645 [*D*], as appears from the Dedication of his *Lexicon Criticum*, printed that same year at Nurenberg. It is only a large *Octavo*, but what cost the Author a prodigious labour, *ærumnabili laboro congestus*, as he speaks himself. He wrote also some Commentaries on the Holy Scripture, and some theological works. I shall give some account of his son Daniel in the next article.

(*f*) It is wanting in Monsieur Baillet's curious collection.

language against Gruterus. But this was nothing but reprisals; for Gruterus had been so outrageous, that people reckoned even 136 most shocking injuries in one of his books against Philip Pareus. It was the Jesuit James Gretserus, who took a pleasure in drawing up that list (1). We see Pareus stiled there an Ass, a Mule, a Boar, a Ram, a Goat, *stercoreus Grammaticalis cellæ inquilinus*, &c. i. e. "A "stinking inhabitant of the grammatical den." It was a long time since Graterus was inclined to fall out with Pareus, as appears from what he wrote to Goldast, June the 19th, 1601. *Miraberis carmen tui Parei, qui me nondum invisit ex quo à vobis abiit, nuper autem factus est Rector scholæ civitatis sic satis magnæ, ut alios regat scilicet qui se non potest* (2). *i. e.* "You "will admire your Pareus's poem, who has not yet "visited me since he left you: he has lately been "made Principal of a College in a pretty large city; he must govern others truly, who cannot rule "himself."

(1) See Theop. Raynaud, *Erotemat.* p. 115.

(2) See the collection of the letters written to Goldast, printed at Francfort, in the year 1688, p. 73.

[*D*] *He was Principal of the College of Hanaw in the year* 1645.] This shews that Paul Freherus was mistaken, when he said that Pareus died about the year 1643 (3). Witte, in the 2d part of his *Diarium Biographicum*, did in all likelihood only abridge Freherus's account of our Philip Pareus; at least he agrees with him in placing his death under the year 1643. If they had cast an eye on the *Lexicon Criticum*, they would have seen the Author's picture prefixed to it, as he looked at the age of threescore and ten; whence they might have inferred, that he did not die at the age of threescore and seven, as they both assert; and if they had consulted the latter part of the dedication, they would have seen that he was still living the 24th of August 1645. It is strange, that he should appear less ugly in his picture of the year 1645, than he does in that of the year 1641, which is prefixed to the third edition of his Plautus. Rivetus, in a book which he wrote in the year 1646 (4), mentions him as a man who was still living. Nay, he was not yet dead in the year 1647, as appears from the dedications of his father's *Exegetical* works, which he published that year at Francfort, in three volumes in folio.

(3) *Theatr.* p. 501.

(4) Rivetus, Grot. Discuss. *Operum*, Tom. 3. p. 1163.

PAREUS (DANIEL), son of the preceding, followed the steps of his father, and applied himself with all his heart to the study of polite Literature. He was pretty well versed in the Greek tongue, and published some books [*A*]. He was unfortunately murthered by some Highwaymen [*B*] in his father's life time. Vossius had a great esteem for him, and applied himself to find him booksellers who would undertake the printing of his works [*C*].

[*A*] *He published some books.*] In the year 1627, he published Musæus's poem on the amours of Hero and Leander, with notes stuffed with quotations and phrases in Greek, or extracted from the most obsolete Latin writers. He published also the same year, a large volume *in quarto*, which he dedicated to the University of Oxford, and which he intitled *Mellificium Atticum*. It is a collection of sentences referred to some general heads, and extracted from the Greek Authors. In the year 1633, he published another work, intitled, *Medulla Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ* (1), and notes, with a Lexicon on Lucretius. But he is not the Author of the Life of Lucretius, which he added to it; he omitted something out of that, which Gifanius wrote. If the scholiast, who published the Lucretius *in usum Delphini*, had took notice of this, he would not have confined himself to Daniel Pareus, as to the first Author of that Life, which he prefixed to his Commentary on that poet; he would have gone back to Gifanius himself. There is in some editions of Quintilian, a *Fabianarum Notarum Spicilegium subcisivum* of Daniel Pareus, which he sent in the year 1628, to Henry Featherstone, Bookseller at London.

(1) See the rem. [*F*] of the article ALTING (Henry).

[*B*] *He was murdered by some highwaymen.*] William Prey acquaints us with this particular, in the verses he wrote on Philip Pareus's *Lexicon Criticum*. *Cessit avus fatis*, says he, *furum scelerata nepotem, trajecit mediis cuspide turma viis*. Others affert, that he was killed at the taking of Keiserslauteren in the Palatinate. See Gisbert Voetius, in the 3d volume of his *Politica Ecclesiastica*, p. 164, 165.

[*C*] *Vossius had a great esteem for him, and applied himself to find him Booksellers . . . . for the printing of his works.*] This appears from a letter he wrote to him (2), when there was a report in Holland that several cities would found Academies (3), after the example of Amsterdam. He gave him to understand, that if this proved true, one might procure him a Professorship. He made him again the same offers to serve him some time after, and gave him an account of the pains he had taken, and would take again, to find him a printer for the History of the Church (4): it was a work of Daniel Pareus. He confesses to him, that le Maire had refused to print it, because, said he, he did not know how big it was, and because his printing presses were very much employ'd. *Le Merium convenit ipse, ac postea idem filius fecit. Sed nihil promittere voluit, qui nesciret de magnitudine libri. Solet ille magis capi iis, quæ minoris sunt molis: addebat jam prælum fervere multis & variis* (5). He gives him hopes, that in case Le Maire continues to refuse it, after the declaration made to him, that it was not required he should print it immediately, others will be glad to print the book. But yet he acquaints him, that there is no country in the world, where it is more difficult to find a man who will print a book, than in Holland, unless in two cases, namely, first, if the Author will bear all the charges; secondly, if it be a work of controversy, or upon some trifling subject: for these are the books that sell best (6). *Quod si is difficilem se præbeat, non deerunt, ut spero, alii, qui lubenter id facient. Dissimulare tamen non possum, nusquam difficilius esse typographum reperire, quam apud nos, nisi quis suis sumptibus librum edat. Fit hoc ob rerum omnium summam caritatem, quam causat grave & diuturnum bellum, quod nobis est cum hoste potentissimo. Sola excipio lexicia, & nugalia, quibus nihil vendibilius, ut ipsi non dissimulant typographi* (7). He observes here, that the reason why the Booksellers did not care to print books at their own expence was, that every thing was extremely dear in Holland, because of the long and expensive war in which the nation was engaged, with a most powerful enemy. This letter of Vossius acquaints us also, that Pareus was soon to be Tutor in the Count of Isemburg's family. Consult the letter 321; you will see there, that our Pareus dedicated a book to Vossius (8).

(2) It is the C. p. 135. edit. Londin. 1693.

(3) If we were to translate word for word the Dutch expression, we should say *Illustrious* or *Noble Schools*.

(4) See his letter 317, p. 307.

(5) Vossius, Epist. 317, p. 307.

(6) Idem, ibid.

7 If Vossius had wrote at this time, as I do, namely, in the year 1696, he would have had still more reason to speak thus. The Booksellers may be vindicated, as above, in the article CRATERUS, remark [*A*].

(8) He dedicated his *Lucretius* to him.

PARISET (LEWIS), was of Reggio in Italy, and lived in the 16th Century. He is the Author of three Orations, *De Divina in hominem benevolentia et beneficentia*, i. e. "Of God's goodness and beneficence towards man;" they are very long (*a*), and written

(*a*) They contain 239 sheets in 8vo.

ten in a pretty good Latin ſtyle. He dedicated them to Pope Julius III. They were printed at Venice in the year 1553, in 8vo, by the ſons of Alders Manutius (*b*), who printed alſo ſeveral of his Latin Poems (*c*).

(*b*) *Epitome Bibliothecæ* Geſneri, p. 557. The edition I make uſe of, is of the year 1559.

(*c*) His *Theopœia* in ſix books, in the years 1550, and 1553; and his *Epiſtles* in ſix books, in the year 1553, in 8vo. *Epitome Bibliothecæ Geſneri*, p. 557.

☞ PARKER (MATTHEW), Archbiſhop of Canterbury, who was ſon of Mr. William Parker, a Citizen of Norwich, and by trade a Calender of Stuffs, by his Wife Alice, of the Worſhipful Family of the Monnins of Suffolk. He was born in the Pariſh of St. Saviour's in Norwich, Auguſt 6, 1504, and educated in Grammar learning in that city, and thence ſent to the Univerſity of Cambridge, where he was admitted into Corpus Chriſti (now Bennet) College, in the beginning of September 1520, being maintained there at firſt by his mother, his father dying in 1516. But on the 20th of March 1521, he was choſen a ſcholar of that College, called a Bible-clerk (*a*), and in 1523 (*b*) took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts. The next year he was made Sub-Deacon, and in April 1527 ordained Deacon, and June following Prieſt; and in September the ſame year, created Maſter of Arts, and choſen Fellow of the College. He had now diſtinguiſhed himſelf to ſuch advantage by his knowledge in Divinity, the Fathers, and Eccleſiaſtical Writers, that he was one of thoſe, who were invited from Cambridge, to go to ſupply that magnificent Foundation of Cardinal Wolſey's (now Chriſt Church) College in Oxford; but by the perſuaſion of his friends, he ſtayed at Cambridge. In 1533 he preached his firſt Sermon to the Univerſity, and continued to preach in the neighbourhood with great applauſe; upon which Archbiſhop Cranmer granted him a licence to preach throughout his Province, and King Henry VIII. confirmed it by his Patent. For Mr. Parker, by his converſation with Latimer, Bilney, and others, had been inſtructed in the Proteſtant Faith. In 1533 or 1534 he was appointed Chaplain to Queen Anne Bolen, who eſteemed him ſo highly for his learning, piety, and prudence, that not long before her death ſhe gave him a particular charge *to take care of her daughter Elizabeth, that ſhe might not want his pious and wiſe counſel.* July 14, 1534 (*c*), he commenced Bachelor of Divinity; and November the 4th following was preſented by Queen Anne Bolen to the Deanry of Stoke-Clare in Suffolk [*A*]. March 1, 1537, he was made one of the Chaplains to the King; and during the Rebellion, which broke out that year, he preached at Eaſter, at Clare near Stoke, when inveighing againſt ſome of the Romiſh ſuperſtitions, articles were drawn up againſt him by ſome of his Popiſh enemies; but he was vindicated by the Lord Chancellor Cromwell, who appointed him to preach at Paul's Croſs. July 1, 1538, he was created Doctor of Divinity, and after that preached ſeveral times before Prince Edward and the Lady Elizabeth. In October 1541, he was inſtalled Prebendary of the ſecond Stall in the Cathedral of Ely, by the collation of his Majeſty; and in 1542 was preſented to the Rectory of Aſhen in Eſſex, which he held not full two years, but reſigned it April 20, 1544; and the next day he was preſented to the Rectory of Birlingham All-Saints in Norfolk. December 4, 1544, he was made Maſter of Corpus Chriſti College by the King's Letters commendatory [*B*]; and January the 25th following was choſen Vice-Chancellor of the Univerſity. September 22, 1545, he obtained the Rectory of Landbeach in Cambridgeſhire, a living whereof his College was Patron, and to which he was admitted December 1. April 1, 1547, he reſigned the Deanry of Stoke-Clare, which College was then diſſolved; but in conſideration of his merits, he had an annual penſion of 40*l.* ſettled on him in lieu of it, and a promiſe of the Deanry of Lincoln. June the 24th the ſame year, he married Margaret, the daughter of Robert Harleſtone, of Matſall in Norfolk, Gent. who proved an excellent wife to him, and by whom he had ſeveral children [*C*]. February the 7th, 1542, he was again choſen Vice-Chancellor of the Univerſity; and the Lent following Archbiſhop Cranmer ſent for him to preach at Court. About this time he wrote two learned diſcourſes in Latin, one defending the marriages of Prieſts, and another againſt alienating the profeſſions of the Church

(*a*) *Life of Archbiſhop Parker.* By John Strype, M. A. p. 2. edit. London 1711, in folio.

(*b*) Idem, ibid. It was 1524, according to an old Regiſter of the Univerſity. See Le Neve's *Lives of the Proteſtant Biſhops*, vol. 1. part 1. p. 3.

(*c*) Strype, p. 8. The old Regiſter above-mentioned, ſays it was in 1535. See Le Neve, *ubi ſupra*, p. 4.

[*A*] *Preſented by Queen Anne Bolen to the Deanry of Stoke Clare in Suffolk.*] Here he founded a Grammar-School, and conſtituted a yearly ſtipend for a ſchool-maſter, and ſeveral other teachers, not only of Grammar, but all other ſtudies of humanity; or, as his own papers relating to this College teſtify, he erected and built a Grammar-ſchool in the North part of the College near the gate, and adorned the old houſe called the Cellerer's Hall, for an hall for the Dean, Prebendaries, and Vicars. He paved it, and decked it with hangings. And to purge the College the more from abuſes and ſuperſtitions, and to make it ſerviceable to the Realm, he cauſed new ſtatutes to be made for it, conſtituting Queen Anne Bolen foundreſs (1).

(1) Strype's *Life of Archbiſhop Parker*, p. 8.

[*B*] *Made maſter of Corpus Chriſti College by the King's Letters commendatory.*] In the ſaid Letters the King ſtiled him *his beloved Chaplain*; and declared to the Fellows of the College, "that it was for the "zeal and love he bore to the advancement of good "letters, that he deſired to ſee them furniſhed with "ſuch a Governor, as in all points might ſeem "worthy of that place. And that therefore he "commended the ſaid Dr. Parker unto them, both "for his approved learning and wiſdom, and honeſ"ty, as for his ſingular grace and induſtry in bring"ing up youth in virtue and learning. And that he "was ſo apt for the exerciſe of the ſaid place, that "he thought it hard to find his like in all reſpects. "And that therefore his truſt was, that at the con"templation of him, they would with one aſſent "elect him for their head, whom he judged worthy "for that office: and laſtly, that he doubted not "they would have cauſe to think themſelves furniſh"ed with ſuch a maſter, as appertained."

[*C*] *By whom he had ſeveral children.*] 1. *John*, born May 5, 1548, who married Joan, daughter of Dr. Richard Coxe, Biſhop of Ely. 2. *Matthew*, who died young. 3. Another *Matthew*, who married Frances, daughter of Dr. William Barlow, Biſhop of Bath and Wells, and died January 28, 1574 (2).

(2) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 687. 2d edit.

[*D*] *He*

Church appointed for the publick uſe of the ſacred Miniſtry. He happened to be at Norfolk during the time of Ket's Rebellion, and went to the Camp of the Rebels, and mounting the Reformation Oak, preached to them, endeavouring to perſuade them to ſubmit and accept of the King's pardon. But while he was in his diſcourſe the rabble began to menace him with their weapons, till one Conyers, a Prieſt, who officiated amongſt them, going on with the ſervice, and ſinging *Te Deum*, Dr. Parker took the opportunity to retire into Norwich. June 21, 1552, he was preſented by his Majeſty to the Prebend of Corringham, in the Dioceſe of Lincoln, and in the ſame month was nominated Dean of the ſaid Cathedral. In the ſecond year of Queen Mary's reign he was deprived of all his Benefices, and lived afterwards in a very mean condition, and was often ſearched for; and one night as he fled he had a dangerous fall from his horſe, of which he never perfectly recovered. During his retirement, he wrote a book in defence of Prieſts marriages, againſt Thomas Martin, and tranſlated the Pſalms into Engliſh Verſe *(d)*. Upon the acceſſion to the Throne, he was nominated to the vacant See of Canterbury, which he accepted of, though with great reluctance, and accordingly was conſecrated to it in the Chapel at Lambeth, December 17, 1659. While he was Archbiſhop elect, he endeavoured to ſtop the Queen's exchanging the Temporal Revenues of vacant Biſhopricks, with impropriations, *&c.* as ſhe was impowered to do by Act of Parliament, becauſe he found theſe impropriations were not of equal value; and urged her Majeſty to remove all images out of Churches [*D*]. In 1561 he was extremely uneaſy to find the Queen averſe to the marriage of the Clergy [*E*]. In 1563 he viſited his Dioceſe, and found the Clergy prodigiouſly illiterate [*F*]. He acted with vigour in order to reduce the Puritans to conformity.

(*d*) Idem, ibid. p. 8——34.

[*D*] *He removed all images out of Churches*] He had received a letter from the Archbiſhop of Dublin concerning a weeping Crucifix in Chriſt's Church there; which was an impoſture contrived by the Prieſts to ſtop the progreſs of the Reformation, upon the arrival of the Earl of Suſſex there, as Lord Lieutenant from Queen Elizabeth. His Lordſhip being in that Church at ſervice with the Privy Council, blood was ſeen to run down the crevices of the Crown of Thorns, and to trickle down the face of the Crucifix, The Prieſt called to the people to obſerve it; and one of the contrivers told them, *that our Saviour could not but ſweat blood, ſince Hereſy was brought into the Church*, alluding to the ſervice, which was then ſaid in Engliſh. This occaſioned a great tumult, the ſuperſtitious people falling down before it, beating their breaſts, and ſaying their prayers on their beads; ſo that the Lord Lieutenant and the Council withdrew for fear of miſchief. But the Archbiſhop of Dublin ordered the Sexton to ſtand up on a form to ſearch and waſh the image, and to ſee if it would bleed a freſh. Upon this the Sexton found a ſponge within the hollow of the crown, which one Leigh, a Monk, had ſoaked in blood, and put there that morning privately. This being taken, and ſhewed to the people, the worſhippers went away aſhamed, and ſome of them curſed the contrivers, who were this Leigh and three or four more, who the next Sunday were obliged to ſtand upon a table before the Pulpit, with their hands and legs tied, and their crime writ upon their breaſts, while the Archbiſhop preached from theſe words, 2 *Theſſal.* ii. 11. *God ſhall ſend them ſtrong deluſions, that they ſhould believe a lie.* And thus they were expoſed three ſucceſſive Sundays, after which they were impriſoned for a time, and then baniſhed. The diſcovery of this impoſture influenced many of the ſpectators to renounce Popery, and the Crucifix was taken down. This happened very opportunely as an argument to Archbiſhop Parker with the Queen, for removing images out of the Churches, which before this time ſhe was inclinable to have continued. But tho' ſhe granted injunctions for doing this, ſhe retained in her own private cloſet a Crucifix and lighted tapers in divine ſervice; which occaſioned the Archbiſhop to argue with her Majeſty about it with great freedom; wherein he was ſeconded by Sir Francis Knollys. But Mr. Strype is of opinion, that ſhe continued them notwithſtanding; and tells us, that another of her Biſhops was ſo much offended at it, that he could ſcarce be induced to officiate there before her.

[*E*] *In* 1561, *he was extremely uneaſy to find the Queen averſe to the marriage of the Clergy.*] In the ſummer of this year her Majeſty went a progreſs into Eſſex and Suffolk, and was much diſpleaſed to find ſo many women and children in Colleges and Cathedrals, alledging it to be contrary to the mind of the Founders; and iſſued out an injunction againſt it on the 9th of Auguſt 1561. Secretary Cecil ſent this order to the Archbiſhop, and to explain himſelf the better to his Grace's ſatisfaction, he told him in a letter, that the Queen was ſtrongly diſaffected to matrimony in the Clergy; that if it had not been for ſomething of dexterity in himſelf, ſhe had abſolutely forbidden Churchmen that ſtate; that he was glad to compound with her Majeſty, and propoſe this expedient to prevent her going farther. However, that he had taken care to ſend copies of the injunction only to his Grace, to the Archbiſhop of York, and to the Chancellor of each Univerſity; and that he recommended this method in order to prevent the inſtruments coming out in a more publick manner. Archbiſhop Parker ſent this injunction through his Province purſuant to her Majeſty's order, but was very much diſſatisfied with the contents. And afterwards waiting upon the Queen, he was ſurprized with her Majeſty's diſcourſe upon this ſubject, as appears by a letter of his to Cecil, publiſhed by Mr. Strype, wherein he obſerves, that he was aſtoniſhed to the laſt degree to hear ſo learned and conſcientious a Princeſs treat the holy inſtitution of matrimony with ſo much ſatyr and contempt. "Her Majeſty, "ſays he, talked of ſetting forth injunctions of ano- "ther nature; but I hope God will ſtop this motion, "and alter her purpoſe; and that as by the divine "aſſiſtance ſhe has begun a good work, ſhe will "hold on the ſame courſe. I do not queſtion but "theſe *Æſtus humani*, theſe ſallies of mere paſſion, "were occaſioned by miſreports; and that her Ma- "jeſty will acquit herſelf to advantage, and like "Theodoſius the Great take time for a mature deli- "beration, and not proceed to a ſudden reſolution "in things of the laſt importance. It would trouble "me, if the Clergy ſhould be forced upon any in- "compliance, and declare with the Apoſtles, that "we muſt *obey God rather than men*. But let thoſe, "who ſuggeſt theſe thoughts, be never ſo conſidera- "able, we have no ſmall number in our contempti- "ble party, that have courage and conſcience enough "to ſacrifice their lives in defence of their Religion."

[*F*] *Viſited his Dioceſe, and found the Clergy prodigiouſly illiterate.*] There is a remarkable inſtance of this in one Mr. Walter Tempeſt, Curate of St. Giles's Cripple, who not being able to tell the meaning of the word *Function*, wrote the following letter to Mr. Perſie, the Archbiſhop's Chaplain. "To the be- "loved in the Lord Jeſus Mr. Perſie. Knew you, "that whereas your maſterſhip ſaid, I know not "what this word *Function* meant, I being *pauperes "ſpiritus*, to a quick oppoſing; it may pleaſe you to "underſtand, that I take it for my utilitie. And "whereas the Prophet David, *impulſus, everſus ſum "ut caderem*; I may ſay for lack of good memory "and a pregnant wit, I was overſeen in making "mine

conformity. He died May 17, 1575, and was ſolemnly interred June the 6th following in his own Chapel at Lambeth [*G*]. He was a man of great piety, charity, and hoſpitality, and an eminent patron of learned men, being an excellent ſcholar himſelf, as appears from his book *De Antiquitate Britannicæ Eccleſiæ* [*H*], and his edition of Matthew Paris, Matthew Weſtminſter, Walſingham, and the four Goſpels in the Saxon language. He founded a ſchool at Rochdale in Lancaſhire; purchaſed an eſtate for founding two Fellowſhips and thirteen ſcholarſhips in Bennet College in Cambridge; built a library for that Society, and beſides a conſiderable value in printed books, furniſhed it with a great number of curious Manuſcripts. He gave an hundred books, half of them in manuſcript to the Univerſity Library. He gave to Bennet College 310 ounces of gilt plate enchaſed, and the Advowſon of St. Mary Abchurch, in London. He made a new ſtreet from the Weſt end of St. Mary's Church to the publick ſchools at Cambridge; and he left legacies in plate to the city of Norwich, Caius College, and Trinity-Hall, where he alſo founded a ſcholarſhip.

" mine anſwer; and the Prophet ſaith furthermore " yet, *Dominus ſuſcepit me*, and I will pray *quotidie*, " that the Lord may increaſe me in my function " and great charge; for I am a Curate over 3000 " and more of God's ſheep, and therefore my function is not to ſleep and be ſluggiſh, but to wait on " my office, to diſcharge as I am charged in teaching and governing, and to exerciſe myſelf to do " my duty, if I were worthy before the Lord; for " he ſaith, *Gratuito recepiſtis, gratuito date*; ſo I " muſt blow the trumpet againſt the ungodly, or " elſe the Lord will require the blood of the people " at my hand, becauſe the office and function is " mine. Therefore my ſuit to my Lord's Grace and " to you is, to have a leſs thing towards my living. " *Scriptus te viginti quinque die mencis Junius, Anno* " 1563. *Per me Walterus Tempeſt, Curatus in Eccleſiâ Sti. Egidii extra Cripplegate, Civitas Londonenſis.*"

[*G*] *Solemnly interred June the 6th following, in his own Chapel at Lambeth.*] It was buried at the upper end againſt the Communion Table on the South ſide; and on the Monument was the following inſcription, writen by Dr. Walter Haddon.

Sobrius & prudens, ſtudiis excultus & uſu
Integer & veræ Religionis amans;
Matthæus *vixit* Parkerus. *Foverat illum*
Aula virum juvenem, fovit & aula ſenem.
Ordine res geſſit, Rector defenſor & æqui:
Vixerat ille Deo, mortuus ille Deo eſt.

But in the year 1648, when upon the diſſolution of Monarchy by the death of King Charles I. Lambeth Houſe became the poſſeſſion of Colonel Thomas Scot, one of the Regicides, he thought fit to turn the Chapel into an hall or dancing-room, and this Monument of Archbiſhop Parker ſtanding in the way was totally demoliſhed; and out of hatred to Epiſcopacy, his body was ordered to be digged up, the lead which incloſed it ſold, and the bones buried in a dunghill, where it remained to the Reſtoration, when Sir William Dugdale hearing by chance of this tranſaction, informed Archbiſhop Sancroft of it, who cauſed theſe bones to be found and decently repoſited again near the place, where the monument ſtood; over which are theſe words ingraven: *Corpus Matthæi Archiepiſcopi tandem hic quieſcit* (3).

(3) Strype, p. 499.

[*H*] *His book* De Antiquitate Britannicæ Eccleſiæ.] He was aſſiſted in writing that work by his Chaplain John Joſſelin, and it was printed at London 1572. Moſt of the copies of this impreſſion which were ſold, conclude with the life of Cardinal Pole, Archbiſhop of Canterbury, who died in 1558. The other copies, which remained, and were to be beſtowed on publick libraries, or elſe to be given to ſpecial friends, had in the year 1574 added to them. 1. The life of the Author Matthew Parker, containing 29 pages. 2. A catalogue of ſuch books, which he gave to the common Library at Cambridge, containing four pages. 3. A catalogue of Chancellors, Vice-Chancellors, Proctors of, and Doctors of all Faculties, who took their Degree in Cambridge from the year 1500 to 1571, containing ſix pages. To this catalogue are prefixed the arms of every College and Hall there, with the area or platform of the common ſchools, the arms and ſeal of the Univerſity, and ſeal of the Chancellor thereof. 4. A catalogue from 1500 to 1571, of all the Biſhops, who had been educated at Cambridge. 5. The titles of ſuch Charters, as have been granted to that Univerſity by divers Kings and Queens from Henry III. to the 13th or 14th of Queen Elizabeth. 6. An account of the particulars, which are ſucceſſively delivered to the Magiſtrates and ſervants of the ſaid Univerſity, when they enter into their reſpective places. 7. The foundation of each College and Hall in Cambridge, with the building of the publick ſchools, and an enumeration of the old Hoſtles. The life of our Archbiſhop above-mentioned, was, immediately after it appeared, tranſlated into Engliſh, and printed in 1574, in 4to, in Holland, with this title, *The life of the 70th Archbiſhop of Canterbury, preſently ſitting*, &c. *Engliſhed.* &c. *This number of ſeventy is ſo compleat a number, as it is great pity there ſhould be one more*, &c. with marginal notes very abuſive of the Archbiſhop. T.

☞ PARKER (SAMUEL), Biſhop of Oxford, was ſon of John Parker, Serjeant at Law, and one of the Barons of the Exchequer before the Reſtoration [*A*], and was born at Northampton, in September 1640, and educated in Grammar-learning there; and in Midſummer Term 1656, ſent to Wadham College in the Univerſity of Oxford (*a*), where

(*a*) Wood, *Athen.* Oxon. vol. 2. col. 814. 2d edit.

[*A*] John Parker, *Serjeant at Law, and one of the Barons of the Exchequer before the Reſtoration.*] Andrew Marvell tells us (1), that " he was bred to the law, " and betook himſelf, as his beſt practice, to be a Sub-" Committee-man; or, as the ſtile ran, one of the " Aſſiſtant Committee in Northamptonſhire. In the " rapine of that employment, and what he got by " picking the teeth of his maſters, he ſuſtained himſelf, till he had raked together ſome little eſtate. " And then being a man for the purpoſe, and that " had begun his fortune out of the ſequeſtration of " the eſtates of the King's party, he, to perfect it the " more, proceeded to take away their lives; not in " the hot and military way, (which diminiſhes always " the offence) but in the cooler blood, and ſedentary execution of a high court of juſtice. Accordingly he was preferred to be one of that number, " that gave ſentence againſt the three Lords, *Capel*, " *Holland*, and *Hamilton*, who were beheaded. By " his learning in the law, he became worthy of the " degree of a Serjeant, and ſometimes to go the circuit, till for miſdemeanor he was petitioned againſt. But for a taſte of his abilities, and the " more to re-ingratiate himſelf, he printed in the " year 1650, a very remarkable book, called, *The* " *Government of the People of England, precedent and* " *preſent the ſame. Ad ſubſcribentes confirmandum, dubitantes informandum, opponentes convincendum:* and " underneath, *Multa videntur quæ non ſunt; multa* " *ſunt quæ non videntur.* Under that engraven two " hands

(1) *Rehearſal tranſpoſed*, part 2. p. 74.

where he was eſteemed a moſt zealous Preſbyterian [*B*]. February 28, 1659, he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts (*b*). Upon the King's Reſtoration, *he was for ſome time*, according to Wood, *at a ſtand what to do* (*c*); but *Andrew Marvell* tells us (*d*), "that he perſiſted, as far as in him was, that is, by praying, caballing, and diſcourſing, "to obſtruct the reſtoring of the Epiſcopal Government, Revenues, and Authority. In- "ſomuch, that finding himſelf diſcountenanced on thoſe accounts, by the then Warden "of Wadham (*e*), he ſhifted Colleges to Trinity; and when there went away without "his Degree, ſcrupling the ſubſcription then required. From thence he came to Lon- "don, where he ſpent a conſiderable time in creeping into all corners and companies, "horoſcoping up and down concerning the duration of the Government . . . and at laſt "ſatisfied himſelf, that the Epiſcopal Government would endure as long as the King "lived; and from thenceforward caſt about how to be admitted into the Church of Eng- "land, and find the highway to his preferments." Lewis de Moulin (*f*) aſſerts, that he was expelled Wadham College by the Warden, Dr. Blandford; but this is a miſtake. At Trinity College, *by the prevailing advice* of Dr. Ralph Bathurſt, then Senior Fellow, afterwards Preſident of that College, he was *reſcued*, as he tells us himſelf (*g*), *from the chains and fetters of an unhappy education.* July 9, 1663, he proceeded Maſter of Arts as a grand Compounder and Member of Trinity College (*b*); and afterwards entering into holy Orders, "was frequently in London, and became, as it is ſaid, Chaplain to a No- "bleman, and a great droller on the Puritans, *&c.* (*i*)." In 1665, he publiſhed at London in 4to, his *Tentamina Phyſico-Theologica de Deo, ſive Theologia Scholaſtica* [*C*], dedicated to Archbiſhop Sheldon; which book introduced him to the acquaintance of that Prelate. About the ſame time he was elected Fellow of the Royal Society. In 1666, his *Free and impartial Cenſure of the Platonic Philoſophie, being a Letter written to his much honoured Friend Mr.* N. B. was printed at Oxford in 4to [*D*]. Soon after Eaſter, in the

(*b*) Idem, *Faſti*, Oxon. vol. 2. col. 124.

(*c*) Idem, *Athen.* Oxon. col. 815.

(*d*) *Rehearſall tranſpoſed*, part 2. p. 77.

(*e*) Dr. Walter Blandford, afterwards Biſhop of Worceſter.

(*f*) *Patronus bonæ fidei*, p. 18. edit. London 1672.

(*g*) See his epiſtle dedicatory, before his *Free and impartial Cenſure of the Platonic Philoſophie.*

(*b*) Wood, *Faſti*, Oxon. vol. 2. col. 151.

(*i*) Idem, *Athen.* Oxon. col. 815.

"hands joined with the motto, *Ut uniamus*; "and beneath a ſheaf of arrows with this device, "*Vis unita fortior*; and to conclude, *Concordia parvæ* "*res creſcunt, diſcordia dilabuntur.*" Mr. Wood ob- ſerves (2), that by virtue of a Return, dated 21 June, 1655, he, by the name of John Parker of the Tem- ple, one of the Commiſſioners for removing of ob- ſtructions at Worceſter-houſe in the Strand near Lon- don, was the next day ſworn Serjeant at Law, Oliver Cromwell being then Lord Protector. About the 18th of January, 1659, he was appointed by the Parliament one of the Barons of the Court of Exche- quer; but being ſoon after removed thence, before or at the Reſtoration of King Charles II. we hear no more of him, but that he was again regularly made Serjeant at Law, by the intereſt of the Lord Chan- cellor Hyde, at the firſt call of Serjeants after the Reſtoration.

(2) *Athen.* Oxon. vol. 2. col. 814. 2d edition.

[*B*] *Where he was eſteemed a moſt zealous Preſbyteri- an.*] Andrew Marvell informs us (3), *that in a ſhort time he entered himſelf into the company of ſome young Stu- dents, who were uſed to faſt and pray weekly together, but for their refection fed ſometimes on a broth, from whence they were commonly called* Gruellers; *only it was obſerved, that he was wont ſtill to put more Graves than all the reſt into his porrage. And after that he had picked acquaintance, not only with the brotherhood at Wadham-College, but with the ſiſterhood too at another old* Elſibeth's, *one* Elizabeth Hampton (4), *a plain de- vout woman, where he trained himſelf up in hearing their ſermons and prayers, receiving alſo the Sacrament in the houſe, till he had gained ſuch proficience, that he too began to exerciſe in that meeting, and was eſteemed one of the* pretioueſt *young men in the Univerſity.*

(3) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 76.

(4) Wood, col. 815, ſays, that ſhe lived in Ha- lywel pariſh near Wadham-college, and was *an old crooked maid, that drove the trade of Laundry, who being from her youth very much given to the preſ- byterian religion, had frequently meetings for the godly party, eſpe- cially for thoſe that were her cuſtomers.*

[*C*] *His* Tentamina Phyſico-Theologica de Deo, ſive Theologia Scholaſtica.] We have an account of this book in the *Philoſophical Tranſactions*, No. 18. It was afterwards enlarged in a Treatiſe, intitled, *Diſ- putationes de Deo*, &c. Theſe *Tentamina* were attack- ed by *N. Fairfax*, M. D. in his book intitled, *Of the bulk and ſelvedge of the world.* Andrew Mar- vell gives a very mean character of this work of our Author (5), which he ſtiles *a tedious tranſcript of his Common-place-book, wherein there is very little of his own, but the arrogance, and the unparallelled cenſorious- neſs that he exerciſes over all other Writers; beſide his undutiful inveighing againſt the* veſicles of the earth, *for meer bubbles, as he did ſhortly after againſt his father's memory, and in his mother's preſence, before ſeveral witneſſes, for a couple of* whining Fanaticks. *However, he accounted it a ſafe book on all ſides, it be- ing of ſo trite and confeſſed an argument, that few judi- cious men would read it to examine the errors; and in- to rough and ſcabbed a Latin, that a man muſt have long nails, and thoſe ſharper than ordinary, to diſtinguiſh between the ſkin and the diſeaſe, the faults and the grammar; to omit his uſual volume and circumference of periods, which though he takes always to be his chiefeſt ſtrength, yet indeed, like too great a line, weakens the defenſe, and requires too many men to make it good. But the cauſe being againſt Atheiſm, he was ſecure that none would attack him. For whether there be any Atheiſts, is ſome controverſy, and he is compurgator for moſt of them; or if there be ſuch, yet they know the baſtions are all undermined, and they ſhould be blown up as ſoon as entered. But let him ſhew me any Atheiſt, that he hath reduced by his book, unleſs he may pretend to have con- verted ſome (as in the old* Florentine *wars) by meer tiring them out, and perfect wearineſs.*

(5) Ibid. p. 79.

[*D*] *His* free and impartial cenſure of the Plato- nick Philoſophie, &c.] In this piece he declares his eſteem for the morality of the Platoniſts, 1. Becauſe, "The rules and directions it preſcribes, are ſober "and practicable; it does not flatter men with ro- "mantic degrees of happineſs, upon fond and fan- "taſtic principles, but complies with the conditions "of human life, and neither promiſes nor deſigns "greater proportions of felicity, than our preſent "capacities will allow of (6)" 2. Becauſe the Pla- toniſts, above all other Philoſophers, are remarkable for *the innocent gaiety and pleaſantneſs of their humours* (7). 3. Becauſe they valued good-nature, in propor- tion to its real excellence (8). "And how much, "*ſays he* (9), will this excellent quality recommend "them to our eſteem, when we conſider at how high "a rate our bleſſed Saviour himſelf valued it? If "we look into his laws, what are they but ſo many "injunctions to the ſeveral inſtances of good-nature, "mildneſs, patience, mercifulneſs, humility, can- "dor, ingenuity? His new and peculiar precept is, "that we ſhould love one another, and be kind, not "only to friends, but enemies. And therefore a "peeviſh ill-natured Chriſtian, is the greateſt con- "tradiction in the world; peeviſhneſs being the "greateſt reproach and weakneſs of human nature, "and moſt contrary to the temper of the divine "mind; ſo that they, who not long ſince were "wont to diſcourſe, that the ſaints or people of "God, (*i. e.* that ſort of people, who can be devout "and godly, without being virtuous) are indeed "peeviſh here, but in Heaven this imperfection ſhall "be removed, might as well have told us, that the "ſaints are drunkards here, but in Heaven they "ſhall be temperate; the ſaints are cheats and knaves "here, but in Heaven they ſhall be honeſt; the "ſaints are adulterous here, but in Heaven they "ſhall be chaſte. For an habitual peeviſhneſs is "as inconſiſtent with the deſign of Chriſtianity, as "the

(6) p. 4.

(7) p. 13.

(8) p. 18.

(9) p. 23.

the year 1667, he left Oxford, and the Michaelmas following was ſent for to Lambeth by the Archbiſhop, who had appointed him one of his Chaplains (*k*). In 1669, he publiſhed

(*k*) Idem, ibid.

" the ſins of an habitual diſhoneſty, drunkenneſs, " and adultery. And then if we look into our Sa- " viour's life, the unparallelled civility, and obliging- " neſs of his deportment, ſeems to be almoſt as high " an evidence of the truth and divinity of his doc- " trine, as his unparallelled miracles were. For it " is altogether unimaginable, that ſo ſweet-natured " a perſon, ſhould be ſuch a baſe and profligate " impoſtor, as he muſt have been, if he had been " one. And among all his favourites, it was the " gentle and ſweet-natured St. *John*, that was his " darling Diſciple, whilſt we often find him check- " ing *Peter*'s rude and unmannerly zeal." 4. Becauſe of *their readineſs and ability in the ſmaller morals*; *by which*, ſays he (10), *I mean their ſkill in the arts of behaviour and converſation*. He then conſiders the *Logic* of the Platoniſts, and obſerves (11), *that as* Plato's *manner of arguing is more ſuccinct than the tedious way of ſyllogiſing, ſo it is not leſs ſure and evident; for what diſcourſe can proceed with greater evidence and conviction, than after you have explained the terms of the queſtion, and agreed with your adverſary about the matter debated of, to propoſe to him ſome principles ſo clear and palpable, that they ſhall either preſuppoſe, or inforce his aſſent, and from thence to lead him by induction through a ſeries of propoſitions, depending upon, and orderly deduced from your firſt* proleptic principles, *till he is fairly brought, or unawares betrayed unto an unavoidable neceſſity of aſſenting to the truth you aſſert; which is the method that* Plato *pretends to?* He afterwards diſcourſes of Plato's *Natural Philoſophy*, of which he ſhews the abſurdities; and then proceeds to give an account of his *Theology*, which he divides into *Practical*, or that which concerns theological virtues; and *Speculative*, or that which concerns ſpeculations about theological matters; " which two parts, *ſays* " *he* (12), integrate a body of divinity, not unlike to " that of King *Ptolemy*'s man in *Lucian*, who was one " half perfectly black, and the other exceeding " white; ſo that part of their [the Platoniſts] the- " ology, which relates to practice, is eminently " clear and perſpicuous; whilſt that, which is em- " ployed in theory and contemplation, is monſtrouſly " dark and ſecure." He then animadverts upon the *Speculative Theology* of the Platoniſts (13), and objects firſt againſt their way of reſolving knowledge into its firſt and fundamental principles, *in that by rejecting the teſtimony and judgment of ſenſe in matters of Philoſophy, they do but involve and perplex the principles thereof, under the pretext of a more abſtracted and intellectual diſcovery of things. For hereby the minds of men are taken off from the native evidence of plain and palpable truths, and are fain to ground all their knowledge upon nice and ſubtle ſpeculations, whereby at leaſt clear and unqueſtionable truths are reſolved into principles infinitely more uncertain and diſputable than themſelves.* A ſecond objection, which he makes to them, is (14), " their ſerious endeavouring to know and define the " notions of abſtracted eſſences; for theſe pure and " ſeraphic intellectualiſts, forſooth, deſpiſe all ſenſi- " ble knowledge, as too groſs and material for their " nice and curious faculties, and diſdain to purſue " any knowledge, but what is pure and intellectual, " that is, ſuch as is ſuitable to their refined, and, " as it were, ſeparated underſtandings; and there- " fore they chiefly employ their thoughts about ob- " ſtructed and purely metaphyſical Beings; and " thence they take upon them exactly to deſcribe the " meer *Eſſences* of all ſorts of Beings, whether mate- " rial or immaterial, whether they belong to the " intellectual or to the ſenſible world. In order " whereto they reſolve all Beings into their ſim- " ple and unmixed ingredients, and then attempt " to aſſign their preciſe notions and differences " from each other." His third objection againſt the the *ſpeculative Theology* of the Platoniſts is, *their affecting myſterious obſcurity and abſtruſeneſs, thereby to render their notions more ſolemn and venerable* (15). His fourth is, that *inſtead of pure and genuine reaſon, they abound ſo much with gaudy and extravagant fancies* (16) His fifth is, that *they employ much of their contemplations in things altogether uncertain and unſearchable* (17). He takes notice (18) of what might be replied in behalf of *Plato*, viz. " That he cannot well be charged " with raſhneſs and futility, but the accuſation muſt " reach *Moſes* alſo and the reſt of the ſacred Pro- " phets; becauſe from them *Plato* borrowed his " choiceſt and ſublimeſt fancies; which, if in any " thing vain and trifling, the firſt Authors ought in rea- " ſon to bear the greateſt blame." That this is the unanimous opinion of all the learned world, who repreſent, that " *Plato* derived many of theſe myſte- " ries from *Pythagoras*, who, in his travels into " Egypt and the Eaſt, had either immediately re- " ceived them from the Jews themſelves, or from the " Egyptian Prieſts, and the Chaldean wiſemen, who " came to know them by converſe with and tradi- " tion from the Jews. And that *Plato* himſelf tra- " velling into Egypt in queſt after knowledge, re- " ceived his choiceſt and moſt important notices " concerning divine and ſupernatural things from the " Jews, who about that time in great flocks reſorted " thither; and from the Egyptian Prieſts, who either " derived them from the Moſaick writings, or re- " ceived them from the Jews by an oral tradition. " For, ſay they, God delivered to Moſes in Mount " Sina a twofold Law, תורה שבכתב, the *written* " *Law*, and תורה שבעל פה, the *vocal Law*, " which is the myſtical and ænigmatical meaning " of the former; but by reaſon of its extraordinay " ſacredneſs, was not expoſed to the rude people, " but only whiſpered and conveyed in the ſlender " pipe of auricular tradition from age to age among " the great Sanhedrim and the Prophets, down to " the time of *Eſdras*, by whom, and the great Syna- " gogue, of which many of the latter Prophets were " Members, it was committed to writing, leſt by " reaſon of their frequent diſputations and captivi- " ties it ſhould by ſome ill fortune periſh; which " carried its ſtream ont of the private channel, in " which it run before, and ſoon ſpread it abroad " among foreign nations, eſpecially in Egypt and " Chaldea, where great numbers of Jews reſided. " For an eminent inſtance of all which they alledge " the Doctrine of the ſacred Trinity, which, ſay " they, being one of the rareſt and choiceſt myſteries " of this *vocal Cabala*, was greedily embraced by " the Egyptians, from whom *Plato* and his Followers " received that clear and full knowledge thereof, " which appears ſo much every where in his writ- " ings." To all this our Author anſwers in the following conſiderations. 1. *That it is ſo far from being matter of commendation, that it is rather a diſparagement to have been converſant in, and borrowed from the old Eaſtern and Egyptian learning. That the antient Sages of Greece and the Eaſt were acquainted with the firſt rudiments of mathematical Sciences, is evident from the moſt authentick records of antient times, and from that ſkill, which the Grecians gained amongſt them. But it is as evident, that all their theological learning was lamentably frivolous, obſcure, fabulous, uncouth, magical, and ſuperſtitious. The Scythian Taraboſteſci, the Perſian Magi, the Indian Brachmans and Gymnoſophiſts, the Egyptian Prieſts, the Bards and Druids of Gaul and Britain, and other antient Sects, have, I confeſs, made a great noiſe in the world, yet they that endeavour to celebrate them moſt, tell us ſo many ſuperſtitious and pedantick ſtories, as ſufficiently evince them to have been no very extraordinary perſons. Any one that conſiders thoſe few opinions and ratiocinations of theirs, that are ſtill extant, will eaſily conclude them to have been men of no great reaſon or judgment. Some have endeavoured to maintain the credit of this antient learning by retrieving and collecting its ſcattered fragments, and others by counterfeiting ſuppoſititious authors, ſuch as* Zoroaſter, *and* Hermes Triſmegiſtus; *but who ever will be at the pains to peruſe* Zoroaſter's *Oracles, and the books of* Triſmegiſtus, *the writings of* Pſellus, *and the Earl of* Mirandula's *Riddles, with which he challenged all the learned world, will need no other proof of the vanity of all pretences to the more abſtruſe and myſtical learning of the antients. I do not queſtion but that great and honourable perſonage I laſt mentioned, was a perſon of ſtupendous parts and learning; yet I am ſure, that thoſe*

(10) p. 27.
(11) p. 34.
(12) p. 47.
(13) p. 53 & ſeqq.
(14) p. 59.
(15) p. 66.
(16) p. 73.
(17) p. 78.
(18) p. 92.

liſhed at London, in 8vo, *A Diſcourſe of Eccleſiaſtical Polity* [E]; *and the* year following a book entitled, *Toleration diſcuſſed in two Dialogues:* London 1670, in 4to. In June 1670, he was inſtalled Archdeacon of Canterbury, in the room of Dr. William Sancroft (*k*), and on the 26th of November following, had the Decree of Doctor of Divinity conferred on him at Cambridge, when the Prince of Orange was entertained there. November 18, 1672, he was inſtalled Prebendary of Canterbury, and about that time was collated to the Rectories of Ickham and Chartham in Kent. In 1673, he publiſhed at London, in 8vo, his *Free and impartial enquiry into the cauſes of that very great eſteem and honour the Nonconformiſt Miniſters are in with their followers*; and in 1671, his *defence and continuation of the* Eccleſiaſtical Polity, *&c.* In 1672, he prefixed to Biſhop *Bramhall's Vindication of himſelf and the Epiſcopal Clergy, from the Preſbyterian charge of Popery*, &c. a *Preface ſhewing what grounds there was of fears and jealouſies of Popery*, London in 8vo. This was immediately attacked by *Andrew Marvell* in his *Rehearſal tranſproſed*, London 1672, in 8vo. In anſwer to which Dr. Parker wrote *A reproof to* the rehearſal tranſproſed, *in a Diſcourſe to its Author*, London 1673, in 8vo. This occaſioned Mr. *Marvell* to publiſh the *ſecond part* of *the rehearſal tranſproſed*, at London 1673, in 8vo. In 1678, our Author's *Diſputations de Deo & Providentiâ Divinâ*, were printed at London in 4to [F]; as his *Demonſtration of the Divine Authority of the Law of Nature, and of*

notions, wherewith he made the greateſt noiſe in the world, were but grand and pompous futilities. 2. He (19) p. 99, 100. tells us (19), that he does not "perceive any ſuch "clear agreement between the Platonick Philoſophy "and the ſacred Scriptures, as may give us any tole-"rable ground of ſuſpecting the one to have been "derived from the other. For moſt of the notions, "in which *Plato* ſpeaks moſt conſonantly to the "Scriptures, are ſo obvious and ſo univerſally ac-"knowledged, that it is eaſy to diſcern how he came "by them, without any acquaintance with the holy "writings; ſuch as are the Being of God, the Im-"mortality of the Soul, the eſſential differences be-"tween good and evil, ſome general rules of natural "and eſſential goodneſs. And then as for their "more hidden and abſtruſe myſteries, where they "ſeem to agree moſt, their difference is greater than "their agreement.... And it would not be difficult "to ſhew how theſe notions, which have the faireſt "conſonancy to Scripture, are derived from Hypo-"theſes, that have none at all." 3. As for the pre-(20) p. 104. tence of a *vocal Cabala*, he obſerves (20), that he can ſcarce without amazement conſider with what confidence and eagerneſs ſome learned men of late have cried up an invention ſo novel and fanciful; "for I know nothing, ſays he, more precarious "and deſtitute of tolerable pretences than theſe *Ca-"baliſtical Traditions*, being only a late and ſilly in-"vention of the Jewiſh Rabbins; for they are alto-"gether unknown to and unmentioned by the antient Oedip. Tom. 2. "both Jews and Chriſtians. And yet *Kircher*, who claſſ. 4. *Præfat.* "never gives out at credulity, would have every "one, that does not believe the divine original of "the *Cabala* to be convicted of Hereſy, as an enemy "to the divine providence. But for my part, I "cannot underſtand how any rational man can be at "all concerned for ſo vain and frivolous an inven-"tion of the modern, *i. e.* trifling Rabbins. But "he that could find all the learning of the world in "an *Egyptian Hieroglyphic*, may find all the articles "of his faith in a *Rabbinical Fable*. 'Tis certain, "that the *Cabala* was invented ſince the diſperſion of "the Jewiſh nation, there being not the leaſt foot-"ſteps of it before; but in what century or period "is uncertain, and muſt remain ſo; for from the "deſtruction of Jeruſalem there commenced, as to "the Jewiſh hiſtory, a *tempus ἄδηλον*, (a period al-"ways fit for Fables,) there being no records or "monuments of their condition and affairs, unleſs "ſome few relations in the *Talmud*. But whatever "became of them, 'tis certain, that being given up "to a vain and trifling ſpirit, they employed them-"ſelves in fooliſh and abſurd inventions; of which "making myſtical and allegorical interpretations of "Scripture is none of the leaſt, eſpecially when they "prefer them ſo much before the true and literal "meaning; for they compare the Scripture itſelf to "a *candle*, but the myſtical ſenſe to a *jewel*, for the "diſcovery whereof the candle is lighted; and the "*Miſnical* Doctors, (that is, they that ſtudy only the "literal ſenſe) are compared to Apothecaries, who "only prepare thoſe medicaments, which the Phyſi-"cian preſcribes; but the *Cabaliſtical* Doctors to "Phyſicians, who underſtand their natures, uſes, "and ſecret properties. And therefore they leave "the literal and ſuperficial ſenſe of Scripture to the "rude and ignorant people, whilſt they that are "learned, dive into the deep myſteries and depths "of the law, and by the help of fancy, fetch "ſtrange and wonderful ſecrets from words, letters, "points, from their ſeveral ſhapes, combinations, "tranſpoſitions, abbreviatures, arithmetical indica-"tions, and the like. And then with a frontleſs "impudence aſſert, that they came originally from "*Adam*, *Abraham*, and *Moſes*. You may ſee enough "of this *cabbaliſtical* traſh in a thouſand authors, "but moſt copiouſly in *Reuchlin de Arte Cabbaliſtica*, "and in that grand Theſaurus of learned trifles, "*Kircher's Oedipus*, Tom. II. Claſſ. IV. The firſt, "that produced them into the Chriſtian world, was "the Earl of *Mirandula*, in whoſe time the very word "*Cabbala* was ſo unknown, that, as *Hottinger* re-"lates out of *Garzon*, it was taken for a witch, "*Vetula veneficiis dedita*. And the Earl himſelf re-"lates in his *Apology*, that one of his greateſt antago-"niſts being aſked what this *Cabbala* was, replied, "that he was a certain notorious Heretick, that had "oppoſed himſelf againſt Jeſus Chriſt, and that "from him his accomplices and followers were named "*Cabbaliſtæ*. The Earl, when he had at a high "price purchaſed ſome ſmall fragments of it from "the Jews, thought himſelf maſter of the moſt "antient and valuable monument in the world. "The miſtake was pardonable in him, but unpar-"donable in thoſe, who ſince have had opportunity "to examine its firſt riſe and antiquity, and cannot "diſcern the leaſt traces of it beyond the *Talmudical* "*Rabbins*." 4. Having thus ſhewn the unwarrant-able raſhneſs of deriving Platonick notions from Jewiſh traditions, he proceeds laſtly to give us an account of the riſe of that ſeeming agreeableneſs between the Platonick and the Chriſtian Trinity, and to ſhew by what principles and ſteps the Pla-toniſts happened upon their *Triad*. To this Tract is ſubjoined another, intitled, *An Account of the Nature and Extant of the divine Dominion and Goodneſs, as they refer to the Origenian Hypotheſis, concerning the Pre-exiſtence of Souls.*

[E] *His* Diſcourſe of Eccleſiaſtical Polity, *&c.*] It was printed at London in 8vo. It was ſoon after attacked in a pamphlet, intitled, *Inſolence and im-pudence triumphant: envy and fury enthroned: the mir-ror of malice and madneſs, in a late Treatiſe, intitled,* A Diſcourſe of Eccleſiaſtical Polity, *&c. on the lively portraicture of* S. P. *limited and drawn by his own hands*, &c. *being a ſhort collection of ſome of his in-temperate revilings and prophane ſatyrs*, &c. London 1669, in two ſheets and an half.

[F] *In* 1678 *our Author's* Diſputationes de Deo & Providentiâ Divinâ, *were printed at London in* 4to.] We have a character of this Book and its Author in Dr. Henry More's *Præfatio Generaliſſima* to the firſt Tome of his philoſophical works, London 1679, in folio. Anthony le Grand, born at Doway in Flan-ders,

of the Chriſtian Religion, was in 1681 at London, in 4to [*G*]. In 1681, he publiſhed a Book, entitled, *The Caſe of the Church of England briefly ſtated in the three firſt and fundamental Principles of a Chriſtian Church. I. The Obligation of Chriſtianity by Divine Right. II. The Juriſdiction of the Church by Divine Right. III. The Inſtitution of Epiſcopal Superiority by Divine Right.* London, in 8vo; and in 1683 another, entitled, *An Account of the Government of the Chriſtian Church, in the firſt ſix hundred years: particularly ſhewing, I. The Apoſtolical Practice of Dioceſan and metropolitical Epiſcopacy. II. The Uſurpation of Patriarchal and Papal Authority. III. The War of two hundred years between the Biſhops of Rome and Conſtantinople, of univerſal Supremacy.* London, in 8vo. In 1684, he publiſhed *Religion and Loyalty: Or, A Demonſtration of the Power of the Chriſtian Church within itſelf, Supremacy of Sovereign Powers over it, and duty of paſſive Obedience and Non-reſiſtance to all their commands, exemplified out of Records*, &c. London, in 8vo. And the year following the *ſecond part* of the ſame work; containing *the Hiſtory of the Concurrence of the Imperial and Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction in the Government of the Church, from the beginning of the Reign of* Jovian *to the end of* Juſtinian. London 1685, in 8vo. In the beginning of the year 1685, he reſigned his Prebend of Canterbury in favour of Dr. John Bradford; and on the 17th of October 1686, was conſecrated Biſhop of Oxford at Lambeth, in the room of Dr. John Fell deceaſed, and held his Archdeaconry in *commendam* with that See. Auguſt the 14th he was appointed by the King's Mandate, Preſident of Magdalen College in Oxford, of which place he took poſſeſſion November the 2d following [*H*]. His *reaſons for abrogating the teſt impoſed upon all Members of Parliament*, Anno 1678, *October* 30. *Firſt written for the Author's own ſatisfaction, and now publiſhed for the benefit of all others, whom it may concern* [*I*], printed

ders, and bred a Dominican Friar, who reſided as a miſſionary ſeveral years in London, publiſhed a defence of Des Cartes againſt Dr. Parker, in his *Apologia pro Renato Des Cartes*, London 1679, in 8vo.

[*G*] *His* Demonſtration of the Divine Authority of the Law of Nature and the Chriſtian Religion.] *The firſt part* contains *a Demonſtration of the Law of Nature from the nature of things, and of the future State of Mankind from the Law of Nature.* The *ſecond* contains *a Demonſtration of the Divine Authority of the Chriſtian Religion, from the undoubted certainty of the matter of fact, and the uninterrupted tradition of the Church.*

[*H*] *Auguſt* 14 *he was appointed by the King's Mandate, Preſident of Magdalen College in Oxford, of which place he took poſſeſſion November the ſecond following.*] Upon the death of Dr. Henry Clark, Preſident of that College, a citation was fixed up to warn the fellows to an election of a new Preſident; but before the time was come to do it, there came a *Mandamus* from King James II. to the Society, to elect to that office a junior Maſter of Arts, named *Anthony Farmer*, formerly of Cambridge, then Maſter of Arts of that College. But the Society taking little or no notice of it elected, according to their Statutes, one of their Fellows, named *John Hough*, B. D. now Biſhop of Worceſter, on the 15th of April 1687. The King reſenting the affair, it was tried before his Eccleſiaſtical Commiſſion newly erected by him; when there were produced ſuch ſcandalous facts relating to the life and converſation of *Farmer*, that he was laid aſide. On the 22d of June following the Eccleſiaſtical Commiſſioners removed Mr. *Hough* from the Preſidentſhip; which was notified by a paper fixed on the Weſt door of the Chapel, on the 2d of Auguſt following, ſubſcribed by the ſaid Commiſſioners. Upon this his Majeſty ſent his Mandate of the 4th of that month to elect Biſhop Parker to be Preſident; but the Fellows not being in a capacity to elect him on account of their oaths and ſtatutes, the King ſent three Commiſſioners to examine into the affair, and put his Mandate in execution. Theſe Commiſſioners having ſate in the College two days, and thrice commanded Mr. *Hough* to deliver up the keys of the Preſident's lodgings, which he refuſed, they inſtalled in the Chapel Mr. *William Wiggins*, Clerk, the Proxy of the Biſhop, Preſident, with the uſual oaths, and afterwards conducted him to the Preſident's lodgings, broke open the doors after thrice knocking, and gave him poſſeſſion October 25, 1687. On the 2d of November following the Biſhop took poſſeſſion of them in his own perſon (22).

(22) Wood, *Athen.* Oxon. vol. 2. col. 815, 816.

[*I*] *His* reaſons for abrogating the teſt, &c.] This Tract was licenſed by the Earl of Sunderland December 10, 1687. It is ſubſcribed *Sa. Oxon.* He obſerves, that the teſt ought to be repealed for theſe reaſons. 1. "Becauſe it doth not only diminiſh, but utterly deſtroy the natural Rights of "Peerage, and turns the Birth-right of the Engliſh "Nobility; ſo that what was in all former ages only "forfeited by treaſon, is now at the mercy of every "faction or every paſſion in Parliament (23)." 2. *Becauſe of its diſhonourable birth and original; it being the firſt born of* Oates's *Plot, and brought forth on purpoſe to give credit and reputation to the perjury* (24). 3. "Becauſe of the *incompetent authority*, by which the "law was enacted. It is a law of an *Eccleſiaſtical* "nature, made without the authority of the Church, "contrary to the practice of the Chriſtian world in "all ages, and indeed to our Saviour's own commiſſion, who ſettled all power of Government, and "eſpecially the legiſlative (which is the higheſt act "of it) upon the officers of his own Kingdom; ſo "that for any other order of men to aſſume the exerciſe of any ſuch authority to themſelves, is no "leſs than to depoſe him from his throne, by diſowning, neglecting, and affronting his commiſſion to his Catholick Church (25)." 4. Becauſe of the uncertainty and falſhood of the matters contained in the declaration itſelf; as firſt, *That there is no tranſubſtantiation in the Sacrament of our Saviour's body and blood*; and ſecondly, *That the invocation of Saints, and the mother of God, is idolatry* (26). Our Author then proceeds to an hiſtorical account of the riſe and progreſs of the controverſy concerning *tranſubſtantiation*, ſhewing how it is ſtated in the Church of Rome, and how it hath been determined in the Proteſtant Churches; and obſerves (27), that with regard to the *real Preſence*, "the thing it"ſelf, as far as he can diſcern, hath been owned "in all ages of the church; the *Modus* of it never "defined but in the ſchools; and though they have "fancied a thouſand definitions to themſelves, their "metaphyſics were never admitted into the church." And having given an account of this controverſy in all foreign churches, he remarks (28), that *all parties of Chriſtendom agree in the* Subſtance *of the doctrine, even the Calviniſts themſelves, who, though they ſometimes attempted to deny it, had not confidence enough to be ſteady to their own opinion, but were often forced to ſubmit it to the conſent of Chriſtendom. From all theſe premiſes*, adds he, *it is evident, that no one thing in the world is more unfit to be ſet up for a Teſt, than* Tranſubſtantiation, *ſeeing all parties agree in the thing, though not in the word; and yet though they do, they again diſagree in numberleſs ſpeculations about it; and when they have done, all parties unanimouſly agree, that the Modus is a thing utterly unknown and incomprehenſible. So that take it one way*, i. e. *as to the thing itſelf, or the* Real Preſence, *the Teſt is a defiance to all Chriſtendom: take it the other way, as to the Modus, it is nothing at all, but only impoſing an unintelligible thing upon the wiſdom and honour of a nation under the ſevereſt penalties. As for the Church of England, ſhe agrees with the Tradition of the Catholic Church, both Roman and Reformed,*

(23) p. 1.
(24) p. 5.
(25) p. 6, 7.
(26) p. 9.
(27) p. 27.
(28) p. 45.

printed at London 1688, in 4to, were attacked by ſeveral writers [*K*], and confirmed the ſuſpicion of his being inclined to the Romiſh Religion: which opinion was entertained by the Roman Catholicks themſelves. For a Jeſuit of Liege, in a letter to another at Friburg, dated February 2, 1687, writes (*l*), that our Author "ſeemed very much to favour the "Catholick cauſe; that he propoſed at Council, whether it was not expedient, that at "leaſt one College in Oxford ſhould be allowed Catholicks, that they might not be forced "to be at ſuch charges by going beyond the ſeas to ſtudy. That the Biſhop inviting two "[Roman Catholick] Noblemen to a Banquet, drank the King's health to an heretical "Baron there, wiſhing a happy ſucceſs to all his affairs; and he added, that the Faith "of the Proteſtants in England ſeemed to him but to be little better than that of Buda "was before it was taken; and that they were for the moſt part mere Atheiſts that de-"fended it, *&c.*" And Father *Edmund Petre*, another Jeſuit, one of the Privy Council of King James II. ſays (*m*), in the ſame month, that "the Biſhop of Oxford has "not yet declared himſelf openly; the greateſt obſtacle is his wife, whom he cannot rid "himſelf of, his deſign being to continue Biſhop, and only change Communion, as it "is not doubted but the King will permit, and our holy Father confirm. Though I "cannot ſee how he can be further uſeful to us in the Religion in which he is, becauſe "he is ſuſpected, and of no eſteem among the Hereticks of the Engliſh Church. Nor "do I ſee, that the example of his converſion is like to draw many others after him, "becauſe he declared himſelf ſo ſuddenly. If he had believed my Counſel, which was "to temporize for ſome longer time, he would have done better; but it is his temper, "or rather zeal, that hurried him on, *&c.*" Our Author died at his lodgings in Magdalen College, March 20, 1687-8, and was interred on the 24th of the ſame month in the South iſle, or part of the outer Chapel of that College. There was publiſhed at London 1690, his *Diſcourſe ſent to the late King* James, *to perſuade him to embrace the Proteſtant Religion; with a letter to the ſame purpoſe.* He was ſaid likewiſe to be the Author of *A modeſt Anſwer to Dr.* Stillingfleet's Irenicum, London 1680, in 8vo; and of a piece, entitled, *Mr.* Baxter *baptized in blood*; and *Andrew Marvell* reports him (*n*) to be the Author

(*l*) See the *Third Collection of Papers relating to the preſent Juncture of Affairs in England, &c.* publiſhed at London in Decemb. 1688. p. 11.

(*m*) Ibid. p. 17, 18.

(*n*) *Rehearſal tranſproſed*, part 2. p. 121.

Reformed, in aſſerting the certainty of the real Preſence, and the uncertainty of the manner of it; though the true account of it hath been miſerably perplexed and diſturbed by the oblique practices of the Sacramentarians. (29) He afterwards obſerves, that *however raſh and prepoſterous it may be for perſons, that believe the* Real Preſence, *to abjure the word* Tranſubſtantiation, *yet to determine any part of divine worſhip in the Chriſtian Church, to be in its own nature* Idolatry, *is inhuman and barbarous.* He then ſhews what is the nature of *Idolatry*, which he affirms to be "the worſhip of the "heavenly bodies, the ſun and moon, and the ſtars, "or any other viſible and corporeal Deity, as the "ſupreme God, ſo as to exclude all ſenſe and ap-"prehenſion of a ſpiritual and inviſible Godhead "(30)." This he endeavours to prove at large; and then remarks (31), that *if we compare this antient Idolatry of the Jews, with that of late charged by ſome men upon all Chriſtians of the Roman Communion, I know not*, ſays he, *which will appear greateſt, the malice or the folly of the charge.*

(29) p. 68.

(30) p. 71, 72.

(31) p. 125.

[*K*] *Attacked by ſeveral Writers.*] It was anſwered by Mr. Goodwin, a Diſſenting Miniſter, in a tract printed at London 1688, in 4to, under the title of, *Tranſubſtantiation a peculiar Article of the Roman Catholick Faith, which was never owned by the antient Church, or any of the Reformed. In anſwer to a late Diſcourſe, called,* Reaſons for abrogating the Teſt. Mr. Wake, afterwards Archbiſhop of Canterbury, publiſhed *A Diſcourſe concerning the Nature of Idolatry, in which a late Author's true and only notion of Idolatry is conſidered and cenſured:* London 1681, in 4to. In the title-page he quotes the following paſſage from our Author's *Tentamina Phyſico-Theologica*, p. 4. *Si inter ſolos Pontificios verſarer, &c. i. e.* "If I con-"verſed with none but Papiſts, and conſidered their "religion corrupted with old wives tales, and were "altogether deſtitute of a rule of faith, by which "to diſcern the vaſt difference between the Chriſti-"an religion, and the trifles of Popery; and laſt-"ly, if no hiſtories were extant, ſhewing how theſe "dotages crept in; if it were thus, I ſay, then I "frankly confeſs, that I ſhould very much ſuſpect "the Chriſtian Religion, nay I ſhould utterly reject "it as fooliſh and mean, and beneath the eſteem of "old Goſſips; nor ſhould I leſs hate the name of "Chriſtianity, than I do that of Popery." In the *Preface* (32), Mr. Wake obſerves, that it ſeemed ſtrange, that our Author *ſhould think to trample upon us now for pretending, that the Church of Rome has defined* Tranſubſtantiation, *as it is underſtood by us, and that ſhe has eſtabliſhed an idolatrous worſhip in our communion; for not only the greateſt perſons of the reformed religion have brought this charge againſt her, but to the truth of it himſelf has ſubſcribed in his time. But it was much more amazing to find ſo new a confidence, ſupported by arguments ſo weak, that it is not without reaſon, that ſome of the Roman Communion are ſaid to complain, that they had been betrayed, rather than defended by him. How unſucceſsfully he has managed his deſign of expounding* Tranſubſtantiation, *has been ſhewn in a late diſcourſe, proving* Tranſubſtantiation *to be the* peculiar Doctrine *of the Church of* Rome, *and in the* Preface *to the* Examination *of the new Articles of the* Roman *Creed by* Catholic Tradition. *If I make it appear, that he has miſcarried as much in the point of* Idolatry, *his* Theological *part will then be conſidered; and for the reſt, we do not by any means preſume to meddle with it.* Mr. *Wake* having confuted the Biſhop's notion of *Idolatry*, gives his own idea of it; and obſerves (33), that "we find two ſorts of Ido-"latry mentioned in the Old Teſtament, and (ſuch is "the misfortune of this poſitive man) both of them "utterly deſtructive of his true and only notion of it, "*viz.* 1. The worſhipping of the true God by a "material ſymbol or repreſentation. 2. The wor-"ſhipping of other Gods, than the God of Iſrael, "and that whether it be ſo as, 1ſt, utterly to for-"ſake the true God, and ſerve others only; or, "2dly, To worſhip other Gods together with him." Mr. *John Philips*, nephew to *Milton*, publiſhed likewiſe a piece, intitled, Samuel, *Lord Biſhop of* Oxford, *his celebrated* Reaſons for abrogating the Teſt *and notions of* Idolatry, *anſwered by* Samuel, *Archdeacon of* Canterbury, 1688, in 4to. There was printed alſo the ſame year in 4to, *The Reaſonableneſs of the Church of England's Teſt and Juſtneſs of her Reformation aſſerted, in anſwer to the Biſhop of* Oxon's *fallacious Reaſons, and precarious Aſſertions againſt it. Alſo the worſhip of Images, Adoration of the Hoſt, and Invocation of Saints proved Idolatry, by the Catholic Doctrine of the Holy Scripture, the antient Fathers, and all reformed Churches. By which the Writings of the Doctors,* Stillingfleet, Tillotſon, More, &c. *are cleared from the charge of* Anticatholic, Antichriſtian, Phanatical, &c. Dr. *Gilbert Burnet* likewiſe publiſhed *An Enquiry into the* Reaſons for abrogating the Teſt *impoſed on all Members of Parliament, offered by* Sa. Oxon. And *A ſecond Part of the* Enquiry *into the* Reaſons *offered by* Sa. Oxon, *for abrogating the* Teſt: *Or, an Anſwer to his Plea for* Tranſubſtantiation, *and for acquitting the Church of Rome of* Idolatry: *and a Continuation of the ſecond*

(32) p. 2.

(33) c. 4. p. 61.

Author of *Gregory Father-Greybeard with his vizard off; or news from the Cabal in ſome reflections*, &c. *in a letter to our old friend* R. L. *from* E. H. London 1673, in 8vo. In 1726, there was publiſhed at London, in 8vo, *Reverendi admodum in Chriſto Patris* Samuelis Parkeri, *Epiſcopi non ita pridem Oxonienſis, de rebus ſui temporis Commentariarum Libri quatuor, è Codice manuſcripto ipſius Authoris manu caſtigato nunc primum in lucem editi.* Two tranſlations of this hiſtory into Engliſh have been printed.

(34) See Dr. Burnet's *Collection of eighteen Papers relating to the Affairs of Church and State, during the Reign of King James the Second*, p. 202. edit. London 1689, in 4to.

ſecond Part of the Enquiry, &c. London 1688, in 4to. In the *Enquiry*, Dr. Burnet tells us (34), that "if "it had not been for the manner of the late King's "[Charles II.] death, and the *papers* publiſhed ſince "his death, he [Biſhop *Parker*] would have wrecked "his malice upon his memory; for he will never "forgive his not advancing him. And the late "King being ſo true a Judge of wit, could not but "be much taken with the beſt ſatyr of our time; "and ſaw that *Bays*'s wit, when meaſured with ano-"ther's, was of a-piece with his virtues, and there-"fore judged in favour of the *Rehearſal tranſproſed*. "This went deep, and though it gave occaſion to "the ſingle piece of modeſty, with which he can be "charged, of withdrawing from the town, and not "importuning the preſs more for ſome years, ſince "even a face of braſs muſt grow red, when it is "ſo burnt as his was then; yet his malice againſt "the elder brother was never extinguiſhed but with "his life." He afterwards obſerves (35), that in the Biſhop's diſcourſe, *he makes his old hatred to* Calvin *and the* Calviniſts *return ſo often, that it appears very conſpicuouſly. I believe*, adds he, *it is ſtronger now than ever, and that for a particular reaſon: when the Prince and Princeſs of* Orange *were married, he was, perhaps, the only man in England, that expreſſed his uneaſineſs at that happy conjunction in ſo clownish a manner, that when their Highneſſes paſt through* Canterbury, *he would not go with the reſt of that body, to which he was ſo long a blemiſh, to pay his duty to them; and when he was aſked the reaſon, he ſaid*, He could have no regard to a Calviniſt Prince. *Now this* Calviniſt Prince *has declared his mind ſo openly and fully againſt the Repeal of the* Teſt, *that no doubt this has increaſed* Bays's *diſtemper, and heightened his choler againſt the whole party.* T.

(35) Ibid. p. 213.

PARRHASIUS (JANUS), born at Coſenza in the Kingdom of Naples, in the year 1470 (*a*), followed the practice of the Humaniſts of that time, who uſed to change their names into others, which ſavoured much more of Heatheniſm, than of Chriſtianity. He took the name of *Aulus Janus Parrhaſius*, inſtead of *Joannes Paulus Pariſius* (*b*). He was well ſkilled in polite Literature, and taught it at Milan with great reputation (*c*). He had the pleaſure to ſee among his Audience, General Trivulcio, who was at that time threeſcore years old. There was ſomething very agreeable in his delivery [*A*]. The liberty he took to cenſure thoſe who taught in the Colleges of the Dutchy of Milan, exaſperated them to ſuch a degree againſt him, that they entered into an horrible conſpiracy againſt his reputation: they traduced him as a man, who had a criminal love for his ſcholars. This ill report, which the people of Milan extremely diſliked, obliged him to reſign his poſt. He ſettled at Rome, where Leo the Xth appointed him publick Profeſſor of Literature [*B*]. He took with him thither Baſil Chalcondylas, his wife's brother, and brother of Demetrius Chalcondylas, Profeſſor of the Greek tongue at Milan. He did not long enjoy the employment which the Pope had beſtowed upon him; for being worn out with the gout, he was under a neceſſity to retire into his native place, where he died ſoon after (*d*). He left his library to his good friend Anthony Seripandus (*e*), who built him a tomb in the Convent of the Auſtin-Fryars at Naples (*f*). Poverty was one of the reaſons which obliged him to leave Rome (*g*). He has been very much commended by Henry Stephen in a dedication (*b*). He has been charged with quoting Authors he never read. You will meet with that imputation in a letter of Andrew Alciat, which was printed at Utrecht, in the year 1697, with ſeveral others taken

(*a*) Nicolo Toppi, *Bibliotheca Napoletana*, p. 112.

(*b*) *Sertorio Quattromani, dell' origine e principio della Citta di Coſenſa*, apud *Nicodemum, Addizioni alla Biblioteca Napoletana*, p. 89.

(*c*) Paulus Jovius, *in Elog.* cap. 127, p. 270.

(*d*) Taken from Paul Jovius, ib.

(*e*) Brother to Cardinal Jerom Seripandus.

(*f*) See Father Mabillon's *Muſæum Italicum*, Tom. 1. p. 110.

(*g*) See the words of Pierius Valerianus, in the remark [*D*], quotation (15).

(*b*) To Lewis Caſtelvetro, prefixed to Parrhaſius's book *de quæſitis per Epiſtolam*, which Henry Stephen publiſhed in the year 1567.

[*A*] *There was ſomething very agreeable in his delivery.*] It was chiefly in this he excelled above all the other Profeſſors. *Cunctos noſtri ſeculi doctores erudito rerum omnium quæ* (1) *explicaret apparatu, ac una præſertim rotundæ pronunciationis gloria ſuperavit* (2). *i. e.* "He was eminent, above all the other Profeſ-"ſors of our time, by his learned way of clearing up "all that he taught, and eſpecially by his fine deli-"very." Pierius Valerianus obſerves, that Parrhaſius's fine voice made a very great concourſe of people come to hear him (3).

(1) That is a Soleciſm, but whether it dropt from Jovius's pen, or muſt be imputed to the printers, I cannot tell.

(2) Paulus Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 127. p. 270.

(3) *Ad cujus jucundam vocem undique concurrebatur.* Pier. Valerianus, *de Infel. Literator.* p. 25.

[*B*] *An ill report . . . . obliged him to reſign his poſt. He ſettled at Rome, where . . . . he was appointed . . . Profeſſor of Literature.*] Paul Jovius, whom I have followed in this account, leaves here a chaſm, which may be filled up, if we conſult an oration of Parrhaſius. We find there, that this Profeſſor left Milan to go to Vicenza, where he was offered a larger ſalary, and that when the ſtates of the Venetians were laid waſte by the troops of the League, he retired into his native country, whence Thomas Phædrus (4) would have made him come to Rome, had not the death of Pope Julius II prevented it: what was a mere project only under Julius II, became a real call under Leo X. *Ut ex animo gaviſus eſt* (Phædrus) *ubi certior à me factus audivit, in Gallia citeriore portum jam me tenere, Mediolanique publicè conductum profiteri. Quid? quum ſequutus uberiora ſtipendia, Veicentiam commigraſſem: Germanis, Gallis, Hiſpanis, cæteriſque barbaris nationibus, infeſtis ſignis irrumpentibus in Venetiam, dii boni, quàm de nobis erat anxius! quàm non aliter ſaluti noſtræ timebat quàm ſi ipſe vocaretur in partem diſcriminis! Extant ab eo ad me tum datæ epiſtolæ, teſtes inquietis animi, quouſque reſcivit elapſum me per medios hoſtes in patriam ſeceſſiſſe. Nec ita quidem de nobis cogitandi finem fecit, auctorque Julio ſecundo fuit ut nos huc evocaret. Sed eo maturè defuncto, Leoni decimo per Janum Laſcarim, virum ad promerendum homines natum, mihi jam conciliato, calcaria ſponte currenti (quod aiunt) admovit. In urbem reverſo jàm præſto mihi fuit? &c* (5). i. e. "How ſincerely did Phædrus rejoice, when he heard "from myſelf, that I was ſettled in Italy, and ap-"pointed publick Profeſſor at Milan. And when be-"ing offered a larger ſtipend, I went to Vicenza, ſoon "after which the French, Germans, Spaniards, and "other barbarous nations, invaded in an hoſtile man-"ner, and laid waſte the territories of the Veneti-"ans; good God, how uneaſy he was upon my ac-"count, being anxious for my ſafety, as though he "himſelf had ſhared part of the danger! The let-"ters he wrote to me at that time, ſhew the great "perplexity he was in, till he heard that I eſcaped "through the enemies army, and got ſafe into my "own country. Nor did he forget me then, for he "perſuaded Julius II. to ſend for me to Rome; but "that Pope dying ſoon after, he prevailed with Leo "X, who was already favourably inclined towards me, "by the recommendations of John Laſcaris, a man born

(4) Profeſſor of Rhetorick, and Canon of Lateran.

(5) Janus Parrhaſius, *in Orat. ante prælectionem Epiſtol. Ciceronis ad Atticum*; it is in p. 142 of the book *de quæſitis per Epiſtolam*, edit. 1567. See there, p. 145.

(i) *Gudii Epiſt.* p. 91.

(k) Ibid. p. 85.

taken from Gudius's library (*i*). The ſame Alciat complains (*k*) that he could never get again a manuſcript of Juvenal which he had lent him. We have an oration, in which our Parrhaſius makes bitter complaints againſt fortune [*C*]. I ſhall relate ſome other particulars in my examination of Moreri [*D*].

PARSONS

" born for the good of mankind; he prevailed, I " ſay, with that Pope, to call me thither, who was " already very willing to do me a favour. How " ready he was to ſerve me after my return to Rome? " &c." He had ſaid juſt before that being at Rome under Pope Alexander VI. he was like to be involved in the misfortunes of Bernardine Cajetanus, and Silius Sabellus, with whom he had had ſome correſpondence; and that Thomas Phædrus adviſed him to eſcape the danger he was in, by retiring to ſome other place.

[*C*] *We have an oration, in which our Parrhaſius complains againſt fortune.*] It is that, from which I have extracted the particulars mentioned in the preceding remark. He declares there, that Fortune never ceaſes making war againſt him, in order to force from him a confeſſion that he is vanquiſhed; but, adds he, though I be ready to ſink under my misfortunes, I ſhall not make ſuch a confeſſion. *Continenter enim (ſi neſcitis) aſſiduumque mecum Fortuna bellum gerit, obnixéque contendit oppreſſo mihi victoriæ confeſſionem extorquere. Rurſus ego, tametſi cumulatis ſtragibus obrutus, extrema tamen experiri malo quàm tantulum de jure meo remittere, nedum manus dare* (6). He obſerves, that as he would not apply himſelf to the law, as his anceſtors had done, he drew upon himſelf his father's indignation, who refuſed to furniſh him wherewithal to defray the expences of his ſtudies (7). He aſſerts that he loſt his library five times, that he was obliged to leave his native country, when the French invaded the Kingdom of Naples, that he loſt in a very little time his mother, his father, his two brothers, and all his children. He laments very much the loſs of Theophilus and Baſil Chalcondylas, his two brothers-in-law, who died young, and were very hopeful men (8).

(6) Idem, ibid. p. 142.

(7) *Indulgentis alioqui in me patris animum depravarit* (fortuna) *ne ſumptus ad ocia Muſarum ſuppeditaret tanquam relicta à majoribus trita ſemita degeneri quod ut illi, leges ediſcere neglexiſſem.* Idem, ibid. p. 143.

(8) See Barthius *in Theb. Statii*, lib. 4. p. 1008.

There is a letter publiſhed, which he wrote to Baſil Chalcondylas, ſoon after the affair of his being appointed Profeſſor at Rome was finiſhed. He mentions in that letter, two domeſtick afflictions, which had juſt befallen him. The firſt was, that his brother's widow, after refuſing, during three years following, like another Penelope, all the addreſſes of her ſuitors, had at laſt married ſecretly one Caputus, and had plundered her children's whole patrimony: *Expilata penitus hæreditate parvorum liberûm* (9). The other was, that his brother's daughter had ſuffered herſelf to be got with child by a Lawyer, a widower, who had been married to that girl's own ſiſter. To avoid the capital puniſhment which they had both to fear in ſuch a caſe of inceſt, they married clandeſtinely, without imparting the ſecret of their wedding to any perſon, but to the mother of the girl who was with child. But this was not ſufficient to free them from danger, unleſs the Pope would grant them a diſpenſation. Parrhaſius employ'd all his friends to obtain that favour from Leo X. and to have the expences for the diſpenſation leſſened. *Itaque cum eo deducta res eſſet, ut utrique moriendum foret, conſcia tantum παρθένια matre concubitum confarreant, atque ſic honeſto nomine nefandum crimen velant. Verum ne ſic quidem, quin ferro cadant, effugient; niſi Deus aliquis eos aſpexerit, id eſt, a ſummo Pontifice veniam inceſtus inſcriptis impetraverint; ut furtivum dedecus profeſſo matrimonio diluatur. Ad hanc rem velim omnes ingenii tui nervos intendas, utariſque gratia ac auctoritate Laſcaris, Phædri, Citrariique, & omnium denique amicorum; ut exleges has nuptias, ad evitandum paratæ cædis periculum, Pontifex privilegio juſtas rataſque faciat, indicta pro copiarum facultate multa. Acceſſit hoc enim meis ærumnis, ut opes ne tantæ ſaltem ſint, quæ poſſint impendia ſuſtinere. Quas ob res abs te primum peto, ſuppliciterque (ſi pateris) oro, omni ſtudio ut cures impetrandam (quam dixi) veniam. Deinde ut quam minimum poteris impendas* (10). He complains, that to all his other misfortunes is added this, namely, that he is too poor to bear the charges of that affair. He deſires therefore Chalcondylas, his brother-in-law, moſt earneſtly to uſe his beſt endeavours, that he might obtain the diſpenſation at the cheapeſt rate. He was anſwered, that the diſpenſation was granted, and that he muſt make haſte to come to Rome to enjoy the Profeſſorſhip which the Pope gave him, with a yearly ſtipend of two hundred ducats annexed to it; he was charged alſo not to forget to bring with him the ſum of money at which the diſpenſation was rated; it was added, that after his arrival, his friends would perhaps find means to get him free from ſo many expences (11).

(9) *Epiſt. ad Gudium*, p. 137, edit. Ultraj. 1697.

(10) *Epiſt. ad Gudium*, p. 137, 138. edit. Ultraj. 1697.

(11) Ex *Epiſtolâ Baſilii Chalcondylæ ad Parrhaſium*, ibid. p. 139.

It will perhaps be aſked why Parrhaſius inquires to what ſum the charges would amount, ſince he might have known it by the book of Rates of the Apoſtolick Chancery. But it muſt be obſerved, that beſides what is ſet down in that book, there is another ſum to pay, for which men muſt agree with the Datary (12).

(12) *Et præterea componendum ſemper eſt cum Datario.* Taxa Cancell. p. 4. edit. 1701.

[*D*] *I ſhall relate ſome other particulars in my examination of Moreri.*] 1. He ſhould not have ſaid, that Parrhaſius being driven from Milan, and troubled *with the gout, retired to Coſenza:* for when he left Milan, he went to Vicenza, to teach polite Literature there. The war made him leave that place, whence he retired into his native country, and afterwards he was Profeſſor at Rome. It is there, if we may believe Paul Jovius, that he was ſo afflicted with the gout, that it forced him to retire to Coſenza. *In Urbem venit; ſed tanti ſuggeſtus honore diu perfrui non potuit, articulari morbo membra omnia ſæviſſimè deformante, unde ei maturatus in patriam reditus cum vitæ exitu contigit* (13). Parrhaſius in the oration I have quoted, and which he delivered at Rome, tells us, that the year before he had been tormented with the gout more than ever: but he does not ſay that this determined him to return into his own country. *Quum ſolito gravius articulari morbo torquerer anno ſuperiori, tuo hortatu, T. Phædre, incredibiles omnium membrorum cruciatus animi vigore ſuperavi: quumque mea magis intereſſet ex hoc ergaſtulo tetroque carcere primo quoque tempore emitti, in tuam gratiam penè revixi* (14), i. e. " When laſt year I was more than ever tor- " mented with the gout, you encouraged me, Th. " Phædrus, to overcome by ſtrength of mind thoſe " incredible torments I ſuffered through all my " limbs: and though it had been better for me to " be immediately delivered out of this horrid pri- " ſon, yet for your ſake I did almoſt revive." I do not quote this with a deſign to diſprove what Paul Jovius aſſerts; for I know very well that the gout, together with poverty, obliged Parrhaſius to leave Rome. The wretched condition to which he was reduced, is deſcribed in theſe words of Valerianus. *Is dum aſſiduis vigiliis, & longæ lectionis laboribus maceratur, in eam incidit articularis morbi truculentiam, ut per annos aliquot nil præter linguam in univerſo corpore haberet incolumem, ſiderato propemodum utroque crure, ut nullis pedum officiis uti poſſet, lacertiſque præ dolore, & contractione redditis inutilibus, magna inſuper inopia, & egeſtate oppreſſus, rerum demum omnium deſperatione ductus, relicta Roma in Calabriam cùm ſeceſſiſſet, in febrim ſubito incidit, qua diu vexatus, miſerabilique eo cruciatu ſuperatus expiravit* (15), i. e. " Being worn " out by his continual lucubrations, and by the la- " bours of his conſtant Lectures, he became ſo cru- " elly afflicted with the gout, that for ſome years he " had no part of his body free but his tongue, hav- " ing almoſt loſt the uſe of both his legs, and of " both his arms; he laboured beſides under ſo great " a poverty, that he loſt all hopes of being ever in a " better ſituation; ſo that he left Rome, and returned " into Calabria, where he fell ſoon ſick of a fever, " which tormented him a long while, and at laſt " carried him off in the greateſt miſery." Obſerve that Moreri, far from filling up the chaſm, which Paul Jovius left, made it ſtill greater. 2. It is not true that Parrhaſius publiſhed but two works, if we ſuppoſe with Moreri, that *he publiſhed Commentaries on Claudian, and on Ovid's Poem in Ibim:* for he publiſhed ſome antient fragments, when he was Profeſſor at Milan. This is what Manutius relates (16) in the fourth book of his Grammar. It is ſomewhat ſtrange

(13) Paulus Jovius, *in Elog.* cap. 127. p. 271.

(14) Parrhaſius, above quotation (5), p. 145.

(15) Pier. Valer. *de Literator. Infelicit.* lib. 1. p. m. 25.

(16) *Apud* Barrium, lib. 2. *de Antiquitate & ſitu Calabriæ*, p. 100, quoted by Nicodemo, *Add. alla Bibl. Napol.* p. 88.

☞ PARSONS or PERSONS (ROBERT), an eminent Writer of the Church of Rome in the 16th Century, was born of honeſt Parents [*A*] at Nether-Stowey near Bridgewater in Somerſetſhire (*a*), in the year 1546, and inſtructed in the Latin tongue by John Hayward, a Prieſt, who had been a Canon-Regular in Devonſhire, and was then Vicar of Nether-Stowey, and having a great affection for our Author, exhibited to him at the Univerſity. In the latter end of the year 1563, he was ſent to Baliol College in Oxford, where he diſtinguiſhed himſelf as an acute Diſputant, both in his College and the publick ſchools (*b*). May 31, 1568, he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts (*c*), and the ſame year was admitted Probationer-Fellow of his College, and afterwards Chaplain-Fellow, and ſo probably entered into holy Orders, being then a noted tutor in the College (*d*). December 2, 1572, he took the Degree of Maſter of Arts (*c*). February 13, 1573-4, he quitted his Fellowſhip of Baliol College [*B*]. In June 1574, he left England,

(a) Parſon's manifeſtation of the folly and bad ſpirit of certain in England, calling themſelves Secular Prieſts, *c.* 7. *fol.* 89. *b. edit.* 1602. *in* 4*to*.

(b) Wood, *Athen.* Oxon, vol. 1. col. 356. 2d edit.

(c) Idem, *Faſti*, Oxon, vol. 1. col. 102.

(d) Idem, *Athen.* Oxon, *ubi ſupra*; and Mr. Edward Gee's Introduction, p. 2. to *the Jeſuit's Memorial*, edit. London 1690.

(e) Wood, *Faſti*, Oxon, vol. 1. col. 106.

ſtrange that it ſhould be impoſſible to know by the large additions which Nicodemo made to Nicolo Toppi's *Bibliotheca Napolitana*, what books Parrhaſius publiſhed. We do not even find there very poſitively that he publiſhed a Commentary on Claudian (17). All the editions which Nicodemo mentions of that Critick's work were printed after his death. What is ſometimes plainly enough told is, that part of Parrhaſius's writings were publiſhed by other people's care. Bernardinus Martiranus publiſhed the Commentary on Horace's Art of Poetry: this is obſerved in expreſs words in the title of the book, which title is tranſcribed by Nicolo Toppi (18), and yet that Author aſſerts that Parrhaſius himſelf publiſhed it. Nicodemo does not ſuffer that blunder to paſs unobſerved (19). 3. It is not at all probable, that Parrhaſius publiſhed a Commentary on Ovid's Ibis. No man pretends to have ſeen it: wherefore Nicodemo (20) looks upon what Paul Jovius aſſerts as a falſity: *Edidit Commentarios in . . . . . Naſonis Ibin* (21. John Matthew Toſcan (22), Gaddi (23), Barri (24), Moreri and ſeveral others follow here in Paul Jovius's account. I have another reaſon to think they are miſtaken, which is, that Monſieur Boiſſieu, who has very carefully enquired after all the Authors who wrote on that Poem of Ovid, does not mention Parrhaſius's Commentary, though he gives us a long liſt of other Commentators (25): but what is more ſtill, he places Parrhaſius only among thoſe Criticks, who have occaſionally corrected ſome paſſages in Ovid. Obſerve that Parrhaſius wrote a great many works, moſt of which have not been printed. Conſult Nicodemo's additions.

(17) Conſult *Barth. in Stat. Th.* lib. 4. p. 1007.

(18) Nicolo Toppi, *Bibl. Napol.* p. 112.

(19) Nicodemo, *Addizioni alla Bibl. Napol.* p. 87.

(20) Ibid.

(21) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 137. p. 271.

(22) In *Peplo Italiæ*, lib. 3. p. 63, 64. *apud* Nicodemum, *Addizion. alla Bibl. Napol.* p. 88.

(23) *De Scriptoribus non Eccleſiaſticis*, Tom. 2. p. 182. *apud eumd.* ibid. p. 87.

(24) *De Antiquitate & Situ Calabriæ*, *apud eumd.* ibid. p. 88.

(25) Dionyſius Salvagnius Boiſſius, *Comment. in Ibin*, p. 2 and 3.

[*A*] *Born of honeſt parents.*] Mr. Wood tells us (1), that his father was *a Plebeian of honeſt repute, and an enemy to the Church of Rome, but by* Alexander Bryant *reconciled thereto. His mother was a known grave matron, living divers years in flight and baniſhment for religion, and died therein at London, very aged, about* 1599. But ſeveral Romiſh Prieſts and others, and among the reſt, Mr. *Thomas Bell* (2), and Dr. *Thomas James* (3), aſſert, that "he was baſely born, of "mean parentage at Stokerſey in Somerſetſhire; "that his ſuppoſed father was a Blackſmith, his "right father the pariſh prieſt of Stokerſey; by "means whereof he was binonymous, ſometimes cal-"led *Rob. Parſons*, ſometimes *Rob. Cowbuck*." And Mr. Edward Gee (4) remarks, that *the world is not agreed either about his name or parentage; for the name of* Parſons *or* Perſons, *as he writes it himſelf, they will have it to be given him upon a ſcandalous reaſon, while the true name of his ſuppoſed father was* Cowback *or* Cubbock.

(1) *Athen.* Oxon. vol. 1. col. 356. 2d edit.

(2) *Anatomy of Popiſh Tyranny*, lib. 2. c. 5. ſect. 1. edit. London 1603.

(3) *Life of Father Parſons*, at the end of *the Jeſuit's Downfall*, p. 52. edit. Oxford 1612.

(4) *Introduction*, p. 1, 2. to the *Jeſuit's Memorial for the intended Reformation under their firſt Popiſh Prince*. edit. London 1690, in 8vo.

[*B*] *February* 13, 1573-4, *he quitted his Fellowſhip of Baliol College.*] Mr. Wood informs us (5), that "he reſigned his Fellowſhip of his own accord, as "Regiſter of Baliol College, p. 125. ſays; though "certain Authors tell us, that he reſigned to prevent "expulſion." Father Parſons himſelf in his *Brief Apology* (6) repreſents the caſe to have been a mere voluntary reſignation. But Mr. Gee acquaints us (7), that *he was turned out of his Fellowſhip and the College with diſgrace: he was not expelled indeed, but forced to reſign, with leave to keep his chambers and pupils a while longer. But this grace was quickly croſſed out, the occaſion of which the Writers of thoſe times, and of his own Society are very much divided about.* Father Morus, a Jeſuit, in his *Hiſtoria Miſſionis Anglicanæ Soc. Jeſu* (8), will have it to be, becauſe he was not only ſuſpected of inclining to Popery, but both thought and ſpoke openly for the Romiſh Religion; and therefore that it was eſteemed an unfit and dangerous thing to truſt ſuch a man with the education of ſo many young men, as he generally had under his care. *But this*, ſays Mr. Gee (9), *cannot be the true reaſon, ſince Father Perſons behaved himſelf as a good Proteſtant, and converſed eſpecially with ſuch men,* (*Mr.* Squire, *and Dr.* Hyde, *for example, then famous men and zealous Proteſtants*) *as might inſtruct and confirm him in the Proteſtant Religion; for which he was afterwards, when he was College-Burſar, ſo very zealous, that he changed a great many old books and manuſcripts for Proteſtant books; and did firſt put Proteſtant writers in their College Library. And after his diſgraceful putting out of the College, when an old friend of his, a Gentleman of the Inner Temple, declared to him, that he had doubts concerning his Religion, he did not only proteſt to the Gentleman, but offered to take his oath upon it, that he was no Papiſt, nor did ever intend to be: others will have his turning out of his Fellowſhip to be occaſioned by his being a turbulent and lewd man, guilty of forgery and knavery, and ſuch like crimes, as made him unfit for a Society. And Dr.* Bagſhaw (*who had been of the ſame College, and afterwards turned Papiſt alſo, and became a ſeminary Prieſt*) *affirms, that he was accuſed of falſifying his College accounts by* Stancliffe *his brother Burſar; and this is often objected to him by the ſecular Prieſts, who have treated him with ſeverity enough, though not with more than his pranks, after he became a Jeſuit, did deſerve. Others aſſign other reaſons of his being diſcharged the College. But to ſet aſide at once the reaſons offered by his brethren, the Jeſuits, and thoſe objected by his ſeverer adverſaries the Secular Prieſts, the matter may be truly decided by the teſtimonies of two unexceptionable witneſſes, who both knew him, and one of them was Fellow of the ſame College with* Parſons, *Archbiſhop* Abbot, *and Mr.* Camden *the Hiſtorian. The Archbiſhop hath written a large letter about this very buſineſs, which I ſhall tranſcribe hither, out of Mr.* Foulis, *who ſays he did tranſcribe it from the original, with the marginal notes upon it.*

(6) Fol. 192, 193, 194, &c. edit. St. Omers, 1601, in 8vo.

(7) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 2.

(8) Lib. 2. p. 39.

(9) pag. 3.

"*To my worſhipful loving friend, Mr. Dr.* Huſſye, *at* "*Mr.* Haiden's *houſe, who dwelleth at the ſign* "*of the Tunn in Watling-ſtreet, give theſe.*

"You write unto me, to know what is in record "any way againſt Mr. *Parſons*; and I return you "here incloſed word for word, ſo much as is in the "Regiſter of Baliol College. In the reſignation, as "you may ſee, he had written *ſponte & coactus*; but "now it is *ſponte non coactus*, [&] being blotted out, "and [*non*] being ſet over *. Which I am deceiv-"ed, if it be not altered by ſomebody elſe of late, "in as much as I am verily perſuaded, that ſince "my coming to the College, I have ſeen it *ſponte* "& *coactus*; which although it carry a contradicti-"on, yet intimateth, that he reſigned againſt "his will. The particular reaſons whereof no man "can tell better than Dr. *Turner*, now dwelling in "Fetter-lane, or Dr. *Hide* † of Sarum; for, as I "take it, they were both preſent at his removing. "The cauſes and manner of giving over, as far as "I could ever comprehend, were theſe. *Bagſhaw* "being a ſmart young man, and one who thought "his penny good ſilver, after he had his grace to be "Bachelor of Arts *, was with ſome deſpite ſwindg-"ed by *Parſons*, being Dean of the College. *Hoc* "*manet altâ mente repoſtum*; and *Bagſhaw* afterward "coming to be Fellow, was moſt hot in perſecution

* Thus { *non* / & }

† In the Proctor's book, I find one Thomas Hyde proceeded Maſter of Arts the ſame year with Rob. Parſons, viz. 1573.

* Chriſtopher Bagſhaw admitted Fellow 1573, left the College 1582; was made Prieſt in France, lived a while in the Engliſh College of Rome, proceeded Doctor, ſome ſay, at Padua [A. P. *Reply*, p. 156] others at Paris, and was one of the faculty of Sorbonne. He was active againſt the Arch-Prieſt in the Stirs at Wisbich. He lived to be very old.

England, and went to Calais, and thence to Antwerp, where having continued for ſome weeks, he took a journey to Louvain, and there met with Father William Good his countryman, with whom he ſpent ſome days in religious exerciſes. He afterwards went to Padua, where he proſecuted his ſtudies in Phyſick, and applied himſelf likewiſe to the Civil Law. But afterwards abandoning theſe ſtudies, agreeably to Father Good's advice, he went to the Engliſh College at Rome, and was there admitted into the Society of the Jeſuits July 4, 1575, and went through the ſeveral claſſes of Divinity. In 1580, he returned to England with Father Edmund Campian and others, to promote the intereſt of the Romiſh Religion [*C*]. While he continued here, which was in the quality of a Superior, he travelled about the country to Gentlemen's houſes, diſguiſed in the habit ſometimes

" againſt *Parſons*. It was the more forwarded by Dr. " *Squire*'s diſpleaſure, who was then Maſter of Baliol " College, and thought himſelf to have been much " bitten by vile libels, the Author whereof he conceiv- " ved *Parſons* to be; who in truth, was a man at that " time wonderfully given to ſcoffing, and that with " bitterneſs, which alſo was the cauſe, that none of " the company loved him. Now Dr. *Squire* and " *Bagſhaw* being deſirous of ſome occaſion to trim " him, this fell out. In the year 1572, *Parſons* had " been Burſar; and being joined in office with one " *Stancliff*, a very ſimple fellow, he took the advan- " tage of the weakneſs of his Collegue, and falſified " the reckonings much to the damage of the Col- " lege; as alſo deeply polling the Commoners " names, whereof there was ſtore in the college; " and withal, not ſparing his own ſcholars. By " all which means it was thought that he had pur- " loined one hundred marks. His office expired at " St. Luke's tide. There were ſome, that between " that and February 1573, ſcanned over the books, " being moved thereunto by the ſecret complaints " of ſome of the Commoners their ſcholars; and " finding it apparent, and alſo being now certified, " that he was a baſtard, whereas it is the firſt qua- " lity required by ſtatute, that every Fellow ſhould " be *legitimo thoro natus*, they proceeded to have his " expulſion ſolemnly. Where by the way, you may " add, that *Parſons* was not of the beſt fame con- " cerning incontinency †, as I have heard ſome " ſay, who lived in Oxon at that time. But whe- " ther that were then objected againſt him, I have " not heard. *Parſons* being put to this puſh in the " College-chapel, and ways ſufficient concurring to " expel him, and in truth, no man ſtanding for " him, maketh humble requeſt, that he might be " ſuffered to reſign, which, with ſome ado, was " yielded to him; and then he wrote as you have " here incloſed. Afterwards, before the Aſſembly " broke up, he intreated, that his giving over might " be concealed, by reaſon that it would be diſgrace- " ful unto him with all men, but eſpecially with his " ſcholars, and their friends; and for theſe cauſes, " humbly prayed, that he might keep his ſcholars, " chamber, &c. and be reputed as a *Fellow* in the " houſe, the matter being conceal'd from all the boys, " and the younger ſort in the houſe; which then in " words was yielded unto, and that other decree, which " now you ſee razed, was enacted for the time; but " afterwards was ſoon croſſed, as you may behold. " And ſoon after their coming out of the Chapel, " by *Bagſhaw's* means, a peal of bells was rung at " Magdalen Pariſh-Church, being the Pariſh wherein " Baliol College ſtandeth: the reaſon of which " ringing, as it was imparted to ſome few, to be " toring out Mr. *Parſons*; ſo generally it was not " known to the world or in the College; which gave " occaſion to this farther jeſt. When *Parſons* was " expelled, he was one of the Deans of the College, " and ſo by his place was to keep *Corrections* in the " Hall on Saturdays. The next time therefore of " *Corrections*, which was the day of *Parſons's* exclu- " ſion, or ſoon after, Dr. *Squire* cauſeth *Parſons* to " go into the Hall as Dean, and to call the *Book* and " the *Roll:* and then cometh Dr. *Squire* himſelf in, " and as if it had been in kindneſs to countenance " him, (but in truth more profound to deride him) " he calleth him at every word *Mr. Dean*, and de- " ſireth him often to have a ſtrict care to the good " government of the youth, and not only for a fit, " but all the time of his year that he was to con- " tinue in office. Some of the Commoners knew all " this pageant, and laught the more ſweetly; and " *Parſons* in the end ſpied how he was ſcorned, and " nothing concealed; nay, underſtanding all his " knell, which was rung out for him, for very ſhame " got him away to London; and there not knowing " what courſe at firſt to take, at length reſolved to " try his fortune beyond ſea, purpoſing, as it ſhould " ſeem, at his departure, to ſtudy Phyſic; but af- " terward, when he came into Italy, reſolving rather " to ſtudy the Civil Law, which he did for a time " at Bononia, as himſelf in that place told Mr. *Da-* " *vers*, brother to the late Sir *John Davers*, as the " ſaid Mr. *Davers* hath himſelf told me; but af- " terwards, belike, wanting means of continuance, " he turned to be a Jeſuit. Preſently, upon his de- " parture out of England, he ſent a letter, or rather " a notable libel to Dr. *Squire*; and he had ſo or- " dered the matter, that many copies of the letter " were taken, and abroad in the hands of others, " before the letter came to the Doctor; which was " the true cauſe, that many lewd things were falſly " reported of Dr. *Squire*, although in truth he was " ſuch a man as wanted not faults, &c.

† Dr. Sutcliff's *Bleſſings on Mount Gerizim*, p. 288.

February 1. 1601. at Univerſity College *.

" Your very loving friend,

" *George Abbot*."

* Whereof he was then Maſter.

The incloſed reſignation mentioned in this letter, runs thus:

Ego Robertus Parſons, *Socius Collegii de Balliolo, reſigno omne meum jus & clameum, quem habeo vel habere potero Societatis meæ in dicto Collegio; quod quidem facio ſponte* $\frac{non}{et}$ *coactus, die decimo tertio Menſis Februarii Anno Dom.* 1573. *Per me,*

Rob. Parſons.

The incloſed decree, about keeping his chamber and pupils, mentioned in the letter, was this:

Eodem tempore decretum eſt unanimi Conſenſu Magiſtri & reliquorum Sociorum, ut Magiſter Robertus Parſons *nuperrimè Socius retineat ſibi ſua Cubicula & Scholares quouſq; voluerit, & Communia ſua de Collegio habeat uſq; ad Feſtum Paſchatis immediatè ſequentis.*

With this account of Archbiſhop Abbot, Mr. Camden's exactly agrees, who ſpeaking of *Parſons*'s and *Campian*'s coming privately into England in 1580, gives this character of them both (9): *This* Parſons *was of Somerſetſhire, a violent, fierce-natured man, and of a rough behaviour.* Campian *was a Londoner, of a ſweet diſpoſition, and a polite man. Both of them were by education Oxford-men, whom I myſelf knew, being of their ſtanding in the Univerſity.* Campian *being of St. John's College, bore the office of Proctor of the Univerſity in* 1568; *and being ordained Deacon, made a ſhew of the Proteſtant Religion, till he withdrew himſelf out of England.* Parſons *was of Baliol College, wherein he openly profeſſed the Proteſtant Religion, untill he was for his looſe* carriage expelled with diſgrace, *and went over to the Papiſts.*

(9) *Annal. Eliz.* lib. 2. ad ann. 1580.

[*C*] *In* 1580, *he returned to England with Father* Edmund Campian, *and others, to promote the intereſts of the Romiſh Religion.*] Our Author and *Campian* departed from Rome on the Sunday after Eaſter 1580, with the Pope's Benediction (10). Their diſpatches were given them, before they ſet out, by *Everard Mercurianus*, the General of their Order (10); which father Morus (11) makes to be ſome commands about faithfully diſcharging their miniſterial function, and by no means, either by word or writing, to meddle with

(10) Gee's *Introduction*, p. 19.

(11) *Hiſt. Miſſion.* lib. 3. p. 61.

times of a Soldier, ſometimes of a Gentleman, and at other times like a Miniſter or an Apparitor (*f*); and being a perſon of a ſeditious and turbulent ſpirit, he excited the Roman Catholicks to endeavour to depoſe Queen Elizabeth (*g*). About this time Father Campian being ſeized and committed to priſon, our Author eſcaped out of England for fear of the ſame fate, and went to Rome, where he was conſtituted Rector of Engliſh College in 1587. He afterwards took a voyage to Spain, where he procured ſeveral ſeminaries for ſupplying England with Prieſts to be founded [*D*]; and by his great abilities in diſputing, writing, and promoting the Roman Catholick cauſe, he became known to and

(*f*) Idem, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 356, 357.

(*g*) *Camdeni Annales Regin. Elizabeth.* ad ann. 1580.

with the publick affairs of the Kingdom of England. *Acceptis ab Everardo mandatis de re Catholicâ per noſtri inſtituti miniſteria diligenter procuranda, atque non minori diligentiâ vitandâ omni rerum, quæ ad regni publici negotia pertinerent, ſeu verbo ſeu ſcripto tractatione.* They paſſed through Geneva, where they had ſome converſation with Beza. *Parſons* firſt embarked at Calais for England, in the diſguiſe of a ſoldier, and arriving ſafe at London, waited there for *Campian*, who likewiſe eſcaped the ſtrict ſearch that was made for them, their pictures as well as an account of the time of their ſetting out from Rome having reached England before them. To underſtand the deſign of their coming thither, it will be proper to conſider the ſituation in which Queen Elizabeth was with regard to the See of Rome. Pope Pius IV. had attempted by fair ſpeeches to perſuade her to ſubmit to that See; and for that purpoſe ſent by his agent Parpaglia a very civil letter, giving her aſſurance of every thing, which ſhe could deſire. But this having no effect, Pius V. reſolved upon harſher methods, and contrived and encouraged plots againſt her, and publiſhed a bill of excommunication and deprivation againſt her, which he cauſed to be fixed by one *Felton* upon the Biſhop of London's gates; the title of which was, *The ſentence declaratory of our holy Lord, Pope* Pius V. *againſt* Elizabeth *Queen of England, and the Hereticks adhering to her; wherein alſo her ſubjects are declared to be abſolved from the oath of allegiance, and whatever other duty they owe unto her; and, thoſe, which from henceforth ſhall obey her, are involved in the ſame Curſe or Anathema.* But Mr. Gee obſerves (12), that as terrible as this title, and as much more terrible as the Bull itſelf was, it did no ways anſwer the Pope's expectation. It was ſo far from raiſing all the Papiſts in the nation againſt her, which was his expectation as well as his command, that it was contemned and ſlighted by moſt, and inſtead of alienating their duty and affections from the Queen, it did them from him, who was ſo ill adviſed, as by ſuch haſty, unreaſonable, and ridiculous provocations to bring the ſeverity of laws and trouble upon them, who had hitherto been ſuffered quietly to enjoy in private the exerciſe of their Religion; but now had no reaſon to expect it any longer, being made every one of them ſo obnoxious and ſuſpicious to the Government, by reaſon of this Bull againſt the Queen. The deſign of *Parſons* and *Campian* in coming to England was evidently to make this Bull effectual, and to raiſe not only the Papiſts, but all others, that they could buy into their intereſt, to depoſe the Queen, and reduce the Realm to the Pope's obedience. But as by the laſt clauſe but one of the Bull, the Papiſts themſelves were put under a curſe and anathematized, if they continued to obey the Queen, how uncapable ſoever they were at preſent to oppoſe her; the two Jeſuits obtained faculties from Pope Gregory XIII. the ſucceſſor of *Pius* V. to free the Romaniſts in England from the curſe of that Bull for the preſent, till things ſhould be more ripe, and a more favourable juncture ſhould offer itſelf; theſe faculties were ſeized in the hands of one of theſe two Jeſuits Accomplices, immediately after *Campian's* execution, and run thus: *Facultates conceſſæ P. P.* Roberto Parſonio & Edmundo Campiano, *pro Angliâ die* 14 *Aprilis* 1580. *Petatur a ſummo Domino noſtro Explicatio Bullæ declaratoriæ per Pium Quintum contra Elizabetham & ei adhærentes, quam Catholici cupiunt intelligi hoc modo, ut obliget ſemper illam & Hæreticos; Catholicos verò nullo modo obliget rebus ſic ſtantibus ſed tum demum, quando publica ejuſdem Bullæ Executio fieri poterit.* i. e. Let it be de-
" ſired of our moſt holy Lord, the explication of the
" Bull declaratory made by *Pius* V. againſt Eliza-
" beth, and ſuch as do adhere to or obey her; which
" Bull the Catholicks deſire to be underſtood in this
" manner, that the ſame Bull ſhall always oblige her
" and the Hereticks; but the Catholicks it ſhall by
" no means bind, as affairs do now ſtand, but here-
" after, when the publick execution of the ſaid Bull
" may be had or made." There followed, as Lord Burghley tells us (13), many other petitions of faculties for their further authority, which all concluded thus: *Has prædictas Gratias conceſſit ſummus Pontifex Patri* Roberto Perſonio & Edmundo Campiano *in Angliam profecturis, die* 14, *Aprilis* 1580, *præſente Patre Oliverio Manarco aſſiſtent.* i. e. " The Pope
" hath granted theſe foreſaid Graces to Father *Robert*
" *Parſons* and *Edmund Campian*: who are now to go
" to England, the 14th day of April 1580. Pre-
" ſent Father Oliverius Manarcus aſſiſtant." The ſecular Prieſts in their *Important Conſiderations*, printed in 1601, obſerve, that our Author, upon his arrival in England, *ſo belaboured both himſelf and others in matters of ſtate, how he might ſet her Majeſty's Crown upon another head (as appeareth by a letter of his own to a certain Earl) that the Catholicks themſelves threatned to deliver him into the hands of the civil Magiſtrate, except he deſiſted from ſuch kind of practice.* This account of his turbulent and ſeditious behaviour is confirmed by Camden, who had it from ſome of the Papiſts themſelves, and ſpeaks of it upon their own credit, that they had thoughts of delivering him into the Magiſtrates hands on this account. But notwithſtanding the intentions and threats of thoſe more peaceable Papiſts, Father Parſons went on his own way; " wherein, ſays Mr. Gee (14), he made ſo
" good progreſs, that though he came into England
" but in June that year, *viz.* 1580, yet before
" Chriſtmas all things ſeemed ready for an inſurrec-
" tion, the Papiſts being taught (and that under pain
" of damnation) to renounce the Queen, who had
" now no more authority over them, being depoſed
" by the ſentence of the infallible Pope of Rome;
" and the Pope's and King of Spain's countenance
" and aſſiſtance promiſed them, if they would but
" riſe and make a Rebellion.' That the Papiſts by that time were generally come over to Father *Parſons's* party, and looked upon the Queen as no longer their Sovereign, by reaſon of her being depoſed by Pius V. and Gregory XIII. who ſent the firſt miſſion of theſe Jeſuits into England, is plain from the confeſſion of *Hart*, one of their Fellows, who was taken about that time; wherein he acknowledged (15), that *the Bull of* Pius V. *(for ſo much as it is againſt the Queen) is holden among the Engliſh Catholicks for a lawful ſentence, and diſcharge of her ſubject's fidelity, and ſo remaineth in force; but in ſome points touching the ſubjects, it is altered by the preſent Pope: for where in that bull all her ſubjects are commanded not to obey her, and ſhe being excommunicated and depoſed, all that do obey her are likewiſe innodate and accurſed, which point is perillous to the Catholicks; for if they obey her, they be in the Pope's curſe, and if they diſobey her, they are in the Queen's danger, therefore the preſent Pope to relieve them hath altered that part of the Bull, and diſpenſed with them to obey and ſerve her, without peril of excommunication, which diſpenſation is to endure but till it pleaſe the Pope to determine it otherwiſe.*

[*D*] *Where he procured ſeveral Seminaries for ſupplying England with Prieſts to be founded.*] Mr. Gee remarks (16), that as he had laboured, while he was in England, in the promoting the Popiſh Recuſancy, and getting the Engliſh Papiſts to be governed by the Jeſuits; ſo after he was obliged to leave his country, he employed all his arts and intereſt to get Seminaries erected for the ſupplying England from time to time with Prieſts to keep up that Recuſancy, and to prepare the Papiſts here to join with any invaſion, which thoſe abroad ſhould procure againſt their own country. As ſoon as he came to Roan, he dealt with the

(12) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 22.

(13) In his Tract, intitled, *Execution of Juſtice in England for Treaſon, and not for Religion*, p. 12, 13.

(14) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 29.

(15) See his confeſſion, taken Decemb. 31, 1580, in Lord Burghley's Tract above cited.

(16) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 41.

and esteemed by the King of Spain. About 1597, he returned to Rome, in hopes of a Cardinal's hat; but missing it, died, as it is said, with grief, as we are informed by Mr. Wood (*b*). But Alegambe (*i*) gives us a different account of the affair, and tells us, that our Author being informed, that King Philip II. of Spain designed to procure a Cardinal's hat for him, applied himself to Pope Clement VIII. before the King's request was signified to him, and desired him with many tears not to grant it, to the great surprize of the Pope, who said that he had never any thoughts of the affair. Some blamed Father Parsons for his over hastiness in it, as if his design had been to offer himself to the Pope for preferment, or to have done himself honour by publishing the King's favourable opinion of him. But Alegambe commends him for his prudence in thus precluding the way to his advancement, since it would have been too late, when the King's desire was once made known to the Pope. Mr. Edward Gee (*k*) observes, that "amidst his projects "for the Spanish interest, he had hopes upon the death of Cardinal *Allen* to be made by "the Spanish interest a Cardinal for England; and there was set about in Flanders by "*Holt* the Jesuit and *Worthington*, a petition to the King of Spain for that purpose, "subscribed by the common soldiers, labourers, artisans, and pensioners, nay, scullions, and Laundresses, as well as by those of better rank and quality. Upon this Father *Parsons* makes haste out of Spain to Rome to hinder it, as the Jesuits say for him. "When he came thither, upon a day set him he waited on the Pope, and acquainted "him how the city was full of the discourse of his being shortly to be made a Cardinal; "and that Spain and Flanders rung with it too; and therefore begged of him, that he "would not think of making him a Cardinal, who might be more serviceable, in the "condition he was now in, to the affairs of England. The Pope told him, that the King "of Spain had not written a syllable to him about any such thing; and that he must not "mind foolish reports; and bid him go and mind his studies." Father Alegambe gives him a very great character for piety and integrity; but Cardinal *d'Ossat* in one of his letters, where he gives the King of France an account of our Author's *Conference*, published under the name of *Doleman*, *concerning the next succession to the Crown of England*, says, that he was a man, who regarded neither truth nor reason. And Pasquin at Rome thus exposed his factious and plotting humour (*l*): "If there be any man, that will buy "the Kingdom of England, let him repair to a Merchant in a black square cap in the "city, and he shall have a very good pennyworth thereof." His zeal for the Romish Religion appears from his unwearied endeavours to keep up an irreconcileable difference between

(*b*) *Ubi supra*, col. 357.

(*i*) *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu*, p. 413. edit. 1643.

(*k*) *Introduction*, p. 54. See Watson's *Quodlibet*, p. 120.

Morus, *Hist. Miss. Jes.* lib. 6. p. 234, 235.

(*l*) Gee, p. 56.

the Duke of Guise to erect a Seminary for such a purpose in Normandy. He afterwards went to Spain, and prevailed with King Philip to encourage and erect such in Spain; so that in a short time they could not only boast of their Seminaries at Rome and Rheimes, but of those at Valladolid, Seville, and St. Lucar's in Spain, at Lisbon in Portugal, at Doway and St. Omer's in Flanders; in all which their youth were educated in violent prejudices against their own native country, and their minds were formed to all the purposes and designs, which Father *Parsons* had in his head. Father Morus, in his *Historia Missionis Anglicanæ Soc. Jesu*, tells us, that Father *Parsons* was for having the youth, who were entered into these Seminaries, to take an oath about faithfully answering the end and benefit of their education there; but he does not say one word of their being obliged to subscribe to the title of the Infanta of Spain to the Crown of England, in oppositon to that of the then King of Scots; which Father *Parsons* afterwards insisted upon their doing, as appears by several Roman Catholick writers. *Clark*, one of the secular Priests, says concerning him (17), that "as touching the Colleges and "Pensions, that are maintained and given by the "Spaniards, which he so often inculcateth, we no "whit thank him for them, as things are handled, "and occasions thereby ministred of our greater persecution at home, by reason of Father *Parsons's* "treacherous practices, thereby to promote the Spanish title to our countrey; and his hateful strata-"gems with such scholars as are there brought up, "enforcing them to subscribe to Blanks, and by pub-"lick orations to fortify the said wrested title of the "*Infanta*, meaning *Isabella Clara Eugenia*, daughter "to Philip II. of Spain, whose right to the English "Crown was maintained in a book by this *Parsons* "made, but published by him under the false name "of *Doleman*." Watson, another secular Priest, observes likewise, that Parsons *earnestly moving the young students in Spain to set their hands to a schedule, that they would accept the Lady* Infanta *for Queen of England, after the decease of her Majesty* [Queen Elizabeth] *that now is; but finding them altogether unwilling to intermeddle with these State-affairs, belonging nothing to them, and most hurtful to both their cause and persons; used this cunning shift to draw on the innocent and simple youths, to pretend forsooth to them of Valladolid, that the students in Seville had done it already; no remedy then but they must follow. And that having thus craftily gotten their names, he shewed them to the students in Seville for an example of their fact and forwardness, which he required them to imitate.* Cardinal d'Ossat also in a letter to Henry IV. of France about the designs of the Spaniards, and Father Parsons against England writes thus (18): "For this purpose also were the Colleges and "Seminaries erected by the Spaniards for the English "at Doway and St. Omer's, wherein the young Gentlemen of the best families in England are entertained; thereby to oblige them, and by them their "parents, kindred, and friends. The principal care, "which these Colleges and Seminaries have, is to catechise and bring up these young English Gentlemen in this faith and firm belief, that the late "King of Spain had, and that his children now "have, the true right of succession to the Crown of "England; and that this is advantageous and expedient for the Catholick Faith, not only in England, "but where-ever Christianity is. And when these "young Gentlemen have finished their humanity studies, and are come to such an age, then to make "them thoroughly Spaniards, they are carried out of "the Low-Countries into Spain, where there are "other Colleges for them, wherein they are instructed in Philosophy and Divinity, and confirmed in the same belief and holy faith, that the "Kingdom of England did belong to the late "King of Spain, and does now to his children. "After these young English Gentlemen have finished "their courses, those of them, who are found to be "most Hispaniolised, and most courageous and firm "to this Spanish Creed, are sent into England, to "sow this faith among them, to be spies, and to "give advice to the Spaniards of what is doing in "England, and what must and ought to be done to "bring England into the hands of the Spaniards; "and, if need be, to undergo Martyrdom, as soon "or rather sooner for this Spanish Faith, than for the "Catholick Religion."

(17) See Gee, p. 44.

(18) Part 2. lib. 7.

[*E*] *His*

between the Kingdoms of Spain and England, and to incite the former to invade England and Ireland [*E*]; and from his writings, which are generally of a ſeditious nature.

[*E*] *His unwearied endeavours to keep up an irreconcileable difference between the Kingdom of Spain and "England, and to incite the former to invade England and Ireland.*] He had at firſt conſulted with the Duke of Guiſe how to depoſe Queen Elizabeth, and eſtabliſh the Queen of Scots; and endeavoured for this purpoſe, as we are told (19), to make a liſt of Catholicks, who under the conduct of the Duke, were to change the State of England, under pretence of ſupporting the title of Queen Mary of Scotland; but that her Council at Paris, which underſtood the buſineſs better, were ſo ſenſible of his preſumption, that they took from him the Queen's Cypher, which he had ſtolen, and commanded never to meddle with her affairs again. It is probable, that he was diſguſted at this neglect ſhewn him by the Queen of Scot's Miniſters; and therefore in revenge attached himſelf wholly to the Spaniſh intereſt, which he eſpouſed ſo far, as not only to ſollicit and encourage the open attempts of the Spaniards againſt England in the invaſion of it, but after the ill ſucceſs of that expedition, to ſet up their pretended title to the Kingdom of England; "and laboured with the King of Spain for a "ſecond invaſion, and after that a third, plotting. "and deviſing all ways to bring the King of Spain "to it, and the Papiſts of England, both thoſe at "home, and thoſe abroad, to join and aſſiſt the King "of Spain in it. But all his pains was loſt about "theſe invaſions from abroad; and therefore he next "ſets himſelf to raiſe a Rebellion in England itſelf, "and deals with Ferdinand Earl of Derby to appear "in and head it; which becauſe he declined to do, "he was poiſoned by Father *Heſketh's* procurement, "who had been ſent to him by Father *Parſons*. But "failing here alſo of the deſired ſucceſs, the poor "Father was at a loſs what to do with this Kingdom "of England; and ſince he ſaw all miſcarried, that "he had plotted againſt Queen Elizabeth, who de"ſcended to her grave full of years and honour; his "next buſineſs was to keep out King James, who was "a Proteſtant alſo, from ſucceeding her. For this "purpoſe he wrote his *Doleman* or *Conference* about "the next ſucceſſion to the Crown of England; the "chief deſign of which was to exclude the Scot's "title, as well the Lady *Arabella's*, as King *James's*, "and to ſet up the Spaniſh *Infanta* (20)." He afterwards went upon ſome other deſigns for the excluſion of the King of Scots; one of which was of exciting the people to ſet up a popular form of Government, for which he had furniſhed them with principles in ſeveral of his books. Another was to engage the Pope in a deſign of making his kinſman the Duke of Parma King of England, or joining with the Lady Arabella, and marrying her to the Duke's brother, Cardinal *Farneſe*. Cardinal *d'Oſſat* gives the King of France a large account of both theſe projects in one of his letters, and in another (21) mentions a fourth, wherein himſelf had been dealt with by *Parſons*, then Rector of the College of Jeſuits at Rome, which was, that the Pope, King of France, and King of Spain, ſhould agree among themſelves upon a ſucceſſor for England, who ſhould be a Catholick; and that they ſhould join their forces to eſtabliſh him on the throne of England. In the firſt volume of the *Memorials of the affairs of State in the reigns of Queen* Elizabeth *and K.* James I. *collected chiefly from the original Papers of Sir* Ralph Winwood, *Knt.* we have ſeveral letters mentioning Father Parſons's deſigns. In a letter of Sir *Henry Neville*, the Engliſh Embaſſador in France, to Sir Robert Cecil, Secretary of State, dated at Paris June 27, 1599. O. S. (22), we find the following paſſage. "I fynd, that there "hath growen great diſſenſion betweene our Papiſts "abroad; and that they have bin divided into two "factions, the one depending upon the Jeſuites, "whereof *Parſons* is now the head, whoſe courſes "have bin violent to ſeeke and wiſhe the overthrowe "of the preſent Eſtate, by conqueſt, or any other "meanes; the other conſiſting chiefly of the laymen "and gentlemen, which are abroad, whereof *Charles* "*Paget* hath bin the chiefe, who could not be "brought, as they pretend, to conſent, or concurre, "to the invaſion and conqueſt of our Kingdom by a "foraine Prince. This diviſion beganne amongſt "them ſoon after the death of the Queene of Scotts, "upon whom they did all concurre, whiles ſhe lived; "but ſince her death, could never agree upon any "courſe, eyther of conqueſt or propoſed title. And "this contention hath proceeded unto great heat "between them, inſomuch as eyther ſyde hathe la"boured to ſupplant and diſgrace the other, but e"ſpecially of late, ſince the title of the *Infanta* of "*Spaine* hath bin ſett on foote, according to the "books written by *Parſons* under one *Doleman's* name. "For the Jeſuite's ſyde promoting that title by all "means, and taking a violent courſe to urge all En"gliſhmen eyther in Spaine, or Rome, or where-els "they may prevayl with them, to ſubſcribe there"unto; *Paget* and his ſyde hath directly oppoſed "themſelves both by word and wryting, as I am in"formed; and they are ſo devided thereupon, as "there is an extreme hatred growen betweene them; "inſomuche as theſe men do openly inveigh againſt "*Parſons* and his adherents, as men ſeditious and "factious, full of treacherie, and without conſci"ence." Mr. Ralph Winwood, in a letter to Secretary Cecil, dated at Paris February 27, 1601. O. S. writes thus (23): Parſons *the Jeſuite hath this laſt weeke written to the Ambaſſador of Scotland, excuſeing himſelf for the writings, which he hath publiſhed, to the prejudice of the Scot's King; and entreated (by his mediation) to fynd ſome entre into his favour and good opinion; with no want of proteſtations, that he will relinquiſh the ſervice of any other, and only adhere to him, upon the ſmalleſt ſhews, that he ſhall make of his inclination towards the favour of the Catholiques. Monſieur* de Rhoſny, *in the laſt ſpeech I had with him, did touch this point, that there were many practiſes to alienate the King of Scotland from the Religion, which he profeſſeth. And when I anſwered, that he was a Prince, wiſe, moderate, and diſcreet, and ſo well founded in the Religion he profeſſeth, that there was no fear that he wold ſuffer himſelfe to be ſeduced, he replyed, that ambition did know no other Religion, then that which did make way for the advancemeat of her deſſeigns. It ſeemeth, he hath received ſome advertiſements to this purpoſe from his brother, the King's Ambaſſador at Rome. The trueth is, the continuance of the Biſhop of* Glaſgow *in this place of Ambaſſador, and many ſollicitations, which he hath made to the Pope by letters, to make the Biſhop of* Weeſmes *Cardinal, have done a generall wrong to the reputation of his judgment as well as honour.* In another letter of Winwood to Secretary Cecil, dated at Paris, October 17, 1602. O. S. he writes (24), that Mr. *Charles Paget* had acquainted him, "that "he had receaved an information, that about the "11th Day of Auguſt there departed from Rome an "Engliſh Jeſuite, whoſe name he knoweth not, of "the age of thirty years, a man of a good faſhion, "of a ſanguine complexion, a yellow beard, of a full "and quick eye, and middle ſtature; who furniſhed "by the Spaniſh Ambaſſador with a ſumme of mony "did take his courſe towards England, with purpoſe "there to attempt againſt her Majeſtie's perſon. He "[*Paget*] made much difficultie to name his Author; "but becauſe I urged Sir *James Lindſey*, who within "theſe two days arrived to this town from Rome, "he acknowledged him to be the man, but ſo that I "would promiſe to conceal his name. As he ſaith, "Sir *James Lindſey* hath ſeen the man, who paſſing "by him on a time, when he was walking with *Par*"*ſons* the Jeſuite, *Parſons* willed him to behold him "well, and aſked him whether if he ſhould meet "that man in England, he would take him for a Je"ſuite. I ſhould much fall in diſcretion, but much "more in duty, not to advertiſe this, though I have "this aſſurance, that the powerful hand of God, "will ever protect her ſacred perſon againſt all diſ"loyal practices of fury and malice." In another letter to Secretary Cecil, dated at Paris, October 20, 1602. O. S. Mr. Winwood writes thus (25): *By the means of the Ambaſſador of Scotland, I have ſpoken with the partie this morning, from whom he receaved the advertiſement, which I ſent by Mr. Bridges the 29th of the laſt month. He averreth the ſame by many proteſtations to be true, and addeth moreover, that* Parſons *did very*

(19) *Jeſuit's Reaſons unreaſonable*, p. 65.

(20) Gee, p. 51, 52.

(21) Part 2. lib. 3. n. 162.

(22) Winwood's *Memorials*, vol. 1. p. 51. edit. Lon. Lon 1725, in folio.

(23) Ibid. p. 388.

(24) Ibid. p. 442.

(25) Ibid. p. 443.

nature [*F*]. He died at Rome, April 15, new ſtyle, in the year 1610, and was interred in

very earneſtly and often deal with him to receave that man into his company, whom above all other marks he noteth to have a high noſe, and to paſs through Scotland into England. I find by him that the Jeſuits, for their countenance, have recourſe to the Duke of Seſſe, *but for their affairs and practices to one* Antonio Taxis, *authoriſed there by the King of Spain. By the opinion he makes, the company doth decay much in reputation in that place, and* Parſons *to be decryed for an impoſture. Only the faction for Spaine doth ſupport them, where ſo long they are gracious, as they by their projects do nouriſh the ambition of their pride, and augment the fury of revenge, wherewith they waſte and conſume way. And though their forces do faile, which are brought to a low ebb, yet their malice hath neither bottom nor brink.*

[*F*] *His Writings.*] Some of them are publiſhed without his name, and others under the names of other perſons. They are as follow: 1. *A brief Diſcourſe, containing the Reaſons why Catholicks go to Church.* Said to be printed at Doway, but really at London 1580, in 8vo, and publiſhed under the name of *John Howlet*, and dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, with a large Epiſtle ſubſcribed *John Howlet*. There is in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, one of the copies of this book, which was ſeized before the title-page was printed, intitled in the firſt page of the book itſelf, *Reaſons that Catholics ought in any wiſe to abſtain from heretical Conventicles.* The running title at the top of every leaf of the book is, *A Treatiſe of Schiſm.* Printed at London, by *William Carter* (executed for treaſon in 1584) who confeſſed, when that book was ſeized in his houſe at Tower-hill, that there had been printed 1250 copies of the ſaid book. At that time the Searchers found the original manuſcript ſent from Rheims, and allowed under Dr. William Allen's own hand to be *truly Catholic*, and *fit to be publiſhed.* This book is undoubtedly the ſame, which *Anthony Poſſevinus* (26) ſtiles, *Nine Reaſons why Catholics ſhould abſtain from heretical Conventicles*, and ſaid by him to be written by our Author. The ſame year that the *Brief Diſcourſe* was publiſhed, there came an anſwer to it, intitled, *A check to Mr.* Howlet's *Schreechings to her Majeſty.* 2. *Reaſons for his coming into the Miſſion of England, with a profer or challenge to diſpute with the Proteſtants.* This book is aſcribed to our Author in Alegambe's *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jeſu:* but in the anſwers to it by Dr. Meredith Hanmer and Mr. William Charke, it is ſaid to be written by Edmund Campian. 3. *Brief Cenſure upon two Books of* W. Charke *and* M. Hanmer, *written againſt the* Reaſons *and* Profer. London 1581, in 8vo. To which W. Charke made a Reply, printed in 8vo. 4. *A Diſcovery of* John Nichols, Miniſter, *miſreported a Jeſuit.* Printed in 1581, in 8vo. Anſwered by Tho. Lupton, in a book intitled, *Anſwer againſt a Jeſuit's Book, intitled,* A Diſcovery, &c. London 1582, in 4to. 5. *A Defence of the Cenſure given upon two Books of* Will. Charke *and* Meredith Hanmer, Miniſters, *which they wrote againſt Mr.* Edmund Campian, *Prieſt of the Society of Jeſus, and againſt his offer of Diſputation.* Printed in 1582, in 8vo. This was anſwered in a book, intitled, *A Treatiſe againſt the Defence of the Cenſure, &c.* Cambridge 1586, in 8vo. 6. *De Perſecutione Anglicanâ Epiſtola, quâ explicantur Afflictiones, ærumnæ, & calamitates graviſſimæ, &c.* Rome and Ingolſtad 1582. Printed alſo in a book, intitled, *Concertatio Eccleſiæ Catholicæ in Angliâ adverſus Ang. Calvino-Papiſtas & Puritanos, &c.* Triers 1583, in 8vo. p. 79. 7. *A Chriſtian Directory, or Exerciſe, guiding Men to eternal Salvation, commonly called* The Reſolution. Firſt printed in 1583, in 8vo. From this edition were publiſhed two others in 1584, one by a Roman Catholic Gentleman, living at Roan in Normandy, full of errors, but in ſenſe the ſame; the other by Edmund Bunney, of Merton-College in Oxford, but altered throughout to the Proteſtant uſe, as appears from Father Parſons's edition of the ſame book, in 1585. 8. *A ſecond Part of a Chriſtian Directory or Exerciſe, &c.* London 1591, in 12mo. Theſe two parts being printed erroneouſly at London, our Author publiſhed an edition of them, under this title, *A Chriſtian Directory, guiding men to their Salvation; divided into three books: the firſt thereof pertaining to Reſolution, is only contained in this volume, and divided into two Parts, and ſet forth now again with many Corrections and Additions, by the Author himſelf, with reproof of the falſified edition lately publiſhed by Mr.* Edmund Bunney. Louvain 1598, in 8vo. Mr. Wood obſerves (27), that "theſe books of "*Reſolution* won our Author a great deal of praiſe, "not only in the Judgment of Roman Catholics, but "of very learned Proteſtants. Yet not to heap more "praiſes upon him than he juſtly deſerves, his ene-"mies, and thoſe of the Proteſtant party ſay, that he "was but a Collector or Tranſlator at moſt; and that "the book was not of his own abſolute invention, "but taken out of other Authors. They ſay further "alſo, that his *praiſe was for well tranſlating, cloſe "couching, and packing it up together in a very ſmooth "ſtile, and ſingular good method*; and add, that *the "platform of the ſaid* Reſolution *was laid to his hand "by* L. de Grenada, *who gave him the principal "grounds and matter thereof; and the penning by one "*Brinkley, *&c.*" 9. *Reſponſio ad Elizabethæ Reginæ edictum contra Catholicos.* Rome 1593, in 8vo. Publiſhed under the name of *And. Philopater.* 10. *A Conference about the next Succeſſion of the Crown of England,* in two parts; printed in 1594, in 8vo, under the name of *N. Doleman* (28). 11. *A temperate Ward-word to the turbulent and ſeditious Watch-word of Sir* Francis Haſtings, *Knight*, &c. printed in 1599, in 4to, under the name of N. Doleman. 12. *A Copy of a Letter written by a Maſter of Arts of Cambridge to his friend in London, concerning ſome talk paſſed of late between two worſhipful and grave Men, about the preſent State, and ſome Proceedings of the Earl of* Leiceſter, *and his Friends in England, &c.* Written in 1584; but the certain year when printed, is not known, unleſs in 1600. It was alſo printed in 8vo (as the other was) in 1631, and has this running title on the top of every leaf, *A Letter of State of a Scholar of Cambridge.* The firſt edition, (and perhaps the ſecond) was printed beyond the ſeas, and moſt of the copies being ſent into England bound, with the outſide of the leaves coloured with green, the book was commonly called *Father* Parſons's *Green-coat.* It is the ſame book with that intitled, *Leyceſter's Commonwealth, conceived, ſpoken, and publiſhed, with moſt earneſt proteſtation of all dutifull good will and affection towards this Realme; for whoſe good only it is made common to many.* Printed in 1641, in 8vo. There is another edition the ſame year in 4to. This book is commonly aſcribed to our Author, who is ſaid to have had the materials of it from the Lord Burghley; and it is expreſsly affirmed to be his by Dr. Thomas James (29). But Father Parſons himſelf, in his *Preface* to the *Ward-word of Sir* Francis Haſtings's *Watch-word*, declares, that he did not write *Leiceſter's Commonwealth*; and it is omitted in the liſt of his work in *Pitſeus, Alegambe, Southwell*, &c. At the end of the edition of this book, in 1641, is printed a poem intitled, *Leiceſter's Ghoſt.* 13. *Apologetical Epiſtle to the Lords of her Majeſty's Council, in defence of his Reſolution in Religion.* Printed in 1601, in 8vo. 14. *Brief Apology or Defence of the Catholic Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy and Subordination in England, erected theſe later years by Pope* Clement VIII. *and impugned by certain Libels printed and publiſhed of late, &c.* St. Omers 1601, in 8vo. About the year 1603, there was publiſhed againſt this, by Humphry Ely, a book intitled, *Certain brief Notes upon a* Brief Apology, *ſet out under the name of the Prieſts united to the Arch-Prieſt.* Paris, in 12mo and 8vo. 15. *Manifeſtation of the Folly and bad Spirit of certain in England, calling them Secular Prieſts.* Printed in 1602, in 4to. This is called a Libel, in an anſwer made to it by *W. C.* Printed in 1603, in 4to; and it was animadverted upon by *A. C.* in his *Second Letter to his diſ-jeſuited Kinſman, concerning the Appeal, State, Jeſuits*, &c. Printed in 1602, in 4to. 16. *A Decachordon of* 10 *Quodlibetical Queſtions about the Contentions between the Seminary Prieſts and the Jeſuits.* Printed in 1602, in 4to. 17. *De Peregrinatione, lib.* 1. Printed in 12mo. 18. *Anſwer to* O. E. *whether Papiſts or Proteſtants be true Catholics.* Printed 1603, in 8vo. 19. *Treatiſe of the three*

(26) *Apparat. Sac.* Tom. 2. *in* Rob. Parſons.

(27) *Ubi ſupra*, col. 358.

(28) See the article of HAYWARD (*John*).

(29) *In the Life of Father* Parſons, printed at the end of *the Jeſuits Downfall*, p. 55, 56, edit. 1612.

in the Chapel belonging to the Engliſh College there, where he had a Monument erected to his Memory.

three Converſions of Paganiſm to Chriſtian Religion. Publiſhed under the name of *N. D.* i. e. *Nicholas Doleman*, in three volumes in 8vo. The firſt volume, which contains two parts of the ſaid treatiſe, was printed at St. Omers in 1603. The ſecond volume, which contains the third part of the ſaid Treatiſe, and an *Examen* of the Kalender or Catalogue of the Proteſtant Saints, Martyrs, and Confeſſors, deviſed by *John Fox*, &c. for the firſt ſix months, was printed at the ſame place in 1604. And the third volume, which contains alſo the third part of the Treatiſe, and an *Examen* of Mr. *Fox*'s Kalender, for the laſt ſix months, was printed at the ſame place in the ſame year. 20. *A Relation of a Tryal made before the King of France in the year* 1600, *between the Biſhop of* Eureux *and the Lord* Pleſſis Mornay, *about certain points of corrupting and falſifying Authors, whereof the ſaid* Pleſſis *was openly convicted.* St. Omer's 1604, in 8vo. publiſhed under the initial letters of *N. D.* 21. *A Defence of the precedent* Relation *of a Conference about Religion*; printed with the *Relation of a Tryal*, &c. 22. *Review of ten public Diſputations or Conferences held within the Compaſs of four Years under King Edward and Queen Mary, concerning ſome principal Points in Religion, eſpecially of the Sacrament and Sacrifice of the Altar.* St. Omres 1604, in 8vo, under the name of *N. D.* 23. *Fore-runner of* Bell's *Downfall*; *or an Anſwer to* Tho. Bell's Downfall of Popery; printed in 1605, in 8vo. 24. *An Anſwer to the fifth Part of* Reports, *lately ſet forth by Sir* Edw. Cooke, *Knt. the King's Attorney General, &c.* St. Omer's 1606, in 4to, publiſhed under the name of a *Catholic Divine*, 25. *De Sacris alienis non adeundis Quæſtiones duæ: ad uſum praximq; Angliæ breviter explicatæ.* St. Omer's 1607, in 8vo. 26. *Treatiſe tending to mitigation towards Catholic Subjects in England, againſt* Tho. Morton; printed in 1607, in 4to. This Morton was afterwards Biſhop of Durham. 27. *The Judgment of a Catholic Gentleman concerning King James his* Apology for the Oath of Allegiance. St. Omer's 1608, in 4to. 28. *Sober Reckoning with Mr.* Thomas Morton; printed in 1609, in 4to. 29. *Diſcuſſion of Mr.* Barlowe's *Anſwer to* The Judgment of a Catholic Engliſhman concerning the oath of Allegiance. St. Omer's 1612. This book being almoſt finiſhed before our Author's death, was afterwards compleated and publiſhed by *Tho. Fitzherbert.* 30. *The Liturgy of the Sacrament of the Maſs.* Printed in 1620, in 4to. 31. *A Memorial for Reformation: Or, A Remembrance for them that ſhall live when Catholick Religion ſhall be reſtored in England, in three parts.* This is probably the ſame with that, entitled, *The High Court or Council of the Reformation.* The Author is ſaid to have been twenty years in compiling it, and finiſhed it in 1596; but it was not publiſhed till ſome years after his death. At length a copy of it coming into the hands of Edward Gee, Rector of St. Benedict near Paul's Wharf, in London, and Chaplain to King William and Queen Mary, he publiſhed it under this title: *The Jeſuit's Memorial for the intended Reformation of England, under their firſt Popiſh Prince, publiſhed from the copy that was preſented to the late King James* II. London 1690, in 8vo. To this Mr. *Gee* hath prefixed an *Introduction*, and added ſome *Animadverſions.* After the *Introduction* is the following title of the *Memorial: A Memorial of the Reformation: Containing certain Notes and advertiſements, which ſeem might be propoſed in the firſt Parliament and national Council of our Countrey, after God, of his mercy, ſhall reſtore it to the Catholick Faith, for the better eſtabliſhment and preſervation of the ſaid Religion. Gathered and ſet down by* R. P. 1596. 32. *Controverſiæ noſtri temporis in Epitomen reductæ:* MS. in Baliol College-Library, written with the Author's own hand: in the front of it is written: *Compilator hujuſce Epitomes eſt* Robertus Perſonius, *ut patet ex* Johanne Rainolde *in cenſurâ Librorum Apocryphorum prælectione ſecundâ, pag. 22. ex Editione Hieronymi Galleri in nobili* Openhemio. 33. He tranſlated from Engliſh into the Spaniſh tongue, *A Relation of certain Martyrs* in England, printed at Madrid 1590, in 8vo.

T.

PARTHENAI, a city of Poitou, under the juriſdiction of the Preſidial of Poitou, was frequently taken and retaken during the wars, on a religious account, in the 16th Century (α). The Proteſtants retired into it, the day of the battle of Moncontour (*a*); but thinking themſelves unable to ſtand a ſiege, they abandoned it at the approach of the Duke of Anjou's troops. They had taken it the foregoing year, and had even hanged Malo who commanded in the Caſtle (*b*); they puniſhing him with this ſeverity, becauſe of his boldneſs in ſtanding out againſt an army. We find by d'Aubigne's hiſtory, that they miſcarried more than once in their attempts, in 1588, to make themſelves maſters of that city by ſurprize. Great numbers of them were there ſince the edict of Nantz, as may be judged from the ill-grounded complaint of the Clergy of France [*A*], and by the anſwer which Drelincourt made to that complaint in 1656. The Lords of Parthenai are honorary ſecular Canons of St. Martin de Tours (*c*). I muſt not omit, that Parthenai is the capital of the little territory of Gaſtine, and of the Dukedom of la Meilheraye (*d*).

(*a*) The 3d of October 1569.

(*b*) *La vraie & entiere Hiſt. des Troubles*, Liv. 4. p. 131.

(*c*) *Mercure Galant*, for February 1693, p. 21.

(*d*) Du Val, *Traite de la France*, p. 144.

The

[*A*] *The ill grounded complaint of the Clergy of France.*] That the reader may not think that I make uſe of this epithet out of party-prejudices, I ſhall draw a parallel between the complaint and the anſwer. The Archbiſhop of Sens, who ſpoke in the name of all the Clergy, ſpeaks as follows: "May it "pleaſe your Majeſty; the piety of the Catholicks, "in the city of Parthenai, was forced laſt ſummer, "to ſubmit to the violence of the enemies of this "holy myſtery. By an abſolutely irreligious attempt, "they preſume to ſolemnize a funeral, the very in"ſtant that a proceſſion was made, to honour, pur"ſuant to the laws of the Church, a ſacrament which "is the center of our Religion. They diſturbed the "whole courſe of this holy ceremony, by a malici"ouſly concerted meeting: and ſuch Catholicks, "who are deſirous of diſtinguiſhing themſelves by "their modeſty, at the ſame time that their evil "brethren endeavour to make themſelves conſiderable "by their inſolence, were forced to yield, being "overpowered by the multitude of thoſe prophane "and impious wretches and to return to Church, "with ſorrowful countenances..... Did your Ma"jeſty ever hear of ſo audacious an action? And will "you ſuffer in your Kingdoms an attempt ſo injurious "to the honour of the ſon of God to go unpuniſhed? "But we can never believe this of your Majeſty; "and we ought to be perſuaded that you will revenge, "in ſuch a manner as may be agreeable to our wiſhes, "the quarrel of the living God (1)." I need give only the ſubſtance of the anſwer, which is as follows, *viz.* that the ſecond Sunday in April, there was brought to Parthenai, from a place two leagues diſtant from it, the corps of a Gentleman, to be buried after the afternoon Sermon; that as the whole company was going to the place of interment, they perceived, by ſome tapeſtry that was near the Citadel, that a proceſſion was to paſs that way; yet they immediately halted; and that as there was no other way to go to the Church-yard which is near the caſtle, it was judged proper to ſend a meſſage, with all poſſible reſpect, to the Pariſh of Holy Croſs, where the proceſſion was to begin, to enquire of the Canons, whether they would have the funeral halt where they then were, till ſuch time as the proceſſion ſhould have paſſed by; or, in caſe their proceſſion was not ready to ſet out, they would

(1) *Remonſtrance du Clerge de France en* 1659, p. m. 20.

The Lordſhip of Parthenai was re-united to the Crown in 1422, by the death of John l'Archevêque [*B*].

(*a*) In 1487, this city belonged to Francis, Count de Dunois, who adhered to the Duke of Orleans's party. The 28 of March, of that year, King Charles VIII. who was engaged in war againſt that Duke and the people of Bretagne, took Parthenai, and razed the walls of it. See Lobineau, *Hiſt. de Britagne*, Tom. I. pag. 765, and 768. Rabelais, *Lib.* I. *Chap.* V. ſpeaks of this demolition of Parthenai. REM. CRIT.

would have the funeral to go on. That anſwer was made, that they might end their funeral, and that their proceſſion would not ſet out ſo ſoon; that accordingly, it did not ſet out till half an hour after all the funeral was gone by; that to ſhew an entire deference, the Proteſtants ſtaid in their Church-yard till the whole proceſſion was ended, and all the tapeſtry was taken down; and conſequently it could not be juſtly ſaid, that the proceſſion returned back, by its meeting the funeral, with great trouble and ſorrow, ſince the proceſſion was not yet ſet out, and did not ſet out till a long time after the funeral was paſt. That not the leaſt mention was made of this affair during ſeveral days; but that, at laſt, the bailiff of Parthenai, a man of a fiery temper, being animated by ſome turbulent people, applied to Mr. Filleau, the King's Advocate at Poitiers, who gloried in perſecuting the Proteſtants on all occaſions; that accordingly ſeveral members of the conſiſtory of Parthenai were ſummoned to appear before the Preſidial of Poitiers, there to be ſentenced to pay a fine, for diſturbing the proceſſion; but that Mr. de le Meilleraye ſtopt this unjuſt proſecution; and that thoſe very perſons who began it were aſhamed, ſo that the thing reſted there (2). I have made uſe of the Author's expreſſions.

Would the Proteſtants have anſwered in ſo confident a manner, had this thing been true? Here then is an error, with regard to fact, which falls under our cognizance. We ſhall leave our readers to reflect on the dreadful ſtorms, which a vehement Orator may raiſe for nothing at all (3).

[*B*] *The Lordſhip of Parthenai was re-united to the Crown in* 1422, *by the death of John l'Archeveque.*] He had ſold this Lordſhip to the Duke of Berry, *reſerving, during his life time . . . . . the profits ariſing from it. . . . . He had no children, and, on this account, the year he died, Meſſire James de Harcourt, who had married his niece, would have diſpoſſeſſed him of the ſaid Lordſhip and Caſtle of Parthenai, but he was prevented by the inhabitants, who took up arms and killed the ſaid Harcourt* (4).

(2) See *a Letter of an Inhabitant of Paris to a Friend in the Country, on the Remonſtrance of the Clergy*, p. 133 *& ſeq.* edit. in 8vo. This letter was writ by Mr. Drelincourt, a Proteſtant Clergyman of Paris.

(3) See the *Critique Generale* of Maimbourg's Calviniſm, letter 23. p. 93 *& ſeq.* edit. 3d.

(4) John Bouchet, *Annales d'Aquitaine*, 4. part, chap. 7. folio, m. 137.

PARTHENAI, a family ſo named, continued for a long courſe of years, with ſplendor. The laſt male deſcendant of that illuſtrious houſe was John de Parthenai-l'Archevêque, Lord of Soubiſe (*a*), who left iſſue but one daughter, Catharine de Parthenai, mother to Duke de Rohan, Commander of the Huguenot armies in France, in the reign of Lewis XIII. We ſhall give the article of this Lady hereafter. Some are of opinion, that the Lords of Parthenai took the ſirname of l'Archevêque, becauſe they ſprung from an Archbiſhop of Bourdeaux. Thoſe perſons are even of opinion, that this Archbiſhop of Bourdeaux was Joſſelin de Parthenai, who died in 1086; and that William de Parthenai, who took the ſirname of l'Archevêque, about the year 1100, was his ſon. Others (*b*) refer this original to one Archambaut, Archbiſhop of Bourdeaux, Joſſelin's predeceſſor; but as this Archambaut was diveſted of his dignity, and became Lord of St. Maixent, and as we do not meet with any perſon of this name, nor any Lord of St. Maixent, in the Parthenai family, this opinion is no ways probable. "The "eldeſt branch of Parthenai, with all its eſtate, fell to the houſe of Melun Tancarville, "from which that of Longueville is deſcended, by marriage; and the Lords of Soubiſe "were ſeparated from the ſtock, about the year 1330, when Guy l'Archevêque, younger "brother to John Sire (Lord) of Parthenai was Lord of Soubiſe. It has aways been "thought, with great probability, that thoſe of Parthenai was of Lezignem, whoſe "arms they bear, rebated, on account of their being the younger branch, with a bend "Gules: but they muſt have ſprung from it before the year 1000; becauſe there is ex-"tant, from that time, the ſucceſſion till John l'Archevêque, Lord of Soubiſe (*c*)," Grandfather by the mother's ſide, to Duke de Rohan. 'Tis obſerved, in the life of this Duke, printed in 1667, that his mother was the principal Hiereſs of the houſe of Luſignan.

(*a*) See his article under the word SOUBISE.

(*b*) Du Cheſne, *Annotat. ſur les Oeuvres d'Alain Chartier.*

(*c*) *Le Laboureur, Addit. aux Memoires de Caſtelnau*, Tom. 1. p. 805.

PARTHENAI (ANNE DE), wife of Anthony de Pons, Count de Marennes, and daughter of John de Parthenai-l'Archevêque, and of Michelle de Saubonne [*A*], was a Lady of great genius and learning. She was one of the brighteſt ornaments of the Court of Renata of France, daughter of Lewis XII. and Ducheſs of Ferrara. Now 'tis well known, that few Courts in the world were ſo polite as that in queſtion. Anne de Parthenai, not ſatisfied with ſtudying the Latin tongue, ſtudied the Greek with ſo much application, that ſhe could read the Authors with pleaſure in that language. *Non modo in Latinis quibus ab ipſis incunabulis naviter operam dediſti, ſed in Græcis quoque ita profeciſti, ut*

[*A*] *Michelle de Saubonne.*] She was a Lady of Britany, who had been one of the Maids of honour to Queen Anne of Britany. She married in 1507, by this Queen's favour, John l'Archevêque V. of that name, Lord of Soubiſe, head of the Parthenai family. The above-mentioned Queen appointed her Governeſs of Renata of France, her daughter, Ducheſs of Ferrara (1). In the third letter of Rabelais, we meet with ſome particulars relating to this Governeſs. "Monſieur de *Limoges*, who was the "King's Embaſſador in Ferrara, obſerving that the "ſaid Duke (2), without giving him any notice of "his deſign, went over to the Emperor, is re-"turned to France. There is reaſon to fear that "this circumſtance will cauſe great uneaſineſs to "Madam Renata. The ſaid Duke has taken Ma-"dam de Soubiſe her Governeſs, and has ſet Italian "women about her, *which is no good ſign.*" This letter was writ in 1536.

(1) See the notes on Rabelais's letter, p. 85.

(2) The Duke of Ferrara.

[*B*] *I*

ut Græcos autores intrepide evolvas (*a*). Her curioſity extended to books of Divinity. She attained to great ſkill in the Scriptures; and took a ſingular pleaſure in diſcourſing, almoſt every day, with Divines on theological ſubjects. The Authors of that age were not ſparing of their encomiums, they applauding her on a thouſand occaſions; and did not omit obſerving, that ſhe ſung like an Angel, and underſtood all kinds of muſick in perfection. *Quid nunc memorem qualis ſis in dignoſcendis & modulandis carminibus, quali venuſtate canas & gratia? Quantum denique in omni Muſica profeceris, id ejus diſciplinæ periti prædicant* (*b*). See the Dedication cited by me (*c*). The great favour ſhe was in with the Ducheſs of Ferrara, and the great ſkill ſhe had attained in Divinity, will doubtleſs make all Roman Catholicks who ſhall read this, ſuſpect her of having a tendency to Calviniſm. However, I will not leave them to bare ſurmiſes, but will quote an Author who will prove to them that ſhe was a ſincere Huguenot [*B*], and the worthy ſiſter of Soubiſe, who was one of the chief ſupports of the party. Her huſband was forced to leave the Court of Ferrara [*C*].

(*a*) Gyraldus, *Epiſt. Dedicat. Dialogi* 2. *Hiſtoriæ Poetarum.*

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

(*c*) See alſo Clement Marot, in his letter, *Loſt at Play*, againſt Madame de Pons, p. 206 *& ſeq.* Hague edit. 1700.

[*B*] *I will quote an Author, who will prove to them that ſhe was a ſincere Huguenot.*] "With regard to "the town of Pons, the Lord of the place, ſo long "as Dame Anne de Parthenai, his firſt wife, and "ſiſter of the Sieur de Soubiſe, lived, was a lover of "virtue and truth; he having attained to ſo great a "knowledge in the ſacred writings, that ſcarce one "Clergyman could be found who was ſo zealous as "he; he himſelf taking the pains to inſtruct his "poor ſubjects, many of whom he edified, as well "officers as others in his town of Pons. But imme-"diately after the death of that very virtuous Lady, "God having deprived him of his underſtanding to "ſuch a degree, that he married, for his ſecond "wife, one of the moſt diſreputable women in all "France, *viz.* Mary de Monchenu, called Lady de "Maſſay, providence bereaved him of the re-"mainder of his ſenſe and judgment; ſo that, "without any manner of reaſon, he became from "that time an enemy and perſecutor of the truth "which he had ſo well known and forwarded (3)." To confirm the above-mentioned aſſertion of Theodore Beza, with reſpect to the aſcendant which the virtuous Anne de Parthenai had over her huſband, I will cite a paſſage from Gregory Gyraldus, in which he declares that the Lady in queſtion, and Count de Marennes her huſband, devoted herſelf to the ſame ſtudies with equal ſucceſs. *Quid porro dicam qua charitate & amore, ac potius pietate proſequaris illuſtrem virum tuum, jure tuum, ut qui eiſdem quibus tu ſtudiis & virtutibus poſt militares artes ſit ornatiſſimus* (4)? i. e. "Wherefore ſhould I take notice of the love and "affection, or rather piety, which you ſhew with "regard to your huſband, who is juſtly yours; "ſince, beſides his knowledge in the military arts, "he is adorned with the ſame ſtudies and virtues as "yourſelf?" This Count was firſt Gentleman of the Bedchamber to the Duke of Ferrara; and Gyraldus dedicated to him the fourth Dialogue of his Hiſtory of the Poets.

(3) Theodore Beza, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* Tom. 1. Liv. 2. p. 201. (and not 199, as it is ſet down in the book) *ad ann.* 1559.

(4) Gyrald. *Epiſt. Dedicat. Dialogi* 2. *Hiſtoiræ Poetarum.*

[*C*] *Her huſband was forced to leave the Court of Ferrara.*] 'Tis he doubtleſs who is ſpoke of in the "following paſſages of our Hiſtorians (5). "If the "King of France thought that there was juſt cauſe "for expelling Monſieur de Pons from Ferrara, be-"cauſe he boaſted his being of as noble a houſe as "thoſe of Aeſt (6); it not being juſt that, ſince he "lived by the Ducheſs of Ferrara, and had a penſion "from her, that he ſhould draw ſuch a compariſon, "although the ſaid late King judged the houſe of "Pons to be as antient as that of Aeſt; in like man-"ner 'tis as inſupportable, that thoſe of the houſe of "Guiſe, who owe all their ſubſtance and ſplendor to "the houſe of France, ſhould compare themſelves "to the Princes of the ſaid houſe." 'Tis extremely imprudent in any perſon, in the ſervice of another, to compare themſelves to him. If they are nobler than he, they ought not once to take notice of it. This conduct is particularly neceſſary with regard to Sovereign Princes. Their relations ought to forget that they are ſuch.

(5) *Preſident de la Place, de l'Eſtat de la Religion*, Liv. 2. folio 63.

(6) We muſt read *Eſte.*

PARTHENAI (CATHARINE DE,) daughter and heireſs of John de Parthenai-l'Archevêque, Lord of Soubiſe, niece of the preceding Lady, was married in 1568 to Baron du Pont, and afterwards in 1575 to Renatus de Rohan II. of that name (*a*); who leaving her a widow in 1585 (*b*), ſhe employed her whole thoughts about the bringing up of her family. Her care was crowned with all the ſucceſs ſhe could promiſe herſelf from it; the eldeſt of her ſons being the famous Duke de Rohan, who aſſerted the Proteſtant cauſe, with ſo much vigour, in France, during the civil Wars, in the reign of Lewis XIII. Her ſecond ſon was Duke de Soubiſe. She had three daughters: Henrietta, who died in 1624, unmarried; Catharine, who married a Duke of Deux-ponts (*c*), and made the beautiful anſwer following to Henry IV. her admirer; *I am too poor to be your wife, and of too noble a family to be your miſtreſs* (*d*); and Anne, who was never married, but ſurvived all her brothers and ſiſters, and became extremely famous for her piety and knowledge. 'Tis plain that I ſpeak of the renowned ANNE DE ROHAN (*e*), who ſupported with ſo much patience and reſolution all the calamities of the ſiege of Rochelle. Her mother's courage was ſtill more wonderful; for ſhe, notwithſtanding her very advanced age, bore with prodigious reſolution, the neceſſity to which ſhe was reduced, of living during three months on horſe-fleſh, and four ounces of bread per diem. Notwithſtanding this miſerable condition to which ſhe was reduced, ſhe yet wrote to her ſon, exhorting him to go on as he had begun; and that the reflexion on the extremity to which ſhe was reduced, ſhould not make him *act any thing to the prejudice of his party, how great ſoever her ſufferings might be* (*f*). She and her daughter refuſed to be included in the articles of capitulation, and remained priſoners of war. They were conveyed to the caſtle of Nicort, the ſecond of November 1628 (*g*). Some writers ſay that Catharine de Parthenai was then fourſcore and eleven years of age [*A*]; but others ſay ſhe was but ſeventy.

(*a*) Thuan. lib. 61.

(*b*) Le Pere Anſelme, and Moreri, who copies him, ſay 1586. I have followed the Author of Duke de Rohan's Life.

(*c*) In 1605. She died in 1607.

(*d*) See the *Obſervations on the Amours of Alcandre*, and the *Key*.

(*e*) See her article.

(*f*) *Hiſt. du Duc de Roban*, p. 99. Dutch edit. 1667.

(*g*) Merc. Franc. Tom. 14 p. 716.

[*A*] *. . . . then fourſcore and eleven years of age.*] Father Anſelme muſt have been of this opinion, ſince, in giving us the Poſterity of Peter de Rohan, called Marſhal de Gié, he declares in the margin, oppoſite to our Renatus de Rohan II. of that name, that Catharine de Parthenai, his wife, *died at Parc in Poitou, the 26th of October* 1631, *aged* 94 *years* (1). Moreri ſays the ſame thing, except that he has put *Pare*

(1) *Hiſtoire des grands Offic.* p. 153.

ſeventy. La Croix du Maine informs me, that ſhe was very well ſkilled in poetry [*B*]. I muſt not omit the troubleſome law-ſuit for impotency, in which her firſt huſband was engaged [*C*]. If what a perſon of great abilities had advanced is certain, *viz.* that *Mademoiſelle de Parthenai, Lady of Soubiſe*, was thought to have been an Author, *before Madame*

Pare into *Pare*. But the author of the hiſtory of Duke de Rohan (2) obſerves, where he ſpeaks of the ſiege of Rochelle, and of the famine with which that Lady was oppreſſed there, that ſhe was ſeventy years of age. This was not a place to ſubſtract from her age; and a perſon who wanted to flatter her, ſhould rather have increaſed than leſſened her age. Nevertheleſs, 'tis very probable that this author made her younger than ſhe really was; a tragedy of her writing being played as early as the year 1574. Women of ſixteen ſeldom write Tragedies; and had this happened, ſuch an author as La Croix du Maine could not have been ignorant of it, nor would have been ſilent on ſuch a particular. I inſiſt leſs on the impotency, whether true or falſe, of Baron du Pont, which gives occaſion to a law-ſuit in 1572. A young woman at fourteen, is more capable of having children than of writing Tragedies at ſixteen. But the remark made by Varillas would be a proof that merits not to be rejected. He ſays (3) that in 1562, *Vicount de Rohan headed the troops of Languedoc and Dauphine, which he had raiſed at the ſollicitation of Soubiſe, who promiſed to give him his only daughter in marriage*. Can a man who is of age to levy and command forces, rely much on the marriage of a girl of four years old? But what follows would make the argument ſtronger. The only daughter in queſtion was married, as early as the year 1567, to Baron du Pont; for we find, among the Lords, who went to join the Admiral after the battle of St. Denys, a Soubiſe, who muſt be the ſame Baron (4). I ſay that this *would* make the argument ſtronger, not *that it is* ſo; becauſe I rely more on a letter ſent me, which declares, that the heireſs of Soubiſe was married to Baron du Pont in 1568, than to the accuracy of hiſtorians about ſuch little particulars. A certain circumſtance is, that Father Anſelme is miſtaken; for John de Parthenai and Antoinette Bouchard of Aubeterre, father and mother of the Lady in queſtion, were married the third of May 1553. She therefore was born at the ſooneſt in 1554, and could be but ſeventy ſeven years of age when ſhe died in 1631. On the other ſide, ſince ſhe was married in 1568, ſhe muſt have been above ſeventy years of age, at the time of the ſiege of Rochelle.

(2) He is ſuppoſed to be Mr. Fauvelet du Toc.

(3) *Hiſt. de Charles* IX. Liv. 3. *init.*

(4) D'Aubigne, Tom. 1. p. 372. Thuanus, Liv. 42. p. 854. Varillas, *Hiſt. de Charles* IX. Liv. 7.

[*B*] *La Croix du Maine informs me, that ſhe was very well ſkilled in poetry.*] That Lady, ſays he (5), *ought to be greatly valued for the excellency and greatneſs of her genius, of which her writings are a ſufficient proof, and we need no other teſtimony; for ſhe has compoſed ſeveral French Tragedies and Comedies, and particularly the Tragedy of Holofernes, which was repreſented publickly in Rochel, anno* 1574, *or thereabouts, but it is not printed yet. She wrote ſeveral elegies or complaints on the death of Baron du Pont, her firſt huſband; and alſo on the Admiral, and other great Lords and illuſtrious Perſonages. She has tranſlated the precepts of Iſocrates to Demonitus, which are not yet printed. She is famous,* continues he, *this preſent year* 1584. *I am not acquainted with any more of her compoſitions, not having the happineſs to know her perſonally.*

(5) *La Croix du Maine, Bibliotb. Franc.* p. 478.

[*C*] *I muſt not omit the troubleſome law-ſuit for impotency, in which her firſt huſband was engaged.*] Our Catharine de Parthenai's mother, and not ſhe herſelf, muſt be blamed for this. It was not the wife who ſued her huſband, but the mother-in-law, who was the plaintiff on this occaſion againſt her ſon-in-law: therefore, though no one can reaſonably doubt of the ſecret confidence between the mother and daughter, it muſt nevertheleſs be confeſſed, that Boileau's reflection (6) does no ways concern the heireſs of Soubiſe:

(6) Satyr 8. ver. 143.

Jamais la Biche en rut n'a pour fait d'impuiſſance
Traîné du fond des bois un Cerf à l'audience;
Et jamais Juge entr'eux, ordonnant le congrès,
De ce burleſque mot n'a ſali ſes arrêts.

The Senſe is,

" No Hind e'er ſued a Stag for impotency;
" Nor dragg'd him from a foreſt, to the commons.
" No Judge e'er call'd a congreſs in the wilds,
" And with ſo drole a word his ſentence ſtain'd."

If, on the one hand, it is ſurprizing, that at a time when the proteſtant Ladies were diſtinguiſhed by the ſtrictneſs of their morals, as well as the purity of their tenets, one of the greateſt women among them (7) ſhould have thought fit to commence a ſuit, which tended ſo little to edification; it muſt be conſidered on the other hand, that their perpetual ſtudy of the Bible was, at that time, more capable of infuſing certain inclinations: for, at that time, people ſtudied with greater application and zeal, the temper and ſpirit of the holy Patriarchs, and that of their wives, among whom there prevailed a very ſtrong, tho' chaſte deſire, of leaving poſterity. The Lady Soubiſe might alſo have been prompted by a religious motive upon another account. The Proteſtant religion was not yet firmly eſtabliſhed; the ſtrongeſt endeavours were made to deſtroy it; and therefore it was neceſſary to perpetuate, by all reaſonable and proper methods, ſuch families, which, like hers, had been the main ſupports of it. But what ſhall we think of the curioſity which the Ladies of the Court of France ſhew'd on this occaſion? But before I relate what Hiſtorians ſay on this matter, it will be proper to obſerve, that an end was put to the law-ſuit, by the maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's day, in which Soubiſe's ſon-in-law loſt his life. We will now hear Varillas (8); *Baron de Pont-Kuelleve* (9) *made ſo very long a reſiſtance, that thoſe who ſaw he did not yield, till he was pierced through with holes like a ſieve, gave this teſtimony of him, that he was more than man in battle, if he was not ſuch in the nuptial bed. He had married the heireſs of Soubiſe; and his wife's mother had commenced a ſuit againſt him for impotency, which was not determined. His body was dragged as far as the gate of the Louvre, where, notwithſtanding the compaſſion, which the ſight of it ought naturally to have excited, yet many court Ladies ſurvey'd it with great attention, in order to ſee whether there were no marks of the defects with which he was reproached.* Thoſe who underſtand Latin, will ſee the noble expreſſions which Thuanus employs in relating this incident. *Eadem calamitas Baudineum Acierii fratrem, Pluvialium & Bernium involvit, crudeliter à militibus regiis occiſos, nec non Carolum Quellevetum Pontium Armoricæ Regulum qui Catharinam Parthenæam Joannis Subiſii filiam & hæredem in uxorem duxerat, ſed à Parthenææ matre frigiditatem generi cauſata de diſſolvendo matrimonio lite aliquanto ante tempore intentata neque dum finita. Itaque cum corpora eorum ſicuti à percuſſoribus ſinguli occidebantur ante arcem Regiſque Reginæ ac totius aulici comitatus conſpectum abjicerentur, frequentes è gynæceo fœminæ, nequaquam crudeli ſpectaculo eas abſterrente, curioſis oculis nudorum corpora inverecunde intuebantur, & in Pontio præcipue aciem deſigebant, ſi qua ratione frigiditatis illius cauſam aut notas perrimari poſſent* (10). i. e.

(7) See the great zeal of this Lady, in the notes on the article SOUBISE.

(8) *Hiſt. de Charles* IX. Tom. 2. p. 276. Dutch edit.

(9) It ſhould be QUELLENEC. See the article ſo called.

(10) Thuanus, lib. 52. p. 1076.

" Baudin, brother to Acier, Pluvial, and Berni,
" were involved in the ſame ſad calamity, they be-
" ing all killed by the King's ſoldiers; and likewiſe
" Charles Quellevé du Pont, a Nobleman of Britta-
" ny, who had married Catharine de Parthenay,
" daughter and heireſs of John Soubiſe; not long
" before which, Catharine's mother had ſued her
" ſon-in-law for impotency, in order to obtain a
" divorce, which ſuit was not then determined.
" When the bodies of theſe unhappy men, in propor-
" tion, as each of them were butcher'd, were brought
" and thrown before the King's palace, in preſence
" of their Majeſties, and of the whole court, ſeve-
" ral Ladies came out of their apartments, and,
" unſhocked at this barbarous ſpectacle, gazed, in
" the moſt immodeſt manner, on the naked bodies;
" but fixed their eyes particularly on du Pont, to diſ-
" cover, if poſſible, the cauſe, or ſome indications
" of his impotency." D'Aubigné ſeems, at firſt ſight, to have committed a blunder on this occaſion, as if he had aſſerted a thing of Soubiſe, which ought to have been ſaid only of his ſon-in-law. The bo-

Madame de Rohan was known in the world (*b*), ſhe muſt neceſſarily have writ when very young [*D*]. ["This perſon of great abilities, Mr. Baillet, is miſtaken, in imagining "that Catharine was only Mademoiſelle de Parthenay, when, in 1572, ſhe publiſhed "ſome Poems of her writing. See alſo QUELLENEC and ROSE hereunder †."] Some are of opinion that ſhe wrote an apology for Henry IV. [*E*], which, in reality, is a ſharp Satyr.

(*b*) Baillet, *Auteurs deguiſez*, part 3. chap. 3. § 3.

† From the rem. to the Paris edition of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 970.

dies of *Berni and Soubize, were dragged and laid before the Louvre, and expoſed to the view of the Ladies, who, ſurveyed the latter, to ſee whether he was incapable of performing conjugal duty, becauſe a law-ſuit was then depending on that account.* But when the Reader is told that the ſon-in-law aſſumed the ſame name as his father-in-law, the moſt for which we can condemn the Hiſtorian in queſtion is, for not introducing ſome word, by way of diſtinction, as the reſt have done. Mezerai is much more inexcuſable. *Who could believe*, ſays he, page 156, Tom. 5. of his *Abregé chronologique, that of ſo many brave men* (he had juſt before given the names of thoſe Noblemen who were murdered on St. Bartholomew's day, and he had not omitted Francis de Quellevé, that is, the heireſs of Soubiſe's huſband) *Guerchi was the only man who died ſword in hand.* He is much more in fault, in his larger hiſtory; for he not only calls the huſband in queſtion Charles de Quellevé-Pontivy, which is making two perſons one, but he ſuppoſes that Baron du Pont's wife commenced the ſuit againſt her huſband for impotency. Now this is caſting an odium upon her, which Thuanus had not done; he declaring that the mother-in-law only had begun and carried on this law-ſuit. See the article QUELLENEC.

[*D*] *She muſt neceſſarily have writ when very young.*] For ſhe loſt the name of Mademoiſelle de Parthenai, anno 1568, by her marriage with Baron du Pont; and could then be but fourteen years of age, ſince her father and mother were married in May 1553. See the cloſe of the remark [*A*].

[*E*] *Some are of opinion, that ſhe wrote an apology for Henry* IV.] It has been printed as a work of Ducheſs de Rohan, in the new edition of the Journal of Henry III. D'Aubigné ſpeaks of this piece as follows. "He that is deſirous of ſeeing this ſubject treated of "more learnedly, may read the apology for the "King, written by Mr. Cahier, at that time Miniſter to *Madame*. The King ſhewed it to me as a "piece written in Madame de Rohan's ſtyle; 'tis a "prevaricating apology, which Roquelaure having "read, cried, plague! how well the Authors of this "piece are acquainted with what we do! Some aſcribe it to *la Ruffie*, becauſe that, after having diſcourſed concerning the King's temper, which is, to "puniſh for ſervices done, and reward injuries; he "ſays to thoſe who complain of his Majeſty, you "ought to complain of yourſelves, not of him; for "knowing his diſpoſition, if you deſire rewards, "you ſhould have merited them by worthy actions "(11)." Whoever wrote the piece in queſtion, is a perſon of wit and genius; and I very much queſtion whether Peter Victor Cayet was capable of ſetting ſlanders in ſuch a light. Varillas did not know who was pointed at in this ſatyr; for, ſpeaking of Anthony King of Navarre, he ſays (12), *That Catharine de Parthenay, mother to the famous Duke de Rohan, reproached him with having never done ſervice except to thoſe who feared him.* Now it was not this Prince, but Henry IV. his ſon, who was reproached after this manner in the Satyr aſcribed to the Lady in queſtion 13).

(11) *Confeſſ. Catbol. de Sancy*, Liv. 1. chap. 5.

(12) In the advertiſement of Tom. 5. *of the Hiſtory of Hereſy.*

(13) See remark [*Q*.] of the article **HENRY IV.**

PARTHENIUS, Author of a book, entitled, Περὶ ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων, *De Amatoriis Affectionibus*, i. e. concerning the paſſions of love [*A*], was of Nicæa, and lived under Auguſtus. There is no room to doubt but that he lived in this age, ſince his book is dedicated to Cornelius Gallus [*B*]. Many are of opinion that he is the ſame perſon with PARTHENIUS the Poet, who being deprived of his liberty in the time of the Mithridatick war, was reſtored to it in conſideration of his knowledge (*a*). Suidas, who informs us of this circumſtance, ſays that this poet lived till the reign of Tiberius, and aſcribes ſeveral works to him [*C*]. This is doubtleſs the Parthenius who taught Virgil the Greek tongue;

(*a*) See Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græcis*, lib. 2. cap. 1.

[*A*] *Author of a book entitled . . . . concerning the paſſions of Love.*] A Latin tranſlation was made of it, by James Cornarius. This tranſlation was printed with the Greek (1), at Baſil, *in officina Frobeniana*, anno 1531, 8vo. (2). The tranſlator who practiſed phyſick, thought he did not do a thing foreign to his profeſſion in tranſlating this piece; he ſuppoſing that the relations told in it may ſerve as phyſick in the diſeaſe of Love, which ſometimes turns to madneſs or a conſumption. *Mihi ſane ejuſmodi narrationes ac* Φιλτήρια *utiliter adhiberi poſſe videntur, quum in aliis mentium perturbationibus, tum præcipue in morbo quem τῦ ἔρωτ@ medici vocant, qui tam graviter quibuſdam incumbit, ut in maniam, aut phthiſin & febrem* ἰκτικὴν *perducantur. Quæ cauſſa fuit cur ego medicinam profeſſus hæc edere non erubuerim, nihil veritus vulgi medicorum de me judicium, qui hoc tantum nomine boni medici videre geſtiunt, quod ſint egregie purpurati, & quam minimum literarum attigerunt* (3). This work conſiſts only of thirty ſix chapters, and all very ſhort. The adventures related in them are taken from ſome very antient authors, which are now loſt. 'Tis not in verſe as is affirmed by Moreri (4).

(1) Not oppoſite to it, but apart.

(2) There is another edition of Baſil 1555, and an edition of Heidelberg 1601, both in 8vo. ["'Tis printed with *Euſtathii de Iſmeniæ & Iſmenes amoribus, &c.* Latin. Leyden 1618. and alſo in *Hiſtoriæ Poeticæ ſcriptores antiqui, Gr. & Lat. ex recens.* T. Gale. . . Paris 1675.] Rem. by the Tranſl.

(3) Janus Cornarius, *Epiſt. Dedicat.* Parthenii.

(4) This error has been corrected by Le Clerc.

[*B*] *This book is dedicated to Cornelius Gallus.*] The tranſlator conjectures, that the deſign of Parthenius was to conſole Cornelius Gallus, who was run diſtracted for the love of Lycoris. A new motive for his tranſlating and publiſhing this work was, that young perſons, who are of too looſe a diſpoſition, might learn to bridle their affections; but Cornarius obſerves, that this kind of medicament was conſidered by ſome peeviſh cenſors, as a real poiſon. *Hunc autem libellum ad Cornelium Gallum poetam ſcripſit, ut ſuſpicor, furoris ejus leniendi ac conſolandi gratia, in quem ex nimio amore Lycoridis amicæ inciderat, ut eſt apud Virgilium & Tibullum. Qua re poterant ſimili modo ſalubria exempla hinc peti juventuti ad libidinem proclivi, ut & patienter & conceſſa amare pergeret, niſi præ moroſitate aut fatuitate potius, multi etiam remedia ac ſalutaria pharmaca inſtar venerorum prohiberent* (5). I know not why this tranſlator ventures to make conjectures, ſince the text of Parthenius informs him of the reaſon of this dedication. This Author affirms that he dedicated his collection, as a piece that would furniſh materials very ſuitable to the Poems of Cornelius Gallus.

(5) Cornarius, *Epiſt. Dedicat.* Parthenii.

[*C*] *Suidas . . . . . aſcribes ſeveral works to him.*] Elegies on Venus, the praiſe of his wife Areta, and a Poem on her death (6). He does not give the title of the reſt, where he ſpeaks of Parthenius; but ſays, under the word Νίκαια, that Parthenius of Nicæa wrote a book of Metamorphoſes, which is mentioned by Plutarch and Euſtathius. Stephanus Byzantinus cites ſeveral other pieces of Parthenius (7). Suetonius informs us, that Tiberius, writing Greek verſes, imitated, among other Poets, Parthenius, whoſe portrait and works he cauſed to be depoſited in the publick libraries. *Fecit & Græca poemata* (Tiberius) *imitatus Euphorionem, & Rhianum, & Parthenium: quibus poetis admodum delectatus, ſcripta eorum & imagines, publicis bibliothecis inter veteres & præcipuos auctores dedicavit* (8). Caſaubon is of opinion, that the perſon mentioned there, is the Parthenius who has left us the little piece, entitled, *De Amatoriis affectibus* (9). Voſſius is of the ſame opinion (10); but Gyraldi declares that a more antient Parthenius is meant, he who deſcended from Homer. See the following remark.

(6) Suidas *in* Παρθέν@.

(7) See Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc.* lib. 2. cap. 1. and Pinedo, in the Index of Authors cited by Stephanus Byzantinus.

(8) Sueton. *in* Tiberio, cap. 70.

(9) Caſaub. *in* Suetan. ibid.

[*D*] *This*

tongue ; and we muſt not confound him with one PARTHENIUS, who was of the iſland of Chios [*D*], and who wrote verſes on Theſtor his Father, one of Homer's deſcendants (*b*).

(*b*) Suidas, Tom. 2. p. 455.

[*D*] *This is doubtleſs the Parthenius who taught Virgil the Greek tongue ; and we muſt not confound him with one Parthenius, who was of the iſland of Chios.*] It may be proved by the following paſſage, that one Parthenius a Poet inſtructed Virgil in the Greek tongue: *Verſus eſt Parthenii, quo Grammatico in Græcis Virgilius uſus eſt:*

Γλαύκῳ καὶ πρωτῶ καὶ ἰνὼ μελικέρτῃ.
Glauco, & Panopeæ & Inoo Melicertæ (11).

(11) Macrob. Saturn. lib. 5. cap. 18. p. m. 412.

Macrobius had taken this obſervation from Aulus Gellius (12) ; but he added to it, the circumſtance of Virgil's having learnt Greek of Parthenius. A groſs blunder has crept into the place where Voſſius cites Aulus Gellius (13). There are more conſiderable errors in Gyraldi. He obſerves (14) that there have been two Poets named Parthenius, the one of Chios, and the other of Nicela. He of Chios, adds he, was ſirnamed Chaos, and deſcended from Homer. Virgil has imitated him in certain things, as Macrobius and Aulus Gellius obſerve. Probus the Grammarian cites Parthenius's work concerning Lovers. Plutarch likewiſe quotes a hiſtory from it. Stephanus Byzantinus quotes the *Iphiclus* and *Propempticon* of the ſame Author. It is to this Parthenius that Gyraldi refers the paſſage of Suetonius (15). As to Parthenius of Nicæa, he ſpeaks as follows concerning him. It is he who inſtructed Virgil in the Greek tongue, as Macrobius affirms. He compoſed a book of Metamorphoſes; he is the elegiac Poet mentioned by Artemidorus, in the 4th book of Dreams ; he is the Author of the Archelaid, cited by Hephœſtion ; of the Hercules, cited by Stephanus Bizantinus ; and of the work intitled ἐρωτικὰ, dedicated to Cornelius Gallus, and cited by Probus the Grammarian.

(12) Aulus Gellius, lib. 13. cap. 25.

(13) *Ex Parthenio hoc verbum* (read *verſum*) *à Marone expreſſum Gellius refert.* Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc.* lib. 1. p. 164.

(14) Gyrald. de Poetar. *Hiſt. Dial.* 3. p. m. 175.

(15) Cited in the remark [*C*].

One may eaſily perceive that Gyraldus confounds things here in a moſt miſerable manner, and is guilty of contradictions. I do not blame Voſſius for not cenſuring him, nor for not quoting him. The caſt of his work was not ſuch, as to engage him neceſſarily to point out the miſtakes of other writers ; and he perhaps might have found, without Gyraldus's aſſiſtance, all the incidents which he might be ſaid to borrow from him. However this be, I muſt obſerve, that the learned Italian in queſtion takes away, and aſcribes the ſame book, to the ſame Parthenius, in the ſame page. He aſcribes to Parthenius of Chios the treatiſe *de Affectionibus amatoriis* ; and, a little after, to Parthenius of Nicæa. He proves by Macrobius, that Virgil imitated Parthenius of Chios ; and immediately he cites Macrobius, to prove that Parthenius of Nicæa inſtructed Virgil in the Greek tongue : but it is certain, that Macrobius has ſpoke but of the ſame Parthenius. Farther, Giraldi would be greatly puzzled, ſhould he be urged to tell on what ground he aſſerts, that Parthenius, Author of the *Hercules*, is not the ſame perſon with Parthenius who wrote the *Propempticon* and the *Iphiclus*. He knew the titles of thoſe books only by Stephanus Bizantinus's quoting them as the compoſitions of Parthenius. This quotation cannot ſettle their ſeveral ſhares or diviſions, and incline us to conclude rather, that they were all writ by Parthenius of Nicæa. He was better known than the reſt of the Parthenius's ; and therefore we ſhould aſcribe the books cited ſimply under that name to him, rather than to the others. Accordingly we ſee in Stephanus Byzantinus the epithet of φωκαιύς, *Phocenſis*, added to the word Παρθένιος PARTHENIUS in two places (16). This epithet implies, that in all other places, Parthenius cited ſimply, differs from him of Phocæa ; and that, had he been different from him of Nicæa, he would have had the ſirname of his country. Let us obſerve, by the way, that Parthenius of Phocæa ſeems to have lived, at fartheſt, in the fourth century ; for Stephanus Byzantinus (17) cites him under a name which was given to a people on account of Decentius, brother of Magnentius (18). I am alſo to obſerve, that Athenæus, citing a Parthenius different from him of Nicæa, does not cite him ſimply, but adds, for diſtinction ſake, ὁ τοῦ Διονύσου (19), *i. e.* the *ſon of Dionyſius*, according to Dalechamp, or *Diſciple of Dionyſius*, according to Voſſius (20). This Parthenius wrote a work, intitled, περὶ τῶν παρὰ τοῖς ἱστορικοῖς λέξεων ζητωμένων, *de vocabulis quæſitis apud hiſtoricos* (21). Voſſius thought him to be the Diſciple of Dionyſius of Alexandria, a famous Grammarian, who flouriſhed from Nero to the reign of Trajan.

(16) *In* Γόρθυι & *in* Δεκέντιοι.

(17) *In* Δεκέντιοι.

(18) Who was Emperor ſome time, and killed himſelf in 353.

(19) Athen. lib. 11. p. 467, and 501.

(20) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc.* lib. 2. cap. 1.

If any one ſhould aſk me, who that Parthenius is, whom Lucian cites, where he gives the name of ſome poets who writ in a diffuſive manner, I anſwer, that Caſaubon ſuppoſes him to be the ſame with him who dedicated a treatiſe to Cornelius Gallus (22), that is, Parthenius of Nicæa. Ὅμηρος . . . καίτοι ποιητὴς ὤν, παραθεῖ τὸν Τάνταλον, καὶ τὸν Ἰξίονα, καὶ Τιτυὸν, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους. εἰ δὲ Παρθένιος, ἢ Εὐφορίων, ἢ Καλλίμαχος ἔλεγε, πόσοις ἂν οἴει ἔπεσι τὸ ὕδωρ ἄχρι πρὸς τὸ χεῖλος τοῦ Ταντάλου ἤγαγεν ; εἶτα πόσοις ἂν Ἰξίονα ἐκύλισε (23). *i. e.* " Homer, although he be a poet, he yet runs through, " in few words, the ſtories of Tantalus, Ixion, Tityus, and others. But if Parthenius, Euphorion, or " Callimachus, were to write concerning them, " what a number of verſes would they employ to " bring the water to Tantalus's lips ; and how many to make Ixion turn on his wheel."

(21) Athen. lib. 11. p. 467.

(22) Caſaub. in Sueton. *in Tiber.* cap. 70.

(23) Lucian. *de conſcrib. Hiſt.* Tom. 1. p. m. 704.

PARTS (JAMES DES), in Latin *de Partibus*, lived in the 15th Century, and was Phyſician to Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy ; and afterwards to Charles VII. King of France (*a*). Some declare him to have been a native of Toumay, but others affirm that he was born in Paris [*A*]. He was a Canon of the Church of Paris (*b*) ; Canon and Treaſurer of the Church of Toumay (*c*) ; and died in the laſt mentioned city, about the year 1465 (*d*). He was one of the moſt learned men of that age, and wrote books which continued a long time in great reputation [*B*]. I ſhall obſerve hereunder (*e*), that

(*a*) Naudæus, *de Antiq. Scholæ Medicæ Pariſienſis*, p. 48.

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

(*c*) *Lindenius renovat.* p. 468.

(*d*) Riolan. *Recherches ſur les Eſcoles in Medecine, de Paris & de Montpellier*, p. 197.

(*e*) In the note of the article PRÆPOSITUS.

[*A*] *Some declare him to have been a native of Tournay, but others affirm that he was born in Paris.*] Merklinius declares for the firſt of thoſe two opinions. See page 490 of *Lindenius renovatus*. Riolanus declares for the latter ; and he has even employed this circumſtance, to prove that James Ponceau was a Pariſian. " *James des Parts* was a native of Paris. " His works (1) were printed under the direction of " James Ponceau, firſt Phyſician to Charles VIII. at " his return from Italy, and at the King's expence. " Janus Laſcaris, who dedicated this book to James " Ponceau, calls him *patriotam*, the countryman, of " James des Parts, & *ejuſdem artis Profeſſorem* (2), and " profeſſor of the ſame art." The circumſtance, which might make one conclude that this Phyſician to Charles VII. was not born in Tournay, is, becauſe neither Swertius, nor Valerius Andreas Diſſelius, Bibliographers of the Low-Countries, make any mention of him, tho' he was ſo capable of doing honour to his country.

(1) In three large volumes. Riolan. *Recherches des Eſcholes de Medecine*, p. 171.

(2) Ibid. p. 170.

(3) See the preceeding remark.

[*B*] *He wrote books which continued a long time in great reputation.*] The principal of theſe is, his Commentary on Avicen. It was printed at Lions, at the King's expence, and under the direction of James Laſcaris (3), *apud Joannem Trechſel*, anno 1498, in 4 volumes, folio (4). Some declare, that the Phyſicians of Paris concealed this noble work, in order that Foreigners might not enjoy the benefit of it. *Cui* (Jacobo de Partibus) *ſi quemadmodum Tacitus* * *Cæſari concedatis, ut propter magnitudinem cognitionis* (5), *& occupationes rerum, & ſæculi ſui fatum, minus eloquentiâ effecerit, quàm divinum ejus ingenium poſtulabat, habebitis alioqui virum tam celebrem, tam eruditum, tam copioſum, ut non veritus ſit affirmare Joannes Agricola Mediacus Germanus* †, " majores veſtros, quibus com- " mentum illud ingens & vaſtum in Avicennum pri- " mum

(4) *Lindenius renovatus*, p. 490. Geſner ſays anno 1497. Riolanus mentions only three volumes.

* *Lit. de claris Oratoribus.*

(5) It is *cogitaliorum* in ſeveral editions of Tacitus.

† *Epiſt. num cupat. comment. in Galenum de locis affectis.*

that ſome other Phyſicians have ſtole from him. He is the firſt who wrote upon the ſpotted Fever (*f*). The Bagnio-keepers of Paris attempted to aſſaſſinate him, becauſe he adviſed the Magiſtrate, not to permit the uſe of baths during the time of peſtilence [*C*].

(*f*) See the remark [*C*].

" mum obtigerat, centum annos perpetuos apud ſe, " clam, & ſecreto continuiſſe, nulliſque nationibus " aliis hoc communicari ſuſtinuiſſe, prius quàm ſecu- " la quædam annorum περιπλομένων revoluta eſſent." *Sed quidquid ſit de hac hiſtoria, vel potius ex ſubducta temporis ratione non ineleganti fabella, hoc loco mihi venit in mentem quod narratur de veteris Romæ tam catis & cautis Juriſconſultis, qui faſtorum, dierumque ſingulorum rationem penes ſe unos eſſe voluerunt, donec inventus eſt quidam ſcriba Cneius Flavius, qui faſtos ipſos populo ediſcendos proponeret, ſuorumque magiſtrorum tam arcanam, occultamque ſapientiam compilaret, ac pervulgaret* ** : *inventus eſt tandem Janus Laſcaris è Paleologorum familia Princeps Conſtantinopolitanus, qui hoc univerſæ Medicinæ ſacrarium, hoc ſi Diis placet, tectum & involutum non Eleuſiniarum, ſed Pariſienſis Æſculapii myſterium, ſymmiſtis omnibus, omnibus medicis reſeravit, aperit, communicavit.*

** *Videatur præfatio & Epiſt. nuncupat. ejus Operibus ab eodem Laſcaris præfixa.*

Hoc autem imprimum, quod Jacobus de Partibus ab iis omnibus, qui illum præceſſerant, legitimè delatum obtinuit; illud idem diverſâ ratione Joannes Fernelius omnibus, qui eum ſecuturi ſunt, ita præripuit, ut non ſolum medicorum ſeculi decimi quinti Princeps (6), &c. *i. e.* " If " we ſay of James de Partibus, as Tacitus did of " Cæſar, that, on account of the vaſt extent of " his knowledge, the affairs he was engaged in, and " the deſtiny of the age in which he lived; his elo- " quence, I ſay, was therefore not ſo efficacious as " might have been expected from his divine genius; " we ſhall, in other reſpects, have a man ſo renown- " ed, ſo learned, and of ſo fruitful a genius, that " John Agricola, a German Phyſician, did not ſcru- " ple to affirm, as follows, *Your anceſtors, who were " poſſeſſed of that mighty Commentary of Avicen, kept " it ſecretly among themſelves for an hundred years to- " gether, and would not permit other nations to have " the leaſt acquaintance with it, till a great number of " years after.* But what truth ſoever there may be in " this ſtory, or rather, conſidering the time, agree- " able fable enough; it juſt now brings to my re- " membrance, what we are told concerning the ſo " wary and circumſpect Civilians of antient Rome, " who wanted to get poſſeſſed of the regulation of " the ſeveral days, in ſhort, the whole management " of the Calendar, till one Cneius Flavius, a Writer " or Notary, who propoſed that the people ſhould " learn the Calendar by heart, compiled and made " public this hidden wiſdom of thoſe who governed " them: in like manner Janus Laſcaris, a Conſtanti- " nopolitan Prince, of the family of the Paleologi, " has unlocked, opened, and communicated, to all " Phyſicians, this ſacred repoſitory of univerſal me- " dicine, this hidden myſtery, not of the Goddeſs " Ceres, but of the Æſculapius of Paris.

" But this aſcendant and ſuperiority, which James " de Partibus lawfully claimed and obtained from all " his predeceſſors, John Fernelius has, on the con- " trary, forced from all who ſhall ſucceed him, that " he not only is the Prince of Phyſicians of the 15th " century, &c." I was obliged to lengthen this citation, in order that it might ſerve as a proof to the text of this remark.

(6) Naudæus, *de Antiq. Scholæ Medicæ Paris*, p. 48 *& ſeq.*

Among the reſt of the works of James de Partibus, mentioned in the *Lindenius renovatus*, I ſhall mention only the two following. *Summa Alphabetica Morborum ac Remediorum ex libris Meſuæ excerpta. Inventurium ſeu Collectorium receptorum omnium Medicaminum, Confectorum, Pulverum, Pilularum, Emplaſtorum, Unguentorum, & Oleorum, & aliorum cuivis uſui reſervandorum.* In this laſt, neither the year, nor place where printed, are ſet down (7).

(7) *Lindenius renovatus*, p. 491.

[*C*] *The Bagnio-keepers of Paris attempted to aſſaſſinate him.*] The whole paſſage, which I ſhall here cite from Riolanus, is curious, and may be of uſe to this article, for which reaſon I ſhall give it entire. " I " cannot bear to hear *Fracaſtorius, a very learned Ita- " lian Phyſician*, where he ſpeaks of the ſpotted fe- " ver, in his treatiſe *de Morbis contagioſis*, ſay, that it " was not known in France, anno 1529, when An- " drew Naugier ††, Embaſſador from the Repub- " lic of Venice, died of that fever in Blois. I can " prove that it was deſcribed a little after the year 1500, " by Sebaſtian Montuus, in his *Opuſcula*; and that, " at the cloſe of the 14th century (8), one James des " Parts, a Phyſician of Paris, firſt wrote, in a clear " and learned manner enough, on that diſeaſe, and " cured it by letting blood. It is he himſelf, who " informs us that, in his time, baths and ſtoves were " ſo common in Paris; that having adviſed the " Magiſtrates to prohibit them during the plague, " the Bagnio-keepers would have murdered him, had " he not made his eſcape (9)."

†† This is Andrew Navagero. See his article.] Rem. by the Tranſl.

(8) It ſhould be the 15th. *Naudæus de Antiq. Scholæ Medic. Paris.* p. 48. commits the ſame error.

Riolanus afterwards quotes ſix Latin verſes, written by Brixianus, an Italian, in which the city of Paris is applauded *for its baths and ſtoves* in the beginning of the 16th century; and it appears by Peter Matthieu (10), that when the Queen made her entrance into Paris, anno 1466, four baths were ſet up for her Majeſty and the Ladies, at John Dauvet's, the firſt Preſident. He ranks this (11) in the number of the ſenſual pleaſures of Lewis XI. *which were no ways common, and little known to the Kings of France, his Predeceſſors.* He is of opinion, that the Prince in queſtion brought *this practice from Flanders*; and cites Philip de Comines, who ranks baths among the *corruptions which peace had brought into the Low-Countries.* But the particulars I have related from James des Parts, ſhew that baths were very much uſed in Paris, before Lewis XI. returned from Flanders.

(9) Riolan. *Recherches des Eſcholes de Medecine*, p. 217, 218.

(10) Matthieu, *Hiſt. de Louis* XI. in the beginning, p. m. 273.

(11) Ibid. Liv. 12. p. 733.

PASCAL (BLAISE), one of the ſublimeſt genius's the world ever produced, was born at Clermont in Auvergne, the 29th of June 1623. He never had any Preceptor but his Father, who was a very learned man [*A*], an able Mathematician, and Preſident of the Court of Aids in the Province where he lived; and had an extreme affection for this child, his only ſon (*a*). This great affection prompted him to quit his employment, and to go and ſettle at Paris in 1631, in order that he might employ his time to greater advantage in the inſtruction of his ſon, who, from his infancy, gave indications of a genius greatly ſuperior to the generality of mankind; *for he always deſired to have a reaſon for every thing . . . . and could never yield to any point but what appeared to him evidently true, ſo that whenever good reaſons were not given him, he would ſearch for better in his own mind; and whenever he applied himſelf to a ſubject, he never left it till he had found ſome reaſon that was ſatisfactory to him* (*b*). Having ſuch a caſt of mind, there was juſt reaſon to

(*a*) He had two daughters, one of whom was a Nun of Port-Royal, and the other wife to Mr. Perier.

(*b*) *Paſcal's Life*, by Mrs. Perier, p. 5.

[*A*] *His father . . . . . was a very learned man.*] His name was Stephen Pascal. He was born anno 1588, *at Clement in Auvergne, and deſcended from one of the beſt families in that Province. His father was treaſurer of France at Riom; and his mother, who alſo was ſurnamed Paſcal, was daughter of the Seneſchal of Auvergne in Clermont* (1). Stephen Paſcal *left the Province (country) after reſigning his employment of Preſident to one of his brothers, and retired to Paris as being a place advantageous* to the deſign he had formed of beſtowing a good education on his ſon (2). He joined with Mr. de Roberval, in anſwering the objections of Des Cartes, in oppoſition to a work of Mr. de Fermat, *de maximis & minimis* (3); but he had little or no concern in the conſequences of that diſpute, he leaving Paris, and *withdrawing to a ſolitude, for*

(1) Baillet, *Vie de Des-Cartes*, Tom. 1. p. 332.

(2) Ibid.

(3) Idem, p. 331, ad ann. 1638.

to fear that he would turn Free-Thinker; and yet he never was tainted with that fault, but diſtinguiſhed with the utmoſt exactneſs, ſo long as he lived, between the laws of faith and thoſe of reaſon [B]. The manner in which it is ſaid he learnt the mathematicks ſeems ſomething miraculous [C]; as well as the great progreſs he made in them, in a very ſhort time [D]: but the particulars we are told concerning his piety and humility (c), are almoſt

(c) See the rem. [G].

for fear leſt his preſence ſhould exaſperate ſome perſons in power who were offended, and prompt them to deprive him of his liberty. The diſgrace into which he imagined himſelf fallen, was only the conſequence of that of one of his intimate friends, who had been ſeized and carried to the Baſtile, for ſome commotions raiſed into the town-houſe. Paſcal firmly perſuaded of the uprightneſs of his friend's heart, had obſerved that there was more of ill-fortune than guilt in the manner in which he had raiſed the diſturbance. He therefore had not barely contented himſelf with ſpeaking in his friend's favour, but had alſo ventured to undertake the defence of ſeveral perſons, who had been unjuſtly treated and oppreſſed by ſome venal ſpirited officers. He likewiſe had been informed, that this incident had been related, with ſome very odious circumſtances, to Chancellour Seguier; and therefore, the fear of his having diſpleaſed that Nobleman, (the firſt Magiſtrate in the Kingdom) had prompted him to retire, to prevent the effects of his reſentment. He continued about a twelve-month in his retirement, till Cardinal de Richelieu, informed of his merit and of the cauſe of his retirement, by the Ducheſs d'Aiguillon and the Chancellor himſelf, recalled him in 1639; *and appointed him, a little after, intendant of Normandy in Roan* (4). He died in 1651 (5); having contracted a friendſhip with Des Cartes.

(4) Baillet, *Vie de Des Cartes*, Tom. 1. p. 339, 340.

(5) Ibid. p. 832.

[B] *He diſtinguiſhed exactly, ſo long as he lived, between the laws of reaſon and thoſe of faith.*] Here follows what we are told in his life written by Mrs. Perier his ſiſter. "He had been hitherto (6) pre-
(6) That is, till the age of 24.
"ſerved, by a peculiar protection of the Almighty, "from all the vices incident to youth; and, a circum-"ſtance that is ſtill more ſurprizing in a perſon of "his turn of mind, and character, he had never in-"dulged himſelf in free-thinking, having always "reſtrained his curioſity to the ſtudy of natural "things. He has frequently told me, that he added "this obligation to all the reſt he owed to my fa-"ther, who, himſelf, having the higheſt reverence "for religion, had inſpired him from his infancy "with the like regard for it; laying it down as a "maxim to him, that whatever is the object of "faith cannot be the object of reaſon, and much "leſs be ſubject to it. Theſe maxims, which were "often repeated by a father, for whom he always "had the higheſt regard, and whom he ſaw to be a "perſon of very great erudition, heightned with "the cleareſt and moſt powerful way of reaſoning, "made ſo ſtrong an impreſſion on his mind, that "none of the diſcourſes or arguments of the Free-"Thinkers could make the leaſt impreſſion on him; "and though very young, he conſidered them as "perſons who laid down the following principles, "*viz.* that human reaſon is ſuperior to all things, "and who don't know the nature of faith: thus "this great, this extenſive, this very inquiſitive and "enlightned mind, which ſo induſtriouſly and care-"fully ſought for the cauſe and reaſon of all things, "was, at the ſame time, as ſubmiſſive to all things "which relate to religion, as a child, and this ſim-"plicity prevailed in him all his life time: inſo-"much that, even after he had formed a reſolution "to apply himſelf to no other ſtudy but that of re-"ligion, he never applied himſelf to ſuch queſtions "in Divinity as were of a curious nature; but em-"ployed the whole power and ſtrength of the facul-"ties of his mind, in informing himſelf, and prac-"tiſing, the perfection of Chriſtian Morality, to "which he conſecrated all the talents that God had
(7) *Vie de Paſcal*, p. 12, 13.
"beſtowed upon him (7)." [*Paſcal's father came to Paris, purpoſely that he might have an opportunity of devoting all his time to his ſon's education, which it would have been impoſſible for him to do in the country, he being ſo much taken up with the exerciſe of his employment and in viſiting his friends. The chief maxim he went upon in educating his ſon was, to always keep him, as it were above his work, that is, not to let him be employed in any ſtudy but what he could comprehend with eaſe. For this reaſon he did not permit him to learn Latin till he was twelve years old; before which he had inſtructed him in a great number of particulars that were eaſier learnt* *.]

* Perrault's *Hommes illuſtres*, Tom. 1. p. 215, 216. Paris 1701, 12mo. Addit. by the Tranſl.

[C] *The manner in which it is ſaid he learnt the Mathematicks is ſomething miraculous.*] His father perceiving in him a ſtrong inclination (8) *to matters of reaſoning*, was afraid that the knowledge of the Mathematicks *would prevent his learning the languages. This made him reſolve to prevent him, as much as lay in his power, from applying* himſelf to Geometry. *Accordingly he locked up all the books which treated of it, and even forbore to ſpeak any thing concerning that ſcience to his friends, when his ſon was preſent.* But he nevertheleſs could not refuſe to make the general anſwer following, to his ſon's important curioſity: *Geometry is a ſcience, which teaches the method of making figures with truth and exactneſs, and to find out the proportions they bear to one another*; but *at the ſame time he commanded him never to ſpeak or meditate any more upon them.* The child (9), merely from this opening, began *to reflect and meditate during the hours allowed him for recreation*, and to draw figures with coal, on the floor of the room. He ſought for the proportions of figures; formed to himſelf definitions, axioms, and afterwards demonſtrations; *and carried his enquiries ſo far, that he attained to the* 32 *propoſition of the firſt book of Euclid:* for his father having ſurprized him one day, in the midſt of his figures, *and aſked him what he was doing; he replied, that he was ſearching for ſuch a thing, which was that very propoſition in* Euclid. *He afterwards aſked him how he came to think on this, to which he anſwered, that he had found out another thing (which he told him) and in this manner going backwards, and explaining every thing by the terms right line and circle, he went back to the definitions and axioms he had formed to himſelf.* The reader may ſee all this at large, with the conſequences that enſued upon it, in the authors cited by me in the margin (10). I have mentioned elſewhere a particular, which is ſomething like this, and relates to father Maignan. See his article, remark [E].

(8) Preface to the *Equilibrium of Fluids*. See alſo Mrs. Perier, *Vie de Paſcal*. p. 6.

(9) He was then but twelve years old. Mrs. Perier, ibid. *and the Preface to the Equilibrium of Fluids.*

(10) *Preface to the Equilibrium of Fluids.* Mrs. Perier, *Vie de Paſcal.* Mr. Baillet, *Enfans celebres*, article 77.

[D] . . . . . *the great progreſs he made in them, in a very ſhort time.*] Mr. le Pailleur being told the above-mentioned particulars, adviſed Mr. Paſcal, who informed him of them, not to reſtrain his ſon any longer. Mr. Paſcal took his advice, and accordingly put Euclid's Elements into the hands of his ſon, who (11), "underſtood them without wanting the leaſt "aſſiſtance; and immediately made ſo great a pro-"greſs in it, that he, from this time, went regularly "to the conferences which were held every week, "where all the ableſt men in Paris uſed to aſſemble, "either to carry their works, or examine thoſe of "others. Young Paſcal had his ſeat there, as a "Member, to bring his own works or examine the "compoſitions of other perſons. He himſelf brought "as many new pieces as any of the Members; and "ſometimes diſcovered errors in the propoſitions that "were examining, which others had overlooked. "And nevertheleſs he employed only his hours al-"lowed him for recreation, in the ſtudy of Geome-"try; he then learning the languages under his fa-"ther. But finding, in thoſe ſciences, the truth "which he was paſſionately fond of in all things; "he made ſuch prodigious advancement in them, "though this application was not very great, that he "wrote at ſixteen years of age a Treatiſe on Conic "Sections, which, in the judgment of perſons of "the greateſt abilities, was looked upon as an aſto-"niſhing effort of the human mind. And therefore "Mr. Des Cartes, who had been in Holland for a "long time, having read it, and heard that it was "the performance of a youth of ſixteen years old, "believed that the father was the real Author of it; "and that he was willing to deprive himſelf of the "fame and glory which was juſtly his, in order to "transfer it to his ſon, rather than imagine that a "child of that age was capable of compiling a "book

(11) Idem, ibid. p. 8 & *ſeq.*

moſt as wonderful [*E*]. After having employed himſelf very aſſiduouſly in making experiments

" book in which ſo great a ſtrength of reaſoning " was required; ſhewing by his backwardneſs in " believing a circumſtance that was matter of fact, " that it was in reality incredible and prodigious. [*It was thought that no ſuch effort of genius had been ſeen ſince Archimedes's time. As our Paſcal was never ſollicitous after fame, he would not let it be printed, notwithſtanding the entreaties of his father's friends, who earneſtly deſired it, both on account of the excellency of the performance, and the circumſtance of the Author's age, which greatly heightned his merit* *.] " At nineteen years of age he found out that " admirable arithmetical machine (12), which has " been looked upon as one of the moſt extraordinary " inventions that was ever ſeen. [*By this inſtrument, calculations of every kind are not only done without the help of pen or counters, but without the perſon's knowing one ſingle rule in Arithmetick, or running the leaſt hazard of miſtaking. It was two years before he brought it to the perfection in which we now ſee it; a circumſtance that was not owing to any difficulty he met with in inventing the motions, but from the trouble it put him to, to make the workmen underſtand them perfectly* *.] " And " afterwards having ſeen, when twenty three years " of age, the Torricellian experiment, he invented, " and made a great number of new experiments in " that taſte." I muſt not omit the very early exertions he gave of his exalted genius. " When he " was but eleven years old, ſome perſon, at dinner, " happening to ſtrike accidentally a fine Delft-ware " diſh with a knife, young Paſcal obſerved that it " made a ſtrong ſound; but that the inſtant a perſon " laid his hand upon the plate the ſound ceaſed. " He at the ſame time was deſirous of finding out " the cauſe of it; and this experiment having engaged him to the making of ſeveral others upon " ſounds, he obſerved ſo many things about them, " that he drew up a little treatiſe on that ſubject, " which was looked upon as extremely judicious and " ſolid (13)." Here follows a particular that deſerves to be related. A man of genius, who has rallied in a delicate manner (14) the authors of the Preface above-cited (15), introduces Des Cartes ſpeaking as follows. " This man (16) is fortunate " in point of reputation. Many people were formerly made to believe, that he had compoſed, " merely from his own fund, a book of Conic Sections at ſixteen years of age. This book was ſent " me; and, before I had gone half through it, I " judged * that he had extracted a great number of " things in it from Mr. des Argues; a circumſtance " that was confirmed to me ſoon after, by his own " confeſſion (17)." The author, who puts theſe words into Des Cartes's mouth, immediately anſwers him as follows (18). *What you tell me here ſurprizes me a little; ſince, in the Preface to a treatiſe on the equilibrium of Fluids, printed after Mr. P's * death, your teſtimony, with regard to this article, is cited, and it does not agree directly with what you now tell me: for no mention is there made of his having been aſſiſted by Mr. des Argues. All that is ſaid there is, that the thing appeared to you ſo incredible and wonderful, that you could not be prevailed upon to believe it. That you was perſuaded, that the work in queſtion was in reality the compoſition of P——'s father, and that he was deſirous to transfer the honour of it to his ſon.* Des Cartes replies, *I know not what I have been made to think or ſay in that Preface; but this I am certain of, that I ſay nothing to you at this time, but what I wrote in expreſs terms to father Merſenne, as ſoon as the work in queſtion had been communicated to me.* I doubtleſs may be allowed to obſerve, that the Author of this Dialogue does not cite exactly Des Cartes's words, as written to Father Merſenne. The words of the letter are as follow (19): " I have alſo received young Mr. Paſcal's Eſſay on Conic Sections; and before I had read it " half through, I judged that he had been taught " by Mr. Des Argues, a circumſtance that was preſently afterwards confirmed to me by his own con" feſſion." This ſignifies evidently, that Mr. Paſcal, a little after the middle of his book, confeſſes that he had received great light from Mr. des Argues; but the words of the Dialogue intimate plainly, that Paſcal made this confeſſion, in a letter written by him to Des Cartes; which would prompt one to believe, that our youth, hearing that this Philoſopher ſuſpected that he had been taught by Mr. des Argues, wrote a letter to confeſs the juſtice of his ſuſpicion. Such are the conſequences that flow naturally from the relation made by the Author of the Dialogues; whence we muſt conclude that he miſleads his readers, and prompts him to form to himſelf a falſe idea of this fact. Nevertheleſs, the objection remains ſtill very ſtrong againſt the Preface of the Equilibrium of Fluids; for, after all, Des Cartes does not write one circumſtance to Father Merſenne, expreſſive of his admiration of young Paſcal; he does not beſtow one elogium upon him; does not give any approbation of the treatiſe on Conic Sections, and ſays not one word in praiſe or diſpraiſe of it. Where then is this teſtimony which is pretended he gave, *that he looked upon this work as incredible and wonderful* (20)? Here it will be anſwered, that it is in another letter that was never printed: but to this it muſt be added, and that was never writ to Father Merſenne; for had ſuch a letter been writ to him, Baillet would have quoted it, and not have been contented with referring us to the Preface on the Equilibrium of Fluids. Baillet informs us of three particulars. 1. That de Roberval, le Pailleur, and the reſt of Paſcal's friends, were diſpleaſed at Des Cartes for writing to Father Merſenne. *And that they inveighed againſt his opinion, as being uncomplaiſant, ſince it related to a youth of ſuch rare and uncommon merit: in which they were followed by the Port Royal, who gave an advice, on this ſubject, to Mr. Clercelier, after he had publiſhed this teſtimony of Des Cartes, in the firſt impreſſion of his Letters* (21). 2. That this great Philoſopher, grounding his belief on probability, could not be perſuaded that ſo good a work had been writ by a child. He therefore diſcovered to his friend his *ſentiments on this matter, without the leaſt artifice or diſguiſe.* He choſe to ſeek, for the work in queſtion, *an Author among the moſt profound Mathematicians, rather than run the hazard of loſing, on other occaſions, the credit he had obtained with thoſe who knew him to be ſincere, by the facility with which he would have believed a thing, of the truth whereof he could not perſuade others, on his bare word. For this reaſon, after making ſome enquiries which cleared up the matter, he ſaw that he could not with any probability aſcribe any part of the work in queſtion to his friend des Argues,* " *he* † *choſe rather* " *to conclude that Paſcal's father was the true Author* " *of it, than to believe that ſuch a youth could have* " *writ a book with ſo much ſtrength of reaſoning*". 3. *That Des Cartes might alſo have been led, by the appearance of probability, into an error about fact, when, upon recollecting the intimate correſpondence between Mr. des Argues and Meſſieurs Paſcal, and finding, in the treatiſe of this young Author, who was but ſixteen years of age, ſome things which he imagined he had ſeen a little before in des Argues's piece; he therefore might conclude that the laſt mentioned had been concerned in writing this treatiſe, eſpecially as young Paſcal cited des Argues there* (22). We cannot form a juſt judgment of this diſpute, till we have cleared up the two particulars following; the firſt, whether it be true that Des Cartes renouncing his firſt opinion, declared in his letter, that Mr. Paſcal's father had transferred to his ſon the fame and honour of his Conic Sections: but this does not appear either by his printed letters; by his manuſcript letters peruſed by Baillet, nor by any other circumſtantial proof: we have nothing, on this ſubject, but the random teſtimony of the publiſhers of the Equilibrium of Fluids. The other particular neceſſary to be cleared up is, to know in what terms des Argues is mentioned in Paſcal's Treatiſe. If he is but barely named in it, Des Cartes did very wrong, in aſſerting that Paſcal owned that he had been inſtructed by des Argues: but if Paſcal made ſuch a confeſſion, his friends, and thoſe of his Father, acted very unjuſtly in complaining of Des Cartes.

[*E*] *The particulars we are told concerning his piety . . are wonderful.*] I ſhall ſpeak more largely of this below (23), and will here mention but one proof of it. *In the four laſt years of his life, as he was not able to undergo any fatigue, his chief delight was to go and viſit thoſe Churches where relicks were ſhewn, or ſome ſolemnity*

* Addit. by the Tranſl.

(12) He preſented one of them to the King, one to the Chancellor, and afterwards gave another to Mr. Carcavi. See Baillet, *Vie de Des Cartes*, Tom. 2. p. 378.

* Perrault's *Hommes illuſtres*, Tom. 1. p. 217. Addit. by the Tranſl.

(13) *Preface to the Equilibrium of Fluids.*

(14) See, *Voyage to the World of* Des Cartes, p. 191, 192. Dutch edition.

(15) That of the *Equilibrium of Fluids.*

(16) *i. e.* Mr. Paſcal.

* Tom. 2. Let. 38.

(17) *Voyage to the World of* Des Cartes, p. 188.

(18) Ibid. p. 189.

* Mr. Paſcal. Tom. 2. Let. 38.

(19) Des Cartes, Tom. 2. Lett. 38. p. m. 217.

(20) *Preface to the Equilibrium of Fluids.*

† *Preface to the Equilibrium of Fluids.*

(21) Baillet, *Vie de* Des Cartes, Tom. 2. p. 40. ad ann. 1639, 1640.

(22) Baillet, *Vie de* Des Cartes, Tom. 2. p. 41.

(23) In the rem. [*G*].

periments according to the new Philoſophy, he quitted his ſtudy [*F*], and *every other kind of learning, to apply himſelf wholly to that only thing which Chriſt calls neceſſary* (*d*). He was not yet four and twenty, when the peruſal of ſome books of devotion inſpired him with this holy reſolution. The patience he ſhewed in his long and repeated illneſſes, may alſo juſtly excite our wonder [*G*]; and we ought ſcarce leſs to admire his frame of mind, with regard to thoſe who offended him, and towards ſuch as were wanting in the obedience

(*d*) *Vie de* Paſcal, p. 12.

ſolemnity practiſed; and for this purpoſe he kept a ſpiritual almanack, pointing out the places where any particular devotion was paid; and he behaved on thoſe occaſions with much devotion and ſimplicity, that all who ſaw him were ſurprized; which gave riſe to the fine ſaying following of a very virtuous and learned perſon, viz. *that the grace of God diſcovers itſelf, in perſons of exalted genius, by little things; and in the vulgar part of mankind, by great things* (24).

(24) Mrs. Perier, *vie de* Paſcal, p. 40.

[*F*] *After having employed himſelf very aſſiduouſly, in making experiments according to the new Philoſophy, he quitted this ſtudy.*] The firſt experiment he made was that of Toricellius, which he repeated ſeveral times (25), *and drew ſeveral conſequences from it, for the proof of which he made ſeveral experiments, in the preſence of the moſt conſiderable inhabitants of Roan* (26), *where he then reſided* (27). . . . . *He printed them in* 1647, *and made a little book of them, which he diſperſed all over France, and in foreign countries. . . . . The ſame year, he was informed of a reflexion that Toricellius had made,* viz. *that the air is heavy; and that it's weight or gravity might be the cauſe of all the effects which till then had been aſcribed to the horror of a vacuum. He thought this a very noble reflection; but as this was merely conjecture, and that there were no proofs; in order to diſcover the truth or falſity of it, he made ſeveral experiments . . . . . which not giving him entire ſatisfaction, he meditated, at the cloſe of the year* 1647, *the famous experiment which was made in* 1648. *The ſucceſs of this experiment, which he repeated ſeveral times, . . confirmed him entirely in Toricellius's experiment with regard to the gravity of the air; gave him afterwards an opportunity of drawing ſome very noble and very uſeful conſequences from it; and of making ſeveral other experiments; which he inſerted in a large treatiſe written by him at that time, wherein he fully explained that matter, and anſwered all the objections that were made to him. But this treatiſe is loſt; or rather, being a great lover of conciſeneſs, he himſelf* reduced it to two little tracts that were publiſhed after his death, one whereof is entitled, *Of the Equilibrium of Fluids*, and the other, *Of the Weight of the Atmoſphere.*

(25) *Preface to the Equilibrium of Fluids.*

(26) His father was Intendant there.

(27) *i. e. anno* 1646. See Baillet, *vie de* Des Cartes, Tom. 2. p. 328.

We muſt not omit the reproach caſt upon him, of not behaving with due gratitude towards Des Cartes. I will cite the Dialogues of a modern Author (28). " Here Mr. Des Cartes interrupted me, and aſked, what " was this experiment of Mr. P. . . s' *? I anſwer'd, " that it was the experiment which was made in " 1648, on le Puy de Domme, with the Torricellian " Tube, in which the quick ſilver did not riſe near " ſo high on the top of the mountain, as in the mid- " dle and at the foot of it; whence the gravity or " weight of the air was evidently inferred. This, " replied Mr. Des Cartes, is called Mr. P. . . . .'s " experiment. . . . . 'Tis therefore becauſe he per- " formed it, or got it performed by Mr. Perrier: " for certainly 'tis not becauſe he invented, or fore- " ſaw the ſucceſs of it. And if this experiment " ought to be named from the inventor of it, it " might more juſtly have been called † Des Car- " tes's experiment: for it was I who deſired him, " two years before (29), to make it; and who aſ- " ſured him of the ſucceſs, as being entirely con- " formable to my principles; for otherwiſe this " could never have come once into his head, he be- " ing of a contrary opinion." Baillet has confirmed the juſtice of this reproach, he informing us, under the year 1647 (30), of what follows. *Deſcartes overjoyed at Mr. Paſcal's diſcourſe, found that all theſe experiments were conformable enough to the principles of his Philoſophy, although Paſcal † ſtill oppoſed them, as being of the ſame opinion with Mr. Roberval, and thoſe who maintained a vacuum. But in return for his converſation, he adviſed him * to make other experiments on the Atmoſphere, to whoſe weight, as we before obſerved, he referred what the vulgar Philoſopher had vainly aſcribed to the horror of a vacuum* †. *He aſſured him of the ſucceſs of theſe experiments, though he himſelf had not tried them, becauſe he ſpoke of them as conformable to his principles. Paſcal, who promiſed, at that time, to offer ſome objections to his* Materia Subtilis, *would perhaps have paid no great regard to his advice, had he not been informed, about the ſame time, of much ſuch a reflection which had occurred to Toricellius. The experiments he made about the weight* § *of the air in* 1648, *on this advice, were very ſucceſsful: but he choſe rather to own his obligation to Torricellius than to Deſcartes, who was deprived of his acknowledgments, both in* ‖ *his letter to Mr. de Ribeyre, firſt Preſident of the Court of Aydes of Clermont-Ferrand, in which he gives the hiſtory of his experiments; and in the Preface written by a friend of his to his poſthumous Treatiſe on the Equilibrium of Fluids, and the weight of the air.* 'Tis plain that Paſcal is not juſtified with reſpect to Des Cartes, as *he had juſt before been with regard to Toricellius, in the following words* (31). " The fame of theſe experiments being " ſpread in Paris, they had been confounded with " thoſe of Italy; and, in this confuſion, ſome aſ- " cribed them all to Paſcal, and others would not al- " low him to be the Author of one of them. Mr. " Paſcal, to inform the publick of this particular " with all its circumſtances; and to do juſtice to all " the perſons who had contributed to this invention, " Paſcal had determined, the year following, to " print an exact relation of the experiments he had " made in Normandy; and had written a Preface, " in which he pointed out thoſe of Italy, the author " of which he did not then know, any more than " his name, which was not known in Paris, till Ca- " valier del Pozzo ſent word from Rome, that the " famous Toricellius, who died about the ſame time, " was the man. This plain concealment of the " name of a perſon, whom Paſcal otherwiſe pre- " ferred to all the Geometricians of antiquity, made " ſome ſuſpect that he deſigned to act the plagiary " with reſpect to Torricellius; and even to believe, " though falſely, that he alſo had ſtole from the fa- " mous Capuchin's *Valerian Magni* (32)." [*The arguments which Paſcal's friends have made, in his favour, againſt the Capuchin, are not near ſo good as that which can be brought to prove, that Paſcal had ſtole from Peter Petit, intendant of the fortifications, and a naturaliſt of good repute at that time. 'Tis as follows. Paſcal did not make his experiments on mercury till* 1647, *whereas Petit had made his at Paris in* 1646. *This laſt circumſtance is an undoubted fact; and is proved in page* 208 *of the* Journal des Savans, *of the 26th of April* 1666. In the citations above (28) (30), *Des Cartes is ſuppoſed to have been the inventor of this experiment among the French: but Petit did not allow this, he declaring that he had taught it Des Cartes. See* Petit's *Traité* Des Cometes, *p.* 222 *.]

(28) *Voyage du Monde de* Des Cartes, p. 188.

* Mr. Paſcal.

† *Lettre* 77 *de* Des Cartes, Tom. 3.

(29) Des Cartes is miſtaken in a year, he deſired Mr. Paſcal to do this in 1647, and the Experiment was made in 1648. See Baillet's *Life of* Des Cartes, Tom. 2. p. 330. I will quote his words immediately.

(30) Baillet, *vie de* Des Cartes, Tom. 2. 330.

† *Lettres.* MS. to Merſenne, dated April 4. 1648.

* Tom. 3. of the Letters, p. 443. 438.

§ See the MS. Letters of Des Cartes to Merſenne, of Dec. 13. 1647. Feb. 7. 1648. Jan. 31. 1648. and April 4. 1648.

‖ Of July 12, 1651.

(31) Baillet, *vie de* Des Cartes, Tom. 2. p. 329.

† Mr. Auzout declares that he gave the ſame advice, at the ſame time, to Paſcal.

Immediately after all theſe experiments, which confirmed Paſcal in the opinion of the weight of the air, he (33) applied himſelf to more ſerious ſtudies, *which gave him ſo great a diſtaſte for the Mathematicks and Phyſicks, that he quitted them entirely. For though he ſince wrote a treatiſe on the* Cycloid, *under the name of Ettonville; this is no ways contrary to what I ſay, becauſe he found every thing contained in it by chance, and without applying himſelf to it; and wrote it only to make it ſubſervient to a deſign entirely remote from the Mathematicks, and from all curious ſciences, as will perhaps be ſhewn one day* (34).

[*G*] *The patience he ſhewed in his long and repeated illneſſes, may alſo juſtly excite our wonder.*] His ſiſter informs us of ſeveral particulars, from which I will copy but one. " This his ardent charity, during " his ſickneſs, was heightned by ſuch admirable pa- " tience, as edified and ſurprized all Perſons about " him. And he often ſaid to thoſe who were griev- " ed at his calamitous condition; that, with regard " to

(32) The ſequel of this paſſage.

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. vol. 2. p. 970. in which we are told of the conviction of this Capuchin, is in remark [*B*] of the article MAGNI.

(33) *Preface to the Equilibrium of Fluids*, near the end. See alſo Mrs. Perier, *vie de* Paſcal, p. 12.

(34) See Mrs. Perier, *vie de* Paſcal, p. 24, 25.

ence due to the King. He was regardleſs and inſenſible with reſpect to the faults of the former, but irreconcileable to the latter [*H*]. He died in Paris the 19th of Auguſt 1662, aged

" to himſelf, it did not give him the leaſt uneaſineſs, " and that all he was afraid of was, that he ſhould " recover. And when he was aſked the reaſon of " this, he uſed to ſay, it is becauſe I know the dan- " ger of health, and the advantage of ſickneſs. He " uſed likewiſe to ſay, when in the greateſt pain, " when the people about him were afflicted to ſee " him ſuffer; do not pity me; ſickneſs is the natu- " ral State of Chriſtians, becauſe they are then as " they ought always to be, *viz.* in a ſuffering condi- " tion; deprived of every bleſſing and the ſeveral " pleaſures of the ſenſes; free from all paſſions " which diſturb us during the whole courſe of our " lives; void of ambition, of avarice, and waiting " continually for death. Ought not Chriſtians to " ſpend their lives in this manner; and is it not a " great happineſs for a man to find himſelf, through " neceſſity, in the ſtate in which he is under an obli- " gation to be; and that all he has to do, is to ſub- " mit himſelf humbly and peaceably? For this rea- " ſon, all I deſire to do is, to beſeech God to grant " me that grace. Such was the temper with which " he ſuffered all his evils (35)." The author of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* has made ſome reflections on this occaſion; and on the advantage that may be drawn from the extraordinary devotion of ſo excellent a Mathematician, and great a Philoſopher. 'Tis of ſervice, ſays he, to refute Free-Thinkers; *they cannot now ſay, that none but perſons of mean genius are indued with a ſpirit of piety* (36). It muſt be confeſſed, that we very rarely ſee perſons, who have once taken a pleaſure in mathematical ſtudies, and made a vaſt progreſs in them, extraordinarily devout. I know not whether we may ſay of them, what Abbé Furetiere ſaid of attornies. "There " are Saints who have been counſellours, bailiffs, nay, " players (37); in fine, there is no profeſſion, how " mean ſoever, but Saints have been of it, that of an " attorney excepted (38)." Mention is made of a Pariſh-Prieſt, who adopted a maxim like that of Paſcal, but it was with reſpect to another, and not to himſelf. I remember that a query is put to Bouchet's Serées; *Whether a Pariſh-Prieſt acted well, in refuſing to pray for the recovery of a pariſhioner of his, who had ſent for him in order to implore Heaven for the recovery of his health? For the Pariſh-Prieſt having aſked him, whether he was the better Chriſtian, in ſickneſs or in health; and the ſick man replying, that it was when God viſited him: it will therefore be better, replied his Pariſh-Prieſt, that you continue ſick, in order that you may be a better man* (39). What the Prieſt did on this occaſion is no very difficult thing; but had he himſelf defired, when afflicted with a grievous fit of ſickneſs, that people ſhould pray to God that it might continue, this would have been very extraordinary.

Some things in Paſcal's conduct and behaviour are as ſurprizing as his maxims with regard to health. " The converſations, in which he was frequently en- " gaged, though they were all on the ſubject of cha- " rity, he yet was ſometimes afraid leſt they ſhould be " of a dangerous conſequence; but as he could not in " conſcience refuſe the aid and relief which people " ſued to him for, he had found out a remedy for " this. He uſed to take occaſionally an iron girdle " ſtuck full of points, and put this round him, next " to his fleſh; ſo that whenever any vain thought " came into his mind, or took any delight in the " place he was in, or any thing like this happened; " he would ſtrike himſelf with his elbow, to make " the points run deeper, and in this manner put him- " ſelf in mind of his duty (40)." The *two great maxims following* were always in his mind, *viz. to renounce every kind of pleaſure, and all ſuperfluity. He practiſed them when moſt grievouſly afflicted with ſickneſs; watching perpetually over his ſenſes, and abſolutely refuſing to gratify them in all ſuch things as were moſt pleaſing to them: and whenever neceſſity forced him to do any thing which might give him ſome ſatisfaction, he had a wonderful art to take off his mind from it, in order that it might have no ſhare in it: for inſtance, being forced, becauſe of the perpetual ſickneſs with which he was afflicted, to eat food of a dainty kind, he took great care not to taſte what he eat* (41). He did not indulge himſelf much in thoſe he loved (42), and uſed to adviſe others not to permit any perſon *to love them in a very high degree; this is a fault which people did not meditate enough upon, becauſe they did not ſufficiently comprehend the greatneſs of it; and did not reflect, that in cheriſhing and entertaining ſuch ardent affections, they poſſeſſed or employed a heart which ought to be devoted to God only: and that it was robbing him of a thing, which is more dear to him than any thing in the world* (43). He uſed to find fault *with ſome* of his ſiſter's *diſcourſes*, which ſhe thought perfectly innocent. *If I happened ſometimes to obſerve*, ſaid ſhe (44), *as the occaſion offered, that I had ſeen a pretty woman, he would be angry, and ſay, that I ought never to ſpeak of ſuch things before footmen and young people, becauſe I did not know what thoughts I might thereby ſuggeſt to them.* So great was his humility, that the Pariſh-Prieſt of St. Etienne du Mont, who ſaw him during the whole courſe of his laſt illneſs, uſed to be for ever ſaying, *he is a child, he is humble and ſubmiſſive as a child* (45). This virtue, which he poſſeſſed, *made him allow people to tell him of his faults with a full liberty, and he followed implicitly any advice that was given him* (46). Having devoted himſelf, when but thirty years old, to a life quite diſengaged from the things of this world, he ſquared his conduct from the following maxim, *to renounce all the pleaſures and ſuperfluities; and ſuch was his practice the remainder of his life. To ſucceed in this, he began, from that time, as he did ever afterwards, to diſpenſe as much as he could with the attendance of his ſervants. Accordingly he uſed to make his bed himſelf; he uſed to fetch his dinner out of the kitchen and carry it to his room; and, after he had dined, carried it back to his kitchen. In a word he employed his ſervants in nothing but in dreſſing his victuals for him, and going up and down the town, and for ſuch things as he himſelf was abſolutely unable to do* (47). In fine, to make choice of one particular (which will be thought ſingular enough) among the ſeveral maxims of Paſcal, which doubtleſs will appear forced to worldly people; I muſt obſerve, that he did not approve of a man's employing theſe expreſſions, *I have ſaid, I have done*, &c. See the laſt remark.

[*H*] *He was . . . . . irreconcileable* with regard to the Rebels.] " He was ſo zealous for the glory of " God, that he could not ſuffer it to be violated in " any reſpect: this made him ſo exceſſively zealous " for his Majeſty's ſervice, that he reſiſted every per- " ſon during the time of the commotions in Paris; " and ever afterwards gave the name of Pretences to " all the reaſons which were given to extenuate the " guilt of that rebellion; and uſed to ſay, that in a " State ſettled in the form of a Commonwealth, as " Venice for inſtance, it was a great crime to at- " tempt to introduce a monarchical Government " there, and oppreſs the liberty of the people, which " providence had indulged them; but that in a State, " in which the regal power is eſtabliſhed, it would " be a kind of ſacrilege for any perſon to attempt to " violate the reverence due to it; ſince it is not only " an image of the Almighty's power, but a partici- " pation of that ſame power, which no perſon could " oppoſe without oppoſing manifeſtly the order of " Heaven; and therefore no one could ſufficiently " aggravate the greatneſs of this fault; not to men- " tion that it is ever accompanied with civil war, " which is the greateſt crime that can be committed " in oppoſition to the love we owe our neighbour; " and he obſerved this maxim with ſo much ſincerity, " that he refuſed at that time ſome conſiderable ad- " vantages which were offered him, that he might " not infringe it. It was uſual for him to ſay, that " he had as great an abhorrence for this crime, as " for aſſaſſination, or robbing on the highway: in " a word, that nothing was more repugnant than " this to his diſpoſition, or expoſed him to fewer " temptations. Such were his ſentiments with re- " gard to his Majeſty's ſervice, and he was irrecon- " cileable with reſpect to all thoſe who oppoſed it; " and, a circumſtance that ſhewed this was not ow-

(35) Mrs. Perier, *vie de* Paſcal, p. 44.

(36) *Nouvelles de la Repub. des Lettres*, for Dec. 1684, in the catalogue of new books, num. 2.

(37) Mr. Chappuzeau, in his *Theatre*, obſerves that there has been a martyr among the Players; and that St. *Geneſt*, whoſe feſtival the church celebrates the 31ſt of Auguſt, ended his life by a glorious tragedy.

(38) Futerieriana, p. 144. Dutch edit.

(39) Bouchet, Sérée 33. p. 224. Lions edit. of 1618, 8vo.

(40) Mrs. Perier, *vie de* Paſcal, p. 22.

(41) Ibid. p. 25.

(42) Ibid. p. 34.

(43) Ibid. p. 35.

(44) Ibid. p. 32.

(45) Mrs. Perier, *vie de* Paſcal, p. 41.

(46) Ibid.

(47) Ibid. p. 19.

aged thirty nine years and two months * (*e*). He had employed a long time in composing a work againſt Atheiſts, and all thoſe who do not admit the truth of the Goſpel. He did not live years ſufficient to give him an opportunity of digeſting the materials he was collecting: ſuch of them as were found among his papers, have been publiſhed and admired. He therein has ſet a thought of Arnobius in a moſt beautiful light [*I*], *viz.* that thoſe who believe the exiſtence of a God may be eternally happy, if they are in the right, and

* Perrrault's *Hommes illuſtri*, Tom. 1. p. 22. Paris 1701, 12mo. might have mentioned the two months he only giving 39 years, as Paſcal's age.] Rem. by the Tranſl.

(*e*) Extracted from his Life, written by Mrs. Perier, his ſiſter. This Life is prefixed to the Amſterdam edition (1684) of Paſcal's thoughts.

" ing to diſpoſition, or a fondneſs for his own opi-
" nions, is, his behaving with the utmoſt mildneſs
" towards thoſe who did him any particular injury:
" ſo that he never made any diſtinction between
" ſuch perſons and the reſt of the world; and for-
" got ſo entirely whatever related only to himſelf,
" that he could ſcarce ever remember any ſuch par-
" ticulars; and, to make him do this, people were
" forced to mention the circumſtances of them (48).
" And as this behaviour uſed ſometimes to be ad-
" mired in him, he would ſay; don't wonder at it;
" it is no virtue in me, but real forgetfulneſs; I
" have not the leaſt idea of what you ſpeak to me
" about. Nevertheleſs, we manifeſtly perceive by
" this, that ſuch injuries as related merely to his per-
" ſon, made little impreſſion on him, ſince he for-
" got them ſo eaſily; for his memory was ſo excel-
" lent, that he uſed to ſay, he had never forgot any
" particular he was deſirous of remembring (49)."
If this circumſtance, and the reſt I have related, are true, it muſt be confeſſed that Paſcal was a prodigy; and, if I might be ſo bold as to employ an expreſſion, I would call him a paradoxical individuum of the human ſpecies. He deſerves more to have it doubted, whether he was born of a woman, than that Sicilian Philoſopher on whom Lucretius beſtows this encomium.

(48) We therefore may apply to him, what Cicero *in Orat. pro Ligario ſub fin.* ſays Cæſar, *qui obliviſci nihil ſoles præter injurias*; " that he " forgot nothing " but injuries."

(49) Mrs. Perier, *vie de* Paſcal, p. 36.

Nil tamen hoc habuiſſe viro præclarius in ſe,
Nec ſanctum magis, & mirum, carumque videtur.
Carmina quinetiam divini pectoris ejus
Vociferantur & exponunt præclara reperta;
Ut vix humana videatur ſtirpe creatus 50).

(50) Lucret. lib. 1. ver. 730.

That is,

" This iſle, tho' with ſuch wondrous ſights as
theſe
" Doth call forth travellers, and the curious pleaſe,
" Is rich with men and fruit, hath rarely ſhown
" A thing more glorious than this ſingle one.
" His verſe compos'd of nature's works declare
" His wit was ſtrong, and his invention rare;
" His judgment deep and ſound, whence ſome be-
gan,
" And juſtly too, to think him more than man."

CREECH.

One circumſtance may leſſen our wonder at the hatred he bore to the mutineers, *viz.* there breaking out, in France, in his time, one of the moſt unjuſt wars that was ever known; ſuch a war as was moſt prejudicial to Monarchy. At the ſight of the terrible conſequences of the ſedition, which the Pariſians raiſed in 1648, in order to reſtore ſome Magiſtrates to their liberty; every man of probity and honour muſt neceſſarily have inſurrections in the utmoſt deteſtation; and argue much after the manner of Balzac, or even with leſs regard for the Prince of Conde, the fatal Chief of the Rebellion (51). *People*, ſays he (52), *began to take courage again, ſince the raiſing the ſiege of Cognac; and we are not now under ſo many apprehenſions with regard to our Province: however, ſhould a peace be concluded to morrow, this ſhort war will leave behind it a long remembrance of the evils it occaſioned. States are to be reformed and governed after this manner, thrice happy are the States which are left in confuſion and diſorder! Mr. Ablancourt's hero was alſo mine; but we have an equal abhorrence of the civil war; and cannot even forgive Julius Cæſar for it, though we tranſlate his Commentaries.* By the way, Paſcal's friends glory very much in their having adhered to the Doctrine which condemns Rebellion. See what Arnauld (53) has cited, from the ſecond Tome of the Moral Eſſays.

(51) That is, the war to which the Barricades (*), of 1648, gave occaſion inſenſibly. [* The commotions raiſed by the Leaguers in Paris.] Rem. by the Tranſl.

(52) Balzac, Letter 25 to Conrart, Liv. 2. p. m. 148, 149. The other is dated 20 Nov. 1651.

(53) Arnauld, *Apologie pour les Catholiq.* part 1. chap. 11. p. 136.

[*I*] . . . . *a thought of Arnobius.*] This Father confeſſes to the Heathens, that the promiſes of Chriſt cannot be proved, ſince they relate to a future happineſs; but he adds, that when two uncertain things are propoſed, it is better to make choice of that which gives us hopes, than of that which gives us none. But the ſtrength of his reaſon will be clearer in the original. *Sed & ipſe* (Chriſtus) *quæ pollicetur, non probat. Ita eſt. Nulla enim, ut dixi, futurorum poteſt exiſtere comprobatio. Cum ergo hæc ſit conditio futurorum, ut teneri & comprehendi nullius poſſint anticipationis attactu; nonne purior ratio eſt, ex duobus incertis, & in ambigua expectatione pendentibus, id potius credere, quod aliquas ſpes ferat, quam omnino quod nullas? In illo enim periculi nihil eſt, ſi quod dicitur imminere, caſſum fiat & vacuum; in hoc damnum eſt maximum, id eſt ſalutis amiſſio, ſi cum tempus advenerit, aperiatur non fuiſſe mendacium* (54). Paſcal unfolds this reflection very well; and employs ſucceſsfully the proportions between a wager, and the hazard of winning or loſing, which makes the wager prudent. See chap. 6. * of his thoughts (55). [The following advertiſement is prefixed to this chapter. *Moſt of the particulars in this chapter relate only to a certain ſort of perſons, who not being convinced of the proofs of religion, and ſtill leſs of the reaſons offered by Atheiſts, continue in a ſtate of ſuſpence between faith and infidelity. The Author's intention is only to ſhew them, from their own principles, and the mere light of reaſon, that they ought to conclude it would be of advantage for them to believe; and that they ought to do this, if this choice depended on their will. Hence it follows, that they ſhould, at leaſt till ſuch time as they have diſcovered light ſufficient to convince themſelves of this truth, uſe their utmoſt endeavours to incline themſelves to it; and diſengage themſelves from all ſuch obſtacles as divert them from this faith, the principal of which are the paſſions and vain amuſements*] †. The thoughts of Paſcal were printed in 1669, and accompanied with ſeveral approbations, which are ſo many elogiums of them. Eight years after a book was publiſhed (56), in which this reaſoning of Paſcal was enforced with great ſtrength, and in a very ample manner. The Author had been little affected with the critique of Paſcal's deſign, made by Father Bouhours's Apologiſt, who concludes his cenſure with the critique of the following paſſage from Paſcal. " It is certain that God is, or is not;
" there is no medium, but there is an infinite chaos
" (diſtance) between theſe two extremes. A man
" plays a game, conſidering this infinite diſtance, at
" croſs or pile; what will you gain by it? You can-
" not ſay, by the dictates of reaſon, that God is;
" and you cannot deny, by the dictates of reaſon, that
" he is not. Do not therefore blame thoſe of falſity,
" who have made a choice; for you know not whe-
" ther they are in the wrong, or have made an ill
" choice. No (will you ſay,) but I blame them for
" having made a choice, not for this choice; and
" he who gueſſes *croſs*, or the other who calls for
" *pile*, are both in the wrong. Yes (would I reply;)
" but a wager muſt be laid; this is not at our opti-
" on; and not to lay a wager that God is, is to lay
" that he is not. Which ſide will you take? Let
" us weigh the loſs and gain, by chooſing to believe
" that God is. If you win, you win all; if you
" loſe, you loſe nothing. If you ſay that it is un-
" certain whether you will win, but that it is cer-
" tain you riſk the pleaſures of this life, which you
" ſtake; and that the infinite diſtance there is be-
" tween the certainty which you riſk, and the uncer-
" tainty of what you would win, equals the finite
" good which you certainly venture, to the infinite
" which is uncertain: this is not the caſe; every
" gameſter riſks with certainty, to win with uncer-
" tainty, without acting repugnantly to reaſon (57)."
Here follows the manner in which the Critique has refuted this. *Hold your tongue* (Paſchaſius;) *I loſe all patience to hear you treat the moſt exalted ſubject in the world, and ground the moſt important of all truths, (the principle*

(54) Arnobius, *adverſus Gentes*, lib. 2. p. m. 44.

* It is the 7th chapter.] Rem. by the Tranſl.

(55) It is intitled, *That it is more advantageous to believe, than to disbelieve what the Chriſtian religion teaches.*

† *Penſees de* Mr. Paſcal, &c. p. 39, 40. Paris 1686, 12mo. Addit. by the Tranſl.

(56) Intitled, *A religious treatiſe againſt Methodiſts, Deiſts, and the modern Scepticks.* Printed at Paris by Lambert Roulland, 1677, 12mo.

(57) *L'Abbe de* Villars, *traite de la Delicateſſe*, Dialogue 5. p. 115, 116. Dutch edit.

and cannot be no loſers if they happen to be miſtaken; but an Atheiſt gains no advantage, if he ſhould be in the right, and makes himſelf eternally miſerable if he is miſtaken. Paſcal's *Lettres Provinciales* † have always paſt, and are ſtill looked upon as a maſterpiece [K]. Some Authors have erroneouſly denied, that thoſe Letters have been condemned

† He was not known to be the Author of them till after his death.] Rem. by the Tranſl.

principle of all truths) upon ſo low, ſo childiſh an idea; in a compariſon drawn from toſſing up croſs or pile, as being more apt to excite laughter than perſuade; and upon an argument that is ſo defective, and grounded on uncertain, and perhaps entirely falſe foundations. I will not ſay, that you at firſt laid down a thing which was not becoming a wiſe man; and I know not with what conſcience you could ſay to a Free-thinker, that we cannot, from the dictates of reaſon, affirm that there is a God. I know many people who would be greatly ſhocked to hear you make ſo horrid an aſſertion; and who would not venture a wager on the theology of the director, who permits you to employ theſe forms of ſpeech. Yet this were ſomething, if your moral reaſon were good; but, to the ſhame be it ſpoken both of his theology, and your morality, it concludes nothing; becauſe its whole force depends on the truth of the following propoſition, that every gameſter hazards with certainty, to win with uncertainty, without acting repugnantly to reaſon. Really, Paſchaſius, *was exiſtence of the Deity as doubtful as this propoſition, we ſhould be in a wretched condition. All fathers and huſbands, who will not permit their wives or children to play, would be rank Atheiſts; and would obſtinately aſſert, that it is very irrational for a man to venture money, which he has certainly in his pocket, and with which he can ſpend life with comfort, to gain an uncertain ſum; and run the hazard, as often happens, of loſing both. But I was informed that you are a great enemy to looſe Caſuiſts: whence comes it to paſs, that you not only do not condemn gaming, but that you are for making Religion and the Deity depend on the game of croſs or pile* (58)*?* This is a weak confutation, and does not deſerve to be examined. It ſuffices that I refer the Reader to the above-cited chapter in Paſcal, and to the Writer who made a fine Paraphraſe on it eight years after. [It may not be improper to hear Mr. de Voltaire on this occaſion. " It is evidently falſe " to ſay, that not to lay that God is, is to lay that " he is not. For he who doubts, and deſires to be " enlightned, certainly does not lay for or againſt. " Beſides, this article ſeems a little indecent and " childiſh; the idea of gaming, of loſs and gain, " is not ſuitable to the gravity of the ſubject. Farther, the intereſt I have to believe a thing, is not " a proof of the exiſtence of that thing. I will give " you (you ſay) the empire of the world, if I believe " that you are in the right. In this caſe, I ſincerely " wiſh you may be in the right; however, till you " have proved this to me, I cannot believe you. " Begin (might we ſay to Mr. Paſcal) by convincing " my reaſon. It is doubtleſs my intereſt that there " ſhould be a God; but if God, according to your " ſyſtem, came only for a few perſons; if the number of the elect is ſo ſmall, that the thought of it " quite terrifies; if I am not able to do any thing " of myſelf, tell me, pray, what intereſt I have to " believe you? Is it not evidently my intereſt to be " perſuaded of the contrary? With what face dare " you point out to me a ſtate of infinite felicity, to " which ſcarce one man out of a million has a right " to aſpire. If you are deſirous of convincing me, " ſtate this, I beſeech you, in a different manner; " and do not firſt ſpeak to me of games of chance, " of wagering, of croſs and pile; and afterwards " terrify me by the thorns you raiſe in that way " which I will, and ought to follow. Your reaſoning would have no other effect, but to make men " Atheiſts, if the voice of univerſal nature did not cry " aloud that there is a God, as ſtrongly, in proportion, as theſe reaſonings are weak *.] I ſhall make but one obſervation, whence it will be concluded, that Father Bouhours's friend failed either in accuracy or equity. He conſiders as a ſcandalous aſperſion, repugnant to wiſdom and conſcience, and deſerving the thundering rebuke of a worthy director, the following words of Paſcal, *You cannot ſay, by the dictates of reaſon, that God exiſts.* He ſuppoſes that this is confeſſing to a Free-thinker, *that one cannot affirm, by the dictates of reaſon,* that God exiſts. But this is a very falſe explication. Paſcal does not acknowledge ſuch a propoſition: he only will not combat with it, and take advantage of it, in order to reclaim Atheiſts. It is as plain as the ſun, that the words which Paſcal addreſſes to the Free-thinkers, amount to theſe that follow: *You aſſert, that by the dictates of reaſon, you cannot ſay, that God exiſts.* [*It is not ſurprizing, that a man who had enriched his mind with ſuch variety of fine ſpeculations, and invented ſo many curious things, ſhould have ſhewn ſo much ſolidity and juſtneſs in his thoughts; but it is ſurprizing he ſhould have writ in ſo polite a ſtyle, and with ſo great a purity, as is ſeldom equalled by thoſe, whoſe talent and chief application is confined merely to the choice and order of the words. This is ſeen in the collection of his thoughts, which have been conſidered, by the whole world, as a prodigy of knowledge, penetration, and good ſenſe: but particularly in a certain work written by him, on occaſion of a diſpute that broke out in the Sorbonne* **.]

** Perrault, *Hommes illuſtres*, p. 218. Paris 1701, 12mo. Addit. by the Tranſl.

[K] *The* Lettres Provinciales . . . . . *have always paſt, and are ſtill looked upon as a maſter-piece.*] See the applauſes which Perrault has beſtowed on this work (59). [The ABBOT. *I could oppoſe to them* (to Lucian and Cicero) *ſeveral Authors who excel in the writing of dialogues; but ſhall content myſelf with producing only one, I mean the illuſtrious Mr. Paſchal, with his eighteen* Lettres Provinciales. *Among a million of men who have read them, it may be affirmed, that they have not tired ſo much as one.* The CHEVALIER. *I have read them above ten times; and though I am naturally impatient, yet I was always pleaſed with the longeſt.* The ABBOT. *Throughout the whole, there appears a purity in the diction, a grandeur in the thoughts, a ſolidity in the arguments, a delicacy in the raillery; and, in every part, a beauty which is ſeldom found in other Authors.* The PRESIDENT. *I confeſs, that the letters in queſtion are gay and diverting; but would you compare eighteen ſmall ſheets with the Dialogues of Plato, Lucian, and Cicero, which compoſe ſeveral large volumes?* The ABBOT. *The number and bulk of the volumes are nothing to the purpoſe: for, if there be more wit in theſe eighteen Letters than in Plato's Dialogues; more delicate and artful raillery than in thoſe of Lucian, but a raillery of a chaſte kind; if there be more ſtrength and art in the reaſoning than thoſe of Cicero; in fine, if we therein find the whole art of dialogue-writing, ought not the ſmalleſt of their ſize draw on them commendation rather than diſpraiſe? Let us confeſs the truth: we have not any thing more beautiful in this ſpecies of writing. Have you ſeen the Latin Verſion, which has been made of them?* The PRESIDENT. *I have, and think it very beautiful.* The CHEVALIER. *Did it pleaſe you as much as the original?* The PRESIDENT. *Equally the ſame.* The CHEVALIER. *I am very glad of it. In your opinion, Lucian's Dialogues in Greek are wonderfully witty, but flat and inſipid in Ablancourt's tranſlation; whereas you judge the* Lettres Provinciales *are equally agreeable in Latin and French; whence you muſt confeſs that I have clearly ſhewn you to be prepoſſeſſed* *.] The Lettres Provinciales determined the beſt pens in France, among the Jeſuits, to refute thoſe letters, in a book (60) which was ſuppreſſed in France as ſoon as it was publiſhed, *viz.* in 1694, and which the Dutch booksellers reprinted. Of the great number of volumes which have been publiſhed againſt the Jeſuits, there is not one which has done them more prejudice, or vexed them more, than the *Lettres au Provincial* *. They have been tranſlated into ſeveral languages. Mr. Nicolle, under the fictitious name of William Wendrockius, a Divine of Straſburg tranſlated them into Latin, and added ſome notes and diſſertations (61). Other writers tranſlated them into Engliſh, Italian (62), and Spaniſh (63). I have ſeen an edition of them in 8vo, in four columns, in French and Latin, Italian, and Spaniſh; two columns in one page, and two in another; ſo that when the book was opened, the four pages were ſeen at once.

(59) In Tom. 2. of *Parallele des Anciens & des Modernes.*

* *Parallele des Anciens, &c.* p. 295 & *ſeq.* Paris 1693. Note, this whole work conſiſts of imaginary dialogues between a Preſident, a Chevalier, and an Abbot.] Addit. by the Tranſl.

(60) Intitled, *Reponſe aux Lettres Provinciales de L. de Montalte, ou Entretiens de Cleandre & d'Eudoxe.* See the extract of it in the hiſtory of the works of the learned, Nov. 1694. p. 113 & *ſeq.*

* That is as much as to ſay, *Letters to a Peaſant.*] Rem. by the Tranſl.

Here follows ſome collections, which will ſhew the opinion that is entertained of the late anſwer of the Jeſuits to the *Lettres Provinciales*; the effect it produced; and the ſeveral particulars which relate to the

(61) See the article NICOLLE, remark [B].

(62) Coſimo Brunetti, a Florentine Gentleman, gave the Italian verſion.

(63) Gratian Cordero, de Burgos, is the Author of the Spaniſh tranſlation.

(58) Ibid. p. 116.

* *Lettres philoſophiques, par Mr. de V . . . .* p. 143, 144. *Rouen, Chez Ioré Libraire,* 1734.

demned by any decrees [*L*]. It was publiſhed that Paſcal, during his laſt ſickneſs, deteſted the work in queſtion, and repented his having been a Janſeniſt (*f*); but this report was

(*f*) See the cloſe of the rem. [*M*].

the hiſtory of thoſe two books. " At the end of forty years, there aroſe from the aſhes of ſo many baffled apologies, a new apology for the extravagancies of the Caſuiſts; an apology, ſo much the more dangerous, as the Author conceals with greater art his aim and deſign; and has employed all the ornaments and artifices which his rhetoric could ſuggeſt, in order to blind and miſlead his Readers. We are well informed, that it was printed againſt the advice of father de la Chaiſe; againſt the expreſs command of the late Archbiſhop of Paris, and againſt all the cuſtomary laws. It has been diſperſed with great profuſion and the utmoſt zeal, and been tranſlated into Latin by one of the ableſt pens of the ſociety. They got an Italian verſion of it to be made by another; and, by theſe various methods, the editions of it have been multiplied, and the world ſtocked with it. The impreſſions, which they have cauſed to be made of it in France, Holland, Flanders, &c. and the care with which they recommended it, and cauſed it to be brought up by their devotees of both ſexes, give juſt reaſon to fear that this book has already made much havock, in an age in which a looſe morality is but too much encouraged. It was hoped that the Holy See would not permit a work of ſo dangerous a tendency to paſs unpuniſhed; but the multitude of affairs of importance, which have been tranſacting for ſome time in Rome, muſt have made them ſuſpend the examination of a book that is filled with a great number of facts and citations, the examining the truth of which will take up a great deal of time (64)." Theſe are the words of the anonymous Author (65), who refuted *the anſwer to the* Lettres Provinciales, *or dialogues between Cleander and Eudoxus*. Thus he ſpeaks in his dedication. Here follows that part of his preface. " The *dialogues between Cleander and Eudoxus*, which are ſaid to be writ by Father Daniel, are the Society's laſt ſtake or ſhift. Almoſt half an age was required to produce ſuch a maſter-piece, and to form workmen; and, the inſtant it appeared in the world, the acclamations which they made every where, plainly ſhewed that this was the Prophet, whoſe coming they expected; and his work, the ſalvation of the Jeſuits. If they had flattered themſelves that they ſhould draw the public into the like ſentiments of eſteem, and to force them, by the ſparkling eloqence of this new defence, to declare againſt Paſcal, it is not my buſineſs to ſay, whether or no they have been miſtaken. Nevertheleſs, I myſelf am greatly out, if, notwithſtanding this late effort, the *Lettres Provinciales* will not be, in all ages, the delight of men of wit, and an almoſt inimitable original. With regard to Wendrockius, the illuſtrious defender of them, his book will be, to lateſt poſterity, a ſovereign antedote againſt the poiſon of corrupt morality; a book in which the moſt important principles of all Chriſtian morality are eſtabliſhed and defended in the moſt agreeable, as well as ſolid manner; and ſuch an apology for the *Lettres Provinciales*, as it will be impoſſible for the ſociety of the Jeſuits ever to weaken." I believe, I may venture to affirm, that tho' Father Daniel's piece were more ingenious, and the reaſonings ſtronger, than thoſe found in it, it yet would not make the admirers of the *Lettres Provinciales* change their opinion. Read, on this ſubject, the words of a Writer, who was of a critical turn of mind, and very much prompted to dip his pen in gall, which are inſerted in one of his collections. *There was lately publiſhed*, ſays he (66), *an anſwer to the* Lettres Provinciales, *which pretends to quite demoliſh them; and which, nevertheleſs, will not do them much harm. How can this be? The reaſon of it is, that, altho' this anſwer evidently ſhews the horrid injuſtice, the abominable ſlanders, and the injurious falſities, with which all theſe letters are interſperſed, againſt one of the moſt famous Societies that maintain the intereſts of the church; nevertheleſs, they have ſo long, by the pleaſant and facetious touches with which they are interſperſed, got the laughers of all denominations on their ſide, that they have acquired ſuch a credit and authority, as it will be difficult to diveſt them of. It will be to no purpoſe for the Jeſuits to do conſiderable ſervices to the church and the public . . . great numbers of people will read, nevertheleſs, with an eaſy credulity, the* Lettres Provinciales, *and will not ſo much as ſee, or even hear the leaſt mention made of the anſwer. It muſt indeed be confeſſed, that prejudice, on this occaſion, is a very unjuſt, very cruel, and very obſtinate judgment; ſince (tho' theſe letters have been condemned by Popes, Biſhops, Divines, and burnt by the hands of the Executioner, purſuant to arrets of Parliament, and the Council of State) they yet have taken ſuch deep root in people's minds, that they reſiſt all thoſe powers.* It is certain, that the zeal of the Anti-Moliniſts, in favour of the *Lettres Provinciales*, is revived ſince Father Daniel publiſhed his anſwer. They have reprinted them with a new Appendix (67), and beſtowed great application on this occaſion. Read the following paſſage. " You know that the late Mr. Nicole had publiſhed, under the name of Wendrock, a Latin tranſlation of the *Lettres Provinciales*, with very large notes by him. This work was lately tranſlated into French, and, as is pretended, by a Lady of Paris. It was printed at Lions in three volumes, 12mo. The Court having information of this, the King gave orders that all the copies ſhould be ſeized: which order was executed with great noiſe, but without ſucceſs. The officers went to the houſes of the partners of Sieur *Aniſſon*, ſuſpected to have printed that work, who, as we are told, had early notice enough given for them to carry off all the copies; ſo that not one was found. Some are ſeen here (in Paris) which now ſell for nine livres; that is, double the price for which they were ſold for before. To the firſt volume an advertiſement is prefixed, in which the Author ſays, that he was prompted to undertake this verſion, becauſe that Father Daniel's dialogues, that were publiſhed in 1694, againſt the *Lettres Provinciales*, attack an Author in French, who wrote in Latin; and that it is proper the whole world ſhould be enabled to judge of this diſpute. Afterwards comes a hiſtory of the *Lettres Provinciales*, which is little more than Wendrock's four Latin prefaces. At the concluſion, an account is given of the cabal or intrigue, carried on in Bourdeaux, in order to incite the Parliament to condemn Wendrock's letters (68)."

(64) The dedication to the apology for the *Lettres Provinciales* of Lewis de Montalte, p. 8. Roan edit. 1697.

(65) He is ſuppoſed to be Petitdidier, a Benedictine of the Congregation of St. Vannes.

(66) Richelet, the moſt beautiful French letters on all ſorts of ſubjects, Tom. 2. p. 322, 323. Amſterdam edit. 1698. He informs us, that Mr. Bordellon is the Author of the letter whence this paſſage is extracted.

(67) See *Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres*, for Aug. 1699, p. 202.

[*L*] *Some Authors have erroneouſly denied, that the* Lettres Provinciales *have been condemned by any decrees.*] A Proteſtant Miniſter having aſſerted, *That the cenſure of the morality of the Jeſuits, written by the Gentlemen of Port-Royal, the* Lettres Provinciales, *and the reſt of the books which cenſured that deteſtable ſyſtem of morality, had been burnt and torn to pieces by the common hangman* (69), the following anſwer was made him. " But whither is Mr. Jurieu ſtraying? For, beſides that we do not know, that any cenſure of the morality of the Jeſuits, written by the Gentlemen of Port-Royal, has been burnt; and that it is falſe, in general, that the hangman burnt and tore to pieces the reſt of the books which cenſured that morality, or even the *Lettres Provinciales*; tho' all this were true, this would have been done merely by the ſecular arm, and not by the authority of the church; and conſequently the church ought not to be reflected upon on that account (70)." The Author who writes theſe words, is Abbot Richard, who is a very good friend of the Janſeniſts. [*This Abbot Richard is the late Father Gerberon, a man incapable of owning certain facts, tho' known univerſally, when they were of prejudice to the party he eſpouſed* *.] How could Abbot Richard be ignorant of the fate of the *Lettres Provinciales*, in a point of ſuch great importance? Ought he to have neglected, to ſo great a degree, the writings which the Jeſuits oppoſed to that in queſtion? Did it become him, to have never once looked into the arret of the Parliament of Aix, which they printed at the end of their anſwers to the *Lettres Provinciales?* The tenor of the decree is as follows: " The Court having heard the report of " the Commiſſioners, who have ſeen and examined " the

(68) *Nouv. de la Repub. des Lettres*, for January 1700, p. 113.

(69) Jurieu, *Prejugez*, Tom. 1. p. 387.

(70) *Critique des Prejugez de* Mr. Jurieu, p. 304.

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. vol. 4. p. 970.

was found falſe [*M*] ; however, it cannot be denied but that here were ſome diviſions between him and the Gentlemen of Port-Royal [*N*]. I forgot to obſerve, that it was from

" the ſaid letters, and having peruſed them, has de-
" clared and declares them diffamatory, ſlanderous,
" and pernicious to the public : and therefore enacts,
" that they ſhall be delivered to the Executioner, to
" be, by him, burnt on the pillory in *Preacher's Square*,
" in this city of Aix ; and prohibits and forbids all
" Bookſellers and Printers, to put them any more
" to preſs, or any treatiſe of the like ſubjects ; and
" all Bookſellers and others, of what condition or
" quality ſoever, to keep, vend, or put off, any of
" them, upon pain of corporal puniſhment ; and en-
" joins them to ſend, without delay, to the Regiſter's
" Office, there to be ſuppreſſed, under the ſame pe-
" nalty ; ordains that the tranſgreſſors ſhall be in-
" formed againſt by the Chief Judge-Royal, or Uſher
" of the Court ; to the end that the informations be-
" ing lodged, the perſons ſo offending, may be pro-
" ſecuted, upon the declaration of the abovementi-
" oned penalties ; and in order that no perſon may
" plead ignorance, the preſent Arret ſhall be read
" and publiſhed by ſound of trumpet, in all and eve-
" ry the places and croſs-ſtreets of the city of Aix.
" GIVEN at the Parliament of Provence, ſitting in
" Aix, and publiſhed at the Bar the ninth of Febru-
" ary, one thouſand ſix hundred and fifty ſeven (71)."
The Author of the hiſtory of Janſenius's five propo-
ſitions, informs us (72), that, *among the ſeveral works of Port-Royal, two of the moſt conſiderable are thoſe which were publiſhed in Latin ; the one, under the name of Paulus Irenæus, to juſtify Janſenius in denying the fact ; the other under the name of Wendrockius, which contained a Latin verſion of the* Lettres Provinciales, *with notes or diſſertations by the ſame Author, who is known to be Mr.* Nicolle. *Theſe two books being put into the hands (in order for their being examined by the King's order) of thirteen Doctors of the Faculty of Paris, whereof four were Biſhops, and moſt of the others Profeſſors of Divinity, were ſentenced to be burnt by a decree of the Council of State, made on the opinion of theſe thirteen Cenſors, the words whereof are as follow :* " We
" whoſe names are underwritten being deputed by
" the King's Order, to give our judgment with re-
" gard to a book, intitled, *Lettres Provinciales de*
" *Louis de Montalte, &c.* after having examined it
" with care, do certify, that the Heretical principles
" of Janſenius, which the church has condemned,
" are maintained and defended in them ; and that
" not only in theſe letters, but alſo in the *Notes of*
" *William Wendrock*, and the *Enquiries of* Paulus Ire-
" næus annexed to them. . . . We farther teſtify,
" that theſe three Authors have ſo natural a propen-
" ſion to ſlander and inſolence, that . . . . and there-
" fore that this book deſerves the penalties, which
" are decreed by the laws againſt diffamatory and he-
" retical libels. Given at Paris this 7th of Septem-
" ber, 1660." Now I leave the Reader to judge, if the Critique made by the Proteſtant Miniſter is excuſable, in his denying a thing ſupported by ſuch facts.

(71) *Reſponſes aux Lettres Provinciales*, p. 517, 518. Liege edit. 1658.

(72) *Hiſtory of the five Propoſitions*, Liv. 3. p. 175, 176.

[*M*] *It was publiſhed . . . that Paſcal . . . repented his having been a Janſeniſt, but this report was found falſe.*] Here follows a paſſage, extracted from a letter of Father Bouhours to a Nobleman of the Court, in 1668. " Who does not now know that Mr.
" Paſcal is author of the *Lettres Provinciales*, and
" that he was engaged in the party at the time that
" he wrote ? Should any perſon doubt ſo certain a
" truth as this, it would be eaſy to convince him
" of it by the teſtimony of Paſcal himſelf, whom
" we know, from good hands *, abjured Janſeniſm,
" at his death (73)." The Janſeniſts aſſerted, that Paſcal had not made any ſuch abjuration. Read thoſe words of the anſwer, which they made to the Archbiſhop of Ambrun's apology : they refer to a writing in which this fact was refuted by convincing proofs. Neither is it neceſſary to overthrow, in particular, all that has been refuted elſewhere by treatiſes written profeſſedly on that account, as what he aſcribes to Paſcal, on a pretended atteſtation of the Pariſh-Prieſt of St. Stephen, *viz.* of his having abjured the principles of Janſenius, the falſity of which has been proved by convincing proofs, which make

* This is atteſted by a writing, ſigned by the pariſh-prieſt of St. Stephen du Mont, who was with Mr. Paſcal in his expiring moments. This piece is in the hands of the Archbiſhop of Paris.

(73) *Letter to a Nobleman of the Court*, p. 21, 22. Paris edit. 1669, 4to.

the ſubject of a letter printed after the refutation of Father Anat's piece, on Monſieur d'Alet's Mandate (74). Father Bouhours having inſerted his letter in a collection of tracts, publiſhed by him at Paris in 1684, ſtruck out every thing relating to that abjuration. This ſhews that he was convinced that it was falſe : and yet he had aſſerted this particular, in very poſitive terms, in his firſt edition, and referred to an authentick proof. What man would not, after this, have been catched ?

(74) *Pieces ſur le Nouveau Teſtament de Mons*, Tom. 1. p. 498. Colen. edit. 1669, 8vo.

Cornelius Hazart, the Jeſuit, in the anſwer to the caſe of Janſenius's relations, affirmed, *that the* Lettres Provinciales *were retracted and deteſted by the author of them, when he was going to give an account of his actions to his ſaviour* (75). He is anſwered in the following manner. " Another falſity, altogether as
" groſs, is, that Paſcal, before he died, retracted
" and deteſted the *Lettres Provinciales*. 'Tis the bu-
" ſineſs of the Jeſuits, who have aſſerted this in their
" Theſes, and ſpread ſuch a report in the publick,
" to exhibit proofs of it. 'Tis now above twenty
" years ſince it has been ſhewn, by a written tract
" which is unanſwered, that what Paſcal had ſaid
" to his confeſſor, in his laſt ſickneſs, concerning a
" ſmall difference or diſpute between himſelf and
" his friends, had been taken in a wrong ſenſe by
" the confeſſor in queſtion, as he himſelf has ſince
" owned ; but an undoubted circumſtance is, that
" this did not relate in any manner to the *Lettres*
" *Provinciales*." Theſe are Arnauld's words, which we may believe to be very true, ſince a writer (a friend to the Jeſuits) has obſerved (76), that Paſcal, who had changed his opinion with regard to the chief matters in *Lettres Provinciales*, and who *could not doubt but that he was obliged to make a publick recantation in that reſpect, to undeceive thoſe, whom his letters had drawn, or might draw over, hereafter, to his firſt opinion* . . (77), *never attempted to inform the publick of this, not even in his dying moments, though he had time ſufficient for that purpoſe*. [" Paſcal, ſtrictly ſpeaking, never was
" a Janſeniſt. His ſiſter, who was not ſparing of
" her encomiums on him, in his life written by
" her, owns * *that he had never applied himſelf to cu-*
" *rious queſtions in Divinity*. This ſhews that he, like
" many others, was a Janſeniſt from inclination and
" prejudice, without knowing very diſtinctly what
" Janſenius's doctrine was. His brethren at Port-
" Royal who had employed him, and for whom his
" pen had done very good ſervices, were at laſt ob-
" liged to confeſs, that all his knowledge in Divinity
" was compriſed in the Memoirs which they them-
" ſelves had furniſhed him with." See the cloſe of the following remark †].

(76) Abbé du Mas, *Hiſtory of the five Propoſitions*, p. 202.

(77) Ibid. p. 203.

* See the remark [*B*] above.

† From the remarks to the Paris edition of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. 970.

[*N*] *There were ſome diviſions between him, and the Gentlemen of Port-Royal.*] We find by the hiſtory of the five propoſitions, that this difference related to two points, *viz.* on the ſigning of the formulary, and the variations of which he accuſed the Janſeniſts.

I. He had ſaid in his 17th and 18th letters, that there was no *diſpute* (78) *about the right, but only about the fact*, and that, *with reſpect to the right*, he thought himſelf bound to ſubmit to the Pope's deciſion (79). " But ſome time after he went over to
" the oppoſite extreme, *viz.* to believe that the
" ſenſe of Janſenius, which he did not diſtinguiſh
" from Grace efficacious in itſelf, had been really
" condemned by the conſtitutions of the Popes : that
" it was nevertheleſs a truth in point of faith, which
" we are not allowed to abandon ; that the Popes
" therefore, in condemning it, had been miſtaken,
" not with regard to the fact, but to the right, or
" doctrine itſelf. Hence Paſcal concluded, that it
" was impoſſible, on this occaſion, to ſeparate the
" fact from the right doctrine : that with reſpect to
" the ſubſcribing of thoſe who defended Janſenius, it
" was fallacious, unleſs they proteſted expreſsly, that
" they would not condemn this ſenſe ; and, in fine,
" that they could not, in conſcience, do otherwiſe.
" This is borrowed partly from a piece of Mr. Paſ-
" cal, and partly from the anſwers which the Di-
" vines of Port-Royal wrote againſt it. He drew up

(78) Ibid. p. 195.

(79) Ibid. p. 196. See this thing turned in a different manner in the *Hiſtory of Janſeniſm*, Tom. 2. p. 515. ad ann. 1661.

from him the Janſeniſts learned to denote themſelves by the Particle *on* [O]. [A French writer ſpeaks of him as follows. *The frequent indiſpoſitions, or rather the perpetual illneſs with which he was afflicted during the four laſt years of his life, put his patience to the moſt ſevere trial. If we examine all the circumſtances of his life, we muſt confeſs that he was a wonderful man upon a great many accounts. His application to fine ſpeculations, the delicacy of his conſtitution, and eſpecially the auſterities he practiſed in the latter part of his life, contributed*

" that piece, on occaſion of ſubſcribing the formu-
" lary of the aſſembly (80) by the Nuns of Port-
" Royal. In ſigning of it they ſaid ; *We embrace*
" *ſincerely, and with all our hearts, all the deciſions,*
" *made by their Holineſſes* (Alexander VII. *and Pope*
" *Innocent* X.) *with regard to the faith, and reject all*
" *ſuch errors as they judged contrary to it :* but they
" did not add expreſsly, that they excepted the ſenſe
" of Janſenius. They ſuppoſed that they had ex-
" cepted it ſufficiently, and had not deviated from
" it ; becauſe they excuſed themſelves, in their ſub-
" ſcribing, from teſtifying any thing elſe but *the*
" *purity of their faith* ; whereby they tacitly intimated,
" that they ſaid nothing with reſpect to the fact of
" Janſenius. Nevertheleſs Paſcal began, *not only*
" *freely to blame that ſubſcribing, but even drew up a*
" *piece, in which he pretended to prove that it was not*
" *ſincere.* Theſe are the words of the Divines of Port-
" Royal, in the ** *Letter of an Eccleſiaſtic to a*
" *friend, upon the ſubject of the declaration made by the*
" *Pariſh-Prieſt of St. Stephen, &c.* This letter, dated
" the 15th of July 1666, is annexed to a piece of
" Port-Royal, entitled, *A Refutation of the book of*
" *Father Annat, containing reflections on the Mandate*
" *of the Biſhop of Alet, &c.* And, in another piece,
" written the following year, and entitled, *A De-*
" *fence of the Faith of the Nuns of* P. R. Part II.
" they repeat ſtill more diſtinctly than before, what
" had been ſaid by them in the letter."

II. (81) *His opinion was not leſs changed with regard to the fact of the Janſeniſts, than with reſpect to that of Janſenius. For whereas, in writing the* Lettres Provinciales, *he affirmed, ſpeaking of them, that their doctrine with reſpect to Grace had never varied ; and that they never had any different from the ſchool of St. Thomas ; he charged them publickly with expreſſing themſelves, ſince the conſtitutions, in a different manner than before. Here follows what they themſelves relate of this, in their* Letter of an Eccleſiaſtick to a Friend, &c. ††. " He even thought, that it was not only
" on this occaſion of the ſubſcribing of the Nuns of
" Port-Royal that inſincerity had been ſhewn ; but
" that the ſame defect might be found in the diffe-
" rent pieces which had been written after the af-
" fair which has ſo long diſturbed the peace of the
" Church : that, in writing it, regard had been
" had to the preſent advantage ; and that, as this
" had changed with the times, their writings did
" not appear altogether conſiſtent. He therefore
" thought it would have been proper to reviſe them
" all, and to make a ſimilitude of expreſſion in
" every part of them. To prompt Meſſieurs de
" Port Royal more ſtrongly to this, he drew up ano-
" ther piece, in which he pretended to point out the
" advantages they gave their enemies by this diſpa-
" rity ; and that it might be proved that they had
" expreſſed themſelves with more facility * ſince the
" iſſuing of the Bulls, than before." *The Janſeniſts anſwered, that Paſcal was miſtaken, in ſuppoſing that he ſaw a contrariety between their works written, before and after the Bull ; becauſe there really was not any. And, to ſhew the cauſe of his error, they aſſure that* he himſelf did not conſult the proofs of what he advanced, but was contented with the memoirs that were furniſhed by ſome of his friends, who did not examine with ſufficient accuracy * the paſſages from which they compoſed them. *Whence it happened, adds he,* that he could not help committing a conſiderable number of miſtakes ; and that there are, in his piece, ſome altogether fabulous ſtories, which ſerve † for a foundation to the pretended contrarieties he laid to their charge ; and ſome dialogues in which people are made to ſay, on both ſides, ſuch things as were never ſpoke of. *That is to ſay that, by the confeſſion of the Janſeniſts themſelves, Paſcal did, at that time, juſt the ſame thing as he had done in their favour in the* Lettres Provinciales, *if we may believe their adverſaries and his.*

All theſe particulars, in the hiſtory of the five propoſitions, are accompanied with many remarks, which perhaps would puzzle any one who ſhould attempt to apologize for Mr. Paſcal.

[O] *'Twas from him that the Janſeniſts learned to denote themſelves by the Particle* on.] *He declared, that a worthy man ſhould avoid naming himſelf, and even making uſe of the particles* I *and* me ; *and he uſed to ſay, on this occaſion, that Chriſtian Piety extinguiſhes or annihilates the worldly* me, and *that worldly civility hides and ſuppreſſes it* (82). *Not that,* adds the *Author of* the Art of Thinking (83), *this rule ſhould be obſerved in a ſcrupulous degree ; for there are ſome occaſions, in which, to endeavour to make ſuch diſtinctions, would be putting one's-ſelf to needleſs trouble ; but it is always good to keep it in view, in order that a man may deviate from that evil cuſtom of ſome perſons, who are ever ſpeaking of, and quoting themſelves, though their opinion is not any way concerned in the affair ſpoken of.* This, in all probability, was the reaſon why the Janſeniſts of France have ſo ſtudiouſly affected to employ the particle *on*. One of their adverſaries has pretended to diſcover by this mark, that the work (84) of a certain anonymous Author, which he was refuting, ought to be aſcribed to them. He delivers himſelf in the following terms, after giving a ſtrong proof of the affection which this anonymous Author had for the Gentlemen of Port-Royal (85) : " But if
" this be not judged ſufficient, and a more glaring
" one is wanting, the whole world knows their *on* ;
" that this is the manner in which they cite one a-
" nother ; that no perſons had ever employed it
" before them ; and that few but themſelves make
" uſe of it. He not only never cites them other-
" wiſe : *Comme* ON *a dit dane la Grammaire reiſonnée* † ;
" i. e. *As it was ſaid in the rational Grammar : Comme*
" ON *l'a remarqué dans l'Art de penſer* ; i. e. *As it has*
" *been obſerved in the Art of Thinking* ; ON *a parlé de cela*
" *dans la Grammaire generale*, i. e. *that was mentioned*
" *in the general Grammar* : but he does not ſpeak of
" himſelf except with this form of ſpeech, in his Pre-
" face :" *En revoyant cet Ouvrage* ON *s'eſt cru obligé* ;
ON *a cru qu'il eſtoit plus à propos*, i. e. " *in reviſing this*
" *work it has been thought an obligation ; it was*
" *thought more proper*. I have heard an excellent man
" ſay, that this manner of ſpeaking of one's ſelf, by
" the particle ON, was a kind of plural, equivalent to
" the particle *nous* (WE) employed by Kings and
" other Potentates (86). Our Critic owns this in
" ſome meaſure, by ſaying that, inſtead of ON, peo-
" ple formerly wrote *hons* *, which ſignified *men* ; ſo
" that, adds he, that ON *dit* (it is ſaid) *is the ſame as*
" *hommes* on *les hommes diſent* (men, or the men ſay.)
" However, this illuſtrious man was of opinion, that
" the Gentlemen in queſtion did not employ that
" form of expreſſion out of vanity, but merely from
" a principle of ſincerity, to denote that they did
" not write any thing, in which ſeveral perſons were
" not concerned ; and conſequently that they could not
" prefix the name of any ſingle Author to their works,
" without acting againſt truth, ſince not one of their
" books was compoſed by one Author only. That
" on the other hand, the ſpecifying of the names of
" all thoſe who have been concerned in them, would
" be attended with other inconveniencies ; but that
" they are all equally avoided by employing the myſ-
" terious particle *on*, which I never could have
" thought to have been comprehenſive, had not I
" been told ſo by the able man in queſtion." Read what follows. After the foregoing ſheet was printed, I happened to meet with the book quoted in the margin (87), whence I have extracted the following paſſage. " Paſcal uſed to ſay of thoſe Au-
" thors, who ſpeaking of their works, ſay, *my book,*
" *my*

(80) *i. e.* the aſſembly of the Clergy of France.

** Page 80.

(81) *Hiſtory of the five Propoſitions*, p. 203.

†† Page 81.

* *Facility* ſeems, by an error of the Copieſt or Printer, to have been put for *faintneſs*.

* Page 81.

† Page 82.

(82) *Art de Penſer*, part 3. chap. 19. num. 6. p. m. 350. See alſo *Paſcal's thoughts*, chap. 29. num. 27.

(83) Ibid.

(84) It is intitled, *Reflections on the preſent practice of the* French *tongue, or new and critical Remarks on politeneſs of ſtyle.* Paris 1689, 12mo.

(85) l'Abbé de St. Real. *Diſcourſe on Criticiſm*, chap. 10. p. 223, Lions edit. 1691.

† p. 256, 318, 523.

(86) See St. Evremond, *Oeuvres melees*, Tom. 4. p. m. 136. where he ridicules the abuſe of the particle *on*. [Tom. 5. p. 372. Dutch edition of 1726]

* p. 342,

(87) Tom. 2. p. 200. Rotterd. edit. 1701, of Vigneul-Marville.

tributed very much to the ſhortning of his days *.] Hereunder is his epitaph [*P*]. Mr. Voltaire has made animadverſions on ſeveral of his *Thoughts concerning Religion* [*Q*]. I ſhall give a ſpecimen in one or two of them [*R*].

* Perrault's *Hommes illuſtres*, Tom. 1. p. 219, 220. Paris 1701. 12mo. Addit. by the Tranſl.

PAS-

" *my commentary, my hiſtory*, &c. that they are like " thoſe trades-people, who are for ever ſaying, *my* " *houſe*. Theſe, adds this excellent man, ſhould ra- " ther ſay, *our book, our commentary, our hiſtory*, &c. " ſince, commonly, more of it belongs to others, " than to themſelves."

[*P*] . . . *his epitaph.*] It is as follows.

D. O. M.
Blaſius Paſcalis Scutarius nobilis.
Hic jacet.
Pietas ſi non moritur, æternum vivet :
Vir conjugii neſcius,
Religione Sanctus, Virtute clarus,
Doctrinâ celebris,
Ingenio acutus,
Sanguine & animo pariter illuſtris,
Doctus, non Doctor,
Æquitatis amator,
Veritatis defenſor,
Virginum ultor,
Chriſtianæ moralis corruptorum accerrimus hoſtis.
Hunc Rhetores amant facundum,
Hunc Scriptores norunt Elegantem,
Hunc mathematici ſtupent profundum,
Hunc philoſophi quærunt ſapientem,
Hunc Doctores laudant Theologum,
Hunc Pii venerantur Auſterum,
Hunc omnes mirantur, Omnibus ignotum,
Omnibus licet notum.
Quid plura Viator quem perdidimus
PASCALEM
IS LUDOV. erat MONTALTIUS
Heu !
Satis dixi, urgent Lachrymæ,
Sileo.
Et qui bene precaberis, bene tibi eveniat,
Et vivo & mortuo.
Vixit Ann. 39. m. 2. Obiit. an. rep. Sal. 1662, 14 Kal. Sept.
ΩΛΕΤΟ ΠΑΣΚΑΛΙΟΣ
ΦΕΥ, ΦΕΥ, ΠΕΝΘΟΣ ΟΣΟΝ
Poſuit, A P. D. C. *Moerens. Aureliam canoniſta.*
Cecidit Paſchalis
Heu! Heu! qualis Luctus ** ?

** *Penſées de Paſcal*, at the end of his Life, Paris 1686, 12mo. Addit. by the Tranſl.

[*Q*] *Mr. Voltaire has made animadverſions on ſeveral of his thoughts concerning religion.*] This he has done by way of letter, which, in the edition before me, is interwoven with his letters concerning the Engliſh nation, an edition of which was printed under the title of *Lettres Philoſophiques*, par M. de V . . . . (Voltaire) *. Here follows the preamble to this letter.

* A Rouen, *Chez Jore Litraire*, 1734.

I now ſend you the remarks which I had made long ſince on Mr. Paſcal's thoughts. I beg you not to compare me, on this occaſion, with Hezekiah, who would have had all Solomon's books burnt. I reſpect Mr. Paſcal's genius and eloquence; but the more I reſpect them, the more I am perſuaded, that he himſelf would have corrected many of thoſe thoughts which he had thrown at random on paper, in order for a future examination; and at the ſame time that I object to his ideas, I admire his genius.

It is my opinion that Mr. Paſcal's deſign, in general, was to exhibit mankind in an odious light. He ſtrenuouſly endeavours to repreſent us all as wicked and unhappy. He writes againſt human nature in pretty near the ſame manner as he wrote againſt the Jeſuits. He aſcribes to the eſſence of our nature, ſuch things as are peculiar to ſome men only; and ſpeaks injuriouſly, but at the ſame time eloquently, of Mankind. I ſhall be ſo free as to take up the pen, in defence of the human ſpecies, againſt this ſublime miſanthropiſt. I dare affirm that we are neither ſo unhappy, nor ſo wicked as he declares us to be. I alſo am firmly perſuaded, that had he proſecuted, in the work he intended to write the plan, which appears in his thoughts, he would have writ a book full of eloquent falſe-reaſonings and falſities, admirably well deduced. I even am of opinion, that all thoſe books, which have been lately writ, to prove the Chriſtian Religion, will be ſo many ſtumbling-blocks inſtead of edifying their readers. Do theſe authors pretend to know more of theſe things than Chriſt and his Apoſtles? This is like ſurrounding an oak with reeds, in order to ſupport it. We may root up thoſe reeds without prejudicing the oak in any manner.

I have made a diſcretionary choice of ſome of Paſcal's thoughts, and annex the ſeveral anſwers to them. It is your buſineſs to judge how I may have acquitted myſelf on this occaſion †.

† *Lettres Philoſophiques de Mr. V.* p. 136, 137. Addit. by the Tranſl.

[*R*] *I ſhall give a ſpecimen in one or two.*] *When I conſider man's blindneſs and miſery, and the aſtoniſhing contrarieties which are ſeen in his nature; and when I behold the whole univerſe dumb, and man unenlightned, left to himſelf, and wandering, as it were in this nook of the univerſe, without knowing who placed him there; what he is come to do; and what will become of him after death; I return back terrified, as a man who having been carried, when aſleep, into a frightful deſart iſland, ſhould awake without knowing where he is, or knowing how to get out of this iſland: hence I wonder that mankind are not ſeized with deſpair, when they conſider the wretchedneſs of their condition* ††.

†† *Paſcal's Thoughts.*

" As I was peruſing this reflection, I received a " letter from a friend who lives in a far-diſtant " country. His words are as follow.

" *I am at this time juſt as you left me; neither* " *gayer nor more ſad, neither richer nor poorer. I enjoy* " *perfect health, and am bleſt with all things that make* " *life agreeable; undiſturbed with love, avarice, am-* " *bition, or envy; and will venture, ſo long as theſe* " *things laſt, to call myſelf a very happy man.*

" Many men are as happy as my correſpondent. " It is with men as with animals. Here a dog " ſhall eat and lie with his miſtreſs: there another " turns the ſpit, and is equally happy; a third ſhall " run mad, and is knocked on the head. As to my- " ſelf, when I caſt my eyes on London and Paris, I " do not ſee any cauſe to throw me into the deſpair " mentioned by Mr. Paſcal. I ſee a city, that does " not reſemble in any manner a deſert iſland, but, " on the contrary, populous, rich, well governed; " and where men are as happy as far as is conſiſtent " with their natures to be: what wiſe man would " attempt to hang himſelf, becauſe he does not " know in what manner God is ſeen face to face, " and becauſe he cannot unravel the myſtery of the " Trinity? He might as well plunge into deſpair, " becauſe he has not four feet and a pair of wings.

" Why ſhould any one endeavour to make us conſi- " der our Being with horror? Our exiſtence is not ſo " wretched as ſome people would make us believe it " to be. To conſider the univerſe as a dungeon, " and all mankind as ſo many criminals who are " carrying to execution, is the idea of an Enthuſiaſt: " to ſuppoſe that the world is a ſeat of delights, " where we ought to meet with nothing but plea- " ſures, is the dream of a Sibarite: but to conclude " that the earth, mankind, and animals are what they " ought to be, in the diſpoſition of Providence, is, " in my opinion, thinking like a wiſe man *."

* *Lettres Philoſophique*, p. 145, 146.

Here follows another reflection. *Thoſe who judge of a work by rule, are, with regard to other men, like thoſe who have a watch in compariſon of ſuch as have none. One man ſhall ſay, we have been here theſe two hours. Another ſays, we have been but three quarters of an hour. I look upon my watch, and ſay to the one, you are tired; and to the other, you think the time very ſhort* †. Here Mr. Voltaire anſwers: " In " works of taſte, in muſick, poetry, and painting, " taſte ſerves as a watch; and that man who judges " of them only by rule, judges wrong **.

† Paſcal's *Thoughts*.

** *Penſees Philoſophiques*, p. 178, 179.

I will give one reflection more. *As we ſay poetical beauty, we ought to ſay geometrical and medicinal beauty; and yet we don't ſay this, the reaſon of which is, that we know very well what is the object of geometry, and what is the object of phyſick; but we do not know in what the agreeableneſs conſiſts, which is the object of poetry. We do not know what this natural model, which we ought to imitate, is; and, for want of this knowledge, certain odd terms have been invented, as golden age, wonder of our time, fatal laurel, beautiful ſtar, &c. and this jargon is called poetical beauty. But that*

PASCHALI (GIULIO CESARE) was one of the Italians who left their native country in the 16th Century, in order to have an opportunity of profeſſing the Proteſtant Religion: He was a good Italian Poet; and publiſhed the Pſalms in Italian verſe, at Geneva, anno 1592, being then threeſcore and five years old (*a*). He annexed to them a collection of *Rime Spirituali*, and the firſt Canto of an Epic Poem, entitled, *Univerſo*. This Poem was finiſhed; and contained, in thirty two Canto's, the whole hiſtory of Moſes, from the creation of the world to the entrance of the Iſraelites into the land of Canaan (*b*). I believe he is the ſame with *Giulio Ceſare P*, who printed at Geneva, in 1557, 4to. his Italian tranſlation of Calvin's inſtitution, and dedicated it to Galeas Caraccioli, Marquis del Vico. The dedication is dated at Geneva the 4th of Auguſt, 1558.

(*a*) See the beginning of his Preface to the Pſalms.

(*b*) See the cloſe of the Preface above-cited.

perſon who ſhall image to himſelf a woman clothed after this model, will ſee a pretty maiden quite covered with looking-glaſſes and copper chains *. Mr. Voltaire anſwers. "This is abſolutely falſe, we ought not "to ſay geometrical beauty, nor medicinal beauty, "becauſe a theorem and a purge do not affect the "ſenſes in an agreeable manner; and becauſe we be"ſtow the name of beauty on thoſe things only which "charm the ſenſes, as muſick, painting, eloquence, "poetry, regular architecture, &c. The reaſon "which Mr. Paſcal gives is equally falſe. We very "well know what it is in which the object of Poetry "conſiſts. It conſiſts in painting with ſtrength, "clearneſs, delicacy and harmony: poetry is har"monious eloquence. Mr. Paſcal muſt have had "very little taſte, to ſay that *fatal laurel, beautiful "ſtar*, and ſuch like ſtuff, are poetical beauties; "and the editors of his thoughts muſt have been but "little acquainted with polite literature, otherwiſe "they would not have printed a reflection ſo un"worthy of its illuſtrious author †."

* Paſcal's *Thoughts*.

† *Lettres Philoſophiques*, p. 184, 185.

The learned Mr. Dacier had before animadverted on the reflection above cited of Mr. Paſcal, in the following terms. *Paſcal's reaſoning*, ſays Dacier **, is entirely falſe, and *founded on a ſenſible error. How could any one imagine that we ſay* poetical beauty, *merely becauſe we do not know what is the object of poetry; and, that the only reaſon why we do not ſay* medicinal beauty, *and* geometrical beauty, is, *becauſe the objects of geometry and phyſick are known? The only reaſon why we do not ſay* medicinal beauty *and* geometrical beauty, *is, becauſe the objects of phyſick and geometry do not require ornaments, and are not ſuſceptible of them. But we ſay* poetical beauty, *and that not through ignorance, but becauſe its object is perfectly known, as well as the beauties which are peculiar to it; and nothing can be falſer and more irrational, than to aſſert that, in order to make up or compenſate for the knowledge which he pretends we have not, of the true beauties of poetry, thoſe empty words, thoſe cold hyperboles were invented, which bad Poets employ, in order to maſk or diſguiſe whatever they may not be capable of expreſſing in a ſimple, and at the ſame time, noble manner. This jargon, ſo far from being what is called* poetical beauty, *has always been laughed at and exploded by the beſt Poets. In fine, Mr. Paſcal's worſt error is, when he affirms,* that we do not know in what the agreeableneſs conſiſts, which is the object of poetry; *and that* we do not know what this natural model, which we ought to imitate, is. *On the contrary, all this is perfectly known, ſince rules have been given for it, and demonſtrations have been made thereof by Ariſtotle and Horace. The epick and dramatick poems, the ode, the elegy, the idyllium, in a word, every ſpecies of poetry has its ſtated ornaments and peculiar characteriſticks. And any Poet who is not able to hit upon theſe characteriſticks, and to give them their proper and peculiar beauties, is unworthy to be called a Poet, as Horace obſerves very juſtly:*

Deſcriptas ſervare vices, operumque colores
Cur ego ſi nequeo, ignoroque, Poëta ſalutor ††?

†† Horace, *de Art. Poet.* ver. 86.

That is,

"Why is he honour'd with a Poet's name,
"Who neither knows, nor would obſerve a rule?"
ROSCOMMON.

If I am not able to give all theſe different characteriſtics, and employ in a proper manner the various colours which all the above-mentioned works require, why am I honoured with the title of Poet *?]

* Addit. by the Tranſlat.

** Horace de Dacier. Tom. 1. p. 80 *&ſeq.* A Hambourg 1733, 12mo.

PASOR (MATTHIAS), Profeſſor of Divinity in Groningen, born at Herborn, in the county of Naſſau, the 12th of April, 1599, was the ſon of GEORGE PASOR, who, after having taught Divinity and the Hebrew language during nineteen years in Herborn, was invited to Franeker in 1626, to be Profeſſor of the Greek language in that city, and died there the 10th of December 1637. Our Matthias had already made a conſiderable progreſs at Herborn, when the plague breaking out, he was ſent to Marpurg in 1614. Here he paſt his time away in a very diſagreeable manner; for the Profeſſors ſhunned him as an infectious wretch; and ſome of the ſtudents inſulted him in a very opprobrious manner, and beat him; by way of revenge, in that his father, when chief maſter at Herborn, had fined them, whenever they were guilty of any irregularity (*a*). He was forced to leave Marpurg, and the year following returned to Herborn, where he applied himſelf cloſely to his ſtudies. He went to Heidelberg in 1616, and meeting there with ſkilful Profeſſors in all parts of learning, he made a vaſt improvement. He even found an opportunity of leſſening the expences, to which his family had been put upon his account; he teaching, privately, the Mathematicks and Hebrew, and entering, as tutor, into a worthy man's houſe in Heidelberg. He gained ſo great a reputation by ſeveral publick exerciſes performed by him, in the Univerſities, that he flattered himſelf with the hopes of obtaining a Profeſſorſhip that was vacant; he flattered himſelf, I ſay, with theſe hopes, though one of his antagoniſts had many more friends than he. By a pretty extraordinary turn of good fortune he was not deceived in his expectations, he being appointed mathematical Profeſſor the 23d of April 1620. Not long after he was forced to fly, on account of the invaſion of the Palatinate. The ſtorm being in ſome meaſure blown over, he went and continued the duties of his employment in Heidelberg, in which unhappy city he ſuffered all the inconveniences and dangers that can be imagined; and did not leave it till it was ſacked by the troops of Count Tilly, anno 1622. He went to Herborn, through numberleſs difficulties; and reſolved, in 1624, to go into England. He read private Lectures in Oxford, both on the Hebrew and the Mathematicks, and went and took a Tour in France with ſome Germans. He ſpent the winter at Paris, where he heard,

(*a*) *Studioſi nonnulli memores mulctæ ſibi ob petulantiam Herbornæ à patre Rectore irrogatæ, me innocentem & minime ferocem ſed meticuloſum depoſitionis in Academiis Germanicis receptæ occaſione, verberibus & contumeliis variis affecerunt.* Mathias Paſor, *in vita ſua*, p. m. 22.

heard, among other Lectures, thoſe of Gabriel Sionita [*A*], Chaldee and Arabick Profeſſor. Returning to England in the ſummer of the year 1625, he found that the ſtudents of Oxford were very much diſperſed, occaſioned by the plague. The infection ceaſing, he had ſome pupils, whom he inſtructed either in Divinity or the oriental tongues; and he choſe to reſide here rather than to go to Ireland with the learned Uſher, who offered him his table and an handſome penſion: the petition he preſented in order to deſire to be made Profeſſor of the Eaſtern languages, met with a favourable reception; ſo that he entered upon his Profeſſorſhip the 25th of October 1626; and exerciſed that employment till the year 1629, when he was invited to Groningen, to be Profeſſor of Philoſophy, and accordingly began to exerciſe his employment the 27th of Auguſt of the ſame year. Six years after he was appointed mathematical Profeſſor, and in 1645 Divinity Profeſſor; for which reaſon he did not go to Harderwic, where he was offered the employment of Profeſſor in ordinary in Divinity and Hebrew. He took his Doctor's Degree in Divinity, at Groningen, the 21ſt of October 1645, and reſigned his mathematical Profeſſorſhip, but kept that of moral Philoſophy. He travelled to Naſſau, his native country, in 1653, and went as far as Heidelberg, where he met with numberleſs civilities from the Elector Palatine (*b*). He lived till the 28th of January 1658. He was never married [*B*], and led an irreproachable life of celibacy (*c*). He did not publiſh any book [*C*]; for which he gives two admirable reaſons [*D*], and theſe ought to ſerve as a rule to many people, and to myſelf in particular.

(*b*) Extracted from the Journal of his Life, written by himſelf, and printed at Groningen, in 1658, 4to.

(*c*) *Ex Orat. funebri.*

[*A*] *He heard . . . . the Lectures . . . . of Gabriel Sionita.*] This Profeſſor has left off his Lectures for ſome years, becauſe he had no auditors. He reſumed his exerciſes at the requeſt of our Paſor; however, he did not read them in the Royal College, but in his own houſe (1). What a ſtrange circumſtance was this! a great Kingdom, ſuch a city as Paris could not furniſh three Auditors to a Profeſſor, whoſe fame was ſo great in foreign countries, that Bangius (2), a learned Dane, would not accept of a Hebrew Profeſſorſhip at Copenhagen, but upon condition that he ſhould be allowed time to go to Paris, and improve himſelf under Gabriel Sionita. And here we have a Heidelberg Profeſſor, who deſires to be a Diſciple of the ſame man, at the ſame time that not ſo many as two ſtudents in Paris are curious of being his Auditors. Such is the temper and diſpoſition of mankind, that they will travel to far diſtant countries in ſearch of things; which, were they at their own doors, they would utterly neglect.

(1) *Ex vita Matthiæ Paſoris*, p. 41.

(2) See his article.

[*B*] *He was never married.*] It is obſerved expreſsly in his funeral oration (3), that his leading a life of celibacy did not proceed from any particular vow, or from his entertaining an averſion to a ſuitable match; on the contrary, he was an advocate for it, and uſed to applaud it; though, at the ſame time, he was extremely ſorry, that ſo uſeful and neceſſary a ſtate of life, and inſtituted even in the ſtate of innocence, ſhould, by reaſon of ſin, be obnoxious to ſo many difficulties. The true reaſons therefore, why he did not marry were theſe; in his juvenile years he deſired to be free from domeſtick cares; in his riper age he laboured under the calamities of perſecution and baniſhment; and afterwards, he found his health a little impaired; in fine, he had entertained great hopes of John George Paſor, his brother's ſon.

(3) Abdius Widmarius, Miniſter of the Goſpel, and Profeſſor of Divinity in Groningen, wrote this funeral oration.

[*C*] *He did not publiſh many books*] He reviſed with care two or three of his father's works, which are of great uſe to ſcholars and ſtudents in Divinity: the books I mean are, *Lexicon Novi Teſtamenti*, the *Manuale Novi Teſtamenti*, and the Greek Grammar of the New Teſtament. This Father wrote ſome other books, as Piſcator's funeral Oration, the Analyſis of the difficult words in Heſiod, *Collegium Heſiodeum*, &c. With regard to our Matthias Paſor, I believe that nothing has been publiſhed of his except ſome Theſes, or general ideas of certain Sciences. The Journal he had drawn up of his own life ought not to have been publiſhed; it ſhould rather have been ſuppreſſed, or at leaſt many trifling particulars ought to have been retrenched; as for inſtance, was it neceſſary the world ſhould be informed, that the publick-houſe, in which the Heidelberg Profeſſors treated, in a body, Matthias Paſor, had ſwords for its ſign, *Partim univerſi in prandio honorario lauto, inſtituto ad ſignum enſium* (4)? Was it neceſſary that the world ſhould know that at Hanaw, in the very beginning of a ſumptuous entertainment he was forced to riſe from table, upon finding himſelf out of order, and his wanting to ſpew out ſome bilious humour? *In prandio lauto nihil ventriculo arridebat, imo ſub initium menſæ ſurgere coactus ſum & bilem evomui* (5). However, I do not wonder that ſuch Journals are publiſhed, ſince, in the funeral orations of profeſſors, we generally meet with a very exact deſcription of all the ſymptoms of their laſt ſickneſs; whether ſuch a day, they ſweated, were coſtive, or were troubled with a looſeneſs, &c.

(4) p. 54.

(5) Ibid. p. 55.

[*D*] . . . . *for which he gives two admirable reaſons.*] The firſt is, becauſe he was not willing that youth ſhould be diverted from reading the good books which are already publiſhed; and ſecondly, becauſe he did not care the bookſellers ſhould riſk their money; theſe very often defraying the expence of books which either ſell very ſlowly, or lie for ever buried in their warehouſes. *Nolui*, ſays he (6), *nimis multa ſcribere*; I. *Ne juventutem abſtraherem à lectione graviorum Authorum, quos per Dei gratiam habemus.* II. *Ne miſeris typographis imponeretur, qui ſæpe magnos ſumptus impendunt libris nunquam vel tardè admodum diſtrahendis.*

(6) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 58.

PATERCULUS (CAIUS (*a*) VELLEIUS), a Latin Hiſtorian, under the Empire of Tiberius. There is great reaſon to believe, that he was born the year of Rome 735 (*b*). His Anceſtors were illuſtrious by their merit and the employments they exerciſed [*A*]. He was a military Tribune when Caius Cæſar, Auguſtus's grandſon, had an interview with the King of the Parthians in an iſland of Euphrates, anno 753 (*c*). He commanded

(*a*) Publius or Marcus, according to others.

(*b*) See Dodwell's *Annales Velleiani*, prefixed to the edition of Paterculus, Oxford 1693, 8vo.

(*c*) Vell. Patercul. lib. 2. cap. 101.

[*A*] *His Anceſtors were illuſtrious on account of their merit and the employments they exerciſed.*] Here follows what he ſays, ſpeaking of the confederate war. *Neque ego verecundia domeſtici ſanguinis gloriæ quidquam, dum verum refero, ſubtraham, quippe multum Minatii Magii, atavi mei, Aſculanenſis, tribuendum eſt memoriæ: qui nepos Decii Magii, Campanorum principis, celeberrimi & fideliſſimi viri, tantum hoc bello Romanis fidem præſtitit, ut cum legione, quam ipſe in Hirpinis conſcripſerat, Herculaneum ſimul cum T. Didio caperet, Pompeios cum L. Sulla oppugnaret, Coſamque occuparet: cujus de virtutibus cum alii, tum maxime dilucideque Q. Hortenſius in Annalibus ſuis retulit: cujus pietati plenam populus R. gratiam retulit; ipſum viritim civitate donando, duos filios ejus creando prætores, cum ſeni adhuc crearentur* (1), i. e. "Nor ſhould modeſty prompt me, to conceal "the glory of my Anceſtors, ſo long as I adhere "ſtrictly to the truth: for much is due to the me- "mory of Minatius Magius, of Aſculum, my great- "grandfather's grandfather, who was grandſon to De- "cius Magius, the chief man among the Campanians, "and famous for his virtue and fidelity. He ſerved "the Romans with ſo much faithfulneſs in this war, "that, with only a ſingle legion which he himſelf

(1) Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 16.

commanded the Cavalry in Germany, under Tiberius; and accompanied that Prince nine years ſucceſſively, in all his expeditions (*d*), for which he was honourably rewarded (*e*). He was raiſed to the Prætorſhip [*B*], but to no higher employment. It is conjectured, with ſome probability, that, on account of the applauſes he beſtowed on Sejanus [*C*], he was looked upon as the friend of that favourite (*f*), and conſequently that he was involved

(*d*) See the rem. [*B*].

(*e*) See the ſame remark.

(*f*) Dodwell, *Annales Vellei.* num. 30.

" had raiſed among the Hirpini, he, in conjunction " with T. Didius, took Herculaneum; beſieged the " Pompeys with L. Sylla, and poſſeſſed himſelf of Coſa. " Among other Authors, Q. Hortenſius has written " with great clearneſs, in his Annals, concerning his " virtue and good qualities. His zeal was nobly re- " compenſed by the people of Rome, they beſtow- " ing upon him, man by man, the freedom of the " city; and creating his two ſons Prætors, at the " time that ſix only were created." We here have ſomething very ſingular with regard to the degrees of deſcent. Paterculus, born the year of Rome 735, reckons, as his great-grandfather's grandfather, Minatius Magius, who, at the head of a legion, which he himſelf had raiſed, beſieged and took cities about the year 664; and who was grandſon of Decius Magius, who greatly diſtinguiſhed himſelf in Capua, by his fidelity for the Romans, the year of Rome 538. On one hand, we have five deſcents in the ſpace of ſeventy one years; and, in the other, we have but two in the ſpace of one hundred and twenty ſix years. In my opinion greater difficulties occur in the five deſcents than in the two; and perhaps we ought to conjecture, that *atavus* has been inſerted, by copiſts, inſtead of *avus*; or that *atavus* did not regularly ſignify, on all occaſions, the great-grandfather's grandfather. Dodwell is of opinion that *atavus* ſignified great-grandfather. *Aves ſimiliter Vellei fuiſſe neceſſe irat Minatii Magii filios ſiquidem atavus ipſe fuerat Minatius* (2). If the conjecture I ſpeak of was true, we muſt ſay that Paterculus did not deſcend from Decius Magius but by the mother's ſide; for there is no doubt but that Caius Velleius, mentioned by him in Chapter LXXVI. of Book II. was his grandfather by the father's ſide, and a different perſon from Minatius Magius. I will quote this paſſage, in order to eſtabliſh all we know of his Anceſtors. *Quod alieno teſtimonium redderem, in eo non fraudabo avum meum: quippe C. Velleius, honoratiſſimo inter illos* CCCLX. *judices loco à Cn. Pompeio lectus, ejuſdem, Marcique Bruti ac Tironis præfectus fabrûm, vir nulli ſecundus, in Campania, digreſſu Neronis à Neapoli, cujus ob ſingularem cum eo amicitiam partium adjutor fuerat, gravis jam ætate & corpore, cum comes eſſe non poſſet, gladio ſe ipſe tranſfixit* (3), i. e. " The teſtimony " which I would beſtow on any indifferent perſon, I " will not rob my grandfather of: for C. Velleius, " a man inferior to none, was appointed by Cn. " Pompey, to fill a moſt honourable ſeat among thoſe " 360 Judges; and nominated ſuperintendant of the " works to the laſt mentioned, and to Marcus Brutus " and Tiro. Upon Nero's leaving Naples, he hav- " ing aſſiſted his party, on account of the great " friendſhip that was between them, being very far " advanced in years and infirm, and finding himſelf " unable to accompany him, he killed himſelf with " his ſword." Here a ſmall ſcruple ariſes. Paterculus had a brother, Magius Celer by name. It is therefore very probable that they deſcended from Decius Magius, by the father's ſide. The printed books give the ſirname of Velleianus to this Magius Celer; but it is pretended, that this epithet is merely an invention of the Criticks, and that it is not found in the manuſcripts (4). Dodwell obſerves (5), that if it were true that Magius Celer was ſirnamed Velleianus, this would be a manifeſt proof that he had paſſed, by adoption, from the family of Vellei to that of Magius. In this caſe it might be ſaid, that he had been adopted by a relation on the mother's ſide, deſcended, in a direct line, from Decius Magius. The learned man whom I juſt now quoted would not admit of this ſuppoſition; he being of opinion, that our Paterculus was related, by the father's ſide, to the family Magia; and that the name Velleius belonged to him only by adoption. *Eritque adeo gentile auctoris noſtri nomen Magius Velleius adſcititium ex adoptione in familiam Velleiam* (6). But it is to be obſerved that his grandfather's name was Velleius. This hiſtorian had an uncle, by the father's ſide, name *Capito*, who was a Senator, and joined with Agrippa in impeaching Caſſius, the murderer of Cæſar. *Quo tempore Capito patruus meus vir ordinis Senatorii, Agrippæ ſubſcripſit in C. Caſſium* (7). I will alſo take notice of his brother. *Cæſar ad alteram Belli Dalmatici molem animum atque arma contulit: in qua regione quali adjutore legatoque fratre meo, Magio Celere Velleiano, uſus ſit, ipſius patriſque ejus predicatione teſtatum eſt, & ampliſſimorum honorum, quibus triumphans eum Cæſar donavit, ſignat memoria* (8), i. e. " Cæſar " devoted his thoughts and his arms to the other " war in Dalmatia. It would be needleſs for me to " obſerve, how greatly he was aſſiſted in that coun- " try by my brother Magius Celer Velleianus, his " Lieutenant-General. This is ſufficiently teſtified " by the account that himſelf and his father gave, " and by the great honours which Cæſar, at his " triumph, beſtowed upon him." He was Prætor, as the reader will ſee in the beginning of the following remark. I take ſome notice hereunder (9) of their father.

(2) Dodwellus, *Ann. Velleianorum*, num. 7. [The beſt and moſt methodical treatiſe, I believe, on Deſcents, is that intitled, *A Diſcourſe concerning the Law of Inheritances in Fee; and therein, concerning the ſeveral degrees of Conſanguinity, &c. with a Kalendar of the perſons inheritable.* A ſecond edition of it was lately publiſhed (1738) by Meſſ. Ward and Chandler; and alſo the Kalendar, (in Latin and Engliſh) curiouſly digeſted and engraved. The *Law concerning Inheritances* ſeems to be here illuſtrated and explained in a manner entirely new; and is ſaid to be written by the very worthy and learned Robinſon, of Gray's-Inn, Eſq; Recorder of Scarborough, &c.] Rem. by the Tranſl.

(3) Vell. Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 76.

(4) Dod. *Ann. Velleiani*, num. 7.

(5) Idem. Ibid.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Vell. Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 69.

(8) Idem, Ibid. cap. 115. add to this what he ſays in chap. 121. *quem (Tiberium in triumpho) mihi fratrique meo, inter præcipuos præcipuiſque donis adornatos viros, comitari contigit.*

[*B*] *He was raiſed to the Prætorſhip.*] It was the ſame year that Auguſtus died. He himſelf informs us of this particular, and with ſuch a turn of expreſſion, as ſhews the ſubtilty of his genius. *Quo tempore mihi fratrique meo candidatis Cæſaris, proxime à nobiliſſimis ac ſacerdotibus viris, deſtinari prætoribus contigit: conſecutis, ut neque poſt nos quemquam D. Auguſtus, neque ante nos Cæſar commendaret Tiberius* (10), i. e. " At which time my brother and I being " elected by Cæſar's order, were appointed Prætors, " immediately after the moſt noble men, and ſuch " as belonged to the prieſthood: and we had " this advantage, that Auguſtus Cæſar did not " recommend any perſon after us, nor Tiberius " before us." Here follow ſome other paſſages, which ſhew the progreſs he made in his fortune. *Habuit in hoc quoque bello*, ſays he (11), ſpeaking of the war againſt the Dalmatians and Pannonians, under the year 759, *mediocritas noſtra ſpecioſi miniſtri locum. Finita equeſtri militia, deſignatus quæſtor, nec dum ſenator æquatus ſenatoribus, etiam deſignatus tribunus plebis partem exercitus ab Urbe, traditi ab Auguſto, perduxi ad filium ejus: in quæſtura deinde, remiſſa ſorte provinciæ, legatus ejuſdem ad eundem miſſus*; i. e. " Tho' ſo mean, " I yet had an honourable poſt in this war, and did " ſome ſervice. Having ended my ſervice in the " Cavalry, I was appointed Quæſtor; and, before I " was a Senator, was upon a level with thoſe of the " Senatorial Order; being likewiſe nominated Tri- " bune of the people, I led from the city, to Au- " guſtus's ſon, part of the army which Auguſtus had " delivered to me. Afterwards, in my Quæſtorſhip, " giving up my chance of a province, I was ſent to " him to be his Lieutenant-General." He ſpeaks as follows in another place (12): *Hoc tempus me functum ante tribunatu caſtrorum, Ti. Cæſaris militem fecit: quippe protinus ab adoptione miſſus cum eo præfectus equitum in Germaniam, ſucceſſor officii patris mei, cæleſtiſſimorum ejus operum per annos continuos* IX. *præfectus aut legatus, ſpectator & pro captu mediocritatis meæ adjutor fui.* i. e. " Having before been a Camp-Marſhal, I now " ſerved under Tiberius Cæſar: for ſoon after his " adoption, I was ſent with him to Germany, as Co- " lonel of horſe, in which poſt I ſucceeded my fa- " ther; and whilſt a Colonel or Lieutenant-General, " I was, during nine years ſucceſſively, a Spectator, " and, ſo far as my mean abilities would allow, an " aſſiſtant in the divine actions performed by him." I before obſerved (13), that he made a conſpicuous figure in Tiberius's triumph. Hankius fixes this triumph to the year of Rome 744 (14): but he anticipates full twenty years, or more; and did not know that Paterculus made his firſt campaign in the year 753. How then was it poſſible for him to appear, anno 744, in a triumph, with the moſt conſpicuous diſtinctions of honour, ſince he did not deſerve theſe, but by his aſſiduous ſervices under Tiberius, after his firſt military exploits (15)?

(9) In the laſt remark No. 3.

(10) Idem, Ibid. cap. 124.

(11) Idem, Ibid. cap. 111.

(12) Idem, Ibid. cap. 104. this refers to the year of Rome 757.

(13) Rem. [*A*], citat. (8).

(14) Hankius, *de Scriptor. Rerum Roman.* Tom. 1. p. 70.

[*C*] *The applauſe he beſtowed on Sejanus.*] See chap. 127 and 128 of his ſecond book. I ſhall extract but one

(15) See Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 101, 104, 121.

voled in his ruin. He wrote a very curious Epitome of the Roman Hiſtory [*D*], and promiſed to give a hiſtory more at large (*g*). The elogiums he beſtows on Tiberius are ſo extravagant; and he had ſo well found out the art to flatter this Emperor, that it is thought he did not ſcruple to ſpeak ill of Germanicus [*E*]. It is a miſtake to aſſert, that there was an Annaliſt of Rome named Cneius Velleius [*F*], as Glandorpius ſuppoſes. I ſhall

(*g*) Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 48, 103, & *paſſim alibi.*

one particular from them, *viz.* his ſhewing, by great examples, that a Prince may divide the toils of government with his Prime Miniſter. *Raro eminentes viri non magnis adjutoribus ad gubernandam fortunam ſuam uſi ſunt; ut duo Scipiones duobus Læliis, quos per omnia æquaverunt ſibi; ut D. Auguſtus M. Agrippa, & maximè ab eo, Statilio Tauro: quibus novitas familiæ haud obſtitit, quo minus ad multiplices conſulatus triumphoſque, & complura eniterentur ſacerdotia, etenim magna negotia magnis adjutoribus egent* (16). i. e. "Great men "frequently employ perſons of merit to aid them "in the adminiſtration of their affairs; as the two "Scipios acted with regard to the two Lælius's, "whom they equalled on all occaſions to themſelves: "as the divine Auguſtus did M. Agrippa, and chiefly "Statilius Taurus, after him. And altho' their families were but newly raiſed, they nevertheleſs "were often appointed Conſuls, had ſeveral triumphs decreed them, and made a figure in different degrees of the Prieſthood: for great affairs "require great aſſiſtants." This paſſage, and ſome others of the like kind, furniſhed a moſt beautiful varniſh or gilding to the panegyriſts of Cardinal Richelieu and Cardinal Mazarin. But they changed their note, and employed other maxims, after the death of the latter, as I have obſerved in another place (17). I muſt not omit a reflection of la Mothe le Vayer. *He is blamed*, ſays he (18), *and that with great reaſon, for having . . . beſtowed ridiculous elogiums, not only on Tiberius, but even on Sejanus his favourite, whoſe merit he exhibits twice, as being one of the principal and moſt virtuous perſonages the Republic of Rome could boaſt of. Now what did he do in this, but what will happen, in all probability, to all thoſe who ſhall take up the pen, with a reſolution of publiſhing the hiſtory of their own times?* This is a juſt reflection. It is ſcarce poſſible for an Author to be ſincere, when he writes of Princes in their life-time, or in that of their ſons.

(16) Idem, Ibid. cap. 127.

(17) See the *Nouvelles Lettres de la Critique Generale de Maimbourg*, p. 81 & *ſeq.*

(18) La Mothe le Vayer, in the treatiſe concerning *Hiſtorians*, p. 194.

[*D*] *He wrote a very curious epitome of the Roman Hiſtory.*] The beginning of it is loſt. It was a general idea of antient times. La Mothe le Vayer was not miſtaken in what I ſhall here ſubjoin (19). "The remembrance of the countries he had ſeen, "when a Military Tribune, and travelling through "the provinces of Thrace, Macedon, Achaia, Aſia "Minor, other countries ſtill more to the Eaſt, and "eſpecially on both ſhores of Pontus, Euxinus, furniſhed him a great number of very agreeable "ideas. Hence we may judge, that had he wrote "that entire and extenſive hiſtory, which he promiſes ſo often, we ſhould have therein read a great "number of very conſiderable particulars, as related "by him who had been an eye-witneſs of, and "partly aſſiſtant in them. In the little that ſtill remains of this, in which he gives nothing but by "way of epitome, we nevertheleſs find therein a "great number of particulars, which are ſo much the "more valuable, as this is the only place where they "occur, occaſioned either by the ſilence of other "Hiſtorians, or by the ſo common loſs, that of part "of their productions. The ſtyle of Velleius Paterculus is highly worthy of the age in which he "lived, that being ſtill the age of beautiful language. He excells particularly, when he cenſures "or applauds thoſe whom he writes of; all which "he does in ſuch beautiful terms, and ſuch delicate "expreſſions, that the like are not met with in a- "ny other Hiſtorian or Author. . . . . (20). We "do not meet with a greater purity of diction in "any of the Latin Authors, nor more worthy of the "ages of Auguſtus and Tiberius." Is it not very ſtrange, that a work which ſo well deſerved to be preſerved with the utmoſt care, and of which, on account of its ſhortneſs, many copies might eaſily have been taken, had like to have been loſt? It is affirmed, that Morbac's manuſcript, from which Rhenanus publiſhed the firſt edition of this Author (21), was the only copy in the world (22). Farther, it is obſerved, that no antient Author, except Priſcian, has ſpoke of Paterculus (23) However, the moderns have done infinitely more juſtice to him. They have publiſhed his works ſeveral times with Notes or Commentaries. It has been tranſlated into French. Mr. Doujat publiſhed one edition of it, *in uſum Delphini*, anno 1679; and, to make his work a continued hiſtory, he ſupplied whatever was wanting in Paterculus. I ſay nothing in particular, either of Lipſius's edition at Leyden 1591, 8vo, nor of that of Sckegkius at Frankfort 1602, 12mo, of that of Gerard Voſſius at Leyden 1639, 12mo; nor of that of Boeclerus at Straſburg 1642, 8vo; nor of the edition *Variorum* at Leyden 1653, 8vo, nor of many others. I ſhall only obſerve, that the *Annales Velleiani* of *Dodwell*, prefixed to the Oxford edition 1693, form a noble piece of Literature, which exhibit a prodigious knowledge of antiquity. It is to be obſerved, that Paterculus wrote this work the year of Rome 782 (24), in the 16th year of the reign of Tiberius (25).

(19) La Mothe le Vayer, in the treatiſe concerning *Hiſtorians*, p. 193, 194. Tom. 3. edit. 12mo. What he ſays concerning the travels of Paterculus, is in chap. 101. book 2.

(20) Ibid. p. 197.

(21) At Baſil, anno 1520.

(22) See the preface to the *Paterculus*, printed at Oxford 1693.

(23) Dodwell, *Ann. Vell.* num. 30.

(24) Paterculus, lib. 1. cap. 8.

(25) Idem, lib. 2. cap. 126.

[*E*] *It is thought that he did not ſcruple to ſpeak ill of Germanicus.*] A learned Critic will not allow this; he aſſerting that the following paſſage, *Quo quidem tempore ut pleraque ignave Germanicus* (26), is not correct, and that we muſt read *gnave* for *ignave*. He grounds his opinion on reaſons which appear to me ſolid (27); for it is certain that Paterculus, in other places, has beſtowed elogiums on Germanicus (28). However this be, the injuſtice, with which he palliates the paſſions of Tiberius, appears manifeſtly by his affecting to paſs ſo lightly over the ſhining actions of Germanicus, and even to ſuppreſs the greateſt part of them, and to ſully the glory of Agrippina, and of thoſe who were obnoxious to the Emperor. Lipſius has thus cenſured him for this. *Ex antiquis bilem mihi etiam movet Vellejus Paterculus. Ælium Sejanum omnibus virtutibus accumulat, & quaſi in theatro plena manu dilaudat. Os hiſtorici! at nos eum ſcimus natum & exſtinctum exitio generis humani. Liviam Auguſtam, poſt multas laudes, diis quam hominibus ſimiliorem feminam concludit. Jam de Tiberio, flagitium ſit ſi uſquam aliter quàm ut de Jove immortali loquatur. Hæc liber & ingenuus animus qui ferat? Contrà ut Germanici Cæſaris virtutes ubique callidè diſſimulat? Ut Agrippinam, & quibus aliis infenſior Tiberius credebatur, obliquè premit? Quid multa? Non aliquid quàm mancipium aulæ agit. Dices, in tuta illis temporibus veritas fuit. Fateor. Sed verà ſcribere ſi non licuit, falſa non debuit, Nemo ſilentii cauſam reddit* (29). i. e. "Velleius Paterculus, among the antients, fires "me with indignation. He exhibits Sejanus as a "man adorned with the whole circle of Virtues, "and applauds him, as in a theatre, in the higheſt "manner. What a front muſt this Hiſtorian have! "But we know that he came into the world, and "died, to the deſtruction of mankind. After beſtowing many elogiums on Livia Auguſta, he ends "with ſaying, that ſhe was a woman who reſembled "the Gods more than mortals. With regard to Tiberius, he looks upon it a crime, to ſpeak of him in "any other terms than of an immortal Jove. But "what man of a ſincere and ingenuous mind could "bear this? On the other ſide, how artfully does he "every where conceal the virtues of Germanicus Cæſar? How inſidiouſly does he endeavour to ruin "Agrippina, and others, for whom Tiberius was "ſuppoſed to harbour an averſion? To ſay all in a "word, he acts no other part than that of a court- "ſlave. But you will ſay, it was not ſafe to ſpeak "truth in thoſe times; I confeſs this: but if he was "afraid of writing the truth, he ought not to have "writ lies. No man is called to account for being "ſilent."

(26) Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 225.

(27) See the notes of Boeclerus, on this paſſage of Paterculus.

(28) Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 116, 129.

(29) *Juſtus Lipſius*, lib. 5. *Epiſtol. Quæſtion.* Epiſt. 11. p. m. 599. Tom. 1.

[*F*] *It is a miſtake to aſſert, that there was an Annaliſt of Rome named Cneius Velleius.*] Glandorpius's words are as follow: *Cneius Velleius, hiſtoricus cujus*

I ſhall animadvert on ſome errors of Moreri [G].

Annales citantur apud Gellium lib. 18. *cap.* 12. *quo tempore in repub. vixerit, non comperi* (30). i.e. " Cneius " Vellius, the Hiſtorian, whoſe Annals are cited in " Aulus Gellius, book 18. chap. 12. I have not " found in what time of the Commonwealth he " lived." In this part of Aulus Gellius, of Henry Stephens's edition, *Cn. Vellius in Annalibus*. Here then is one error of Glandorpius, *Velleius* for *Vellius*. And another is this, he ſhould have read in Aulus Gellius, *Gellius* and not *Vellius*; for he doubtleſs cites the ſame author there as he cited in chapter 13. book 8. and chap. 21. of book 13. under the name of *Cn. Gellius: Voſſius* (31) ſays, that Glandorpius has conjectured, that, inſtead of *Cn. Vellius*, we are to read *Cn. Gellius*, in chap. 12. book 18. of Aulus Gellius; but the above cited words of Glandorpius ſhew evidently that this is a falſity. Had Voſſius ſaid that, according to Glandorpius's conjectures, Gellius the Annaliſt is the ſame perſon with Cneius Gellius, againſt whom Cato the Cenſor pleaded (32), he would have been very much in the right, for Glandorpius expreſſes himſelf as follows (33): *Fors idem eſt annalium ſcriptor cujus librum* 2. *citat Gellius* 13, *capite* 21 *&* 15 (34). Now there is nothing here which relates to the paſſage, where it is *Cn. Vellius* in Henry Stephens's edition.

(30) Gland. *Onomaſt.* p. 887.

(31) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* lib. 1. cap. 8. p. 34.

(31) Aul. Gellius, lib. 14 cap. 2.

(33) Glandorp. *Onomaſt.* p. 380.

(34) We cannot find what Glandorpius means by this 15; but whether he means the chapter or book, he is miſtaken.

[G] *I ſhall animadvert on ſome errors of Moreri.*] I. The Moderns are in doubt very much, ſays he, whether his firſt name was Caius, Marcus, or Publius. This is not a good phraſe; it leading the reader to ſuppoſe, that Paterculus was firſt called by one of theſe names, and that he afterwards laid it aſide to aſſume another. This is very much practiſed by the Moderns: one of the French Chaplains of the 17th Century, gained great fame by the name of Count de Bouteville, and afterwards by that of Duke of Luxemburg. But nothing like this muſt be ſuppoſed of our hiſtorian, with regard to the name Caius or Publius, *&c.* the Romans always preſerving thoſe kinds of names: in a word, Moreri ought to have ſaid *prænomen*, or the *proper name*, and not the *firſt name*. II. He ſhould not have aſſerted that Paterculus was *of a family that came from Naples*: where did he find this? He ſays that his *atavus* was of Aſculum (35), and that the grandfather of this *atavus* was the chief man among the people of Campania, *Campanorum principis* (36). He affirms in another place (37), that no man in Campania was ſuperior to his grandfather. There is not one thing particular in this place, concerning the city of Naples; and I am ſurprized that Dodwell ſhould ſay, that Paterculus's grandfather was born in this city (38); for this cannot be inferred, becauſe this old man laid violent hands upon himſelf, when he could not accompany Tiberius at his leaving Naples. Doujat has committed theſe two errors as well as Moreri (39), occaſioned probably by his tranſcribing from him: whence we may infer, that a Dictionary writer has frequently the honour of being conſulted and copied by perſons who know more than himſelf: ſo well people love not to take the pains to collect materials, when they meet with collections of them ready at hand. III. Paterculus indeed ſucceeded his father in the command of the Cavalry: *Miſſus cum eo* (Tiberio) *præfectus equitum in Germaniam ſucceſſor officii patris mei* (40); but then he did not ſucceed him before he had been a *Military Tribune*. He had already been Camp-Marſhal, *Functum ante tribunatu caſtrorum* (41), a poſt ſuperior to that of a mere Tribune of the ſoldiers. IV. His father was not his Collegue in any employment. V. *Magius Celer Velleianus* was his brother, and not his father. VI. It does not appear that he was *Lieutenant-General under Tiberius, in the armies of Germany and Hungary*, but in Dalmatia (42). VII. And in this caſe his brother, who was abſent (43), could not be his collegue.

(35) Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 16.

(36) Idem, Ibid.

(37) Idem, Ibid. cap. 76. See remark [A], citat. (1) above.

(38) Dodwell, *in Synopſi Chronolog. ad calcem Annal. Velleian.*

(39) Doujat, Preface to his tranſlation of Paterculus.

(40) Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 104.

(41) Idem, Ibid.

(42) Idem, Ibid. cap. 115.

(43) Had he been preſent, would he have ſaid merely, that his brother had had the advantage of being with Tiberius?

PATIN (GUY), Profeſſor of Phyſick in the Royal College of Paris, was a perſon of great wit and erudition. See his Elogium prefixed to his Letters. Theſe are ſo well known all over the world, that this circumſtance will be my excuſe for not expatiating on his merit. It will be ſufficient for me to obſerve, that the reader may be informed of it in the Preface above hinted at. It would ſhew too great a delicacy in any perſon, to be diſpleaſed at the Author of the Elogium in queſtion, for not giving the hiſtory of Guy Patin. This is the common way of thoſe who write Elogiums. They ſeldom or never take the pains to inform us of the place of a man's birth, nor in what manner he raiſed himſelf; and do not ſpeak of his actions, unleſs they relate in a diſtinguiſhed manner to the virtue for which they applaud him. It is therefore neceſſary that I inform my readers, that our Patin was born at Houdan in Bray, three Leagues from Beauvais (*a*), in 1602 *. He does not boaſt of his being well deſcended, he ſpeaking of his family much after the ſame manner as Horace does of his [A]. He doubtleſs made his way into the world merely

(*a*) Patin, *Letter* 293, p. 561. Tom. 3. Geneva edit. 1691.

* He was born the 6th of Auguſt, 1602. From the rem. on the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. vol. 4. p. 970.

(*b*) It is ſaid in his elogium, that he died at ſeventy years of age, in 1672.

[A] He ſpeaks *of his family much after the ſame manner as Horace does of his* (*a*).] " My Parents, " ſays he (1), were good honeſt people, whom I " would not have exchanged for others who are " richer. Their picture is here before my eyes: I " daily remember their virtue, and am extremely " glad that I was an eye-witneſs to the innocence of " their lives, which was wonderful. The inhabi- " tants of cities, and particularly thoſe of Paris, do " not lead ſuch lives. I now ſee nothing but vanity, " cheating, and knavery. God reſerved us for a " fraudulent and dangerous age." I will now hear what Horace ſaid of his father:

Purus & inſons
(Ut me collaudem) ſi vivo, & charus amicis,
Cauſa fuit pater his, qui macro pauper agello,
Noluit in Flavi ludum me mittere magni.
. . . . . .
Nec timuit, ſibi ne vitio quis verteret, olim
Si præco parvas, aut (ut fuit ipſe) coactor
Mercedes ſequerer: neque ego eſſem queſtus. Ob hoc nunc
Laus illi debetur, & à me gratia major.
Nil me pœniteat ſanum patris hujus: eòque
Non, ut magna dolo factum negat eſſe ſuo pars,
Quòd non ingenuos habeat claroſque parentes,
Sic me defendam: longè mea diſcrepat iſtis
Et vox & ratio. Nam ſi natura juberet
A certis annis ævum remeare peractum,
Atque alios legere ad faſtum, quoſcunque parentes
Optaret ſibi quiſque: meis contentus, honeſtos
Faſcibus & ſellis nolim mihi ſumere E demens:
Judicio vulgi (2).

(1) Patin, *Letter* 293. p. m. 561.

(2) Horat. Satyr. 6. lib. 1. ver. 68.

That is,

" If innocent my life, if (to commend
" Myſelf) I live belov'd by every friend:
" I thank my father for't, for being poor,
" His farm but ſmall, the uſual ways forbore;
" He did not ſend me to Sir Flavius ſchool
" To teach me arts, and make me great by rule.
. . . . . .
" Nor did he fear the cenſuring world ſhould blame
" His high deſigns, or I be damn'd with ſhame.
" If after all his coſt I ſhould be made
" A common cryer, or a meaner trade;
" Or elſe, as he himſelf, have poorly liv'd
" A mean exciſeman, nor ſhould I have griev'd:
" I owe more thanks, and more reſpect for this,
" Nor ſhall I e're whatever fops adviſe,
" Repent of ſuch a father if I'm wiſe.

" Therefore

merely by the force of his genius ; and I was informed by a perſon whoſe veracity cannot be

" Therefore as others when they haughty ſcorn,
" *'Twas not our fault we were not nobly born,*
" I do not ſay, nor mind thoſe meaner cares ;
" My words and thoughts are different far from theirs.
" For ſhould kind nature bid my ſoul retire,
" Go back to birth, and chooſe a noble ſire,
" As great as thought could frame, or pride deſire;
" Content with thoſe I have, let others chooſe,
" I wou'd the noble and the great refuſe :
" And this is fooliſh, this a wild deſign
" I'th Crowd's opinion."—— CREECH.

[How agreeable a picture does Mr. Pope give of his parents !

Of gentle blood (part ſhed in honour's cauſe,
While yet in Britain honour had applauſe)
Each parent ſprang——" What fortune, pray ?"----
Their own,
And better got than Beſtia's from the throne.
Born to no pride, inheriting no ſtrife,
Nor marrying diſcord in a noble wife,
Stranger to civil and religious rage,
The good man walk'd innoxious thro' his age :
No courts he ſaw, no ſuits would ever try,
Nor dar'd an oath, nor hazarded a lye :
Unlearn'd, he knew no ſchoolman's ſubtile art,
No language, but the language of the heart.
By nature honeſt, by experience wiſe,
Healthy by temp'rance, and by exerciſe,
His life, tho' long, to ſickneſs paſt unknown,
His death was inſtant, and without a groan.
O grant me thus to live, and thus to die !
Who ſprung from Kings ſhall know leſs joy than I *.]

* Pope, epiſt. 7. to Dr. Arbuthnot. Addit. by the Tranſl.

§ (α) It is true indeed, that in three volumes of Guy Patin's letters, printed at Geneva in 1691, we do not meet with any particular in them, concerning his family, which does not very well correſpond with the idea which Bayle gives here of it ; but this learned man might have found in Anthony Loiſel's tracts, a note of Claude Joly, which would have given him a more advantageous idea of Patin's family ; and informed him that this famous Phyſician was not the firſt who diſtinguiſhed himſelf in it. Here follows the note in queſtion. It explains a place in the alphabetical Index of antient perſons, mentioned in Anthony Loiſel's dialogue concerning the Advocates of Paris, *&c.* " Mr. JOHN PATIN, after ſpending ſome years " at the Bar of the Parliament of Paris, withdrew " to the city of Beauvais, the place of his birth, " where he was appointed the King's Counſellor and " Advocate in the Preſident Court, he there exer- " ciſing both thoſe employments together, by virtue " of an Arret of Parliament, paſt in his favour the " 15th of February 1588, as appears by the *Confe-* " *rences des Ordonnances*, the laſt edition, printed in " 1641, Tom. I. p. 427. Book II. Tit. VI. Paragr. " V. He exerciſes theſe two employments with " great conſtancy and reſolution, at the time that " this city was prevailed upon to ſide with the " Leaguers ; and therein maintained the King's au- " thority, with great ſkill, and with all the fidelity " that can be required in a man of probity and ho- " nour ; till at laſt, being perſecuted by the factions " of the Mayor Godin, and the Lieutenant General " called Nicholas, who were the two chief ring- " leaders of the League in Beauvais, as he was ſpeak- " ing to the people, according to the duty of his of- " fice, and exhorting them to keep the allegiance " he owed to King Henry IV. he narrowly eſcaped " being ſtoned by the ſecret practices of theſe two " arch-leaguers ; ſo that he was forced to leave the " city, and to retire to the King his maſter, where " he met with ſupport, upon the recommendation of " Mr. de Freſnes-Forget, Secretary of State. He " at laſt was reſtored to his two employments, when " the city returned to the allegiance, due to his Ma- " jeſty ; and there adminiſtred juſtice with reputation, " till, in 1605, he died of a quinſey, at his return " from a journey to Fontaine-bleau, whither he had " been ſent on a commiſſion, in the name of the city, " to the King. He uſed to be frequently employed " on ſuch commiſſions, as well on account of his " employment of King's Advocate, as becauſe of " his eloquence, and his great knowledge in hiſ- " tory and politicks. When he was forced, by the " wild havock made by the Leaguers, to leave Beau- " vais, his houſe was plundered, on which ſad occa- " ſion his excellent books were loſt ; books for which " he had an eſtimable value, and regretted all his " life-time. He left but one daughter, Frances Pa- " tin. He was uncle to Francis Patin, Advocate in " Parliament, who was the father of Mr. Guy Patin, " Doctor, Regent, and Dean of the Faculty (of Phy- " ſick) in Paris, who informed me of the above- " mentioned particulars, and alſo communicated to " me an epigram written in praiſe of his great uncle " in queſtion, printed *in libello Epigrammatum vario-* " *rum ad amicos pro Xeniis per Petrum Geuſſainvil-* " *lum, Montfortenſem, pro anno* 1574, printed at Paris, " *apud Dionyſium à Prato* 1574,

" A D DOM.
" JOANNEM PATIN, BELLOVACUM,
Facundiſſimum in ſupremo Pariſienſi Senatu Patronum.

" *Cùm tu facundas ſolitus nunc ire per artes,*
" *Elogium & mirum creſcat in ore tuo :*
" *Cauſidicumque bonum ſic te Polyhymnia reddit,*
" *Omnes ut ſuperes viribus eloquii :*
" *Sic tua Muſa mihi quædam incrementa dediſſet,*
" *Ditior & Cræſo redderer arte ſua :*
" *Sed quia nummorum non extat plena crumena,*
" *Pro nummis tribuit Carmina miſſa tibi* (3).

(3) *Opuſcules de Leiſel*, p. 756, 737.

The Senſe is,
TO
Mr. JOHN PATIN of BEAUVAIS,
A very eloquent Advocate in the Parliament of Paris.

" Whilſt you're in arts of eloquence employ'd,
" From your ſweet tongue the periods flow har- " monious.
" By fam'd Polyhymnia taught the pleader's art,
" You all excel, and ſhine with brighteſt luſtre.
" Had but your Muſe indulg'd to me a ſmile,
" I'd vie in riches with the Lydian Cræſus.
" But ſince my purſe few golden pieces boaſts,
" Accept, dear friend, this tribute of my verſe."

To this I will add a paſſage ſtill more curious, and which it was not poſſible for Bayle to have any knowledge of, ſince it is tranſcribed from a book that was not printed till ſome years after his death. The work I mean, is, *A new Collection of Letters of the late Mr. Guy Patin, taken from the Study of Mr. Charles Spon*, printed at Amſterdam by Steenhouwer and Uytwerf, 1718, in two volumes, 12mo. A work that was publiſhed in too careleſs a manner ; and where the proper names, in particular, are often greatly diſguiſed. Patin there ſpeaks as follows concerning his family. " You deſire to be informed " of ſome particulars concerning my family, after " having acquainted me with yours. This, for your " ſake, I'll do with great freedom and pleaſure. " Not to mention that, without boaſting, *abſit jactan-* " *tia verbo*, you deſire a thing which twenty other " people have aſked before, moſt of whom were ne- " vertheleſs but little acquainted with me, except by " letter. Imagining here was no harm in this, and " taking it kindly from them, I informed them of " what you will juſt now read. I was born in a " village at three leagues diſtance from Beauvais in " Picardy, named Houdan, the third Barony of the " county of Clermont in Beauvaiſis. The moſt an- " tient perſon of my family I could diſcover, was " Noel Patin, who lived in the ſame pariſh above " 300 years before, whoſe family has continued " down to me. Some of his deſcendants withdrew " to cities, and ſome of them were Notaries in " Beauvais, and Woollen-drapers in Paris ; ſome " embraced a military life, and others continued in " the country. My grandfather, whoſe name I " bear, had a brother, Counſellor in the Prefidial- " Court, and the King's Advocate in Beauvais, he " being a man of vaſt erudition, and his memory

" was

be called in queſtion, that he was corrector in a printing-houſe (c). It would be no eaſy matter to determine, whether it were better that the Letters extant of his had been digeſted by their Author, for the publick; than to have been written in a careleſs manner, for

(c) Mr. DRELINCOURT, Profeſſor of Phyſic at Leyden, informed me of this.

" was greatly venerated by my father. My grand-
" father was a ſoldier, as all were in thoſe martial
" times. My late father went through a courſe of
" ſtudies, to qualify himſelf to be an Advocate in
" this place, and was admitted there in 1588, a
" week before the barricadoes of Paris, after having
" ſtudied at Orleans and Bourges, under the late
" Meſſ. Fournier and Cujas. He would have ſettled
" all his life in Paris, had not the death of Henry
" III. and the ſiege of Paris which followed it, pre-
" vented him. In 1590, he was taken priſoner by
" the Leaguers, and could not be ranſomed under
" the ſum of four hundred livres, which was to be
" paid down; a ſum that is not very conſiderable
" in theſe days, but was ſo in that age, and particu-
" larly in time of war, and in the country. My late
" grandmother told me, that to make up this ſum,
" which was collected in ſeveral places, ſhe was forced
" to pawn her wedding-rings, and her ſilver girdle
" with pendants, to a goldſmith in Beauvais, at a
" high intereſt; which I have often heard her relate
" with tears, and deteſting the calamity of thoſe times.
" The chief Nobleman of our country, obſerving
" that my father, who was a handſome young man,
" ſpoke admirably well, and was no ways inclined
" to vice, might be of ſervice to him, found means
" to keep him in his family, in order to make uſe of
" him in his affairs, *annuente avo meo, imo urgente*,
" i. e. " my grandfather conſenting, nay preſſing
" him to it," and to engage him the more, and keep
" him in that country, he got him the moſt advanta-
" geous match in it; and prevailed with him to mar-
" ry, by fair promiſes which he never performed,
" my late mother, whoſe name was Clara Maneſſier,
" deſcended from a worthy antient family in Amiens.
" My late father's name was Francis Patin, an honeſt
" man, if ever there was one in the world. Were
" all people like him, there would not be any occaſi-
" on for Notaries. He uſed to come every year to
" Paris, upon his maſter's buſineſs, and had great cre-
" dit in that city. I have there found a conſiderable
" number of friends, with whom I was not acquainted
" in any manner, who were exceedingly kind to me
" upon his account; which has made me regret him
" ſtill more, a thouſand and a thouſand times. From
" this marriage ſprung ſeven children *adhuc ſuperſti-*
" *tes* (ſtill living;) two ſons, of whom I am the eldeſt,
" and a brother who is in Holland. The five daugh-
" ters are all married; and inherited all my mother's
" eſtate, which being divided into five parts, were
" portions ſufficient for each. My brother and I had
" the paternal eſtate, which, when remitted hither,
" does not produce an hundred crowns a year; but
" thoſe honeſt worthy people could not help this, they
" having lived, like the antients, *moribus antiquis*,
" free from avarice and ambition. The only miſ-
" fortune of my late father was, his having had to
" do with an ungrateful covetous maſter, with whom
" he got nothing, notwithſtanding he had ſerved
" him, in a very painful way, for almoſt thirty years.
" His concern for his having left Paris, and ſettling
" in the country, on the ſpecious promiſes of a No-
" bleman, *qui nimium attendebat ad rem ſuam*, (who
" was too ſolicitous for his own intereſt,) made him
" form a reſolution, when I was but a child, to give
" me ſuch an education, as might qualify me to be
" an Advocate here; ſaying, that living in the coun-
" try was quite unprofitable; that it was people's
" intereſt to go and reſide in cities; and uſed frequent-
" ly to repeat the following remark of the wiſe man,
" *Labor ſtultorum affliget eos qui neſciunt in urbem per-*
" *gere*, i. e. " (The toil of fools, will afflict thoſe
" who do not go and live in towns;) for which rea-
" ſon he uſed to make me read aloud, when I was but
" a child, Plutarch's lives, and taught me a graceful
" way of reading. In this view, he ſent me, when
" but nine years of age, to the great ſchool in Beau-
" vais; and afterwards ſent me to the great ſchool or
" college of Boncourt in Paris, where I was a boarder
" two years, and went through a courſe of philoſo-
" phical ſtudies. Some time after the Nobility, to
" reward him in a way that might be no expence to
" them, would have given him a benefice for me,
" which I flatly refuſed, proteſting abſolutely, that I
" would never be a prieſt: (*benedictus Deus, qui mihi*
" *illam mentem immiſit in tenera adhuc ætate.* (I bleſs
" the Lord for inſpiring me with ſuch a reſolution in
" ſo tender an age.) My late father, who thought
" there was ſomething good and ingenious in this
" refuſal, was not very angry with me upon that ac-
" count; but my mother was exaſperated at me upon
" that account for five years, ſaying, that I refuſed
" the recompence for the long ſervices which my
" father had done for the Noblemen in queſtion;
" but no other reward was to be had. Providence
" aſſiſted me: I ſpent five years without once ſeeing
" her, or going to our houſe. In this interval, I
" got acquainted with a man who adviſed me to turn
" Phyſician in Paris: for this purpoſe I ſtudied very
" hard from the year 1622 till 1624, when I was
" admitted here; and then my parents were recon-
" ciled; and gave me what money they could, to
" enable me to take my degree, and purchaſe books.
" Five years after, *duxi uxorem* (I married,) and ſhall
" inherit (in right of my wife,) an eſtate worth twen-
" ty thouſand crowns, as ſoon as her father and mo-
" ther, who are very old, ſhall have left the world;
" not to mention a ſiſter, who has no children, and
" is very rich. Providence has bleſſed my marriage
" with four ſons, *viz.* Robert, Charles, Peter, and
" Francis. *Annum ætatis attegi* 41. (I am now one
" and forty,) with more practice than merit in my
" profeſſion, and with leſs health than would be re-
" quiſite for me, *quam potiſſimum labefactarunt vigiliæ*
" *juges & elucubrationes nocturnæ, à quibus etiam nec-*
" *dum abſtineo, ſed hoc erat in fatis*; (which has been
" chiefly impaired by continual watchings, and noc-
" turnal ſtudies, which I do not refrain from even
" at this time; but ſuch was my fate.) This, me-
" thinks, is what you requeſted of me, and perhaps
" much more. Excuſe my importunity and prolix-
" ity *in re tam vili & tam exigua* (4), (in ſo trifling a
" ſubject, and of ſo little importance.)" He ſays
ſomewhere elſe, in the letters in queſtion (5), *that he was pretty nearly related to the Preſident Miron, Intendant of Languedoc*, and that *his wife was ſecond couſin* to this Preſident's *daughter*.

(4) Guy Patin's *Letters* to Charles Spon, *Letter* 18. Tom. 1. p. 78, 79, 80, 81.

(5) Ibid. p. 196 and 214.

As Bayle has ſpoke only of Guy Patin's letters, I ſhall here give a catalogue of his other works, extracted from Merklin's *Lindenius renovatus*. It contains the following books. *De valetudine tuenda per vivendi normam, uſumque legitimum rerum ad benè ſalubriterque vivendum neceſſariarum. Extat* p. 341. *Medici officioſi à Philb. Guiberto editi, Pariſiis, apud Vid. Th. Popinguè*, 1649, 8vo. *Notæ in Nicolai Ellain Tractatum de Peſte. Ibidem*, p. 485. *Notæ in Galeni Librum de Sanguinis miſſione. Ibid.* p. 538. *Quæſtio de Sobrietate. Pariſiis*, 1644, 4to. *Et Medici officioſi*, p. 446. *An totus homo naturâ ſit morbus.* Ibid. 1944, 4to. *Extat etiam cum D. D. Virorum Epiſtolis & Reſponſis cum medicis, tum Philoſophicis Roterodami, apud Rudolphum à Nuyſſel*, 1665, in 4to. *Caſpari Hoffmanni Apologiam pro Galeno edidit. Lugduni apud Laurentium Aniſſon*, 1666, in 4to. (6). I ſhall add two articles not mentioned by this Author, *viz.* the Latin tranſlations of divers treatiſes of Andrew du Laurens, inſerted in the Latin edition of the works of this Phyſician, printed at Paris in 1627, 4to. under the direction of Guy Patin (7); and a Latin Treatiſe *De Elephantiaſi*, mentioned by him in one of his letters to Charles Spon (8). The firſt of theſe works had been printed ſeparately at Paris in 1632, in 12mo, with the following title; *Traité de la Conſervation de la Santé par un bon régime & légitime Uſage des choſes requiſes pour bien & ſainement vivre*, i. e. " A " Treatiſe ſhewing how health may be preſerved, " by a proper regimen, and a fit uſe of ſuch things " as conduce to well and healthy living." I ſhall here tranſcribe the judgment which Patin himſelf has formed of this treatiſe. *I wonder who could tell you*, ſays he (9), *that I was the Author of the little book concerning the preſervation of health, annexed to the* Charitable

(6) Mercklini *Lindenius renovatus*, p. 396.

(7) See the rem. [B] of the article LAURENS.

(8) Patin's *Letters* to Spon, Tom. 2. p. 115.

(9) Ibid. Tom. 1. p. 90, 91.

for the particular uſe of thoſe to whom they were ſent [*B*]: but what judgment ſoever may be formed on this occaſion, I am ſure it will be owned, that the printing of them is of advantage to the publick. The letters indeed are extremely injurious to Paris, which they repreſent as a city infected with a moſt horrid corruption [*C*]; and filled with wretches

Charitable Phyſician. *It is no ways worthy your peruſal. I formerly wrote it at the requeſt of the worthy charitable Phyſician himſelf, Mr. Guybert, from whom I received the Doctor's cap. He deſired me to make it as much for the uſe of the common people as poſſible, in order that it might be annexed to his book. It does not deſerve that you ſhould throw away any time upon it. . . . . If ever I have any leiſure, I will endeavour to retouch the the treatiſe in queſtion, and to put it into a little better condition than it is at preſent: and, in the mean time, beg you would be ſo good as not to inform any perſon that it is a compoſition of mine, for I really am aſhamed of it.* Rem. Crit.

[*B*] *Whether it were better that the letters extant of his had been deſigned, by their author, for the publick, than to have been written . . . . for the particular uſe of thoſe to whom they were ſent.*] "There are ſo few "good letters, and ſo many bad ones, by the con- "feſſion of Bayle himſelf, that there is no room to "doubt but that it were better they had never been "printed, *&c.* See, on this ſubject, the *Bibliotheque* "*du Richelet*, where I alſo have examined the ac- "cuſation of Atheiſm, falſely imputed to Patin, "*&c.* *."] Had he deſigned them for publick view, he would have filled them with learning; with accurate obſervations on the hiſtory of the learned, and on their works; he having an excellent memory, a great compaſs of reading, and a fine library. He would not have publiſhed particulars imperfectly enquired into; and as they preſented themſelves to his imagination; in a word, we ſhould have found fewer falſities in his work; but then we ſhould not have ſeen his wit and genius painted in their natural colours; we ſhould not have met with ſo many curious incidents, nor ſo many lively bold touches, which are ſo diverting, and ſuggeſt ſolid reflections. Some ſelect letters of his were publiſhed at Geneva in 1683, which were reprinted ſoon after in Holland. The quick ſale they met with, encouraged a Bookſeller of Geneva to publiſh thoſe which had been rejected at the firſt impreſſion; accordingly he added them to the former; and, by this means, gave a collection in three volumes, anno 1691 (*a*). This edition was counterfeited in Holland a little after. It were better it had been counterfeited in Germany; becauſe the German Bookſellers have the laudable cuſtom of getting good indexes added to the books they reprint, and no work ever wanted one more than that in queſtion. The public ſoon diſcovered that ſome falſities are inſerted in it. Here follows the judgment paſſed upon it by the Author of *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*. "It may be proper to inform the Reader, that all "the witty ſayings, or incidents related by him, "are not true. In ſome there appears a horrid ma- "lice and a ſurprizing boldneſs, in endeavouring to "give a criminal turn to every thing. We ſhould "be greatly in the wrong, to give credit to the par- "ticulars hinted at, becauſe they are printed. All "we can gather from them is, that Mr. Patin wrote "them to a friend, as particulars he had heard from "other people; and in purſuance of the cuſtom he "had long obſerved, of correſponding with him by "letter, in the ſame manner as if they had been taking "a walk together. It is well known that men, in "converſation, talk as ſoon of a report that is cur- "rent in town, though it be not true, as of any "piece of news that is true. And when this hap- "pens to be the caſe with regard to men of a ſaty- "rical temper, as it muſt be confeſſed Patin was, "ſuch perſons publiſh more induſtriouſly ſuch parti- "culars as are diſadvantageous to others, than others "which give praiſe (10)." Menage forms the ſame judgment of them. Guy Patin's *Letters abound with falſities. Mr. Bigot and I took notice of a great many ſuch. Mr. Patin was no ways cautious in what he wrote; and prejudice made him give credit to a thouſand things which were not true* (11). See the *Acta Eruditorum*, for May 1648 (12). We are promiſed Guy Patin's Latin Letters, with a *beautiful and learned Elogium*, written *by Mr. Theveneau, a Phyſician of Nevers* (13).

§ (*a*) The new *Menagiana*, Tom. II. p. 223. and Tom. III. p. 413. of the Paris edition, cites theſe letters as from an edition printed in five volumes at leaſt, which I had never heard of; the two paſſages cited from which are not found either in the edition in three volumes of 1691, nor in the following of 1692, in two volumes. By the way, in both theſe editions a very curious letter is omitted, concerning ſome errors which G. Patin had remarked in Thuanus's Hiſtory. This letter dated the 4th of February 1672, is the 137th in the Rotterdam edition in one volume 12mo. 1689. Rem. Crit.

[*C*] His *letters are extremely injurious to Paris, which they repreſent as a city infected with a moſt horrid corruption.*] It would be endleſs ſhould we collect all the complaints which have been made on this head; for which reaſon I will confine myſelf to the obſervations he makes on the crimes of ſuch lewd women as deſtroy their children. "Mademoiſelle de Guer- "chi's death makes a great noiſe here. The mid- "wife had been impriſoned in the Chatelet, whence "ſhe has been removed to the Conciergerie * by a "rule of Court. The Pariſh Prieſt of St. Euſtache "refuſed the above-mentioned Lady Chriſtian burial. "It is reported that her body was carried to the "Hotel de Condé, and there put into lime, to con- "ſume it the ſooner; and prevent its being known, "in caſe a ſearch ſhould be made. The midwife has "made a tolerable defence hitherto, but *aliæ admove-* "*buntur machinæ, aliæ artes adhibebuntur ad eruendum* "*verum*; but other engines will be ſet to work, and "other methods employed in order to extort the "truth. I am of opinion that ſhe will be put to "the torture. The Vicar-Generals and † Peniten- "tiaries have complained to the firſt Preſident, that, "within a twelvemonth, ſix hundred women have "confeſſed their having killed and deſtroyed their "fruit; and that they have taken particular notice "of this, on the report which had been made to "them (14)." Since I have begun to ſpeak of this adventure, I muſt relate the conſequences of it (15). *A Libel is publiſhed here conſiſting of eight pages in 4to.* (16), *by which it is proved*, that the crime of which Dame Conſtantin the midwife was lately charged with, is only a ſequel of the doctrine of the Jeſuits; and alſo to undeceive ſuch women as ſuffer themſelves to be impoſed on by this error, upon pretence that the Fathers in queſtion teach it in their books. *It is ſaid that the midwife makes a very good defence. She owns that Madam de Guerchi died at her houſe, but that ſhe did not give her any potion: that ſhe came to her houſe very ſick, and died there, making dreadful outcries: that ſhe had heard of a certain potion, which that Lady had taken: but that ſhe did not know what it was, nor who had prepared it . . . .* (17). *Dame Conſtantin the midwife is ſtill confined in the Chatelet: ſhe is to be examined to morrow. N. and le Large have been ſubpœna'd, to come there and anſwer, as to the facts of the depoſition they have made*, an ut ibi fatis cedat pudore carceris, & metu lethalis ſupplicii confecta? *We are told that ſhe makes a good defence, and that there are not ſufficient proofs againſt her to condemn her to die; but ſome monitions are expected, which are to be publiſhed in all the pariſhes of the city and ſuburbs of Paris. Others ſay that ſhe will be cleared, and that perſons of the greateſt figure have made ſtrong intereſt for her. Nevertheleſs it is thought that ſhe deſerves death, and more than death; and that were ſhe to be hanged, ſhe would not die innocent. It is ſaid that her houſe was a publick brothel; and that a great number of ſtrumpets uſed to go and lie in there*, vel abortum paſſuræ, "*or to procure abortions* "*. . . . .* (18)." *Wedneſday the 14th of July, Dame Conſtantin, the midwife, was ſentenced, in the Chatelet, to be hanged and ſtrangled, after having been put to the torture, whence ſhe appealed, and have been removed to the Conciergerie. It is thought the next week the ſentence will be confirmed at* la Tournelle . . . * (19). *The midwife is ſtill in priſon; it is reported that it will be only for the next week, and that the Attorney General appeals againſt her from her ſentence* à minima; *that he will*

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 970. col. 1.

* The priſons belonging to the Parliament of Paris. Rem. by the Tranſl.]

† Penitentiary is a Prieſt who is impowered by the Biſhop, to abſolve ſuch caſes as are reſerved to him. Rem. by the Tranſl.]

(10) *Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres*, April 1684. art. 1. p. m. 115, 116.

(11) Menagiana, p. 279, of the firſt Dutch edit.

(12) p. 248 & *ſeq.*

(13) See the Preface to Patin's letters, edit. of 1691.

(14) Patin, *Letter* 184, dated 22 June 1660. See p. 113, of Tom. 2.

(15) Ibid. 185. p. 119, of the ſame Tome.

(16) It was burnt by the Hangman at La Croix du Tiroir, by a decree of the Lieutenant-civil. Patin, *Letter* 190. p. 142, 143.

(17) Ibid. *Letter* 187. p. 130, 131.

(18) Ibid. *Letter* 188. dated 16 July, 1660. p. 136.

* A Court of Juſtice belonging to the Parliament of Paris. Rem. by the Tranſl.]

(19) The ſame *Letter*, 190. p. 144.

wretches who, after uſing their endeavours to people the world, ſtrive afterwards to people

will give in his opinion, which will be very ſevere againſt her that ſhe ought to be burnt alive unleſs ſhe diſcovers all her accomplices. In fine, he informs his friend, in a letter dated the 16th of Auguſt 1660 (20), that Dame Conſtantin was hanged : " *Damnata fuit laqueo infe-* " *lix obſtetrix & ſuffocata*, in good company at " la Croix du Tiroir * (21)" We have ſeen the concluſion of the Tragedy, both with regard to the midwife, and the Lady delivered ; but let us now ſee part of the Preliminaries concerning the letter. I do not warrant them to be true : and if they happen to be falſe, the writer cited by me muſt anſwer for it (22). " Duke de Joyeuſe made his addreſſes " to Mademoiſelle de Guerchi, companion of Made- " moiſelle du Pons (23), who ſoon ſacrificed him " to the Commander de Jars, of the houſe of Ro- " chechouard . . . . (24). She left the Commander " de Jars for Jeannin de Caſtille, the Treaſurer ; " and behaved with ſo little diſcretion that the " Queen baniſhed her the Court. Notwithſtanding " this, Duke de Vitry made his addreſſes to her ; " and treated her with as much reſpect as if ſhe had " always lived chaſtly, though, at that time, ſhe " had had four or five children by different men. She " was again with child, and the Duke would have " had her delivered before her time, to ſave her " reputation, which he did not ſuppoſe to be ſo far " loſt as it really was. In vain ſhe declared, that it " would be a prodigious pleaſure for her to have " this pledge of his love : he was abſolutely deter- " mined to make her deſtroy the fruit of their " amours ; and, for this purpoſe, ſent to her one " Conſtantin a midwife, who would have forced the " child out of her, but ſhe died in the operation, " and Conſtantin was hanged. Duke de Vitry was " inconſolable for her death ; and reſpected her " memory to ſuch a degree, that he afterwards had " an intrigue with a common proſtitute, becauſe ſhe " was like her. This woman growing rich by the " Duke's munificence to her, married afterwards " Marquis de Goudron, a younger brother of the " family of Gamache." [Henault the Poet was ſuppoſed to have Mademoiſelle Guerchi in view, (though the truth of this is very much doubted †) when he wrote his famous Sonnet on an Embrio **. As this Sonnet is looked upon as a very fine one, has been celebrated by ſo many Authors, and many inaccurate copies of it are printed, I ſhall tranſcribe it here from the little volume of Henault's works, it being rarely met with.

(20) The 194th, p. 162 of Tom. 2.

* A public fountain, over which a croſs ſtood, in Paris. Rem. by the Tranſl.]

(21) I believe ſhe is hinted at by Abbé Marolles, in the paſſage which will be quoted hereunder, citat. (63). Compare this with the *Memoirs* of Chavagnac, p. m. 210.

(22) *Galanteries des Rois de France*, Tom. 2. p. 198. Bruſſells edit. 1694.

(23) That is to ſay, that ſhe was Maid of Honour to the Queen-Mother, Ann of Auſtria.

(24) *Galanteries des Rois de France*, Tom. 2. p. 210.

† See the cloſe of rem. [*A*], of the article HENAULT [*N*].

** See the whole Rem. [*A*] of the article HENAULT.

" SONNET.

" *Toy qui meurs avant que de naître,*
" *Aſſemblage confus de l'être & du néant,*
" *Triſte Avorton, informe Enfant,*
" *Rebut du Néant & de l'être.*

" *Toy que l'amour fit par un Crime,*
" *Et que l'honneur défait par un crime à ſon tour.*
" *Funeſte Ouvrage de l'Amour,*
" *De l'honneur funeſte victrime.*

" *Donne fin aux remors par quî tu t'és vangé ;*
" *Et du fond du Neant où je t'ay replongé,*
" *N'entretiens point l'horreur dont ma faute eſt ſuivie.*

" *Deux Tyrans oppoſez ont decidé ton ſort.*
" *L'amour malgré l'honneur t'a fuit donne la vie.*
" *L'honneur malgré l'amour te fait donner la mort* ††.

†† *OEUVRES DIVERSES, &c. Par le Sieur D. H**** (Henault). p. 237. Paris 1670, 12mo.

There being alſo a Latin tranſlation of the abovementioned Sonnet, (probably by Henault himſelf) printed in his works, it may not be improper to add it here.

" *Tu, qui necdum ortus, cadis ipſo in limine vitæ,*
" *Mixta gerens nibili, & naturæ inſignia moles,*
" *Informis triſti fœtus ſucciſus abortu :*
" *Naturæ, & nibilo, fatis male creditus infans.*

" *Tu, quem inſanus amor furtivo crimine finxit,*
" *Quem pudor inſanus furtivo crimine mactat,*
" *Væ ! nimium inſani funeſtum pignus amoris,*
" *Victima væ ! nimium, inſani funeſta pudoris.*

" *Temperet à meritis, ſine, mens ſibi conſcia pœnis.*
" *E nihilique ſinu, quo te ſcelerata recondo,*
" *Et ſcelera, & ſcelerum horrorem non ingere matri.*

" *Fata per adverſos tua ſunt diſtracta tyrannos.*
" *Te vita donavit amor, nolente pudore.*
" *Te vitâ nolente pudor ſpoliavit amore* *."

* Ibid. p. 238.

This Sonnet having been tranſcribed by ſome of our Engliſh writers ; and no one having given it in Engliſh, an imitation is attempted hereunder.

O thou, whoſe eyes were cloſed in death's pale night,
E'er fate reveal'd thee to my aking ſight !
Ambiguous ſomething ! by no ſtandard fixt ;
Frail ſpan, of naught and of exiſtence mixt :
Embrio ! imperfect as my tort'ring thought :
Sad outcaſt of exiſtence and of naught.

Thou, who from guilty Love receiv'dſt thy frame ;
Whom guilty honour kills, to hide her ſhame.
Dire off-ſpring, form'd by love's too pleaſing power ;
Honour's dire victim in a luckleſs hour.

Soften the pangs which ſtill revenge thy doom ;
Nor, from the dark abyſs of nature's womb,
Where back I've caſt thee, let revolving time
Call up paſt ſcenes to aggravate my crime.

Two adverſe tyrants rul'd thy wayward fate,
(Thyſelf the ſacrifice to their fierce hate.)
Love, ſpite of honour's dictates gave thee breath :
Honour, in ſpite of love, pronounc'd thy death †.]

J. LOCKMAN.

† Addit. by the Tranſl.

Theſe citations do not carry me ſo far from my ſubjects as might be imagined ; they exhibiting proofs of the text of this remark, or at leaſt, confirm the relation of Guy Patin. Beſides, I ſhall not value the being cenſured for giving too long citations, provided I do but ſave a conſiderable number of my Readers the diſſatisfaction of being inſtructed only by halves ; or the trouble of ſearching the ſequel of things, by turning over a variety of books. But however this be, here follows a quotation, which bears a nearer relation to Patin's narrative.

Thuanus relates, that in 1557, a law was enacted, ſentencing to death, as guilty of parricide, all women who ſhould conceal their pregnancy or delivery, and that ſhould not produce certificates concerning the condition in which their child was born ; in caſe there was any proof of its having been buried without the requiſite ceremonies, and unbaptized. *Ea lege ſancitum, ut quæ graviditatem partumve celaſſet neque alterutrius teſtationem aut de edito fœtu ſeu vivo ſeu mortuo proferret, ſi eum lavacro juſtiſve exſequiarum privatum probationibus conſtaret, de illa tanquam parricidii rea ultimum ſupplicium ſumeretur* (25). From that time this crime in queſtion was puniſhed with greater ſeverity than any ; and, that no perſon might plead ignorance, the Judges always cauſed it to be inſerted in the ſentence of condemnation, that the ordinance ſhould be publiſhed by ſound of trumpet, in all cities where there are courts of juſtice ; and that the Pariſh-Prieſts ſhould publiſh it from their pulpits, on feſtival days, in all towns and villages (26). Nevertheleſs, this crime continued to be more common than any other ; for Thuanus declares, that there were very few weeks, in which the Judges of criminal matters in Paris did not try one or more women charged with the crime in queſtion ; ſo mighty is the power of ſhame, ſince it prevails, in a fearful ſex, over the fears of a gallows, and the remorſe of conſcience. *In nullum crimen ab eo tempore ſeverius vindicatum fuit. Ac ne qua ignorantiæ excuſatio prætexeretur, ſententiis judicum ſemper additum eſt, ut lex in inferioribus tribunalibus palam & per plateas urbium publica præconis voce promulgaretur, & per oppida ac pagos à curionibus coram populo diebus feſtis recitaretur. Nihilominus nullum frequentius crimen etiam hodie eſt, nec ulla*

(25) Thuan. lib. 19. p. 395. ad ann. 1557.

(26) See the cloſe of the rem. [*E*].

ulla fere ſeptimana abit, quin in claſſe, quæ de judiciis capitalibus cognoſcit, una pluresve tam horrendi flagitii reæ producantur ; adeo malus pudor in verecundo & impotenti ſexu ſupplicii terrorem, & quod omni corporis pœna gravius eſt, conſcientiæ morſus vincit (27). It will be proper to relate the occaſion of enacting this law. Notice had been given that ſeveral women, to preſerve themſelves from infamy, uſed to kill their children after their delivery ; and throw them into the river, or the neceſſary-houſe ; or buried them in unconſecrated ground, without initiating them into the Chriſtian church by baptiſm. Such as were proſecuted for this crime, uſed to alledge to the Judges, that ſhame would not permit them to make a diſcovery of their pregnancy ; and that, contrary to their deſire, their children were ſtill-born. By this means they got off clear, there not being any witneſſes to prove the contrary ; and moſt of the Judges uſed to give it as their opinion, that they ought to be put to the torture. If they bore it, without confeſſing that they had deſtroyed their children, they were acquitted from all farther puniſhment. It was thought, that impunity increaſed the wickedneſs in queſtion ; and therefore a very ſevere law was ſolicited, and obtained ; but though it was executed with great ſeverity, ſtill the evil was not healed. Let us hear Thuanus (28) : *Altera lex in ſpeciem ſevera, ſed qua impiis & abominandis parricidiis, quæ antea impunita, nunc etiam poſt legem conditam nimis frequentia ſunt, pœna conſtituta eſt, poſtulante Senatu promulgatur V. Non. Martias. Fœminæ, quæ viros non habebant, ubi ex furtivo complexu conceperant, malo pudore territæ utero celato ad extremum partus fere enecabant, geminato ſcelere famæ conſulere ſe exiſtimantes, & enecatos aut in ſterquilinium ſeu profluentem abjiciebant, aut loco profano defoſſos perdebant, atque ita neceſſaria ſacri lavacri relligione ac ſepulturæ honore privabant. Quod ſi quando res in judicium deduceretur, pudorem, quominus culpam confeſſæ eſſent, cauſſatæ mortuos ſe enixas dicebant, & ita deficientibus aliunde probationibus debitam inhumano ſceleri pœnam effugiebant. Nam judicum in hujuſmodi cauſſis incertæ plerumque erant & vagabantur ſententiæ, cum ad mortem alii tanti criminis reas damnarent ; alii, quod ſæpius accidebat, pronioribus ad miſericordiam animis, quæſtionum violentiæ ſubjiciendas cenſerent, ut vivoſne an mortuos fœtus enixæ eſſent ex ipſarum confeſſione conſtaret ; quam ſi obſtinato animo ferrent, liberæ dimittebantur* (29).

(27) Thuan. lib. 19. p. 395. ad ann. 1557.

(28) Idem, ibid.

(29) We ſhall obſerve, in the remark [D] hereunder, that the procuring of abortions is of very great antiquity. See the Commentators on Minutius Felix, in *Editione Ouzeliana*, on the following words. *Sunt quæ in ipſis viſceribus medicaminibus epotis, originem futuri hominis extinguant, & parricidium faciant antequam pariant.*

A COMPARISON between the power of conſcience, and that of the point of honour.

(30) See articles 162 and 163 of *Penſees ſur les Cometes.*

This very ſtrongly corroborates ſome of the doctrines of the Author of the *Thoughts of Comets* (30). For what man, after having read the abovementioned paſſage of Thuanus, would preſume to deny, that the ideas, with regard to the point of honour, are not the ſtrongeſt bank which could be thrown up, to ſtop the flood of incontinency ? Who would dare to affirm, that, in general, the laws of religion are more effectual, or as effectual a remedy as that in queſtion ? If religion had a greater aſcendant over women, than the point of honour, would ſo great a number of them deſtroy their children ? Is not this a more cruel and barbarous murder, than to kill an antient man in ſome wood or foreſt ? Can any crime be more horrid, and more repugnant to nature, than that of the wicked mothers in queſtion ? They are perſuaded that, in deſtroying the fruit of their womb, they commit a parricide ; that it is more deteſtable, in the eye of Heaven, than the action of thoſe who rob and murder on the high-way. Beſides, moſt of thoſe hinted at by Thuanus and Patin, are alſo perſuaded, that they deprive their children of eternal life ; and that they caſt them into Limbus, where they muſt be deprived of the ſight of God to all eternity. This perſuaſion aggravates their crime to ſuch a degree as is inexpreſſible. Nevertheleſs, they perpetrate it in contempt of God, and in ſpite of the religion they profeſs ; and this merely, that they may not loſe their ſhare of worldly honour : this honour, therefore, muſt have a greater aſcendant over them, than the inſtinct of conſcience, and all divine laws. It is even ſtronger than the fear of death ; for, after the ſevere law mentioned by Thuanus, they ran the hazard of being put to death, and there was great probability of their being puniſhed for it ; and nevertheleſs this law, though very often put in execution, was to no effect ; theſe murders being as frequent as ever. What argument can be brought to prove in a ſtronger manner the power of the punctilio of honour, and the mighty aſcendant it has over us ? Will any one deny, that this punctilio alone would be ſufficient to reſtrain incontinence within thoſe limits, in which we ſee it confined ? It is not its buſineſs to prevent hidden crimes ; this is the buſineſs of conſcience : but when thoſe hidden crimes draw after them ſuch conſequences as are with great difficulty concealed from the public, it is of great power, in order to prevent them. Such is the incontinence of a woman who has no huſband. It will be to no purpoſe to ſay, that the art of procuring abortions is brought almoſt to perfection ; and that if we except that of curing venereal diſtempers, there is none, which a wretched induſtry, excited by the wants of numberleſs multitudes of people, has improved more than this ; for it cannot be denied, but that the conſequences I am ſpeaking of, are very perplexing. How many women, after labouring under difficulties, and having been under the greateſt tortures of mind, and after taking a great many drugs, could yet not prevent their crime from coming to the knowledge of the world ? Murther does not always hide it ; it ſometimes making it more infamous and fatal, becauſe of the puniſhment which accompanies it ; ſo that if a violent paſſion, and furious tranſport of natural diſpoſition, do not entirely take away the uſe of reaſon, women will never expoſe themſelves to inconvenient and dangerous conſequences, like thoſe in queſtion. Hence we may conclude, that ſince Thuanus and Patin declare that a great number of women break through this barrier, the fair ſex muſt be tortured in a violent manner (31). The Reader will particularly obſerve, that they ſpeak only of ſuch as deſtroy the fruit of their womb. If the confeſſors would give us a liſt of ſuch as uſe precautions ſtill earlier, and before the ſoul is come into the body, they would not confine themſelves to ſix hundred in ſuch a city of Paris, which, by the account of the moſt unprejudiced travellers, is not ſo immerſed in lewdneſs, as moſt capitals in the weſtern part of the world. By the way, theſe immature or anticipated abortions are a real parricide, in the opinion of good Caſuiſts. Read the following paſſage from Tertullian. *Nobis vero homicidio ſemel interdicto, etiam conceptum utero, dum adhuc ſanguis in hominem delibatur, diſſolvere non licet : homicidii feſtinatio eſt prohibere naſci, nec refert natam quis eripiat animam, an naſcentem diſturbet : homo eſt & qui eſt futurus ; etiam fructus omnis jam in ſemine eſt* (32). i. e. " Murther " being once forbidden, we are not allowed to de- " ſtroy the fœtus, though uninformed in the womb. " It is haſtening of murther to hinder the birth : " and it is the ſame to take away life when already " formed, or whilſt it is only forming. That is " man which would be man ; and all fruit is al- " ready in the ſeed." Guy Patin had pointed out this paſſage to the Lieutenant-Criminal, at the time of Mrs. Conſtantine's trial.

(31) See *Penſees ſur les Cometes*, articles 162, 163.

(32) Tertull. in *Apologet.* cap. 9. Patin's *Letters*, 188, p. 137, cites him. What he quotes, p. 144, from the ſame Tertullian *de Anima*, cap. 25, is not to the purpoſe.

I remember to have heard this queſtion put, whether, in order to prevent ſuch women as have not the gift of continency, from committing ſo many crimes, and to ſave the State ſo many ſubjects, of which it is deprived, it were not neceſſary to leſſen a little the aſcendant of the punctilio of honour ; that is, to decreaſe conſiderably the ſhame of an unmarried woman who happens to be with child ; for it is obſerved that, in ſuch countries where people are not ſo delicate on this article, and where ſuch women as thoſe we are ſpeaking of eaſily get huſbands, and appear confidently in companies, abortions are vaſtly leſs frequent ; and the Judges are not ſo much employed in puniſhing thoſe who deſtroy their children. A grave Gentleman immediately anſwered, and proved, by very good arguments, that the remedy would be worſe than the diſeaſe ; and that there is nothing which the State ought to preſerve with greater care, than the fear of diſhonour, when it is connected with criminal actions, as in the preſent caſe. For this reaſon, adds he, Magiſtrates ought to be extremely cautious of ſtigmatizing people. A man who has once loſt his reputation, caſts off the rein which kept him to his duty ; and infamy is leſs dreaded, when we ſee it inflicted every day. *Da principio ſi hanno in grande horrore gli infami, mentre ſi veggono miſti tra gli altri Cittadini : ma con l'aſſuefarſi à tolerarli, pare, che sì di giorno in giorno ſi allegeriſca la macchia, che quaſi al fine ſvaniſca in tutto. Così vienſi à poco à poco à porre in uſo nella Città il traſcurare l'infamia, errore d'ogni altro più grave, e più pericoloſo per il viver non*

Civile. Però ſtimo io bene l'andar lento à dichiarar publicamente infami i rei, quando la nota, con cui ſi ſegnano, non ſia perpetua per terrore degli altri. Perchè, ſe ben l'infamia naſce propriamente dalla operatione, di chi commette il misfatto; nondimeno non bene manifeſta da tutti ſi diſcerne, finche publica dichiaratione non vi ſi aggiunga (33). i. e. " Infamous perſons are at firſt looked up-
" on with horror, whilſt they are blended with the reſt
" of the citizens; but by cuſtom in tolerating them, the
" infamy ſeems to leſſen every day, and at laſt to va-
" niſh quite away. In this manner, it becomes a
" practice, inſenſibly, to overlook infamy; the great-
" eſt and moſt dangerous error in ſociety. However,
" I think it prudent, to be ſlow in ſtigmatizing
" guilty perſons publickly, when the ſtigma, with
" which they are branded, is not perpetual, to ſtrike
" terror into others. Becauſe, though infamy re-
" ſults properly from the action of him who perpe-
" trates a crime; nevertheleſs, it is not plainly diſ-
" covered by all, till a public declaration is added
" to it." But ſince I have ſaid ſo much on this ſub-
ject, the Reader will give me leave to add a word
or two more. If he is deſirous of ſeeing, in the
ſtrongeſt light, how greatly ſuperior the aſcendant or
power of the punctilio of honour is to that of
conſcience, let him conſider one of the ſix hun-
dred women who had made away with her child.
Religion diſſuaded them from it for a variety of rea-
ſons. It ſuggeſted to them the parricide, the eter-
nal damnation of the child, the injuſtice of their de-
ſign, and the goodneſs they ought to have made of
their fault. They were deſirous of preſerving the re-
putation of being virtuous women: now this was an
unjuſt deſign, it was a theft, a mere uſurpation of a
benefit which did not belong to them: it was even
an uſurpation intended for a very bad uſe, to impoſe
upon the public in general, and a huſband in par-
ticular; for they were deſirous of being in a condi-
tion to beſtow themſelves upon a man, as a chaſt,
modeſt, and unblemiſhed maiden. The advantage
they might have reaped from diſcovering their fault,
was great, with reſpect to their ſalvation; they
might have drawn from thence a thouſand arguments
to turn them to humility and contrition. Yet no ſoon-
er did the punctilio of honour appear, but it threw
down this great number of batteries. Muſt we not
therefore own, that it is a thouſand times ſtronger
than conſcience. The Italian Author is ſtill on my
ſide. *Però ſi dovera à giudicio mio aſſerire, che aſſolu-
tamente la religione ſia più atta à render gli huomini
giuſti, & innocenti: ma che all' incontro per lo riſpetto
degli intereſſi, e per la ripugnanza degli affetti, i quali
quaſi venti contrarii, turbano il mare della vita civile,
più operi per la felicità Morale il zelo dell' Honore. Per-
che gli huomini ſono più facili à moverſi à bene operare
per lo premio dell' Honore, & à guardarſi dal mal fare
per la macchia della infamia, che ſi veggono innanzi à
gli occhi, che per le promiſſe di premii, ò pur di caſtighi
futuri, e lontani* (34). i. e, " Yet it muſt, in my opi-
" nion be owned, that religion is abſolutely the beſt
" adapted to make men juſt and innocent; but, on
" the other ſide, on account of ſelf-intereſt, and the
" reluctance of the paſſions, which, like contrary
" winds, diſturb the ocean of civil life, the puncti-
" lio of honour is moſt conducive to moral felicity.
" Becauſe mankind are more perſuaded to do good,
" from a motive of honour; and to refrain from evil,
" from a dread of infamy, which is preſent to their
" eye, than from the promiſe of rewards, or dread
" of puniſhments, which are future and far diſtant."

(33) *Lodovico Zuccolo, Academico Filopono di Faenza, Diſcorſo dell' Honore*, capitol. 22. p. 122, Venice edit. 1623.

(34) Ibid. capitol. 20. p. 106.

[" Bayle's long digreſſion, comprehended in the
" remarks *C*, *D*, *E*, *F*, is but a part of the proofs
" he had collected, to ſupport a paradox he was
" mighty fond of, and which he has introduced in
" ſeveral places in his Dictionary. This paradox is,
" that religion has very little influence over the mo-
" rals of men; and conſequently that, in a ſociety
" conſiſting wholly of Atheiſts, there neither would
" be more moral evil nor leſs good, than in a ſo-
" ciety compoſed entirely of Chriſtians. It is to prove
" this in part, that he inſiſts ſo ſtrongly in this ar-
" ticle, *that the point of honour is a thouſand times
" more powerful than conſcience*, to bridle incontinence
" in both ſexes. But though we ſhould allow him
" all the facts he produces here, and that in particular
" relating to the *ſix hundred women*, whom he ſup-
" poſes after (citat. 33.) deſtroyed the fruit of their
" womb in the ſpace of a year, and that only in the
" city of Paris; it will be impoſſible for him to
" draw, from theſe particular inſtances, the follow-
" ing general conſequence, that *the point of honour is
" a thouſand times more powerful than conſcience.*
" I. We may juſtly object to him, that the very ſame
" year, and in the ſame city of Paris, a much greater
" number of women had been prevailed upon, by
" religious views and motives of conſcience, not to
" ſwerve from their duty. This is a fact that no
" man, who is not poſſeſſed with the moſt obſtinate
" prejudice, can deny. II. Bayle may be refuted by
" what he himſelf lays down. He ſuppoſes, after
" Patin, (citat. (14.) that *the Vicar-Generals and Pe-
" nitentiaries had complained to the firſt Preſident, that,
" within a twelvemonth, ſix hundred women had con-
" feſſed their having killed and deſtroyed their fruit.*
" What had forced the ſix hundred women in queſ-
" tion to make this humiliating confeſſion of their
" crime; what but conſcience and religion? Here
" then religion triumphs, in its turn, over the point
" of honour. But why had theſe ſix hundred wo-
" men, whom their ordinary confeſſors refuſed to
" abſolve, by referring them to the Penitentiaries,
" recourſe to penance, *&c.*? It was becauſe they
" were conſcious of the enormity of their crimes;
" were terrified at the reflection on them; were
" grieved for their having commited them; were
" deſirous of reconciling themſelves to Heaven, and
" were in hopes that its grace would preſerve them
" from the like guilt for the future, *&c.* Since theſe
" circumſtances were known only by the ſecret con-
" feſſion they had made of them, their honour was
" conſequently ſkreened. Inſtead of theſe ſix hun-
" dred women, (bad Chriſtians if you will, but ne-
" verthleſs Chriſtians and who had not quite extin-
" guiſhed the ſentiments of religion) ſuppoſe, ac-
" cording to Bayle's ſyſtem, ſix hundred atheiſtical
" women, who were firmly perſuaded that there is no
" God, Paradiſe, nor Hell, and conſequently that a
" concealed ſin is an action merely indifferent, what,
" in this caſe, could have prompted them to repent?
" Bayle ſays, (a little after citat. 30) *What man,
" after having read the above-mentioned paſſage of
" Thuanus, would preſume to deny, that the ideas with
" regard to the point of honour are not the ſtrongeſt bank
" which could be thrown up, to ſtop the flood of inconti-
" nence*, &c.? In oppoſition to this, I ſay, that we
" may naturally conclude from the paſſage in queſ-
" tion of Thuanus, that the ideas with regard to the
" point of honour, were very weak in the women in
" queſtion. Not one of them had been checked by
" the point of honour, in their committing the firſt
" crime. It is true indeed, that, after having com-
" mitted the crime without having enough conſidered
" the conſequences of it, an unexpected pregnancy
" prompted them to ſcreen their honour by a murder;
" and that honour, in this particular caſe, prevailed
" over conſcience. But it is reaſoning very ill to ar-
" gue from thence, that *the ideas with regard to the
" point of honour are the ſtrongeſt bank which could be
" thrown up, to ſtop the flood of incontinency.* We may
" look upon it as a truth, that motives of religion
" and conſcience prevent a thouſand impure actions,
" but that the *ideas of the point of honour ſcarce pre-
" vent one*,

" Bayle himſelf, in the whole, cannot deny this.
" He ſays, after citat. 31. *It is not the buſineſs of the
" point of honour to prevent hidden crimes; this is the
" buſineſs of conſcience.* The law of God forbids, not
" only fornication, adultery, and all other exterior
" ſins of this kind; but it alſo condemns all ſuch in-
" ternal ſins as correſpond to them. All internal ſins,
" which are infinitely more numerous than external
" ones, are out of the ſphere of the point of honour.
" The ſame may be affirmed of above three fourths
" and more of external ſins, as *oſcula, tactus impudici,
" mollities, &c.* On the other ſide, there is no room to
" doubt but there are millions of Chriſtian women
" (by which I mean the whole ſex in general) who not
" only refrain from actions, which, as Bayle ſays,
" *draw after them ſuch conſequences as are with great
" difficulty concealed from the publick*; but who alſo are
" in a conſtant diſpoſition of mind, not to conſent to
" one impure deſire; and who would not give way,
" ſpontaneouſly or upon reflection, merely to thoughts
" of an impure kind. It is clear as the ſun, that
" nothing but religion is able to produce and preſerve
" women in ſuch a frame of mind, notwithſtanding

ple *Limbus* [*D*]. This will give me an opportunity of ſpeaking of an ordinance of Henry II. (*d*), which was ſo very rigorous, that it might happen that a woman might ſuffer death, who was not guilty of deſtroying the fruit of her womb. Hereunder is a remark,

(*d*) Vid. the rem. [*E*].

" the propenſion to evil, which is a fatal conſequence " of original ſin. Farther, nothing but religion can " prompt women, who have been long immerſed in " guilt, to become converts. If we look narrowly " into the diſpoſitions of ſuch women as are the moſt " abandoned to evil, it will appear that honour has " no influence over them; but that the ſentiments " of religion, notwithſtanding the kind of hardened " States in which they live, are not quite extinguiſhed " in them. We ſcarce meet with one in a thouſand " of theſe women, who would willingly die in ſo " deplorable a condition; and who do not hope, to " extricate themſelves from it one day or other, at " leaſt in their expiring moments. From all theſe " reflections it ſeems a clear demonſtration to me, " that Bayle was influenced by prejudice more than by " good ſenſe when he aſſerted, that *the point of ho-* " *nour is the ſtrongeſt bank which could be thrown up,* " *to ſtop the flood of incontinence; and that it is a thou-* " *ſand times ſtronger than* conſcience, religion, *&c.* *." [*D*] *To people Limbus.*] This does not require a large Commentary after what the reader has peruſed above. I nevertheleſs will add a paſſage from Drelincourt. *One would imagine,* ſays he, ſpeaking to Miſſionaries (35), *that ſome of the maſters of the ſchools have really deſcended into the bowels of the earth, and had very carefully diſcovered and viewed all the lurking holes there. The opinion moſt commonly received among them is* *, *that there are four different places under the earth, or a deep place divided into four parts. They ſay that the loweſt place is hell, in which all the damned are; where their bodies will be after the reſurrection, and where all the devils will likewiſe be confined. That the place neareſt to hell is purgatory, where ſouls are purged; but rather where they ſatisfy God's juſtice by their ſufferings. They declare that here is the like fire, as well as an intenſe heat in theſe two places; and that the only difference is in the duration. They think that next to purgatory, is the Limbus for ſuch children as die without the ſacrament (baptiſm) and that the fourth place is the Limbus of the fathers, that is, the place where were gathered together ſuch ſouls of the juſt as died before the death of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. They declare that this place is empty at preſent, ſo that it is a houſe to let.* According to this Doctrine, the Limbus of little children is become the veſtibule or porch of hell, ſince Chriſt's aſcenſion; for the Limbus of the fathers muſt be looked upon as nothing from that time. The ſame queſtion might therefore be aſked on this occaſion, as the cynical Philoſopher did, upon ſeeing the entry to a ſmall houſe; *Where is the houſe belonging to this gate* (36)? The entry to this houſe being very large. The frontiers of hell muſt neceſſarily be of a greater extent than the whole Kingdom, which is monſtrous. If we put together all the children who die unbaptiſed, whether they die after coming into the world, or are loſt by a voluntary or involuntary miſcarriage, theſe will no doubt compoſe two thirds of mankind. The number of immature births would doubtleſs be ſurprizing, could we know it; though we ſhould take in only ſuch as are victims to the punctilio of honour, thoſe who fall a ſacrifice to jealouſy (37), and thoſe to effeminacy (38). In all ages, the inhabitants of every part of the earth have been concerned in this crime. This might be eaſily proved, but we will content ourſelves with two teſtimonies. Conſider the following words of Juvenal.

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. vol. 4. p. 970.

(35) Drelincourt, *Dialogue on Chriſt's deſcent into Hell*, p. 309. edit. of 1664.

* See Cardinal Bellarmin's *Treatiſe of Purgatory.*

(36) Diogen. Laert. book 6. num. 57. relates this otherwiſe. *Myndum profectus* (Diogenes Cynicus) *cum videret magnificas portas & urbem modicam, viri, inquit, Myndii portas claudite, ne urbs veſtra egrediatur,* i. e. " Diogenes obſerving that " the city of " Myndus was " ſmall, and " had magnifi- " cent gates; " ye Myndians " (ſays he) ſhut " your gates, " for fear your " city ſhould go " out through " them."

(37) That is, in thoſe countries where Polygamy is allowed, the wives of the ſame husband play a thouſand tricks, to prevent one another's bearing of children.

(38) That is, that ſome married women, to preſerve a good ſhape, or ſave money, deſtroy their fruit. It is ſaid that ſome Caſuiſts aſſiſt them in this.

(39) Juven. Sat. 2. ver. 32.

Cum tot abortivis fœcundam Julia vulvam
Solveret (39).

That is,

" Himſelf the while
" With impious drugs and potions did beguile
" The teeming Julia's womb, and thence did wreſt
" Crude births, that yet th' inceſtuous fire confeſs'd." DRYDEN.

And in another place,

Sunt quas eunuchi imbelles, ac mollia ſemper
Oſcula delectent, & deſperatio barbæ,
Et quod abortivo non eſt opus (40).

(40) Idem, Sat. 6. ver. 364. See alſo ver. 593.

That is,

" There are who in ſoft Eunuchs place their bliſs,
" To ſhun the ſcrubbing of a bearded kiſs,
" And 'ſcape abortion." DRYDEN.

[" Bayle was ſo very intent upon carrying his " point, and multiplying the number of immature " births, that he did not conſider he gave a moſt " abſurd proof upon this occaſion. *The number of* " *immature births, would doubtleſs, ſays he, be ſurpriz-* " *ing, ... though we ſhould take in only ſuch, &c.* " One of the proofs he gives of the following, in " citat. 39.

" *Sunt quas Eunuchi . . . .*

. . . . . .

" *Et quod abortivo* NON *eſt opus, &c.*

" What was Bayle thinking of when he quoted " ſuch inſtances as theſe, to prove the *ſurprizing* " *number* there are of immature births † ?"]

† From the rem. of the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. vol. 4. p. 970, 971.

Ovid had exclaimed againſt this grievous crime before Juvenal; and had even repreſented the danger to which thoſe who perpetrated it expoſed themſelves.

Quid juvat immunes belli ceſſare puellas,
Nec fera peltatas agmina velle ſequi;
Si ſine Marte ſuis patiuntur vulnera telis,
Et cæcas armant in ſua fata manus?
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
Hoc neque in Armeniis tigres fecere latebris:
Perdere nec fœtus auſa leæna ſuos.
At teneræ faciunt, ſed non impune, puellæ.
Sæpe, ſuos utero quæ necat, ipſa perit.
Ipſa perit, ferturque toro reſoluta capillos:
Et clamant, Meritò, *qui modocunque vident* (41).

(41) Ovid. *Amor.* lib. 2. eleg. 14.

That is,

" What boots it that the fair are free from war,
" And what, that they're forbid the ſhield to bear;
" Againſt themſelves if they new arms employ,
" And madly with new wounds their lives deſtroy?
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
" The tygreſſes that haunt th'Armenian wood,
" Will ſpare their proper young, tho' pinch'd for food;
" Nor will the Lybian lioneſſes ſlay
" Their whelps; but women are more fierce than they;
" More barbarous to the tender fruit they bear,
" Nor nature's call, tho' loud ſhe cries, will hear.
" But righteous vengeance oft their crimes purſues,
" And they are loſt themſelves who would their children loſe;
" The pois'nous drugs with mortal juices fill
" Their veins, and undeſign'd themſelves they kill.
" Themſelves upon the bier are breathleſs born,
" With hair tied, which was in ringlets worn,
" Thro' weeping crowds, that on that corps attend,
" Well may they weep for their unhappy end."
DRYDEN.

I have given other paſſages from this Poet in the remark [*F*]. This furniſhes me with new proofs with regard to the point of honour. The methods employed at that time to deſtroy the child were of dangerous conſequence to the mother; they often killed both; and yet young women choſe rather to run the riſk of loſing their lives than of loſing their

remark, upon this ſubject, of a famous Civilian [*E*] ; and I will quote a paſſage from Henry Stephens, which informs us, among other particulars, that this very rigorous law was fatal to none but women ſervants [*F*]. Patin's letters in queſtion ſhew particularly that

ſame. In this age, ſuch as ſtay too long, die ſometimes under the courſe, as Mademoiſele de Guerchi It is to be obſerved, that ſuch as do not make away with their children, make no noiſe whilſt they are delivering, unleſs they happen to be in a place, where they are not under any fear of loſing their character, by the diſcovery of the myſtery. This too is a freſh proof of the inconceivable power of the point of honour. It ſuppreſſes the effects of the ſharpeſt pangs in a tender ſex, which groans, weeps, and cries, for the mereſt trifles.

A perſon one day ſaid to a miſſionary, you cannot ſay of Limbus, what the Poets uſed to ſay of Hell, that it is a ſmall houſe.

(42) Horat. *Od.* 4. lib. 1.

. . . . *Domus exilis Plutonia*. . . . .

That is,

" Pluto's ſmall manſion."

He anſwered, Embrio's do not take up much room. But how many (was it replied to him) children of four or five years of age go to Limbus? Beſides, do not you know that Embrio's, and all children in general ſhall riſe grown men? As to that, replied he, do not trouble yourſelf ; the world is wide enough.

By the way, ſome perſons are of opinion that Virgil, who believed a Limbus, ought to have divided it into two parts. The one for children who die before their birth ; the other for ſuch as die in their infancy. The number of the former is ſo very great, that they would well deſerve (ſay theſe people) a claſs apart. Whence was it therefore that this great Poet did not take any notice of thoſe unhappy creatures ?

Continuò auditæ voces, vagitus & ingens,
Infantumque animæ flentes in limine primo,
Quos dulcis vitæ exſortes, & ab ubere raptos
Abſtulit atra dies, & funere merſit acerbo (43).

(43) Virgil. *Æn.* lib. 6. ver. 426.

That is,

" Firſt ſhrill laments, and tender cries are heard,
" The ghoſts of infants weeping in the door,
" Whom of ſweet life abridg'd, and from the breaſt
" Untimely ſnatch'd, the fatal day cut off,
" And in a funeral immature involv'd."

TRAPP.

[*E*] *Hereunder is a remark upon this ſubject, by a famous Civilian.*] He ſays, that the benefit and utility of the laws ought not to be ſuſpended, upon pretence of ſome inconveniencies they may produce ; and he quotes, on this occaſion, the ſaying of Cato, *viz.* that no law is convenient or advantageous to all perſons in general. Here follows Bodins's words (44).

(44) Bodin, *Demonomanie des Sorciers*, Liv. 4. chap. 5. p. m. 447, 448.

" I readily confeſs, that it were better to clear the " guilty, than to condemn the innocent : but then " I ſay, that he who is convicted by ſtrong preſumptions, is not innocent ; as that perſon who was " found with a bloody ſword near a perſon murdered, " no one being there but himſelf, and other conjectures which we remarked. For this reaſon, King " Henry II. made a very uſeful edict in this Kingdom, which was publiſhed and regiſtred the fourth " of March, in the year one thouſand five hundred " and fifty ſix (45) ; wherein he declares, that that " woman ſhall be ſuppoſed to have killed her child, " and be put to death, who has concealed her pregnancy and delivery, and if her child died without baptiſm, and ſhe cannot produce witneſſes of " one or other of theſe things ; nor ſhall they be believed who ſay that the child was ſtill-born : which " has ſince been put in practice by ſeveral decrees . . . " And nevertheleſs it may happen, that a woman, " to preſerve her honour, may conceal her pregnancy " and delivery ; and that the child ſhe would have " been glad to bring up, died as it was coming into " the world ; but foraſmuch as it was obſerved, that " under the pretence that a child was ſtill-born, ſeveral parricides were committed, it was prudently " reſolved, that ſuch a preſumption was ſufficient, " to ſentence to death the perſon impeached, in order to revenge the innocent blood. For we muſt " not, becauſe of an inconvenience which does not " frequently happen, forbear to enact a good law * ; " and for this reaſon I gave it as my opinion, that a " woman of Muret, near Soiſſons, ſhould be ſentenced to die, for having concealed her pregnancy " and deliverance, and buried her child in a garden, " in the month of May M.D.LXXVIII." I know that the Author of the Flemiſh Haerlem Gazette, publiſhed not long ſince (46), under the article of Paris, that it had been ordered, that this edict of Henry II. ſhould be revived in its former rigour, and be read on feſtival days, in all pariſh Churches. I cannot ſay whether the reſt of the Gazetteers have mentioned this ; but I do not remember to have found this piece of news either in the *Mercure Politique*, or the *Lettres Hiſtoriques :* and yet it might have ſuggeſted a great many reflections. [" This " article with regard to the putting in force the edict " of Henry II. is true ; and the ordinance is repeated from time to time *."]

(45) Supposing the year to begin after Easter.

* *l.* 3 & 4. *de legib. ff.* 9. *Sic Cato dicebat nullam legem ſatis commodam omnibus eſſe.*

(46) I believe it was in 1698.

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 971.

[*F*] *A paſſage from Henry Stephens . . . . informs us, among other particulars, that this rigorous law was fatal to none but women-ſervants.*] As theſe other particulars may ſerve as a confirmation and ſupplement to the preceding remarks, I am not contented with relating thoſe circumſtances which concern the impunity of perſons of diſtinction ; but have alſo annexed ſeveral incidents and notes which this writer gives us, before he obſerves that a reſpect was had to perſons, in the execution of the edict of Henry II. The time, in which he wrote, ſhews pretty evidently, that he had an eye to the puniſhments which followed upon this ordinance. *With regard to ſuch women as murther their children*, ſays he (47) . . . " the number is great, as well of thoſe who murther them " in the inſtant they are born, as of thoſe who exerciſe the like cruelty upon them, even before they " come into the world And firſt ; as to the latter, " it is certain their wickedneſs is of great antiquity. " For we find Phocylides, the Greek Poet, expreſsly " commanding women to refrain from the commiſſion of ſuch actions. And Ovid, who alſo was a " Heathen, reproaches a woman very ſeverely on " that account, and at the ſame time adds ſeveral " fine remonſtrances. We likewiſe find that Hippocrates, among other things, which he took an oath " to obſerve, places the following, *viz.* never to give " women any thing with which they may deſtroy " the fruit of their womb. Now this wickedneſs is " practiſed on two accounts : by ſome women, for " fear it ſhould be known that they have been robbed of their virgin-flower ; or in general, for fear " they ſhould be diſcovered to have been engaged in " an unlawful commerce, whether they are married " women or widows : by the reſt, for fear they " ſhould ſhorten the time of their youth (48), and " eſpecially for fear of what Ovid ſays :"

(47) Henry Eſtienne, *Apologie d'Herodote*, Liv. 1. chap. 18. p. 223 & *ſeq.* Antwerp edit. 1568, 8vo.

(48) See citat. (38) above : but obſerve that Henry Stephens commits a conſiderable fault on this occaſion ; he applying thoſe two verſes of Ovid, to ſuch mothers as deſtroy their fruit, for other reaſons than that of concealing their crime. See citat. (56) above, that this fear *rugarum ventris*, is not the fear of ſpoiling ſome corporeal beauties, but the fear of carrying about them, convincing proofs of their having been with child.

" *Scilicet ut careat rugarum crimine venter,*
" *Sternetur pugnæ triſtis arena tuæ* (49) !

That is,

" The belly muſt be ſmooth, no wrinkle there,
" To ſhock the lover's wanton glance appear.
" His touch as well as ſight they fain would pleaſe,
" And the womb early of its burthen eaſe.

DRYDEN.

" And as to what I ſaid concerning the ſhortning " of youth, the ſame Poet declares this alſo ;

(49) See citat. (56) below.

" *Adde quod & partus faciunt breviora juventæ Tempora.*

The

The Senſe is,

Add too, that child-birth ſhortens the gay bloom of youth.

" And, though we had not his teſtimony, we " have daily ocular experience of this. I alſo have " heard of ſome young gentlewomen, and even have " known ſome, who did not ſcruple to wear buſks, " to the deſtruction of the child they were going " with; and, that they might not loſe the honour " of being genteelly ſhaped, made no conſcience to " deſtroy that, which ought to be as dear to them as " life. For I ſpeak of thoſe very perſons who were got " with child in a lawful way. As to thoſe who " murder their children as ſoon as they are delivered; " throwing them, or cauſing them to be thrown " away, the convent of Nuns, not many years ſince, " might have furniſhed them with a good number " of examples to this purpoſe, (as well as of thoſe " who deſtroy them in the womb) even in Ponta- " nus's time, as is manifeſt from the following paſ- " ſage of this Author. *Quod quidem execrationis ge-* " *nus maximè ſacerdotes attingit, quæ Deo virginitatem* " *quum voverint, pollutis tamen votis, ritúque ſacerdo-* " *tali perjuranter atque inceſtè contaminato, gravidæ* " *factæ, ne ſcelus pateat, execrabiliori conantur ſcelere* " *idipſum prohibere ac corrigere: dum aut medicaminibus* " *adhibitis abortionem procurant, aut partum ſtatim ip-* " *ſum exanimant, terræque aut cloacis clàm infodiunt.* " i. e. " This crime, of a moſt execrable kind, is " committed chiefly by Nuns, who, though they " had devoted themſelves to Heaven by a perpetual " vow, yet breaking it; and profaning, in a perju- " rious and inceſtuous manner, the ſacerdotal Rite; " and becoming pregnant, to ſcreen their wicked- " neſs, they endeavour to conceal it by perpetrating " a ſtill more horrid crime: ſince, by taking medi- " cines, they either procure abortions, or murder the " babe immediately at its coming into the world, " and then bury it privately, or throw it into a ne- " ceſſary-houſe. Now when I ſay that a conſidera- " ble number of theſe would have been found, ſome " years ſince, I do not mean but that ſome might be " eaſily found at this time, if there were occaſion " for it, but that the number was then greater than at " preſent; as well becauſe there were more Nuns " then, as becauſe they were more afraid than at " preſent of being diſhonoured; and even of being " rebuked or corrected, in caſe they ſhould be con- " victed of playing a looſe game, their Father-Con- " feſſors not being ſo very ſevere (50); but, on the " contrary, they themſelves, on a proper occaſion, " would be forward enough to give a looſe to a cri- " minal paſſion. Beſides, as they ſee many, who " were Nuns before, like themſelves, married pub- " lickly (51), and live happily; this conſideration " makes them more conſcientious than to think of per- " petrating ſuch murders. But it muſt be owned that " this wickedneſs extends far beyond the Cloyſter, " even to marriageable women who live with their " parents, or under the inſpection of their relations, " and even to women of good families, not to men- " tion that many widows give a looſe that way. The " above-mentioned Pontanus has not concealed this " circumſtance, with regard to the women of his " time; he adding to the above-mentioned paſſage " I quoted from him; *Nec verò monſtroſa hac feritate* " *ſacerdotes tantùm, verumetiam viduæ ac nubiles pu-* " *ellæ ſplendiſſimæque etiam fœdantur familiæ.* Servant- " wenches have alſo played frequently at the game " in queſtion (52); and theſe, not thoſe we before " hinted at, generally fall victims to the ſecular " arm, according to the proverb we before cited " from Juvenal:

Dat veniam cervis, vexat cenſura columbas.

That is,

" Yet theſe obnoxious men without remorſe,
" Againſt our tribe will put the laws in force,
" Clip the dove's wing, and give the vulture courſe. DRYDEN.

" For I remember to have ſeen in Paris many ſer- " vant wenches (but of no other rank) hanged for this " crime; and I remember particularly to have ſeen, " in the phyſic-ſchools, the ſkeleton of a ſervant- " wench, who had been hanged for the crime in queſ- " tion, *viz.* for throwing her child into a privy . . . " (53). Now, no perſons could know more of theſe " ſecrets than midwives, was it not the cuſtom at this " time to go and fetch them from their houſes; and " after hoodwinking them, to take them to the " houſe of the woman who wants them; which wo- " man is then maſked, or otherwiſe covered, for fear " of being known by the midwives, whoſe eyes they " then are obliged to uncover . . . . (54). Many " Ladies, indeed, in this age, have no need to go " ſuch lengths, they employing remedies to prevent " conception." There are ſome errors in this paſſage from the apology for Herodotus, as the Reader will ſee, if he takes the pains to read the notes I have thrown into the margin, which alone would ſufficiently apologize for my giving ſo long a quotation.

The firſt paſſage of Ovid, cited by Henry Stephens (55), is from elegy 13, book 2. *de Amoribus*, and ſhews, that, in that age, a thing was commonly known in Rome, which an antient Apothecary, who had read a great number of books of Surgery and Phyſic, owned to me, he was wholly ignorant of, till he had read a book lately publiſhed, which I lent him. He told me, when he returned it, that it had informed him of two very curious obſervations he had never heard of before; and which relate to the indications, whereby it may be known whether a woman has had children. The book in queſtion was writ by Mr. Lamy, a Phyſician of the Faculty of Paris, and his words are as follow (56). " This woman (57) " had born children; and before we opened her, " or had the leaſt ſuſpicion of what we found, " we diſcovered it by undoubted ſymptoms. Mrs. la " Marche, chief Midwife of the *Hotel-Dieu*, was pre- " ſent on that occaſion; ſhe is extremely well ſkilled " in her profeſſion, and ſhews great wit and ſagacity " on all occaſions. I aſked her opinion on a great " many particulars, concerning the indications or " marks of virginity; and deſired her to inform me, " how ſhe came to know at firſt ſight, that the woman " we were going to open had born children; ſhe " then pointed out to me the folds or wrinkles of the " belly; and upon my obſerving, that the dropſy " might have occaſioned theſe, or that her belly " might have ſwelled from other cauſes than her be- " ing pregnant, and that theſe wrinkles might have " remained; ſhe pointed out to me, and the reſt of " the company, what the Midwives call among them- " ſelves *le dechirement de la fourchette*, which is the " rending the extreme of the loweſt part of the ori- " fice towards the *Anus*, which always happens at " the birth of a firſt child, and which is conſequently " an infallible mark of a woman's having had a " child." Of theſe two indications of child-birth, the former is infinitely more dreadful than the latter, with regard to one who paſſes for a maid, and is betrothed to a man; for ſhe has great reaſon to believe, that her huſband will not find out the ſecond, and be under the ſtrongeſt apprehenſions of his diſcovering the former. This enables us to underſtand the verſes from Ovid, much better than by the Commentators; and we evidently know the reaſon why the unmarried women among the Romans expoſed themſelves to ſo dreadful a peril, to avoid the *rugarum crimen*, that the wrinkles in their bellies might not reveal their crime. Theſe wrinkles were therefore much more dangerous than thoſe of the face; and there is no doubt but that the conſequences of theſe are as well known in our age, as in that of Auguſtus; and that this leaves a terrible uneaſineſs even on the minds of ſuch perſons as have had Lucina's (58) aſſiſtance, though with the utmoſt ſecrecy. Their invocations, according to the form of prayer which was addreſſed to Laverna (59),

Labra move, metuens audiri: Pulchra Laverna
Da mihi fallere, da juſtum ſanctumque videri:
Noctem peccatis & fraudibus objice nubem (60).

That is,

" *He* murmurs ſoftly, to be heard afraid,
" *Good, good Laverna, hear me, grant me aid*

(50) Henry Stephens is miſtaken here; for, in his time, the wickedneſs of monaſteries, and the connivance of Confeſſors, were not ſo flagrant as before: the reproaches of the Proteſtants having excited a kind of ſhame in them, and put them, in ſome meaſure, upon their guard.

(51) I don't underſtand the reaſon which Henry Stephens gives in this place; for he either ſpeaks of ſuch Nuns as were turned Proteſtants, or of ſuch as were permitted, by the Pope, to marry; and neither of theſe circumſtances ſeem adapted to prompt a Nun who is with child to preſerve it; the declaring her pregnancy, is not the way to prevail with the Pope to diſpenſe with her obſervation of her vows.

(52) See the article LAUNOI (MATTHEW DE) rem. [B], why ſervant-wenches are more liable to be debauched than other women.

(53) *Henri Eſtienne, Apologie, d'Herodote*, p. 225.

(54) Ibid. p. 226.

(55) Citat. (49) above.

(56) G. Lamy's *Diſſertation againſt the new opinion, that all animals ſpring from an egg*, p. 218 *& ſeq.* This Diſſertation was printed with ſome other treatiſes of the ſame Author, at Paris, 1678, in 12mo.

(57) That is, a woman who had been anatomized.

(58) The Goddeſs who preſided over child births.

(59) The Goddeſs who patroniſed thefts, and ſuch attempts as people would have concealed.

(60) Horat. epiſt. 16. lib. 1, ver. 60.

For

that their Author's Creed was not clogged with many articles [G], and that he behaved with great tenderneſs towards his children. This circumſtance alone is ſufficient to refute the

" *For ſuch a cheat, let all believe me good.*
" Let me ſeem juſt and honeſt to the crowd,
" And o'er my cheats and forgeries ſpread a cloud. CREECH.

Their invocations, I ſay, though indulged in all reſpects, according to the intention of the above-mentioned form of prayer, do not free their minds from the fears, with regard to the approaches of a bridegroom, who does not expect to find any folds or wrinkles; and for this reaſon, they have recourſe to drugs as ſoon as poſſible. It was with juſt reaſon Henry Stephens ſuppoſed, that in his time *many Ladies knew ſeveral remedies to prevent pregnancy* (61). The antient Greeks and Romans were but novices in this wicked art, in compariſon of the people of the 16th century; and we are told, that the 17th century ſurpaſſes the 16th in that particular; and yet they have put in practice the groſſeſt and moſt dangerous methods mentioned by Ovid (62). Read Abbé de Marolles's words on the following paſſage of Ovid:

(61) *Henri Eſtienne, Apologie d'Herodote*, p. 226.

(62) Ovid. eleg. 14. lib. 2. *Amor.* ver. 27.

Veſtra quid effoditis ſubjectis viſcera telis!

The ſenſe is,

" Why, with ſharp darts, do you your entrails pierce?

(63) L'Abbé de Marolles, rem. on the 2d book of Ovid's *Amorum*, p. 269, 270. This book was printed in 1661.

" It is ſtrange (ſays he) (63), that ſo damnable an " invention ſhould have been practiſed ſo long ſince, " and ſhould be revived in our time. A wicked woman, " convicted of this abominable crime, after killing " the mother, thinking only to kill the child in her " womb, has been puniſhed in an exemplary manner " for it at Paris, the ſame year that I wrote this " book." How ingenious ſoever the paſſions may be, which are kept up by the point of honour, that maiden or widow, who may grant the laſt favour to a gallant, runs very great riſks to this day; for often the remedies fail of a deſired effect: the ninth month comes thundering upon them, and this is the devil; this is infinitely the moſt perplexing ſcene; for the truth of which I appeal to Madame des Houlieres verſes.

BALADE à Mademoiſelle D***.

Ores eſt temps de vous donner conſeil
Sur les perils où beauté vous expoſe.
Fille reſſemble à ce bouton vermeil
Qu'en peu de jours on voit devenir roſe.
Tant qu'eſt bouton on voudroit en jouïr,
Nul ne le voit ſans deſirs de rapine.
Dès que Soleil l'a fait épanouïr,
On n'en tient conte, un matin le ruïne,
De roſe alors ne reſte que l'épine.
Lorſqu'un amant, l'exemple eſt tout pareil,
Fait voir deſirs à quoy pudeur s'opoſe,
Si l'on ne fuit, l'amour eſt un Soleil,
Point n'en doutez, par qui fleur eſt écloſe.
Alors en bref on voit s'évanouïr
Tranſports & ſoins par qui fille peu fine
Préſume d'elle, & ſe laiſſe éblouïr.
Mépris ſuccede à l'amour qui décline;
De roſe alors ne reſte que l'épine.
Plus de commerce avecque le ſommeil,
Ou ſi par fois un moment on repoſe,
Songe cruel donne fâcheux réveil;
Cent & cent fois on en maudit la cauſe.
Voir on voudroit dans la terre enfouïr
Tendre ſecret duquel on s'imagine
Qu'un traiſtre ira le monde réjouïr.
Parle-t-on bas, on croit qu'on le devine,
De roſe alors ne reſte que l'épine.

ENVOI.

Galans fiéfez donneurs de gabatine,
J'ay beau preſcher qu'on riſque à vous ouïr,
A coqueter toute fille eſt encline.
Pluſtoſt que faire aprouver ma Doctrine,
On fileroit chanvre ſans le rouïr,
Mais quand tout bas faut apeller Lucine,
De roſe alors ne reſte que l'épine (64).

(61) *Poeſies de Madame des Houlieres*, p. 134, 135. Amſt. edit. 1694.

* It is in French *Balade*, a particular ſpecies of French Poetry, in which the rhymes are diſpoſed after a certain manner. It does not anſwer to our Engliſh word *Ballad*, tho' always (I believe) tranſlated ſo. Rem. by the Tranſl.

The ſenſe is,

VERSES * to Mrs.... D***.

" Now is the proper ſeaſon for advice,
" To guard from perils, rais'd by your bright beauty.
" A maid reſembles the fair-blooming bud,
" Which in few days, burſts forth a lovely roſe.
" In its flow-budding ſtate, all men deſire it;
" Each eye that ſees its beauties would enjoy them.
" But when once blown, by Sol's prolific ray,
" Deſpis'd by all, a morning ſees it wither,
" And of the roſe, the thorn alone remains.
" Thus when a lover, (the example tallies)
" Exhibits, to a fair-one, guilty wiſhes;
" Unleſs ſhe flies, love ſoon becomes a ſun,
" And, ſure as fate, will raiſe her virgin-flower.
" Then, on ſwift wings, each balmy tranſport flies;
" Tranſports which ſwell'd her melting breaſt with pride,
" And (hapleſs maiden,) prov'd her fatal ruin.
" To now-declining love, contempt ſucceeds,
" And, of the roſe, the thorn alone remains.
" No longer ſlumbers cloſe her weeping eyes;
" But ſhould kind Morpheus plunge her ſoul in ſleep,
" Startling, ſhe wakes, in terrors, from a dream,
" And her whole ſoul is ſorrow and repentance.
" In wild deſpair, ſhe curſes now the cauſe
" Of her tumultuous woes, and deep would bury
" The tender ſecret, which (fond ſhe) imagines
" Her faithleſs wretch will blazon to the world.
" Conſcious of guilt, a whiſpering wakes her bluſhes:
" Of the bright roſe, the thorn alone remains.

MESSAGE.

" The faithleſs ſparks, beguilers of the fair,
" In vain I cry, that liſtning to you's ruin;
" For every virgin's boſom heaves with love.
" Much ſooner theſe would ſpin unwater'd flax,
" Than once approve my ſalutary counſels.
" But when Lucina, ſoftly, they invoke,
" Of the bright roſe, the thorn alone remains.

[G] *Their Author's creed was not clogged with many articles.*] I will cite the following words from his elogium (65). " He ſpoke with the gravity of a Stoick, " but then his expreſſions were very ſatyrical, and, in " this article, he might have taught Rabelais himſelf. It was ſaid that he had written a Commentary on that Author, and underſtood him perfectly. " For this reaſon he was accuſed of being a Free-thinker in ſome meaſure. The truth is, he could " not endure bigottry, ſuperſtition, and knavery; but " he had an upright ſoul, and a well diſpoſed heart. " He had a paſſionate affection for his friends, and " behaved with affability and courteſy to every one, " eſpecially with regard to foreigners and learned " men." The Reader will pleaſe to obſerve in particular, that the Author of the elogium, in his anſwering the charge with regard to Free-thinking, does not ſay that Patin was, in the main, an orthodox Chriſtian; he contenting himſelf with affirming, that he hated ſuperſtition, and was an honeſt man. See the *Nouvelles de la republique des Lettres* (66). Such an anſwer as this was not made in behalf of the Prince of Conde; his friends oppoſing, to common fame, the declaration he made in his expiring moments: *I never doubted of the myſteries of religion, whatever may have been ſaid on this occaſion; but I doubt of them leſs now than ever* (67). It perhaps will be ſaid, that the Bookſellers of Geneva foiſted whatſoever they thought proper into the work in queſtion of Patin, but this would be a ridiculous ſuppoſition.

(65) *Advertiſement to the Reader*, before Guy Patin's *Letters*, folio * 6 *verſo*.

(66) For April 1684. art. 1. p. m. 116, 117. See alſo the *Acta Eruditor*, 1684. p. 251.

(67) See his *Funeral Oration*, ſpoke by the Biſhop of Meaux, March 10, 1687, p. 56, 57. Dutch edition.

[H] *The*

the abominable falſity publiſhed by a German writer [*H*]. It has been obſerved that Guy Patin was like Cicero [*I*]. He died in 1672, and left a ſon, who made a great figure in the world [*K*], and excelled in the knowledge of medals. He had loſt his eldeſt ſon, for whom he had procured, in 1667, the reverſion of his Profeſſorſhip (*e*), and

(*e*) See *Letter* 455, p. 337. Tom. 3.

[*H*] *The abominable falſity publiſhed by a German Writer.*] His name was *Axtius*. He publiſhed *in a Letter about Antimony, annexed to a treatiſe* de Arboribus coniferis, *at Jena* in 1679, that Mr. Patin attempted *to poiſon his own ſon with Antimony, which he ſuppoſed to be a poiſon; but* that, *contrary to his expectation, it wrought a happy cure* (68). Charles Patin, having complained of this injurious treatment, to the College of Phyſicians of Jena, obtained all the ſatisfaction he could deſire; the Faculty ordering Dr. Axtius to make a public recantation. *Saluberrima Facultas illum παλινῳδίαν* (69) *cantare coëgit, quam ſupreſſa calumnia typis mandatam ad me tranſmiſit*, (theſe are Charles Patin's words (70)) *his verbis:* Editioni Tractatus hujus de arboribus, benevole Lector, ſubjunxeram Epiſtolam de Antimonio, cui relationem de Illuſtriſſimo Guidone Patino inſerueram: Quia autem certo comperi illam falſam, & ab ipſius malevolis ſine dubio efficta esſe, Epiſtolam rurſus imprimi curavi, fabulam expunxi, & Manibus celeberrimi illius viri injuriam factam eſſe aperte profiteor, *i. e.* "*The Faculty of* "*Phyſic forced him to make a recantation, which, after* "the ſuppreſſing of the *calumny, they ſent to me printed,* "*and was as follows.* I had annexed, kind Reader, "a Letter concering Antimony, to this Treatiſe of "Trees, wherein I had introduced a ſtory relating to "the moſt illuſtrious Guy Patin: but having found "this to be wholly falſe, and to have been certainly "forged by enemies who bear a ſpite to him; I "cauſed this letter to be reprinted; expunged that "falſity; and openly confeſs that an injury had been "done to the memory of that famous man."

(68) Extracted from Guy Patin's *Elogium*, prefixed to his *Letters*.

(69) He ſhould have ſaid παλινῳδίαν.

(70) *Carolus Patinus, in Lyceo Patavino*, p. 102, 103.

[*I*] *It has been obſerved that Guy Patin was like Cicero.*] "The late Mr. Huguetan, a Counſellor of "Lyons, who was perfectly well acquainted with "him, thought he had the air of Cicero, whoſe "ſtatue we ſee in Rome (71)." This calls to my mind what was ſaid of the Chancellor de l'Hopital, that he was like Ariſtotle: *Specie fuit auguſta, vultu gravi & tranquillo, qui ut ex vetere numiſmate apparuit Ariſtotelis faciem plane referret* (72), i. e. "He had a "noble aſpect, a countenance grave and compoſed, "and which greatly reſembled Ariſtotle's face, as "we find it on an antient medal."

(71) Extracted from the *Elogium* above-cited.

(72) Sammarthanus, *Elog.* lib. 1. p. m. 59.

[*K*] *He left a ſon, who made a great figure in the world.*] This was CHARLES PATIN. He was born in Paris the 23d of February 1633; and made ſo ſurprizing a progreſs, that he maintained Theſes in Greek and Latin, on all parts of Philoſophy, anno 1647. The Profeſſor (73) under whom he ſtudied, who was an Iriſhman, and was ignorant of the Greek tongue, was very angry at theſe Theſes, when they were brought for him to examine; but finding the young man prepared to maintain them without a moderator, he was forced to preſide at the diſpute, to ſave his reputation. The Pope's Nuncio, thirty four Biſhops, and ſeveral perſons of quality of the court and city, were preſent at this Theſis. The reſpondent maintained the diſpute during five hours, in both languages; and was admitted with great glory to his Maſter of Art's Degree. He ſtudied the law, in compliance to an uncle, by the mother's ſide, an Advocate in Parliament: he took his licence at Poitiers, after ſixteen months, and was admitted an Advocate in the Parliament of Paris. He ſpent ſix years in this ſtudy, but he could not lay aſide that of Phyſick, for which he always had an inclination. It was therefore no reſtraint upon him to comply with his father's will, which was, that he ſhould quit the law, and devote himſelf to phyſick. He ſoon approved the good reaſons that were alledged to him, and which were confirmed to him by Mareſcot's teſtimony. This famous Phyſician acknowledged himſelf indebted to his profeſſion for three things, which he could never have obtained by the Prieſthood, for which his father deſigned him. He had enjoyed a perfect ſtate of health till the age of eighty two years; had amaſſed an hundred thouſand crowns; and gained the intimate friendſhip of ſeveral eminent perſons. *Artem diſceres docereſque non Magiſtratibus tantum ſed Regibus ipſis & Imperatoribus leges præſcribentem: Sapientiſſimos tandem quoſque ab ore tuo pendentes, tuoque ſubmiſſos arbitrio cerneres. Recorderis, mi Stoice* (ſic quippe ob neſcio quam ἀπάθειαν me compellare ſolebat) *Mareſcottum noſtrum tria ſe ſatræ arti noſtræ debere profeſſum, quibus caruiſſet, ſi propoſitum à Parentibus ſacerdotium ſuſcepiſſet, ſanitatem athleticam ætatis anno* LXXXII. *centum aureorum millia, atque intimam innumerorum illuſtrium amicitiam* (74), i. e. "You would learn, and inſtruct others in an art, "which lays down laws, not only to Magiſtrates, "but alſo to Kings and Emperors. You would be- "hold men of the greateſt wiſdom liſtning to you, "and paying ſubmiſſion to your judgment. (Remem- "ber, my dear Stoick, *for by this name he uſed to call* "*me, becauſe of a certain indifference he perceived in* "*me*) that our friend Mareſcot owned, that he was "indebted, for three things to our ſacred profeſſion, "which he could not have obtained, had he de- "voted himſelf to the Prieſthood, as his parents in- "tended he ſhould, *&c.*" As ſoon as Charles had taken his Doctor's Degree in Phyſick, he applied himſelf to practice, and ſucceeded greatly. He read Lectures on Phyſick, in the place of Lopez the Profeſſor, who was gone to Bourdeaux. Being afraid that he ſhould be thrown into priſon, if he ſtaid longer in France, he intended to retire into Holland. *Excedere patria conſultius fuit, quam libertatis diſcrimen ſubire* (75). But the ſeas were then ſo much infeſted by the Oſtend privateers, that he returned from Havre de Grace to Paris, and afterwards ſet out for the Palatinate. He made ſome ſtay in Heidelberg, and afterwards travelled into Germany, Holland, England, Switzerland, and Italy. He was ſettled at Baſil; but the war carrying on between the French and Germans gave him ſo much uneaſineſs, that he went to Italy with his whole family. In 1676 he was appointed Profeſſor of Phyſick in Padua; three years after which he was created a Knight of St. Mark. He was informed in 1681, that the King of France would receive him into favour; and he poſſibly would have returned to Paris, had not the Magiſtrates of Padua promoted him to the Chair of principal Surgeon, and increaſed his ſalary. Theſe particulars are extracted from a book which he publiſhed at Padua in 1682, intitled, *Lyceum Patavinum, ſive Icones & Vitæ Profeſſorum Patavii* 1682 *docentium*. He died in that city (76) in 1694 (77), having two daughters who gained great fame by the works they publiſhed (78). ["His two daughters, as well as their fa- "ther, were made Members of the *Recouvrati* of "Padua, and wrote ſeveral pieces. Charlotte Ca- "tharine ſpoke in Padua, the laſt day of October "1683, a Latin oration on the raiſing the ſiege of "Vienna, printed the ſame year, and afterwards in "1691, in her *Tabellæ Selectæ*. In the *Acta Erudi-* "*torum* * is an extract of one of her letters to the "Authors of that Journal, wherein ſhe defends a "piece written by her father, on the monument of "Marcellinus, which they had criticiſed. She alſo "publiſhed, *Tabellæ Selectæ ac explicatæ à Carola* "*Catharina Patina, Pariſina, Academica. Patavii* "1691. fol. fig. 42. This is the explication of 41 "pictures of the moſt famous painters which are en- "graved there. The 42d plate repreſents the family "of Charles Patin. His other daughter Gabriel "Charlotte alſo publiſhed *De Phœnice in Numiſmate* "*Imp. Antonini Caracallæ expreſſa*. Venice 1683, "4to. She alſo ſpoke in the Academy of Padua "1685, a Panegyrick on Lewis XIV."] His wife alſo was an authoreſs (79). ["Her name was Mag- "dalen Hommet, daughter of a Phyſician in Paris, "who printed, in 1680, a collection of *Reflections,* "*Moral and Chriſtian*. He married her in 1663 †."] Here follows a catalogue of his works, publiſhed by him between the years 1662, till 1682. *Itinerarium Comitis Briennæ: Pariſiis*, 1662, 8vo. *Familiæ Romanæ ex anti. Numiſmatibus: Paris* 1663, *fol. Traité des Tourbes combuſtibles:* Paris, 1663, 4to. *Introduction à l'Hiſtoire des Medailles:* Paris, 1665, and Amſterdam,

(73) This was Roger Omoloy.

(74) *Carolus Patinus*, in *Lyceo Patavino*, p. 83, 84.

(75) Idem. Ibid. p. 91.

(76) A Polypus was found in his heart, and in the great artery, which choaked him. I was informed of this by Mr. Drelincourt, Profeſſor in Leyden, who was told it by a Profeſſor of Padua, that was in the retinue of the Venetian Embaſſadors; I mean the Embaſſadors who arrived in Holland in March 1696, to congratulate his Britannic Majeſty. They went to Mr. Drelincourt's Lectures, with their whole train, the 2d of April of the ſame year, and paid him a great many civilities, which he juſtly merited.

(77) See *Acta Eruditorum*, 1702, p. 85.

(78) See *Acta Eruditorum*, for 1684, p. 587; and for 1691, p. 337 and 547. *Nouv. de la Republ. des Lettres*, for April 1685. p. 452.

* For anno 1691, p. 237.

† Addit. by the Tranſl. from Niceron's *Hommes illuſtres*, Tom. 10. part 1. p. 90 *& ſeq.*

(79) *Nouv. de la Republ. des Lettres*, ibid. p. 453.

† Addit. by the Tranſl. from Niceron, ibid.

and who did not behave with the gratitude which was due to the affection of ſo good a father (*f*). This increaſed the affliction which the diſgrace of his other ſon had brought upon

(*f*) See his 1035th *Letter*, p. 539. Tom 3.

ſterdam, 1667, 12mo. *Imperatorum Romanorum Numiſmata: Argentinæ*, 1671, fol. *Theſaurus Numiſmatum: Amſtelodami*, 1672, 4to. *Quatre Relations Hiſtoriques:* Bâle, 1673, and Lyons, 1674, 12mo. *Prattica delle Medaglie: Venezia*, 1673, 12mo. *Suetonius illuſtratus: Baſileæ*, 1675. *De Numiſmate antiquo Auguſti & Platonis: Baſileæ*, 1675, 4to. *Encomium Moriæ Eraſmi, cum fig. Holbenianis: Baſil.* 1675, 12mo. *De optima Medicorum Secta: Patavii*, 1676, 4to. *De Febribus, Patavii*, 1677, 4to. *De Avicenna, Patavii*, 1678, 4to. *De Numiſmate ant. Horatii Coclitis*, 1678, in 4to, *De Scorbuto: Patavi*, 1679, 4to. *Judicium Paridis: Patavi*, 1679, 4to. [" The " complete title is, *Judicium Paridis de tribus Deabus* " *reatum in Numiſmate Antonini Pii expreſſum.* The " medal explained here, and the explication, are " curious *."] *Le pompoſe Feſte di Vicenza:* Padua, 1680, 4to. *Natalitia Jovis: Patavii*, 1681, 4to. *Quòd optimus Medicus debeat eſſe Chirurgus: Patavii*, 1681, 4to. *Lyceum Patavinum, Patavii*, 1682, 4to. [" The diſcourſe, containing the lives of the learned " men, is very ſhort, He gives himſelf here, a- " mong the learned, and exhibits a catalogue of his " own works †."] He himſelf has given us this catalogue in his *Lyceum Patavinum*, and yet he omitted this, *Epiſtolæ ad Eggelingium de Numiſmatibus quibuſdam abſtruſis Imperatoris Neronis*, publiſhed at Bremen in 1681, with Egglingius's anſwers (80). He afterwards gave a Latin tranſlation of the introduction to the *Science des Médailles* (81), which was printed in 1683 (82). *Diſſertatio Therapeutica de Peſte:* at Auſburg, 1683, 4to. *Commentarius in tres Inſcriptiones Græcas Smyrna nuper allatas*, Padua: 1685, 4to. *Commentarius in antiquum Monumentum Marcellinæ:* Ibid. 1688, 4to. *Commentarius in antiquum Cenotaphium Marci Artorii Medici:* Ibid. 1689, 4to. He likewiſe was concerned in the *Theſaurus Numiſmatum Petri Mauroceni*, publiſhed at Venice in 1683, and added ſome notes to it. Perhaps I may have omitted ſome of his works. [We may add the following pamphlets of his. " *In ſtripem regiam Epigrammata.* " *Mottos and Emblems of the* Royal Family, French " and Latin: Paris, 1660, 4to. Reprinted at Am- " ſterdam in 1695, with the following letter, at the " end of his *Introduction to Hiſtory*; the title of which " was changed as follows in this edition: *The Hiſtory of* " *Medals, or an Introduction to the knowledge of that Art.* " There are ten emblems, which were engraved by " *F. Chauveau. An Epiſtle to the King*, dated the 26th " of March, 1662, 4to. In this piece Patin be- " ſeeches his Majeſty to give him leave to dedicate a " work to him, compoſed on the conſular Medals, " and which was publiſhed the year following. In " the *Amænitates Litterariæ* of John Schelhorn **, " is a pretty long letter of Patin to John Faber, dated " at Padua the 20th of December 1677. He here " ſays, that not long before he was going to be in- " vited to Vienna, to be the Emperor's Phyſician " there; however this came to nothing. Note, the " *Prattica delle Medaglie*, mentioned by Bayle, in the " catalogue of Charles Patin's works above, is only " a tranſlation of, *Introduction à l'Hiſtoire des Me-* " *dailles.* The complete title of the *Prattica delle* " *Medaglie* is as follows: *Introduzione à l'Hiſtoria della* " *prattica delle Medaglie, tradotta dal Franceſe da* " *Conſtantino Belli: In Venetia*, 1673, 12mo." " In a letter of Boeclerus, dated the 12th of May 1670, ††, it is ſaid, that " Charles Patin publiſhed the " Letters of Peter Martyr, printed at Amſterdam in " 1670, folio *."] There is an Italian Verſion of his " Hiſtorical Relations with the following title: *Vi-* " *aggi di Carlo Patini: In Venetia*, 1685, 8vo. In " the fourth part of his catalogue of Baron de Kiel- " mans-Egge's Library ‖, is a book entitled, *Nou-* " *velles de Charles Patin au Marquis du Baden-Dourdac,* " *Frederic.* Straſburg, 1673, 8vo. But I know not " what to make of this book †."] I ſhould add, that his Hiſtorical Relations were printed in Holland, anno 1695; and that his Introduction to the knowledge of Medals, was reprinted at Paris the ſame year (83). This book was cenſured by Mr. Sallo the firſt time it was printed (84). The Author anſwered this cenſure, in the following piece, *A Letter from a Friend of Mr. Patin, on the* Journal des Savans, *of the 23d of February* 1665. Mr. Sallo, ſpeaking of this Letter (85), continued to treat Mr. Patin with great contempt. [" The *Journal des Savans* gave " the following judgment of the work in queſtion. " *This is really a very pretty book, though it be ſcarce* " *any thing but a repetition of what we meet with in* " *Savot*; *and as this is the true ſtate of the caſe, it is* " *ſomething ſurprizing that the Author, in his Preface,* " *ſhould ſay that the books which treat of this ſubject,* " *are moſtly Latin, Italian, or Spaniſh, without once* " *naming Savot, who has writ better in French, than* " *any other Author has done in his language* **. *It* " *muſt nevertheleſs be owned, that there are ſome new* " *things in this work*; *but there are very few of theſe*; " *and the other had done better to have ſuppreſſed ſome* " *of them.* So unfavourable a judgment muſt naturally " ſhock a writer's pride. Both father and ſon were " ſtung to the quick; the father's letters are filled " with complaints againſt the Journal, againſt which " he inveighs, as uſual, with the utmoſt vehemence. " As to the ſon, he employed a friend's pen, or ra- " ther he himſelf wrote *the Letter from a friend of* " *Mr. Patin, on the Journal des Savans, of the 23d of* " *Feb.* 1665. He endeavoured to defend himſelf, but " the Journaliſts, ſpeaking of this Letter, attacked " him again, and quite overthrew his defence. Pa- " tin would have replied again, but he was adviſed " to be ſilent, for fear the credit of the Journaliſts " ſhould be of fatal conſequence to him ††."] Guy Patin was highly exaſperated at the treatment his ſon met with from the Author of the *Journal des Savans*, as appears by the following paſſage from his CCCLI. Letter. I ſhall give it a little at length, becauſe it informs us, among other particulars, the reaſon which prevented Charles Patin from continuing his apology. " I do not know whether you have re- " ceived a kind of Gazette or News-paper, called " *Journal of the Learned*, the Author whereof hav- " ing complained of a little article againſt my ſon " Charles, with regard to the Medal which was " ſtruck here laſt year for the Swiſs, he anſwered " him. I have ſent you his anſwer, which is pru- " dent and modeſt. The new Gazetteer in queſtion " has made a reply, which ſhews him to be both ig- " norant and a madman. This would have been " anſwered in the ſtrongeſt, ſharpeſt, and moſt ra- " tional manner, had not my ſon Charles been deſired " to ſuſpend his reply, and threatned with a Letter *de* " *Cachet*. The truth is, Mr. Colbert patronizes the " Authors of this Journal, who are ſaid to be Mr. " Salo, a Counſellor of Parliament, Abbot de " Bourzé, Mr. de Gomberville, Mr. Chapelain, *&c.* " ſo that Charles is deſired to delay his anſwer, and " is even adviſed to this by the firſt Preſident, who " deſired it. (A particular reaſon is given for this, " *viz*, that he has loſt Mr. Colbert's favour, ſince " the proſecution of Mr. Fouquet.) We ſhall ſee " hereafter, whether theſe pretended Cenſors, *ſine* " *ſuffragio Populi & Quiritum*, whether theſe Authors " ſhall have ſo much credit and authority, as to " criticiſe in this manner all, whoſe writings ſhall " not pleaſe them. Are we now in Juvenal's age, " who boldly ſaid,

Dat veniam corvis, vexat cenſura columbas?

" Clip the Dove's wings, and gives the Vulture courſe? DRYDEN.

" One circumſtance however comforts us, which is, " that we are not in the wrong, and that the learned " and judicious are of our opinion; but theſe Au- " thors make an ill uſe of their credit. The literary " world is for us, but Mr. Colbert is againſt us; and " if my ſon offers to defend himſelf, it is ſaid he " will be impriſoned in the Baſtile. A man had " better not write at all (86)."

[*L*] *The*

(84) See *Journal des Savans*, for Feb. 23, 1665. p. m. 150.

(85) In the *Journal des Savans*, March 9, 1665. p. m. 202.

** This Savot's book is entitled, *Diſcours ſur les Medailles antiques.* It was printed at Paris in 1627. Rem. by the Tranſl.]

†† Niceron, *Hommes illuſt.* Tom. 2. p. 217, 218, 219. Addit. by the Tranſl.]

(86) Guy Patin, *Letter* 351, p. 34, 35, of Tom. 3. See alſo p. 33, 34, 62, 64, 73, of the ſame volume.

* Addit. by the Tranſl.

† Addit. by the Tranſl.

(80) See *Acta Eruditor.* 1684. p. 35.

(81) I make uſe of the title he employs in his liſt, tho' the true title is, *Introduction à l'Hiſtoire par la connoiſſance des Medailles.*

(82) At Amſterdam, in 12mo.

** Tom. 10. p. 1252.

†† Inſerted in Struvius's *Acta Literaria*, Faſc. 6. p. 23.

* Niceron, *Hommes illuſt.* Tom. 10. part 2. p. 293, 294. Addit. by the Tranſl.]

‖ No. 4421.

† Niceron, ibid. p. 115, 116. Addit. by the Tranſl.]

(83) See *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans*, for Dec. 1694, p. 174.

upon him [L].

[L] *The diſgrace of his . . . . ſon.*] Charles Patin bewailed it, and affirms that it was entirely owing to calumny; but he draws a vail over the whole. *Cùm ecce ἀτυχία*, ſays he (87), *veriùs διαβολὴ, & calumniam dixero, me præcipitem egit, & κακῶν ἰλιάδα intulit. Timanthum* (88) *imitari liceat, benigne lector, qui cùm mæſtos pinxiſſet adſtantes, & triſtitiæ omnem imaginem conſumſiſſet, ob Iphigeniam ſtantem ad aras perituram, patris vultum velavit quem ſatis mæſtum pingere deſperabat. Velum hic protendamus, ſeu dolore commoti ob fortunas perditas, ſeu charitate ob invidorum nequitiam.* i. e. "When lo! misfortune, or rather calumny and detraction, plunged me into numberleſs evils. Permit me, gentle reader, to imitate Timanthes, who, when he had painted the ſpectators with ſorrowful countenances, and had quite exhauſted his imagination in repreſenting grief, on account of Iphigenia, who was ſtanding at the altar, in order to be ſacrificed; vailed her father's face; he deſpairing ever to give, with his pencil, ſufficient ſtrength to his ſorrow. Give me leave alſo to draw a vail on this occaſion; whether prompted by grief for the loſs of my fortune, or by concern for the wicked treatment of thoſe who envy me." His father was not ſo myſterious on this occaſion, he ſpecifying certain cauſes, or rather pretences of I know not what prohibited books which had been found in his ſon's ſtudy. But we had better hear his own words. *Every body pities him, no one lays any thing to his charge; and, if we except a few raſcally bookſellers, he is univerſally beloved. He nevertheleſs is abſent from me; and we forced him to ſubmit to this, in ſpite of his ſtoical diſpoſition. He had always entertained hopes, that his Majeſty's Juſtice would have been extended to him, but our enemies have been too powerful. However, to allay the ſmart of our wound, it is ſaid,* 1. *That he was proſecuted for not appearing when ſummoned by the Court, as a man who is abſent, and will not make any defence.* 2. *That it was by a particular and ſupreme commiſſion, without allowing of an appeal, which is an unuſual way of proceeding, and ſhews more evidently the deſign his enemies had to ruin him.* 3. *That letters, under the King's ſignet, were directed to moſt of the Judges, and it was recommended to them, that it would be neceſſary to make an example of him. . . . .* 4. *It is ſaid, that a very powerful man, behind the curtain, carried on the cauſe againſt us; promoted, and ſet every engine at work againſt us; becauſe there were found among thoſe books, ſome volumes of Mr. Fouquet's caſe, and the Hiſtory of Gigeri's attempt. . . . . Three books have been ſpecified; one filled with impiety,* viz. *a Huguenot book, entitled, the* Anatomy of the Maſs, *by Peter de Moulin, a Proteſtant Miniſter of Charenton; as though the inquiſition was eſtabliſhed in France. This is a little ſixpeny piece. Paris is over-run with ſuch books; and ſome are found in moſt libraries, and even the Friars have them. The ſecond was a book, (as they ſay) againſt his Majeſty's ſervice: it is entitled, the* Shield of State, *which was ſold publickly in the Courts of Juſtice, and to which two anſwers are printing here. The third is,* The Hiſtory of the Amours of the Court, *which are certain ſmall libels that deſerve our contempt more than our anger. I am of opinion that theſe three books are only an handful; and that ſome perſon acts ſecretly againſt my ſon, and cauſes our misfortune* (89). All this is nothing to the purpoſe, I mean, with regard to the cauſe which was given out in Paris, to have occaſioned his diſgrace. It was ſaid, 1. That Charles Patin was ſent to Holland, with orders to buy up all the copies of the *Amours du Palais Royal*, and to burn them immediately, without ſparing ſo much as one. 2. That a great Monarch gave him that commiſſion, and promiſed him a reward. 3. That this perſon commiſſioned, having bought up all the copies, did not burn them, but ſent a conſiderable number of them into the Kingdom. This is the common report, but whether well or ill grounded I cannot ſay.

(87) *Carolus Patinus*, in *Lyceo Patavino*, p. 91.

(88) It ſhould be *Timanthem.*

(89) Guy Patin, *Letter* 468. p. 370. Tom. 3.

PATRICIUS * (AUGUSTIN), in Latin *Patricius* (*a*), Canon of Sienna, afterwards Maſter of the Ceremonies of the Pope's Chapel, and at laſt Biſhop of Pienza in Tuſcany, flouriſhed about the cloſe of the 15th Century. Cardinal Francis Piccolomini, Archbiſhop of Sienna, who was afterwards Pope by the name of Pius III. †, ordered him to write an Abridgment of the Acts of the Council of Baſil. The reader will ſee hereunder, in what manner this was executed [*A*]. This is not the only work which Auguſtin Patrizi wrote, he compoſing another concerning the Ceremonies of the Pope's Chapels (*b*) [*B*]. He was Secretary to this Cardinal Francis Piccolomini, when he went Legate to Germany, under the Pontificate of Paul II. (*c*). I ſhall examine whether Father Mabillon ſhould have ſaid, that there was an Auguſtin Patrizi different from this [*C*]. It

* In Italian *Patrizi*. See the additions to this article. Rem. by the Tranſl.

(*a*) This muſt alſo be underſtood of the Patrizi of the two following articles.

† This is an error of Bayle, or of the Printer, it ſhould be Pius II. Rem. by the Tranſl.

(*b*) See the rem. [*D*] of the art. GRASSIS (Paris de).

(*c*) Extracted from Spondanus, ad ann. 1431. num. 9. p. m. 805.

[*A*] *The Reader will ſee, hereunder, in what manner this was executed.*] Auguſtin Patrizi made uſe, among other books, of two large volumes, a copy of which Cardinal de St. Mark lent him. He affirms that he ſaw them at Baſil, where they were kept with prodigious care, as thoſe of the Sybils were antiently preſerved; and that theſe two volumes were writ by John of Segovia, a Spaniard, called the Cardinal of St. Calixtus by the Council of Baſil, a man who perſiſted obſtinately in the ſchiſm till his death. He adds, that he made uſe of a hiſtory which Dominick, Cardinal of Ferma, had drawn up of the firſt part of this Council. This Cardinal had a ſeat in that Aſſembly, till the rupture broke out between Eugenius IV. and them. I muſt obſerve, that Auguſtin Patrizi's work is not printed *. Mr. Rigault lent it in manuſcript (1) to Spondanus (2). ["There is the "following piece of our Patrizi, *Summa Conciliorum "Baſileenſis, Florentini, Lanſanenſis & Piſani.* Father "Labbe inſerted it in the thirteenth Tome of his "Councils, col. 1448." †]

[*B*] *He compoſed another* treatiſe, *concerning the ceremonies of the Pope's chapel.*] The Latin expreſſions of Spondanus, whom I have followed, are theſe; *Librum de* Ritibus Sacelli Pontificii *conſcripſit* (3). This doubtleſs is the ſame work I ſpoke of elſewhere (4), where I related a paſſage of Mr. Couſin, where we ſee, by whom, and in what manner, Auguſtin Patrizi's book on *the rites* of the Church of Rome ** was publiſhed, and the conſequences of that publication. We there find alſo, that Auguſtin Patrizi was nephew of Pope Pius II. *who had given him the ſirname of Piccolomini*, and that he began to be maſter of the ceremonies under that Pontif. It is certain, that in the dedication of his book *Sacrarum Ceremoniarum*, inſerted by Father Mabillon, in the 2d Tome of the *Muſeum Italicum* (5), and dated from Rome, the 1ſt of March 1488, he ſtiles himſelf *Auguſtinus Patricius Piccolomineus*; but I dare not aſſert, either that this Pope Pius II. gave him that ſirname, or that this Pope was his uncle ††. It appears more probable to me, that it was given him by Cardinal Francis Piccolomini his maſter. However, I wont affirm any thing. I know that Pope Pius II. gave the name of Piccolomini to a perſon of abilities, who had been his Secretary (6), and whom he raiſed to the Purple.

[*C*] *I ſhall examine whether Father Mabillon ſhould have ſaid, that there was an Auguſtin Patrizi different from this.*] He has inſerted, in Tome 1. of the *Muſeum Italicum* (7), the life of Fabian Bencius, written by Auguſtin Patrizi, Biſhop of Pienza, and ſays (8), that this Biſhop, who had been Maſter of the Ceremonies, in the Pontificate of Innocent VIII. differs from Auguſtin Patrizi, who was Secretary to Cardinal Francis Piccolomini; and who wrote an account of the tranſactions of the Diet of Ratiſbon, at the time that this Cardinal was ſent thither. Here then, according to him, are two Authors, named Auguſtin Patrizi;

* [This is an error of Bayle, that work being printed in Tom. 13, of Father Labbe's Councils. Rem. by the Tranſl.]

(1) He had taken it from the King's Library.

(2) Extracted from Spondanus, ad ann. 1431. num. 9. p. m. 805.

† Addit. by the Tranſl.

(3) Spondanus, *ubi ſupra.*

(4) Remark [*D*] of the article GRASSIS (Paris de).

** See the rem. [*A*] of the additions to this article.

(5) p. 524 & *ſeq.*

†† See the text of the addition to this article.

(6) James Amanatus, generally known by the name of the *Cardinal of Pavia.* See the *Nomenclator Cardinalium*, p. m. 96.

(7) p. 251 & *ſeq.*

(8) Mabill. *Muſ. Ital.* Tom. 1. p. 255.

It may be very proper to add a Supplement, there being ſome errors in the foregoing Article.

☞ PATRICIUS (AUGUSTIN), was native of Sienna, and deſcended from an illuſtrious family, but the year of his birth is not known. He went through his ſtudies in his own country. In 1460 he was appointed Secretary to Pope Pius II. who took an affection for him, and made him aſſume the ſirname of Piccolomini, (the name of his family) as was his cuſtom to do with regard to thoſe who, being devoted to his ſervice, diſcovered ſuperior abilities and prudence (*a*). This Pope dying in 1464, Patrizi entered into the ſervice of Cardical Piccolomini. Patrizi was Maſter of the Ceremonies in 1468, when the Emperor Frederick III. went to Rome a ſecond time. Thomas di Teſta, ſirnamed Piccolomini, for the ſame reaſon as Patrizi, Biſhop of Pienza, and of Montalcino, the Churches of which were then united, dying in 1482, Sixtus IV. appointed Auguſtin Patrizi to be his ſucceſſor. The latter preſided over this See till his death, which happened at Rome in 1496, under the Pontificate of Alexander VI. Several Authors have miſtook, by dividing the perſon whoſe article we are now writing into two ; and by making two Auguſtin Patrizis, both natives of Sienna, contemporaries [*A*]: whilſt others have committed an error of another kind [*B*]. Hereunder is a complete catalogue of his works [*C*].

(*a*) Elogium of Auguſtin Patrizi, in the Journal of Venice, Tom. 18.

Patrizi ; one of them was Maſter of the Ceremonies ; and afterwards, in 1483, Biſhop of Pienza : the other was Secretary of Francis Piccolomini. The former wrote the Life of Fabian Bencius ; and an account of the entry of the Emperor Frederic III. into Rome (9) : the latter drew up the acts of a Diet of Ratiſbon. It is of the latter, continues Father Mabillon, and not of the former, that Voſſius ſpeaks in his work on the Latin Hiſtorians. We, indeed, obſerve, that Voſſius does not indeed give any other title to his Auguſtin Patrizi, but that of Secretary to Francis Piccolomini, Cardinal of Sienna ; and makes him Author of no other work, but the Relation of the Tranſactions of the Diet at Ratiſbon. He obſerves that the Author dedicated it, in 1471, to James Piccolomini, Cardinal of Pavia (10) ; and adds, that Campanus called this Patrizi, Cicero's ape. *Auguſtinum hunc ſimiam Ciceronis ob ſtudium ornandæ dictionis appellat Campanus Epiſtolâ quadam inter eas Piccolominæi, quas diximus* (11). I will venture to affirm, that Father Mabillon is miſtaken. It does not appear to me, in any manner, neceſſary to ſuppoſe, on this occaſion, two Authors of the ſame name ; and I declare for Spondanus, who is of opinion, that the ſame Auguſtin Patrizi, Secretary to Francis Piccolomini, was Maſter of the Ceremonies, and Biſhop of Pienza. [See all this explained in the Text and Notes of this article *].

(9) It is in the *Muſæum Italicum*, ibid. p. 256 & *ſeq.*

(10) Voſſius *de Hiſt. Latin.* p. 604.

(11) Idem, ibid.

* Rem. by the Tranſl.

[*A*] *Several Authors have miſtook . . . by making two Auguſtin Patrizis.*] As Father Labbe, in his *Bibliotheque of Manuſcripts* ; Father Mabillon, in his *Muſæum Italicum* ; Wharton, in his addition to Cave's *Hiſtoria Litteraria* ; John Godfrey Olearius, in his *Bibliotheque of Eccleſiaſtical Writers* ; and du Pin's *Bibliotheque of Eccleſiaſtical Authors*. One eaſily ſees that theſe Authors copy one another. But all the Writers of Sienna ſpeak but of one Auguſtin Patrizi, to whom only the titles and works, which foreigners aſcribe to two perſons, belong (1).

(1) Niceron's *Hommes illuſt.* Tom. 7. p. 394.

[*B*] *Others have committed an error of another kind.*] Wharton, and after him Olearius, in ſtiling him *Epiſcopus Pojentinus* (2) ; Placcius (3), by ſtiling him *Epiſcopus Picentinus*.

(2) Ibid. p. 395.

(3) *Theatruum anonymorum.*

[*C*] *Hereunder is a complete catalogue of his works.*] 1. *Commentarius de Comitiis Imperii Ratiſbonæ celebratis.* This work is inſerted in all the editions of the letters of Cardinal Piccolomini, otherwiſe called the Cardinal of Pavia ; and in the ſecond Tome of the Writers of the Hiſtory of Germany, by Marquard Frequerus. This is only the beginning of what Patrizi had wrote on this ſubject, ſince we therein find nothing but the reaſons why the Cardinal of Sienna was ſent on this Legation ; his ſetting out for Germany, and his arrival in the territory of Verona. The remainder is in manuſcript in the Library of the Vatican. 2. *Deſcriptio adventus Frederici* III. *Imperatoris ad Paulum Papam* II. Father Mabillon has inſerted this deſcription in his *Muſæum Italicum* (4). 3. *Summa Conciliorum Baſileenſis, Florentini, Lauſanenſis & Piſani.* Father Labbe has inſerted this work in the thirteenth Tome of his Councils, col. 1488. 4. *Vita optimi ac integerrimi viri Fabiani Bencii Politianenſis, Sacrorum Canorum Profeſſoris.* Patrizi wrote this Life after Benci's deceaſe, which happened at Rome the 30th of November, 1481. It was firſt publiſhed by Father Mabillon, in his *Muſæum Italicum*. 5. *De Senæ urbis antiquitate.* This piece, which is merely a collection of fictions, was never printed. 6. *Hiſtoriarum Sinenſium libri.* This hiſtory likewiſe was never put to the preſs. It begins with the year 1186, and ends with 1338. Cardinal Piccolomini had ſome ſhare in writing this piece ; but he no doubt was not ſatisfied with it, ſince he himſelf drew up another, which however was never printed. 7. *De Annatis.* This work, as well as thoſe above, is alſo in manuſcript in the Vatican Library, and was never publiſhed. 8. *Pontificalis liber magna diligentia Reverendi in Chriſto patris, viri D. Johannis Burckardi Præpoſiti & Canonici Eccleſiæ S. Florentii Haſelacenſis, Argentinenſis Diverceſis, correctus & emendatus. Romæ* 1485. *folio.* This is the firſt edition of this work, in which Patrizi had no greater ſhare than Burckard, and Janus Lucio Biſhop of Cajazzo, who aſſiſted in the compoſition of it with him. The ſecond was publiſhed at Rome in 1486, and Lucio and Burckard are named as the chief Authors. The third was printed at Lions in 1511, folio. In theſe three editions, is a dedication of Patrizi to Pope Innocent VII. Father Albert Caſtellano, a Dominican of Venice, afterwards wrote additions to this Pontifical, which was firſt printed, with his additions and corrections, at Venice in 1520, and afterwards at Lyons in 1542. Patrizi is alſo mentioned in theſe, but his name is not printed in the modern editions. 9. *Rituum Eccleſiaſticorum, ſive Sacrorum Ceremoniarum Romanæ Eccleſiæ libri tres.* It was by order of Pope Innocent VIII. that Patrizi undertook to collect and correct the Ceremonial, as he had done with regard to the Pontifical ; and for this reaſon he inſcribed it to him in a dedication dated the 1ſt of March, 1488. He owns his having been greatly aſſiſted in this work by John Burckard, then Maſter of the Ceremonies. However, this Ceremonial was not printed till a long time after Patrizi's death, ſince the firſt edition was printed at Venice in 1516, folio. It has born ſeveral impreſſions ſince, but Patrizi's name was not mentioned, whence Marcellus, who publiſhed it, was looked upon as a Plagiary. The firſt edition of it is extremely ſcarce, becauſe Graſſi, who did all that lay in his power, but without ſucceſs, to ſuppreſs this work, deſtroyed all ſuch copies of it as fell into his hands (5).

(4) Tom. 1. part 2. p. 256.

(5) *Journal of Venice*, Tom. 18.

I.

PATRICIUS (FRANCIS) Biſhop of Caieta, a native of Sienna, ſhewed a great deal of reading in his books *De Regno & Regis Inſtitutione*, and in thoſe *De Reipublicæ Inſtitutione*. He flouriſhed in the 15th Century. He is ſometimes miſtaken for another FRANCIS PATRICI (*a*), a great Philoſophor, an Anti-peripatetic, who was born (*b*) in the

(*a*) See the rem. [*A*].

(*b*) At Cliſſa in Iſtria, according to Thuanus, lib. 119. p. 817.

the territories of the Venetians, anno 1592, or 1503 (*c*), and who died in Rome the 6th of February 1597 (*d*). Conſult Moreri, and ſtill more Teiſſier (*e*). They have anticipated me in moſt of the particulars which I could have related; and for this reaſon I ſhall content myſelf with pointing out certain errors, and make ſome obſervations with regard to the editions [*A*]. I will only add, that Francis Patrizi the Philoſopher complains

(*c*) His effigies prefixed to his *Peripatetic Enquiries* informs us, that he was in his 51ſt year in 1580; and he ſays, in the begining of his *Nova Philoſophia de Univerſis*, that he was writing it in 1588, being the 58th year of his age.

(*d*) Thuan. lib. 119. p. 817.

(*e*) Additions to *Elogiums*, extracted from Thuanus.

[*A*] *I will content myſelf with pointing out certain errors, and make ſome obſervations with regard to the editions.*] Gesner (1) had no reaſon to believe, that Francis Patrizi of Sienna was perhaps a different perſon from *Franciſcus Lucius Durantinus*, Author of a book *de optima republicæ Gubernatione*, printed at Venice in 1522. He ought to have ſaid that they are two Writers; for this Lucius's work is divided into three books only, the laſt whereof is partly calculated to celebrate the Republic of Venice; but Patrizi's work is divided into nine books, and has nothing in particular relating to the Venetians. In Geſner's epitome (2), Francis Patrizi, the Anti-Peripatetic, is miſtaken for the Biſhop of Caieta. The ſame error is made in the catalogue of the Bodleian Library; for therein is aſcribed, to one and the ſame Author, the Peripatetic enquiries or diſcuſſions, &c. and the books *de regno & de reipublicæ Inſtitutione*. In Geſner's epitome, mention is made of two other Patrizis, who are merely ideal perſons; for the pretended *Fredericus Patricius Venetus* is not a different perſon from him who attacked Ariſtotle. This appears evidently from hence, that the ſame books are aſcribed to him (3), which had juſt before been aſcrib'd to *Franciſcus Patricius Senenſis*. We can ſcarce conceive that there are compilers ſo inattentive and heedleſs. They tell us, in the ſame column of one page, that *Franciſcus Patricius Senenſis*, wrote peripatetic diſcuſſions or enquiries, and ten dialogues in Italian, *de legendæ ſcribendæque Hiſtoriæ ratione*, and that *Fridericus Patricius Venetus*, wrote the ſame dialogues in Italian, and the Peripatetic enquiries. They ſpeak of one *Franciſcus Patricius*, whoſe Commentaries were epitomized and printed at Paris. It is the ſame Author they had juſt before given an article of; it is, I ſay, *Franciſcus Patricius Senenſis*. Konig merits ſome cenſure, he not knowing Patrizi of Sienna, and applying to the other Patrizi a paſſage of Barthius, which cannot ſuit with him. Take particular notice that, according to him (4), the Patrizi he mentions died at Rome, in 1597, and he deſcribes him with ſuch characteriſticks that no one can take him for any other but the Anti-Peripatetic. It is therefore abſurd to aſſert that, according to Barthius, he was beheaded. This will eaſily be diſcovered, if we do but juſt caſt our eye on the following words of Barthius (5): *Sed quid coarcevemus plures? cum hanc rationem* æra pulſandi (6), *neque aliam potuiſſe inducere videam qui horum clangorum meminerunt, è quibus Pindarum & Steſichorum cum aliis jam olim produxit, & inde Juvenalem enarravit Franciſcus Patritius lib. 2. de Regno & Inſt. Regia, vir omnino meliore fato dignus, quam qui in patria ſua ſecuri capite truncatus fuerit, anno* 1447, *aut paucis ante, ſcribente Raphaele Volaterrano lib. 21. Comm. Urbanor*, i. e. "To what "purpoſe ſhould I collect more? ſince this method "of *ſtriking kettles*, and no other could induce thoſe "who call to mind ſuch noiſes or ſounds, among "whom Pindar and Steſichorus, &c. in antient times, "and afterwards Juvenal, are related by Francis Patrizi, in book 2. *de Regno & Inſt. Regia*, a perſon "highly deſerving a better fate, than to loſe his "head in his native country, in, or a little before, "the year 1447, as we are told by R. Volaterranus, "book 21. of his *Commentariorum Urbanorum*." Can one apply to a man who died in 1597 (7), a paſſage where mention is made of a man who was beheaded in 1447, or a little before? I am of opinion that Barthius did not commit a chronological error in this place, ſince, although Volaterranus does not ſpecify the year in which this Patrizi was put to death, he yet intimates ſufficiently that it was about that time. Having mentioned Gregory of Tiferno and Anthony Panormita, he adds, *Joannes Auriſpa Secretarius Apoſtolicus ſub Eugenio inter eruditos non admodum ignobilis ea tempeſtate. Patricii quoque Senenſis, qui in factione civitatis ſecuri percuſſus fuit, magnopere commendatur oratio ſimul & eruditio. Petrus Candidus Nicolai* V. *Magiſter Brevium fuit* (8), i. e. "John "Auriſpa, the Apoſtolical Secretary, under the Pon"tificate of Eugenius, was conſidered as a learned "man at that time. The eloquence and erudition "of Patrizi at Sienna, who loſt his head in a ſedi"tion of the city, are likewiſe highly applauded. "Peter Candidus was maſter of the Briefs under "Pope Nicholas V." This ſeems to intimate that a Patrici is ſpoken of, who flouriſhed under Eugenius IV. and was not living under Pope Nicholas V. I own that this is not a convincing proof; but however, if Barthius has not hit upon the true year, he is excuſable, and we ought ſooner to pardon him this error than that he has committed, where he ſuppoſes that an author was beheaded in 1447, is the ſame Francis Patrizi of Vienna, who wrote the books *De Regno & Inſt. Regia*. The latter lived under Sixtus IV. (9), to whom he dedicated his Treatiſe *De Republica, & Reipublicæ Inſtitutione*. It is to be obſerved that Volaterranus, in book 4. (10) of his work, ſays that the Patrizi, whom the people of Sienna beheaded, was put to death, during the war in which they were engaged with Pacininus, who poſſeſſed himſelf of one of their cities, whence they drove him, by the aid of Pope Calixtus. Now this Pope was not elected till 1455. Moreri did wrong in not ſaying, that Patrizi of Sienna was Biſhop of Caieta. He ſuppoſes him to be Biſhop of *Carriati* in *Calabria*; and he probably was led into an error by a typographical error, which he was not aware of in Aubertus Miræus. He had read, in this Author, *Franciſcus Patritius, Senenſis. præſul Caretanus* (11), i. e. "Francis Patrizi of Sienna, Biſhop of Carriati:" and not perceiving that it ought to be read *Caietanus*, he fixed the Biſhoprick at Cariati in Calabria. It is on the authority of the ſame writer that he has placed this prelate in the beginning of the 16th Century, which he would not have done, had he known that Francis Patrizi, appointed Biſhop of Caieta by Paul II. (12), died in 1494. Had Moreri, who refers us to Ughelli (13), conſulted him, he would have found this. What he ſays, after Miræus, with regard to the editions of the works of his pretended *Biſhop of Carriati*, requires a ſmall Supplement. The Latin edition of the 9. books *De Regno*, and of the 9. books *De Republica*, printed at Paris in 1519, is illuſtrated with notes by John Savigni, *Cum Joannis Savigneii Scholiis . . . . cum ejuſdem Annotationibus* (14). The *Scholia* or ſhort expoſitions relate to the book *De Regno*, and the notes to the books *De Republica*. One Nicodon of Saint Maixent publiſhed the books of the Republick at Paris, in 1580, in 16°. and added to them the arguments of the chapters, and the citations of Authors (15). John le Blond, Lord of Branville, drew up extracts of all theſe works of Patrici, and publiſhed them in French at Paris in 1550, as we are informed by du Verdier (16). Joli (17) obſerves, that this John le Blond tranſlated into French an *Extract or Collection of the firſt Maxims from* Eraſmus's *book* De Inſtitutione Principis Chriſtiani, and that this extract was printed at Paris in 1546, with Francis Patrici's Epitome of the Commonwealth. He alſo obſerves, that this extract was drawn up by *Giles d'Aurigni, called le Pamphile, an Advocate of Parliament:* and that it was printed at Paris, anno 1543, with an Epitome of Francis Patrizi's Commonwealth. We find in du Verdier's Bibliotheque (18), that *John du Ferey, Knight of Dur Eſcu, Counſellor of his Majeſty's Privy Council, tranſlated from the Latin, the firſt books of the writings of Francis Patrizi oof Sienna, Biſhop of Caieta, treating of the Reign or Government of one perſon, called Monarchy, and of the inſtitution of a good King*, Paris, 1577, 8vo. This is a French tranſlation of the 9. books of the Commonwealth, printed at Paris in 1610, 8vo. This tranſlation was by the Sieur de la Mouchettiere. I cannot ſay whether the notes added to the end of every chapter are by the tranſlator, or only a verſion of John Savigni's notes. Who would ſuppoſe, when he is told of ſo many editions,

(1) Geſnerus, *in Biblioth.* folio, 250 and 253 *verſo*.

(2) p. 242.

(3) In Geſner's *Epitome*.

(4) Konig. *Bibliotb.* p. 612.

(5) Barthius, in lib. 2. (and not as Konig ſays) *Thebaidos Statii*, p. 437.

(6) He ſpeaks there of the kettles which uſed to be ſounded when the moon was eclipſed.

(7) In the *Jugemens des Savans ſur les Poetes*, num. 1062, it is ſaid that Francis Patrizi (the Philoſopher who oppoſed Ariſtotle) was beheaded at Rome in 1597.

(8) *Volaterran. Commentar. Urbanor.* lib. 21. p. m. 773.

(9) Who was made Pope in 1471.

(10) p. m. 158.

(11) *Miræus de Scriptor. Sæculi* 16. p. 22.

(12) The 23d of March, 1460. *Ughelli ubi infra.*

(13) *Ughelli, Italia Sacra*, Tom. 1. p. 588.

(14) *Epitome Bibliotb. Geſneri.*

(15) Ibid.

(16) *Biblioth. Franc.* p. 406.

(17) Joly, *Codicille Gbretien*, in the preface, p. 35. edit. of 1666.

(18) p. 689, 690.

plains grievouſly of his fate [*B*].

He diſguiſed himſelf, under the name of Francis Mutus (*f*), in the title page of *Diſceptationes contra Theodori Angelutii calumnias.* This Angelutius, a famous Phyſician, had

(*f*) Naudæus, *de Fato & vitæ termino*, p. m. 27.

that this work in queſtion is an admirable one? And yet it has been treated with contempt by good judges. *Eorum fermè tempore* (19) *Franciſcus Patricius Senenſis Farraginem quandam exemplorum ſub Reipublicæ titulo, puerorum credo uſui ac chriarum in ſcholis compoſitioni, evulgavit: tantum diſſimilis alteri Franciſco Patricio Romano* (20), *qui non nihil pariter de hac re inter opuſcula juvenilia protulit, quantum noctua Aquilæ, aut anſer diſpar eſt olori* (21), i. e. "Much about the ſame "time, Francis Patrizi of Sienna publiſhed a "rhapſody of examples, entitled, the Republic, de"ſigned, as I ſuppoſe, for children, and for rhetori"cal exerciſes in ſchools. All this is as unlike to the "other Francis Patrizi, a native of Rome, who like"wiſe publiſhed ſomething upon this ſubject among "his juvenile performances, as an owl is unlike an "eagle, or a gooſe is unlike a ſwan."

(19) *i. e.* at the time that a book of Robortel was publiſhed, and Jerom Vida's treatiſe *de Republica.* Naudæus is miſtaken: for Patrizi's book was dedicated to Pope Sixtus IV. Robortel and Vida were ſtill alive after the middle of the 16th century.

(20) Naudæus is miſtaken, this Patrizi was not born in Rome, but in the Venetian territories.

(21) Naudæus *Bibliograph. Polit.* p. m. 21.

The reader will find in the treatiſe on the Origin of printing at Paris, that the edition which John Savigni cauſed to be printed, did not pleaſe him, though very good types were uſed on that occaſion. It was full of faults, which vexed him the more, becauſe he had taken great pains *in correcting the errors of the manuſcript:* this edition being made *from a manuſcript which John Provoſt, a Counſellor of Parliament, had brought from Italy* (22). Whence it may be inferred that this Paris edition is the firſt.

(22) Chevillier, *Origine de l'Impr. de Paris*, p. 187.

[*B*] *Francis Patrizi the Philoſopher complains grievouſly of his fate.*] He regrets the ſeven years he had ſpent in the iſland of Cyprus, far removed from his ſtudies, and employed in affairs, the whole benefit of which was reaped by others. Being grown weary of a buſineſs from which he himſelf reaped ſo little advantage, he devoted himſelf to the ſervice of Philip Mocenigo, Archbiſhop of that iſland; and after having lived ſome time with him, he followed him to Venice, and afterwards to Padua (23). Returning with great ſatisfaction to his ſtudies, he began to write the life of Ariſtotle, but his unhappy fate drew him from that delightful employment, and carried him to Spain; he, who, from nine years of age, had ſcarce done any thing but ramble about from place to place by ſea and land. *Ecce me fati quædam vis, quæ me novem annorum puerum, ad hanc uſque ætatem, peregrinationibus continuis terraque marique exercuerat, in Hiſpanias abripuit* (24). He returned to Venice ſix months after, and finiſhed the life of Ariſtotle. This work contained alſo a judgment on the writings of this Philoſopher; it is, in a word, the firſt volume of his Peripatetic Diſcuſſions (25). Theſe particulars we are told in the dedication to this volume. The dedication to the ſecond volume informs us, that the Author found an aſylum at the Duke of Ferrara's Court, and employment to his mind, ſince he was permitted to teach the Philoſophy of Plato in the Univerſity of Ferrara. *Cui melius labores meos dicarem*, in this manner he addreſſes himſelf to Anthony Montecatino, Chief Secretary to Alphonſo d'Eſte, the ſecond of that name; .... *quam ei viro qui me peſſum Cyprico bello datum, peſſimorumque hominum ingratitudine, fraudibus, inſidiiſque agitatum, perque multos annos fortunæ adverſiſſimæ fluctibus actum, in portum recepit, in Sereniſſi. Principis hujus familiam interpoſuit. Platonicam philoſophiam, in ſingulare hujuſce Academiæ ornamentum, publice profiteri dedit* (26)? i. e. "To whom could my labours be more juſtly dedi"cated, than to him, who when I had been greatly "oppreſſed in the Cyprian war, injured by the in"gratitude, fraud, and wily deceits of wicked "wretches; toſſed up and down, during a long "courſe of years, by the waves of ill fortune, re"ceived me into Port, and fixed me in this moſt "Serene Prince's Family. He gave me leave to read "Lectures on and teach the Platonic Philoſophy, "whence great honour redounded to this Univer"ſity." Thus he ſtrongly complains, in a few words, againſt the malice of thoſe who envied him, and his hard fate. He repeats the ſame thing in the dedication to the 4th Tome; for, in addreſſing a Biſhop who had formerly been his fellow-ſtudent in Padua, he informs him of the retreat he had found after a great number of misfortunes, in the city of Modena, and how Ferrara ſerved him at laſt for a harbour. *Neque enim locorum diſtantia, qua tu quidem per Italiam pene que Galliam, ego verò per Dalmatiam, per Græciam, per Aſiam, ad demum per Hiſpaniam atque Galliam disjuncti poſtea ſemper fuimus, potuit eam oblivioni tradere; neque ex animis noſtris eradere fortuna diſpar, quæ te in arduis ſemper negotiis ac magnis, magnorum principum habuit, donec ad eam dignitatem, qua nunc frueris, longè meritò es evectus. Ego verò pauperie preſſus, dum aliena commoda curo, mea non curo, continuis itineribus terraque marique exercitus, Cyprica claude oppreſſus, atque ingratiſſimorum peſſimorumque hominum fraudibus inſidiiſque circumventus, Mutinæ in patria tua te abſente, apud veteres amicos, apudque Alexandrum Baranzonum equitem, ac Tarquiniam Molziam ſingularem totius jeculi fœminam, primum reſedi; poſtea è marinis, fortunæque fluctibus in hunc portum jam devectus* (27), i. e. "Nor would the diſtance of countries, by "which we have been ever ſince divided, you by "Italy and France, and I by Dalmatia, Greece, "Aſia, and laſtly by Spain and France, eraſe it "from our memories; nor that diſparity of fortune, "which kept you for ever employed in the weighty "and arduous affairs of mighty Princes, till ſuch "time as you was raiſed to the dignity which you "now ſo deſervedly enjoy, could obliterate it from "our minds. But alas! unhappy I, after being borne "down by poverty, whilſt I took care of other peo"ple's buſineſs and was negligent of my own, ha"raſſed with perpetual journies and voyages, oppreſ"ſed with the Cyprian overthrow, and over-reached "by the deceit and ſnares of moſt wicked and un"grateful men, firſt fixed my abode in Modena, "your native country, during your abſence, with my "old friends, and with Cavalier Alexander Baran"zoni, and Tarquinia Molzia, a Lady not to be pa"rallel'd in this age; and was afterwards waſted, "by the waves of the ocean and of fortune, into "this port." I do not find that he was Profeſſor in Padua, as Lorenzo Craſſo (28), and after him Moreri declared. It had been better to have followed Thuanus (29), who relates that Patrizi, after having been a Profeſſor ſeventeen years in Ferrara, went to Rome (30), upon the invitation of Pope Clement VIII.

(23) See the dedication of Tom. 1. of the *Diſcuſſions Peripatetiques.*

(24) Ibid.

(25) It was printed at Venice in 1571, 4to.

(26) Patricius, *Epiſt. Dedicat.* Tom. 2. *Diſcuſſ. Peripat.* p. 177. edit. Baſil. 1581. folio.

(27) Patricius, *in Epiſt. Dedicatoria*, Tom. 4. *Diſcuſſ. Peripat. ad Benedictum Manzolium Epiſcopum Regienſem*, p. 363.

(28) Lor. Craſſo, *Elogii d'Huom. Letter.* Tom. 1. p. 62.

(29) Thuan. lib. 119. p. 817.

(30) Lor. Craſſo, *Elogii*, Tom. 1. p. 62. and Moreri, fix his Profeſſorſhip in Rome, before that which it is pretended he had in Padua.

A certain perſon ſpoke as follows to me the other day. Patrizi was born at Cliſſa in Iſtria, as Thuanus affirms, and there is a fortreſs called Cliſſa in Dalmatia. Perhaps therefore *Franciſcus Patricius Dalmata* may not differ from this Patrizi; though Teiſſier (31) adviſes us *not to confound* FRANCIS PATRIZI, *of whom we now ſpeak, with* .... FRANCIS PATRIZI, *born in Sclavonia, Author of a book, entitled,* Eſpoſitione delli Oracoli di Leone Imperatore (32). I anſwered peremptorily, that no diſtinction ought to be made between them. Thuanus, in the firſt book *De Vita ſua*, gives the epithet Dalmatia to Franciſcus Patricius, Author of the Peripatetic Diſcuſſions. I was not ſo poſitive with regard to the following words of Teſſier's book, *his new Philoſophy concerning the Predicables* (33). He has ill tranſlated, ſaid the perſon to me, the *Nova de Univerſis Philoſophia*, of Thuanus. The above tranſlation means, that this Philoſopher propoſed ſome new doctrines in the five methods of Porphyry, the *genus, ſpecies, differentia, propriam & accidens*; and it is not probable that he took the pains to refute the ſchoolmen, about ſuch particulars, in all that work. I did not dare to be poſitive.

(31) Teiſſier, *Eloges*, Tom. 2. p. 279. edit. of 1690.

(32) See Hankius, *de Scriptor. Byzantinis*, part 1. p. 417.

(33) Teiſſier, *Eloges*, Tom. 2. p. 277.

Now I know what this book, is which Teiſſier calls *the new Philoſophy concerning the Predicables.* The Latin title of this work ſhould not have been tranſlated in this manner, it not treating in any manner of the Predicables. It is a folio, the Venetian edition of which, printed anno 1593, *apud Robertum Meiettum*, is thus entitled: *Nova de Univerſis Philoſophia libris quinquaginta comprehenſa. In qua Ariſtotelica methodo non per motum, ſed per lucem & lumina ad primam cauſam aſcenditur. Deinde nova quadam ac peculiari methodo tota in contemplationem venit divinitas. Poſtremo methodo*

had undertaken, in oppoſition to him, the defence of Ariſtotle. There is, in the laſt edition of Moreri's Dictionary, a new article [*C*], on which I muſt make a remark.

methodo Platonica rerum univerſitas à conditore Deo deducitur. Auctore Franciſco Patricio Philoſopho eminentiſſimo, & in celeberrimo Romano Gymnaſio ſumma cum laude eandem philoſophiam publice interpretante, quibus poſtremo ſunt adjecta Zoroaſtris oracula CCCXX. *ex Platonicis collecta. Hermetis Triſmegiſti libelli & fragmenta quotcunque reperiuntur ordine ſcientifico diſpoſita. Aſclepii diſcipuli tres libelli. Myſtica Ægyptiorum à Platone dictata, ab Ariſtotele excepta, & perſcripta philoſophia. Platonicorum dialogorum novus penitus à Franciſco Patricio inventus ordo ſcientificus. Capita demum multa in quibus Plato concors, Ariſtoteles vero Catholicæ fidei adverſarius oſtenditur.* The reader may have obſerved, that the title promiſes but fifty books; and nevertheleſs we find the work divided into four parts; the firſt whereof contains ten books, the ſecond twenty two, the third five, and the fourth twenty two, which makes in all ſixty nine books. The Author entitles the firſt book *Panaugia*, the ſecond *Panarchia*, the third *Pampſychia*, and the fourth *Pancoſmia*. He treats on the moſt ſublime queſtions of Phyſicks and Metaphyſicks, and this he does on extraordinary hypotheſes. He ſtarts many paradoxes, and at the ſame time ſhews a wonderful depth of genius. He dedicated this work in queſtion to Pope Gregory XIV. and the dedication is dated from Ferrara the 5th of Auguſt, 1591. This book was cenſured, and the Author was obliged to make a recantation (34), which was a little before he died (35).

(34) Thuan. lib. 119. p. 817.

(35) Idem, ibid.

[*C*] *Moreri . . . has . . . a new article, on which I muſt make a remark.*] This new article is that of PATRIZI (FRANCIS), and is in page 133, Paris edition of 1699. It relates as follows; that this Francis Patricius *(Patrizi) lived in the 17th Century: that he wrote, in Italian, a hiſtory of Poetry, divided into ten books; that he contented himſelf with writing as an hiſtorian on this, he not expatiating very much on the rules of the art; and that he loſt his head at Rome in* 1597. Janus Nicius Erythreus, *in Pinotheca* I. p. 204, 205. is cited. My firſt obſervation is, that this Francis Patrizi ſhould not have been made the ſubject of a new article, ſince he is the ſame perſon with Francis Patrizi the Philoſopher, mentioned in page 134. This may be proved demonſtratively; for it is as clear as the ſun, that Nicius Erythreus in the place cited, ſpeaks only of Francis Patrizi, Ariſtotle's opponent; and relates two or three particulars concerning him, which Moreri aſcribes to the Patrizi of page 134. It is alſo certain that Erythreus has aſcribed to Patrizi a work *De Arte Poëtica*, which work is the ſame with that, wherein, if we may credit Father Rapin cited by Baillet (36), that Author is contented with *writing as an Hiſtorian, without expatiating very much on the rules of the art.* By the way, we may probably ſuppoſe that this Jeſuit was but little acquainted with this piece of Francis Patrizi. It is a work divided into two decades (37), in the firſt of which the Author writes as an Hiſtorian; and in the ſecond, as a diſputant, who attacks Ariſtotle with prodigious vigour (31). My ſecond remark is, that ſince the compilers in queſtion intended to relate but one diſadvantageous particular concerning this work, they ought not to have cited merely Nicius Erythreus, who ſpeaks very much in commendation of it. *Edidit de ſcribenda Hiſtoria tres Dialogos, & de Arte Poëtica totidem Decadas, quibus precium ſtatui pro illorum æſtimatione vix poteſt* (39), i. e. "He publiſhed three "Dialogues concerning the writing of Hiſtory, and "the like number of decads on the Art of Poetry, "which are invaluable." Neither ſhould he have obſerved, that this piece is divided into ten books, Erythreus ſuppoſing that it contained three decades. I believe he is miſtaken, but it is certain that it contained two. In fine, it ſhould not have been aſſerted, that Patrizi was beheaded, this being falſe, and is not in the Author who is cited. The placing a man in the 17th Century, when it is ſuppoſed he was beheaded in 1597, is an error which muſt be laid to the charge of the printers; but not that of ſaying, that Caieta is in Calabria (40).

(36) In Tom. 1. of the *Jugement ſur les Poetes*, num. 1062.

(37) *Della Poetica Deca Iſtoriale. Della Poetica Deca diſputata.* This work was printed at Ferrara in 1586.

(38) Lor. Craſſo, *Elogii*, Tom. 1. p. 62.

(39) Nic. Erythræus, *Pinac.* 1. p. 204, 205.

(40) We find this in Moreri's Dict. Dutch edit. 1628, and in that of Paris in 1699, in the article of PATRICIUS (Patrizi) Author of *de Regno & Regis Inſtitutione.*

PATRICIUS (ANDREW), was one of the learned men who were born in Poland in the 16th Century. He ſtudied at Padua, where he acquired the eſteem of the moſt illuſtrious Profeſſors of that country, and particularly of Sigonius and Paul Manutius (*a*). He publiſhed books which gained him great reputation [*A*]; and ſome conſiderable benefices in his native country were beſtowed upon him. At laſt he was Provoſt * of the Church of Warſaw, Archdeacon of that of Wilna, and at laſt Biſhop of Wenden. Stephen Battori, King of Poland, having recovered Livonia, of which the Muſcovites had poſſeſſed themſelves, erected the city of Werden into an Epiſcopal See, and beſtowed it on our Patricius, who did not enjoy it long, he dying ſoon after, *viz.* in 1583 (*b*).

(*a*) See the three Letters which Paulus Minutius wrote to Andrew Patricius. They are the 19th and 20th of book 4, and the 6th of book 3.

* This is one of the chief dignities in chapters. Rem. by the Tranſl.

(*b*) Extracted from Simon Starovolſcius, *in Elogiis centum Polonorum*, p. 27, 28.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral works which gained him reputation.*] He had diligently ſtudied polite literature, and he wrote polite enough in Latin. All this is ſeen in his Commentaries on two of Tully's orations, and in his ſpeeches to the King of Poland, Stephen Battori, to congratulate him, in the name of the Clergy of Warſaw, for having thrice defeated the Muſcovites. The pains he took, which doubtleſs was very great, to collect the fragments of Cicero, diſcovered very good things, which great numbers of the Literati would never have diſcovered, ſo much they were diſperſed, till he had collected them. Such of Cicero's pieces as are loſt were better than thoſe which are extant. Several paſſages from that Roman, which we meet with in St. Auſtin, and other Writers, are prodigiouſly fine; but how many Literati would never have fought for them in thoſe books? Andrew Patricius has conſequently done them great ſervice in collecting them. He alſo wrote ſome controverſial works. *Paralleli Eccleſiæ Orthodoxæ cum Synagoga Hæreticorum. De vera & falſa Eccleſia libri quinque* (1).

(1) See Starovolſcius, *in Elog. centum Polonorum*, p. 26.

☞ PATRICK (*a*) (SIMON), a very learned Engliſh Biſhop [*A*], was born at Gainſborough in Lincolnſhire, Sept. 8. 1626. His father was a Mercer of good credit in that place, who deſigning his ſon for a ſcholar ſent him to ſchool to one Mr. Merryweather, an excellent Latiniſt, as appears by his tranſlation of Sir Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici*. He was admitted into Queen's College in Cambridge, in 1644, under the tuition of Mr. Welles, and was very intimate with Mr. John Smith, Fellow of the ſame College, ſufficiently known by his excellent Tracts publiſhed after his death by Mr. John Worthington. Mr. Patrick took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1647, and that of Maſter

(*a*) For the particulars of this article, we are obliged to the very learned Samuel Knight, D. D. Prebendary of Ely, and Archdeacon of Berkſhire, Author of the *Lives of Dean Colet* and *Eraſmus*; and who intends likewiſe to oblige the public with a very curious and ample *Life of Biſhop* Patrick.

[*A*] *A very learned Engliſh Biſhop.*] This appears from his writings, which are as follow. 1. *A Sermon preached at the funeral of Mr.* John Smith, *late Fellow of Queen's College in Cambridge, who departed this life, Aug.* 7. 1652. and lyes interred in the Chapel of the ſame College With a *ſhort Account of his Life.* Printed with Mr. Smith's *ſelect Diſcourſes* 1660, in 4to. 2. *Divine Arithmetic; or, the right Art of numbering our Days. Being a Sermon preached June* 17, 1659, *at the funeral of Mr.* Samuel Jacomb, B. D.

Maſter in 1651, and received Holy Orders from Biſhop Hall of Norwich in his retirement at Higham after his ejection from his Biſhoprick. He had been then ſometime Fellow of his College; and ſoon after removed to Batterſea in Surry to be Chaplain to Sir Walter St. John. He was afterwards Vicar of that Church. His next and much better preferment was the Rectory of St. Paul's Covent-Garden in London, which was given him without any ſolicitation by the Earl of Bedford; where he was very uſeful and diligent in his miniſterial function, and continued all the time of the plague in the year 1665 among his Pariſhioners, to their great comfort. The ſame year he took his Degree of Doctor of Divinity at Oxford, being before admitted into Chriſt Church there. In the year 1668, he publiſhed his *Friendly debate between a Conformiſt and a Non-Conformiſt*, in ſeveral parts; which was anſwered by the Diſſenters, whom he had much exaſperated by it; but by his candour and moderation towards them afterwards, they were perfectly reconciled to him, and he brought over many of them to the communion of the eſtabliſhed Church. The ſame year he was offered by Dr. Fuller, Biſhop of Lincoln, the Archdeaconry of Huntingdon, which he thankfully refuſed, as likely to take him off too much from the buſineſs of the great cure, in which he was employed. In 1678 he was made Dean of Peterborough, where he conſtantly reſided that portion of time which was alloted him, and was very uſeful and conſequently much beloved in that place. Here he ſet up weekly Communions. In the year 1680, he was freely offered by the Lord Chancellor the rich living of St. Martin's in the Fields, which he refuſed on the account of the eſteem he had for his Pariſhioners of Covent-Garden, and his apprehenſion that he ſhould not be able to diſcharge the duty of ſo great a cure; and therefore he recommended to his Lordſhip Dr. Thomas Teniſon, who had ſtrength of body and mind to execute ſuch a charge. In the year 1682, Dr. Lewis du Moulin, who had been a Hiſtory Profeſſor at Oxford, and had written many bitter books againſt the Church of England, ſent for Dr. Patrick upon his ſick-bed, and made a ſolemn declaration of his concern and regret on that account, which he ſigned, and it was publiſhed after his death. In 1686, Dr. Patrick and Dr. Jane, the King's Profeſſors of Divinity at Oxford, held a conference with ſome Popiſh

B. D. Miniſter of the Goſpel, at St. Mary Woolnoth, in Lumbard-ſtreet, London, and lately Fellow of Queen's College in Cambridge. London 1660, in 4to. There are two dedications of this Sermon, the former to his *worthy friend Mr.* Thomas Jacomb, *Miniſter of the Goſpel at Martin's Ludgate*, the latter to *the Right Worſhipful* Thomas Viner, *Alderman of the City of London, and the reſt of the Inhabitants of the pariſh of Mary Woolnoth, Lumbard-ſtreet.* 3. Menſa Myſtica; *or, a Diſcourſe concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; in which the ends of its Inſtitution are ſo manifeſted, our Addreſſes to it ſo directed, our Behaviour there and afterwards ſo compoſed, that we may not loſe the Benefits which are to be received by it; with ſeveral Prayers and Thankſgivings inſerted to make it of more uſe:* To this is added, Aqua Genitalis, *a Diſcourſe concerning* Baptiſm; *in which is inſerted a brief Diſcourſe to perſuade to a Confirmation of the Baptiſmal Vow.* 4. *Jewiſh Hypocriſie; a Caveat to the preſent Generation, wherein is ſhewn both the falſe and true Way to a Nation's or Perſon's complete Happineſs, from the Sickneſs and Recovery of the Jewiſh State.* To which is added, *A Diſcourſe upon* Micah vi. 8. *belonging to the ſame Matter.* London 1660, in 8vo. 5. Heart's Eaſe; *or, a Remedy againſt all Troubles; a conſolatory Diſcourſe particularly directed to thoſe, who have loſt their Friends and dear Relations.* London 1660, in 8vo. To the eighth edition are added two papers, written in the time of the plague, in 1665. 6. *The Parable of the Pilgrim: written to a Friend.* London, in 4to. 7. *An Expoſition of the Ten Commandments.* London, in 8vo. 8. *A friendly Debate between a Conformiſt and a Non-conformiſt.* In three parts. The firſt and ſecond parts were printed at London 1669, in 8vo. The ſixth edition of them, *corrected and enlarged*, was printed at London 1684, in 8vo. The *Imprimatur* of the *firſt part*, is dated Nov. 7. 1668. In the *general Preface* to the *ſixth edition*, our Author obſerves, that "the "Bookſeller having acquainted him with his intention of reprinting this treatiſe, which hath now "been in the world fifteen years, he thought good "to let the Reader know, that the Author of it ſees "no cauſe, after ſo long obſervation, and ſerious conſideration of things, to retract or alter any thing "he hath written therein; but is rather confirmed "in his opinion, that it was and is an uſeful and ſeaſonable Diſcourſe. Which, as it was written to take "down the pride and inſolence, wherewith the Non-"Conformiſts, began at that time to treat us, and "to perſuade men to conform themſelves to the "eſtabliſhed orders; ſo to give them withall a true "notion of Religion; to preſerve them from being "abuſed with phraſes; to inſtruct them in many "parts of their Chriſtian duty; to inform them "wherein Chriſtianity doth chiefly conſiſt, and what "will make them thoroughly good; and particularly how neceſſary a part of Chriſtian piety it is "to obey the public laws, which no way contradict "the laws of God; and to live in unity with their "Chriſtian brethren. What is to be done alſo for "the reſtoring of this unity, is here declared; and "how vain a thing it is to cry up unity, when men "themſelves keep up the diviſion; and that the "preſent ſeparation may be cured, if men pleaſe "but to do their plain duty, that is, if the Non-"conforming people would but do what the beſt of "their Miniſters acknowledge may be lawfully done "by them, and if thoſe Miniſters would but honeſtly preſs upon them, as it is here demonſtrated "they ought to do, and that they cannot juſtify "them, but muſt, if they will ſpeak as they think, "condemn the people in their ſeparation. And how "they can juſtify themſelves in ſtanding out, becauſe "of a few ceremonies (which have been the great "exception againſt conformity) I am not able to di-"vine; ſince they themſelves impoſed, without "any ſcruple, as many ceremonies (this Author "hath obſerved in taking the *Covenant*, which they "looked upon as a ſacred thing) as our Church doth "in the performance of divine ſervice." *But tho' theſe and ſuch like things are the whole ſcope of this book, yet the Author of it hath been loaded with many hard cenſures and unjuſt reproaches, as if he had done the greateſt wrong, not only to them, but to true Religion. Which, thanks be to God, have not at all diſcouraged his reſolution of adhering firmly to the principles, which he avows in his book; for he was aware of ſuch uſage, and prepared againſt it, before he ſet pen to paper, having obſerved in the very book itſelf, that* no man ever oppoſed their fancies, but preſently they voted him to be a perſon unacquainted with God, led by intereſt, and not by religion. *Yet that ſuch a man as Judge* Hales *ſhould paſs that ſentence upon the Author, which Mr.* Baxter *hath lately reported, was, it muſt be confeſſed, ſomething ſurpriſing. For as he was a perſon of great learning and piety, ſo his candour (if common fame may be believed, for I knew him not) was no leſs eminent; and yet, as Mr.* Baxter *tells us* *, *he was pleaſed* to expreſs ſo great a diſlike of the *debate*, and the *Eccleſiaſtical Policy*, as tending to the injury

* *Second Defence of Nonconformity*, p. 188.

piſh Prieſts at the deſire of the Earl of Rocheſter, then Lord Treaſurer, King James II. being then preſent. The reſult was, that the Earl was convinced, that the Religion of the Proteſtants was a *ſafe way to Salvation.* During the reign of that King, the Dean's behaviour ſhewed, that he had nothing more at heart than the Proteſtant Religion, for which he ventured all that was dear to him by preaching and writing againſt the errors of the Church of Rome. On this account he was ſent for by the King, and with a ſevere check refuſed to be introduced to his Majeſty by Dr. Crew, then Biſhop of Durham, but was introduced by Biſhop Spratt. The King treated him very kindly, and deſired him to remit of his zeal againſt his Church, and quietly enjoy his own Religion. The Dean anſwered with great courage, that he could not give up a Religon ſo well proved as that of the Proteſtants. In 1687, he publiſhed a *Prayer* compoſed for that difficult time, when perſecution was expected by all who ſtood firm to their Religion; and the ſame year, by a large ſum of money, which he and Dr. Teniſon received from the Lady Coventry, they were enabled to ſet up a ſchool at St. Martin's, to confront the Popiſh one, opened at the Savoy, for the ſeducing the youth of the town into Popery; which money afterwards was employed to the uſe of the poor Vicars in the Dioceſe of Canterbury and Ely, made more firm ſince by an Act of Parliament. At the Revolution great uſe was made of the Dean, who was very active in ſettling the affairs of the Church. He was called upon to preach before the Prince and Princeſs of Orange, who were appriſed of his zeal in oppoſing of the reading of King James's *Declaration.* He was ſoon after appointed

injury of Religion itſelf, that he wiſhed the Authors would openly profeſs, that they wrote for themſelves, and no more abuſively pretend it was for religion. *But it muſt be remembered, that wiſe and good men are wont ſometimes to overſhoot themſelves, when they are angry; and that they are never more apt to be ſo, than when thoſe beloved ſchemes, which they have been long in drawing, and of which (having laboured much in them) they have entertained an high opinion, are rejected and torn in pieces. This is provoking to men that look upon themſelves as maſters in policy, as well as in law and religion; and is all the fault, that I can think of, wherewith this Author can be juſtly charged. He was not then, nor is now, for that project of* Comprehenſion, *in favour of which every body knows Sir* M. Hales *was ſtrongly prepoſſeſſed. The* Debate, *as he angrily calls it, came in the way of that, and lay croſs to it. But as for his charge of the Author's writing for himſelf, I can demonſtrate, that, as things then ſtood, it was impoſſible (unleſs we will ſuppoſe him to have been a fool) he ſhould have any ſuch reſpect to ſecular advantages, which he might thereby reap, ſave only the preſerving himſelf by preſerving the government; which he was bound to do as a member of this Church and Kingdom, which he loves unfeignedly, and whoſe preſent conſtitution he will always endeavour ſteadfaſtly to uphold. For they, whom he oppoſed, had too much power, he knew very well, at that time to obſtruct him in ſuch a deſign; and as they uſed all their intereſt to depreſs him, ſo they had ſuch an influence, I can prove, upon ſome who are now dead and gone, that by their means they did actually keep him down a long time from riſing at all in the world. Which he the more contentedly endured, becauſe he had the teſtimony of his conſcience (which is a thouſand times more valuable than all the applauſes they beſtowed upon thoſe, who would wink at their evil doings) that this book was not contrived to ſerve any worldly intereſt; but, quite contrary, notwithſtanding any prejudice it might do him in this world, faithfully to repreſent unto men the truth, as it is in the Lord Jeſus. Which could not be done indeed, without expoſing the follies, nay inſincerity ſometimes, of ſome perſons, who would be thought the only, or the moſt ſincere lovers of him. But in expoſing them, religion is ſo far from being injured (as the forenamed cenſure ſuggeſts) that it is reſcued from the contempt, which muſt neceſſarily fall upon it, if they paſs without controul for the moſt religious people.* Mr. William Harris obſerves †, "that "it has been generally allowed, that Dr. Patrick "wrote the firſt volumes of the *Friendly Debate*, in "the heat of his youth, and in the midſt of his ex- "pectations; which by aggravating ſome weak and "uncautious expreſſions in a few particular Writers, "deſigned to expoſe the Non-Conformiſt Miniſtry to "contempt and ridicule. The deſign was after- "wards carried on by a worſe hand, and with a more "virulent ſpirit **: a method altogether unreaſon- "able and unworthy, becauſe it will be always eaſy "to gather raſh and unadviſed expreſſions from the "weaker perſons of any party of men; and only "ſerves to expoſe religion to the ſcorn and contempt "of the profane. But Biſhop Patrick, in his ad- "vanced age, and in a public debate in the Houſe of "Lords about the Occaſional Bill, took the opportu- "nity to declare himſelf to this purpoſe; *That he "had been known to write againſt the Diſſenters with "ſome warmth in his younger years; but that he had "lived long enough to ſee reaſon to alter his opinion of "that people, and that way of writing; and that he "was verily perſuaded there were ſome, who were ho- "neſt men, and good Chriſtians, who would be neither, "if they did not ordinarily go to Church and ſometimes to "the Meeting; and on the other hand, ſome were ho- "neſt men and good Chriſtians, who would be neither, "if they did not ordinarily go to the Meetings, and ſome- "times to the Church.* A rare inſtance this of retrac- "tation and moderation, which, I think, redounds "greatly to his honour, and is worthy of imitation."

† *Memoirs of the Life of Dr. Thomas Manton*, p. 32, 33. edit. Lond. 1725, in 8vo.

** Dr. Samuel Parker, afterwards Biſhop of Oxford.

9. *The Chriſtian Sacrifice: a Treatiſe ſhewing the Neceſſity, End, and Manner of the receiving the Holy Communion; together with ſuitable Prayers and Meditations for every month in the year, and the principal Feſtivals in memory of our bleſſed Saviour.* In four parts, in 8vo and 12mo. 14th edition. 10. *A Sermon at the funeral of Mr.* Thomas Grigg, *Sept.* 4. 1670. on *Cor.* v. 9. London 1670, in 4to. 11. *The Devout Chriſtian inſtructed how to pray and give thanks to God; or, a book of Devotions for Families, and for particular Perſons in moſt of the concerns of human life.* 14th edit. in 12mo. 12. *Advice to a Friend.* 7th edit. in 12mo. 13. *Jeſus and the Reſurrection juſtified in Heaven and in Earth.* 2d edit. in 8vo. 14. Angliæ Speculum: *A glaſs that flatters not; preſented to a country congregation at the ſolemn Faſt,* April 24th, 1678, *in a parallel between the Kingdom of Ireland and England.* 4to. 15. *A Sermon preached at Covent-Garden on Advent-Sunday,* 1678, in 4to. 16. *The whole book of Pſalms paraphraſed, with arguments to each Pſalm.* In two parts. London 1680, in 8vo. 17. *The book of Job paraphraſed.* London, in 8vo. 18. *The glorious Epiphany, with the devout Chriſtian's love to it.* London, in 8vo. 19. *The Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, in ſix books; written in Latin by* Hugo Grotius, *and now tranſlated into Engliſh, with the addition of a ſeventh book againſt the preſent Roman Church,* London, in 8vo. 20. *A book for Beginners, or a Help to young Communicants, that they may be fitted for the Holy Communion, and receive it with profit.* 17th edit. in 24°. 21. *A Sermon preached before the Lord Mayor at Guild-hall Chapel,* Octob. 31, 1680. London, in 8vo. 22. *Chriſt's Counſel to his Church, in two Sermons preached at the two laſt Faſts,* April 27, 1679, *and* Decemb. 22, 1680. London, in 8vo. 23. *A Paraphraſe upon the books of* Eccleſiaſtes, *and the Song of* Solomon, *with Arguments to each chapter, and Annotations thereupon.* London, in 8vo. 24. *The* Proverbs *of* Solomon *paraphraſed, with Arguments to each chapter, which ſupply the place of commenting.* London, in 8vo. 25. *A Treatiſe of the Neceſſity and Frequency of receiving the Holy Communion; with a Reſolution of Doubts about it: in three Diſcourſes, begun upon Whitſunday, in the Cathedral Church of Peterborough,*

pointed one of the Commiſſioners for the review of the Liturgy. Upon the death of Dr. Lake, Biſhop of Chicheſter, in 1689 the Dean was appointed to ſucceed him in that See, which he immediately viſited, and diſcharged in all reſpects the duties of a vigilant Paſtor. He was employed with others of the new Biſhops to ſettle the affairs of the Church of Ireland; to which end all the Clergy of that Church, who had fled to England for ſafety, were ſent home, and ſeveral worthy perſons recommended to their Majeſties to fill the vacant Sees. In 1691 he was tranſlated to the See of Ely in the room of Biſhop Turner, who was deprived on account of his refuſal to take the oaths to the Government. The firſt thing Biſhop Patrick did, after he was ſettled in that See, was maintaining two Lectures in two Churches at each end of the town of Cambridge, *viz.* Botolph's and St. Clement's, allowing to each of them thirty pounds a year, for an afternoon Sermon every Sunday. He alſo finiſhed an affair, which had been long depending between the Biſhops of Ely and the Lord Hatton, relating to Hatton-Garden in London; and procured a rent-charge of an 100 *l.* a year to be ſettled on that Biſhoprick for ever. He was alſo a great Benefactor to his Palace at Ely, making commodious gardens for his own and his ſucceſſors benefit. He died at Ely May 31, 1707, in the eighty firſt year of his age, and was interred in the Cathedral, where a monument is erected to his memory; the inſcription upon which was written by Dr. John Leng, afterwards Biſhop of Norwich [*B*].

rough, 1684, *to preſs the Obſervation of the fourth Rubrick after the Communion Office*, 12mo. 26. *A Treatiſe of Repentance and Faſting, eſpecially of the Lent Faſt*, 12mo. 27. *A Sermon preached on St. Mark's day, 1686, in the Pariſh Church of St. Paul's Covent-Garden.* 28. *A Diſcourſe concerning Prayer, eſpecially of frequenting the daily publick Prayers. In two parts*, 12mo. 29. *Search the Scriptures: A Treatiſe ſhewing that all Chriſtians ought to read the holy book, with directions to them therein. In three parts*, 12mo. 30. *A Diſcourſe of profiting by Sermons*, London, in 4to. 31. *A Diſcourſe about Tradition; ſhewing what is meant by it; and what Tradition is to be received, and what to be rejected*, London, in 4to. 32. *The Pillar and Ground of Truth: A Treatiſe ſhewing, that the Roman Church falſely claims to be that Church, and the pillar of that Church, mentioned* 1 Tim. iii. 15. *which is explained in three parts*, 1687, in 4to. 33. *A Sermon preached upon St. Peter's Day, printed with enlargements*, 4to. 34. *The Virgin Mary miſrepreſented by the Roman Church, in the Traditions of that Church concerning her Life and Glory, and in the devotions paid to her as the mother of God. Both ſhewed out of the Office of that Church, the Leſſons on her Feſtivals, and from their allowed Authors*, Part I. *wherein two of her Feaſts* [her Conception and Nativity] *are conſidered.* Our Author promiſed a *ſecond part*, but we do not find whether it was ever printed. 35. *An Examination of* Bellarmine's *ſecond note of the Church*, viz. *Antiquity*, 1687, in 4to. 36. *The Texts, which Papiſts cite out of the Bible for the proof of their Doctrine*, Of the Supremacy of St. Peter and the Pope over the whole Church, *examined.* In two parts, 4to. 37. *A private Prayer to be uſed in difficult times*, 8vo. 38. *A Thankſgiving for our late wonderful Deliverance*, 1689, 8vo. 39. *A Prayer for perfecting our late Deliverance*, 1668, 8vo. 40. *A Prayer for Charity, Peace, and Unity, chiefly to be uſed in Lent*, 8vo. 41. *A Prayer for the King's ſucceſs in Ireland*, 1690, 8vo. 42. *A Sermon preached in St. James's Chapel before the Prince of Orange, Jan.* 20. 1688, *on* Iſaiah ii. 6. 4to. 43. *A ſecond part of the Sermon preached before the Prince of Orange, on the ſame Text, preached in Covent-Garden*, 4to. 44. *A Sermon preached before the Queen in March*, 1688-9. *on* Coloſ. ii. 15. 4to. 45. *A Sermon againſt Murmuring. preached at Covent-Garden in Lent*, 1688-9. *on* 1 Cor. x. 10. 46. *A Sermon againſt Cenſuring, preached at Covent-Garden in Advent, on* 1 Cor. iv. 10. 47. *A Faſt Sermon before the King and Queen, April* 16, 1690. *on* Prov. xiv. 34. 48. *A Thanſgiving Sermon before the Houſe of Lords, Nov.* 26. 1691, *for the reducing of Ireland, and the King's ſafe return, on* Numb. x. 9. 49. *An Anſwer to a Book ſpread abroad by the Romiſh Prieſts, intitled*, The Touchſtone of the Reformed Goſpel; *wherein the true Doctrine of the Church of England, and many Texts of the Holy Scriptures are faithfully explained*, 8vo. 50. *A Letter to the Clergy of the Dioceſe of Ely at his primary Viſitation.* 51. *A Commentary on the firſt Book of Moſes, called* Geneſis, 3d Edit. 4to. 52. *A Commentary on the ſecond Book of Moſes, called* Exodus, 2d Edit. 4to. 53. *A Commentary on the third Book of* Moſes, *called* Leviticus, 2d Edit. 4to. 54. *A Sermon preached before the Lord Mayor, &c. on Eaſter Monday*, 1696, *on* 1 Tim. ii. 8. 55. *A Sermon preached before the Houſe of Lords, Novemb.* 25, 1696, *on* Dan. iv. 5. 56. *A Commentary on the fourth Book of Moſes, called* Numbers, 2d Edit. 4to. 57. *The Work of the Miniſtry, repreſented to the Clergy of the Dioceſe of Ely*, 1698. 58. *A Commentary on the fifth Book of Moſes, called* Deuteronomy, 2d Edit. 4to. 59. *A Commentary upon the Books of* Joſhua, Judges, *and* Ruth, 4to. 60. *A Commentary on the two Books of* Samuel, 4to. 61. *The Dignity of the Chriſtian Prieſthood, directed to his Clergy on his fourth Triennial Viſitation.* 62. *An Exhortation ſent to the Clergy of the Dioceſe of Ely, before his fifth Triennial Viſitation*, 1704. *With a Diſcourſe on Rev.* xvi. 9. *upon occaſion of the late terrible Storm of Wind*, 1703, in 12mo. 63. *A Commentary on the two Books of* Kings, 4to. 64. *A Commentary on the two Books of* Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, *and* Eſther, 4to. 65. *An Exhortation to the Clergy of the Dioceſe of Ely, at his ſixth Triennial Viſitation.* 66. *Fifteen Sermons upon Contentment and Reſignation to the Will of God. As alſo two Sermons on the Miniſtration of Angels. With a Prayer at the end of each Diſcourſe, ſuitable to the particular ſubject of it. Never before printed. With an exact Catalogue of his Works*, London, 1719, in 8vo. In the Preface we are told, that "the ſeventeen Sermons contained in "this volume are the only pieces of our Author, "which have been publiſhed ſince his death. They "were compoſed in the prime of his years, and very "fairly written out by himſelf in one volume. They "were put into the bookſeller's hands by his Relict, "Mrs. *Penelope Patrick*, now living, with her deſire, "that they might be made publick. The Author "was ſo eminent for his great learning and ſingular "piety, and his practical writings and books of de-"votion have been ſo well received, that the book-"ſellers think it a conſiderable recommendation of "theſe diſcourſes, and the prayers annexed to them, "that they can aſſure the world they are the genuine "works of that excellent Prelate, and printed with "great care and exactneſs from his own manuſcript. "They have alſo been aſſured by their friends, who "have peruſed theſe Sermons, that as men's being "contented in all eſtates of life is a matter of great "conſequence to their happineſs, ſo the reader will "here find the duty of contentment very fully treated "of, and recommended with all that clearneſs and "ſtrength of reaſoning, and with all that learning "and true piety, which might be expected in ſo ce-"lebrated an Author, writing upon ſo important a "ſubject." 67. He made large additions to Mr. *Gunton's Hiſtory of the Church of Peterborough*, publiſhed in a thin folio.

[*B*] *The Inſcription upon which was written by Dr. John Leng, afterwards Biſhop of Norwich.*] It is as follows.

M. S.
Reverendi admodum in Xto Patris
SIMONIS PATRICK
Per biennium Ciceſtrenſis, per XVI annos deinde
Elienſis Epiſcopi:
Ad hos ampliſſimos dignitatis gradus propter
Eximia erga Eccleſiam ac Rempublicam merita

☞ PAUL (FATHER) was Son of Franciſco Sarpi, a Merchant, and Iſabella Morelli, a native of Venice. He was born at Venice Auguſt 14, 1552, and was baptiſed by the name of Peter. Upon the death of his Father, his Mother's Brother, Ambroſio Morelli, Prieſt of the Collegiate Church of St. Hermagoras, took him and a little ſiſter of his from under the care of his mother, who retired to a religious life (*a*). Ambroſio, who was well ſkilled in polite Literature, and taught the children of ſeveral Noblemen, took a particular care of the education of his nephew, who ſoon made a great progreſs in learning, and was very ſerious from his infancy, and averſe to thoſe paſtimes, which are the uſual amuſements of youth, and remarkable for two qualities, which ſeldom meet in the ſame perſon, a ſtrong memory [*A*], and clear judgment. At thirteen years of age he applied himſelf to Philoſophy, Mathematicks, and the Greek and Hebrew languages. John Maria Capella of Cremona, of the Order of the Servites, read to him Lectures in Logick, and ſoon after boaſted, that he had a ſcholar, who was capable of being his Maſter. The frequent converſation, which our young Sarpi had with Capella, inſpired him with a reſolution to enter into the Order of the Servites, notwithſtanding the oppoſition of his mother and uncle, who intended him for his own Order. He took upon him the habit of the Servites, November 24, 1566, and two years after made his tacit profeſſion, which he ſolemnly renewed May 10, 1572. Upon entering into this Order he changed his name of *Peter Sarpi* for that of *Paul*. During a Chapter held at Mantua at that time, he defended ſeveral Theſes in natural Philoſophy and Divinity with ſuch ſucceſs, that Duke William of Mantua appointed him his Chaplain; and Boldrino, Biſhop of that City, made him Reader in his Cathedral of Poſitive and Caſuiſtical Divinity, and Canon Law. Theſe employments animated him to proſecute other ſtudies, and particularly that of the Hebrew language, of which he made himſelf a complete Maſter, and of Hiſtory; but he ſhewed the utmoſt contempt for judicial Aſtrology [*B*]. Being now weary of a Court life [*C*], he returned to his Convent at Venice, and applied himſelf ſo intenſely to his ſtudies, that his conſtitution, which was naturally very delicate, was greatly injured by it [*D*]. At two and twenty years of age he was ordained Prieſt, and went to Milan at the time, when Cardinal Borromeo was reforming his Church, who had ſhewed great reſpect to him. However, his great reputation expoſed him to envy; for before he left Mantua, one *Claudio*, who was jealous of his ſuperior talents, accuſed him to the Inquiſition of Hereſy, for having denied, that the Doctrine of the Trinity could be proved from the firſt Chapter of Geneſis. But Father Paul, appealing to Rome, was honourably acquitted, and the Inquiſitor reprimanded for preſuming to determine upon things written in a language, which he did not underſtand. After he had taken the Degree of Doctor of Divinity, and was admitted a Member of the College of Padua, he was choſen Provincial of his Order for the Province of Venice, though he was then but twenty ſix years of age; an inſtance, which had never happened before among the Servites. He diſcharged this poſt with ſuch dignity and honour [*E*], that in 1579 in a general Chapter held at Parma, he was appointed with two others, who were more advanced in years, to draw up new Regulations and Statutes for his Order. This employment made it neceſſary for him to reſide at Rome, where he executed it alone with great ſucceſs. When his Office of Provincial was ended, he retired for three years to the ſtudy of

(*a*) Moſt of the particulars of the life of our Author, are extracted from Fra. Fulgentio's *Vita del Padre Paolo*; an Engliſh tranſlation of which, though very incorrectly done, was printed at London 1651, in 8vo. and likewiſe prefixed to ſome editions of Sir Nathaniel Brent's tranſlation of the *Hiſtory of the Council of Trent*. Mr. John Lockman has prefixed an extract of this piece of Fulgentio to the third edit. of Mr. Jenkins's tranſlation of Father Paul's *Treatiſe of Eccleſiaſtical Benefices and Revenues*, as Father *Courayer* has alſo done before his tranſlation into French of Father *Paul's Hiſtory of the Council of Trent*.

Ab optimis Principibus Gulielmo & Mariâ evecti:
Cujus Pietatem inſignem, mores ſanctiſſimos,
Ingenium elegans, acre, copioſum, præclaram
In omni Literarum genere ſcientiam
Abunde teſtantur dicta, facta, ſcripta ipſius omnia,
Præſertim eruditiſſimi & luculentiſſimi in SS. Scripturam
Commentarii,
Quovis elogio majores, quovis marmore diuturniores.
Vir, ſi quis alius, candore & charitate verè Xtianâ,
Conſtantiâ animi invictâ, æquitate nullo partium
Studio inclinata, in optimis artibus colendis promovendiſq;
In negotiis maximi momenti gerendis,
In univerſis vigilantiſſimi Epiſcopi muneribus explendis,
Ad extremum uſq; ſpiritum perpetuus & indefeſſus:
Cumulatis jam vitæ omnibus officiis pientiſſimus ſenex
Placide animam Deo reddidit, 31 Maii A. D. 1707.
Ætatis 81. T.

[*A*] *A ſtrong memory.*] It was ſo ſtrong, that to leſſen the idea of it, he uſed to ſay out of modeſty, that he could never repeat above thirty verſes, after he had heard them read once over (1).

(1) Fra. Fulgentio, *Vita del Padre Paolo.*

[*B*] *He ſhewed the utmoſt contempt for judicial aſtrology.*] He us'd to ſay, *Il futuro, ò non ſi può apere, ò non ſi può ſchiffare*, i. e. "Future things either cannot "be known, or cannot be avoided." But a little while before Father Paul left Mantua, there happened the following incident. Duke William, who was fond of ſoftening the cares of Government with pleaſant ſallies of humour, having a mare, that was ready to fole a mule, engaged our Author to beſtow a whole night's ſtudy on the horoſcope of the animal. This being done, and the ſcheme taken, the Duke cauſed copies of it to be ſent to all the eminent Aſtrologers in Europe, with this note, that at ſuch an inſtant of time, a baſtard was born in the Duke's palace. Some of the Aſtrologers anſwered, that this baſtard would be a Cardinal; others, a great General; and others, even a Pope (2).

(2) Idem, ibid.

[*C*] *Being now weary of a Court life.*] Fra. Fulgentio ſays, that this was the true cauſe of his departure from Mantua; though he obſerves, that others were of opinion, that Father was diſguſted at the odd capricious humour of the Duke of Mantua.

[*D*] *Applied himſelf ſo intenſely to his ſtudies, that his conſtitution, which was naturally very delicate, was greatly injured by it.*] He contracted habitual infirmities, with which he was troubled till old age, and which obliged him to drink a little wine, from which he had abſtained till he was thirty years old; and he ſaid, that one of the things, of which he moſt repented, was, that he had been perſuaded to drink wine. He eat ſcarce any thing but bread and fruits, and uſed a very ſmall quantity of food till he was fifty nine years of age; and even then always with great reſerve, becauſe it rendered him liable to violent pains of the head.

[*E*] *He diſcharged this poſt with ſuch dignity and honour.*] In his judgments, he ſhewed an inflexible regard to right; and could never be induced to accept the ſlighteſt preſent; a method, which he obſerved all his life after. He gave the utmoſt diſpatch in matters of juſtice. None of his deciſions were ever reverſed: he baniſhed all factions and parties

of natural and experimental Philoſophy and Anatomy [*F*]; and was then choſen Procurator-General of his Order, and during his three years reſidence at Rome, he aſſiſted, by the Pope's command, at ſeveral congregations, where matters of the higheſt importance were debated. He was greatly eſteemed there by Pope Sixtus V. and contracted an intimate friendſhip with Cardinal Bellarmin, and other eminent perſons [*G*]. From Rome he went to Naples, under the character of Vicar-General of the Chapters, and Viſitor of the Convents; where he became acquainted with John Baptiſa Porta, who mentions him in his works with great honour. Upon his return to Venice, he reſumed his ſtudies, beginning them before ſun-riſe, and continuing them all the morning, except thoſe hours in which he was called to the publick devotions. The afternoons he ſpent in philoſophical or mechanical experiments, or in converſation with his learned friends. But now he was called forth from his ſtudious and retired courſe of life, and expoſed to a ſeries of troubles, on occaſion of one Gabrielle Colliſſoni's aſpiring to be General of the Order, who being oppoſed by Father Paul, in order to revenge himſelf upon the latter, accuſed him to the Inquiſition

parties from among thoſe whom he governed; and eſtabliſhed ſuch orders and regulations, as, if his ſucceſſors had followed them, would have prevented many inconveniencies, to which they were expoſed. In ſhort, in this office, he ſhewed himſelf capable of managing the moſt important affairs; and his penetration and ſagacity were ſuperior to matters of the greateſt perplexity.

[*F*] *He retired for three years to the ſtudy of natural and experimental philoſophy and anatomy.*] Among other experiments, he employed himſelf in the tranſmutation of metals; but not with any view to diſcover the Philoſopher's Stone, which he always laughed at as an impoſſible attempt. In the courſe of his experiments, he found out ſeveral uſeful ſecrets. He ſtudied likewiſe Anatomy, eſpecially that part of it, which relates to the eye; on which he made ſeveral curious obſervations, ſo that the famous Aquapendente cited Father Paul's authority in his writings, with great approbation; and Fra. Fulventio is ſurprized, that Aquapendente, in his book *de Viſu*, did not own his obligations to our Author in ſtill ſtronger terms, ſince almoſt all the new diſcoveries in that treatiſe were due to him. He aſſerts likewiſe, that Father Paul diſcovered the valves, which ſerve for the circulation of the blood; "a thing, ſays he, "which not one of the antients or moderns had ever "ſpoken of, and conſequently was unknown till our "time, when Aquapendente propoſed it in a pub-"lic lecture of anatomy. But there are ſeveral "Phyſicians of great learning ſtill living, particu-"larly Santorio and Peter Aſſelineau, the latter "of whom is a Frenchman, who know that this obſer-"vation and diſcovery was not originally Aqua-"pendente's, but Father Paul's, who conſidering "the weight of the blood, concluded, that it could "not continue ſuſpended in the veins, if there were "not banks to keep it in, and doors, which by "opening and ſhutting might give the motion and "equilibrium neceſſary to life." Fra. Fulgentio's own words are as follow: *Di qual argomento non ſi trova ch' alcuno, ne gl' antichi, ne dé Moderni habbia fatta mentione, perche era coſá incognita ſin' a noſtri tempi, che l'Aquapendente ne moſſe la queſtione in una publica Anatomia. Ma ſono ancora viventi molti eruditiſſimi & eminentiſſimi Medici, tre queſti Santorio Santorio & Pietro Aſſelineo Franceſe, che ſanno che non fu ſpeculatione ne inventione del Acquapendente, mà del Padre, il quale conſiderando la Gravita del ſangue, venne in parere, che non poteſſe ſtare ſoſpenſo nelle vene, ſenza che vi foſſe Argine che la retineſſe, & chiúſure, ch' aprendoſi, & riſerrandoſi, gli daſſero il fluſſo & equilibrio neceſſario alla vita.* In the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (3), it is obſerved, that Johannes Leonicenus ſays, that Father Paul diſcovered the circulation of the blood, and the valves of the veins, but durſt not make the diſcovery public, for fear of expoſing himſelf to trouble, ſince he was already ſuſpected, and there wanted only ſuch a paradox to transform him into a Heretic, in a country where the Inquiſition prevails. For this reaſon he intruſted the ſecret to Aquapendente alone, who being cautious of rendering himſelf obnoxious to the rage of a great many perſons, who would treat ſuch a notion as a capital offence againſt the antients, never opened the ſecret intruſted to him by Father Paul to any, but men of whom he had not the leaſt ſuſpicion; and waited till his death before he would ſuffer his treatiſe of the *Valves* of the *Veins* to be preſented to the Republic of Venice. But becauſe in that country the ſlighteſt novelties are apt to terrify the minds of people, this treatiſe was repoſited privately in the library of St. Mark. But as Aquapendente had diſcovered the ſecret to a curious young Engliſh Gentleman, whoſe name was Harvey, and who ſtudied under him at Padua, and at the ſame time Father Paul made the ſame diſcovery in confidence to the Engliſh Embaſſador; thoſe two Engliſhmen, upon their return home, being in a country of freedom, publiſhed it, and having confirmed it by a variety of experiments, claimed the whole honour to themſelves. But Dr. George Ent, in his Letter to Dr. Harvey, prefixed to his *Apologia pro Circulatione Sanguinis*, having obſerved, that Charles Fracaſſati, in his preliminary Epiſtle to Malpighi, and John Walæus, in his firſt Epiſtle to Bartholinus, aſſert Father Paul to have been the firſt diſcoverer of the circulation of the blood; he remarks, that Dr. Harvey had long before related to him the occaſion of this ſtory, which was as follows. The Venetian Embaſſador, upon his return home, having been preſented by Dr. Harvey with his book *concerning the circulation of the blood*, lent it to Father Paul to read, who tranſcribed a great many things out of it, in order that he might remember them: theſe tranſcripts, after his death, came among his papers into the hands of his executors, and gave occaſion to ſeveral perſons to imagine, that he was the Author of thoſe Tranſcripts. And Dr. Harvey had letters from Fra. Fulgentio, Father Paul's moſt intimate friend, which ſet the affair in a clear light. *Carolus Fracaſſatus in Epiſtolâ præliminari ad Malpighium ait, Italum quendam hoc Inventum ante Harveium excoluiſſe. Is nempe eſt Pater Paulus Servita, quem Joannes Walæus* (*Epiſt.* 1. *ad Bartholinum*) *etiam in ſcenam protraxit, Circulationiſq; hujus primum Auctorem prædicat. Nimirum nec Lux eſt abſq; umbrâ, neque gloria ſine invidiâ. Iſtius autem commenti fabulam jampridem à te mihi narratam memini. Nempe Legatum Venetum ad ſuas reditum parantem libro tuo de Circulatione Sanguinis à te donatum fuiſſe, eundemq; poſtea Patri Paulo legendum exhibuiſſe; indeq; virum hunc celebrem, memoriæ cauſâ, pluſcula tranſcripſiſſe; quæ, ipſo mox defuncto, in hæredis manus inciderint; habereque te Literas a Patre Fulgentio ipſius Sodali ad te ſcriptas, quæ rem eandem clarè exprimerent.* There is a very great difficulty in this paſſage of Dr. Ent; for it is certain, that Dr. Harvey's book *de Motu Cordis* was not printed till 1628, whereas Father Paul died January 14th, 1623, and conſequently could not make extracts out of that book, unleſs Dr. Harvey gave the manuſcript of it to the Venetian Embaſſador.

(3) Mois de Juin, 1684. *Art.* 2.

[*G*] *Contracted an intimate friendſhip with Cardinal Bellarmin, and other eminent perſons.*] He became acquainted likewiſe with Cardinal Caſtagna, afterwards Pope Urban VII. and it is extremely probable, that if this Pope had enjoyed the See longer, (for he ſat in it but thirteen days) he would not have forgot his friend Father Paul. He was alſo very intimate with one of Ignatius Loyola's ten companions, who told him, that Ignatius never intended that his Society ſhould be advanced to the height, in which it then was; and that if he were to return to the world, he would not know his ſucceſſors, ſo ſurpriſingly were they changed.

[*H*] *Who*

Inquiſition at Rome [*H*]. This drew upon him great vexations for ſeveral years, all which he ſupported with exemplary patience and magnanimity, proſecuting his ſtudies of eccleſiaſtical and prophane hiſtory, of ſcripture and chriſtian morality, with more vigour than before, and writing ſeveral treatiſes. In the beginning of the 17th century, he was drawn forth from his private ſtudies into publick affairs, upon the occaſion of the diſpute between the Republic of Venice and the Court of Rome, relating to eccleſiaſtical immunities [*I*]. Father Paul being appointed one of the Divines and Conſultors of the Republic, took up his pen in defence of it; and wrote a piece upon *Excommunication* [*K*], and

[*H*] *Who being oppoſed by Father Paul, in order to revenge himſelf upon the latter, accuſed him to the Inquiſition at Rome.*] Father Paul, upon his leaving Venice to go to Rome, had left his friends under the care and direction of Colliſſoni, with whom he had formerly joined in the redreſſing of certain grievances. But Colliſſoni did not anſwer Father Paul's expectations, being guilty of great exactions; and, when the Father intended to return to Venice, diſſuaded him from it, knowing that his return would put an end to his impoſitions, and therefore artfully repreſented to him, that by ſtaying at Rome, he would not fail of making his fortune. To which Father Paul returned an anſwer in cypher, "that there was no way "of advancement at the Court of Rome but by "ſcandalous means; and that he was ſo far from "valuing the dignities there, that he had them in "abomination." After this he returned to Rome, and coming to an irreconcileable rupture with Colliſſoni, on account of his corrupt practices, the latter ſhewed this letter to Cardinal Santa Severina, who was then at the head of the Inquiſition, but did not then think proper to attack Father Paul himſelf, tho' he perſecuted him in the perſon of his friends; and particularly Friar Guilio, a man of unexceptionable conduct. But when Father Paul exerted himſelf in oppoſition to Colliſſoni's being elected General of the Order, the latter accuſed him to the Inquiſition at Rome, of holding a correſpondence with the Jews; and to aggravate his charge, produced the letter in cypher above-mentioned. He alſo engaged his nephew Santo to accuſe him to the Inquiſition at Venice, as though Father Paul had declared in a Chapter, which had been held, that recourſe muſt be had to human means, when a motion was made to implore the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, in order to appeaſe the diviſions, which prevailed in their Order. This latter charge, after the ſeveral witneſſes had been examined, being found invalid, was ſuppreſſed. And though the Inquiſitors at Rome did not think proper to continue the proſecution; yet Father Paul, on account of the letter in cypher, was conſidered as a moſt inveterate enemy to the grandeur of the Court of Rome. He was charged alſo with ſhewing too great reſpect and civility to Hereticks; which was occaſioned by this, that his vaſt reputation for learning inviting perſons of all perſuaſions, who came to Venice, to viſit him, and theſe paying him the higheſt regard, he was obliged to return their civilities. And this expoſed him to the imputation of being a favourer of Hereticks, and prevented Pope Clement VIII. from nominating him to the See of Nola, when he was ſolicited by ſome perſons in the Father's favour. This is the account of Fra. Fulgentio; and in the *Melange critique de Litterature recueilli des Converſations de feu Monſieur* Ancillon (3), we are informed, that "Father *Paul* was an intimate "friend of *Du Pleſſis Mornay*, *Diodati*, and ſeveral "eminent Proteſtants; and that when a motion was "made at Rome to beſtow on him a Cardinal's hat, "that which appeared the greateſt obſtacle to his advancement was, his having a greater correſpondence with Hereticks than Roman Catholicks. "*Diodati* informed me, *continues Monſieur* Ancillon, "that obſerving in his converſations with Father "*Paul*, that in many opinions he agreed with the "Proteſtants, he ſaid that he was extremely rejoiced "to find him not far from the Kingdom of Heaven; "and therefore ſtrongly exhorted him to profeſs the "Proteſtant Religion publickly. But Father *Paul* anſwered, that it was better for him, like St. *Paul*, "to be *Anathema* for his brethren; and that he did "more ſervice to the Proteſtant Religion in wearing "that habit, than he could do by laying it aſide. . . . "The elder Monſieur *Daillé* told me, that in going "to and coming from Rome with Monſieur de Villarnoud, Grandſon to Monſieur du Pleſſis Mornay, "whoſe Preceptor he was; he paſſed by Venice, and "viſited Father Paul, to whom Du Pleſſis Mornay "had recommended him by letters: that having de"livered them to the Father, he diſcovered the high"eſt eſteem for the illuſtrious Monſieur *Du Pleſſis* "*Mornay*; that he gave the kindeſt reception to Mr. "*Villarnoud* his Grandſon, and even to Monſieur "*Daillé*. That afterwards Monſieur Daillé became "very intimate with Father *Paul* and *Fra. Fulgentio* "his companion, who alſo was a perſon of great in"tegrity and abilities, and who afterwards wrote "that Father's life, which is very well drawn up." After the death of *Coliſſoni*, *Santo* his Nephew, ſucceeding him in the direction of the affairs of the Order, endeavoured to oppreſs Father Paul, knowing that as long as the Father ſhould be concerned in any influence in the Government of the Order, it would be impoſſible for himſelf to continue his unjuſt practices. He objected therefore to the Father, in a Chapter of the Order, three trifling articles, which were treated with contempt by the whole Aſſembly. The firſt was his wearing a ſquare cap, contrary to the prohibition made under Pope Gregory XIV. The ſecond was, his uſing ſlippers after the French mode; Santo falſely affirming, that all, who wore ſuch ſlippers, were, by the prohibition, diſqualified from giving their votes. Thirdly, that he never at the end of the Maſs ſaid the *Salve Regina*. Father Paul's ſlippers being taken by the Judge's Order, it became a Proverb, *Eſſor il Padre Paolo coſi incolpabile & integro, che ſivio le' ſue pianiſſe erano ſtate canonizate*, i. e. "Father Paul is ſo irreproachable and free from all "ſcandal, that his very ſlippers were canonized." Santo's complaints were therefore rejected; ſome time after which he went to Rome, where living in a very extravagant manner, he was obliged to retire to the Iſle of Candy, and there ſetting up for a Merchant, he ſoon died, having ſpent his whole fortune.

(3) Tom. 2. p. 288 *& ſeq.* edit. 1698, in 12mo.

[*I*] *The diſpute between the Republic of Venice and the Court of Rome, relating to eccleſiaſtical immunities.*] About the year 1603, the Republic of Venice made ſeveral injunctions againſt lay-perſons giving lands or goods to the church, without licenſe from the Civil Magiſtrate; and in that inhibition they aſſigned theſe reaſons, "that when any goods or lands once came "into the hands of the Eccleſiaſtics, they were not "ſubject to alienation; by which means, as the "Laity at their death were charitable even to exceſs, "the Clergy grew every day more numerous, and "pretended an exemption from all public ſervice and "taxes, and from all ſecular juriſdiction, ſo that "the burthen grew thereby too heavy to be born by "the Laity." Another occaſion of the difference was, that about this time complaints were made by the Venetians againſt two Clergymen, *viz. Brandolino Valde-Marino*, Abbot of Nerveze, and *Scipione Saracino*, Canon of Vicenza; the firſt as being guilty of rapine and theft, accuſed of poiſoning his father and brother, of inceſt with his ſiſter, of having cauſed ſeveral perſons to be aſſaſſinated, and of employing magic to corrupt women: the latter, for having broken off the ſeals put upon the Biſhop's Court by the Magiſtrates, and for having attempted the chaſtity of a widow of quality, with moſt villainous outrages. Theſe two having been long complained of at Rome in the name of the Senate, and no ſatisfaction given to them, they ſeized the Abbot and the Canon, and committed them to priſon. The juſtice or injuſtice of ſuch or the like power then uſed by the Venetians had formerly been debated between the former Pope Clement VIII. and that Republic; but upon that Pope's death, Paul V. who ſucceeded him (tho' not immediately, yet in the ſame year) being a man of a much hotter temper, brought this difference

[*K*], and revived another Tract upon the ſame ſubject formerly compoſed by *John Gerſon* [*L*], which he printed in Latin and Italian, and prefixed it to an anonymous letter, in which he exhorted the Prieſts to perform their ordinary Functions, without any apprehenſion that this was contrary to their duty. This piece being condemned by the Inquiſition, and attacked by Bellarmin, Father Paul publiſhed *Apologia per le Oppoſitioni fatte dal Cardinale Bellarmino alli Trattati & Reſolutioni di Gio. Gerſone ſopra la Validità delle Scommuniche*, printed at Venice 1606, in 4to. This was followed by another Tract of his, entitled, *Conſiderationi ſopra le Cenſure di Paolo* V. which was attacked by ſeveral Writers, particularly Father Bovio, in his *Riſpoſta alle Conſiderationi dal Paolo da Venetia ſopra le Cenſure di Paolo* V. printed at Rome 1606, in 8vo. In anſwer to which there was publiſhed *Confirmationi delle Conſiderationi de P. M. Paulo di Venetia contra le Oppoſitioni del Gio. Ant. Bovio*, Venice 1606, in 4to. the materials of which ſeem to have been collected by Father Fulgentio, and the whole methodized by Father Paul. He drew up alſo in a few days a Supplement to the Hiſtory of the *Uſcocchi* (*b*), entitled, *Aggionta e Continuatione all' Hiſtoria de gl' Uſcocchi, col Manifeſto*; and wrote a little piece, entitled, *De Jure Aſylorum Petri Sarpi J. C.* and made an extract of a Tract of his, compoſed by order of the Government, concerning the Immunity of ſacred places within the Dominions of the Venetians. He compoſed likewiſe a work on the *Inquiſition of Venice*; and had a conſiderable ſhare in the *Treatiſe concerning the Interdict*, publiſhed in the name of the ſeven Divines of the Republick [*M*]; which book contains nineteen propoſitions, proving, that the Interdict was contrary to all Laws; that the Eccleſiaſticks were ſo far from being obliged to pay any regard to it, that they could not ſubmit to it with innocence; and that the Government ought to prevent the execution of it. He drew up alſo the plan of a work on the *Sovereignty of Princes* [*N*]. He managed the controverſy with great temper; and while the writers in defence of the Court of Rome were daily publiſhing the moſt ſcandalous Satires againſt the Republick of Venice and himſelf, he was one of the ten Cenſors appointed to inſpect all books deſigned for the preſs, in order that nothing defamatory might be publiſhed againſt that Court. However, that Court was ſo exaſperated againſt him, as to cite him by a decree of October 30, 1606, under pain of excommunication, to appear in perſon at Rome, in order to anſwer to the charges of Hereſies urged againſt him. But inſtead of appearing, he publiſhed a Manifeſto, ſhewing the invalidity of the ſummons, and afterwards drew up a piece of ſome length, which was preſented to the Pope, wherein he repreſented ſeveral manifeſt Hereſies and tyrannical Doctrines contained in the writings of thoſe, who pretended to defend the Pope's cauſe in this controverſy. He offered likewiſe to diſpute with any of the Pope's Advocates in a place of ſafety, on the articles laid to his charge; promiſing at the ſame to retract immediately any errors, in which he might be found. In April 1607, the controverſy between the Republick and the Court of Rome was ended by the interpoſition of the King of France [*O*]; and Father Paul, though extremely odious to the Pope's party, was

(*b*) A people of Auſtrian Croatia, whoſe anceſtors were Dalmatians, who flying from the tyranny of the Turks, retired to Cliſſa, and afterwards to Segna.

with the Venetians to a much higher contention; alledging, that thoſe late acts of the Senate were a diminution of his juſt power; and limited a time of twenty-four days for the revocation of them; threatning, if he were not obeyed, to proceed to excommunication of the Republic, who ſtill offered to ſhew both reaſon and antient cuſtom to warrant their actions. But this Pope, contrary to his predeceſſors's moderation, required abſolute obedience without diſputes. Thus it continued for about a year, the Pope ſtill threatning excommunication, and the Venetians ſtill anſwering him with fair ſpeeches, and no compliance; till at laſt the Pope's zeal for the Apoſtolic See induced him in April 1606, to excommunicate the Duke, the whole Senate, and all their dominions; and then to ſhut up all their churches, charging the whole Clergy to forbear all ſacred offices to the Venetians, till their obedience ſhould render them capable of abſolution. But this act of the Pope did but the more confirm the Venetians in their reſolutions not to obey him; and to that end, upon the hearing of the Pope's *Interdict*, they publiſhed by ſound of trumpet a proclamation to this effect; "That whoſoever hath received from Rome any "copy of a Papal Interdict, publiſhed there, as well "againſt the law of God, as againſt the honour of "this Nation, ſhall immediately bring it to the "Council of Ten upon pain of death." Then Duado their Embaſſador at Rome was recalled; and the Inquiſition ſuſpended by order of the State.

[*K*] *Wrote a piece upon* Excommunication.] It was afterwards publiſhed in Holland in French, under this title, *Droits des Souverains defendus contre les Excommunications, &c.* i. e. "The rights of Sovereigns "defended againſt Excommunications, &c." But the Italian original was intitled, *Conſolation of Mind, to quiet the Conſciences of thoſe, who live well, againſt the Terrors of the Interdict, publiſhed by Paul* V.

[*L*] *Revived another tract upon the ſame ſubject, formerly compoſed by* John Gerſon.] He publiſhed it in Latin and Italian at Venice 1606, in 4to.

[*M*] *He had a conſiderable ſhare in the* Treatiſe concerning the Interdict, *publiſhed in the name of the ſeven Divines of the Republic.*] In the French tranſlation of this treatiſe, which was printed in 1607 at St. Vincent, and is ſaid in the title-page to be done from the copy printed at Venice by Robert Mejetti, in 1606, there are only ſix Divines named, viz. *Pietro Antonio*, Archdeacon and Vicar-General of Venice; *Fra. Paolo*, of the Order of the Servites, and Divine of the moſt Serene Republic of Venice; *Fra. Bernardo Jordano*, Cordelier of the Obſervance, Divine; *Fra. Marc-Antonio Capelli*, Conventual Cordelier, Divine; *Fra. Camilli*, an Auguſtinian, Divine; and *Fra. Fulgentio*, of the Order of the Servites, Divine.

[*N*] *He drew up alſo a plan of a work on the* Sovereignty of Princes.] Fra. Fulgentio tells us, that "this plan is ſo finely drawn up, that we may juſtly "preſume it would, if finiſhed, have been the nobleſt "and moſt important work, that ever was publiſhed; "and was to have conſiſted of 206 chapters."

[*O*] *In April* 1607, *the controverſy between the Republic and Court of Rome was ended, by the Interpoſition of the King of France.*] Fra. Fulgentio tells us, that this affair was tranſacted at Rome by Cardinal Perron, by order of the King of France. But ſome Writers are of opinion, that this accommodation between the Venetians and the Pope was owing to the miſconduct of King James I. and that if he had ſupported the Venetians, the latter would have abſolutely

was comprehended in the accommodation. However, on the 5th of October following he was attacked in his return to his Convent by five Aſſaſſins, who gave him fifteen wounds, and

ly divided the See of Rome. Mr. Iſaac Walton (4) obſerves, that during the diſpute, it was reported abroad, that " the Venetians were all turned Proteſ- " tants; which was believed by many, for that it " was obſerved, the Engliſh Embaſſador (5) was ſo " often in conference with the Senate, and his Chap- " lain, Mr. *Bedell* (6) more often with Father *Paul*; " and alſo for that the Republic of Venice was " known to give Commiſſion to Gregory Juſtiniano, " then their Embaſſador in England, to make all " their proceedings known to the King of England, " and to crave a promiſe of his aſſiſtance, if need " ſhould require. And in the mean time they re- " quired the King's advice and judgment; which " was the ſame, which he gave to Pope Clement at " his coming to the crown of England, (that Pope " then moving him to an union with the Roman " church) namely, *To endeavour the calling of a free* " *Council for the ſettlement of peace in Chriſtendom*; and " *that he doubted not, but that the French King, and* " *divers other Princes, would join to aſſiſt in ſo good a* " *work, and in the mean time, the ſin of this breach,* " *both with his and the Venetians dominions, muſt of ne-* " *ceſſity lye at the Pope's door.* In this contention, " which laſted almoſt two years, the Pope grew ſtill " higher, and the Venetians more and more re- " ſolved and careleſs; ſtill acquainting King James " with their proceedings, which was done by the " help of Sir *Henry Wotton*, Mr. *Bedell*, and *Padre* " *Paulo*, whom the Venetians did then call to be one " of their Conſultors of State, and with his pen to de- " fend their juſt cauſe: which was by him ſo perform- " ed, that the Pope ſaw plainly, he had weakened his " power by exceeding it, and offered the Venetians " abſolution upon very eaſy terms; which the Vene- " tians ſtill ſlighting, did at laſt obtain, by that " which was ſcarce ſo much as a ſhew of acknow- " ledging it. For they made an order, that in that " day, in which they were abſolved, there ſhould be " no public rejoicing, nor any bonfires that night, " leſt the common people might judge, that they de- " ſired an abſolution, or were abſolved for committing " a fault." Dr. Burnet (7) tells us, *that the breach be-* *tween the Pope and the Republic was brought very near a criſis, ſo it was expected a total ſeparation, not only from* the Court, but the Church of Rome, *was likely to follow it. It was ſet on by* P. Paulo, *and the ſeven* (8) *Divines, with much zeal, and was very pru- dently conducted by them. In order to the advancing of it, King* James *ordered his Embaſſador to offer all poſſi- ble aſſiſtance, and to accuſe the Pope and the Papacy, as the chief Authors of all the miſchiefs of Chriſtendom . . .* P. Paulo, *and the ſeven Divines, preſſed Mr.* Bedell *to move the Embaſſador to preſent King* James's Premonition to all Chriſtian Princes and States, *then put in Latin, to the Senate, and they were confident it would produce a great effect. But the Embaſſador could not be prevailed with to do it at that time, and pretended, that ſince St.* James's *day was not far off, it would be more proper to do it on that day. If this was only for the ſake of a ſpeech, that he made on the conceit of St.* James's *day, and King* James's *book, with which he had pretended to preſent it, it was a weakneſs never to be excuſed. But if this was only a pretence, and that there was a deſign un- der it, it was a crime never to be forgiven. All that* Bedell *could ſay or do to perſuade him not to put off a thing of ſuch importance, was in vain; and, indeed, I can hardly think that* Wotton *was ſo weak a man, as to have acted ſincerely in this matter. Before St.* James's *day came . . . the difference was made up, and the hap- py opportunity was loſt; ſo that when he had his audience on that day, in which he preſented the book, all the an- ſwer he could get was, that they thanked the King of England for his good-will, but they were now reconciled to the Pope.* Dr. Hickes has the following remark upon this paſſage (9): " Behold here a ſtory as falſe as " formal; and great pity it is, that Sir *Henry Wotton*'s " heir, if any ſuch be now alive to repreſent him, " ſhould not have the benefit of an action againſt " our hiſtorian, to repair the honour of his anceſtor, " which is ſo deeply wounded by him. For if this " ſtory were punctually true, it would not bear the " ſevere reflections, which he hath made upon Sir " *Henry* for it, becauſe he might not think fit to fol- " low his Chaplain's advice, without order from the " King his maſter, which he might hope to receive " before St. *James*'s day, and yet for private reaſons, " not think fit to tell his Chaplain the reaſon of his " delay. But the ſtory muſt needs be falſe, becauſe " the King's book, of which he makes mention, was " not then extant. For the Pope and the Venetians " were reconciled in April 1607 (10), and the King's " *Præmonition* came not out till 1609. Nor will it " help him to ſay, that this was only a miſtake of " the *Præmonition* for the *Apology*, which was reprint- " ed with it, and to which, in the King's own " phraſe, it was a *Preamble*; for the firſt edition of " the *Apology* was as little extant before the Recon- " ciliation mentioned, as the *Præmonition*. For that " which occaſioned the King's writing the Apology, " as himſelf tells us, was the two Breves ſent over by " the Pope, and Cardinal *Bellarmin*'s letter; and " the latter of the Breves bares date from Rome but " in Auguſt 23d, 1607, and the letter September " 28th following. By which it appears, that the " reconciliation was made ſeveral months before ei- " ther of theſe were written, and longer before they " could come to the King's hand, longer yet before " he could finiſh the *Apology* in *Engliſh*, and again " longer before it could be put into Latin. From " whence it appears, that this fine-told ſtory, which " ſo diſhonours the memory of Sir *Henry Wotton*, to " honour that of his Chaplain, is a pure fiction, and " as much the birth of ſome body's brain, as ever a- " ny thing the vanity of *Varillas* wrote was his." Dr. *James Welwood* tells us (11), that *as in moſt foreign tranſactions King James was unhappy, ſo more particu- larly in the difference between Pope Paul and the Vene- tians. There appeared at that time a wonderful diſ- poſition in that State to work a reformation in the Church, and throw off the Papal yoke. In order to ad- vance it, King James diſpatches Sir Henry Wotton his Embaſſador to Venice, and hearing Spain had declared for the Pope, he declared for the Venetians, and ac- quainted Juſtinian, their Embaſſador in England, that he would not only aſſiſt them with all the forces of his Kingdom, but engage his Allies in their defence. At Sir Henry Wotton's arrival, the breach between the Pope and the Republic was brought very near a criſis; ſo that a total ſeparation was expected, not only from the Court, but the Church of Rome; which was ſet on by the learn- ed Padre Paulo, and the ſeven Divines of the State, with much zeal, and conducted with as much prudence. The Embaſſador, at his audience, offered all poſſible aſ- ſiſtance in his Maſter's name, and accuſed the Pope and Papacy of being the chief Authors of all the miſchiefs in Chriſtendom. This was received with great deference and reſpect to King James. And when the Pope's Nun- cio objected, that King James was not a Catholic, and ſo was not to be relied upon; the Doge took him up briſkly, and told him, that* the King of England believed in Jeſus Chriſt, but he did not know in whom ſome others believed. *King James ſent with Wotton his* Premonition to all Chriſtian Princes and States, *tran- ſlated into Latin, to be preſented to the Senate; which Padre Paulo, and the other Divines, preſſed might be done at his firſt audience, telling him, they were confident it would have a very good effect. The Embaſſador could not be prevailed with, alledging he had poſitive orders to wait till St. James's day, which was not far off. This conceit of preſenting King James's book on St. James's day ſpoiled all; for before that day came, the difference was made up, and the happy opportunity loſt. So that when he had his audience on St. James's day, and had preſented the book, all the anſwer he got was,* " that " they thanked the King of England for his good- " will, but they were now reconciled to the Pope, " and that therefore they were reſolved not to ad- " mit of any change in their religion, according to " their agreement with the Court of Rome." But this paſſage, which ſeems partly borrowed from that of Dr. Burnet cited above, is liable to the ſame ob- jections.

(4) *Life of Sir Henry Wotton.*

(5) Sir Henry Wotton.

(6) William Bedell, afterwards Biſhop of Kilmore in Ireland.

(7) *Life of Biſhop Bedell*, p. 12 *& ſeqq.*

(8) This is a miſtake of Dr. Burnet, for Father Paul was himſelf one of the Seven, there being but ſix employed by the Senate beſides.

(9) *Some Diſcourſes upon Dr. Burnet and Dr. Tillotſon, occaſioned by the late funeral Sermon of the former upon the latter*, p. 30, 31. edit. London 1695, in 4to.

(10) See *Interdicti Veneti Hiſtoria*, tranſlated by Bedell into Latin from the Italian, p. 218. edit. London 1626, in 4to.

(11) *Memoirs of the moſt material Tranſactions in England for the laſt hundred years preceding the Revolution*, p. 34 *& ſeqq.* edit. London 1700, in 8vo.

and left him for dead [*P*], and retired then to the Palace of the Pope's Nuncio in Venice, from whence they eſcaped that evening either to Ravenna or Ferrara. Theſe circumſtances diſcovered who were at the bottom of this attempt; and our Author himſelf could not forbear ſaying pleaſantly, that the wounds were made *Stilo Romanæ Curiæ*. How ſcandalous ſoever this deſign againſt his life was, it was attempted again more than once afterwards, and

[*P*] *On the 5th of October following he was attacked, in his return to his Convent, by five Aſſaſſins, who gave him fifteen wounds, and left him for dead.*] In a letter of his dated at Venice December 11, 1607 (12), he gives this account of the affair. "And ſince I am "ſpeaking of promiſes, it puts me in mind, that I "am bound to give you ſome account of the happy "eſcape I had on the 5th of October, when three "bravo's ſet upon me behind and before in ſuch a "manner, that neither my ſervant nor myſelf were "aware of them. They gave me three ſtabs, two "in my neck, and one in my temples, all of them "above four fingers deep, with a ſtilletto or dag-"ger, which they thought was poiſoned. It pleaſed "God, that all the wounds went ſlanting, ſo that "the daggers run in all that way but little within "the fleſh, and I am now in no great danger; which "is a bleſſing, that I acknowledge due only to the "mercy of God, who was pleaſed to ſhew me ſuch "a ſtrange and ſignal deliverance. I make no doubt "but they might have murdered me a thouſand "times upon the place, if God's protection had not "prevented them. He be ever praiſed for it. I "ſhould not be againſt dying for that cauſe, which "theſe men undertook to do me miſchief for; "nor am I much concerned, that I was not killed, "excepting *that it hath pleaſed the Divine Majeſty to "let me ſtill live and do further ſervice to that very "cauſe*." Fra. Fulgentio relates the circumſtances of the Aſſaſſination in the following manner. As the Father was returning in the evening from the Palace of St. Mark to his Convent, he was attacked by five Aſſaſſins, armed with ſtilletto's and other weapons, who gave him fifteen thruſts, three of which only did execution. He received two wounds in the neck, and the third was made by the ſtilletto's entering his right ear, and coming out between the noſe and right cheek; and ſo violent was the ſtab, that the Aſſaſſin was obliged to leave his weapon in the wound. It was very extraordinary, that the villain did not pierce him in any part of the body, where the wound would have been mortal, the Father making not the leaſt reſiſtance. It is remarkable, that Father Paul had never ſtirred abroad before without three companions at leaſt for three months till this day, when he was only attended by *Fra. Marino*, his ſervant, *Fra. Fulgentio* being gone to ſee the ruins made by a fire lately broke out in Venice. *Fra. Marino* was ſeized and bound by ſome of the Aſſaſſins, whilſt others of them drawing their ſwords, and preſenting their Muſkets, kept off ſuch as might come to help him. *Marino* was ſo terrified at what he ſaw, that he ran away with the utmoſt precipitation; but *Aleſſandro Malipiero*, an old Gentleman, who had a great affection for Father *Paul*, walking before him, when the Aſſaſſins were gone, turning back, and ſeeing the ſtilletto ſticking in the Father's face, drew it out, and called for aſſiſtance, as likewiſe did ſome women, who had ſeen the whole affair from their windows. It happened unluckily, that the players were that evening to repreſent a celebrated Comedy, which drew ſuch crowds of people to the Theatre, that very few were left in that part of the city, where the Father was attacked; and this gave the Aſſaſſins an opportunity of eſcaping to a Gondola, which had been prepared for them, and conveyed them to the Palace of the Pope's Nuncio in Venice; whence they fled that evening to Ravenna or Ferrara. The populace hearing of what was done, ſurrounded the Nuncio's Palace, and would have ſtormed it with the utmoſt fury, if the Council of Ten had not ſent a guard to protect it. Father Paul being come to himſelf, and having had his wounds dreſſed, told thoſe about him, that the firſt two wounds, which he had received, ſeemed like two flaſhes of fire, which ſhot upon him at the ſame inſtant; and that at the third wound, he thought himſelf loaded, as it were with a prodigious weight, which oppreſſed and ſtunned his ſenſes. The chief of the Aſſaſſins was *Ridolfo Pomâ*, a bankrupt Merchant of Venice, who retiring to Rome, was highly careſſed there, and particularly by Cardinal Borgheſe, Nephew to the Pope. The other four were *Aleſſandro Pereſio* of *Ancona*, *Giovanni* of *Florence*, *Paſquale* of *Bitonto*, and *Michael Viti* of *Bergamo*, a Prieſt belonging to the Church of Trinity in Venice, who ſerved as a guide to them, and uſed to viſit *Frâ. Fulgentio*, and diſcourſe with him upon religious ſubjects; "ſo commonly, ſays Fulgentio, "is Religion made uſe of as an inſtrument to perpe-"trate the moſt ſhocking deſigns by thoſe, whoſe "circumſtances are deſperate, or who being infa-"tuated by powerful errors, are hurried away by a "blind obedience." *Coſi facilmente & ordinariamente la Religione è fatta iſtromento delle piu gran ſceleraggini di quelli, che ò ſono cadute alla deſtra, ò aſſaſcinati da potente errore, con ubbidienza cieca ſi laſciano guidare.* The ruffians met with great favour for ſome time at Rome; but not being rewarded according to their expectation, and murmuring upon that account againſt the Pope and Cardinal *Borgheſe*, both of whom, ſome ſay, they threatned to murder, they were obliged to leave Rome, and afterwards came to a miſerable end. But to return to Father *Paul*, as ſoon as his wounds were dreſſed, he received the Communion with the utmoſt humility, beſeeching the Fathers, who all ſtood weeping round him, not to let any ſearch be made after the aſſaſſins, all of whom, he ſaid, were unknown to him, and conſequently that he had not offended them in any manner; declaring that he freely forgave them. The only thing, that he deſired, was, that the Senate would appoint a guard for the ſecurity of his perſon for the future, in caſe Heaven ſhould prolong his life. He deſired to be attended only by a young Surgeon; but the Senate being greatly ſolicitous for his recovery, ordered all the eminent Phyſicians and Surgeons of Venice to uſe their utmoſt endeavours to ſave his life. *Aquapendente* and *Adrian Spigelius* were particularly ordered not to ſtir out of the Convent, till it ſhould be certainly known whether he would recover or not. This was long doubtful; for the wounds being very dangerous in themſelves, were ſtill more ſo, on account of the delicate conſtitution of the patient, who before was a mere Skeleton; to which we may add his prodigious loſs of blood, and the extreme pain, which he was obliged to undergo, through the various opinions of the Phyſicians. He ſuffered inexpreſſible torture from the dilating of the orifices; and his jaw-bone being broken, inflammations enſued, which were attended with a violent fever, till at laſt he was perfectly cured; the ſcars remained in thoſe places where he had been ſtabbed. Malipiero, who had drawn the ſtilletto out of his head, deſiring to have it, as thinking it his due, it was at laſt civilly refuſed for this reaſon, that as the Father had eſcaped ſo miraculouſly, it was fit that the bloody inſtrument ſhould be preſerved as a public monument; and therefore it was hung up at the feet of a crucifix, in the Church of the Servites, with the following inſcription, *Deo Filio Liberatori*, i. e. "To God the Son, "the Deliverer." The Senate of Venice, to ſhew their high regard for the Father, and deteſtation of this horrid attempt, broke up immediately upon the news, and with the deepeſt grief in their countenances came in ſuch numbers that very night to the Convent of the Servites, that one would have concluded it to have been the place of their Aſſembly. They ſent money to the Convent to defray the expence of the cure; and beſides the daily concourſe of the chief Senators, ſome of the principal Magiſtrates were appointed to viſit him every day; and the Phyſicians were ordered to come into the Senate, to acquaint them of the ſtate of the Father's health. The Republic afterwards knighted *Aquapendente*, and preſented him with rich chains and gold medals, for the great care he had taken of Father Paul.

The

(12) See *The Letters of Father Paul, tranſlated out of the Italian by Edward Brown, Rector of Sundridge in Kent*, Letter 2. p. 6 edit. Lond. 1693, in 8vo.

and even Monks and thoſe of his own Order were employed in thoſe deſigns [Q]. The Senate took all imaginable precautions for his ſecurity, and he himſelf determined to live in a more private manner than before. In this receſs he applied himſelf to the writing of his

The moſt ſevere penalties were enacted againſt the aſſaſſins; and large rewards promiſed to thoſe who might kill or ſeize any perſon, who ſhould make any attempt on his life, or diſcover any conſpiracy forming againſt him. They gave the Father leave to go always with armed attendants for his ſecurity, and appointed him an houſe near the Palace of St. Mark, where he might lodge in ſafety. However, he could never be prevailed with to quit his convent; only ſome little galleries were built adjoining to his chamber, in order that he might always go abroad by water, and never be obliged to return home in the night-time through the narrow lanes and alleys, when he came from publick buſineſs.

[Q] *His life was attempted again more than once afterwards, and even Monks, and thoſe of his Order, were employed in thoſe deſigns.*] In 1609, a new conſpiracy againſt his life was diſcovered, the particulars of which were as follow. *Bernardo*, a young Friar, who was highly careſſed by Cardinal *Borgheſe*, prevailed with the General of the Order of the Servites, to ſend to Padua a Friar named *Gio. Franceſco* of Perugia, upon pretence of proſecuting his ſtudies in that Univerſity. The little diſtance there is between Padua and Venice gave *Franceſco* an opportunity of going often to the Convent of Servites at Venice, where he contracted a friendſhip with *Fra. Antonio* of Viterbo, who was Father *Paul*'s Amanuenſis. Theſe two Friars were townſmen, and had formerly been great friends. Father Paul was not pleaſed with this intimacy between them; but he only hinted his diſlike to *Fra. Antonio*. However, upon this, the latter was viſited no more by *Franceſco* in the uſual place, but they met elſewhere, and wrote letters to each other, which they ſent by a Jew. It happened one day, that when *Antonio* was not at home, the Jew delivered one of theſe letters to another Friar, telling him at the ſame time, that he was always the meſſenger upon theſe occaſions, but that he intended to be ſo no longer, becauſe he did not know what buſineſs they were upon. The Friar carrying this letter to Father *Paul*, the latter gave it afterwards to *Antonio*, charging him to break off his correſpondence with *Franceſco* upon pain of being diſmiſſed his ſervice. Antonio made the beſt excuſe he could, but ſtill continued to meet *Franceſco* privately at a certain woman's houſe, till ſuch time as the affair was ripe for execution. One morning, at day break, theſe two Friars being together in the Sacriſty, where they had a long conference, *Franceſco* took out a great piece of wax, which drawing with it a packet of letters, theſe dropped on the ground, unperceived by the two Friars, and were taken up after they were gone by the Sacriſtan, who carried them to *Fulgentio*. The latter found theſe letters all written in cypher, whence he concluded, that they concealed ſome myſtery. He afterwards diſcovered, that *Bernardo* had written to *Franceſco*, to deſire that he would preſs *Antonio* to diſpatch this *Quadrageſimale*; that the nine hundred crowns were ready for him; and that he might depend on the twelve thouſand crowns more, and even a larger ſum. In ſome of the letters he ſaid, that he had ſpoken with the *Signor Padre*, i. e. "the Lord Fa-"ther," in other places, with *il Fratello*, i. e. *the Brother*; and it appeared, that none of the perſons mentioned, except the General of the Order of the Servites, were under the degree of Cardinal. He told him likewiſe, that the General of the Servites bid him not doubt, but that he ſhould be beatified; and that they all wiſhed for this *Quadrageſimale*. Theſe letters being ſhewn to Father *Paul*, he immediate ſuſpected the purport of them; but earneſtly deſired *Fulgentio* not to take the leaſt notice of any thing, till they ſhould have got more light into the affair; declaring that in the mean time he would diſmiſs *Antonio* from his ſervice. *Fulgentio*, however, carried this packet, conſiſting of eight letters at leaſt, to one of the Inquiſitors of State; upon which *Franceſco*, and afterwards *Antonio* were ſeized. The affair being examined into, it appeared, that under the word *Quadrageſimale*, the attempts were concealed. The firſt was this: that as the Father, on account of a relaxation of the *ſphincter ani*, was obliged to have that part ſhaved once a week, and would not truſt any perſon on this occaſion but his ſervant *Antonio*; this Friar ſhould take this opportunity of giving Father *Paul* a mortal wound with the razor. But *Antonio* excuſed himſelf from undertaking this by ſaying, that he always fainted at the ſight of blood; and that he could not be ſo cruel as to murder his benefactor in ſo barbarous a manner. The ſecond attempt was the ſending of poiſon from Rome to mix with the Father's victuals or drink, *perche con una fava havrebbono preſe due columbe*, as they expreſſed it, *i. e.* "that they might catch two Pigeons with "one bean;" by which they meant, that Father *Paul* and *Fulgentio* might both be deſtroyed by the ſame doſe. But this was judged too hazardous, as it would be ſcarce poſſible to poiſon theſe two Fathers, without diſpatching thirty more at the ſame time, ſince the ſame food was prepared for them all without diſtinction: beſides, that all ſuch food, as was given to the two Fathers, was always inſpected very carefully ever ſince they had both been taken extremely ill with eating only a little biſket. The third attempt, which the two Friars approved as moſt eaſy and ſafe, was, that *Antonio* ſhould take the impreſſion of the keys of the Father's cell with the wax above-mentioned; and by this means getting other keys made, let in Ruffians in the dead of night, to murder the Father in his bed. The affair being brought before the Council of Ten, they pronounced as follows. That *Franceſco* ſhould be hanged, unleſs he, in a certain time mentioned in the ſentence, ſhould make a diſcovery of the whole conſpiracy; upon which condition he ſhould be impriſoned only for twelve months, and afterwards be baniſhed for ever from the Dominions of the Republick. The Senate alſo cauſed his chambers at Padua to be ſearched, in a private corner of which ſuch letters and cyphers were found, as ſufficiently cleared up the dark ſcene, and at the ſame time brought to light many other particulars; all which, ſays *Fulgentio*, the Senate, out of the reſpect which they bore to Religion, induſtriouſly concealed. Notwithſtanding the horridneſs of this attempt, Father Paul ſhewed his uſual compaſſion, and requeſted on his knees, that the criminals might not be put to death; and it is thought, that the commutation of the ſentence was owing to his intreaties. Several other conſpiracies were afterwards formed againſt his life, ſome of which were revealed to him by thoſe, who did it in view of being rewarded; and others were diſcovered to the inquiſitors of State. One of theſe plots was to carry him off alive out of the Dominions of the Venetians; but this deſign was afterwards laid aſide. We ſhall be a little more particular in the following relation. A young man arrived at Venice in a military habit; but behaving very aukwardly in it, was ſuſpected to be a Prieſt in diſguiſe. This man employed every artifice to get acceſs to Father *Paul*, upon pretence that he wanted to inform him of ſome particulars, which concerned his life; ſaying, that he would willingly conſent to come unarmed into his preſence. He always ſpoke to *Fulgentio* on theſe occaſions; and at laſt told him, that he was a near relation of Cardinal *Baronius*, but had loſt his favour. *Fulgentio* aſſuring him once for all, that he could never be admitted to the Father, but that if he wanted money, he ſhould be ſupplied with ſome; the man was ſurprized at the offer, and fixing his eyes ſtedfaſtly on *Fulgentio*, ſaid to him, *Guardatevi da Traditori, che n'havete biſogno, &c.* i. e. "Take care of traytors. God preſerve you all; "for I find you are not ſuch people as you were re-"preſented." Soon after this he left Venice, and was never heard of afterwards.

his *History of the Council of Trent* [*R*], for which he had begun to collect materials long before. His name ever since the Interdict was become very famous over all Europe, so that many great personages went to Italy to converse with him; and several Princes honoured

[*R*] *In his recess he applied himself to the writing of his* History of the Council of Trent.] Mr. Isaac Walton (13) tells us, that the contests between the Court of Rome and the Republick of Venice "were "the occasion of *Padre Paulo's* knowledge and inte- "rest with King James, for whose sake principally "*Padre Paulo* compiled that eminent History of the "remarkable Council of Trent; which History was, "as fast as it was written, sent in several sheets in let- "ters by Sir *Henry Wotton*, Mr. *Bedell*, and others, "unto King James and the then Bishop of Canter- "bury into England, and there first made publick, "both in English and in the universal language." And Dr. Burnet (14) observes, that Father Paul gave Mr. *Bedell* the manuscript of the *History of the Council of Trent*. But these two writers are undoubtedly mistaken; for Mr. *Bedell* left Venice in 1610. whereas in a letter of Sir Henry Wotton to the King, written in 1619, and entitled, *A Report of my Negotiation in Germany, and of some particularities occurring in my journey* (15); that History is mentioned as a work then in hand, or but newly finished. Sir Henry's words are as follow. "I acquainted them [*the Princes of Ger-* "*many*] how greedy the Italians were of our Trea- "tises in matter of controversy, and of divers ways, "that had been used both to excite and satisfy that "curiosity, both by the works of the Archbishop of "*Spalato*, since his retirement into your Majesty's "protection; and of a discourse, that was ready to "come abroad, wherein should be discovered by a "great intelligent man, even of their own breeding, "all the practices of the Council of *Trent*, out of "the original registers and secret papers; wherein "your Majesty had a hand, for the benefit of the chris- "tian world." *Fra. Fulgentio* informs us, that *Camillo Olivo*, who had been Secretary to one of the Legates at the Council of *Trent*, gave Father *Paul* great lights into the transactions of that Council, that Secretary having had a considerable share in all the Negotia- tions, and known the most secret particulars of it. He shewed the Father several writings and memoirs, which he had read over with great attention, and took notes of what was most remarkable. This His- tory was printed first at London 1619, in folio, and dedicated to King James I. by the Archbishop of Spalato. It was afterwards translated into Latin, English, French, and other languages; and a new translation of it into French by Dr. Le Courayer, was published at London 1736, in two volumes in folio; and reprinted at Amsterdam 1736, in two volumes in 4to. under this title. *Histoire du Concile de Trente, ecrite en Italien par Fra. Paolo Sarpi de l'Ordre des Servites, & traduite de nouveau en François avec des Notes critiques, Historiques, & Theologiques, par Pierre François Le Courayer, Docteur en Theologie de l'Université d'Oxford, & Chanoine Regulier & ancien Bibliothecaire de l'Abbaye de Ste Genevieve de Paris.*

(13) *Life of Sir Henry Wotton.*

(14) *Life of Bishop Bedell*, p. 17.

(15) See *Reliquiæ Wottonianæ*, p. 486 & *seqq.* 4th edit. London 1685.

In 1705, Dr. Lewis Atterbury, Brother to the late Bishop of Rochester, published *Some Letters relating to the History of the Council of Trent*, London, in 4to. pagg. 26. and in the Dedication of them to Henry Reynell of Sheperton, Esq; observes, that he receiv- ed these papers from Mr. Basil Brent, son of Sir Na- thaniel Brent, the translator of that History. He remarks, that though these papers "at the first view "they may appear of no great moment, and too in- "considerable an entertainment for a judicious and "and learned Reader; yet when carefully perused, "they will be found useful to discover some truths, "which otherwise might have been concealed; to "clear up some transactions, which have not been "well understood; to rectify some mistakes; and to "set us right in several material passages relating to "the *History of the Council of Trent*. They will give "us a taste of the management of the Inquisition; "they will inform us at whose costs this useful work "was procured, by whom translated, and how agree- "able to the original, by what means transmitted to "us, and with what prudence and care the whole "affair was managed, and what danger Sir *Natha- "niel Brent* exposed himself to for the service of the "Church; and to advance the interest of the Pro- "testant Religion." Dr. Atterbury having desired Mr. Basil Brent to recollect what he could concerning that history, the latter wrote the following answer (16). *Sir, what I can say of Father* Paul, *is but lit- tle material; however, to satisfy your desire, I send you this account*, viz. *that my Father having been once before at Venice, was sent by* George Abbot, *Archbishop of Canterbury, a second time, on purpose to procure the* His- tory of the Council of Trent; *where he fell into ac- quaintance with* Padre Paulo *and* Padre Fulgentio *(two famous persons who sat in that Council* (17) *) who were the persons who composed the History of that Council, and my father sent it over weekly, as they composed it, to the Archbishop in Italian; to whose hands it came, after five or six superscriptions to other persons, for the greater secu- rity. And when he had sent it all over, he came over himself, and translated it out of Italian into English and Latin. My father sent to them to desire the favour of them to send him their pictures, which they did accord- ingly, drawn upon canvas half way, and my father put them into plain black frames. I had them in my possession some time, but they were burnt in my lodgings in Fleet- street, in the great fire at London, I being then in the country. I have heard my father say, that he believed they were Protestants in their hearts, though they durst not own it, or else they might have discovered the business he came about, which might have cost him his life in the Inquisition.* Next follows this letter, directed to Mr. John Brent, an English Gentleman at Padua (18):

(16) *Some Let- ters relating to the History of the Council of Trent*, p. 2, 3.

(17) This is a very gross mis- taken, for nei- ther of them ever sate in that Coun- cil.

(18) *Some Let- ters, &c.* p. 3 & *seqq.*

"Sir, out of respect I bear you as my countryman, I "could do no less (having understood of your being "at Padua) than to give you notice of an accident "lately befallen me, the knowledge whereof doth "much concern you. It happened of late, that I "came to Milan (being the 29th of this present "month,) where I had not made abroad for one "day, but towards the evening, came into the Inn "where I lay, certain Officers, who demanded for "Englishmen lodged in that house. The Host an- "swered them, that there was only one, and withal "shewed them my chamber, into which they were "no sooner entered, but they told me that they were "sent by the Father Inquisitor's command to have "me come to him. I knowing there was no way to "avoid those forelaid snares, went with them, tho' "with heavy chear; where I was no sooner come, "but the Inquisitor took me apart into a retired "chamber, and began to examine me, first, if I "were an Englishman? to whom I answered, yes. "Secondly, if I had not been a Student in the Uni- "versity of Oxford? I told him I had been many "times in Oxford, but never any Scholar there. "Hereupon he demanded me, from whence I "came? I told him from Rome: what I had done "there? I answered, for to visit that holy place, and "that in my way, I had likewise passed by Madonna "di Loretto, where I spent two days in devotion. "No sooner heard he me say so, but presently re- "plied, it seems by your actions, you should be a "good Christian: to which, I answered, I should be "exceedingly sorry to be otherwise, and that I did "rather desire to die, than not to live a good Ca- "tholic. All this I said, tho' false, in regard I ima- "gined it might serve my turn for the present, to "imprint a good conceit of me in him. This dis- "course was no sooner ended, but he began a-new to "examine me more strictly, if I knew in Italy any "of my Nation, who were Hereticks. To which I "answered him, not any that I could directly say to "be so, in regard I did not know any that did not "usually frequent churches and religious places. No! "(quoth he) do not you know one called *Giovanni* "*Brent Oxonienſis*, who is already come, or will "shortly come into Italy, in company of divers Eng- "lish Gentlemen? I told him no, tho' I had heard "of you. I thought (quoth he,) that you had been "the man, for I have had particular notice from "those parts where you came, that such an Eng- "lishman

noured him with their letters, and obliged their ſons to viſit him in their travels; and two Kings made him very advantageous offers to reſide in their Dominions. We ſhall give his

" liſhman ſhould paſs, who, as I underſtand, is a " great enemy to the Catholic cauſe, and very dan- " gerous, for as much as he comes as a Spy into " this country, rather to give falſe and ſcandalous " relations, at his return home, of Catholics, and " their manner of living, than for any curioſity to " ſee the country. And after a long and tedious in- " vective againſt ſuch malicious perſons (to uſe his " own terms,) who, as he ſaid, were fitter fuel for the " fire, than to live among Chriſtians; he concluded, " that he would not be wanting in his endeavours to " be informed, that there were ſuch a man as your- " ſelf in Italy, as likewiſe any ſuch of the like ſort, " that by rewarding ſuch as you, according to their " merits, he might do God, and poor perſecuted " Catholics, good ſervice; and ſo after a friendly " admonition to continue firm in the Catholic " Faith, with a paternal Benediction, I gave him a " long ſcrape of the leg, and departed. The fear " and apprehenſion I had to undergo ſome unlucky " misfortune ſtruck ſo deep an impreſſion in me, " that it hath altogether changed my reſolution in " my journey; for whereas I purpoſed to go thro' " all Italy, I have now changed my mind (to pre- " vent the malice of future times) intending to go " through Switzerland into Germany, having ſpent " only five months in Italy, which was but in Genoa " and places *circumvoiſini*. If I have been tedious in " this relation, pardon me, in regard I have ſought " to expreſs each particularity of the aforeſaid inter- " rogation (though but of ſmall moment) were they " but to reſolve you in all doubts, and to clear you " in what my brevity in writing might give error " to your underſtanding. However, I being a true " Engliſhman, as you are, and hating all traitors, I " could do no leſs than give you notice hereof, to " the end, that being forewarned, you might, thro' " your own diſcretion, be armed againſt their trea- " cherous combinations, and live to know me for " your friend, with whom, though I have not had " the honour to be acquainted, yet the good report I " have heard of you, and your virtues, have obliged " me eternally.

" Yours to command,

Milan the 26th of June, 1614 (19). " *John Renalds*."

(19) This ſhould be 1618.

Then follow ſeveral letters from Archbiſhop Abbot, to Sir Nathaniel Brent; the firſt of which, dated at Lambeth, June 21, 1618, is as follows: Salutem in Chriſto. *I am glad that you are ſafely arrived whether you deſired to go. I have read your letters, and the* Canzoni *incloſed, which are twelve in number, whereof I ſhall make ſuch uſe as is fit. I have not acquainted the Greateſt with any thing of your perſon, nor with the matter ſo much deſired; ſo that you may confidently tell your two good friends, that they need to dread nothing. And I may ſay in general, that there is no man living, to whom I have made known any thing in this matter, ſaving to you; only in general the old man, that liveth with me, underſtandeth of my deſire to get what I can appertaining to thoſe ſongs. Perſiſt, I pray you, in that courſe, which you have begun; and ſo commending me unto you, and wiſhing you to live as privately as you can, I reſt,*

Your very loving friend,

G. Cant.

The next letter, dated at Lambeth, July 15th, 1618, is as follows:

" *Salutem.* At the time of the writing this letter, " I have received four ſeveral bundles, and in them " forty and nine *Canzoni* in the whole. Things are " here carried on with that quietneſs, that there is " no ſpeech at all of that wherein we labour. I am " glad to hear, that there is ſome hope, that by the " firſt of October, or thereabout, the whole courſe " of this muſic may be perfect. Commend me to our " two good friends, to whom I wiſh health and hap- " pineſs. And ſo letting you know that all is well " here, and that I do only communicate theſe affairs " unto my old gueſt, I remain

" Your loving friend,

" G. Cant."

Then follow three other letters of the Archbiſhop, one dated at Croydon, Aug. 10th, 1618; another dated there, Sept. 9th, and the laſt, Sept. 24, the ſame year; in all which the ſeveral parts of the manuſcripts of the Hiſtory of the Council of Trent are ſpoken of as *Canzoni*. After theſe, we have two letters of Father Fulgentio to Sir Nathaniel Brent, and two other letters, one to Fulgentio, and another of Dr. Thomas James to Sir N. Brent.

Dr. Gilbert Burnet (20) obſerves with regard to this work, that " the ſtyle and way of writing is ſo " natural and maſculine, the intrigues were ſo fully " opened, with ſo many judicious reflections in all " the parts of it, that as it was read with great " pleaſure, ſo it was generally looked on as the rareſt " piece of Hiſtory, which the world ever ſaw. The " Author was ſoon gueſſed; and that raiſed the eſ- " teem of the work; for as he was accounted one " of the wiſeſt men in the world, ſo he had great " opportunities to gather exact informations. He " had free acceſs to all the Archives of the Repub- " lick of *Venice*, which has been now looked on for " ſeveral ages, as very exact, both in getting good " intelligence, and in a moſt careful way of preſerv- " ing it; ſo that among their records he muſt have " found the diſpatches of the Embaſſadors and Pre- " lates of that Republick, that were at Trent; " which being ſo near them, and the Council being " of ſuch high conſequence, is not to be doubted, " but there were frequent and particular informations, " both of more publick informations and ſecreter " tranſactions tranſmitted thither. He had alſo " contracted a cloſe friendſhip with *Camillus Oli- " va*, that was Secretary to one of the Legates, " from whom he had many diſcoveries of the " practices of the Legates, and of their corre- " ſpondence with Rome. Beſides, many other ma- " terials and notes of ſome Prelates, that were at " Trent, which he had gathered together. His " work came out within fifty years of the concluſion " of the Council, when ſeveral, who had been pre- " ſent there, were ſtill alive, and the thing was ſo " recent in men's memories, that few thought a man " of ſo great prudence as he was would have ex- " poſed his reputation by writing in ſuch a nice " matter things which he could not juſtify. Never " was there a man more hated by the Court of Rome " than he was; and now he was at their mercy, if " he had abuſed the world by ſuch falſhoods in " matter of fact, as have been ſince charged on his " work; but none appeared againſt him for fifty " years." Monſieur *Jurieu*, in his *Hiſtorical Reflections on Councils*, prefixed to his *Hiſtory of the Council of Trent*, ſpeaks of Father *Paul's Hiſtory* in the following terms. *It hath pleaſed God in his providence to raiſe up even in the Church of Rome a wiſe, moderate, judicious, and ſincere man, one that in a word was the greateſt man of his age, who hath carefully wrote this* Hiſtory [of the Council of Trent.] *He has all the perfections required to compleat an Hiſtorian; of great judgment and abilities, ſtrong and clear ſenſe, perfectly inſtructed in affairs, of a vaſt penetration, and one that wanted no kind of aſſiſtance needful to the completing of his work. When this Author began to appear in the world, the memory of the Council of Trent was ſtill freſh in men's minds; ſo that he may very well paſs for a contemporary Author. . . . . He was a neighbour to the place, where the things he writes of had been tranſacted. He lived in a city full of curious perſons, who had collected memorials of what had paſſed in this great affair; and was himſelf one, who kept correſpondence with all the learned men of Europe. Nay, he had great intimacy with* Camillo Oliva, *who had been Secretary to the Cardinal of Mantua, Legate and Preſident of the Council in the laſt Convocation. And there is no doubt but he drew conſiderable advantages to his work from ſuch a perſon, who had been an eye-witneſs of all that had paſſed.*

(20) Preface to a book intitled, *The Policy of Rome: or, the Sentiments of the Court and Cardinals there, concerning Religion and the Goſpel, as they are delivered by Cardinal* Palavicini, *in his* Hiſtory of the Council of Trent. *Engliſhed out of French.* edit. London 1681, in 8vo.

his character in the note [*S*]. He ſaw death approaching him with a firmneſs and tranquillity,

paſſed. Now ſince this Author was neither Lutheran nor of the Reformed Religion, he is not in reaſon to be ſuſpected by the Church of Rome; and as he was no ſervile Idolater of the Court of Rome, he ought not to be ſuſpected by Proteſtants. There ſhines throughout his work an air of ſincerity and honeſty, which happily united to his vaſt abilities, has made him paſs as unqueſtionably the ableſt man of his age in the art of writing Hiſtory. But in an age ſo depraved as ours, it is dangerous to be honeſt. The ſincerity of Father Paul *hath raiſed againſt him a multitude of enemies. The Court of Rome endeavours to make him paſs for an impoſtor and the moſt profligate of men, and his work for a malevolent and venomous ſatyr. And yet to ſo many important truths, by him laid open to the world, nothing but ſcurrility and abuſe were oppoſed; till at laſt after forty years Cardinal* Pallavicini *bethought himſelf to publiſh a new Hiſtory of the Council of Trent, or, if you pleaſe, an anſwer to Father* Paul, *for he cites him and refutes him in every page. This work appeared with all the external advantages, which can well recommend a book. It had Pope* Alexander VII. *to whom it was dedicated, for Patron, and for its Author, one of the Princes of the Church, as they are called; one that was of a Society well acquainted with the arts of engaging men's minds; and one who in this work defended a favourite cauſe, ſupported by the number and quality of the Partiſans.* " And yet with " all this he has not been able to attract all that ap- " plauſe and approbation, which the contract of " Rome had hoped. Men judged, that he came " much too late to inſtruct them in the tranſactions " of this Council; nor indeed is an opinion once " ſettled ſo eaſily ſhaken off. After having left the " Venetian Divine for fifty years together in peace- " able poſſeſſion of our belief of his Hiſtory, this " new comer will find it difficult to eradicate that " eſtabliſhed belief. An hundred years after the " Council of *Trent*, he bethinks himſelf of giving " the hiſtory of it; which certainly is a prudent " courſe to avoid being taken in falſities, on ac- " count of the diſtance of time; though indeed " many for the ſame reaſon think fit to excuſe " their giving credit to his Hiſtory. It is true, he " tells us, that he took from the memorials and " regiſters of the Vatican, which were communicat- " ed to him, the acts and proceedings of the Coun- " cil. One may believe this as one pleaſes; and ſo " long as ſuch pieces are not made publick, there " will always be ſome Infidels, who will call in queſ- " tion the credit of them. Beſides, there is another " claſs of men, of no mean parts, nor Hereticks, " who have no good opinion of theſe *Vatican* Re- " cords, from which the Cardinal ſays he made his " collections. It is very well known, that the Court " of Rome being governed by the moſt refined Po- " liticks, makes no collection of pieces, which may " prove injurious or dangerous to herſelf; or, if ſhe " had any ſuch, would not permit them to be made " publick. Thoſe that pretend to judge of ſtyle, do " likewiſe diſreliſh this work of the Cardinal. He " manages all with pomp, but miſplaces it; and is " extremely florid, but without art. . . . But above all " his uſage of Father *Paul* is diſliked by all men of " honour; ſince though the Father was certainly one " of the greateſt men of his time, the Cardinal has " treated him with rage and fury, unjuſtly, and even " childiſhly. People laugh at the liſt of 360 errors, " which he imputes to Father *Paul*. They ſay, " there is a myſtery in that number, and Aſtrology is " doubtleſs concerned in it; for there is no probability " that by mere chance alone there ſhould be a diſco- " very of juſt ſo many errors in a book, as there are " degrees in the greater circles. To complete the " catalogue, he brings in trifles not worth naming, " as the miſtakes of a few days or nights; nay, the " eſcapes of the preſs are improved into errors of " the Author."

[*S*] *We ſhall give his character in the note.*] *Fra. Fulgentio* obſerves, that notwithſtanding the great animoſity of the Court of Rome againſt him, the moſt eminent Prelates of it always expreſſed the higheſt regard for him; and that though many perſons thought him a Hypocrite, yet his whole conduct proved the contrary, ſince he never uſed any of thoſe actions, which Hypocrites perform ſo induſtriouſly in publick; ſuch as the making a parade of his beads in the ſtreets, kiſſing medals as he was walking, ſhewing himſelf among a great concourſe of people, talking in an affected ſtrain of piety, or wearing a mean ſordid habit. The ſame writer remarks, that he was abſolutely exempt from avarice and ambition; that learning, which is too apt to inflate the mind, had a quite contrary effect on him, his humility increaſing with his knowledge; and that as a proof how much he had the peace of his country at heart, was, that though the Senate reſolved to protect him againſt any attack from what quarter ſoever, he was yet extremely deſirous, that the Republick might not ſuffer in any manner on his account. And therefore Gregory XV. having ſucceeded Paul V. in the Pontificate, the Venetian Embaſſadors congratulating him on his acceſſion, he anſwered, that there would never be a firm union between the Apoſtolick See and the Republick of Venice, ſo long as the latter ſhould make uſe of Father Paul's counſels. Upon hearing of this the Father reſolved to leave the Venetian Dominions, rather than be the occaſion of any new diſpute: and becauſe neither his religion nor conſcience would ſuffer him to lay violent hands on himſelf, and that he could not retire into the Dominions of any of the Proteſtants without the hazard of being thought a convert to their Religion, nor be ſafe in any Roman Catholick country; he determined to go to Conſtantinople or ſome other city in the Eaſt, and accordingly he had begun to prepare for his voyage, and even obtained a paſſport from the Grand Signior. But the Pope's reſentment ceaſing, he laid aſide his deſign. This is the account of *Fulgentio*; but Dr. Burnet (21) tells us, that " when " the reconciliation with Rome was concluded, Fa- " ther *Paul* was out of all hopes of ever bringing " things to ſo promiſing a conjuncture [*a Reformation*] " upon which he wiſhed he could have left Venice, " and come over to England with Mr. *Bedell*. But " he was ſo eſteemed by the Senate for his great " wiſdom, that he was conſulted by them as an ora- " cle, and truſted with their moſt important ſecrets; " ſo that he knew it was difficult for him to obtain his " *Conge*; and therefore he made a ſhift to comply, as " far ashe could, with the eſtabliſhed way of their " worſhip. Bu he had in many things particular " methods, by which he rather quieted than ſatiſ- " fied his conſcience . . . . He never prayed to Saints." Sir *Henry Wotton*, in a letter to Dr. *Collins*, Regius Profeſſor of Divinity at Cambridge, dated January 17th, 1637 (22), ſays, that Father Paul *was one of the humbleſt things that could be ſeen within the bounds of humanity, the very pattern of that precept*, quanto doctior, tanto ſubmiſſior, *and enough alone to demonſtrate, that knowledge well digeſted* non inflat. *Excellent in poſitive, excellent in ſcholaſtical and polemical divinity. A rare mathematician even in the moſt abſtruſe parts thereof, as in Algebra and the Theoriques; and yet withal, ſo expert in the Hiſtory of Plants, as if he had never peruſed any book but Nature. Laſtly, a great Canoniſt, which was the title of his ordinary ſervice with the State; and certainly, in the time of the Pope's Interdict, they had their principal light from him. When he was either reading or writing alone, his manner was to ſit fenced with a caſtle of paper about his chair, and over head; for he was of our Lord of St.* Alban's *opinion, that all air is predatory, and eſpecially hurtful, when the Spirits are moſt employed . . . . He was of a quiet and ſettled temper, which made him prompt in his counſels and anſwers; and the ſame in conſultation, which Themiſtocles was in action,* αὐτοσχεδιάζειν ἱκανώτατος, *as will appear unto you in a paſſage between him and the Prince of* Conde. *The ſaid Prince, in a voluntary journey to Rome, came by Venice, where to give ſome vent to his own humours, he would often diveſt himſelf of his greatneſs, and after other leſs laudable curioſities, not long before his departure, a deſire took him to viſit the famous obſcure Servita. To whoſe Cloyſter coming twice, he was the firſt time denied to be within; and at the ſecond it was intimated, that by reaſon of his daily admiſſion to their deliberation in the palace, he could not receive the viſit of ſo illuſtrious a perſonage without leave from the Senate, which he would ſeek*

(21) *Life of Biſhop Bedell.*

(22) See *Reliquiæ Wottonianæ.*

quillity, which gave teſtimony to the integrity of his life, and the purity of his intentions; and

ſeek to procure. This ſet a greater edge on the Prince, when he ſaw he ſhould confer with one participant of more than Monkiſh ſpeculations. So after leave gotten, he came the third time: and then, beſides other voluntary diſcourſe (which it were a tyranny over you to repeat) he aſſailed him with queſtions enough to have troubled any man but himſelf, and him too, if a precedent accident had not eaſed him. "The queſtion was παρρησιαν this; "he deſired to be told by him before his going, "Who was the true unmaſked Author of the late "*Tridentine Hiſtory?* You muſt know this, that but "newly Advertiſement was come from Rome, that "the Archbiſhop of *Spalato* being then re-arrived "from England, in an interview between him and "Cardinal *Ludoviſio*, nephew to *Gregory* XV. the ſaid "Cardinal, after a complimental welcoming him "into the Lap of the Church, told him, by order "from the Pope, that his Holineſs would expect "from him ſome recantation in print, as an antidote "againſt certain books and pamphlets, which he "had publiſhed, whilſt he ſtood in the revolt; "namely, his firſt *Manifeſto*; item, two Sermons "preached at the Italian church in London; again, "a little tract, intitled, his *Scogli*; and laſtly, his "greater volumes about Church Regiment and Con-"troverſies. Theſe were all named; *for as touching "the* Tridentine Hiſtory, *his Holineſs* (ſays the Car-"dinal) *will not preſs you to any diſavowment thereof, "though you have an Epiſtle before the original edition; "becauſe we know well enough, that Friar* Paolo *is the "father of that brat.* Upon this laſt piece of the "aforeſaid Advertiſement, the good Father came "fairly off; for on a ſudden laying all together, "that to diſavow the work was an untruth, to aſſume "it a danger, and to ſay nothing an incivility, he "took a middle evaſion, telling the Prince, that he "underſtood he was going to Rome, where he "might learn at eaſe, who was the Author of that "book, as they were freſhly intelligenced from "thence." Cardinal Perron (23) ſaid thus of our Author: *I ſee nothing eminent in that man: he is a man of judgment and good ſenſe, but has no great learning; I obſerve his qualifications to be mere common ones, and a little ſuperior to an ordinary Monk's.* But Daniel George Morhof (24) remarks, that this judgment of Perron is abſurd and malignant, and directly contrary to the cleareſt evidence, ſince thoſe who are acquainted with the great things done by Father Paul, and the extent of his learning, will allow him to be ſuperior, not only to Monks, but Cardinals, and even Perron himſelf. *Ineptum eſt & malignum Cardinalis* Perronii *de* Paulo Sarpio *judicium . . . Adverſus ſolem hoc loqui eſt. Qui norunt quantas qualeſq; res geſſerit* Sarpius, *quibus ille doctrinis excelluerit, illi non ſupra Monachum ſed & ſupra Cardinalem, ac ipſum hunc* Perronium, *ſapuiſſe largientur.* Dr. Le Courayer tells us (25), that our Author, "in imitation of *E-"raſmus, Caſſander, Thuanus,* and many other great "men, was a Catholic in general, and ſometimes a "Proteſtant in particulars. He obſerved every thing "in the Roman Religion, which could be practiſed "without ſuperſtition; and in points, which he "ſcrupled, he took great care not to ſcandalize the "weak. In ſhort, he was equally averſe to all ex-"tremes; if he diſapproved the abuſes of the Catho-"lics, he condemned alſo the too great heat of the "Reformed; and uſed to ſay to thoſe, who urged "him to declare himſelf in favour of the latter, that "*God had not given him the Spirit of Luther* . . . . . "We ſee by ſeveral of his letters, that he wiſhed "extremely the progreſs of the Reformation, but in a "manner a little different from that, which had been "taken to procure it. *Perhaps,* ſays he, in one of "his letters, *God's will in this age, is to extinguiſh "the tyranny by means more gentle, than thoſe made "uſe of in the laſt age. He, who began to lay the foun-"dation, did not finiſh the work. Who knows whether "by beginning at the roof, as is done at preſent, it may "not be more effectual? It may be hoped for, if God bleſs "the undertaking.* . . . . In ſeveral other letters, it "appears, that he was greatly pleaſed at all the ſuc-"ceſſes of the Reformed in France, and wiſhed them "new advantages, as of uſe to the progreſs of truth. . . "*If there be a war in Italy,* ſays he, in a letter, dated "April 27, 1610, *it will be of vaſt ſervice to Religion; "and this is what Rome is afraid of; the Inquiſition "will be ſtopped, and the Goſpel have its courſe. Believe me,* "ſaid he in another letter, dated Auguſt 26th, 1608, "*there is a very great number of Hypocrites in Italy; "and be not ſurpriſed, that they ſhut their eyes againſt "the light, ſince they have always ſhut them againſt "the truth, and opened them to their intereſt.* In "a word, he regarded the reformation as the only "means of reducing the power of Rome, and the "reducing of that power as the only means of mak-"ing the purity of religion flouriſh again. *There "is nothing of greater importance,* ſays he, in a letter "dated July 5, 1611. *than to deſtroy the credit of the "Jeſuits; by ruining them, Rome is ruined; and if "Rome be deſtroyed, Religion will reform of itſelf.*" Dr. Le Courayer likewiſe obſerves, that Father *Paul wiſhed for a reformation of the Papacy, and not the deſtruction of it; and was an enemy to the abuſes and pretenſions of the Popes, and not their place. He was an enemy to ſuperſtition; but he tolerated Ceremonies without any reluctance. He condemned an eagerneſs of making new doctrines, and did not always think it his duty to ſubmit to deciſions made too haſtily; but he did not imagine himſelf obliged to break communion on account of new opinions, which were imprudently raiſed into Articles of Faith. He readily ſubmitted to the authority of the Church in all things relating to Rites and Diſcipline; but he could have wiſhed, that the ſuperiors of the Church had been more eaſy in relaxing ſomething of the rigour of poſitive laws. He hated perſecution; but he hated ſchiſm likewiſe. He was a Proteſtant, if that is not giving blindly into all prevailing opinions, and condemning freely abuſes introduced and ſupported by intereſt. But he was a Catholick, if that be loving ſincerely the purity of the Church, hating diviſions, maintaining order and ſubordination, and being animated with a zeal to reform Religion, and not to tear it to pieces.* The Author of the *Bibliotheque Raiſonnée* (26) having quoted this paſſage of Dr. Le Courayer, has the following remark upon it. "All this forms, in my opinion, "an incomprehenſible contraſt. To be deſirous of "reforming the Church, without cauſing diviſions "in it; to reduce the Popes without deſtroying "them; to baniſh ſuperſtition, and yet tolerate "ceremonies, which are made only to ſupport it; "to eſteem it equally bad, that conſcience ſhould "be forced to continue in a communion, which it "diſapproves, and that it ſhould be at full liberty to "ſeparate from that communion; is not this at-"tempting an impoſſibility? It ſeems evidently ſo "to me; and if this really was what Father *Paul* "attempted, are we to be ſurpriſed at the ſmall ſuc-"ceſs of his undertaking? He muſt neceſſarily fail "in the execution of a deſign, which naturally was "impracticable; and all that can be ſaid in his fa-"vour is, that being impoſed on by the beauty of "the ideas, he flattered himſelf too much with their "being compatible, becauſe he paſſionately wiſhed it. "None but minds elevated above the common rank "can fall into ſuch a miſtake." The ſame writer obſerves (27), that the account of Father Paul's inclination for the reformation will receive ſome confirmation from the following paſſages relating to *Fra. Fulgentio*, the moſt intimate of his friends, and who was beſt acquainted with his ſentiments. Dr. Burnet (27) informs us, that *Fulgentio* preaching upon Pilate's queſtion, *What is truth?* told the audience, that at laſt after many ſearches he had found it out, and held out a New Teſtament, and ſaid, that there it was in his hand; but then put it in his pocket, and ſaid coldly, *But the Book is prohibited.* The Author of the *Bibliotheque Raiſonnée* then quotes the following manuſcript relation. *Dr.* Duncomb, *who had the care of ſome Engliſh Noblemen, being at Venice after the death of Father* Paul, *fell ſick there, and appearing to be extremely uneaſy in his mind,* Fra. Fulgentio *deſired to know the cauſe of it, and offered him all the aſſiſtance in his power. The Doctor frankly owned to him, that he had always prayed to God, that he might die in a place, where he might receive the Sacrament according to the method of the Church of England, that is, under both kinds;*

MEMORANDUM, that this Recantation was, to my knowledge, never printed at Rome, or elſewhere, thro' more haſte belike to his death, or otherwiſe upon farther conſideration, that things extorted with fear, carry no credit, even by the *Prætor's Edict.*

(23) See *Perroniana.*

(24) *Polybiſtor,* p. 293, 294.

(25) *Vie abrégée de Fra. Paolo,* prefixed to his tranſlation of *the Hiſtory of the Council of Trent.*

(26) Tom. 17. part 1. art. 5. p. 148.

(27) Ibid. p. 142.

(28) *Life of Biſhop Bedell,* p. 120.

and died with ſtrong ſentiments of piety, January 14, 1623 [*T*], aged ſeventy one years. His funeral was diſtinguiſhed by the publick magnificence of it, and the vaſt concourſe of the Nobility and perſons of all ranks attending it. And the Senate out of gratitude to his memory erected a monument to him, the inſcription upon which was written by John Anthony Venerio, a noble Venetian. Though ſeveral Kings and Princes had deſired him to ſit for his picture, he conſtantly excuſed himſelf, refuſing it even to his intimate friend Dominico Molini [*U*]. He was of a middle ſtature; his head very large in proportion to his body, which was extremely lean. He had a wide forehead, in the middle of which was a very large vein. His eyebrows were well arched, his eyes large, black, and ſprightly; his noſe long and big, but very even; his beard thin, and his chin in ſome places bald of hair, which yet was no ways unſeemly. He had a ſoft complexion, which, when he was in health, was formed with an agreeable mixture of white and red, though with a yellowiſh caſt. His aſpect, though grave, was extremely inviting; and he had a very fine hand. Monſieur Amelot de la Houſſaye publiſhed

kinds; but that unhappily he had not hopes of obtaining this in the country where he then was. What would have been a difficulty to another, was none to Fulgentio. *He immediately comforted the Doctor, by ſaying, that he had the Common Prayer in Italian; and that if he deſired it, he would come himſelf with ſome of his brethren, and adminiſter to him the Communion under both kinds; and ſo much the rather as there were in his Convent ſeven or eight Diſciples of Father* Paul, *who met from time to time, and received the Sacrament in that manner. Dr.* Duncomb *gave this account, upon his return to England, to the Lord* Hatton; *and Biſhop* Atterbury *declared, that he had it from Captain* Hatton, *who had frequently heard it from his Father.* The Author of the *Bibliotheque Raiſonnée* ſubjoins this reflection (29): (29) p. 143.

" What ſhall we then believe concerning Father " *Paul*, Father *Fulgentio*, and others of the ſame " character, who lived and died in the Roman Ca" tholick Religion? Was their profeſſion only gri" mace and hypocriſy? Monſieur *Le Courayer* aſ" ſerts, that their conduct does not ſhew this in any " manner; and I own, that I find myſelf as much " inclined as any perſon to acquit them from any " blame. But I think, that it will eaſily be granted " me, that with ſuch ſentiments, and ſuch great " lights, thoſe Divines muſt have been in a very " diſagreeable and uneaſy ſituation. Let us not con" demn any man: it is God alone, to whom judg" ment belongs. But ſhall not we pity thoſe conſci" ences, whoſe inward voice is ſo much the ſtronger " and more clamorous, as it is reſtrained without? " Can one better expreſs this embarraſſment, than Fa" ther *Paul* himſelf has done in the fragment of a " letter, which the French writer of his life has " thought proper to cite? *In the ſervice of God*, ſays " that great man (30), *I do what I know; but al*" *ways full of fear of doing ſomething unſeaſonably, and* " *thereby preventing ſomething. Father* Fulgentio *does* " *the ſame. We muſt not deceive ourſelves, but wait for* " *every thing from above.* To ſpeak plainly, if *Luther* " had had the *Spirit of Father Paul*, the Papal yoke " would have been now perhaps as heavy and as uni" verſally received, as it was in the beginning of the " 16th century; and if Father *Paul* had had the *Spirit* " *of Luther*, it is very probable, that within about " 130 years, the Reformation would have prevailed " in the very boſom of Italy."

(30) In his Letter of May 26, 1609.

[*T*] *Died with ſtrong ſentiments of piety, January 14th, 1623.*] In the beginning of the winter, 1622, his health began to decline greatly; upon which he withdrew his thoughts pretty much from his ſtudies and public affairs, to the meditation of the other world. In the beginning of the year 1623, he told his friends, that this year would be his laſt; and on the 6th of January, notwithſtanding his indiſpoſition, he went to the Palace; but returned home very weak. On the 8th, being Sunday, he ſaid Maſs, and dined in the Refectory, and walked for a conſiderable time with his friend, Signor *Secchini*. Till the day before he died, he always got up, dreſſed himſelf, wrote and read as uſual, and when he was not able to do this, he laid himſelf along upon his cheſt, and heard others read. Being dreſſed on the Monday morning, he found himſelf deprived, as it were in an inſtant, of the uſe of his limbs, and had a violent nauſea. But his judgment and memory were as perfect as ever; and on the Saturday morning he ſaid to his friends, *Io v' ho tenuti conſolati ſinò ch' hò potuto; hora non poſſo più, e tocherebbe a voi tenermi allegro*, i. e. " I have endeavoured to comfort you as " long as I was able; and as I am no longer capa" ble of doing it, it is your buſineſs to divert me." On the 12th, he took the Sacrament with ſo much devotion and reſignation, as drew tears from all who were preſent. On the 14th, which was the day he died, he cauſed the chapter of St. John's Goſpel, relating to our Saviour's Paſſion, to be read, as had been done the preceding days; and declared his reliance on the mercy of Chriſt. One of the Phyſicians telling him, that he found by his pulſe that he had but a few hours to live, he anſwered with a chearful countenance, *Sia lodato Iddio; mi piace ciò ch' a lui piace; col ſuo aiuto faremo bene queſta ultima Attione*, i. e. " God be praiſed: what pleaſes him, " pleaſes me: with his aſſiſtance, we ſhall perform " well this laſt action." He continued very chearful, without ſhedding a tear, or venting the leaſt groan; and uſed to cry at every little interval, *Horsù, andiamo ove Dio ci chiama*, i. e. " Come, let us go " whither God calls us." The clock ſtriking eight, he counted it, and a little after calling *Fulgentio*, ſaid to him, *Horsù non reſtate più à vedermi in queſto ſtato; non è dovere. Andate à dormire, & io n' andarò à Dio, d' onde ſiamo venuti*, i. e. " Leave me, there is no occa" on for you to ſtay to ſee me in this condition. Go " to ſleep, and I ſhall go to God, from whom we " all came." After which he deſired a kiſs of him, and a particular embrace; and then *Fulgentio* broke from his dear friend and maſter. And now the Prior returned with the reſt of the Monks, who kneeling round his bed repeated the uſual prayers. The laſt words which he uttered, were, *Eſto perpetua*; which was ſuppoſed to be a prayer for the Republic. A little after, throwing his arms acroſs, fixing his eyes on a crucifix, caſting them downwards, and ſhutting them, he reſigned his ſoul into the hands of his Creator. The particulars of his death, ſolemnly atteſted by the whole Convent of the Servites, were publiſhed by order of the Senate, to refute a ſcandalous report ſpread about, that he died yelling and howling; that an hideous black dog was ſeen; and that horrid noiſes were heard in and about his cell. The like ſlanderous rumours had been raiſed to aſperſe the memory of the excellent *Leonardo Donato*, and to blacken thoſe, who, at the time of the *Interdict*, eſpouſed the cauſe of the Republic. When the news of his death was brought to Rome, the Courtiers rejoiced; and a thouſand falſe and ſcandalous particulars were raiſed concerning him. Nor could the Pope himſelf forbear ſaying, that the hand of God was viſible in taking him out of the world; as if there was any thing miraculous in a man's dying at ſeventy one years of age.

[*U*] *Though ſeveral Kings and Princes had deſired him to ſit for his picture, he conſtantly excuſed himſelf, refuſing it even to his intimate friend Dominico Molini.*] This is the account of *Fra. Fulgentio*; who tells us likewiſe, that " tho' many pictures of the Father " go abroad for originals, yet they are all but co" pies of one, which is ſaid to be in the gallery of " a great King, which was taken againſt his will, " and by a ſtratagem." But Sir Henry Wotton, in his letter to Dr. Collins, cited in the remark [*S*], writes thus: " And now, Sir, having a fit Meſſen" ger,

publiſhed a French tranſlation of our Author's *Treatiſe of the Eccleſiaſtical Benefits and Revenues*, illuſtrated with remarks. And we have an Engliſh tranſlation of the ſame work, the third edition of which was printed at Weſtminſter 1736, in 8vo. under the title of *A Treatiſe of Eccleſiaſtical Benefices and Revenues, written originally in Italian by the learned Father* Paul, *Author of the Hiſtory of* the Council of Trent, *tranſlated by* Tobias Jenkins, *Eſq; late Member of Parliament, and Lord Mayor of York. And illuſtrated with Notes by him, and from the ingenious* Amelot de la Houſſaye. *To which is prefixed (never before printed) the Life of Father* Paul, *by Mr.* Lockman; *and a Preface giving an account of the Work.* His *Letters* were tranſlated out of Italian into Engliſh, by Mr. *Edward Brown*, Rector of Sundridge in Kent; and printed at London, in 1693, in 8vo.

" ger, and not long after the time when love-tokens " uſe to paſs between friends, let me be bold to " ſend you for a New-year's-gift, a certain memo- " rial, not altogether unworthy of ſome entertain- " ment under your roof; namely, a true picture of " *Padre Paulo* the Servite, which was firſt taken by " a painter, whom I ſent unto him, my houſe then " neighbouring his monaſtery. I have newly added " thereunto, a title of my own conception, *Conci- " lii Tridentini Eviſcerator*; and had ſent the frame " withal, if it were portable, which is but of plain " deal coloured black, like the habit of his Order . . . " You will find a ſcar in his face; that was from a " Roman aſſaſſinate, that would have killed him " as he was turned to a wall near to his Convent; " and if there were not a greater providence about " us, it might often have been eaſily done, eſpeci- " cially upon ſuch a weak and wearyiſh body." T.

(a) Platina, *in* Paulo II.

PAUL II. choſen Pope Auguſt the 31ſt 1464 (*a*), was the ſon of Nicholas Barbo, a Nobleman of Venice, by a ſiſter of Pope Eugenius IV. Moreri obſerves that *the Proteſtants have given* Paul II. *a very bad character:* but as he mentions but few particulars, I muſt ſupply his omiſſions here. They aſſert (*b*) that he was privy to the wicked deſign of Ferdinand King of Naples, who cauſed Picininus to be baſely murdered; that he was the perſecutor of the learned [*A*]; that he ſold all the employments; that *he did not care to give Biſhopricks but to ſuch perſons, who had already ſome other poſts, which they could reſign to him, to ſell them for his own profit*; *that he extended the bull of caſes reſerved to the Popes as far as he could, that by that means he might have more pretences to extort money from all quarters*; *that he bought at any price all the fineſt jewels he could meet with, to adorn the Papal Mitre, with which he delighted to be ſeen abroad, having alſo his face painted*; *that he detained ſtrangers in town, and had the holy handkerchief ſhewed according to cuſtom, that there might be at once more people to behold him.* That he had a baſtard daughter [*B*]; *that he was ſtrangled in the night time by the Devil in the very act of fornication*;

(b) See Du Pleſſis Mornai, *Myſtere d'Iniquite*, p. m. 542, 543.

[*A*] *The Proteſtants aſſert . . . that he was the proſecutor of the learned.*] " He had ſo great an averſion " for men of letters, that he looked upon them " as Hereticks; and he deprived of their em- " ployments all the learned who had been prefer- " red by his Predeceſſors: *As he was extremely igno- " rant*, (ſays our Hiſtorian, who is a great flatterer " of the Popes*) *he perſecuted moſt cruelly all learned " and honeſt men*; *he uſed to call Hereticks, all the Ro- " mans who applied themſelves to Literature, and he al- " ways exhorted the youths of Rome never to ſtudy. He " not only deprived ſeveral learned men of their eſtates, " but alſo put them in priſon, and made them ſuffer the " moſt cruel torments: amongſt others, were Baptiſt Pla- " tina, and Milverton, an Engliſhman, who was Pro- " vincial of the Carmelites* (1)." I have related in ſome other paſſages of this Dictionary (2), the perſecution which Platina ſuffered, and what was the occaſion of it. I ſhall only tranſcribe here the paſſage in which he gives us an account of that Pope's taſte for Literature. *Humanitatis ſtudia ita oderat & contemnebat, ut ejus ſtudioſos uno nomine hæreticos appellabat. Hanc ob rem Romanos adhortabatur ne filios diutius in ſtudiis litterarum verſari paterentur: ſatis eſſe ſi legere & ſcribere didiciſſent* (3), i. e. " He deſpiſed and " hated the ſtudy of polite Literature to ſuch a de- " gree, that he uſed to call indifferently, all thoſe " who applied themſelves to it, Hereticks. And " therefore he adviſed the Romans not to ſuffer their " children to ſtudy too long, ſaying it was enough if " they learned only to read and to write." Monſieur du Pleſſis having given a tranſlation of that paſſage, adds, that it gave Genebrard an occaſion, in the 2d part of his Chronicle, to ſtile this Pope *an enemy to Virtue and Learning* (4). Father Gretſer not meeting with that paſſage in Genebrard's Chronicle, of the edition printed at Cologne, in the year 1581, ſuſpected it was a falſe quotation (5). I cannot determine the matter: for though my edition, which is that of Lyons 1609, does not contain that remark in the paſſage where Paul II. is mentioned, yet Genebrard may have ſtiled this Pope thus in ſome other paſſage. Let us obſerve here, that one cannot eaſily comprehend, how there ſhould be an edition of Genebrard's Chronicle printed at Cologne in the year 1581, ſince the Author's Dedication is dated in November 1584; and it is obſerved there, that the book was then printed for the firſt time. Father Gretſer's Printer put, perhaps, LXXXI. inſtead of LXXXXI. Now ſince after all, the edition he made uſe of was not the firſt (*a*); it remains ſtill to be examined, whether it was not caſtrated in the paſſage which Du Pleſſis read in the firſt edition.

* Wicelius, *in Epitome Rom. Pontif.*

(1) Jurieu, *Prejugez legitimes contre le Papiſme*, Tom. 1. p. 245.

(2) See the art. PLATINA, rem. [*B*], &c. and the article EXPERIENS, rem. [*A*].

(3) Platina *in* Paulo II. *ſub fin.* folio m. 362 *verſo.*

(4) Du Pleſſis, *Myſtere d'Iniq.* p. m. 543.

(5) Gretſer, *in Exam. Myſterii Pleſſæani*, p. 535.

[*a*] *The edition he made uſe of was not the firſt.*] This is true indeed, if Mr. Bayle's ſuppoſition of the error of the preſs be well grounded; but as he does not prove it, may we not ſuppoſe that the Printer put LXXXI. inſtead of LXXXIV? in which caſe there can be no caſtrated edition, and Du Pleſſis's memory muſt have failed him. ADD. REM.

[*B*] . . . . *that he had a baſtard daughter.*] To prove this particular, the following lines are quoted from Janus Pannonius.

Pontificis Pauli teſtes ne Roma requiras
Filia quam genuit, ſat docet eſſe marem.
Sanctum non poſſum, Patrem te dicere poſſum,
Cum video natam, Paule ſecunde, tuam (6).

i. e. " If Rome requires witneſſes of Pope Paul's man- " hood, the daughter he begot proves him a man. " I cannot call you holy Paul II. though I can call " you *father*, when I behold your daughter."

(6) See Du Pleſſis Mornai, *Myſtere d'Iniq.* p. 543, and John Zwinger, *de Feſto Corporis Chriſti*, p. 132.

This is confirmed by the following lines of another Poet.

Quum ſit filia, Paule, ſit tibi aurum,
Quantum Pontifices habere raros
Vidit Roma prius, Pater vocari
Sanctus non potes, at potes beatus.

i. e. " Since you have a daughter, Paul, and ſo much " gold, that few of your Predeceſſors ever were ſo " rich, you may be ſtiled, not indeed an holy, but yet " a bleſſed father."

cation [C]; that he uſed to ſleep in the day time, and to paſs the night in reckoning his money, and admiring his jewels and pictures (c); that he was a hard drinker, and that he cauſed ſome drunken games to be celebrated in Lent, to which he invited perſons of all ſorts, by giving them hopes of receiving prizes and rewards; that he abandoned himſelf to ſodomy and magick (d) [D]. Some of theſe particulars are related by Platina, either as matters of fact, or as common reports. The others are not grounded on very certain authorities. However it be, I do not think that the Proteſtants ever mentioned a more notorious injuſtice of this Pope, thna is to be met with in the works of a Cardinal, who was his contemporary, and one of the moſt illuſtrious Prelates of that age. I ſhall relate it

(c) Revius, *in Hiſtor. Pontificum Romanor.* p. 245.

(d) Idem, Ibid.

It is added (7), that Paul II. having read theſe poems, fell a crying, and complained of the ſevere law of celibacy, and reſolved to abrogate it. You will find in another place (8), on whoſe authority this is aſſerted. I muſt not forget to obſerve, that Platina has not ſaid a word of that baſtard daughter, and his ſilence is taken by Paul the Second's Apologiſts, for an argument that clears him: for, ſay they (9), that Hiſtorian, out of anger and reſentment, ſpoke ſo ill of that Pope, that he would not have ſpared him, with regard to incontinency, if he could have traduced him as the father of a daughter, publickly known at Rome. They make the ſame obſervation, with regard to the other imputations which Platina has not mentioned.

(7) Ibidem.

(8) In the rem. [B] of the art. ORICHOVIUS.

(9) See Gretſer, *in Examine Myſterii Pleſſæani*, p. 536, and Coeffeteau, *Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquite*, p. 1199.

[C] . . . *that he was ſtrangled in the night-time by the Devil, in the very act of Fornication.*] Monſieur Du Pleſſis Mornai, relates this particular upon Peucer's credit. I have conſulted that Author, and found that he expreſſes himſelf thus. *Paulus Secundus ob ſpurciſſimam libidinem maſculam & artes Dæmoniacas publice infamis atque execrabilis, utpote quem tandem in concubitu à Dæmone ſtrangulatum, obtorti colli terribile ſpecie mortis genus oſtendiſſe fama eſt* (10). That is to ſay, according to Simon Goulart's tranſlation, *Paul the Second, infamous and execrable to all the world, on account of his ſodomitical practices and magic arts, who was at laſt, according to the accounts of the Hiſtorians, ſtrangled in his bed by the Devil, who broke his neck.* I am apt to think that this Tranſlator, through an overſight, imagined that there was in the text *cubitu* (bed), and not *concubitu*, (the act of fornication). Or perhaps he made uſe of an edition, in which the Printer omitted the firſt ſyllable of the word *concubitu*. Otherwiſe, I cannot imagine, why he would have enervated Peucer's account, by omitting the circumſtance of the lewd act, in which that Pope was ſtrangled by the Devil. It is not Simon Goulart's cuſtom to weaken ſuch accounts; on the contrary, he takes a delight in making them ſtronger. We have an inſtance of it in this very paſſage. For he tranſlates the Latin words *fama eſt*, by theſe, *according to the accounts of the Hiſtorians*. Now there is a great difference between ſaying, *it is reported, men ſay*, and *the Hiſtorians relate*. Peucer made uſe only of the former expreſſion, whereas his Tranſlator uſed the latter. They were both in the wrong: for a man ought never thus to traduce even his enemies, without unqueſtionable vouchers: but Goulart is more to blame ſtill, than Peucer. The illuſtrious Author (11), who only quoted a Proteſtant Writer on this occaſion, ought to have foreſeen that this would expoſe him to opprobrious language from the oppoſite party; and thus it happened accordingly, as appears from the following paſſage of a Jeſuit. *Illud Diabolicum mendacium eſt*, Paulo in ipſo acto venereo a Diabolo ſtrangulatum; *nam omnes apoplexia exſtinctum tradunt, etiam acerrimus hoſtis ejus Platina. Sed Pleſſæus dicti ſui teſtem laudat Peucerum, hominem mendaciloquentiſſimum; cui qui fidem commodandam cenſet, is neſcit adhuc, quam in rebus referendis infidus, & fide indignus ſit Peucerus, etiam apud ipſos Sectarios, præſertim Lutheranos Ubiquitiſtas, qui Peucerum ob ſcelera ſua decennali carcere macerarunt: quo forſan tempore à* Diabolo *hoc de Paulo mendacium accepit* (12), i. e. "It is a deviliſh falſity, that *Paul* "*was ſtrangled by the Devil in the very act of fornica*"*tion*. For all the Hiſtorians, and even Platina, his "moſt bitter enemy, relate that he died of an apo"plectick fit. But du Pleſſis quotes Peucer for his "voucher, the greateſt liar in the world: ſo that "whoever thinks that he deſerves the leaſt credit, "does not know how unfaithful an Hiſtorian he is, "and how unworthy he is to be believed, even by "the Sectaries themſelves, eſpecially by the Lutheran "Ubiquitarians, who condemned him for his crimes "to a ten years impriſonment; during which time, "the Devil acquainted him, perhaps, with that ſto"ry concerning Paul II." Here follows Coeffeteau's anſwer, as to this particular. "Du Pleſſis quotes in "the margin Peucer (13), a notorious Heretick, "ſon-in-law to Melanchton, from whom one cannot "expect any true account of the Popes (14)."

(10) Peucer, *Chronicorum*, lib. 5. p. m. 895.

(11) Du Pleſſis Mornai.

(12) Gretſer, *in Examine Myſterii Pleſſæani*, p. 530.

(13) It ſhould have been obſerved, that du Pleſſis ought to have written *Peucer*, and not *Peucher*.

(14) Coeffet. *Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniq.* p. 1178.

[D] . . . . *that he abandoned himſelf to Sodomy and Magic.*] The chapter, in which Mr. du Pleſſis-Mornai ſpeaks of this Pope, ends thus. *But what is worſe ſtill, there is an Author who charges him with Magic and Sodomy* (15). He does not ſay who that Author is, and by that ſilence, he expoſed himſelf to the moſt bitter reproaches. Gretſer challenges him to name that Author, and in the mean time, he charges him with forgery and calumny, which neither Platina, nor Bale himſelf, ſay a word of. *Non vult Pleſſæus, homo religioſiſſimus, Paulum* magiæ & præpoſteræ Libidinis *accuſare; & tamen dum non vult, impudentiſſime accuſat. Ait*, non deeſſe, qui illum horum criminum inſimulent. *Quinam illi? Certè non Platina, qui odio Pauli talia flagitia vix latere ſuiſſet. Non ipſe calumniatorum primipilus Balæus. Quare nulla injuria Pleſſæum gravabis, licet ex ipſius officina deteſtabile hoc commentum proceſſiſſe credas; donec unde acceperit auctorem edat, quem ſi ediderit, Pleſſæo tam ſimilem conſpicies, quàm ovum ovo, & lac lacti* (16), i. e. "Du Pleſſis, a "moſt religious man, will not accuſe Paul II. of ma"gic and ſodomy; and yet, whilſt he would ſeem "to ſcruple it, he does it all along moſt impudent"ly. *There are not wanting thoſe*, ſays he, *who charge* "*him with theſe crimes*. Who are thoſe? Certainly, "not Platina, who was too much exaſperated againſt "Paul II. to ſuffer ſuch odious crimes to be buried in "oblivion. Not Bale himſelf, the moſt notorious "ſlanderer in the world. You will not therefore "do du Pleſſis the leaſt injury, if you ſuppoſe him "the contriver of that abominable ſtory, till he "names the Author from whom he borrowed it; and if "ſhould name him, you will find him of the ſame "character with himſelf." One may be ſurpriſed that Monſieur de Mornai ſcrupled to quote Peucer for that particular, ſince he had cited him juſt before for a particular which is not leſs infamous. For Peucer relates, as we have ſeen above (17), both the abominations mentioned in the text of this remark. Gretſer did not know this.

(15) Du Pleſſis, *Myſtere d'Iniq.* p. 544.

(16) Gretſer, *in Examine Myſterii Pleſſæani*, p. 536.

(17) In the rem. [C].

I ſhall obſerve by the by, that if Peucer had quoted ſome Author of the 15th century, he would have avoided the reproach he is liable to, of giving no other proof, but an uncertain tradition, far remote from its firſt origin. He wrote an hundred years after Pope Paul's death; a time long enough to alter ſuch traditions, as were not fixed at firſt by being ſet down in ſome writings (18). There is another obſervation to be made, which is, that we ought to miſtruſt a diſhonourable tradition much more, than a tradition which contains an elogy, when the queſtion is about perſons, who by their cruel extortions, drew the publick hatred upon themſelves. There was no ſtory, but the people believed in France, when it was diſgraceful to Cardinal Richelieu, or to Cardinal Mazarin. If a ſervant turned out of doors for very good reaſons, or a family moſt juſtly puniſhed, did but ſlander their Eminences, and invent whatever ſtory they pleaſed, it was immediately ſwallowed with the greateſt pleaſure imaginable, and ſoon ſpread abroad. Would it become a wiſe Hiſtorian to make a collection of ſuch reports? A contemporary writer might do it without blame, becauſe it would be poſſible for him to make all the neceſſary inquiries in order

(18) See the *Reponſe aux Queſtions d'un Provincial*, Tom. 1. p. 31.

it in the very words of a writer of Port-Royal [*E*]. Paul II. died of an apoplectick fit [*F*], July 28th, 1471 (*e*). It was he who ordered that *the Jubilee ſhould for the future be*

(*e*) Platina, *in* Paulo II. Others ſay the 25th.

order to find out the truth. But after three or four generations it is almoſt impoſſible to diſcover the grounds of thoſe uncertain and vulgar reports, which no Hiſtorian thought worthy to be mentioned. It is proper to remember here, that Paul II. was haughty and ſevere, that he was greedy of gain, *&c.* (19). Let us conclude, that Peucer was abſolutely obliged to quote ſome Author, and not only fame in general.

(19) *Moroſus erat & difficilis tum domeſticis tum externis; & ſæpe quod promiſerat mutata ſententia invertebat.... Durus interdum & inexorabilis, ſi quid ab eo peteres habebatur, neque hoc contentus convitia & proba in te conjiciebat.* Platina, *in* Paulo II. *in fine. i. e.* " He was peeviſh and moroſe, both with his own ſervants, and with ſtrangers, and he often came back from his word.... He was ſometimes ſevere and inexorable, when you asked him any thing, and not content with refuſing you, he would alſo give you opprobrious language."

[*E*] *I ſhall relate* a moſt notorious injuſtice of Paul II. *in the very words of a writer of Port-Royal.*] " It is a cuſtom with the Cardinals, when they are " meet together for the election of a Pope, to make " among themſelves ſome laws, which they think " uſeful for the Church, and to bind themſelves by " an oath to keep them in caſe they ſhould be raiſed " to the papal dignity. This cuſtom was followed " before the election of Pope Paul II. it was agreed " amongſt other things, never to put in any bull or " in any decree, that ſome order was made by the " advice of the Cardinals, unleſs it had been really " ſubmitted to their examination, and they had " given their conſent to it: *Nil in diplomatibu factum " dicere ex fratrum conſilio, quod ad verum conſulentibus " iis decretum non eſſet,* ſays Cardinal James of Pavia, " *Comment.* II. (20). Nothing was more reaſonable " than that reſolution, ſince it was only obliging " themſelves not to lie. And accordingly, Peter, " Cardinal of St. Mark, a Venetian being choſen " Pope in that conclave, and taking upon him the " name of Paul II. confirmed when he was Pope, " what he had ſworn to when but a Cardinal; add- " ing that he would have obſerved thoſe orders, " though he had not been obliged to it by a vow and by " a ſolemn oath. And yet as men are naturally inclined " to free themſelves of all ſorts of ties, and to look " upon the laws as a troubleſome reſtraint, from " which it is proper to be delivered, this Pope did " ſoon hearken to ſome ambitious and flattering Pre- " lates, who repreſented to him that he was not " bound to ſubmit to thoſe regulations, which li- " mited the Papal power, which ought not to be li- " mited by any laws: ſo that he was ſo far from " keeping what he had ſworn to, that he would even " oblige the Cardinals to ſign bulls and decrees, " without giving them the leaſt knowledge of what " they contained. Such proceedings ſeemed very hard " and odious to the ſacred College, which was fully " perſuaded that the Pope could not refuſe to keep " a promiſe which was ſo ſolemn and juſt: their incli- " nation and opinion therefore was, that they muſt ab- " ſolutely refuſe to ſign what the Pope required of " them. But it appeared very plainly on that occa- " ſion, that the courage neceſſary to reſiſt ſo power- " ful a Sovereign, who has ſo many means to hurt, " is not a very common virtue; and that as there is " nothing ſo eaſy and ſo common as that obedience " which is paid to all the orders of a Sovereign, " whatever they be, ſo there is nothing more difficult " and more ſcarce than that holy diſobedience which " makes men reſiſt their ſuperiors in things unjuſt or " unreaſonable. *The Cardinals,* ſays James of Pa- " via, *were forced, partly by fair words, and partly by " threatnings, to ſign briefs which they never read; and " Pope Paul's tyranny was ſuch, that Cardinal Beſſarion " running away from his chamber, that he might not be " obliged to ſign a decree he had not ſeen, the Pope ſtopt " him with his own hand, and threatned to excommu- " nicate him, if he did not ſign it,* which he did at " laſt, not having courage enough to reſiſt ſo powerful " a Sovereign, though in an action moſt evidently " unjuſt. Thoſe Cardinals, who had more honour " and conſcience, made a little more reſiſtance a- " gainſt the Pope's commands: and the Cardinal of " Pavia, who had a great deal of honour, did not " only refuſe at firſt to obey, but he even wrote a " very ſevere letter to the Pope, in which he repre- " ſented to him very freely the obligation he was " under to keep the oath he had made, and how un- " juſt thoſe ſubſcriptions were, which he required of " them. But at laſt he was daunted like the reſt, " and carried away with the ſtream of baſeneſs. " There was but one perſon in the whole ſacred Col- " lege, namely Cardinal Carvial (21), who had cou- " rage enough to reſiſt to the laſt, and to be conſtant " in his refuſal to ſign thoſe decrees. This is what " Cardinal James of Pavia repreſents himſelf, con- " feſſing his own weakneſs, with great humility, " and extolling on the contrary the Chriſtian gene- " roſity of Cardinal Carvial, a Spaniard. *We have " all ſubſcribed,* ſays he in his 182d Letter; *partly " through the deſire of obtaining what we wiſh for, " and partly through the fear of being continually expoſed " to the dreadful effects of his Holineſs's indignation. It " is true we have been cowards, and too much ſwayed " by our own private intereſt; we have had no regard " for the glory of God, but only for the fleſh, and for a " worldly happineſs. However, none of us approved " the Pope's proceedings; but Cardinal John Carvial, " a very old man, and eminent by his merit, is the only " perſon who on this occaſion gained the reputation of a " man of courage. He declined conſenting to that ſhame- " ful action, nor could he be brought back from his reſo- " lution by all the moſt artful ſolicitations of the Pope, " who endeavoured to win him: to all the entreaties " that were made him, he anſwered, that it was not to " be expected that he would forſake juſtice in his old age, " which he had never forſaken in his youth. I ſhall not " create you any trouble, ſaid he to the Pope, about thoſe " laws, but ſuffer me to have a regard for my conſcience, " and for my reputation.* Which makes the Cardinal " of Pavia, conclude that this worthy man deſerved " not only to ſit among them as Cardinal, but even " to preſide over them as a Pope. VIR *profecto dignus, " non qui nobiſcum ſedeat, ſed qui præſideat ad conſilium " Sedis Romanæ* (22)."

(20) Theſe words are to be met with in the 2d book of *Jacobi Cardinalis Papienſis Commentarii*, p. 37, of the Francfort edit. 1614.

(21) It ſhould be *Carvagral.*

(22) *Les Imaginaires*, Lettre 9. p. 180, &c. edit. of Cologne 1683, in 8vo. Obſerve that the anonymous Writer, (I imagine it was F. Queſnel) who in the year 1704, publiſhed a book, intitled, *Avis ſinceres aux Catholiques des Provinces Unies ſur le Decret de l'Inquiſition de Rome contre Monſ. l'Archeveſque de Sebaſte Vicaire Apoſtolique*, quoted this long paſſage from the *Imaginaires*, p. 95, &c.

I wonder that ſuch a particular ſhould have eſcaped the notice of ſo many Proteſtant Authors, who have made collections of the wicked actions of the Popes.

[*F*] *Paul* II. *died of an apoplectick fit.*] The Authors of the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary, who complain of the Proteſtants about the cauſe they aſcribe his death to, do not relate it accurately; for they ſuppoſe that *the Proteſtants aſſert he was ſtrangled by a man, who found him in bed with his wife.* Now we have ſeen above (23), that they charge the Devil with that execution. The truth of the matter is that no man ſaw him die (24). Platina thinks that he died of an apoplectick fit occaſioned by his eating two large melons. *Bibaciſſimus quidem erat: ſed vina admodum parva & diluta bibebat. Peponum eſu, cancrorum, paſtillorum, piſcium, ſuccidiæ admodum delectabatur, quibus ex rebus ortam crediderim apoplexiam illam, qua è vita ſublatus eſt, nam duos pepones & quidem prægrandes comederat eo die quo ſequenti nocte mortuus eſt* (25), i. e. " He was a great drinker, but he drank only " weak wines, and even mixed with water. He " liked very much to eat melons, crab-fiſhes, paſtils, " fiſh, and dainties, which in my opinion occaſioned " the apoplectick fit of which he died: for the day " before his death he eat two pretty large melons." This Hiſtorian ſays in another place, that he thinks this Pope's apoplexy was occaſioned by the heavineſs of the jewels, with which he delighted to load his head. *Qui* (Leo IV. Imperator) *adeo gemmis delectatus eſt, ut direpto ſacrario S. Sophiæ coronam magni ponderis ac precii ſibi conſtituerit, qua quidem ita frequenter utebatur, ut aut propter, pondus, aut ob frigiditatem lapillorum ſubito morbo correptus ſit. Idem quoque accidiſſe noſtra ætate Paulo* II. *putaverim, quod adeo his muliebribus delinimentis delectatus eſt, conquiſitis undique magno precio gemmis, & exhauſto pene Eccleſiæ Romanæ ærario, ut quotieſcunque in publicum prodiret, Cybelle quædam Phrygia ac turrita, non mitrata videretur. Hinc ego ortam tum ſudore præpinguis corporis, tum gemmarum pondere apoplexiam illam puto, qua correptus ſubito morbo interiit* (26), i. e. " The Emperor Leo IV. took ſo " great a pleaſure in jewels, that he plundered the " Veſtry-room of St. Sophia, and cauſed a very rich " Crown to be made, which he wore ſo often, that " either the weight or the coldneſs of the precious " ſtones threw him ſuddenly into a diſtemper. I am " apt to think that the ſame happened in our time to " Pope Paul II. who took ſo great a delight in thoſe " womaniſh ornaments, that having got jewels at a

(23) In the rem. [*C*].

(24) Apoplexia ſolus in cubiculo nemine vidente, ſecunda noctis hora moritur. *Genebr. Chron.* lib. 4. p. m. 701, and *Carranza*, in *Summa Concilior.* p. m. 879.

(25) Platina, *in* Paulo II. folio 362 *verſo.*

(26) Idem, *in* Adriano I. folio 125 *verſo.*

(f) Du Pleſſis, *Myſtere d'Iniq.* p. 543.

be celebrated every 25 years, being in hopes to have the pleaſure of ſeeing that fair in the year 1475 (*f*).

" great price from all places, and almoſt exhauſted " the treaſury of the Church of Rome, he might, " whenever he appeared in publick, be like a Phry- " gian Cybele, with a Turret on his head inſtead of " a Mitre. I imagine that either his ſweating too " much, for he was very fat, or the weight of the " jewels occaſioned the apoplectick fit, of which he " died ſuddenly."

PAUL (FATHER), a Servite Monk, and Theologue to the Republick of Venice. See SARPI (*α*).

(*α*) Mr. Bayle refers us to the word Sarpi for the article of Father Paul; but he could not keep his word for a reaſon which he mentions in the text of the article *Peireſc*. REM. CRIT.

PAULICIANS. Thus the Manicheans were called in Armenia, when a certain Paul headed them in the 7th Century. " They became ſo powerful * either through the " weakneſs of the Government, or by the protection of the Saracens, and even by the " Emperor Nicephorus's favour, who was very zealous for that Sect, that at laſt, being " perſecuted by the Empreſs Theodora, conſort to Baſilius †, they were in a condition " to build cities, and to riſe in arms againſt their Princes. Theſe wars continued a long " time, and were very bloody under the reign of Baſilius the Macedonian, that is to " ſay, towards the end of the ninth Century (*a*)." And yet they had made ſo great a ſlaughter of theſe Hereticks under the Empreſs Theodora [*A*], that one would have thought they would never have been able to retrieve their loſs. It is preſumed, that the Preachers, whom they ſent into Bulgaria [*B*], eſtabliſhed the Manichean Hereſy in that country, from which it ſpread ſoon after into the other parts of Europe. They condemned the worſhipping of the Saints, and the images of the Croſs [*C*]. But this was not their chief Characteriſtick. Their fundamental Doctrine was that of two coeternal Principles, independent on each other. Such a Doctrine immediately ſtrikes one with horror, ſo that it is ſtrange that the Manichean Sect could ſeduce ſo many people [*D*]. But on

* Cedrenus, Tom. 2. p. 480.

† Ibid. p. 541.

(*a*) Mr. de Meaux, *Hiſt. des Variations*, Liv. 9. num. 13. p. m. 128.

[*A*] *They had made ſo great a ſlaughter of theſe Hereticks under the Empreſs Theodora.*] This is mentioned in the ſupplement to Moreri's Dictionary (1), where Father Maimbourg is quoted, whoſe words are as follow. " Theodora . . . reſolved to procure ef- " fectually the converſion of theſe Paulicians, or to rid " the Empire of them, if they ſhould obſtinately op- " poſe their real happineſs. . . . It is true, that thoſe " to whom ſhe gave the commiſſion, and ſufficient " forces to perform that deſign, acted with too much " ſeverity, and too great a cruelty, for inſtead of en- " deavouring at firſt to bring them back gently, and " with charity, to the knowledge of the truth, " they ſeized thoſe unfortunate wretches who were " diſperſed in the cities and towns, and it is ſaid, " they put about an hundred thouſand of them to " death throughout Aſia, by all manner of torments; " which obliged all the reſt to ſurrender, and ſubmit " to the Saracens, who knew very well how to em- " ploy them ſome time after againſt the Greeks. " But the Empreſs, who was not concerned in the " inhuman conduct of her Lieutenants, reaped, how- " ever, this advantage from it, that the Empire was " free from thoſe vermin during her reign, which " laſted fourteen years (2)." This method of converting people is entirely Mahometan, and confirms what has been obſerved in another place (3), that the Chriſtians have been infinitely more cruel than the followers of Mahomet, againſt thoſe who were not of their religion.

(1) Under the word *Paulicians*.

(2) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. des Iconoclaſtes*, lib. 6. p. 263, Dutch edit. under the year 845.

(3) In the article MAHOMET, remarks [*O*] and [*AA*].

[*B*] *The Preachers whom they ſent into Bulgaria.*] Peter (4) of Sicily, whom the Emperor Baſilius the Macedonian ſent to *Tibricum in Armenia, one of the towns belonging to theſe Hereticks, to negotiate an exchange of priſoners* . . . (5), *diſcovered, during the time of his Embaſſy, that it had been reſolved in the Council of the Paulicians, to ſend Preachers of their Sect into Bulgaria, to ſeduce the people there, who had been lately converted to the Chriſtian Religion. Thrace, which is near that country, had been a long time before infected with that hereſy. So that there was but too much reaſon to fear for the Bulgarians, in caſe the Paulicians, the moſt artful of all the Manicheans, attempted to ſeduce them: this obliged Peter of Sicily to direct to their Archbiſhop the book we have mentioned juſt now* (6), *in order to ſtrengthen them againſt the attacks of ſuch dangerous Hereticks. But notwithſtanding all his cares, it is certain that the Manichean hereſy took very deep root in Bulgaria.*

(4) Monſieur de Meaux, *Hiſt. des Variations*, Liv. 11. num. 14

(5) Ibidem, num. 16.

(6) It is a book intitled, *Hiſtoria de Manichæis*, (an hiſtorical account of the Manicheans.) Raderus tranſlated it out of Greek into Latin, and publiſhed it at Ingolſtat with notes, in the year 1604, in 4to.

[*C*] *They condemned the worſhip of the Saints, and the Images of the Croſs.*] Peter of Sicily relates, " that a " Manichean woman ſeduced an ignorant Lay-man " named Sergius, by telling him that the Catholics " worſhipped the Saints as ſo many Deities, and that " this was the reaſon why the Laity were not ſuffer- " ed to read the Scripture, leſt they ſhould find out " ſeveral other errors of the ſame kind (7)." See what is quoted from Father Maimbourg, in the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary.

(7) *Hiſt. des Variations*, Liv. 11. num. 15.

[*D*] *It is ſtrange that the Manichean Sect could ſeduce ſo many people.*] We have obſerved in another place (8), with how much zeal Pope Leo warned all the Biſhops, not to ſuffer that theſe Hereticks, who were ſentenced to baniſhment by the laws of the Empire, ſhould find any retreat or ſanctuary. And yet this hereſy kept its ground, ſo that it was neceſſary to make much more ſevere laws againſt it, and to condemn the profeſſors of it to death. However, it continued *to ſubſiſt, and even ſpread farther. The Emperor Anaſtaſius, and the Empreſs Theodora, Juſtinian's Conſort, favoured it; and we meet with the followers of it in Armenia, even under Heraclius's children, that is to ſay, in the ſeventh century* (9). We have already mentioned the great progreſs that hereſy made there; we have ſeen that the maſſacre of an hundred thouſand Paulicians could not prevent the propagating of that hereſy from Thrace into Bulgaria. Several perſons were afterwards infected with it in many provinces of France. Conſult Monſieur de Meaux (10). Lambert Daneau obſerves, that it prevailed very much in Perſia, Syria, and Meſopotamia, under the Emperor Anaſtaſius, and in Sicily under Pope Gregory the Great. *Romam ipſam occupavit hæc hæreſis, unde tamen expulſa eſt a Leone Pontifice Romano circa annum a Chriſto paſſo* 414. *In Arabia tamen, Perſide & Ægypto maxime viguit potuitque, unde poſtea Mahumatiſmus tanquam ex ſerpentis, viperæque ovo enatus & excluſus. Diutiſſime etiam ſubſtitit; nam & Anaſtaſii Imperatoris temporibus adhuc in Perſide, Meſopotamia, & Syria graſſabatur aperte: & Gregorii Magni Pontificatu in Sicilia, id eſt, annos poſt Manetem mortuum plus quam* 340 *ut apparet ex Gregorii Epiſt.* 6 *lib.* 4. *& P. Diaconi lib.* 15. *Hiſtoria, ubi Indaganam eorum Epiſcopum commemorat* (11), i. e. " That hereſy " got

(8) In the art. MANICHEANS, rem. [*E*].

(9) *Hiſt. des Variat.* Liv. 11. num. 13.

(10) *Hiſt. des Variat.* Liv. 11.

(11) Lambert. Dan. *Not. in Auguſtin. de Hæreſib.* cap. 46. folio m. 119 *verſo*.

on the other hand, it is ſo difficult to anſwer all the objections concerning the origin of Evil [*E*], that we ought not to wonder the Hypotheſis of two Principles, the one good, the

" got alſo ground at Rome, whence it was however " driven, by Pope Leo, about the year 414. But it " flouriſhed and ſpread very much in Arabia, Perſia " and Egypt; and from that hereſy ſprung after- " terwards Mohamediſm, as from a ſerpent's and a " viper's egg. The Manichean hereſy continued a " great while; for it raged ſtill publickly in Perſia, " Meſopotamia and Syria, under the reign of the " Emperor Anaſtaſius, and in Sicily, under Pope Gre- " gory the Great; that is to ſay, above 340 years " after the death of Manes, as appears from the 6th " epiſtle of the 4th book of Gregory's letters, and " from the 15th book of Paul the Deacon's hiſtory, " where he mentions *Indagana*, a Manichean " Biſhop." I dare not aſſert, that this hereſy ſpread into the provinces of the Eaſt, where we find ſome nations who hold the doctrine of two principles: they might have received it ſome other way, than from the Manicheans. I am very much of Lewis Thomaſſin's opinion. *The accounts which are often given us of Aſia*, ſays he (12), *ſhew that there are ſtill, in that part of the world, ſome Manicheans beyond the borders of the antient Roman Empire. I cannot aſſert very poſitively that they are the remains, or the poſterity of thoſe, who being often baniſhed from the whole Roman Empire, retired into the neighbouring provinces. There is ſome probability in this, but not the ſame certainty, as when we ſay the ſame of the Arians, the Neſtorians, and the Eutychians. Theſe are really Hereticks, who would have no other Origin, but from the Catholick Church of their time, whoſe bowels they rent to get out of it. But the Manicheans came originally from the Eaſt, being derived from the antient Idolaters, who admitted alſo two firſt principles, the one the Author of good, the other of evil, as we read in Plutarch, and in ſeveral other heathen Hiſtorians.*

(12) Thomaſſin, *de l'Unite de l'Egliſe*, Tom. 1. part 2. cap. 9. p. 378.

[*E*] *It is ſo difficult to anſwer the objections* of the Manicheans *concerning the origin of evil.*] I have prepared my Readers (13) to find here three obſervations, which I would have inſerted in the article of the Manicheans, had it not been that I was afraid of making that article run to too great a length. Let us acquit ourſelves of our promiſe, and not diſappoint thoſe who may be willing to conſult our Reference. I ſhall put hereunder, (14) by themſelves, the ſecond and third obſervations. But here follows the firſt.

(13) In the art. MANICHEANS, quotation (61).

(14) In the rem. [*G*] and [*H*].

The Fathers of the Church, who have ſo well refuted the Marcionites, the Manicheans, and generally all thoſe who admitted two principles, have but indifferently ſolved the objections, which relate to the origin of evil. They ought to have given up all the arguments *a priori*, as weak out-ſides, open to every attack, and which cannot be defended: they ſhould have kept to the arguments *a poſteriori*, and put their whole ſtrength behind that entrenchment. The Old and New Teſtament are two parts of a Revelation, which confirm each other: ſince therefore the Manicheans admitted the Divinity of the New, it was no difficult taſk to prove to them the Divinity of the old, which being done, it was an eaſy matter to ruin all their objections, by ſhewing that they were inconſiſtent with a matter of fact. There is, according to the Scriptures, but one principle, and that a good one, and yet moral and natural evil crept in amongſt mankind; it is not therefore inconſiſtent with the nature of the good principle, to ſuffer the introduction of moral evil, and to puniſh ſin: for it is not more plain that 4 and 4 make 8, than it is plain, that if a thing happened, it is poſſible. *Ab actu ad potentiam valet conſequentia*, is one of the moſt clear and unqueſtionable axioms of Metaphyſicks (15). This is an impregnable bulwark, and ſufficient to make the cauſe of the Orthodox triumph, though their arguments *a priori* could be refuted. But can they be refuted, will ſome aſk? I anſwer, yes: It is not only unaccountable, but even inconceivable, how evil could creep into the world, under the government of a ſovereign Being, infinitely good, infinitely holy, and infinitely powerful; and all that is objected againſt the arguments urged to account for that Being's permitting evil is more agreeable to right reaſon, and to our notions of order, than thoſe very arguments are. Do but well examine the following paſſage from Lactantius; it contains an anſwer to an objection of Epicurus. *Deus, inquit* Epicurus, *aut vult tollere mala, & non poteſt; aut poteſt, & non vult; aut neque vult, neque poteſt, aut & vult & poteſt. Si vult, & non poteſt, imbecillis eſt; quod in Deum non cadit. Si poteſt, & non vult, invidus; quod æque alienum à Deo. Si neque vult neque poteſt, & invidus & imbecillis eſt; ideoque neque Deus. Si vult & poteſt, quod ſolum Deo convenit, unde ergo ſunt mala? aut cur illa non tollit? Scio pleroſque Philoſophorum, qui providentiam defendunt, hoc argumento perturbari ſolere, & invitos pene adigi, ut Deum nihil curare fateantur, quod maxime quærit Epicurus. Sed nos ratione perſpecta, formidoloſum hoc argumentum facile diſſolvimus. Deus enim poteſt quicquid velit; & imbecillitas, vel invidia, in Deo nulla eſt: poteſt igitur mala tollere, ſed non vult; nec ideo tamen invidus eſt. Idcirco enim non tollit, quia & ſapientiam (ſicut docui) ſimul tribuit, & plus boni, ac jucunditatis in ſapientia, quam in malis moleſtiæ. Sapientia etiam facit, ut etiam Deum cognoſcamus, & per eam cognitionem immortalitatem aſſequamur; quod eſt ſummum bonum. Itaque niſi prius malum agnoverimus, nec bonum poterimus agnoſcere. Sed hoc non vidit Epicurus, nec alius quiſquam; ſi tollantur mala, tolli pariter ſapientiam; nec ulla in homine virtutis remanere veſtigia; cujus ratio ſuſtinenda & ſuperanda malorum acerbitate conſiſtit. Itaque propter exiguum compendium ſublatorum malorum maximo, & vero, & proprio nobis bono careremus. Conſtat igitur, omnia propter hominum propoſita, tam mala, quam etiam bona* (16), i. e. " God, ſays Epicurus, either " would remove evil, and cannot, or he can, and will " not, or he neither will nor can, or he both will " and can. If he would but cannot, he wants power " and is weak, which is inconſiſtent with the nature " of God; if he can but will not, he is malicious, " which is equally unbecoming him. If he nei- " ther will nor can, he is both malicious and weak, " and therefore no God. If he both will and can, " which alone becomes his nature, whence comes " evil? Or why does he not remove it? I am ſenſi- " ble, that ſeveral Philoſophers, who maintain a " Providence, have been perplexed by that argu- " ment, and almoſt forced by it to acknowledge, " though againſt their will, that God does not mind " the things of this world, which is what Epicurus " chiefly aims at. But we, having fully examined " the whole matter, eaſily ſolve that mighty ar- " gument. God can do whatever he wills, there is " neither weakneſs nor malice in him. He can there- " fore remove evils, but he wills not: and yet he " is not malicious: for he does not remove it, be- " cauſe, (as I have ſhewed before) he has endowed " us alſo with wiſdom; and there is more good, " more ſweetneſs in wiſdom, than there is uneaſineſs " and trouble in evil. It is alſo owing to wiſdom, " that we know God, and by that knowledge, ob- " tain everlaſting life, which is the ſupreme good, " and chief happineſs. If therefore we had not firſt " known evil, we could not have known good. But " neither Epicurus, nor any other man, obſerved, " that if you remove evil, you remove alſo wiſdom " at the ſame time, nor will there remain the leaſt " footſtep of virtue in men, which conſiſts in ſuffer- " ing with conſtancy, and even conquering the great- " eſt evils. So that for the ſmall comfort of being " free from evil, we ſhould be deprived of the great- " eſt and true good, which is the moſt proper for " us. It is therefore certain, that all, both good " and evil, is deſigned for man's happineſs."

(15) See above the article MANICHEANS, remark [*D*], quotation (59).

(16) Lactant. *de Ira Dei*, cap. 13. p. m. 548.

It was impoſſible to ſtate the objection more fairly; Epicurus himſelf could not have propoſed with more clearneſs, nor with more ſtrength. See the margin (17) But Lactantius's anſwer is a moſt wretched one; it is not only weak, but it even abounds with errors, and perhaps alſo with hereſies. It ſuppoſes that God was under a neceſſity to produce evil, becauſe he could not otherwiſe have given us either wiſdom, or virtue, or a ſenſe of good. Can there be any thing more monſtrous than ſuch a doctrine? Does it not overthrow all that the Divines teach us of the happineſs of Paradiſe, and of the ſtate of innocence. They

(17) Obſerve, that this objection of Epicurus, does not relate to moral evil. It would be much more perplexing, if it related to it.

the other bad, ſeduced ſeveral antient Philoſophers, and got ſo many followers amongſt the Chriſtians, whoſe Doctrine of the profeſſed hatred of the Devils againſt the true God

tell us that Adam and Eve enjoyed, without the leaſt mixture of evil, all the pleaſures, which the garden of Eden could afford them, a moſt charming and delicious place, which God had given them to live in. The Divines add, that if our firſt parents had not ſinned, they and all their poſterity would have enjoyed that happineſs, without being ſubject to diſtempers, or to vexations, and that neither the elements nor the beaſts would ever have done them the leaſt injury. It was their ſin that expoſed them to heat and cold, to hunger and thirſt; to pain and grief, and to the miſchief which ſome animals do us. It is therefore ſo far from being true, that virtue and wiſdom cannot belong to man, without natural evil, as Lactantius aſſerts, that on the contrary we muſt maintain, that a man is expoſed to evil, only becauſe he forſaketh virtue and wiſdom. If Lactantius's doctrine were true, it would follow unavoidably from thence, that the good Angels are expoſed to a thouſand inconveniences, and that the Souls of the Bleſſed paſs ſucceſſively from a ſtate of joy to a ſtate of ſadneſs. So that in the very place of bliſs, in the ſight of God himſelf, men would not be free from adverſities. Nothing is more inconſiſtent than this with the unanimous opinion of all the Divines, and with reaſon. It is even certain, that according to ſound philoſophy, it is by no means neceſſary that our Soul ſhould have felt evil, in order to have a ſenſe and taſte of good; or that it ſhould paſs ſucceſſively from pain to pleaſure, and from pleaſure to pain, in order to be capable to know that pain is an evil, and pleaſure a good. So that Lactantius's Doctrine claſhes both with right reaſon, and with Divinity. We know by our own experience, that our Soul cannot feel at once pleaſure and pain: it muſt therefore the firſt time feel either pain before pleaſure, or pleaſure before pain. If its firſt ſenſation was that of pleaſure, it found it an agreeable ſituation, though it had no notion of pain: and if its firſt ſenſation was that of pain, it found it a diſagreeable ſituation, though it had no notion of pleaſure. Suppoſe its firſt ſenſation continued ſeveral years following without any interruption, you will eaſily comprehend that the Soul muſt have found itſelf either in an agreeable or diſagreeable ſituation. Do not pretend to object that experience is againſt me: do not ſay, that a pleaſure which continues too long becomes inſipid, and that pain will at length become tolerable: for I ſhall anſwer that this is owing to an alteration in the organs, by which it happens, that though the continued ſenſation be ſtill the ſame as to its kind, yet it is not the ſame as to the degree of intenſity: if at firſt you have a ſenſation of ſix degrees, for inſtance, it will no longer be of ſix degrees at the end of two hours, or of a year, but only of one degree, or of one fourth part of a degree. Thus it is that cuſtom takes off the edge of our ſenſations: their degrees anſwer to the commotion of the parts of the brain; that commotion grows weaker and weaker by the frequent repetitions; whence the degrees of our ſenſations grow leſs. But if pleaſure or pain were communicated to us in the ſame degree for an hundred years following, we ſhould be as happy or as unhappy the hundredth year as we were the firſt day. Which proves evidently, that a creature can be happy by a continued good, or unhappy by a continued evil, and therefore that the alternative mentioned by Lactantius is but a poor ſolution: it is grounded neither on the nature of good and evil, nor on that of the ſubject which receives either, nor on that of the cauſe which beſtows it. Pleaſure and pain are not leſs proper to be communicated the ſecond moment than the firſt, nor the third moment than the ſecond, and ſo on. Our Soul is as ſuſceptible of them after it had taſted them one moment, as before it had any ſenſe of them: and God who beſtows them is not leſs capable to produce them the ſecond time than the firſt. This is what we find by the natural notions we have of theſe objects. The Chriſtian Theology confirms this moſt invincibly: for it teaches us that the torments of the damned will be eternal, uninterrupted, and as ſevere at the end of an hundred thouſand years as the firſt day; and that on the contrary, the pleaſures of Heaven will laſt for ever, without any interruption, and without loſing the leaſt degree of their livelineſs. I would be glad to know whether, if we were to make a very eaſy ſuppoſition, namely, two Suns, the one of which ſhould always riſe, when the other ſhould ſet, it would not follow from thence, that mankind would have no notion of darkneſs. But according to Lactantius's fine Philoſophy it would alſo follow from thence, that man would have no notion of light, that he would not know it is day-light, that he ſees the objects before him, &c. Conſult the margin (18).

(18) I ſhall quote hereunder, in the remark [G], a paſſage from *Plutarch*, which may be urged againſt *Lactantius*'s anſwer.

What I have been obſerving, proves methinks unqueſtionably, that a man would not much puzzle our Paulicians, by repreſenting to them, that God mixed good with evil, only, becauſe he foreſaw, that good unmixed, would in a little time ſeem inſipid to us. They would anſwer, that this propriety is not contained in the idea we have of good, and that it is inconſiſtent with the common Doctrine concerning the happineſs of Heaven. And as for experience, by which we find but too much, 1. That the pleaſures of this life affect us more or leſs, according as they deliver us from a ſad condition: 2. That they are ſoon attended with a diſguſt, if they continue but a while; they would maintain that this phænomenon is unaccountable, unleſs we have recourſe to their hypotheſis of two principles. For if we depend, would they ſay, only on an almighty cauſe, infinitely good, infinitely free, which diſpoſes of all Beings in general, according to its will and pleaſure, we ought never to feel any evil, all the good things we enjoy muſt be without mixture, nor ought we ever to find the leaſt diſguſt in them. If the Author of our Being is infinitely beneficent, he ought to take a continual delight in making us happy, and in preventing all that could interrupt or leſſen our pleaſures. This is a propriety eſſentially contained in the idea of the ſupreme goodneſs. The fibres of our brains cannot be the cauſe why God ſhould take off the edge of our pleaſures; for according to you, he is the only Creator of matter, he is Almighty; nothing can prevent him from acting according to the full extent of his infinite Goodneſs. It is in his power to make our pleaſures independent on the fibres of our brains; or if he will make them depend on thoſe fibres, he can continue them eternally in the ſame condition: it is in his power to prevent their being worn out, or to cauſe the damage they receive to be immediately repaired. You cannot then account for what we experience, but by the hypotheſis of two principles: if we enjoy any pleaſure, it is the good principle which beſtows it upon us: but if we do not enjoy it without ſome allay, if we are ſoon diſguſted of it, it is becauſe the bad principle thwarts the good one: the latter is ſoon even with the former; he cauſes pain to become leſs troubleſome through cuſtom, and makes us find ſome relief in the greateſt misfortunes. This, together with the good uſe men often make of adverſity, and the bad uſe they often make of happineſs, can be admirably well accounted for in the Manichean Syſtem. They are facts which lead us to ſuppoſe, that the two principles have made an agreement together, by which their reſpective operations are limited within certain bounds (19). The good principle cannot do all the good he could wiſh; but in order to do us a great deal of good, he was obliged to conſent, that the bad principle ſhould do us as much miſchief: for without ſuch a conſent, the Chaos had always continued a Chaos, and no creature had ever enjoyed any happineſs. So that the good principle finding a better method to ſatisfy his inclination, by ſuffering the world to be ſometimes happy, and ſometimes miſerable, than by ſeeing it never happy, made an agreement, from which ſprung the mixture of good and evil, which we obſerve among men. If you ſuppoſe your principle almighty, and give him the glory of enjoying eternity alone, you deprive him of that attribute, which goes before all the reſt; for the *optimus* (beſt) always proceeds the *maximus*

WHY cuſtom takes off the edge of our ſenſations.

(19) In the 1ſt *a-linea* or break of the remark [I], we give an explication, which ſuppoſes no agreement at all.

God is attended with the Doctrine of the rebellion and fall of ſome of the good Angels. The Hypotheſis of two Principles would probably have made a greater progreſs ſtill, had

maximus, (greateſt), in the ſtyle of the moſt learned nations, when they ſpeak of God: you ſuppoſe that though nothing hinders him from loading his creatures with bleſſings, yet he loads them with miſery, and if he raiſes ſome on high, it is only that their fall may be the heavier (20). We clear him from all this, and without calling his goodneſs into queſtion, we explain all that can be ſaid of fortune's inconſtancy, of Nemeſis's jealouſy, and of that continual play, which Æſop makes to be God's employment. *He abaſes the high*, ſaid Æſop, *and exalts the low* (21). He could not, ſay we, get better terms for his adverſary: he has extended his goodneſs as far as he could, and if he does not do us more good, it is becauſe it is not in his power; ſo that we have no reaſon to complain.

(20) *Tolluntur in altum ut lapſu graviore ruant.* Claudian. in Rufinum, lib. 1. *circa init.*

(21) See the article ÆSOP, remark [*I*].

Who would not wonder at, and lament the ſad fate of our reaſon? Here you ſee the Manicheans, who with an Hypotheſis entirely abſurd and inconſiſtent, account for matters of fact an hundred times better than the orthodox do with the moſt juſt, neceſſary and only true ſyſtem of a firſt principle who is Almighty and infinitely good.

Let us ſhew by another inſtance how little ſucceſs the Fathers had in their controverſy with theſe Hereticks concerning the origin of evil. Here follows a paſſage from St. Baſil. *At neque à Deo ipſum malum profluxiſſe pium eſt dicere: propterea quod nihil contrariorum à contrario ſuo gignitur——at ſi nec ingenitum, inquies, ipſum malum nec à Deo profluxit, unde naturam ſortitur? Nam mala eſſe nemo particeps vitæ contradixerit. Quid igitur eſt dicendum: nempe malum non eſſentiam viventem animaque præditum eſſe, ſed affectionem animæ virtuti contrariam, deſidioſis ac inertibus, propterea quòd à bono deciderunt, inditam. Noli itaque malum forinſecus circumſpicere, atque inquirere, neque quandam naturam principem malignitatis imaginare, ſed malitiæ quiſque ſuæ ſeipſum Autorem agnoſcat. Nam ſemper ea, quæ nobis eveniunt, partim è natura proficiſcuntur, ut ſenectus, ut infirmitas: partim ſuâ ſponte proveniunt, quales ſunt caſus inopini alienis principiis accidentes——partim verò in nobis ipſis ſunt collocata, ut cupiditates ſpernere, aut voluptatibus modum non ponere, continere iram, aut manus injicere in eum qui injuriâ laceſſivit, vera dicere aut falſa, manſuetum moribus eſſe ac moderatum, aut faſtu ſuperbum arrogantiaque elatum. Quorum itaque tute Dominus es, horum principia non aliunde quærere velis, ſed quod propriè malum eſt——id ab ultronea & voluntaria electione ſumpſiſſe principium ſcito, &c.* (22), i. e. "Religion requires us to maintain "that evil did not come from God, ſince nothing "can produce its contrary——But you will ſay, if "evil be uncreated, and did not come from God, "whence does it come? For no man living can "deny there are evils in the world. What muſt "we ſay then? We muſt ſay, that evil is not a living "ſubſtance, and has no Soul. But that it is only an "affection of the mind contrary to virtue, under "which the ſlothful and negligent are made to la"bour, becauſe they fell from good. Do not there"fore conſider and examine evil as though it were "without you; do not imagine there is a certain na"ture, who is the cauſe and principle of evil; but "let every one acknowledge himſelf the Author of "his own wickedneſs: for all the evils which hap"pen to us come partly from nature itſelf, as old "age, infirmities, &c. partly of themſelves, as "thoſe unexpected accidents, which are occaſioned "by foreign cauſes . . . . but thoſe evils are alſo "partly owing to ourſelves, as for inſtance, to curb "our appetites, or to ſet no bounds to our deſires; "to conquer anger, or to revenge an injury, to ſpeak "the truth, or to tell lies; to be mild and humble, "or haughty and proud. Do not therefore pretend "to look abroad for the cauſe of thoſe things, which "are owing to yourſelf, but know that whatever is "really evil, ariſes from a free and voluntary "choice." The German Divine (23), who quotes this paſſage, obſerves very juſtly, that this Father grants to the Marcionites more than he ſhould; for he will not even confeſs that God is the Author of natural evil, as diſtempers, and old age, and an hundred other accidents, which happen to us from without and unexpectedly. So that to ſolve a difficulty he admits errors, or perhaps even hereſies. But another defect of his anſwer is, that he imagines he will diſentangle himſelf, and juſtify providence, by barely ſuppoſing that the vices have their origin in men's Souls. How came he not to ſee that this was only evading the difficulty, or giving for a good ſolution the very thing in which the chief difficulty conſiſts? Zoroaſter, Plato, Plutarch, the Marcionites, the Manicheans, and in general all thoſe who admit a principle naturally good, and a principle naturally bad, both eternal, and independent, all theſe, I ſay, pretend that it is impoſſible to account otherwiſe for the origin of evil. You anſwer, it comes from man himſelf: but how can that be, ſince, according to you, man is created by a Being infinitely holy, and infinitely powerful? Muſt not the work of ſuch a Being be good? Can it be otherwiſe than good? Is it not more poſſible that darkneſs ſhould ariſe from light, than it is poſſible that the production of ſuch a principle ſhould be bad? Herein lies the ſtreſs of the difficulty. St. Baſil could not be ignorant of it. Why then does he anſwer only, that we ought to look for the cauſe of evil in man himſelf. But who put it there? Man, by the ill uſe he made of his Creator's grace, who being immenſely good had created him in a ſtate of innocence. If you anſwer this, you only beg the queſtion. You are arguing againſt a Manichean, who aſſerts, that two contrary Creators concurred in the production of man: and that man received from the good principle all that is good in him, and from the bad principle all that is bad in him: and you anſwer his objections by ſuppoſing that there is but one Creator of man, and an infinitely good one; is not this giving your own Theſis for an anſwer? It is plain, that St. Baſil argues wrong: but beſides, as this is a ſubject which puts philoſophy to a nonplus, he ought to have retired into his ſtrong hold, that is to ſay, he ſhould have proved by the word of God, that there is but one Creator of all things, who is infinite in goodneſs, and in all kind of perfections: that man came innocent and good from his hands, but loſt his innocence and goodneſs by his own fault (24). This is the origin of moral evil, and of natural evil. Let Marcian, and all the Manicheans argue as much as they pleaſe, in order to prove, that under the government of an infinitely good and holy Providence, the fall of innocent man could not happen, they will argue againſt a matter of fact, and conſequently expoſe themſelves to ridicule. I ſuppoſe always, that they are perſons, who may be brought by arguments *ad hominem* to acknowledge the divinity of the old Teſtament. For if we had to deal with a Zoroaſter, or with a Plutarch, it would alter the caſe.

(22) *Baſilius Magnus Hexaem. Homil.* 2. apud *Tobiam Pfannerum Syſtem. Theologiæ Gentilis*, cap. 9. p. m. 253.

(23) Tobias Pfannerus, ibid.

(24) See the art. MANICHEANS, between the quotations (58) and (59), and above, the remark [*E*] of this article, at the firſt *a-linea* or break.

Thus the Reader may ſee, it is not without reaſon I maintain, that we muſt object againſt thoſe Sectaries only this Maxim, *ab actu ad potentiam valet conſequentia*, and this little Enthymen, *this happened, and therefore it is not repugnant to the holineſs and goodneſs of God*. I obſerve, that it is impoſſible to engage the diſpute upon another footing, without ſome diſadvantage. The reaſons for the permiſſion of ſin, which are not borrowed from the myſteries revealed in Scripture, how good ſoever they may be otherways, yet have this defect (25), that they may be confuted by other reaſons more ſpecious ſtill, and more agreeable to the notions we have of order. For inſtance, if you aſſert, that God permitted ſin with a deſign to ſhew his wiſdom, which appears with more glory, amidſt the diſorders, which men's wickedneſs occaſions daily, than it would do in a ſtate of innocence you will be anſwered, that this is comparing God either with the father of a family, who ſhould ſuffer his children's legs to be broke, in order to ſhew what an able bone-ſetter he is; or with a King, who ſhould ſuffer diſorders and ſeditions to rage throughout his dominions, that he might gain a great reputation by ſuppreſſing them (26). The conduct of that Father and of that King is ſo inconſiſtent with the clear and diſtinct ideas, by which we are wont to judge

(25) Refer to this what a Father of the Church ſaid, *Felix culpa quæ talem meruit habere redemptorem*, i. e. "Happy "crime, which "deſerved to "have ſuch a "Redeemer."

(26) See in the article CALLISTRATUS, quotations (7) and (8) the words of *Seneca*.

had it been explained in a leſs groſs manner, and had it not been attended with ſeveral odious

judge of goodneſs and wiſdom, and in general of all duties of a father and of a King, that our reaſon cannot comprehend how God could chooſe to act thus. But you will ſay, the Lord's ways are not our ways. Keep then to that; it is a text from the ſcripture (27), and do not pretend to argue any more (28). Do not pretend to tell us, that had it not been for the fall of the firſt man, God's juſtice and mercy had continued unknown; for you will be anſwered that nothing was more eaſy than to give man a notion of theſe two attributes. The bare idea of a Being infinitely perfect teaches even ſinful men that God is poſſeſſed of all the virtues, which become a nature infinite in every reſpect. How much more would it have taught the innocent man, that God is infinitely juſt? But, you will ſay, he would have puniſhed none: I anſwer, even this would have made his juſtice known: it had been a continual act, a perpetual exerciſe of that virtue: no man would have deſerved to be puniſhed; and conſequently the ſuppreſſion of all puniſhment had been a function of juſtice. Pray anſwer me? Here are two Princes, the one of whom ſuffers his ſubjects to fall into a wretched condition, that he may deliver them after they ſhall have ſuffered enough: the other keeps them conſtantly in a ſtate of proſperity. Is not the latter a better Prince, is he not even more merciful than the former? They who hold the immaculate conception of the bleſſed Virgin, prove to a demonſtration that God diſplayed his mercy and the benefit of Chriſt's redemption upon her much more than on the reſt of mankind. Nor need a man be a Metaphyſician to underſtand this: the moſt ignorant country fellow knows moſt diſtinctly, that there is much more goodneſs in preventing a man's falling into a ditch, than in ſuffering him to fall into it, to help him out of it an hour after (29); and that it is much better to prevent an Aſſaſſin from committing murder, than to have him broke upon the wheel for the murders he was ſuffered to commit (30). All this ſhould warn us, not to engage in a controverſy with the Manicheans, unleſs we ſet down beforehand, the doctrine of *the exaltation of Faith, and the abaſement of Reaſon* (31).

They who hold that God permitted ſin, becauſe he could not have prevented it without affecting the free-will, which he had endued man with, and which was the moſt noble preſent he had made him, lay themſelves very much open. This reaſon has, indeed, ſomething dazzling in it; it ſeems grand; but it can be refuted by other reaſons, which are better ſuited to the capacity of the bulk of mankind, and better grounded on common ſenſe, and on the notions of Order. Without reading Seneca's beautiful treatiſe on Benefits, a man may know by his own natural reaſon, that it is the eſſential character of a benefactor, not to beſtow favours, which he knows will be ſo ill uſed, as to promote only the ruin of him on whom they are beſtowed. There is no enemy, let him be never ſo exaſperated, but would in ſuch a caſe load his enemy with favours. It is the eſſential character of a benefactor, to ſpare nothing that is neceſſary to make his kindneſs procure the happineſs of the perſon he honours with it. If, though it were in his power to confer the art of making a good uſe of his favours, he ſhould refuſe it, he would but indifferently act the part of a benefactor: nor would he act it better, if when it was in his power to prevent his client's making an ill uſe of his favours, he did not prevent it by curing him of his wicked inclinations (32). The common people are not leſs acquainted with theſe notions than the Philoſophers. I confeſs, that if the ill uſe of a favour could not be prevented, but by breaking the legs and arms of one's clients, or by putting them in chains, and throwing them into a dungeon, one would not be obliged to prevent it; and it were better in ſuch a caſe to refuſe the favour. But if the ill uſe of it could be prevented, by altering a man's heart, and by giving him a taſte for what is good, the benefactor would be obliged to do it. Now this is what God could eaſily do, if he pleaſed. Take notice of what Cicero objects to thoſe who aſſerted it was not God's fault that men made an ill uſe of his favours. *Huic loco ſic ſoletis occurrere, Non idcirco non optimè nobis à diis eſſe proviſum, quòd multi eorum beneficio perverſè uterentur: etiam patrimoniis multos malè uti: nec ob eam cauſam eos beneficium à patribus nullum habere. Quis iſtuc negat? aut quæ eſt in collatione iſta ſimilitudo? nec enim Herculi nocere Deianira voluit, cùm ei tunicam, ſanguine Centauri tinctam, dedit: nec prodeſſe Phæreo Jaſoni, is qui gladio vomicam ejus aperuit, quam ſanare medici non potuerant. MULTI ENIM, ETIAM CUM OBESSE VELLENT, PROFUERUNT, ET CUM PRODESSE, OBFUERUNT. Ita non fit ex eo, quod datur, ut voluntas ejus, qui dederit, appareat: nec, ſi is, qui accepit, bene utitur, idcirco is, qui dedit, amice dedit* (33), *i. e.* "To this argument you uſe to object, that "tho' men make an ill uſe of the favours of the "Gods, it does not follow from thence, that the "Gods did not provide for our happineſs as well as "it was poſſible. Many make an ill uſe of their patrimony; but have they therefore no obligation to "their fathers? Who denies this? Or what likeneſs is there in that compariſon? For Deianira did "not deſign to hurt Hercules, when ſhe ſent him a "garment dyed with the Centaur's blood. Nor did "he, who with a ſword cut an impoſthume in Jaſon "of Pheræa's body, which the Phyſicians could not "cure, intend that Prince a kindneſs. *For many, "when they pretended to hurt, have been uſeful; and "many have done harm, when they deſigned a favour.*" Whence it is plain, that a man's deſign does not "always appear, by what he gives; and that if a "good uſe is made of it, yet it does not follow from "thence, it was kindly given."

There is no kind mother, who having given her daughters leave to go to the maſquerade, but would go back from her promiſe, if ſhe knew for certain that her daughters would yield to the addreſſes of a lover, and leave their maidenhead there. Any mother, who, knowing that this would infallibly happen, ſhould ſuffer them nevertheleſs to go to the ball, being content with only exhorting them to chaſtity, and threatning them with her indignation, if they returned women; ſuch a mother, I ſay, would very juſtly draw upon her the blame of having no love for her daughters, and no value for chaſtity. It were to no purpoſe for her to ſay in her own vindication, that ſhe would not put her daughters liberty and free-will under any reſtraint, nor ſhew them the leaſt miſtruſt: ſhe would be anſwered, that this was a very imprudent circumſpection, becoming an exaſperated ſtep-mother, rather than a kind parent; and that it had been much better not to let her daughters go out of her ſight, than to give them ſo prepoſterouſly ſuch a privilege of free-will, and ſuch proofs of truſt. This ſhews the raſhneſs of thoſe, who pretend to alledge as a good reaſon, the regard which they ſay God had for the firſt man's free-will. It is better to believe and be ſilent, than to give reaſons, which may be refuted by the inſtances I have mentioned. Cotta, in a book of Cicero, urged ſo many arguments againſt thoſe who aſſert, that the faculty of reaſoning is a preſent which the Gods made to men, that Cicero did not think himſelf capable to ſolve thoſe difficulties: for if he had thought himſelf capable of it, he would have anſwered them. His academical genius was in its true element, when he could ſhew that one can argue for ever for and againſt the ſame queſtion. Since therefore he left Cotta's arguments unanſwered, we ought to infer from thence, that he did not know what to reply (34). And yet Cicero was one of the moſt excellent wits that ever were. Cotta having ſhewed that reaſon is an accomplice of all men's crimes, and that therefore the Gods ought to have given it us, if they deſigned us harm, objects to himſelf the common ſolution, which is, that men make an ill uſe of the favours of Heaven. *Sed urgetis identidem hominum eſſe iſtam culpam, non deorum . . . in hominum vitiis ais eſſe culpam* (35). He replies, that the ill uſe ſhould have been prevented, and that man ought to have been endued with ſuch a reaſon, as might make him avoid all evil; that they cannot be excuſed, who make a preſent, which they know will prove pernicious. This he ſhews by ſeveral inſtances. *Eam*

(27) Iſaiah, chap. 56. ver. 8.

(28) See hereunder, rem. [M], towards the end.

(29) See Garaſſe, *Somme Theologique*, p. 430.

(30) *Cur omnium cruadeliſſimus tamdiu Cinna regnavit? At dearit pœnas. Prohiberi melius fuit, impedirique ne tot ſummos viros interficeret, quam ipſum aliquando pœnas dare. Summo cruciatu ſupplicioque Varius homo importuniſſimus periit; ſed quia Druſum ferro, Metellum veneno ſuſtulerat, illos conſervari melius fuit, quam pœnas ſceleris Varium pendere.* Cicero, de Natura Deorum, lib. 3. cap. 33, 34.
i. e. "Why did "Cinna, the "moſt cruel of "all men, govern ſo long? "He was puniſhed at laſt. "But it had "been better to "prevent him "from putting "ſo many of the "beſt men to "death, than to "puniſh him for "it afterwards. "Varius, the "moſt outrageous man that "ever lived, "ſuffered the "moſt cruel "capital puniſhment, becauſe he had "killed Druſus "with the "ſword, and "Metellus with "poiſon: but it "had been better to ſave their "lives, than to "puniſh him for "murthering "them."

(31) Mr. Amyraut wrote a book with that title: See his article, remark [H].

(32) Concerning all this, ſee the remark [E] of the article ORIGEN.

(33) Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*, lib. 3. cap. 28. Add to this, what has been obſerved concerning Horace's *Eutrapelus*, in the art. ORIGEN, quotat. (43).

(34) As it began to be late, Balbus did not anſwer Cotta, and put it off till another day, which never came. *Quoniam ad veſperaſcit, dabis diem nobis aliquam, ut contra iſta dicamus.* Cotta anſwered, that he deſired and hoped to be refuted. *Ego vero & opto redargui me, Balbe, & ea quæ diſputavi diſſerere malui quam judicari, & facile me a te vinci poſſe certo ſcio.* Cicero de Natura Deorum, lib. 3. *ſub fin.*

(35) *Non ut patrimonium relinquitur, ſic ratio homini eſt beneficio Deorum data. Quid enim potius hominibus dediſſent, ſi iis nocere voluiſſent.* Cicero, de Natura Deorum, lib. 3. cap. 28, 31.

odious actions (c), or if there had been then as many controverſies as there are now about Predeſtination [F], in which the Chriſtians charge each other, either with making God the

(c) See the rem. [B] of the art. MANICHE-

Eam dediſſes hominibus rationem, quæ vitia, culpamque excluderet. Ubi igitur locus fuit errori Deorum? nam patrimonia ſpe bene tradendi relinquimus, qua poſſumus falli: Deus falli quî potuit? An ut Sol in currum cùm Phaëthontem filium ſuſtulit? aut Neptunus, cùm Theſeus Hippolytum perdidit, cùm ter optandi à Neptuno patre habuiſſet poteſtatem? Poëtarum iſta ſunt: nos autem philoſophi eſſe volumus, rerum auctores, non fabularum. Atque ii tamen ipſi Dii poëtici ſi ſciſſent perniciosa fore illa filiis, peccaſſe in beneficio putarentur. Et ſi verum eſt quod Ariſto Chius dicere ſolebat. Nocere audientibus Philoſophos iis qui bene dicta male interpretarentur: poſſe enim aſotos ex Ariſtippi, acerbos è Zenonis ſcholâ exire. Prorſus, ſi qui audierunt vitioſi eſſent diſceſſuri, quòd perversè philoſophorum diſputationem interpretarentur; tacere præſtare philoſophis, quàm iis qui ſe audiſſent, nocere. Sic ſi homines rationem bono conſilio à Diis immortalibus datam, in fraudem, malitiamque convertunt, non dare illam, quàm dari humano generi melius fuit, ut ſi medicus ſciat eum ægrotum, qui juſſus ſit vinum ſumere, meracius ſumpturum, ſtatimque periturum, magnâ ſit in culpâ: ſic veſtra iſta Providentia reprehendenda, quæ rationem dederit iis, quos ſcierit eâ perversè & improbè uſuros. Niſi forte dicitis eam neſciviſſe. Utinam quidem, ſed non audebitis: non enim ignoro quanti ejus nomen putetis (36), i. e. "He ought "to have given ſuch a reaſon to men, as might pre- "vent all vices and guilt. Whence then came the "miſtake of the Gods? For when we leave an eſtate "to our children, it is in hopes that they ſhall make "a good uſe of it; wherein we may be diſappoint- "ed: but how can God be miſtaken? Is it as Apol- "lo was, when he put his ſon Phaeton in his cha- "riot? Or as Neptune, when Theſeus loſt his ſon "Hippolytus, though his father Neptune put it three "times in his power to have his wiſh? Theſe are po- "etical ſtories, you will ſay; but we are Philoſo- "phers, who mind real facts, and not ſtories. But "even theſe poetical Gods would be thought to have "but ill beſtowed their favours, had they known that "they would prove pernicious to their children. And "if that be true, what Ariſto of Chios uſed to ſay, "that the Philoſophers do an injury to thoſe, who "miſconſtrue their ſayings, as if ſome were to come "debauched from Ariſtippus's ſchool, or cruel from "Zeno's; or in the general, if ſome were to become "vicious, by miſunderſtanding the Philoſopher's diſ- "putations; in ſuch caſes it were better for the Phi- "loſophers to be ſilent, than to do an injury to their "hearers. Thus if reaſon, which the immortal "Gods gave men with a good deſign, be by them "uſed to their own prejudice, and make them "wicked, it had been better for mankind, not to "make them that preſent: for as a Phyſician would "be much to blame, who ſhould preſcribe wine to "a patient, knowing that he will drink it un- "mixed with water, and die immediately; ſo your "Providence is to blame for giving reaſon to men, "knowing that they would make a bad and wick- "ed uſe of it. Unleſs you ſay, Providence did not "foreſee it. I wiſh you would, but you will not dare "to ſay it, for I know how much you value that "Providence." With ſuch arguments it is eaſy to ſhew, that the free-will of the firſt man, which was preſerved whole and entire to him in ſuch circumſtances in which he was to uſe it to his own prejudice, to the ruin of mankind, to the introduction of a dreadful flood of moral evils, and natural evils, and to the damnation of the greateſt part of his deſcendants, was not a good preſent. We ſhall never be able to comprehend that ſuch a privilege was preſerved to him out of kindneſs, and from a love for holineſs. They, who aſſert it was neceſſary there ſhould be free Beings, that God might be loved through choice (37), are ſenſible in their conſcience, that ſuch an hypotheſis does not ſatisfy our reaſon. For when it is foreſeen that ſuch Free-Beings will chooſe, not the love of God, but ſin, it is plain that God's deſign was fruſtrated, and therefore it was not neceſſary to preſerve free-will. I ſhall examine this again in the remark [M]. See in the margin (38), the leſſon that is given us.

(36) Idem, cap. 31.

(37) See Father Malebranche's *Traite de Morale.*

(38) *Sancta illa & profunda fidei myſteria non pari paſſu cum cauſis naturalibus ambulant, eoque rectius illa & creduntur clauſis oculis & intelliguntur.* Il ſegreti del Ciel ſol colui vede, Che ſerra gli occhi e crede. *Franciſcus Redi, de Gener. Inſectorum*, i. e. "Thoſe holy "and deep myſ- "teries of Faith, "are not pro- "portioned to "the natural "cauſes, where- "fore they are "better believ- "ed and under- "ſtood with our "eyes ſhut. *He "alone ſees the "ſecrets of Hea- "ven, who ſhuts "his eyes and "believes.*" *Obſerve, that the two Italian lines quoted here, are of Count* Guido Ubaldo Bonarelli, *at the end of his Paſtoral, intitled,* Filli di Sciro.

[F] *I there had been then as many controverſies as there are now about Predeſtination.*] If the Manicheans were to ſtop here, they would give up their greateſt advantage: for here follow ſome objections much more terrible. 1. One cannot conceive how the firſt man could receive the faculty of doing evil from the firſt principle. That faculty is a vice: all that can produce evil, is bad, ſince evil cannot come but from a bad cauſe: and therefore Adam's free will came from two oppoſite principles: as far as it could chooſe good, it depended on the good principle, but as it could chooſe evil, it depended on the bad principle. 2. It is impoſſible to comprehend that God only permitted ſin: for a bare permiſſion of ſin added nothing to free will, and did not make it poſſible to foreſee, whether Adam would perſevere in his ſtate of innocence, or fall from it. Beſides, by the ideas we have of a created Being, we cannot conceive that it can be a principle of action, that it ſhould move itſelf, and that receiving every moment of its duration its very Being and the Being of its proprieties entirely from another cauſe, it could create by its proper modalities within itſelf. Theſe modalities muſt be, either undiſtinguiſhed from the ſubſtance of the Soul, as the modern Philoſophers hold, or diſtinct from the ſubſtance of the Soul, as the Peripateticks aſſert. If they are undiſtinguiſhed, they cannot be produced but by the ſame cauſe, that can produce the very ſubſtance of the Soul; now it is plain that man is not, nor can be that cauſe. If they are diſtinct from the Soul, they are created Beings, Beings made out of nothing, ſince they are not made of the Soul, nor of any pre-exiſting nature; they cannot therefore be produced but by a cauſe that can create. Now all the Sects of Philoſophers agree that man is not, nor can be ſuch a cauſe. Some pretend, that the action which moves him, comes from without, but that he can nevertheleſs ſtop it, or direct it to ſuch or ſuch an object (39). This is a contradiction; for there is no leſs ſtrength requiſite to ſtop what is in motion, than to move what is at reſt. Since therefore a creature cannot be put into motion by a bare permiſſion of acting, and has no principle of motion within itſelf, it is abſolutely neceſſary that God ſhould move it: he does then ſomething more than barely ſuffering it to ſin. 3. This may alſo be made to appear by another argument, which is, that we cannot comprehend how a bare permiſſion ſhould take contingent events out of the number of things merely poſſible, nor how it ſhould make the Deity capable to know with certainty that the creature will ſin. A mere permiſſion cannot be the ground of God's Preſcience: for which reaſon moſt of the Divines ſuppoſe, that God made a decree, the purport of which is that the creature ſhall ſin. This is according to them the foundation of his foreknowledge. Others maintain that the purport of the decree is that the creature ſhall be put in ſuch circumſtances, in which God foreſaw it would ſin. So that the former aſſert that God foreſaw ſin becauſe of his decree, and the latter, that he made his decree becauſe he had foreſeen ſin. But in whatſoever manner they expreſs themſelves, it follows evidently from thence that God would have man to ſin, and that he preferred this before a continual duration of innocence, which it was eaſy for him to procure and to decree. Reconcile this if you can with the goodneſs he ought to have for his creatures, and with the infinite love he muſt have for holineſs. 4. If you ſay with thoſe, who come neareſt to the method by which providence would be cleared, that God did not foreſee Adam's fall, you will not get much by it; for you muſt own at leaſt, that God knew moſt certainly, that the firſt man was in great danger of loſing his innocence, and of introducing into the world all the natural and moral evils, which were the conſequence of his rebellion. Neither God's goodneſs, nor his holineſs, nor his wiſdom, could ſuffer him to run the riſk of thoſe ſad events. For our reaſon teaches us moſt plainly that a mother, who ſhould ſuffer her daughters to go to a ball, when ſhe knew moſt certainly that their honour would run the greateſt danger, would ſhew thereby that ſhe loves neither her daughters,

(39) Father Malebranche, in his *Traite de la Nature, & de la Grace.*

the Author of ſin, or with denying his providence. The Heathens could eaſier anſwer the

daughters, nor chaſtity: if it be ſuppoſed that ſhe has an infallible preſervative againſt all temptations, and yet does not give it her daughters when ſhe ſends them to the ball, one ſees plainly that ſhe is guilty, and does not care whether or not her daughters keep their maidenhead. Let us carry this compariſon a little farther ſtill. If that mother went to the ball, if through a window ſhe ſaw and heard one of her daughters defending herſelf but weakly in the corner of a cloſet againſt the preſſing inſtances of a young lover, if even when ſhe ſhould ſee her daughter juſt ready to yield to the tempter's wiſhes, ſhe did not run to her aſſiſtance, and deliver her from the ſnare, would it not be juſtly ſaid that ſhe acted like a cruel ſtep-mother, and was capable of ſelling her own daughter's honour (40)? Now this is an image of the conduct which the Socinians aſcribe to God (41). They cannot ſay, that God knew the ſin of the firſt man only as a poſſible event. He knew every degree of the temptation, he could not but know, a moment before Eve fell, that ſhe was juſt going to ruin herſelf: he could not, I ſay, but know it, with ſuch a certainty, which renders one inexcuſable, if he does not prevent the evil, ſo that one cannot ſay, *I had reaſons to think this would not happen, I had a great deal of hopes left ſtill.* There are no men, who have a little experience of the world, but will, without ſeeing what paſſes in a woman's heart, and knowing it only by outward ſigns, be certain, that ſhe is ready to yield to a lover, if they ſee through a window how ſhe defends herſelf, when her fall is really near at hand. The moment ſhe will conſent, is preceded by ſome ſigns which are not at all equivocal. How much more muſt God, who knew all Eve's thoughts as they aroſe in her mind (for the Socinians do not deny him that knowledge) how much more, I ſay, muſt God have been certain that ſhe was juſt going to fall? Adam's ſin has been foreſeen with more certainty ſtill. For Eve's example gave hints, whereby the huſband's fall could be the eaſier foreſeen. If God had been concerned for the preſervation of man and of innocency, and for preventing all the misfortunes, which were to be the unavoidable conſequence of ſin, would he not at leaſt have ſtrengthened the huſband after his wife's fall? Or would he not have given him another wife holy and entire, inſtead of her who ſuffered herſelf to be ſeduced? Let us ſay therefore, that the Socinian Syſtem, by depriving God of his Preſcience, reduces him to a ſtate of ſlavery, and to a wretched method of governing the world; and yet it does not remove the grand difficulty, which was to be removed, and which drives thoſe Hereticks to a denial of God's foreſeeing the contingent events (42).

I refer you to a Profeſſor of Divinity, who is ſtill living (43), who proved moſt evidently, that neither the Syſtem of the Scotiſts, nor that of the Moliniſts, nor that of the Remonſtrants, nor that of the Univerſaliſts, nor that of the Pajoniſts, nor that of F. Malebranche, nor that of the Lutherans, nor that of the Socinians, were proper to ſolve the objections of thoſe, who charge God with introducing ſin into the world, or who pretend that his introducing it is inconſiſtent with his goodneſs, his holineſs, and his juſtice (44); ſo that this Profeſſor not finding his account better in any other Syſtem, keeps to St. Auguſtin's Hypotheſis, which is the ſame with that of Luther and Calvin, and which is alſo that of the Thomiſts, and of the Janſeniſts; he keeps to that, I ſay (45), *though perplexed with the* terrible *difficulties* he has diſplayed (46), and *though ready to ſink under the heavy load* (47). Since Luther and Calvin appeared, I do not think there ever paſſed one year, in which they were not charged with making God the Author of ſin. The Profeſſor I ſpeak of owns, that the charge is well grounded with regard to Luther (48). The preſent Lutherans ſay the ſame of Calvin: the Roman Catholicks aſſert it of both. The Jeſuits maintain it alſo with regard to Janſenius. They who are moderate, and judge fairly, do not charge an adverſary with diſhoneſty, who proteſts that he does not accuſe God of man's ſin, and does not make him the Author of it: they are willing to acknowledge that he does not aſſert it poſitively, and does not ſee all the conſequences of his Doctrine: but then they add, that *Proteſtatio facto contraria nihil valet*, a proteſtation againſt matter of fact is void; and that if he will take the trouble to determine exactly what God muſt have done to be the Author of Adam's ſin, he will find, that according to his Doctrine, God has really done all that was requiſite for it. You do, therefore, add they, the contrary of what Epicurus did: he denied, in reality, the Being of the Gods, though he ſaid there were Gods (49); but you on the contrary deny in words, that God is the Author of ſin, though you really teach it.

Let us come now to the text of this remark. The controverſies, which aroſe in the Weſt among the Chriſtians ſince the Reformation, have ſo plainly ſhewn that men do not know what party to chooſe, when they will ſolve the difficulties concerning the origin of evil, that a Manichean would be now a more dreadful adverſary, than he was formerly, for he would refute us all the one by the other. You have ſpent, would he ſay, the whole ſtrength of your wit; you have invented the *ſcientia media*, or *middle ſcience*, as a God deſcending from a machine to diſentangle your Chaos: but it is a chimerical invention: one cannot conceive it is poſſible that God ſhould have future events otherwiſe than by means of his decrees, or by the neceſſary connection of cauſes and effects. This is not leſs inconceivable in Metaphyſicks, than it is inconceivable in Morals, that God, being infinitely good and holy, ſhould yet be the author of ſin. I refer you to the Janſeniſts: ſee how they run your middle ſcience down both by direct proofs, and by a retortion of your own arguments: for notwithſtanding that ſcience, all man's ſins and all his misfortunes are nevertheleſs owing to God's free choice: and we may compare God *(abſit verbo blaſphemia:* Let it be ſaid without blaſphemy) [See the margin (50)] with a mother, who knowing certainly that her daughter would give her maidenhead, if at ſuch a place, and at ſuch an hour, ſhe were preſſed to it by ſuch a one, ſhould procure the meeting, lead her daughter to the place, and leave her there to herſelf. The Socinians being perplexed with this objection, endeavour to ſolve it by denying God's preſcience: but they find to their ſhame, that their hypotheſis only debaſes God's Government, without clearing him, and is but little leſs liable to the compariſon of that mother, than the other ſyſtems. See above, quotation (41). I refer them to Proteſtants, who run them down and put them to a non-plus. As for the abſolute decrees, which are a ſure cauſe of preſcience, pray ſee, how the Moliniſts and the Remonſtrants confute them. We have here a Divine, as ſtout and reſolute as Bartolus, who confeſſes almoſt with tears in his eyes, that *no man is more perplexed than he by the difficulties* of thoſe decrees, and that he continues to hold that ſyſtem, only becauſe he found himſelf *ſtill labouring under the ſame perplexity*, when he would go over to more remiſs ſyſtems (51). He has expreſſed himſelf with more ſtrength ſtill (52), and you cannot deny but he has unanſwerably refuted all thoſe ſyſtems, and conſequently you cannot extricate yourſelf, unleſs you admit my ſyſtem of two principles. All the difficulties will then vaniſh away; you will fully clear the good principle, and you will find that it is only paſſing from a leſs reaſonable to a more reaſonable Manicheiſm: for if you examine your own Hypotheſis with ſome attention, you muſt acknowledge, that you admit, as well as I, two principles, the one of good, the other of evil, but inſtead of placing them, as I do, in two different ſubjects, you combine them together in one and the ſame ſubſtance, which is monſtrous and impoſſible. The only principle, you admit, reſolved from all eternity, that man ſhould ſin, and that the firſt ſin ſhould be contagious (53); that it ſhould continually be productive of all crimes imaginable on the whole face of the earth; after which he prepared for mankind in his life all the misfortunes that can be conceived, as plagues, war, famines, pains, and griefs, and after this life an hell in which almoſt all men will be eternally tormented in

(40) See the quotation (50).

(41) I ſhall ſpeak of this again in the following column.

(42) See Monſieur Arnauld, *Reflexions ſur le Syſteme du P. Malebranche*, Liv. 1. chap. 13. p. 256, &c. *where he ſhews, that* unleſs God by particular decrees combines the ſeveral wills of men, with the motions of matter, thoſe events, which are called contingent, will ſtill be ſo, even with regard to God.

(43) This was wrote in the beginning of April 1696.

(44) Jurieu, *Jugement ſur les Methodes rigides & relachees d'expliquer la Providence & la Grace.* See above, quotation (36), of the article NIHUSIUS.

(45) Ibid. p. 23.

(46) p. 19, 20, 21, 22.

(47) Ibid. p. 23.

(48) Having related Luther's opinions, he adds, *Hæc omnia abdicamus & horremus ut religionem omnem peſſundantia & Manicheiſmum ſpirantia.* i. e. "All this "we explode "and abhor, as "overthrowing "all religion, "and favouring "of Manichei-"iſm." *Petrus Jurius, de Pace inter Proteſtantes ineunda*, p. 214. See Monſieur de Meaux, in the addition to the *Hiſtoire des Variations.*

(49) *Epicurum verbis reliquiſſe Deos, re ſuſtuliſſe.* Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*, lib. 1. cap. 30. See alſo Lactantius, *Libro de Ira Dei*, cap. 4.

(50) This compariſon ſeemed ſhocking to ſeveral perſons of the Reformed Religion; but I deſire them here to conſider, that it is only deſigned to be even with the Jeſuits and the Arminians, who make the moſt horrid compariſons between the God of the Calviniſts (as they ſay) and Tiberius, Caligula, &c. It is very proper to ſhew them, that ſuch arms may be turned againſt themſelves.

(51) Jurieu, *Jugement ſur les Methodes*, p. 23.

(52) See the rem. [I].

(53) According to the Moliniſts, he decreed to put men in ſuch circumſtances, in which he knew for certain they would ſin, and he might, either have put them in other circumſtances, or not have placed them in thoſe.

the objections of the Manicheans, than the Chriſtians [G]; but ſome of their Philoſophers found it a difficult taſk (d). We ſhall ſhew hereunder in what ſenſe the orthodox ſeem

(d) See the rem. [G].

in ſo terrible a manner as makes one's hair ſtand an end, when the deſcriptions of it are read. If ſuch a principle be on the other hand perfectly good, if he loves holineſs infinitely, muſt it not be acknowledged, that the ſame God is at once both perfectly good, and perfectly bad, and that he does not love vice leſs than virtue. Now is it not much more reaſonable to divide theſe oppoſite qualities, and to aſcribe all the good to one principle, and all the evil to another principle? The hiſtory of mankind will prove nothing to the diſadvantage of the good principle. I do not ſay, like you, that of his own accord, from his own free will, and becauſe ſuch was his pleaſure, he made all mankind ſubject to ſin and miſery, when it was in his power to make it holy and happy. I ſuppoſe that he conſented to this, only in order to avoid a greater evil, and, as it were, againſt his own inclination. This clears him. He ſaw that the bad principle would ruin all; he oppoſed him as much as he could, and by agreement (54), he obtained that things ſhould be in the condition they are in. He has done like a Monarch, who, to prevent the ruin of all his dominions, ſacrifices one part of them, for the preſervation of the reſt. It is a great difficulty, which at firſt ſhocks our reaſon, to ſpeak of a firſt Principle, and of a neceſſary Being, who does not do all that he wills, and who through want of power, is forced to ſubmit to the circumſtances of things: but it is a greater defect ſtill for ſuch a Being, freely, and of his own accord, to reſolve upon doing evil, when it is in his power to do good (55). Such might be the language of a Manichean. Let us conclude with the good uſe, for which I deſigned theſe remarks.

(54) In the rem. [I] at the firſt break, we propoſe another Method, than that of an agreement.

(55) See what ſhall be quoted from Plutarch and from Tully, in the following remark.

WHAT uſe we ought to make of the controverſy related above.

It is much more uſeful than ſome people may think, to humble man's reaſon, by ſhewing him how effectually the moſt abſurd Hereſies, as thoſe of the Manicheans are, confound his underſtanding, by perplexing the moſt important truths. This ſhould teach the Socinians, who pretend that reaſon muſt be the rule of faith, that they walk in a bad road, which will by degrees lead them to deny every thing, or to doubt of every thing, and that they expoſe themſelves to be put to a non-plus by the moſt execrable Hereticks. What muſt we do then? We muſt captivate our underſtanding under an obedience of faith, and never diſpute upon ſome ſubjects. And more eſpecially we ought not to pretend to refute the Manicheans but by the Scripture, and by the principle of ſubmiſſion, as St. Auguſtin did. *Their Doctors, who were Philoſophers, or rather Sophiſts, and pretended to follow only reaſon, without having any regard for authority, did by their arguments, and by the falſe ſubtleties of a merely human Philoſophy, very eaſily perplex thoſe, who were not learned enough to anſwer them, and who had nothing to oppoſe them but the Scripture and the authority of the Church, who alone has a right to explain the true ſenſe of it. So that as they promiſed their Diſciples to teach them the truth by the natural light of reaſon and good ſenſe only, and made all that is above reaſon, as are our Myſteries, paſs for errors, they perverted a great many perſons; which engaged* St. *Auguſtin, who was well acquainted with the ſtrong and weak ſide of that Sect, to write againſt them his excellent Treatiſe of the uſefulneſs of Faith, and the neceſſity we are under to believe, chiefly with regard to things ſupernatural, and which belong to religion* (56).

* *Aug. de utilit. cred.*

(56) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. de St Leon*, Liv. 1. p. 16, 17, of the Dutch edit.

[G] *The Heathens could eaſier anſwer the objections of the Manicheans, than the Chriſtians.*] I do not ſpeak abſolutely of all the Heathens, for we have ſeen above (57), that the Philoſopher Meliſſus, who held but one Principle of all things, would not have been capable to anſwer the objections of Zoroaſter, who held two Principles, the one good, the other bad. If there be but one Principle, and if that Principle be eſſentially good, how comes it that men are ſubject to ſo many miſeries? How comes it that they are ſo wicked (58)? If he made the world for their ſake, what did he get by it? *An hæc, ut fere dicitis, hominum cauſâ à Deo conſtituta ſunt; ſapientumne? propter paucos ergo tanta eſt facta rerum molitio: an ſtultorum? at primum cauſa non fuit cur de improbis bene mereretur: deinde quid eſt aſſecutus, cùm omnes ſtulti ſint ſine dubio miſerrimi, maximè quòd ſtulti ſunt? Miſerius enim ſtultitiâ quid poſſumus dicere? Deinde quod ita multa ſunt incommoda in vita, ut ea ſapientes commodorum compenſatione leniant: ſtulti nec vitare venientia poſſint, nec ferre præſentia* (59), i. e. "Was the world created "for the ſake of men, as you are almoſt determined "to ſay? But was it for the ſake of the wiſe? So "great a fabric was then made for but a few. Was "it for the unwiſe? But firſt; what reaſon was there "why he ſhould deſerve well of the wicked? Se"condly, what did he get by it, ſince all the uni"verſe are unqueſtionably miſerable, even becauſe "they are unwiſe. For is there any thing that "makes men more wretched than folly? Laſtly, "how many conveniencies are there not in this "life? The wiſe, indeed, allay them by a kind of "compenſation of inconveniencies; but the wicked "or fooliſh cannot avoid the evils that are coming "upon them, nor bear thoſe that are preſent." If that only Principle you admit is bad, why can man enjoy ſo many pleaſures (60)? Why can they croud in upon him through all his ſenſes, as through ſo many doors? Whence comes it, that he ſo paſſionately ſeeks after them? Whence that inexhauſtible induſtry, with which he multiplies them, and invents new ones? Nay, whence comes it, that he not only has a notion of honeſty, but that there are even many virtuous and charitable actions done among men? It is impoſſible, will the Manichean ſay, to account for all this, if we do not ſuppoſe that two Principles, the one good, the other bad, ſettled the conditions of the marriage of our ſoul with our body, and in general, all that relates to the government of the world. Meliſſus and Parmenides were not the only Philoſophers, whom theſe difficulties could perplex: The Stoicks were alſo very much puzzled by them: the Stoicks, I ſay, who without denying that there were many Gods, reduced them all to Jupiter, as the ſupreme Diſpenſer of all events (61). To him they aſcribed Providence, and acknowledged him for an infinitely good and infinitely wiſe Being. It was againſt this Plutarch argued, in the objections he urged againſt them, taken from the miſery of mankind. "There is not, ſays he (62), "nor ever was, a wiſe man upon earth; and on the "contrary, there are innumerable millions of un"happy to the utmoſt exceſs, under the government "of Jupiter, whoſe adminiſtration is perfectly good. "But can there be any thing more abſurd than to "ſay, that though Jupiter governs extremely well, "yet we are extremely miſerable? If therefore, "which it is a crime to ſay, he would be no longer "a Saviour, a Deliverer, a Protector, but quite the "contrary of what is ſignified by theſe noble titles, "it would be impoſſible to increaſe the good that is "already in the world, either with regard to the "number, nor with regard to the intenſity of it; "for, as they ſay, where men live in the utmoſt mi"ſery, neither vice nor unhappineſs can be increaſed "in the leaſt. Nor is this the worſt; but they are "angry with Menander, for ſaying, as a Poet, in a "play, that *the greateſt cauſe of human miſery, is the too-good Being*: for this, they pretend, is againſt "common ſenſe. And yet, they make God, who "is good, the cauſe of evils. For matter could not "produce evil of itſelf, ſince it is deſtitute of all "qualities; and all the diverſities that are in it, "come from him, who moves and forms it; that is "to ſay, from the mind within it, ſince it cannot "move nor form itſelf: it follows, therefore, that "evil comes from nothing, and from what is not; "or if it comes from a moving Principle, it muſt be "from God. But if they imagine that Jupiter does "not govern every part of himſelf *, and does not "uſe it according to his own will and pleaſure, they "ſpeak againſt common ſenſe, and ſuppoſe an ani"mal, whoſe ſeveral members are not ſubject to its "will, but have a particular power in themſelves, "by which they act, without being moved by the "animal to which they belong. For there is no "animal ſo formed, that againſt his will his legs "may walk, his tongue ſpeak, or his horns ſtrike. "But

(57) In the art. MANICHEANS, remark [D].

(58) Ibidem.

(59) Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*, lib. 1. cap. 9.

(60) *Siquidem Deus eſt, unde mala? bona vero unde ſi non eſt?* Boet. de Conſol. lib. 1. Proſa. 4. p. m. 11. See what I ſhall quote from Tully in the article PERICLES, remark [K].

(61) See Plutarch. *adverſus Stoicos*, p. 1075.

(62) Ibid. I make uſe of Amiot's tranſlation, *Oeuvres Morales*, p. 707. Tom. 2. of the Geneva edit. 1621, in 8vo.

* That is, by ſuppoſing him the mind of the Univerſe, every part of which may be then conſidered as a part of Jupiter, as every limb is a part of man. ADD. REM.

" But God muſt ſuffer all this, if his parts being " wicked, do lie, cheat, rob, or murder againſt his " will. But if, as Chryſippus maintains, there is not " the leaſt part in Jupiter that does not act according " to his will, if all that is animated, acts and moves " as it is impelled and moved by Jupiter himſelf, " this is worſe ſtill. It were much better to ſay, " that on account of Jupiter's want of power, there " are numberleſs of his parts, that act againſt his " nature and will, than to ſay that there is no wick- " neſs, no crime, but of which Jupiter is the au- " thor." Obſerve well that concluſion: if we were to chooſe between two evils, and to ſay, either that Jupiter wants power, or that he wants goodneſs, Plutarch is of opinion, that we ought to chooſe the former, and that it is better to aſſert, that God has not the neceſſary power to prevent crimes, than to pretend that he is the cauſe of their being committed (63). Cicero made an advantage of the ſame Doctrine of the Stoicks concerning Jupiter's Almighty Power, to refute Providence, as though the only excuſe that can be alledged for the many diſorders which happen upon earth, were to ſay, that God cannot mind every thing. If this were the ſole excuſe, the Stoicks would be left defenceleſs, for they held that Jupiter's power was infinite. Here follow Cicero's words. *At ſubvenire certe potuit* (Deus) *& conſervare urbes tantas, atque tales. Vos enim ipſi dicere ſoletis, nihil eſſe quod Deus efficere non poſſit, & quidem ſine labore ullo: ut enim hominum membra nulla contentione, mente ipſa ac voluntate moveantur, ſic numine Deorum omnia fingi, moveri, mutarique poſſe. Neque id dicitis ſuperſtitioſè, atque aniliter, ſed phyſicâ, conſtantique ratione. Materiam enim rerum, ex qua, & in qua omnia ſint, totam eſſe flexibilem, & commutabilem, ut nihil ſit, quod non ex ea quamvis ſubitò fingi, convertique poſſet. Ejus autem univerſæ rectricem, & moderatricem divinam eſſe Providentiam: hanc igitur, quocunque ſe moveat, efficere poſſe quicquid velit. Itaque, aut neſcit quid poſſit, aut negligit res humanas, aut quid ſit optimum, non poteſt judicare* (64), i. e. " But God could certainly come to " the aſſiſtance of ſuch great and conſiderable cities, " and preſerve them from ruin. For you maintain " that there is nothing but God can do it, and even " without any trouble: for as a man's members are " moved without any trouble, by the mind and at " his own will, thus all things can be framed, " moved, and altered by the bare will of the Gods. " Nor do you maintain this like old women without " any reaſon, but philoſophically, and by arguments. " For you aſſert, that matter, out of which every thing " is made, is flexible, and entirely mutable, ſo that " any thing may be immediately made of it; and " that Divine Providence regulates and governs the " whole; and can do whatever it pleaſes. Whence " it follows, either that God does not know his own " power, or that he neglects the things of this world, " or that he cannot judge what is beſt." Cicero had obſerved juſt before, that the fall of Corinth was to be aſcribed to Critolaus, and that of Carthage to Aſdrubal, and not to God's anger, ſince, according to the Stoicks, God was never angry, notwithſtanding which he ought to have come to the aſſiſtance of theſe two cities (65). The Stoicks were preſſed ſo cloſe, that they were driven to ſay that vice is uſeful, otherwiſe, ſay they, there would have been no virtue (66). * * * *Homines feciſſe dicatur: tantam vim eſſe ærumnarum & malorum. Adverſus ea Chryſippus quum in libro* περὶ προνοίας *quarto diſſereret, Nihil eſt prorſus iſtis, inquit, imperitius, nihil * inſipidius, qui opinantur bona eſſe potuiſſe, ſi non eſſent ibidem mala. Nam quum bona malis contraria ſint; utraque neceſſarium eſt oppoſita inter ſeſe & quaſi mutuo adverſo quæque fulta niſu, conſiſtere. Nullum adeò contrarium ſine contrario altero. Quo enim pacto juſtitiæ ſenſus eſſe poſſet, niſi eſſent injuriæ? aut quid aliud juſtitia eſt, quam injuſtitiæ privatio? quid item fortitudo intelligi poſſet, niſi ex ignaviæ oppoſitione? quid continentia niſi ex intemperantiæ? quo idem modo prudentia eſſet, niſi foret contrà imprudentia? proinde, homines ſtulti cur non hoc etiam deſiderant ut veritas ſit & non ſit mendacium? namque itidem ſunt bona & mala, felicitas & infortunitas, dolor & voluptas. Alterum enim ex altero, ſicuti Plato ait, verticibus inter ſe contrariis deligatum eſt. Suſtuleris unum; abſtuleris utrumque*, i. e. " Some pretend that " men were made by chance †, conſidering the many " evils to which they are ſubject to. Againſt which " Chryſippus argues thus in his 4th book concerning " Providence: he obſerves, that there can be no- " thing more impertinent and ſilly, than to aſſert, " that there could be good, if there were not evil. " For as good is the oppoſite of evil, it is neceſſary " that both ſhould exiſt, as coming originally from " two contrary tendencies oppoſite to each other: ſo " that nothing can exiſt without its contrary. For " how could there be a ſenſe of juſtice, if there " were no injuries? Or what is juſtice, but a priva- " tion of injuſtice? How could one have a notion of " courage, if there were no cowardice? How of " providence, if there were no imprudence? Why, " adds he, do not ſilly men wiſh alſo there were no " truth, that there might be no falſity? For good " and evil, happineſs and unhappineſs, pleaſure and " pain muſt exiſt together. The one, as Plato ob- " ſerves, being connected with the other, as it were " by their oppoſite ends: if you ſuppreſs either, you " ſuppreſs both."

Let us ſee with how much ſtrength Plutarch refutes the Stoicks upon this ſubject (67). " We muſt there- " fore conclude, that there is no good among the " Gods, ſince there is no evil among them: and " when Jupiter having again collected within him- " ſelf the whole matter, ſhall be alone, all other " diverſities being aboliſhed, there will then be more " good, ſince there will be no evil. But cannot a " whole company ſing, though no man ſings ill? " Cannot the whole body be in health, though no " part of it be out of order? Why then can there " be no virtue without vice? . . . . I wonder why " they do not alſo ſay, that a conſumption is neceſſary " to make a man enjoy his health, and the gout to " make him walk the better; and that Achilles " could not have had a fine head of hair, had not " Therſites been bald. For what difference is there " between them, who ſhall aſſert theſe ſilly things, " and thoſe who maintain that incontinence was uſe- " ful for the being of chaſtity, and injuſtice for the " being of juſtice? Let us then pray the Gods, that " there may be always wickedneſs, bad morals, flat- " teries, and lies; for if theſe be ſuppreſſed, virtue will " alſo vaniſh away with them, and be no more. " But will you have a better notion of his ſweet elo- " quence, and fine method of arguing, conſider " what he adds. As there are ſometimes, ſays he " (68), ridiculous epigrams or ſayings in Comedies, " which of themſelves have no ſenſe, but yet add " ſome eloquence to the play, thus vice may be con- " demned on its own account; but yet it is of uſe " with regard to other things. But firſt, nothing " can be more abſurd, than to aſſert that vice exiſts " by the providence of God, as a bad epigram is " made by the Poet's will. For this being granted, " how can the Gods be ſtyled the authors of good " rather than of evil? How can they hate wicked- " neſs? And how can we anſwer thoſe ſhocking ſen- " timents, *When the Gods will ruin a family, they in- " vent ſome cauſe or another*; and *what God urged " them thus to quarrel together* (69)? But farther, a " bad Epigram is ſometimes an ornament to a play, " and leads the Poet to his end, which is to pleaſe " the ſpectators, and make them laugh. But Jupi- " ter the Father of mankind, the ſovereign Being, " the adminiſtrator of juſtice, the beſt artificer (as " Pindar ſtyles him) did not deſign, when he created " the world, to make a great and diverſified Co- " medy, ſerving to inſtruct, but a city common both " for Gods and men, wherein they might live in " concord and happineſs, by the practice of juſtice " and virtue; but to compaſs ſuch a noble deſign, " what occaſion was there for robbers, murderers, " parricides, and tyrants? For wickedneſs was not " ſome elegant Epiſode, pleaſing to Jupiter, ſince " it is not proper to divert men, or to make them " laugh, but rather to occaſion injuſtice and miſery; " ſo that it has not the leaſt ſhadow in it of that " boaſted agreement with nature. But beſides, that " bad Epigram is but an inconſiderable part of the " play, which takes up a very little place in it, nor " are there many ſuch Epigrams, ſo that it does not " offend any of the ſpectators, nor take off the leaſt " thing of the beauty of the performance. But all " abounds with wickedneſs; and the life of man, " from the beginning to the end, is a continual ſcene " of diſorder and miſery, not the leaſt part of it " being

(63) Μυρία γὰρ ἂν ἐπιτιμήσειεν ἀσθένεια καὶ ἀδυναμία τῷ Διὶ ἐκλειπόμενα τὰ μέρη, πολλὰ δρᾷν ἄτοπα παρὰ τὴν ἐκείνου φύσιν καὶ βούλησιν· ἢ μήτε ἀκρασίαν εἶναι, μήτε κακοργίαν, ἧς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Ζεὺς αἴτιος. *Tolerabilius enim erat infinitas partes dicere Jovi ob ejus imbecillitatem vi facta agere multa improbe contra ipſius naturam & voluntatem, quam nullam eſſe libidinem, nullum ſcelus quod non Jovi autori imputandum eſſe.* Plut. *adverſus Stoicos*, p. 1076. *E.*

(64) Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*, lib. 3. cap. 38 and 39.

(65) *Critolaus, inquam, evertit Corinthum, Carthaginem Aſdrubal. Hi duos illos oculos oræ maritimæ effoderunt, non iratus alicui, quem omnino iraſci poſſe negatis, Deus, &c.* Ibid. cap. 38.

(66) Aulus Gellius, lib. 6. cap. 1. The Aſterisks ſet down here, denote that there is a gap here in this paſſage of Aulus Gellius.

* Others read *injubidius, ſillar.*

† Thus Anthony Thyſius imagines the words of Aulus Gellius muſt be underſtood; he ſuppoſes that the word *Caſu*, or *Fortuna*, or ſuch like, was omitted. *In A. Gellium*, lib. 6. cap. 1. note 2. ADD. REM.

(67) Plut. *adverſus Stoicos*, p. 1065. Mr. Bayle quotes Amiot's tranſlations; but we have tranſlated this paſſage, and the foregoing, from the original.

(68) That is to ſay Chryſippus, in his book of *Nature.*

(69) *Iliad.* lib. 1.

ſeem to admit the two firſt principles [*H*], and in what ſenſe one cannot ſay, that according

" being free from blame, as they themſelves ac- " knowledge: ſo that it is the worſt and moſt diſ- " agreeable play imaginable (70)." Read in Plutarch the remainder of that paſſage; you will meet there with other arguments, which fully confute the Stoicks paradox concerning the uſefulneſs of vice. And yet it muſt be acknowledged that they were in the right in ſome reſpects: what is there, for inſtance, more uſeful than luxury ** for the ſupport of a great many families, who would ſtarve, if great Lords and Ladies ſpent but little? Our Paulicians might argue this in order to prove this ſyſtem of two principles. The bad, would they ſay, produced luxury; the good principle conſented to it as a compenſation for ſomething good, which his adverſary ſuffered him to produce, and beſides he kept to himſelf the right to make ſome advantage of the evil production. But if he had been alone, neither luxury nor any other vice had ever exiſted among men: virtue pure and unmixed had been our good, the object of our deſires, and our happineſs.

Let us obſerve by the by, that no man ought to wonder that Cicero and Plutarch argued as they did againſt the Stoicks: for though that Sect of Philoſophers admitted two principles (71), God and matter, God as an active, and matter as a paſſive principle, yet they did not hold that matter was a bad principle, wherein they were more orthodox than Arnobius. *Quid enim*, ſays he (72), *ſi prima materies quæ in rerum quatuor elementa digeſta eſt, miſeriarum omnium cauſas ſais continet in rationibus involutas.* i. e. " But what, " if matter, which conſiſts of the four elements, " contains within itſelf the cauſes of all manner of " miſeries?"

The bulk of the Heathens were not expoſed to the objections I have mentioned; for their publick religion was grounded on theſe two Principles, the firſt, that ſome Gods were benevolent, and the others malevolent; the other, that in the general, the Gods were not always ſwayed by the ſame paſſions: that they were angry, and appeaſed by turns: that they changed ſides; and ſome undertook to favour a nation, and others to perſecute it; in a word, that they thwarted each other's deſigns (73). By this Hypotheſis, the Hiſtory of mankind could be as eaſily accounted for, as by Zoroaſter's. Arnobius has very effectually refuted this Syſtem of two kinds of Gods, ſome benevolent, others malevolent. But he has gone too far, for he urges a Principle, which favours the Manichean Syſtem. He aſſerts, without any reſtriction, that the nature of God does not ſuffer him to vex any one. Whence then, might he have been aſked, come plagues and famines? Do not the Chriſtians call them the ſcourges of God? However it be, let us tranſcribe his own words (74): *Quod dici à vobis accepimus, eſſe quoſdam ex Diis bonos, alios autem malos, & ad nocendi libidinem promptiores: illiſque ut proſint, his vero ne noceant, ſacrorum ſollemnia miniſtrari: quanam iſtud ratione dicitur, intelligere confitemur non poſſe. Nam Deos benigniſſimos dicere, leneſque habere naturas, & ſanctum, & religioſum & verum eſt: malos autem, & lævos nequaquam ſumendum eſt auribus; ideò quoniam divina illa vis ab nocendi procul eſt dimota & disjuncta natura. Quidquid autem potis eſt cauſam calamitatis inferre, quid ſit primùm videndum eſt, & ab Dei nomine longiſſima debet differitate ſeponi. Itaque ut vobis commodemus aſſenſum, dextrarum, finiſtrarumque rerum Deos eſſe fautores, ulla nec ſic ratio eſt, cur alios alliciatis ad proſpera, alios verò, ne noceant ſacrificiis commulceatis & præmiis. Primùm quòd Dii boni male non queunt facere, etiam ſi nullo fuerint honore mactati. Quidquid enim mite eſt, placidumque natura, ab nocendi procul eſt uſu, & cogitatione diſcretum: malus verò comprimere ſuam ferociam neſcit, quamvis gregibus mille, & mille alliciatur altaribus. Neque enim in dulcedinem vertere amaritudo ſe poteſt: aut ariditas in humorem, calor ignis in frigora: aut quod rei cuicumque contrarium eſt, id quod ſibi contrarium eſt, ſumere in ſuam atque immutare naturam. Ut ſi manu viperam mulceas, venenato blandiaris aut ſcorpio, petat illa te morſu, hic contractus aculeum figat: nihilque illa profit alluſio, cùm ad nocendum res ambæ non ſtimulis exagitentur irarum, ſed quadam proprietate naturæ. Ita nihil prodeſt promereri velle per hoſtias Deos lævos, cùm ſive illud feceris, ſive contrà non feceris, agant ſuam naturam, & ad ea quæ facti ſunt ingenitis legibus, & quadam neceſſitate ducantur. Quid quòd iſto modo utrique Dii definunt eſſe ſuis in viribus, & ſuis in qualitatibus permanere. Nam ſi bonis ut proſint, res divina conficitur, aliis autem ne noceant, iiſdem rationibus ſupplicatur: ſequitur ut intelligi debeat, nihil dexteros profuturos, nulla ſi acceperint munera, ſierique ex hoc malos: malos autem ſi acceperint, nocendi poſituros mentem, ſierique ex hoc bonos. Atque ita producitur res eo, ut neque hi dexteri, neque illi ſint lævi: aut, quod fieri non poteſt, utrique ipſi ſint dexteri, & utrique iterum lævi*, i. e. " I cannot comprehend what " I have heard you aſſert, that ſome Gods are " good, and others bad, and inclined to hurt; and " that divine worſhip is paid them, to ingage the " former to do men good, and diſſuade the latter " from hurting. For it is pious, religious, and true " to aſſert, that the Gods are moſt kind and bene- " volent by their own nature; nor ought we ſo much " as to hear them ſtiled bad, and unkind; becauſe " their divine nature is intirely averſe from all diſ- " poſition to do ill. Whatever can be the cauſe of " miſery, muſt be far remote from the nature of the " Gods. But though we ſhould grant you, that the " Gods are the Authors both of good and evil, yet " even then there would be no reaſon to allure them " by ſacrifices and offerings, to obtain favours from " ſome, and prevent the others from doing us miſ- " chief. For the good Gods could do no harm, " though they were not worſhipped: whatever is be- " nevolent and kind by its own nature, cannot have " even the leaſt thought to hurt; and a malevolent " Being cannot conquer its natural fierceneſs, though " it were courted with thouſands and thouſands of " ſacrifices. For bitterneſs cannot turn itſelf into " ſweetneſs, nor dryneſs into moiſture, nor the heat " of fire into cold. Though you ſtroak a viper, or " coax the venomous ſcorpion, the former will cer- " tainly bite you, and the latter ſting you; nor will " your coaxing prevent your being hurt by them, for " neither of them are provoked to do hurt by any " paſſion of anger, but by their own nature. It is " therefore to no purpoſe to ſooth the malevolent " Gods with ſacrifices, ſince whether you offer them " or not, they will always act according to their own " nature, and follow their inward diſpoſitions, which " urge them on unavoidably. But farther, according " to your Syſtem, both the good and the bad Gods " muſt ceaſe to be what they were by their own na- " ture; for if a divine worſhip is paid to the good, " that they might be uſeful, and to the bad, that " they might not hurt; it follows from thence, that " the benevolent Gods would do no good if they " were not worſhipped, whereby they become bad; " and that the malevolent, if they were worſhipped, " would alter their reſolution of doing harm, and " thus they would become good. So that the matter " is now reduced to this; either that the former are " not good, nor the latter bad; or, which is impoſ- " ſible, that they are both benevolent, and malevo- " lent, at the ſame time." Though this paſſage of Arnobius favours the Manicheans, yet it contains an obſervation which muſt perplex them, and which overthrows their whole worſhip. For the reaſon why they admitted a bad principle was, that they imagined the good principle could do no harm; they thought therefore that the other could do no good; ſo that their worſhip proved needleſs: the benevolent God would never have puniſhed their want of religion, and they could never render the malevolent God propitious. Arnobius argues this objection home againſt the Heathens: but they might have anſwered him, that the fierceſt tyrants make a very great difference between thoſe who honour them, and thoſe who deſpiſe them, and that the meekeſt Kings make the ſame difference between thoſe who revere them, and thoſe who offend them: and that it is thus we ought to judge of the benevolent and malevolent Gods. I do not think that the ſyſtem of Zoroaſter, or that of the Manicheans, are liable to this objection, if a man would argue coherently againſt them.

[*H*] *The Orthodox ſeem to admit two Principles.*] It is

(70) See what I have obſerved above, rem. [*E*], againſt Lactantius. All that Plutarch urges here, does wonderfully corroborate my refutation of that Father's Doctrine.

** See upon Luxury, the ingenious and reverend Mr. Warburton's *Divine Legation of Moſes, &c.* book 1. ſect. 6. where he has admirably well refuted what Mr. Bayle, and the Author of *the Fable of the Bees*, have aſſerted, concerning the uſefulneſs of luxury as a vice, which he proves to be only " the " uſing (and " thereby abu- " ſing) the gifts " of Providence, " to the injury " of the Uſer, " either in his " own perſon or " fortune, or to " the injury of " any other, to- " wards whom " he ſtands in " any relation " which obliges " him to aid " and aſſiſ- " tance." p. 84.

(71) Diog. Laert. lib. 7. num. 134. whereupon ſee the Commentators, and Lipſius, *Phyſ. Stoic.* lib. 2. Diſſer. 2.

(72) Arnob. lib. 1. *adverſus Gentes*, p. 6.

(73) *Sæpe premente Deo, fert Deus alter opem. Mulciber in Trojam, pro Trojâ ſtabat Apollo: Æqua Venus Teucris, Pallas iniqua fuit. Oderat Æneam propior Saturnia Turno: Ille tamen Veneris numine tutus erat. Sæpe ferox cautum petiit Neptunus Ulyſſem: Eripuit patruo ſæpe Minerva ſuo.* Ovid. Triſt. lib. 1. eleg. 2. ver. 4.

(74) Arnobius, lib. 7. p. m. 228, 229. See the paſſage from Aulus Gellius, in the article MANICHEANS, quotation (34).

ing to the Manicheans God is the Author of ſin [*I*]. We ſhall alſo refute a modern Writer, who denied that the Doctrine, which makes God the Author of ſin, leads to irreligion. He

is an opinion, which has always been admitted among the Chriſtians, that the Devil is the Author of all the falſe religions, that it is he who urges the Hereticks to dogmatize, that it is he who inſpires men with errors, ſuperſtitions, ſchiſmatical inclinations, lewdneſs, covetouſneſs, intemperance, in a word, who puts them upon all the crimes that are committed in the world: that it was he who made Eve and her huſband loſe their innocence; which fall became the cauſe of all the moral evil, and of all the miſeries to which man is ſubject. The Devil therefore is the firſt principle of evil: but as he is not from eternity, nor uncreated, he is not the firſt bad principle in the ſenſe of the Manicheans. This gave theſe Hereticks I know not what pretence to boaſt, and to inſult the Orthodox. You do the benevolent God a much greater injury, might they ſay, than we do, for you ſuppoſe him the cauſe and creator of the bad Principle; you pretend that he produced him, and that whereas he might have ſtopt him at his firſt ſetting out on his wicked proceedings, yet he ſuffered him to get ſo great an Empire upon earth, that mankind being divided into two cities, that of God, and that of the Devil (75), the former has always been very ſmall, and even for many ages ſo ſmall, that it had not two inhabitants, againſt the other two millions. We are not obliged to explain why our bad Principle is ſo wicked: for when an uncreated Being is ſuch or ſuch, one cannot ſay why it is ſuch: it is its nature: we muſt of neceſſity ſtop there. But with regard to the qualities of a creature, we ought to enquire into the reaſons of them, nor can we find them any where but in the cauſe that produced it. You muſt maintain then, that God is the cauſe of the Devil's wickedneſs; that he produced it himſelf; or that he put the ſeeds of it into the ſoil he created. Now this is doing an infinitely greater injury to God, than we do, by aſſerting that he is not the only independent and neceſſary Being. This makes all thoſe objections appear again, which we have diſplayed above, concerning the fall of the firſt man: it is needleſs therefore to inſiſt any longer upon them. We muſt humbly acknowledge, that all our philoſophy is put to a non-plus here, and that its weakneſs ought to lead us to the light of divine revelation, where alone we can find a firm ground to caſt our anchor. Obſerve that theſe Hereticks made an ill uſe of thoſe paſſages of the ſcripture, in which the Devil is called the Prince of this world (76), and the God of this world (77).

(75) See St. Auguſtin's books, *de Civitate Dei.*

(76) St. John's Goſpel, chap. 14. ver. 30.

(77) 2d Epiſtle to the Corinthians, chap. 4. ver. 4.

[*I*] *In what ſenſe one cannot ſay, that according to the Manicheans, God is the Author of ſin.*] The Orthodox ſpeak conſtantly in the ſame ſtrain, when they mention this; it has been the cuſtom, time out of mind, to ſay that to be a Manichean, and to make God the Author of ſin, are two expreſſions, which ſignify one and the ſame thing, and when one Chriſtian Sect charges the other with making God the Author of ſin, they never fail to charge them alſo with Manicheiſm in that reſpect. This charge is well grounded in one ſenſe, ſince it is true, that the followers of Manes acknowledge, that an eternal Being is the cauſe of ſin. But if you turn the tables, you will find, that in another ſenſe they may maintain, that they do not make God the Author of ſin: for they may aſſert, that the good Principle alone deſerves the name of God, and that this great and noble name ought never to be given to the bad Principle; and that conſequently, of all Syſtems, theirs alone clears God of all imputation of evil: all the reſt charge him with it, as the Miniſter I have quoted above owns. "If it be but ſuppoſed, ſays he "(78), that God made a ſcheme of all the events "that were or are to happen throughout all eternity, "and that he ſuffered all the evils, diſorders, and "crimes, which prevail in the world, to be a part of "his ſcheme, this is enough. No man will be perſuaded, that ſo many crimes came accidentally, "and by mere chance, to be a part of the ſcheme of "Providence: and if they were a part of it by the "diſpenſation of God's infinite wiſdom, let that diſpenſation be called permiſſion, or will, you can "never be able to ſilence inquiſitive and bold "men; you will never clearly perceive, that this is "conſiſtent with that hatred, and averſion which "God otherwiſe ſhews for ſin; you will never prevent the Free-thinkers from charging Chriſtianity "with making God the author of ſin: for all men's "common ſenſe leads them to this: namely, to believe, that he, who could prevent the firſt man's "fall as eaſily as he permitted it, and who opened "all thoſe ways in which men have erred ſince, "which he could eaſily ſhut up, may be conſidered "as the author of an evil, which he ought to have "prevented according to his own principles, and to "the hatred he has for ſin, and which he might "have prevented without the leaſt trouble." He ſuppoſes afterwards that the *ſcientia media* will be objected to him, and he anſwers thus. "This does by no "means remove the difficulty. For I may always "ſay, ſince it be ſo, that God foreſaw that Adam "being placed in ſuch ſad circumſtances, would ruin "himſelf, and numberleſs millions of men, by his "free will, and yet placed him in thoſe ſad circumſtances; it is plain, that he is the firſt author of "all thoſe evils. A Prince, who ſhould know for "certain, that if he puts a man with a ſword in his "hand amidſt a crowd of people, he will raiſe a ſedition, and occaſion a battle in which ten thouſand "men will be killed, might be juſtly conſidered as "the firſt Author of all theſe murders. It were to "no purpoſe for him to ſay, I did not order that "man to uſe his ſword, I did not command him to "raiſe a ſedition: on the contrary, I forbad it him: "I have not moved his arm to kill, nor framed his "voice to encourage men to battle. He will always "be anſwered, you knew very well, and with certainty, that that man placed in ſuch circumſtances, "would occaſion all thoſe misfortunes. It was in "your power to put him in more favourable circumſtances, which had been productive of all kinds of "goods. I am fully perſuaded that that Prince "would have nothing to ſay in his own defence, that "were proper to ſuppreſs the murmurings of his people. And if men will be ſincere, they muſt confeſs, that nothing can be anſwered in God's behalf, "proper to ſatisfy our minds . . . . . (79). Laſtly, "even Socinus's God may be charged with being the "author of ſin . . . . (80). To conclude, I maintain, that there is no ſyſtem free from difficulties, "from St. Auguſtin's God, down to the God of Epicurus, who minded nothing, or to Ariſtotle's God, "whoſe care did not extend farther than the ſphere "of the Moon. For as ſoon as you acknowledge a "general providence, whoſe cares extend to every "thing, in what manner ſoever you conceive it, the "difficulties appear again, and when you think you "have ſhut them out at one gate, they creep in thro' "another." This is ſpeaking very plain. But if this Miniſter had thought of the God of the Manicheans, I mean the good principle which they called God by way of eminence, would not this have obliged him not to expreſs himſelf quite ſo poſitively, and to acknowledge, that their Hypotheſis, at leaſt, clears God; for it charges the bad principle with all the evil? It may be of ſome uſe to know how that Miniſter anſwered thoſe who cenſured him. "We "find alſo among that heap of trifles, *adds Monſieur* "*Jurieu* (81), an obſervation upon what I have aſſert-"ed ſomewhere, that whatever method be followed it "will never be able to remove all the difficulties, "which the objections of the prophane raiſe in our "minds, with regard to God's providence concerning "ſin. If theſe Gentlemen know of a method which "perfectly clears up all theſe difficulties, we ſhall be "obliged to them, if they will acquaint us with it."

(78) Jurieu, *Jugement ſur les Methodes rigides & relachees*, p. 68, 69.

(79) Ibid. p. 72.

(80) Ibid. p. 73.

(81) Jurieu, 2 *Apologie*, p. 3. col. 2. quoted by Saurin, *Examen de la Theologie de Mr. Jurieu*, p. 340.

You are in the wrong, will ſome ſay to me, to acknowledge that the ſyſtem of the Manicheans clears God: for if they pretend that he made an agreement with the bad principle, as you aſſerted above (82), he conſented to the introduction of evil, he engaged himſelf by articles to ſuffer it, and he will'd poſitively, that all the crimes and all the misfortunes of mankind be produced. This is an hea-

(82) Quotation (19) See alſo the article MANICHEANS, rem. [*D*], at the firſt *a-linea* or break.

He has even aſſerted that that doctrine exalts God to the higheſt degree of greatneſs, that can be imagined. The antient Fathers knew very well that the queſtion concerning the origin

vier charge againſt him, than if it were ſaid, with the Socinians, that he did not know, whether the free creature would ſin or not: and that if he reſolved to run the riſk of it, it was becauſe he had great hopes that the knowledge his creature enjoyed, together with his threatnings, would prevent it from doing evil. I do not think that a Manichean would be much puzzled by that difficulty. For in the firſt place, he might ſay, that God made that agreement, becauſe otherwiſe it would never have been in his power to do the creature any good. There is then a very great difference between Manicheiſm and Socinianiſm. The Socinian owns, that though God could eaſily prevent man's being guilty and miſerable, yet he ſuffered him to fall both into ſin and into miſery. But the Manichean ſuppoſes that he conſented to that fall, only out of a mere neceſſity, and to avoid a greater evil. In the ſecond place one might deny that God ever made an agreement with the bad principle, and aſſert, that with all his ſtrength he does continually and without end oppoſe the ſin and the miſery of the creature, with a deſign to make it perfectly holy, and perfectly content; but that the bad principle, exerting alſo on his part all his power with a quite contrary deſign, there ariſes from this continual ſtrife, that mixture of good and evil which we obſerve in this world; juſt as the action and reaction of cold and heat produce a mixed quality. Apply to this what the ſchoolmen teach of the nature of thoſe mixed bodies, which ariſe from the ſtrife of the elements. I am ſenſible that both theſe expoſitions open a frightful abyſs of difficulties before us: but the queſtion here is only whether or not that hypotheſis clears God. Now theſe wretched Hereticks pretend, that any difficulty whatſoever is trifling in compariſon to that which ariſes from making God the Author of ſin: and it is certain that all the Chriſtians abhor the thought of owning him the cauſe of it.

WHETHER or not the Doctrine which ſuppoſes God the Author of ſin, would lead men to Atheiſm.

The Jeſuits maintain (83), *it were better to be an Atheiſt, and to acknowledge no God, than to pay a Divine worſhip to a nature*, which forbids man to do evil, and yet makes him commit it, and then puniſhes him for it. They aſſert, *that the God of Epicurus is more innocent, and if one may ſay ſo, more a God*, than ſuch a one would be. *And when the Marcionites and the Manicheans took it into their heads to imagine a ſecond God, whom they ſuppoſed the author of all evils, they worſhipped another, who beſtowed all manner of good. Whereas yours*, ſay the Jeſuits of the Reformed, *is worſe than men.* They, on whom theſe imputations are laid, do not explode thoſe conſequences; they explode only the principle, from which they are inferred: they aſſert only that one cannot without the moſt notorious calumny charge them with making God the author of ſin (84). The Jeſuits pretend that Calvin's Doctrine with regard to Predeſtination is attended with ſuch conſequences as *entirely deſtroys the notion we ought to have of God, and leads afterwards directly to Atheiſm* (85). The Miniſter, who anſwered Monſieur Maimbourg, convicted him of giving an unfair account of Calvin's Doctrine. He ought to have ſtopt there: for when he pretends that Monſieur Maimbourg drew a falſe conſequence from the Doctrine with which he had charged Calvin, he argues moſt wretchedly. Let the reader judge of it (86). *Beſides this, I maintain, that his conſequence is wrong, and that there is nothing more abſurd, and leſs theological, than the inference which the Sieur Maimbourg pretends to draw from the doctrine of theſe Divines*: namely, that it entirely deſtroys the notion we ought to have of God, and leads afterwards to Atheiſm. *Was there any thing ſaid more raſhly? Let us ſuppoſe the worſt. If that doctrine* deſtroys the notion we ought to have of God, *it is becauſe it repreſents to us a God, cruel, unjuſt, chaſtiſing and puniſhing innocent creatures with everlaſting torments. And this is exactly what the Sieur Maimbourg means, namely, that this deſtroys the notion of God, becauſe in the notion of God are contained the ideas of the attributes of goodneſs, juſtice, and equity. But in good conſcience, does that doctrine lead to Atheiſm, which repreſents God to us under the notion of a cruel Being, of a tyrant, who exerts his right with an exceſſive ſeverity? . . . . It is a fooliſh imagination to aſſert, that a Doctrine leads to Atheiſm, which ſuppoſes that God is concerned in every thing* (87), *which makes him to be the cauſe of all things, which makes him be himſelf the ultimate end of all his own actions, which exalts him above the creatures, ſo as that he may deal with them according to ſuch rules as ſeem even unjuſt to the ſenſe of the fleſh. That opinion of the Supralapſarians is ſo far from leading to Atheiſm, that on the contrary it extolls the Deity to the higheſt degree of grandeur and exaltation that can be imagined. For it does ſo humble the creature before the Creator, that according to this ſyſtem the Creator is not bound to the creature by any laws whatſoever, but may diſpoſe of it as he pleaſes, and make it ſubſervient to his own glory by ſuch means as he thinks proper, and the creature as not the leaſt right to contradict him.*

(87) And yet Spinoziſm, which ſuppoſes that all things are God himſelf, is a moſt execrable Atheiſm.

This is really the moſt monſtrous doctrine, and the moſt abſurd paradox, that was ever aſſerted in Divinity; and I am very much miſtaken if any celebrated Divine ever ſaid ſuch a thing. Men have turned themſelves all ways imaginable, in order to explain God's influence over the actions of ſinners: they have adhered to the hypotheſis of an abſolute Predeſtination, when they thought it was not inconſiſtent with God's holineſs: but they exploded it as ſoon as they imagined it affected it in the leaſt. They who did not perceive that free will is inconſiſtent with a phyſical predetermination, have conſtantly taught that predetermination: but they who imagined it was inconſiſtent with free will, have exploded it, and admitted only a concomitant and indetermining concurrence. They who imagined that all kind of concurrence is inconſiſtent with the creature's liberty, ſuppoſed it the only cauſe of its own actions (88). Nothing determined them to ſuppoſe it, but the thought, that all the decrees, by which God would concern himſelf in the operations of our will, would render events neceſſary, ſo that our wicked actions would be no leſs an effect of God's will than of the creatures (89). They did not find their account in maintaining that ſin is no being, that it is a mere privation, a mere nothing, which has no efficient but only a *deficient* (90) cauſe. Laſtly, men have been brought to maintain, that God cannot foreſee the free actions of the creature. Why ſo many ſuppoſitions? What has been the meaſure and rule of all theſe proceedings? It was the deſire of clearing God: men underſtood moſt evidently, that the whole of religion is concerned in this queſtion; and that if it were once taught that God is the author of ſin, it would unavoidably lead men to Atheiſm. And indeed all the Chriſtian Sects, which are charged by their adverſaries with teaching that doctrine, clear themſelves from it as from an horrid blaſphemy and an execrable impiety, and complain of being moſt wickedly ſlandered. And yet we have here a Miniſter, who comes and tells us very gravely, that it is a doctrine, which *extols the Deity to the higheſt degree of grandeur and exaltation that can be imagined.* Such is the commendation he does not ſcruple to give to a doctrine, *which repreſents to us a God, cruel, unjuſt, chaſtiſing and puniſhing* INNOCENT *creatures with everlaſting torments.* He calls our conſcience to witneſs whether the notion of a tyrant God leads us to Atheiſm. And ſuppoſing the worſt, that is to ſay, ſuppoſing that Maimbourg was in the right to aſſert, that according to Calvin, *God created moſt men with a deſign to damn them, not becauſe they deſerved it by their crimes, but becauſe ſuch was his will and pleaſure, and that he foreſaw their damnation only becauſe he had decreed it, before he foreſaw their crimes* (91); ſuppoſing, I ſay, that Maimbourg charges Calvin very juſtly with aſſerting that they who ſuffer the torments of hell *are guiltleſs creatures* (92), and conſequently that God is the author of their ſins, Monſieur Jurieu cannot bear that Maimbourg ſhould infer from thence, *Therefore Calvin's doctrine deſtroys the notion we ought to have of God, and leads afterwards directly to Atheiſm.* He does not pretend only, that *there never was any thing more raſh and inconſiderate* than that inference (93); he ſtyles it, *a fooliſh*

(88) Durand de S. Portieu, and ſeveral other famous Divines ſuppoſe it. See a Treatiſe of Monſieur de Lannoi, an abridgment of which is inſerted in Monſieur Papin's *Eſſais de Theologie*, printed in the year 1687.

(89) See the book of the Capuchin Lewis de Dole, intitled, *Diſputatio quadripartita de modo conjunctionis concurſuum Dei & creaturæ ad actus liberos ordinis naturalis, præſertim vero ad pravos, adverſus determinantium & aſſertorum ſcientiæ mediæ modernorum opiniones.* That book was printed at Lyons in the year 1634, in 4to.

(90) See againſt all this Monſieur Papin's *Eſſais de Theologie*, in the Treatiſe againſt *Phyſical Predetermination.*

(91) Jurieu, *Apologie pour la Reformat.* part 1. chap. 19. p. 241.

(92) Ibid. p. 246.

(93) Ibidem.

(83) Father Adam, quoted by Daillé, *Replique à Adam & à Cottibi*, part 2. chap. 1. p. 2, 3.

(84) See the ſame Monſieur Daillé, throughout that chapter.

(85) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. du Calviniſme*, Liv. 1. p. m. 73. See alſo p. 56.

(86) Jurieu, *Apologie pour les Reformateurs*, part 1. chap. 19. p. 245, 246. edit. in 4to.

origin of evil is extremely perplexed [*K*]. They could not ſolve it by the Hypotheſis of the peculiar to that Miniſter. *That opinion of the* Supralapſarians, ſays he (104), *is ſo far from leading to Atheiſm, that on the contrary it extolls the Deity to the higheſt degree of grandeur and exaltation, that can be imagined. For it does ſo humble the creature before the Creator, that according to this ſyſtem, the Creator is not bound to the creature by any laws whatſoever, but may diſpoſe of it as he pleaſes, and make it ſubſervient to his own glory by ſuch means as he thinks proper; and the creature has not the leaſt right to contradict him. This doctrine is otherwiſe ſubject to many inconveniencies, I own it, it abounds with difficulties, which cannot be well ſolved; it has ſomething harſh and cruel in it, which ſhocks us. Wherefore St. Auguſtin's Hypotheſis is doubtleſs preferable to it.* What a ſtrange doctrine have we here! What! a Profeſſor of Divinity dares to aſſert, that there are ſyſtems unqueſtionably preferable to that, *which extolls the Deity to the higheſt degree of grandeur and exaltation that can be conceived?* Is it not certain that all our thoughts muſt aim, not only at the glory of God, but alſo at his greateſt glory? Muſt not our opinions and our actions tend *ad majorem Dei gloriam?* This muſt not be the motto of a particular company, but of all corporations, of all ſocieties, and even of all private perſons, of each individual. So that a Divine, who on the one hand confeſſes, that the ſyſtem of the Supralapſarians tends to the greateſt glory of God, and promotes it better than any other Hypotheſis, and who aſſerts on the other hand, that *St. Auguſtin's Hypotheſis is doubtleſs preferable*, is guilty of a prophane and blaſphemous thought. This prophanation cannot be excuſed by conſidering, that the Supralapſarian ſyſtem abounds with ſhocking difficulties; for a few difficulties, more or leſs, do not make it lawful to prefer the leſſer glory of God to the greater, and *to place* the ſovereign Being in an inferior *degree of grandeur and exaltation*. If St. Auguſtin's ſyſtem were eaſy and ſmooth, we ſhould not ſo much wonder at the author's bad taſte; but he owns himſelf, that he meets with unqueſtionable difficulties in it, and that though ready to ſink under the load he keeps to that ſyſtem, only becauſe the remiſs methods cannot extricate him (105). For the ſame reaſon he ſhould be a Supralapſarian: for if the ſuppoſition of the Jeſuits do not remove the difficulties of St. Auguſtin's ſyſtem, it is plain alſo, that that Father's Hypotheſis does not move the ſhocking difficulties of the Supralapſarian, ſcheme. All things being duly weighed and conſidered, it is found upon the whole, that the Supralapſarians and they who are called *Infralapſarians*, do after all hold the ſame ſyſtem; they cannot hurt each other much; the arguments *ad hominem* and the retortions extricate them out of every objection. You have here in a few words the character of that Doctor: there is no accuracy in his cenſures; no connection in his doctrines; all abounds with incoherencies; inconſiſtencies and flat contradictions run through all his works. They who will be at the pains to examine them with attention, will meet every moment with matter for ſuch a cenſure as this is.

Let us infer from all this, that a Manichean, who will make an advantage of the great application with which the Divines endeavour to invent ſyſtems which may clear God, and of their reſolution never to acknowledge that they make God the author of ſin, will always maintain boldly and with confidence, that that rock is more terrible than any other. Conſider well what has been objected to Chryſippus, who aſſerted (106), *it is not without deſign that there are ſome uſeleſs, hurtful, and miſerable perſons. If it be ſo,* replied Plutarch (107), *what is Jupiter? I mean Chryſippus's Jupiter, if he puniſhes a thing, which is not of itſelf, nor uſeleſs. For vice, according to Chryſippus's opinion, would not be to blame; and on the contrary, Jupiter would be to blame, if he made vice to no purpoſe, or if he puniſhed it, having made it for ſome purpoſe.*

[*K*] *The . . Fathers were not ignorant that the queſtion concerning the origin of evil is extremely perplexed.*] One paſſage only from Origen, will be inſtead of all the quotations I could bring in here. Ἐπεὶ δ' ἄλλος τις τόπος

(94) Ibid.

(95) Ibid. p. 247.

(96) Ibid.

(97) Ibid. p. 245.

(98) Scaurus *apud* Senecam, *Controverſ.* 28. p. m. 272.

(99) Jurieu, *Apol. pour la Reformat.* p. 244, 245.

(100) See the *Apol. pour la Reformat.* part 1. chap. 19. p. 246, 247.

(101) *Nec multo abſurdiora ſunt ea quæ poetarum vocibus fuſa, ipſa ſuavitate nocuerunt, qui & ira inflammatos, & libidine furentes induxerunt Deos, feceruntque ut eorum bella, pugnas, prælia, vulnera videremus: edia præterea, diſſidia, diſcordias, ortus, interitus, querelas, lamentationes, effuſas in omni intemperantiâ libidines, adulteria, vincula, cum humano genere concubitus, mortaleſque ex immortali procreatos.* Cicero, lib. 1. *de Nat. Deor.* cap. 16.

(102) See the rem. [C] of the art. ÆGIALEUS, and the remarks [*X*] and [*Y*] of the article HELENA.

(103) Obſerve, that if it be maintained, as the Proteſtants do, that man is the only cauſe or author of his ſin, the diſtinction they make between God, conſidered as a lawgiver, and as the diſpenſer of events, holds good, notwithſtanding what Pufendorf objects in p. 290, of his *Jus feciale divinum*, &c.

(104) Jurieu, *Apologie pour la Reformat.* part 1. chap. 19. p. 246.

(105) See above, quotation (51).

(106) Plut. *de Stoicor. Repugn.* p. 1051.

(107) Πεῖός τις ὁ Ζεύς, λέγω δὲ τὸ Χρυσίππου, κολάζων πρᾶγμα, μήτε ἀφ' αὑτοῦ, μήτε ἀχρήστως γινόμενον; ἢ μὲν γὰρ κακία πάντως ἀνεγκλήτους ἔχει κατὰ τὸν τοῦ Χρυσίππου λόγον· ὁ δὲ Ζεὺς εἰ, κλητέος εἴτε ἀχρήστου ὄσας τὴν κακίαν πεποίηκεν, εἴτε ποιήσας ἂν ἀχρήστως, κολάζει. *Qualis eſt Jupiter (de Chryſippeo loquor) rem puniens neque ultro neque inutiliter factam? nam Chryſippi ratio efficit vitia omnino culpanda non eſſe, ſed Jovem; ſive is fecit vitia, quæ nihil prodeſſent: ſive punit, cum feciſſet non inutilia.* Idem, ibid.

the Platoniſts, which after all is only a branch of the Manichean ſyſtem [*L*], ſince they admitted two principles: the Fathers were therefore obliged to have recourſe to the privileges of man's free will: but the more one reflects on that method of ſolving the difficulty, the more one finds, that our natural reaſon and philoſophy furniſh us only wherewithal

τόπῳ τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐξετάσεως διόμενος, δυσθήρατός ἐστι τῇ φύσει ἡμῶν, ἐν τούτοις κἀ ἡ τῶν κακῶν ταχθεὶη ἂν γένεσις, *i. e.* "If there be any difficult queſtion, it is certain-
(108) *Origines contra Celſum*, lib. 4. p. 207. "ly that of the origin of evil (108)."

[*L*] *The Hypotheſis of the Platoniſts, which after all is only a branch of the Manichee Syſtem.*] I ſhall conſider this hypotheſis here, only as it has been explained Maximus Tyrius, in his treatiſe on the the queſtion, *Whence come Evils, ſince God is the Author of all that is Good* (109)? This Author ſuppoſes, that in order to know the cauſe of the good things which are in this world, there is no occaſion to conſult the Oracle, ſince it is plain enough that they come from God, and that the evils cannot deſcend from Heaven, where there are no envious natures (110); but that in order to know whence the evils come, it is neceſſary to go to the Soothſayers, that is to ſay, to conſult Jupiter, Apollo, or ſuch other Deity, who propheſies, and takes care of the things of this world. He reckons up afterwards the miſeries to which our body is ſubject, whence he infers (111), that man is the moſt unfortunate of all the living creatures.

(109) Τὸ θεῷ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιοῦντος, πόθεν τὰ κακά. *Cum Deus bona faciat, unde ſint mala.* This is the Title of Maximus Tyrius's 25th Diſſertation.

(110) Οὐ γὰρ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ μὰ Δία, οὐκ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. φθόνος γὰρ ἔξω-θεν τοῦ (See hereunder quotation (118) χορεῖ ἵσται. *Non enim e cœlo me hercules, non e cœlo. Exulat enim illic invidia.* Maxim. Tyrius, *Diſſertatione* 25, p. m. 253.

(111) Idem, ib. p. 253.

'Ουδὲν ἀκιδνότερον γαῖα τρέφει ἀνθρώποιο,
Nil nutrit tellus homine infelicius uno.

He conſiders next, the numberleſs evils which perſecute our ſoul; and he pretends, that the anſwer of the fatidick Gods, who have been conſulted, is, that men are very much in the wrong, to charge God with being the cauſe of their misfortunes, ſince they themſelves are the Authors of them, by their own fault. He quotes two lines of Homer to repreſent this (112). Τί ἂν ἔτι πρὸς ταῦτα ἀποκρίναιτο ὁ Ζεὺς, ἢ ὁ Ἀπόλλων, ἤ τις ἄλλος μαντικὸς θεὸς; ἀκούσωμεν τοῦ ὑποφάτου λέγοντος,

(112) Idem, ib.

Ἐξ ἡμέων γάρ φασι κάκ' ἔμμεναι. οἱ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ
Σφῇσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὑπὲρ μόρον ἄλγε' ἔχουσι.

Quid quæſo ad iſta aut Jupiter, aut Apollo reſpondebit, aut alius fatidicus Deus? Audiamus quid eorum interpres dicat:

Aſſcribunt ſuperis homines mala, cum tamen ipſi
Criminibus propriis ſibi talia damna crearint *.

* The full ſenſe of this paſſage is given, in the words that go before it.

Heaven and Earth, continues he, are two different places. There are no evils in heaven, and upon earth there is a mixture of evils and goods; but in ſuch a manner, that the goods come from heaven, and the evils ariſe from a depravation natural to the earth, which depravation is of two kinds, the one conſiſting in the properties of matter, the other in the ſoul's free-will: ἢ τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ, ἐπίῤῥυτα ἐκ τῆς ἑτέρας· τὰ δὲ κακὰ, ἐξ αὐτεφυοῦς μοχθηρίας ἀνίσταται. διτὴ δὲ αὕτη, ἡ μὲν ὕλης πάθος, ἡ δὲ, ψυχῆς ἐξουσία. *Ita ut bona quidem è cœlo veniant: mala vero (ex naturali depravatione terræ inſitâ †) improbitas vero ea duplex; aut enim corrupta materiæ effectio eſt, aut animæ licentia* (113).

† Theſe words are left out in my edition of Mr. Bayle's Dict. which is that of Paris 1734.

(113) Idem, ib. p. 256.

As to the firſt kind of theſe depravations, he obſerves, that matter muſt be conſidered as a ſubject on which a good Artificer works: all the beauties it acquires muſt be aſcribed to art: but as there are works upon earth, which are not as they ſhould be, theſe irregularities muſt not be imputed to the Artificer. for his intention never deviates from the rules of his art, no more than a Legiſlator's intention does from the rules of juſtice; it muſt even be remembered, that the divine intelligence does more happily hit its ſcope, than human art does. He makes uſe afterwards of a compariſon; which is, that in Mechanicks there are ſome things which are the chief object of the art, and are directly aimed at, and others which are not an effect of the art, but only conſequences following from the modifications of matter. Such are the ſparks of fire which fly about, when a piece of hot iron is beating upon the anvil. They are no part of the Smith's deſign, but only accidental conſequences, which ariſe from the Smith's action, without his aiming at them, and which are annexed to the properties of iron. Thus we muſt alſo hold, that the evils we obſerve upon earth, are not the work of the divine art; the Artificer aims firſt and directly at the conſtruction of the world; but it happens that theſe evils emanate neceſſarily from his work. The Author adds an obſervation, which is not very well connected with this. He aſſerts, that the Artificer gives the name of Conſervation of the World to thoſe evils we complain of, and which we ſtyle ruins and devaſtations. He pretends, that the architect of this world, deſigns the preſervation of the whole, and that for the good of the whole, it is neceſſary the parts ſhould be afflicted. Ταῦτα ὁ τεχνίτης καλεῖ σωτηρίαν τοῦ ὅλου· μέλει γὰρ αὐτῷ τοῦ ὅλου· τὸ δὲ μέρος ἀνάγκη κακοῦσθαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὅλου. *Ea conſummationem * totius vocat opifex. Quia totum reſpicit, cujus cauſa neceſſe eſt corrumpi partes* (114). Plagues, inundations, earth-quakes, the fires of Mount Ætna, do damage to ſome parts of the whole, and ſerve to produce ſome others: for, as Heraclitus obſerved, theſe live by the death of thoſe, and thoſe die by the life of theſe. The death of the earth makes the fire live, that of the fire makes the air live, that of the air makes the water live, and that of water makes the earth live (115). Why then, might one have aſked Maximus Tyrius, did you aſſert, that the natural evils of mankind, were not deſigned by God, nor an effect of his art? If they be ſo neceſſary for the preſervation of the whole, and if the Artificer deſigns the preſervation of the whole, muſt he not deſign thoſe evils alſo? Notwithſtanding this objection, we may aſſert, that according to this Philoſopher's ſyſtem, the plagues, famines, and other misfortunes of mankind, are involuntary, with regard to God, and that they came into his work only as unavoidable conſequences of the diſpoſitions of matter (116). Let us ſee what he teaches, with regard to the other kind of depravation, namely, moral evil. He aſſerts (117), that the power of the ſoul is the matter and nurſe of that kind of evil; and that as it was neceſſary to make an earth, which might produce plants and animals, and contain the evils within its bowels, it was there that the evils being driven from heaven were lodged; that the animals were divided into two kinds, namely of beaſts, and men; that it was neceſſary men ſhould excel the beaſts, and yet be inferior to God: that this inferiority does not conſiſt in their being mortal, for their death is only the beginning of another and an everlaſting life; that God, in order to make them inferior to the divine Nature (118), invented this: he placed the ſoul to a mortal body, as a coach-man on a coach-box, gave her the reins into her hands, and ſuffered her to drive wherever ſhe pleaſed. He put it in her power to drive that chariot according to the rules of art, or againſt thoſe rules. She directs it, and reſtrains the impetuoſity of the horſes. But theſe are perfectly ignorant of all the rules; they turn ſome one way, ſome another; theſe towards intemperance, others towards inconſideration and folly; ſome are dull and lazy: ſo that the chariot being carried up and down, the driver is diſturbed, and ſuffering himſelf to be overcome, he runs to the place where the moſt unruly horſe carries him. He abandons himſelf to intemperance, and to incontinence, if the ſtrongeſt horſe turns that way, and ſo on. Such is this Platonick Philoſopher's whole ſolution.

* Or rather, *Conſervationem.*

(114) Maximus Tyrius, *Diſſertatione* 25. p. m. 257.

(115) Concerning this Doctrine of Heraclitus, ſee Daniel Heinſius's Notes in Maximum Tyrium, p. 110. and above, quotation (160) of the article OVID, where that Poet makes Pythagoras teach the ſame Doctrine.

It is defective in two reſpects: for in the firſt place he acknowledges two Principles, God, and Matter; the former indeed very good, but who cannot entirely reform the depravation of the other (119). That natural, and abſolutely incorrigible depravation is the ſpring of natural evils, and the occaſion of moral evil: it gives the human body ſo ſtrong an inclination for vices and crimes, that the ſoul is carried away to them, as it were by unruly horſes, who run away with their rider. In the ſecond place, Maximus Tyrius does not clear God's infinite goodneſs, nor his

(116) See a thought like this in the remark [*T*] of the art. CHRYSIPPUS.

(117) Maxim. Tyrius, *Diſſertatione* 25. p. 257.

(118) This is abſurd and impious, and does not agree with what the Author aſſerted above, quotation (110), that there is no envy in heaven. Obſerve, that according to Heinſius's conjecture, θεῖς muſt be joined with χορεῖ in this paſſage.

(119) Compare this with Juſtus Lipſius's words tranſcribed above, in the quotation (59) of the art. CHRYSIPPUS, and in quotation (164) of the article EPICURUS. See alſo the quotation (167) of that article.

withal to tye and bind that Gordian knot faſter and faſter [*M*]. A learned man pretends that the Pythagoreans gave riſe to that difficult queſtion. They would find in every thing the ſuperlative: that is to ſay that by their interrogations they aimed at the knowledge of what is raiſed to the higheſt degree in every ſpecies. They aſked, for inſtance, what is the ſtrongeſt thing in the world, the moſt antient, the moſt common, the moſt true?

his infinite holineſs. And a kind virtuous father would never ſuffer his children to ride unruly horſes, nor would he ever ſend them to the army, if he foreſaw with certainty, or only if he judged with a great probability, that notwithſtanding all their ſkill, they would fall from their horſes, and be killed by the fall, and that notwithſtanding their good education, they would be ſo corrupted in the army, as to become the moſt infamous of all men. In a word, that hypotheſis ſets bounds to God's power, and leaves all his other attributes open to the Manichean objections: ſo that it is liable to all the difficulties of the Chriſtian Syſtem concerning free-will, without having the conveniencies of it.

[*M*] *The more one reflects . . . . the more one finds that our natural reaſon . . . . furniſhes us only wherewithal to tye . . . that Gordian knot faſter.*] I found it by experience, when I read this article over again, to prepare it for a ſecond edition. There aroſe new reflections in my mind, which I had not made before (120), and which convince me again, and more ſtrongly than ever, that the beſt anſwer which can naturally (121) be made to the queſtion, *Why did God ſuffer man to ſin?* is to ſay, *I do not know; I believe only that he had reaſons for it, becoming his infinite wiſdom, but which are inconceivable to me.* By ſuch an anſwer, you will ſtop ſhort the moſt obſtinate diſputers; for if they pretend to continue arguing, you will let them talk alone, and they will ſoon hold their tongue. If you entered the liſt with them, if you pretended to maintain, that the ſacred and inviolable privileges of free-will were the true reaſon which moved God to ſuffer men to ſin, you would be obliged to ſolve the objections they ſhould urge againſt you; and I do not know how you could acquit yourſelves of the taſk: for after all, they might object to you two things, which to our reaſon ſeem evident.

(120) See alſo the new reflections, ſet down in the art. ORIGEN.

(121) That is to ſay, without conſulting the ſcripture, but only our philoſophical ideas.

I. The firſt is, that God having given Being to his creatures by an effect of his goodneſs, he ought alſo, in the character of a benevolent cauſe, to have beſtowed upon them all the perfections proper to each reſpective ſpecies. Wherefore it muſt be ſaid that he ſhewed more love to thoſe who received the moſt excellent, than to thoſe who received leſs excellent proprieties from him. It was therefore from a moſt particular goodneſs, that he beſtowed free-will on men, ſince that property places them above all the other Beings which are upon earth. Now it cannot be conceived that a benevolent nature ſhould make a diſtinguiſhing preſent, without deſigning to promote thereby more effectually the happineſs of thoſe, to whom the preſent is made, and therefore he muſt ſee that they receive benefit from it, and prevent them, if poſſible, from turning that preſent to their own ruin and deſolation. If there be no other method to prevent it but by taking the preſent back, it muſt be taken back; for the character of a patron and a benefactor is much better kept up thereby, than by any other means: this is not changing with regard to the *Donee*; it is preſerving without the leaſt variation the ſame kindneſs to him, with which the preſent was made him at firſt. The ſame goodneſs, which engages one to give a thing, which is judged proper to make thoſe happy who enjoy it, obliges to take it back, the moment it is obſerved it makes them unfortunate: and if one had time and the neceſſary power, one would not wait to take the preſent back, till it had really proved the cauſe of ſome misfortune, one would take it back before it had been detrimental. This is what we find by our ideas of order, and by the notions from which we judge of the nature and eſſential characters of goodneſs, in whatſoever ſubject it reſides, whether in the Creator, or the creature, in a father, a maſter, a King, &c. Whence ariſes the ſubject matter of this dilemma? God beſtowed free-will on men, either through an effect of his goodneſs, or without any goodneſs at all. You cannot ſay, it was without any goodneſs: you will ſay therefore, it was with a great deal of goodneſs: but it follows from thence unavoidably, that he ought to have deprived them of it at any rate, rather than wait till it proved the occaſion of their eternal damnation by the production of ſin, a monſter which from his very eſſence he abhors. And if he had the patience to leave them ſo fatal a preſent, till the evil happened, it is a ſign, either that his goodneſs was altered, even before they left the good road, which you will not dare to acknowledge; or that free-will was not given them out of kindneſs, which is againſt the ſuppoſition granted in the dilemma above.

There are ſome regards of a ſtrict obligation; one ought not to neglect them but in caſes of neceſſity: but when ſuch caſes happen, all thoſe regards muſt be overlooked. A ſon, who ſhould ſee his father ready to throw himſelf out of the window, either in a fit of madneſs, or in a moſt violent grief, would do very well to chain him down, if he could not otherwiſe prevent the miſchief. If a Queen fell into the water, the firſt footman who could get her out again, by taking her round the waſte, or pulling her by the hair (122), though he ſhould tear above half of it off her head, would do very well: ſhe would by no means complain of his want of reſpect for her. Could a man give a more vain and ridiculous excuſe for his ſuffering a Lady well dreſſed to fall into a precipice, than ſaying, that to prevent it he had been obliged to tumble her ribbons, and her head-clothes? On ſuch occaſions it is a kindneſs to force people, and make them ſuffer violence; and though they were to be ſnatched againſt their will out of the jaws of death, it were a kindneſs to do it, even though one ſhould be in danger of putting one of their members out of joint. They will be the firſt that will thank you, when their paſſion will be cooled. The maxim, that to ſave a man who is determined to periſh, is the ſame thing as to kill (123), is of no uſe on this occaſion; and the moſt zealous advocates for toleration will own, that the pretended commandment *compel them to come in* would be obligatory in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, if the only ſure and infallible method to ſave the Hereticks was to drive them with ſtrokes and blows to Church or to Maſs. I call to witneſs the philoſophical Commentator *. *If I ſhould ſee a man*, ſays he (124), *ſtanding before the door of a houſe in a great ſhower of rain, and if pitying him I had a mind to deliver him of the inconveniency of being wet through, I could make uſe of theſe two methods: I might either deſire him to walk in, or, if I were ſtronger than him, take him by the arm, and pull him in. Both theſe methods are equally proper to obtain the end I propoſed. If he be but ſheltered, it is no matter whether it be of his own accord or againſt his will. For whether he enters the houſe of himſelf, or waits till he be deſired to walk in, or is pulled in by force, he is equally under a covert. If the caſe was the ſame with regard to the avoiding of Hell, I confeſs that our converters would be well-grounded: for if it were ſufficient for that purpoſe to be under the roof of a Church, it would be no matter whether a man entered it of his own account, or was dragged into it by main force; ſo that it would be proper to hire the ſtrongeſt labourers or porters, to ſeize the Hereticks as ſoon as they ſtirred abroad, and carry them on their backs to the next Church: nay, it would be proper, in caſes of ſickneſs, to break open their doors with petards, to pull them out of their beds, and carry them quickly to ſome Church.* What we have obſerved concerning the right men have, from the rules of Charity, to vex and even to force thoſe who by that means are preſerved from death, is more true ſtill with regard to Fathers. They would forget their duty, if they did not ſnatch from a ſon a knife or a ſword with which they ſaw he was going to hurt himſelf. They would be obliged, notwithſtanding his tears and his cries, to take from him their preſents, if they knew he would make an ill uſe of them: and if they ſaw he was ready to ruin himſelf for all his life time by ſome intrigue, it would

(122) Thus Queen Chriſtina, who fell into a lake near Stockholm, was got out of it. I think St. Amant inſerted this particular in his poem, intitled, *Moyſe ſauvé*.

(123) *Invitum qui ſervat idem facit occidenti.* Horat. de Arte Poet. ver. 467.

* Who was Mr. Bayle himſelf.

(124) *Commentaire Philoſophique ſur contraint les d'entrer*, part 3. p. 57, &c.

true? It was anſwered with regard to this laſt point, that men are bad, and that God is good. Which occaſioned this other queſtion; how comes it to paſs, that God being good, men are bad [*N*]? Simplicius judged it a matter of great importance to ſolve that

would be their duty to diſengage him from it by main force, and even by the authority of the civil Power. If in theſe reſpects they neglected to promote their ſon's advantage, if they alledged that they would not uſe force as though he were a ſlave, they would ſhew either that they have no love for him, or that they do not know how to exert it well.

All theſe obſervations prove evidently, that they, who would ſubmit to the judgment of our reaſon the conduct of God's providence with regard to the permiſſion of the firſt ſin, would infallibly loſe their cauſe, if they had no other arguments to urge but this, *viz.* that the privileges of free-will ought by no means to be infringed. They would be anſwered, what! you conceive God as the father of men, and yet you pretend that he chooſes rather to ſpare them the ſhort and trifling vexation of being forced to leave off an agreeable converſation, in which they were juſt going to make a fatal uſe of their free-will, than to prevent their eternal damnation, which they were drawing upon them by that ill uſe of their liberty? Where did you meet with ſuch notions of a fatherly kindneſs? To have a great regard for free-will, to abſtain carefully from conſtraining a man's inclination, who is going to loſe his innocence, and to damn himſelf for ever, you call it a lawful preſervation of the privileges of liberty? You would be leſs unreaſonable, if you were to ſay to a man who ſtanding by your ſide, fell down and broke his leg, *I might indeed have prevented your fall, but I was afraid of tumbling your gown; I had too great a regard for its ſymmetry to undertake the ſpoiling of it: I thought it therefore reaſonable and lawful to leave you expoſed to the danger of breaking ſome of your bones.*

I do not deny, that the permiſſion of uſing a thing and abuſing it (125) is ſometimes a moſt particular favour; but in ſuch a caſe, that permiſſion is attended with a promiſe that the abuſe ſhall go unpuniſhed. This therefore is foreign to the queſtion before us. See the margin (126).

II. But what I have to propoſe in the ſecond place will ſtill more perplex the defendants. I have argued hitherto from this principle: when the perſons we love cannot be preſerved either from death, or from infamy, or from ſome other great evil, unleſs we make them ſuffer a leſſer evil, we are obliged to make them ſuffer it. The complaiſance or the indulgence we might have for their fancies, or for their bad inclinations, would in ſuch a caſe be an act of cruelty rather than of kindneſs: and as they would be the firſt to complain of it, as ſoon as they had conſidered the conſequences of it, ſo they would be the firſt to thank us for the evil we made them ſuffer to ſo good a purpoſe. Theſe propoſitions are plain and evident to all the world, nor can it be queſtioned but Adam and Eve would have conſidered the *jerks* which God had given them to prevent their fall, as a new favour not leſs conſiderable than all his former bleſſings.

Such is the ſubject matter of my firſt obſervation; but I ſhall now urge another argument. I grant the adverſaries all that they pretend: let them aſſert, that ſince man had received the privilege of free-will, it was neceſſary to leave him the entire poſſeſſion and full uſe of it, and not to conſtrain him in the leaſt for any reaſon whatſoever. Let them maintain that it was not then the time to ſave a man by pulling him by the arm, or by the hair, or by throwing him down on the ground, and telling him, *It is hard for thee to kick againſt the pricks* (127): that liberty was a ſacred barrier, never to be violated, and a privilege which it was never lawful to infringe in the leaſt; I grant all this: but yet were there not other means enough to prevent the fall of the firſt man? The buſineſs was not to oppoſe a corporal motion, which is always a vexatious oppoſition: the buſineſs was only about an act of the will. Now all the Philoſophers maintain with one accord, that the will cannot be conſtrained; *voluntas non poteſt cogi*; and it is a flat contradiction to ſay that a *volition* is forced; for every act of the will is eſſentially voluntary. Now it is infinitely more eaſy for God to imprint in the Soul of man ſuch acts of the will as he pleaſes, than it is for us to fold up a napkin, therefore, *&c.* Here follows an obſervation which is ſtill more to the purpoſe. It is the opinion of all the Divines that God can raiſe infallibly a good act of the will in the human Soul, without depriving it in the leaſt of the functions of liberty (128). A prevenient delectation, the ſuggeſting an idea proper to weaken the impreſſion of the tempting object, a thouſand other preliminary means of acting on the mind, and on the ſenſitive ſoul, do infallibly determine the reaſonable ſoul to make a good uſe of her liberty, and to turn herſelf into the road of virtue, though without being invincibly carried thither. Calvin would not have denied this with regard to Adam's ſoul during the time of his innocency, and all the Divines of the Church of Rome, without excepting the Janſeniſts themſelves (129), acknowledge it with regard to ſinful men. They confeſs that he can merit, though acting only by a grace either efficacious by itſelf, or ſufficient to ſuch a degree, as to produce its effect infallibly. They muſt therefore acknowledge, that an aſſiſtance granted by God to Adam ſo opportunely, or ſo well contrived, as to prevent his fall infallibly, would have been very well conſiſtent with the uſe of free-will, and would not have made him perceive any conſtraint, or any thing diſagreeable, and would ſtill have left him an opportunity to merit (130).

Thus you ſee the defendants are driven out of all their intrenchments. Will they, being reduced to their laſt ſhifts, aſſert, that God owes nothing to the creature, and was under no obligation to furniſh man with a neceſſitating or infallible grace? But why then did they ſay above, that he muſt have a regard for human liberty? If he was obliged to preſerve that privilege to man, and not to conſtrain it in the leaſt, it follows that he owes ſomething to his own work. But waving the argument *ad hominem*, could they not be anſwered, that if he owes nothing to the creature, he owes all to himſelf, and cannot act inconſiſtently with his own eſſence? Now it is eſſential to an infinite holineſs (131) and an infinite goodneſs, which at the ſame time is Almighty, not to ſuffer the introduction of moral evil, nor of natural evil.

Be it ſo, will they reply at laſt; but *ſhall the thing formed ſay to him that formed it, why haſt thou made me thus* (132)? This is very well ſaid; and there they ſhould have ſtopt at firſt: it is returing again to the ſtarting-place of the race, whence it had been better not to ſtir. For it is needleſs to engage in a controverſy, if after you have argued a while, you are obliged to confine yourſelf within your own Theſis. The doctrine therefore, which the Manicheans attack, muſt be conſidered by the orthodox as a matter of fact clearly revealed to us; and ſince it muſt be at laſt confeſſed that the grounds and reaſons of it are inconceivable, it is better to own it at firſt and to ſtop there; let the Philoſophers run on with their objections, we muſt look upon them as mere cavils, and oppoſe them only in an humble ſilence, and the *Shield of Faith*.

[*N*] *That men are bad, and God is good. Which occaſioned this other queſtion, how comes it to paſs . . . . . that men are bad?*] Daniel Heinſius is the learned man who acquaints me with this (133). *Antiquiſſima Pythagoricorum diſputatio, & ab iis potiſſimum quos* ἀκουσματικοὺς *vocabant Pythagorici, qui tria quærere ſolebant: Primo,* τὸ τί ἐϛι, *ſecundo,* τὸ τί μάλιϛα, *tertio,* τὸ τί δεῖ πράτ]ειν . . . . (134). *In qua quæſtione tota conſtabat ſeptem ſapientum Philoſophia, qui nihil aliud quærebant quam* τί μάλιϛα. *Nec quid bonum ſed quid optimum, nec quid difficile ſed quid difficillimum. Notum eſt illud ex Plutarch. Sympoſio ſeptem ſapientum . . . . . Sic cum quæreretur, quid veriſſime diceretur, reſpondebant,* ὅτι πονηροὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ὅτι ἀγαθὸς ὁ θεός. *Unde primo manavit* πόρισμα *tale,* Τῷ θεῷ ἀγαθῷ ὄντι πόθεν κακοὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι. *Quod teſtantur verſiculi apud Jamblichum Hippodamantis antiqui Poëtæ, qui in laudem hujus quæſtionis ſcribebat:*

(125) The Emperor Nerva permitted theſe two things to the Father of Herod Atticus, who had found a treaſure in his houſe. See Triſtan's *Commentaries*, Tom. 1. p. 357, and Monſieur Spon's *Voyages*, Tom. 2. p. 164. Dutch edit.

(126) The beſt method of beſtowing a favour is not to give leave to make an ill uſe of it, but to add to it the art of uſing it well. Otherwiſe, a favour is like a body without a ſoul, as Horace hints, Epiſt. 4. lib. 1. ver. 6. *ad Tibullum. Non tu corpus eras ſine pectore: dii tibi formam,*
Di tibi divitias dederant, ARTEMQUE fruendi, i. e.
" For you are
" not all body
" void of mind,
" The Gods
" have given
" a ſoul of noble
" kind;
" And wealth,
" and ſkill
" enough to uſe
" thy ſtore."
CREECH.

(127) *Acts of the Apoſtles*, chap. 9. ver. 5.

(128) See the rem. [*G*], of the article MARCIONITES.

(129) That is to ſay, by making an advantage of their aſſerting, that they condemn the propoſitions of Janſenius, in the ſame ſenſe in which the Pope has condemned them.

(130) As to this argument, that it was neceſſary to leave man the means to deſerve a reward, ſee the article ORIGEN, remark [*E*], num. 1. towards the end.

(131) That is to ſay, it ſeems ſo to the light of our weak reaſon.

(132) *Epiſtle to the Romans*, chap. 9. ver. 20.

(133) Dan. Heinſius, *Notis in Maximum Tyrium*, p. 106.

(134) I have omitted here what I met with in the original, becauſe it is in confuſion: I ſuſpect that the Printers have skipped ſeveral lines.

that difficulty (*e*).

(*e*) See the rem. [*N*] quotation (138).

Ω θεῖοι πόθεν ἐστὲ, πόθεν τοῖοί δ' ἐγένεσθε :
Ἄνθρωποι πόθεν ἐστὲ ; πόθεν κακοὶ ὧ δὲ γένεσθε ;

Unde hoc dimanavit, Θεῷ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιοῦντος, πόθεν τὰ κακὰ, i. e. " It was a moſt antient controverſy a- " mong the Pythagoreans, eſpecially among thoſe " who were called *Hearers*, who uſed to propoſe " three queſtions ; Firſt, *What is ?* Secondly, *What* " *is the chiefeſt ?* Thirdly, *What is proper to be* " *done?* . . . . . In which queſtion the whole phi- " loſophy of the ſeven wiſe men conſiſted, who " examined nothing but *what is the chiefeſt*. For " they did not examine, what is good, but what " is beſt ; nor what is difficult, but what is moſt diffi- " cult. . . . . Thus if it were aſked what was the " trueſt ſaying, they anſwered, *men are bad, and God* " *is good.* Whence aroſe firſt this queſtion, *ſince God is* " *good, how comes it that men are bad?* This appears " from ſome lines of Hippodamas an antient Poet, " who wrote upon that queſtion ; thoſe lines are " quoted by Jamblichus, (and are to this purpoſe) " *Whence are the Gods ? How comes it they are ſuch ?* " *Whence are men ? How came they to be bad ?* This " gave riſe to the following queſtion : *Since good* " *comes from God, whence comes evil?*" Heinſius relates all this in his notes on the diſſertation, which I have quoted above, and of which I have ſet down the title (135). He adds that Maximus Tyrius examined that ſubject, becauſe of an opinion of Plato concerning three attributes of God (136) ; 1. That God is eſſentially good, and goodneſs itſelf. 2. That he is immutable. 3. That he is truth itſelf. By the firſt attribute is meant, not only that God is good, but alſo that he produces good, ſince he is the idea of good, and that the idea of good is the cauſe which produces good. Now as the Platoniſts held that every idea is God, they admitted no idea of evil, and conſequently no cauſe of evil. Thence aroſe that queſtion, *whence comes evil ? Ex primo ſequitur, Deo, ſi talis ſit, convenire non tantum bonum καλὰ δύναμιν, ſed etiam καλὰ ἐνέργειαν, nec tantum ut bonus ſit, ſed etiam ut efficiat bonum : quia idea boni eſt. Idea autem boni, boni quoque cauſa eſt & exemplar. Porro cum Ideam mali tollant Platonici, quia, ut Parmenides dicebat, πᾶσα ἰδέα θεός ἐστι, ſequitur ut quæratur, Unde mala proficiſcantur* (137). Laſtly, Heinſius obſerves that this queſtion was thought to be of very great importance with regard to piety, and he refers us to Simplicius's Commentary on Epictetus. The words of that Commentator appeared ſo remarkable to me, that I thought they would be an ornament to my Dictionary in this placer ; I ſhall therefore tranſcribe them here (138) : Περὶ τῆς ὑποϛάσεως τῶν κακῶν ὁ λόγος μὴ καλῶς διορθωθεὶς, καὶ τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἀσεβείας αἴτιος γέγονε, καὶ τῆς τῶν ἠθῶν ἀναγωγίας τὰς ἀρχὰς διεϛάραξε, καὶ πολλαῖς καὶ ἀλύτοις ἀπορίαις ἐνέβαλε τοὺς μὴ καλῶς αἰτιολογοῦντας αὐτήν. Εἴτε ἀρχήν τις λέγει τὸ κακὸν, ὡς εἶναι δύο τῶν ὄντων ἀρχὰς, τό, τε ἀγαθὸν, καὶ τὸ κακὸν, πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἄτοπα συμβαίνει. i. e. " The queſ- " tion concerning the origin and nature of evil not " being well handled, has been the occaſion of im- " piety towards God, deſtroyed the principles of mo- " rality, and expoſed thoſe, who have not well ex- " plained it, to many and unanſwerable difficulties : " *For whether one makes God the author of evil* †, or " ſays that it is a principle by itſelf, ſo that there " are two principles of all things, the one good, the " other bad, there will follow from thence many and " very great abſurdities." He hints there three great inconveniencies ; for he aſſerts that a falſe account of the origin of evil has been the cauſe of impiety ; and has deſtroyed the Principles of Morality ; and expoſed to many unanſwerable difficulties thoſe who argued wrong upon that ſubject. He confutes the general ſyſtem of the Manicheans with a great deal of ſtrength, and a wonderful judgment : he ſucceeds better ſtill when he comes to their particular explications. But when he attempts to clear up and to prove his own Hypotheſis, he does not ſo well ſatisfy his readers. He follows the ſame method which the antient Fathers followed ; I mean that he aſcribes no other cauſe of the origin of evil but the free-will of the human Soul. He could not chooſe any other ſyſtem ; we muſt abſolutely come to that ; and then we find ourſelves in a croſs-way, of which a learned Abbot at Paris ſaid this not long ago. I have four roads round me, that of the Calviniſts, that of the Janſeniſts, that of the Thomiſts, and that of the Moliniſts. I know very well which I muſt not take, but not which I muſt take. *Quem fugiam habeo, quem ſequar non habeo.* The firſt road is contrary to the Council of Trent, the ſecond to the Conſtitutions of the Pope, the third to Reaſon, and the fourth to St. Paul. They who are not Roman Catholicks may more eaſily extricate themſelves out of that perplexity, by preferring St. Paul's authority to that of the Popes and of the Councils.

(135) In the rem. [*L*] quotation (109).

(136) In lib. 2. *de Republica.*

(137) Heinſius, *Notis in Maximum Tyrium*, p. 107.

(158) Simplicius, *in hæc Enchiridii Epicteti verba*, cap. 34. Ὥσπερ σκοπὸς εἴ τις θείη πρὸς τὸ ἀπόλυχνον, ἵνας ἐδὴ κακὸς φύσις ἐν κόσμῳ γίνηται. i. e. " As one " does not put " a put a mark, " to make people " wander out of " the way, ſo " the nature of " evil does not " exiſt in the " world."

† This ſentence is not in the Greek here, but as it is in the Latin tranſlation annexed to it, I ſuppoſe the Printers omitted ſome words, as for inſtance theſe, Εἰπὲ τὸ θεῖον τις λέγει τῶν κακῶν αἴτιον εἶναι. ADD. REM.

PAULINA (LOLLIA). See the notes (*a*) of the article LOLLIUS.

(*a*) Remark [*G*].

PAYS (RENATUS LE) paſſed for a wit. He was of Britany ; but he hardly appeared in any other place but in the Province of Dauphiné [*A*], where he had ſome employment in the finances. His *Amitiez, Amours, et Amourettes*, printed in the year 1664, were admired in the Provinces, and even deſerved the approbation of the capital city [*B*]. There were ſome Ladies of the firſt Quality who read that book with a great deal of pleaſure, and who enquired from the bookſeller what ſort of a man the author was. As ſoon as he heard the Ducheſs of Nemours had that obliging curioſity, he ſent her a deſcription of his perſon. That piece is entitled, *Portrait de l'Auteur des Amitiez, Amours, et Amourettes.* It is intermixed with proſe and verſe. The ſtyle of it is gay, like that of the work which

[*A*] *He appeared hardly in any other place but in the Province of Dauphiné.*] It is for this reaſon Monſieur Allard put him in the Catalogue of the Writers of that Province. *The greateſt part of his works*, ſays he (1), *were compoſed in Dauphiné, either at Grenoble, or at Valence.* He might do this without receding from the common practice : for they who draw up a Bibliotheque of a certain country, do ſeldom fail to give a place in it to thoſe ſtrangers, who dwelt there when they wrote or publiſhed ſome books. The following paſſage from the author of the *Amitiez, Amours, et Amourettes*, will not be foreign to my purpoſe. *What likelihood is there, that a genius ſo elevated as* YOUR HIGHNESS'S *is, a genius to which the greateſt wits of this age do daily pay their homage, and which is conſidered at Court as a ſpring of knowledge, ſhould find any thing agreeable in that collection of my trifles, and in the writings of a man educated in the darkneſs of a remote Province ? Could a wit originally come from Britany, tranſplanted into Gaſcony, and thence upon the mountains of Dauphiné, produce fruits capable to pleaſe ſo fine and delicate a palate as yours is? No,* MADAM, *I ought not to imagine it ; it would be too great a preſumption in me ; I ſhould be afraid to do you an injury* (2).

(1) Allard, *Bibliotheque de Dauphiné*, p. 169.

[*B*] *His* Amitiez, Amours, et Amourettes . . . . . *deſerved even the approbation of the capital city.*] The people of Paris eaſily pardon the writing of a good book in a man born in the country, provided he lived a great while at Paris : but they take it very ill, if a man, who never left the country, proves a good author : they look upon it as an attempt of a dangerous conſequence : one would think they imagine this is ſomething irregular ; that it is ſhaking off the authority of one's lawful ſuperiors, and ſetting up in the Republick of Letters the Sect of the Independents, which is ſo odious in the Church. They

(2) Le Pays, in his letter to the Ducheſs of Nemours, in which he draws his own character.

which that Princeſs had already approved. The ſucceſs of that firſt work encouraged Monſieur le Pays to give the printers more buſineſs. But his *Zélotide* being diſliked, he reſtrained his paſſion for writing, and appeared only now and then in print. The letter he wrote to Monſieur du Gué, Intendant of Dauphiné, when enquiries were made about the families of thoſe who falſely pretended to be Gentlemen, was eſteemed pretty good. He proved there the nobility of his Muſe, which was deſcended from Voiture's [*C*], and collected together ſeveral curious particulars concerning the genealogy of Poets conſidered as ſuch. He only imitated one of the moſt beautiful Epiſodes of Mademoiſelle de Scuderi's *Clelia*. Some time after he publiſhed a new collection of pieces. It appears from ſome of his Letters, that he had been in Holland and in England. The accounts he gave of thoſe countries are too ludicrous, and very unfair: he intermixed them with ſome ſerious reflections which are abſolutely falſe [*D*]. They caſt a diſgrace on the French name. He

They were therefore very little inclined to judge favourably of our Author's *Amitiez*, &c. for it was a book that came to them from the country of the *Altobroges*; it was the production of an Author born in Britany, and tranſplanted firſt into Guienne, and afterwards on the mountains of Dauphiné. Theſe were the ſchools where he became a Diſciple of Voiture, and where he formed the deſign to ſet up for his ſucceſſor. So that men were very little prepoſſeſſed in his favour. And yet his book ſold extremely well at Paris: it was approved by a great many perſons both at Court and in the city; however, I do not pretend to aſſert thereby, that it was not cenſured, nor deſpiſed by ſeveral perſons. Read theſe words of Monſieur Gueret. *As long as the one will be writing love-letters to his Peggy, and the other ſilly jeſts to his butcher, they will not conſpire againſt the State* (3). He means Monſieur Le Pays's Letters, and thoſe of Montreuil. He is not ſo diſobliging in the next page, but his compliments are very dry. *Becauſe*, ſays he, Amours, Amitiez, et Amorettes, *was looked on as a pretty title, does it follow from thence, that* Fleurs, Fleurettes, et Paſſetems, *will meet with the ſame reception?* Monſieur Boileau Deſpreaux hinted ſomething againſt Monſieur le Pays. The laſt was received in an handſome manner; Monſieur le Pays did not fall in a paſſion, he did not inveigh againſt him as moſt of his fellow-ſufferers * did. He anſwered civilly and modeſtly (4). Obſerve that what I have ſaid of Paris, I think alſo of antient Rome. I do believe that in Cicero's time, or in Pliny the younger's, the Romans would have been angry, if the Poets and the Orators, who lived beyond the Alps or beyond the Pyrenean hills, had made beautiful works, before they had left their native country.

(3) *Parnaſſe Reformé*, p. m. 113.

* Who were laſhed in Boileau's Satyres.

(4) See his letter to Monſieur Tiger; it is the 1ſt of the 2d book of the 2d part of his *Nouvelles Oeuvres*, or *New-Works*.

In order to ſupport by an authentick proof what I have aſſerted of the great ſucceſs of our Author's firſt work, I need only quote the words of a Journaliſt, who is no flatterer. Let us ſee how he begins his account of another work of that Writer (5). *Monſieur le Pays's* Amours, Amitiez, & Amourettes *have been ſo well received by the gay and polite part of the world, that one muſt conceive an agreeable notion of this controverſy between wit and judgment, as ſoon as it ſhall be known he is the Author of it. It was ſpread abroad that Cupid gave him a feather from his wings to write his* Amours, *and he made Love quarrel formerly ſo ingeniouſly with Reaſon, that he certainly hath omitted none of the arguments, which can be urged in behalf of wit againſt judgment* (6).

(5) Intitled, *Demeſlé de L'Eſprit & du Jugement*, printed at Paris, 1688.

(6) Baſnage de Beauval, *Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Savans*, for Sept. 1688. art. 15. p. 129.

[*C*] *He proved the nobility of his Muſe, which was deſcended from Voiture's.*] The letter he publiſhed upon that ſubject, was afterwards printed in the edition of his new works; it is intitled, *Titres de Nobleſſe de la Muſe Amourette à Monſeigneur Du Gué Conſeiller ordinaire du Roi, &c* (7). *i. e.* "Proofs of the Nobility "of the Muſe Amoretta; to my Lord Du Gué, Coun- "ſellor in Ordinary to the King, &c." A perſon, who read it when it firſt came out, told me for certain, that the Author's deſign was to prove he was a Nobleman in right of his Muſe, and that therefore they were not to require any other proofs of his Nobility, nor pretend to make him pay the land-tax as a Commoner, in caſe he did not give ſuch proofs. But having read that work, I could not meet with any thing in it, that ſhewed ſuch an intention. I cannot tell whether that Author was a Gentleman or not; for it is ſo long ſince I have read his works, that I do not remember thoſe paſſages, in which he might have ſaid *I am a Gentleman*, either in ſo many words, or in words to that purpoſe. I remember the paſſage in which he mentions a quarrel of his brother: what he ſays of him, is of a Gentleman, but there are numberleſs Commoners, who as they live in a noble manner, would not ſpeak leſs ſtoutly on ſuch an occaſion. Here follows what he ſays in an anſwer to a conſolatory letter (8): *The care you have taken in my brother's quarrel, and the kindneſs with which you endeavoured to pacify it, have put me under ſuch obligations to you, that I ſhall never be able to ſhew you my gratitude. I am very ſorry that this little misfortune happened to my brother; but as he muſt have prudence never to engage himſelf in a quarrel, he ought alſo to have courage to defend himſelf, when he is abuſed without reaſon: I would never pardon him, if he ſhould ſuffer himſelf to be expoſed to the leaſt diſgrace in the world* (9).

(7) It is the 26th *Letter*, of the 2d book, of the 2d part.

(8) It was written to him, during the affliction he was under for the loſs of a ſiſter of his. The manner in which he expreſſes his grief, and the love he had for the deceaſed, ſhews that he had a tender heart, and was an honeſt man. See the *Letters* 42 and 43 of the 2d book.

(9) Le Pays, *Amitiez, Amours, & Amourettes*, Liv. 2. Lett. 22. p. 1664, of the Dutch edition, 1665.

[*D*] *He made ſome . . . reflections which are abſolutely falſe.*] "What ſticks very much to my heart, is, that "they ſuffer the Jews at Amſterdam, where they "will not ſuffer the Catholicks. The ſtews at Paris "do not dread the Conſtable, ſo much as the Ca- "tholicks do Amſterdam, for thoſe houſes where "the holy Maſs is celebrated. However, I have "obſerved, that the greateſt enemy our religion has "here, is policy. The Dutch do not hate Rome, ſo "much as they do Madrid, and I believe they would "chooſe to ſubmit to Alexander VII. rather than to "Philip IV. This is ſo true, that in a company "where I was lately, a perſon ſaying out of joke, "that a Proteſtant Miniſter had got leave to preach "at Madrid, that the Inquiſition was going to be "ſuppreſſed there, and that the Catholick King was "ready to turn Proteſtant; an old Dutchman anſwer- "ed immediately, and from his heart, that if Spain "turned Proteſtant, Holland would be obliged to "turn Catholick. Judge now, Sir, how zealous they "are for their religion, and how much they hate "ours. One may ſafely ſay, that they hate only "to be under the government of Spain (10)." The letter, from which I have extracted this paſſage, is not dated, which is the common defect of that kind of works (11); but we may know by ſome circumſtances, that it was wrote in the year 1662. Judge then, whether the Author knew what he ſaid. Would not one think, that he drew up this account from ſome books compoſed in the time of the Duke of Alva, or before the end of the truce, which Henry IV. cauſed to be concluded between Philip III. and the United Provinces? At that time, ſatyrical Writers might pretend that the Dutch hated the government of the Spaniards, more than their own religion; and I do not queſtion, but this was inſerted in ſeveral books. But it is certain, that when Monſieur le Pays was in Holland, the Dutch had no longer any hatred for the Spaniſh nation: their hatred laſted only as long as their fear: now it was long ſince their fear was vaniſhed away. Since the taking of Boiſleduc, Maeſtricht and Breda, and ſince the war, which Lewis XIII. declared againſt Spain, the United Provinces were ſure never to fall again under the Government of the Spaniards. They were more uneaſy, for fear leſt the Spaniards ſhould be too much weakened, and leſt France ſhould make an advance of their weakneſs, than for fear leſt they ſhould recover what they had loſt. It was this uneaſineſs, which contributed as much as any thing elſe to forward the treaty they concluded at Munſter with Philip IV. and ſince that time, they have been more hearty friends to the Spaniards, than to the French. This was natural, and according to the rules of good policy. There is no occaſion to refute our

(10) Le Pays, ibid. *Letter* 38, of the 2d book, p. 153, 154.

(11) Do not take this in a very ſtrict ſenſe; for theſe writings are ſometimes dated.

He was a Member of the Academy of Arles [*E*]. He had the honour to be eſteemed by the Duke of Savoy [*F*], who conferred upon him the Knighthood of St. Maurice. He wrote a very pretty letter upon that ſubject [*G*]. He complains often of fortune [*H*], and loads her with no leſs injuries than the Heathen Poets did. But ſuch complaints are only

Author, with regard to the complaints he makes of the want of liberty, under which he pretends the Catholicks labour at Amſterdam, nor with regard to his ſilly and ſatyrical jokes againſt the Engliſh women (12), and againſt the Dutch women (13).

(12) In the 36th *Letter* of the 2d book.

(13) In the 38th *Letter* of the ſame book.

[*E*] *He was a Member of the Academy of Arles.*] It is an academy of wits, eſtabliſhed after the example of the French academy. No man can become a member of it, no more than of that at Paris, but by petitioning for it. Monſieur le Pays knowing that they deſired to admit him a Member of the Academy of Arles, and that the petition he was to ſend in for that purpoſe, according to their by-laws, would be favourably received, wrote to theſe Gentlemen, and was immediately admitted into their body. His letter is dated from Grenoble, May the 12th, 1668; it is inſerted in the 2d part of his *Nouvelles Oeuvres* (14), with the compliment of thanks which he wrote to that Academy (15).

(14) It is the 33d *Letter* of the 1ſt book.

(15) Dated from Grenoble, June the 12th, 1668. It is the 39th *Letter* of the ſame book.

[*F*] *He had the honour to be eſteemed by the Duke of Savoy.*] If my memory does not fail me, he dedicated his *Zelotide* to that Duke, who wrote him a very obliging letter. The anſwer he wrote that Prince, March the 5th, 1666, is the 19th letter, of the 2d part of his new works. He made a journey to Turin, in the year 1670, and gives us the following account of the honours he received there. "I can aſſure you, "without vanity, or with vanity, if you pleaſe, that "their Royal Highneſſes gave me the moſt obliging "reception. I have been invited, by their orders, "to the hunting-match which is to be on St. Hubert's "day: it will be a moſt ſplendid entertainment. "The Ladies will hunt a ſtag, with equipages em"broidered all over with gold and jewels. After "this, there will be for two days ſucceſſively, Feaſts, "Balls, Balets, Concerts of Muſick, and an Opera. "Preparations have been making a long while for "all this: but after all this, will you believe me, if I "tell you, that his Royal Highneſs ordered a room "to be got ready for me in the Palace, and com"manded his officers to furniſh me with horſes from "his own ſtables for the hunting match (16)."

(16) Le Pays, *Nouv. Oeuvres*, part 2. Liv. 1. *Lettre* 41. p. 105, of the Dutch edit.

[*G*] *He wrote a very pretty letter upon that ſubject.*] He was admitted *a Knight by the Marquiſs of St. Damian*, and was *preſented* by one of that Lord's ſons: another of that Lord's ſons gave the entertainment (17). He deſired the latter, in a very genteel manner, to grant him the income of ſome commandry, becauſe otherwiſe it would be out of his power to accompliſh his vow of hoſpitality. Here follow ſome fragments of his letter; let us remember that he writes to the Grand-Prior of the Order of St. Maurice. *Since you are my ſuperior*, ſays he (18), *and I have the honour to be one of your brethren, I ought from time to time to give your Excellency an account of my behaviour. I would be very unfortunate, if the Alps, which are between us, ſhould deprive me of the inſtructions by which you can direct me. Being thus abſent, I want them more than the reſt of our brethren, and I humbly deſire you, Sir, for the eaſe of my conſcience, to aſſiſt me with your wholeſom advice, and to remove ſome ſcruples I have about the performing of my vows. As for that of chaſtity, I keep it very religiouſly, thanks to the unkindneſs of the Ladies. As for obedience, I have not tranſgreſſed it; and my ſuperiors, who have commanded me nothing, cannot complain of me. But as for hoſpitality, that is indeed the ſubject of my ſcruples; it is with regard to that vow, I have very great remorſes of conſcience. For to tell you the truth, Sir, I do not keep that vow. Not but that I have a great inclination to be hoſpitable; but can a man be hoſpitable, who has neither a houſe to receive his Gueſts in, nor a ſufficient fund to entertain them? Methinks, Sir, when I made that laſt vow, I made alſo tacitly that of being a Commander, ſince it cannot be fulfilled without a Commandry. This muſt determine you to procure me one, and even one of the beſt, that I may be the better able to perform my vow . . .* (19). *Beſides, by making me a Commander, you will make a thouſand ridiculous perſons hold their tongue, who come and aſk me impertinent queſtions concerning the croſs I wear. Some are ſilly enough to come and aſk me*, pray, dear Sir, how much do you get yearly by wearing that croſs? *I muſt own that I do not know how to anſwer them. When I ſhall have a Commandry, I ſhall be able to ſatisfy all the world; I ſhall have wherewithal to accompliſh my vow of hoſpitality, and people will let me alone about the income of my croſs. Be ſo kind, Sir, to anſwer my argumenss, and to remove my ſcruples, and you will thereby quiet the ſoul of him, who of all your brethren, is, with the greateſt reſpect, &c.*

(17) Ibid. *Lettre* 43, of the ſame book, p. 112; it is dated from Grenoble, May the 20th, 1671.

(18) Ibid. p. 110.

(19) Ibid. p. 112.

[*H*] *He complains often of Fortune.*] This fault is almoſt an epidemical diſtemper in the Republick of Letters. They, who are called Wits, ſignalize themſelves above all the reſt in that kind of complaint. They imagine it would not be giving themſelves airs, if they acknowledged that fortune looked kindly upon them. One would think they fancy, that if they ſeemed to be ſatisfied with her favours, the publick would take it for a confeſſion that they want merit. For it is a common, but very antient ſaying, that ſhe is blind, and does not know how to beſtow her favours well. Read all Balzac's letters with attention: they will acquaint you with two particulars; the one, that he had a very handſome income, ſo that he could treat his friends, give them excellent ſoops, &c. and afford himſelf all the conveniencies of life, in one of the moſt delicious countries of the Kingdom: the other, that he looked upon himſelf as a man confined to a deſart, and ſo cruelly perſecuted by ill fortune, that one would think her ſharpeſt and moſt venomous darts had been ſet apart againſt him. What conſequence can we draw from theſe two particulars, unleſs it be, that he had too good an opinion of himſelf? For a man truly modeſt, whatever merit he may have, will think himſelf fully rewarded, if he has but wherewithal to ſupply all his wants. So that all thoſe common-place topicks, which our wits, and a great many other Writers, urge againſt Fortune, are in reality nothing elſe but a pompous encomium of the great and noble qualities, with which they imagine they are adorned. There is therefore a little too much vanity in the caſe. Let us add, that ſuch complaints are much oftner a proof of the Author's ingratitude towards their age, than of the age's ingratitude towards the Author's: for, generally ſpeaking, they who beſt enjoy the conveniencies of life, make the moſt complaints againſt the perverſe humour of fortune, and againſt the injuſtice of the times.

A REFLECTION on the Author's complaints againſt Fortune.

I ſay this only in general: I do not pretend to make an application of it to our Monſieur le Pays: I am not well enough acquainted with the hiſtory of life, to determine whether or not he ought to have been ſatisfied with his condition. But I think he ſhould not have thought it ſtrange, that men of buſineſs puſhed their fortune better than he could do. For an Officer of the Finances, who writes Love-letters, Sonnets, and Madrigals, muſt never pretend to deſerve the good-will of his ſuperiors, nor their recommendation to be promoted to the greateſt employments, as he would deſerve it by obſerving punctually, like the reſt, this precept of Monſieur Deſpreaux.

Pren moi le bon parti: laiſſe là tous les livres.
Cent francs au denier cinq combient font-ils! Vingt livres.
C'eſt bien dit. Va, tu ſçais tout ce qu'il faut ſçavoir.
Que de biens, que d'honneurs ſur toi s'en vont pleuvoir!
Exerce-toi, mon fils, dans ces hautes ſciences.
Prens au lieu d'un Platon le Guidon des Finances.
Sçache quelle Province enrichit les Traitans:
Combien le ſel au Roi peut fournir tous les ans.
Endurcy-toi le cœur: Sois Arabe, Corſaire,
Injuſte, violent, ſans foi, double, fauſſaire (20).

(20) *Deſpreaux*, Satire 8. ver. 283.

"Would'ſt thou get honour and a fair eſtate,
"And have the looks and favours of the great?
"*Cries an old father to his blooming ſon;*
"Take the right courſe, be rul'd by me, 'tis done.

"Leave

only common-place topicks, which are generally too much owing to a man's pride. Let us

" Leave mouldy Authors to the reading fools,
" The poring crowds in colleges and ſchools :
" How much is threeſcore Nobles ? *Twenty Pound.*
" Well ſaid, my ſon, the anſwer's moſt profound :
" Go, thou know'ſt all that's requiſite to know ;
" What wealth on thee, what honours haſte to flow !
" In theſe high ſciences thyſelf employ,
" Inſtead of Plato, take thy *Ricard*, boy.
" Learn there the art to audit an account,
" To what the King's Revenue does amount :
" How much the Cuſtom and Exciſe bring in,
" And what the managers a year purloin.
" Get a caſe-hard'ned conſcience, *Iriſh* proof,
" Which nought of pity, ſenſe, or ſhame, can move :
" Turn *Algerine*, *Barbarian*, *Turk*, or *Jew*,
" Unjuſt, inhuman, treacherous, baſe, untrue *."

* BOILEAU's works, tranſlated by ſeveral hands, *Satyr* 8.

To ſtudy politeneſs, to ſpend whole days in writing a Love-letter, to correct a ſonnet or a ſong an hundred times over, till the concluſion of it be happy, well turned, very tender, and very moving ; this is not the way to ſupplant a rival, or to prevent him from ſupplanting you : I mean a rival with regard to the employments which depend upon the Directors of the Finances. If it be a rival in love, well and good. One would much better learn to ſupplant him by ſpending one's time in writing a love-letter, than by employing it in a rule of Arithmetick. But even this parallel holds good only as to the immediate effects : for if you ſhould urge, that a man will be more capable to grow rich by applying himſelf to the rules of arithmetick, than to a piece of gallantry, and that the richer rival will be favoured rather than the man of wit ; I will not pretend to argue againſt it. I have read ſomewhere, that *Lewis Sforza uſed to ſay, that wit is but an indifferent qualification for a ſoldier, and that he was not willing to admit thoſe into his ſervice who pretended to it* (21). Mareſhal de Gaſſion was of the ſame mind ; he was once ſo offended at the Abbot de la Riviere's reflections, who pretended that his R. H. the Duke of Orleans ought to have raiſed the ſiege of Coutray, that " his anger pro-
" voking his natural roughneſs, he fell out with him,
" and told him theſe words, *Sir Abbot, your men of*
" *wit are but poor tools for the war* (22)." They are as little capable of the Finances, generally ſpeaking.

(21) Silhon, *Miniſtre d'Etat*, Liv. 1. chap. 13.

(22) The Abbé de Pure, *Vie du Marechal de Gaſſion*, Tom. 4. chap. 4. p. 36. under the year 1646.

But let us come at laſt to the point : let us ſpeak of our Author's complaints againſt his deſtiny. His letter of complaints (23) againſt fortune is pretty well turned, and contains ſome pretty good thoughts. Here follow ſome paſſages extracted from it. " I
" was born under a certain conſtellation, the malig-
" nity of which cannot be conquered, and I am ſo
" fully convinced of that unfriendly conſtellation's
" power, that I lay all my misfortunes to its charge,
" without being ever angry with any man for them.
" And therefore, Madam, though you ſhould never
" obtain for me the favour, for which you make ſo
" much intereſt, and with ſo much zeal, I ſhall ne-
" verthelefs be all my life time obliged to you for
" your generous and active friendſhip. This is not
" the firſt time, that the attempts which are made to
" prefer me, prove unſucceſsful. You remember,
" *&c*, ... In my youth I have done like the reſt ;
" I have hunted after fortune with a reſtleſs mind.
" I have examined which are the places ſhe moſt
" frequently viſits, and I have endeavoured to put
" myſelf in her way. Going to meet her, I ima-
" gined that as ſhe is blind, ſhe would fall in with
" me even without minding it : but I am apt to
" think that ſhe had eyes for me alone, ſince ſhe al-
" ways knew ſo well how to avoid all my approaches.
" I have done all that lay in my power to court her.
" Having obſerved from what happens in the world,
" that ſhe uſes men of letters ill, and men of buſi-
" neſs kindly. I have acted againſt my own incli-
" nation, and made the Finances my ſerious oc-
" cupation, and the Muſes only my diverſion. And
" yet all my cares and pains have been unſucceſsful ;
" till this day, I could never find her propitious to
" me. Since fortune is ſuppoſed to be a blind
" Deity, but a Deity to whom men pay a worſhip,
" which looks like ſomething religious, I imagine
" that one may believe without being an Heretick,
" that this Goddeſs has among her creatures ſome
" elect, and ſome reprobates, who are happy or un-
" fortunate by her choice only, without owing any
" thing to their own conduct. Since I have found
" that ſhe placed me among the latter, I endeavour
" by all poſſible means to comfort myſelf. . . . . If
" my reflections were not tedious to you I would
" make many more before I put an end to this let-
" ter ; I would ſpeak to you with more warmth ſtill
" againſt the whims of fortune. You muſt know
" however, that I do not hate her ſo much for not
" raiſing me, as I hate her for derpeſſing our incom-
" parable friend. I think him much more unhappy
" than myſelf. A man cannot fall from ſo high a
" place, without feeling all his life time the pain of
" the blow received by ſuch a fall. But for my part, as
" I was always low in the world, I could never fall.
" All the misfortune I labour under is a certain weak-
" neſs, occaſioned by the unſucceſsful attempts I
" have made to raiſe myſelf. Our dear friend's caſe
" is much more to be lamented : I pity him ſo much
" the more, as he had not deſerved his downfall.
" When I ſee a giddy-headed fellow forſaken by
" fortune, I am not more ſurpriſed at it, than at a
" blind-man's falling down a precipice, when he
" walks without a guide. But when I ſee fortune
" pull down a man, ſupported by the moſt conſum-
" mate prudence, I cannot ſufficiently rail againſt
" her unjuſt cruelty. The misfortune is, that a man
" can hardly put himſelf in a condition to eſcape her
" unjuſt practices. She is a Deity who makes a ſport
" with her admirers as well as with her enemies : ſhe
" often hurts thoſe who would avoid her. At
" Court ſhe will raiſe you an enemy, who will miſ-
" repreſent all your actions to make them odious, or
" a rival, who will put you out of favour with the
" Prince. In the country ſhe will break a ſtone from
" a rock, or make an eagle take up a tortoiſe, and
" drop it on your head to cruſh you in pieces. She
" laughs almoſt equally at the altars, which the
" Courtiers ſet up to her, and at the contempt which
" the Philoſophers ſhew her. Alas ! if wiſdom and
" virtue could but ſecure us againſt her ſtrokes, honeſt
" men would not much fear her, and we ſhould ſee
" none unhappy but the ſtupid, and the wicked. But
" men of honour and wit ſeem to be the moſt ex-
" poſed to her power. The eyes of prudence are
" not ſharp enough to diſcover the ſecret ſprings,
" which make her wheel turn. The motions of
" them are hid from our ſight, and as we cannot
" know the cauſe ſo we cannot avoid the effects of
" theſe motions. And ſince it is ſo, it would be
" a folly to grieve at it. We ought to ſuffer her
" motions, and look upon them as upon thoſe of
" the cœleſtial bodies. A man, who ſhould make
" himſelf uneaſy on account of an eclipſe of the
" Sun and the Moon, would be thought a ſilly man.
" He who is vexed at the inconſtancy of fortune is not
" much wiſer." In another letter (24) he deſcribes the vexations he went through at Fontainebleau, in the proſecution of an affair wherein he did not ſucceed. They had cut off a thouſand crowns from his penſion ; and he could never get them reſtored again. *Since I am at Fontainebleau*, ſays he, *I loſe regularly every day nine or ten hours in a very dull hall, where I have indeed the company of a great many perſons much more conſiderable than myſelf, and who are not received with more ceremony, nor diſpatched with more diligence. . . . . To alleviate* my grief, *I imagine ſometimes, that a man, who ſhould come without any buſineſs, and with a mind perfectly indifferent, into this hall, where ſo many perſons wait impatiently, would be very much diverted by obſerving our different poſtures. Some are thoughtful, ſome rail, others walk about, others lean againſt the wall : and upon the leaſt noiſe that is made at the Patron's door, all look that way, and though the perſon that comes in through that door be only a footman, they all bow very low to him. If that footman ſays the Patron is ſlightly indiſpoſed, all the affairs fall ſick ; and the misfortune is, that when the Patron is recovered, my buſineſs does not fare much*

(23) It is the 1ſt of the 1ſt book of the 2d part of his *Nouvelles Oeuvres*. It is written to Madam the Counteſs of . . . and not dated.

(24) The 30th of the 2d book of the 1ſt part of his *Nouv. Oeuvres*. It is written from Fontainebleau, Auguſt the 13th, to the Count de Lionne. The year is not ſet down.

A DESCRIPTION of the proſecuting a buſineſs at Court.

*) Thus, I think, we may tranſlate the word *Patineur*, which ſignifies a man who touches the women's breaſts, and ruffles their tuckers.

us obſerve, that he was not ſorry the world ſhould know he was a great pawer or ruffler * with the Ladies [*I*]. The letter he wrote to a Lady, who boaſted that ſhe had given him a ſlap of the face, is pretty malicious (*f*). It is perhaps only a fiction, a letter which was not really wrote to any perſon; nor would it be the only ſtory which ſeems to be imaginary among the particulars which he relates. It is

(*f*) See the rem. [*I*].

much the better for it. Sometimes, at laſt, he appears like a flaſh of lightning; then all follow him, fall upon him, and ſtrive to be heard. I endeavoured to be heard like the reſt, but my feeble voice is loſt in the noiſe of the crowd, and cannot be heard. Sometimes to drown my ſorrow, I go and behold the charms of Fontainebleau, and the beauties of the Court. Sometimes I viſit the Queen's maids of honour, and ſometimes the rooms and galleries of the palace. Afterwards I walk along the canals, and then fall into the thick of the foreſt. But the loſs of my thouſand crowns ſpoils all my diverſions, and makes the eyes and complexions of the faireſt Ladies look dull to me, as of Meſdames de Soubiſe, de Briſſac, and de S. Geran, and of Meſdemoiſelles de Lanois, de la Mark, and de Rouvroy; it obſcures the brightneſs of the tapeſtries, pictures, and fineſt ornaments of the moſt ſtately apartments: it makes the water of the canals, fountains, and caſcades look muddy; and fades the leaves and flowers of the elms, of the linden-trees, and of the orange-trees.

I have not read the verſes he wrote on a *Decree by which he was ruined, becauſe he was ſentenced by it to anſwer for a man, who had embezzled the King's money* (25) (*), but I have a good opinion of thoſe lines, when I conſider that they are inſerted in a collection of Poems, in which there is a piece which deſerved the approbation of a witty and ſkilful judge, who is by no means laviſh of his commendations. *One might add a third to them*, ſays he (26), *which is that* Monſieur le Pays *wrote an Encomium on Tobacco; which did no doubt contribute very much to raiſe the price of the farming of it, and to make it ſell better. He wrote two Poems on that barren ſubject, and he found the art of treating it in ſo graceful a manner, and extolling the virtues of tobacco ſo well, that that plant will henceforth appear among the flowers of Parnaſſus.* To underſtand the beginning of this paſſage, it muſt be obſerved that the Author had already mentioned two other reaſons. I ſhall tranſcribe them here, becauſe they belong to the hiſtory of the perſon who is the ſubject of this article. "Beſides, the arguments drawn from "the merits of the cauſe, there are two other rea- "ſons, which, one would think, ought to have ſe- "cured Monſieur le Pays againſt ſo ſevere a ſentence. "The one is, that he is not grown rich, ſince thirty "years he has been concerned in the farming of the "King's Revenues: the other, that he is too much "a wit to meddle with the accounts and calculations "relating to the Finances." We may, I am ſure, conjecture, that a Poet who ſucceeded ſo well in the Encomium on Tobacco, deſcribing very elegantly in the ſame volume his reſentment againſt the injuſtice of ſo cruel a decree. A man's Muſe is never more eloquent, nor more lively, nor more fruitful in ſmart reflections, than on ſuch an occaſion. Theſe are not circumſtances, in which one muſt ſay, *curæ leves loquuntur, ingentes ſtupent, a light grief breaks out into words, but a great vexation is ſilent.* However, I leave it to them, who have read thoſe pieces, to judge whether we may ſay of Monſieur le Pays, what he wrote to a Count. "It were pity, Sir, you had "no grief. You know ſo well how to make an "agreeable uſe of it, and your letter to me contains "ſo lively a deſcription of it, that I ſhould be ſorry "now that you had carried the cauſe, which occa- "ſions your uneaſineſs. *Neque Dii neque Deæ faciunt "ut te fortuna in deliciis habeat. Let neither the "Gods nor the Goddeſſes ſuffer you to be in fortune's fa- "vour.* If I were Seneca, you ſhould be my Luci- "lius, and I would make you ſuch a Compliment. "And indeed, Sir, ſhould I not be in the right to "ſpeak thus to you, after reading the ſad and plea- "ſant things, which your pretended misfortune made "you write? .... Yes, Sir, your grief has diverted "me very much, becauſe you expreſs it ſo wittily, "that really you muſt not be much troubled with it. "For if you were overwhelmed with it, as you ſay, "you would not ſpeak of it in ſuch an eaſy and un- "concerned manner as you do (27)." Coſtar was very near of the ſame taſte. *Here is but one thing*, ſaid he (28), *which the moſt ſevere Criticks can blame*, in Monſieur de Balzac's complaints of his diſtempers and his misfortunes: *It is that they are too eloquent and too elaborate. And indeed he makes uſe of ſo many witty thoughts, that he calls to my mind the player Apelles, who whilſt the Emperor Caligula had him whipped, cried in ſo harmonious a tone, that this wicked Prince, to enjoy the longer the pleaſure it gave him, cauſed the puniſhment of that unfortunate wretch to be continued* (29). *None but a Caligula could be capable of ſuch a barbarous action. But I am apt to think that there have been ſome perſons, who, without being cruel, loved their pleaſure ſo much, that they almoſt rejoiced at our Orator's ſciatica, or gravel, when they read ſome of his letters*, &c. He gives ſome inſtances of it, and then adds (30), *Moſt of thoſe things are ſo wittily imagined, that I ſhould be an open enemy to the pleaſures of the publick, if it were true that I find fault with them, as my adverſary aſſerts.*

§ (*) The Mercure Galant for March 1689, pag. 195, and 196, of the firſt part, acquaints us, that "Monſieur le Pays, after many proſecutions, which "had been carried on to make him pay a very con- "ſiderable ſum of money, for which a farmer of "the King's Revenue pretended to make him anſwer- "able, has at laſt been cleared by a decree of the "Council, whereupon he wrote the lines, which you "will ſee hereunder.

A MONSIEUR LE CONTROLLEUR GENERAL.

Après de ſi longues allarmes,
La Paix eſt chez moy de retour.
Je dors la nuit, je ris le jour,
Du repos je ſens tous les charmes.
Enfin me viola degagé
Du procès où j'étois plongé.
Quand tout preſt à faire naufrage
Le ſecours arrive à propos,
Plus on a tremblé dans l'orage,
Et plus on goute le repos.

i. e. "After ſo many dreads and fears, peace is at "laſt returned to me. I ſleep by night, I laugh by "day; I taſte all the delights of reſt. I am at laſt "free from the proſecution that was carried on againſt "me. When ready to be caſt away, we happen to be "timely ſaved; the more we trembled in the ſtorm, "the ſweeter does reſt ſeem to us."

[*I*] *He was not ſorry the world ſhould know he was a great pawer or ruffler with the Ladies.*] He ought to have concealed that fault, for it is a little citizen-like. Conſult Furetiere's Dictionary; you will meet there not only with the definition, but alſo with the condemnation of that practice. The definition contains theſe words (31). "A man is ſaid to *paw* or "*ruffle* a woman, when he handles her arms, her "breaſt, &c." The condemnation is expreſſed thus. "None but country girls, or maid-ſervants, ſuffer "themſelves to be *pawed* or *ruffled*. It is not the "faſhion to *paw* among people of diſtinction. . . . . "The country-gentlemen are great *rufflers*." Furetiere is in the right to aſſert this of the country-gentlemen. He might have added, that this fault prevails more or leſs in the Provinces of France, according as they are more or leſs remote from Paris: and that it is much more common in the cities than in the country, and more in ſmall towns, than in great cities. This proves that men do not follow herein the eternal rules of morality, but only thoſe of politeneſs, or the faſhion of the Court. There is another very remarkable proof of this, which is, that lewdneſs carried to the higheſt degree, and to the laſt act is more common in the cities, than in the villages, and in great cities, more than in little towns. It is quite the reverſe with regard to *ruffling*. Let us obſerve by the by, that notwithſtanding the great politeneſs which prevailed under the reign of Auguſtus, the

(25) See the *Hiſt. des Ouvrag. des Savans*, for Sept. 1688. p. 132.

(26) Baſnage de Beauval, *Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Savans*, Ibid. p. 133.

(27) Le Pays, *Nouv. Oeuvrages*, part. 2. Liv. 1. *Lett.* 9. It is written to Count du Bouchage, and dated June the 12th, 1668.

(28) Coſtar, *Apologie*, p. 111.

(29) Suetonius does not ſay this, he ſays only, *Cum aſſiſtens ſimulacro Jovis Apellem tragœdum conſuluiſſet, uter illi major videretur, cunctantem flagellis diſcidit: collaudans ſubinde vocem deprecantis, quaſi etiam in gemitu prædulcem.* Suet. in Calig. cap. 33. *i. e.* "Being near the "ſtatue of Ju- "piter, he ask- "ed Apelles, "the Actor of "tragedies, "Whether he "or Jupiter "ſeemed the "greateſt to "him? And "as Apelles did "not anſwer "immediately, "he had him "whipped, and "praiſed his "groaning voice, "as being even "then ſweet "and harmoni- "ous."

(30) Coſtar, *Apologie*, p. 130.

(31) Furetiere's Dictionary, under the word *Patiner*.

is very probable that he never ſaw his Miſtreſs quite naked [K], and ſuppoſed it only that he might have an opportunity to relate ſeveral merry conceits. He was caſt in a vexatious law-ſuit a few years before his death (g), and died at Paris April 3, 1690.

(g) See the rem. [H].

the young maidens at Rome were obliged to defend themſelves againſt the rufflers hands; they made uſe of their nails, but after having pared them very cloſe.

Nos convivia, nos prælia virginum
Sectis in juvenes unguibus acrium,
Cantamus vacui (32).

(32) Horat. Od. 6. lib. 1.

" I ſing ſoft boys and virgins's wars,
" How ſoon they ſmile, how angry ſoon,
" With cloſe-par'd nails, and tender tooth,
" They all invade the ruffling youth."

CREECH.

Horace obſerves in another place that they defended themſelves very feintly againſt thoſe who would kiſs them.

Dum fiagrantia detorquet ad oſcula
Cervicem, aut facili ſævitiâ negat,
Quæ poſcente magis gaudeat eripi,
Interdùm rapere occupet *?

* Idem, Ode 12. lib. 2. See alſo Ode 9. lib. 1.

" Whene'er her head ſhe gently moves,
" To take the earneſt of her loves,
" A balmy kiſs; or elſe denies
" With eaſy forwardneſs, which ſhews
" That ſhe is more content to loſe
" Than he that begs to win the prize;
" Or when ſhe runs to ſnatch an eager kiſs."

CREECH.

(33) In the article Lycurgus the Legiſlator, quotation (9).

I have quoted elſewhere (33) a paſſage, which relates probably to a country-gentleman, who had lived a long time at Paris, and yet thought that to make himſelf welcome with Ladies of Quality he muſt *paw* or *ruffle* them. Let us quote that paſſage again, and add the ſequel to it. " Mr. M. . . . went into " Britany with the Marchioneſs de Lavardin, to pay " a viſit to Madam de Sévigny. He was in the Mar- " chioneſs's coach, and in the road, *per non parer troppo* " *coglione*, he entertained her with flattering expreſ- " ſions, and took up her hand to kiſs. Madam de La- " vardin ſaid to him with a ſmile, Sir, you are prac- " tiſing your leſſon againſt you go to Madam de " S. . . . . The ſame being in company with the " Counteſs de la Suze, was playing with her hands; " whereupon ſhe repeated to him this line from " Scaron;"

Les patineurs ſont gens inſupportables;

" Your rufflers are inſufferable men."

To which he replied readily by the next line,

Même aux beautez qui ſont très patinables (34).

(34) *Suite du Menangiana*, p. 178, 179. Monſieur Menage himſelf is the perſon meant here.

" Even to thoſe who deſerve to be
" Handled and &c."

You do not prove, will ſome ſay, what was to be proved: have a little patience; you will ſoon meet with the proof: it is to be found in ſeveral of Monſieur le Pays's Letters, and eſpecially in the firſt book of his Amitiez, in the 24th Letter, where he ſpeaks thus to his Caliſto. *Though you were naked* (35) *and unarmed, yet I feared you, though in all probability you had not then by you that curſed bodkin with which you puniſh* SO OFTEN *the little liberties I take.* What follows contains a clearer proof ſtill: I tranſcribe it from a letter he wrote to a Lady, who boaſted that ſhe had given him a box on the ear. " Do not be miſtaken, " dear Madam; the glory of having uſed me ill is not " ſo great as you may imagine. I have had twenty " Miſtreſſes haughtier than you; who know better " how to repel my attempts, and yet they do not " take a pride in it. You are ſtill but a young be- " ginner in matters of cruelty, and your waiting- " woman might teach you. Miſs Katy has uſed me " more cruelly for leſſer liberties: you have given " me but one box of the ear, ſhe has given me above " a dozen. You tore me only a ribbon, ſhe tore " half my hair off my head; and yet ſhe never " mentioned it to any one living. You are as to " vanity like your tall couſin; he was never in war " but on one pitiful occaſion, of which he is con- " tinually giving an account to all the world: you " never abuſed perhaps any one but me, and you " tell the ſtory to the whole town. But you ſhould " not at leaſt intermix fables with your ſtory: if you " would relate faithfully how things paſſed between " us, I could bear with your vanity, and would not " complain of your indiſcretion. What is the mean- " ing of all that oſtentation of pride? Why will " you by your diſcourſes extenuate the exceſſive li- " berties I took? Why exaggerate the bitterneſs of " the opprobrious language, and the heavineſs of " the blow you gave me? Indeed, Madam, if you " will remember it, your injuries were not very bit- " ter, nor was the blow exceedingly heavy. I juſtly " deſerved much more, and though you had done " all that you pretend you did, you had not done " half your duty. And yet, you know very well " in your conſcience, that you was afraid you had " carried your paſſion too far: you feared leſt I " ſhould be more angry than you, and at laſt you " put on ſuch a countenance as to perſuade me my " boldneſs would no longer offend you; but your " good nature did not appeaſe my reſentment, and " when I ſaw your reſiſtance ſlackened ſo ſoon, I " deſpiſed ſo eaſy a victory. Confeſs the truth: it " is this, Madam, that exaſperated you; you took " offence at my contempt, and you thought it pro- " per to conceal it under a ſhew of contempt for me " (36)." The letter which preceeds this is not leſs malicious; it was written to a Lady, who thought Monſieur le Pays a little too familiar: it deſerves to be read, and may afford inſtructions to ſeveral perſons, who may have occaſion for them.

(36) Le Pays, *Nouvelles Oeuvr.* part. 1. liv. 2. *Lettre* 3. p. m. 107, 108.

[K] *It is very probable that he never ſaw his Miſtreſs quite naked.*] He aſſerts it poſitively. " At laſt, " Caliſto, all your artifices have proved unſucceſsful. " I found laſt night the place where you was gone to " bathe yourſelf. . . . . Pray why do you take ſo " much care to hide your body? Indeed you ſhewed " no part, which you need to be aſhamed of: and " if there were any, they were the knees and other " parts of your ſiſter, and of your couſin, which " ſhould have been aſhamed to appear before yours. " But as for you, though you ſhewed all, yet you " ſhewed nothing but what was beautiful, nothing " but what you may take a pride in. I found " then, that thoſe parts which you hide, are not in " the leaſt leſs handſome, than thoſe you ſhew: and I " agreed with myſelf, that there are ſome Ladies, " who would have more reaſons to hide their noſe, " than you your thighs (37)." The reſt of this letter contains many thoughts witty enough to make me imagine, that the Author invented this ſtory, that he might have an opportunity to publiſh them. Though the fair ſex may have the privilege in ſeveral Provinces of France, to take with decency ſuch liberties, as would ruin their reputation in Italy, yet I am perſuaded, that neither Monſieur le Pays's Miſtreſs, nor the ſiſter, nor the couſin of this Caliſto, did bathe themſelves in a river, without a ſhift on, or without a ſheet about them, and in one another's ſight: and with ſo little precaution, that a man might ſurprize them in that condition, and compare them leiſurely the moſt ſecret parts of the one, with thoſe of the others. I queſtion whether country-women ever take ſuch liberties. How much more ought we to judge, that young maidens, who without too great an abuſe, were ſtyled Ladies (*Demoiſelles*) would not tranſgreſs to ſuch a degree, the laws of modeſty and decency? If they undreſſed themſelves quite, in order to enjoy the better the coolneſs of the weather, they waited unqueſtionably till it was dark. Things are not at preſent upon the ſame footing, as in the time of Diana (38). We may therefore aſſert, of this letter of Monſieur le Pays, and of ſeveral

(37) Le Pays, *Amitiez, Amours, & Amourettes*, Liv. 1. *Lett.* 24. p. m. 22.

(38) See *Ovid. Metamorph.* lib. 2. ver. 461, and lib. 3. ver. 179.

1690. There was a *Satyr publiſhed againſt him in the year* 1670 (*b*).

(*b*) Printtd, if I am not miſtaken, either at Grenoble, or at Lyons. He was very ill uſed in that little Pamphlet.

ſeveral other little works of the ſame kind, that only ſtories invented by the Authors. things are related there as matters of fact, which are

☞ PEARSON (JOHN), a moſt learned Engliſh Biſhop in the 17th Century, was ſon of Mr. Robert Pearſon, Rector of Creak and Snoring in Norfolk, by Elizabeth, one of the Daughters of Dr. Richard Vaughan, ſucceſſively Biſhop of Bangor, Cheſter, and London. He was born at Snoring February 28, 1612-13 (*a*), and was ſent in May 1623 to Eaton-ſchool, from whence he was elected to King's College in Cambridge April 1632. In 1635 he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts, and in 1639 that of Maſter (*b*); and was Fellow of his College, but in 1639 reſigned his Fellowſhip, and lived a Fellow-Commoner in the College (*c*). In 1639 he entered into holy Orders (*d*); and December 30th the ſame year he was collated to the Prebend of Netherhaven in the Church of Sarum (*e*). In June 1640 he was appointed Chaplain to the Lord Keeper Finch, who in December the ſame year preſented him to the Living of Torrington in Suffolk (*f*). Upon the breaking out of the Civil Wars he became Chaplain to the Lord Goring, whom he attended in the army; and afterwards Chaplain to Sir Robert Cook in London. In 1650 he was made Miniſter of St. Clement's Eaſt-cheap in London (*g*). In 1657 he and Mr. Peter Gunning had a diſpute with two Roman Catholicks, upon the ſubject of Schiſm; an account of which was printed at Paris in 1658 [*A*]. In 1659 he wrote

(*a*) From ſome manuſcript notes written by Dr. Thomas Smith, of Trinity College, Cambridge, and communicated by Thomas Clarke, of the Middle-Temple, Eſq; and from an Extract of the Regiſter of King's-College, Cambridge, communicated by Robert Bankes, M. D. Fellow of that College, and of the College of Phyſicians at London, and Phyſician to Chriſt's Hoſpital, London.

(*b*) From the Univerſity Regiſter.

(*c*) From the College Regiſter.

(*d*) Dr. Smyth's MS. notes.

(*e*) *Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy*, part 2. p. 67.

(*f*) Smyth's MS. notes.

(*g*) From the College Regiſter.

[*A*] *An account of which was printed at Paris in* 1658.] It was printed under the following title: *Schiſme unmaſk't: Or, A late Conference betwixt Mr.* Peter Gunning, *and Mr.* John Pierſon, *Miniſters, on the one part, and two Diſputants of the Roman Profeſſion, on the other: wherein is defined, both what Schiſme is, and to whom it belongs. With a brief Recapitulation; wherein at one view may be ſeen, the whole Drift of this Conference, for ſuch as want either Learning to reach, or Leiſure to read the whole Tract. And all is concluded with a Deciſion of the main Queſtion, Whether* Proteſtants, *or thoſe of the* Roman Church, *be Schiſmatiques. Alſo an Index is drawne, pointing at the principall Matters. Printed at Paris,* cum Privilegio, 1658. One of the Roman Catholic Diſputants went under ſeveral names, as *Spencer*, or *Tyrwhitt*, or *Hatcliffe*; and the other was a Phyſician. To the whole is prefixed, *a Preface of the Catholique Diſputants, containing the Proceedings of both Parties in Matter of Fact*; in which we are informed, that the conference began in May 1657, a little before Whitſuntide.

With regard to the publication of this book, we have the following account in a book of Mr. Thomas Smith, of Chriſt College in Cambridge, printed at London, in 1659, and intitled, *A Gagg for the Quakers; with an Anſwer to Mr.* Denn's Quaker no Papiſt. "That which follows, *ſays Mr. Smith*, in "your book about Mr. *Gunning* and Mr. *Pearſon*, "who diſputed againſt the Romaniſts, all who know "theſe Miniſters know to be ſuperfluous and frivo- "lous. However, I think fit to tell you, the Roma- "niſt, who put forth an edition [*of that Diſpute*] "hath ſo changed, tranſpoſed, added, diminiſhed, "and made of it what he liſt, that I believe it will "be as ſoon owned for your (I mean not *J. S.* but "*H. D.*'s) conference, as Mr. *Pearſon*'s or Mr. *Gun- "ning*'s. I muſt now tell you further, (what you "have been oft enough told of) that that relation "cannot expect to be regarded by Mr. *P.* or any "ſober perſon, which is diſclaimed and diſowned by "three of the four, who were diſputants, *viz.* by "both the Proteſtants, and half the Papiſts. But "chiefly, I muſt intreat you to conſider, whether the "inſerting above 200 lines at a time, as a part of "the conference, which never was part of it, beſides "all profeſſed additions; ſecondly, whether the "leaving out whole ſheets of the Proteſtants, which "the Papiſts thought too hard to anſwer; and third- "ly, the ſcarce ſuffering any one argument and an- "ſwer of both to come together, but caſting uſually "parts of the ſame paper of Mr. *G.* many ſcore "leaves aſunder one from another, be not a ſcan- "dal, that any Chriſtian would deſire might be co- "vered with ſilence? And I would gladly know "from any ingenious perſon, whether this might "not be anſwer enough to a book put out at the "charge of the Romaniſt's own purſe and conſcience; "a diſcourſe, by being mangled, rendered ſo un- "intelligible, that ſcarce any man ever read it over, "or will. . . . . Reverend Mr. William Moor, the "deceaſed Library-keeper, was perſuaded by *J. S.* "to read one leaf; but profeſſed, before many wit- "neſſes, he would not read another, if you would "give him the whole impreſſion, becauſe it was ſo "unintelligible, for the cauſes abovementioned." This *Conference* was re-printed at Oxford, during the reign of King James II. under this title; *The Schiſm of the Church of England demonſtrated, in four Arguments, formerly propoſed by Dr.* Peter Gunning *and Dr.* John Pearſon, *(the late Biſhops of Ely and Cheſter) by two Catholic Diſputants, in a celebrated Conference upon that point.* This was ſoon after animadverted upon by William Saywell, D. D. Maſter of Jeſus-College, Cambridge, in a pamphlet printed at Cambridge, 1688, in 4to, under this title; *The Reformation of the Church of England juſtified, according to the Canons of the Council of Nice, and other General Councils, and the Tradition of the Catholic Church. Being an Anſwer to a Paper re-printed at Oxford, called,* The Schiſm, &c. *in which anſwer the unworthy and falſe dealings of the Papiſts are ſhewed, and the charge of Schiſm returned upon them, and the Church of England proved truly Catholic and Apoſtolick in her doctrine and conſtitution.* In the Preface we are informed, that "the conference "was managed in writing about thirty years ago; "and by mutual agreement nothing was to be made "publick without the allowance and conſent of both "parties. But ſuch was the diſingenuity and un- "worthineſs of one of the Romiſh Diſputants, that "contrary to the faith and promiſe he had made, he "ſets forth a book, and pretends it to be an account "of the conference with Biſhop *Gunning* and Biſhop "*Pearſon*, when he had left out, changed, and miſ- "placed the matters as he pleaſed himſelf; inſomuch "that his partner was very much aſhamed of this "diſhoneſt and unfaithful dealing, and did utterly "condemn him for what he had done, and renounced "his having been engaged in approving or conſent- "ing to ſuch a baſe and diſingenuous proceeding, and "did openly own and acknowledge ſo much to the per- "ſons concerned." Dr. Saywell then quotes the paſſage above-cited from Mr. Smith, and proceeds thus. *But perhaps ſome will demand, why was not the conference then printed whole and entire? Now the reaſon of that was, the Popiſh adverſary did run all the diſpute into obſcure and metaphyſical niceties, that few could underſtand, and fewer would take the pains to read it, and ſo it was not thought fit, and a needleſs charge, to trouble the world with it. Beſides, both the Biſhops did tell their friends, when they diſcourſed with them about a fuller anſwer, that they thought it altogether unneceſſary, becauſe though the diſpute were mangled and miſrepreſented, yet that which they had printed will ſtill be unanſwered by them, and unanſwerable by any of their party; and they were perſuaded that all men, who would carefully read the book, would be of the ſame mind. And as for this paper that is added at the end of the pretended* Conference, *and now reprinted at Oxford, the*

wrote a *Preface* to Mr. *Hales's Remains* [*B*]; and publiſhed at London in 4to, his *Expoſition*

Author does not ſo much as ſay, that it was part of their diſpute, but a pure addition of his own, wherein they were no more concerned than other Divines, and they did not think they were bound to anſwer whatſoever he ſhould afterwards write and publiſh to the world; and yet this Oxford paper would, without any ground or the leaſt colour, impoſe upon the world, that this was a part of that mentioned Conference.

[*B*] *In* 1659 *he wrote a* Preface *to Mr.* Hales's Remains.] Theſe *Remains* were printed at London 1659, in 4to, under the title of *Golden Remains of the ever memorable Mr.* John Hales *of Eaton-College.* In the Preface Mr. Pearſon obſerves, that if Mr. *Farindon* had not died before the impreſſion of this book, he would have prefixed to it the life of Mr. *Hales*, which he had begun. He then aſſures the Reader, that in drawing Mr. Hales's character, he ſhall ſpeak no more, than *my own long experience*, ſays he, *intimate acquaintance, and high veneration grounded upon both, ſhall freely and ſincerely prompt me to.* We ſhall take the opportunity to inſert here ſome particulars concerning Mr. *Hales*, which have been communicated to us by the learned *Arthur Aſhley Sykes*, D. D. Dean of St. Burien, ſince the printing of our article of that great man. Dr. Nathaniel Ingelo, Prebendary of Windſor, in a letter to Mr. Richard Marriot, dated from Eaton College, October 29. without mentioning of the year, writes as follows:

" *Ad* (1m.) Mr. *Hales* went to the Lady *Salter's* " ſome time after Biſhop *King*, and about a year af- " ter his ejection from the College.

" *Ad* (2m.) The ſame Order, which carried Mr. " *Farindon* from his preaching in London, removed " Mr. *Hales* from the Lady *Salter's*; he affirming, " that he would be gone, leſt he ſhould miſchief his " friends.

" *Ad* (6m.) Mr. *Mountague* ſays, that he gave an " explication of his belief concerning the Trinity, to " Mr. *Salter*, according to the Doctrine of the Church " of England.

" *Ad* (7m.) Mr. *Mountague* has often heard Mr. " *Hales* ſay, that the perſon in the ſtory mentioned " by Mr. *Farindon* in his preface, was *Epiſcopius*.

" *Ad* (8m.) Mr. *Hales* went Chaplain to Sir *D.* " *Carleton* to Dort, only to accompany him in the " Embaſſy.

" Admitted Fellow of Eaton, May 4, 1613, for " I find it ſo in our books.

" As to Mr. *Hales's* being diſcontented, he was ſo " far from it, that he would willingly have waved " the Prebend of Windſor, when it was ſent to him " knowing nothing of it by Archbiſhop *Laud*; and " he would have refuſed it, but that it was preſent- " ed to him at a publick dinner among many " friends, who perſuaded him to the contrary. " Archbiſhop *Laud* did alſo ſend for him, and told " him, he might have what Preferment he pleaſed; " and he anſwered, *If it pleaſe your Grace, I have* " *what I deſire.*

" He was made Prebendary of Windſor about two " years before the wars, and enjoyed it but two " years. He ſtaid in his Fellowſhip, refuſing the " Covenant, nor otherwiſe complying in any thing " with the times; and was put out for refuſing the " engagement. He was not long ſick, about a fort- " night, and then not very ill; but diſcourſed with " all his friends as freely as in his health, till within " half an hour before his death; for Mr. *Montague* " was then talking with him, and left him for half " an hour, and before he returned, he was dead, " and had his perfect ſenſe to the laſt minute.

" After he came to Eaton, for thirty years toge- " ther, he was never hindered by any ſickneſs, he " ſtudying conſtantly from five of the clock in the " morning, till night, ſeldom eating any dinner.

" About the time of Archbiſhop *Laud's* death, he " retired from his lodgings in the college, into a " private chamber at Eaton, where he remained for " a quarter of a year unknown to any; and ſpent in " that time only ſix pence *per* week, living only upon " bread and beer. And as he had formerly faſted " from Tueſday night to Thurſday night, ſo in that " time of his retirement, he abſtained from his bread " and water; and when he heard that the Arch- " biſhop was murdered, he wiſhed that his head had " been taken off for his."

Mr. Hales's laſt will was as follows:

" *In Dei Nomine Amen. Maii decimo nono A. D.* 1656.

" My ſoul having been long ſince bequeathed unto " the mercies of God in Jeſus Chriſt, my only Savi- " viour; and my body naturally bequeathing itſelf to " duſt and aſhes, out of which it was taken; I *John* " *Hales*, of Eton, in the County of Bucks, Clerk, " by this my laſt Will and Teſtament, do diſpoſe " of the ſmall remainder of my poor broken eſtate, " in manner and form following.

" Firſt, I give to my ſiſter *Cicely Coombes* five " pounds. More I give to my ſiſter *Bridgett Gulli-* " *ford* five pounds. More I give to the poor of the " town of Eton, to be diſtributed at the diſcretion of " my Executrix hereafter named, five pounds. More " I give to ſix perſons to be appointed by my ſaid " Executrix, to carry my body to the grave, three " pounds, to be diſtributed among them by even " portions. More I give to Mr. *Thomas Manfield*, of " Windſor, Grocer, five pounds. More I give to " Mrs. *Mary Collins*, wife to Mr. *John Collins*, of " Eton, five pounds, to this end and purpoſe, that " ſhe would be pleaſed to provide her a ring in " what manner ſhe liſteth, to remain with her, in " memory of a poor deceaſed friend. All which " monies here bequeathed, do at this preſent reſt " intruſted in the hands of my ſingular good friends, " Mr. *William Smith*, and Mr. *Thomas Mountague*.

" Moreover, all my Greek and Latin books (ex- " cept St. *Jerom's* works, which I give to Mr. *Tho-* " *mas Mountague*) I give to my moſt deſervedly be- " loved friend, *William Salter*, of Rich-Kings, Eſq; " to whom I further give five pounds, to this end, " that he would provide him a fair ſeal-ring of gold, " engraven with his arms and hatchments doubled " and mantled, to preſerve the memory of a poor " deceaſed friend. All my Engliſh books, together " with the remainder of all monies, goods, and u- " tenſils whatſoever, I give and bequeath to Mrs. " *Hannah Dickinſon*, of Eton, Widow and Relict of " *John Dickenſon*, lately deceaſed, in whoſe houſe, " (for her's indeed it is, and not mine, as being " bought with her money, howſoever for ſome rea- " ſons I have ſuffered the publick voice to entitle me " to it) in whoſe houſe, I ſay, I have for a long " time (eſpecially ſince my unjuſt and cauſeleſs ex- " truſion from my College) been with great care and " good reſpect entertained. And her the ſaid *Han-* " *nah* I do by theſe preſents conſtitute and ordain my " ſole executrix. And unto this my laſt will I make " overſeers my very good friends Mr. *Thomas Mon-* " *tague* and Mr. *William Smith* of Eaton; and to each " of them I give five pounds, humbly requeſting " them to be aſſiſtants to my ſaid executrix with " their beſt advice to help, if ſo be ſhe chance to " find any trouble.

" Now becauſe monies are many times not at " command, but may require perchance ſome time " to take them up, I ordain, that in ſix months after " my departure ſhe ſee all theſe my bequeſts and le- " gacies orderly and faithfully diſcharged.

" As for my funeral, I ordain, that at the time of " the next even-ſong after my departure (if conve- " niently it may be) my body be laid in the church- " yard of the town of Eton, (if I chance there to die) " as near as may be to the body of my little Godſon " *Jack Dickenſon* the elder; and this to be done in " a plain and ſimple manner, without any ſermon, " or ringing the bell, or calling the people together; " without any unſeaſonable commeſſation, or com- " potation, or other ſolemnity on ſuch occaſions u- " ſual.

" And I ſtrictly command my executrix, that nei- " ther of her own head, neither at the importunity, " or authority of any other, neither upon any other " pretence whatſoever, to take upon her to diſpenſe " with this point of my will; for as in my life I " have done the Church no ſervice, ſo will I not, " that in my death the Church do me any honour."

ſition of the Creed [C], which was afterwards reprinted at London in folio, with improvements. In 1660 he took the Degree of Doctor of Divinity (*h*); and on the 17th of Auguſt that year was collated by the Biſhop of London to the Rectory of St. Chriſtopher's in that city (*i*); and in the ſame year was made Maſter of Jeſus College in Cambridge, and Archdeacon of Surrey. Before the end of the year following he was Prebendary of Ely, Margaret Profeſſor of Divinity in Cambridge, and Maſter of Trinity College in that Univerſity. In 1672 he was advanced to the See of Cheſter, to which he was conſecrated, February 9, 1672-3. Beſides his *Expoſition of the Creed*, he wrote ſome other works [D]. He died at Cheſter July 16, 1686.

(*h*) From the Univerſity Regiſter.

(*i*) *Newcourt's Repertorium*, vol. 1. p. 325.

He

Probatum fuit Teſtamentum prædict, coram me Richardo Alleſtree, *Sacræ Theologiæ Profeſſore, Præpoſito Collegii Reginalis beatæ Mariæ de Eton juxta Windſor in Com. Bucks Ordinar. Peculiar. Exempt. Juriſdictionis ibid. viceſimo nono die Menſis Martii A. D.* 1666. *ac pro me probatum, inſinuatum, legitimèque pronuntiatum per eod. commiſſaq; eſt adminiſtratio omnium & ſingulorum Bonorum dict. Defunct. Executrici in eodem Teſtamento nominat. in Juris forma Jurat. remedio & inter eſſe cujuſcunq; in omnibus ſemp. ſalvis. Dat. ſub ſigillo Officii mei Præpoſ. die & anno prædict.*

[C] *In* 1659 *he publiſhed at London, in* 4to, *his* Expoſition of the Creed.] It is dedicated to *the right worſhipful and well-beloved, the Pariſhioners of St. Clement's Eaſt-cheape*; and in the dedication he writes thus: "If I ſhould be at any time unmindfull of "your commands, you might well eſteem me unworthy of your continued favours. And there is "ſome reaſon to ſuſpect I have incurred the interpretation of forgetfulneſs, having been ſo backward in the performance of my promiſes. Some "years have paſſed, ſince I preached unto you upon "ſuch texts of ſcripture, as were on purpoſe ſelected "in relation to the *Creed*, and was moved by you "to make theſe meditations publick. But you "were pleaſed then to grant what my inclinations "rather led me to, that they might be turned into "an Expoſition of the Creed itſelf; which partly by "the difficulty of the work undertaken, partly by "the intervention of ſome other imployments, hath "taken me up thus long, for which I deſire your "pardon." In the preface, he obſerves, that *the Creed without Controverſy, is a brief comprehenſion of the objects of our Chriſtian Faith, and is generally taken to contain all things neceſſary to be believed*; and that the method, which he propoſed to himſelf, and has proſecuted in every article, is, firſt, to ſettle the words of each article, according to their antiquity, and generality of reception in the Creed. Secondly, to explicate and unfold the terms, and endeavour a right notion and conception of them, as they are to be underſtood in the ſame. Thirdly, to ſhew what are thoſe truths, which are naturally contained in theſe terms ſo explicated; and to make it appear, that they are truths indeed, by ſuch arguments and reaſons, as are reſpectively proper to evidence the verity of them. Fourthly, to declare what is the neceſſity of believing thoſe truths; what efficacy and influence they have in the ſoul, and upon the life of a Believer. Laſtly, by a recollection of all, briefly to deliver the ſum of every particular truth; ſo that every one, when he pronounceth the Creed, may know what he ought to intend, and what he is underſtood to profeſs, when he ſo pronounceth it. In his *Expoſition* of the *firſt Article* of the *Creed*, he rejects the notion of an innate idea of God. *Altho' ſome*, ſays he (1), *have imagined, that the knowledge of a Deity is connatural to the ſoul of man, ſo that every man hath a connate inbred notion of God; yet I rather conceive the ſoul of man to have no connatural knowledge at all, no particular notion of any thing in it from the beginning, but to receive the firſt apprehenſions of things by ſenſe, and by them to make all rational collections. If then the ſoul of man be at the firſt like a fair ſmooth table, without any actual characters of knowledge imprinted in it; if all the knowledge, which we have, comes ſucceſſively by ſenſation, inſtruction, and natural collection; then muſt we not refer the apprehenſion of a Deity to any connate notion, or inbred opinion.*

(1) p. 32 edit. London 1659, in 4to.

[D] *Some other works.*] 1. *No Neceſſity for a Reformation.* London 1661, in 4to. 2. *A Sermon preached before the King upon the* 19*th of March*, 1671, on Eccleſ. xii. 14. *publiſhed by his Majeſty's ſpecial Command.* London 1671, in 4to. 3. *Annales Cyprianici, ſive tredecim annorum, quibus S. Cyprianus inter Chriſtinos verſatus eſt, hiſtoria chronologica*; printed with *S. Cæcilii Cypriani opera cognita & illuſtrata, per Joannem Oxonienſem Epiſcopum.* Oxford 1682, in fol. 4. *Vindicatio Epiſtolarum Ignatii adverſus Dallæum.* Cambridge 1672, in 4to. 5. *Cl.* Joannis Pearſoni *Ceſtrienſis nuper Epiſcopi, Opera poſthuma. De ſerie primorum Romæ Epiſcoporum Diſſertationes duæ: quibus præfiguntur Annales Paulini & Lectiones in Acta Apoſtolorum. Edenda curavit & auxit* H. Dodwellus, *cujus acceſſit de eâdem ſucceſſione Diſſertatio ſingularis.* London 1688, in 4to. Theſe poſthumous works of our Author contain a diſſertation upon the life of St. Paul; five Analyſes upon the Acts of the Apoſtles, and two diſſertations upon the ſucceſſion of the Biſhops of Rome. The *Annales Paulini* contain ſcarce any thing, but what is collected from the Acts of the Apoſtles and the Epiſtles of St. Paul. The Martyrdom of that Apoſtle is placed by the Biſhop at the end of Nero's reign. In the Analyſes upon the Acts of the Apoſtles he obſerves, that it is very difficult to determine preciſely the time of the birth, death, and aſcenſion of our Saviour. We know in general, that he was born under the reign of Herod; but there is no circumſtance, which can lead us to fix poſitively upon the year. The Jews, through malignity, have confounded the Order of thoſe times, and the Fathers have not taken much pains to clear it up. They were only poſſeſſed with this falſe notion, that Chriſt preached but oneyear. However, our Author owns, that this is a point of curioſity, which does not at all affect the truth of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; and he lays it down as the foundation of his Chronology, that Chriſt ſuffered in the nineteenth year of Tiberius's reign. He explodes occaſionally two methods of reaſoning in Baronius, which are admirably well ſuited to ſupport the Doctrine of the Church of Rome with regard to images, and the power of the Pope. For from the paſſage, where it is ſaid, *that Peter's ſhadow healed the ſick*, that Cardinal concludes, 1. That painting having taken its origin from the ſhadow, which is the image of a perſon, God has conſecrated the worſhip of images by the miracles, with which he honoured St. Peter's ſhadow. 2. That God having given to the ſhadow of St. Peter the ſame virtue as his body, the Popes, who repreſent the perſon, and are, as it were, the ſhadow of that great Apoſtle, ought to have the ſame power and the ſame prerogatives with him.

Our Author afterwards examines, who was the author of this tradition, that "Tiberius propoſed to "the Senate to place Chriſt among the Gods." Every body allows, that Euſebius and the other Fathers aſſerted this merely upon the credit of Tertullian. Monſieur le Fevre (2), without any regard to Tertullian's authority, maintains, that this was a pious invention, with which he thought proper to adorn his Apologetick; becauſe there is no manner of probability, that Tiberius, who had the utmoſt diſregard for Religion, would give himſelf any trouble about deifying our Saviour. Beſides, the reaſon, which Tertullian mentions of the Senate's refuſal, renders the thing extremely ſuſpected. For he ſays, that the Senate oppoſed it, becauſe recourſe had not been had to their authority. But is it probable, that the Senate, who were abſolutely ſlaves to Tiberius's will, ſo that they even offered him altars and divine honours, would become ſo jealous of their power at that ſingle inſtant, and venture to reject a propoſition ſupported by the Emperor, towards whom they had carried their complaiſance to the loweſt ſervility? Mr. Van Dale (3), who thinks, that the Fathers gave a little too much into the Doctrine of a good intention,

(2) Epiſt. 12. L. 2.

(3) *Dearaculis Ethnic.*

He had a younger brother *Richard*, educated at Eaton-ſchool, and elected thence to King's College in Cambridge in 1646, where he took the Degree of Maſter of Arts. He was a Profeſſor of Civil Law in Greſham College at London, and kept his Fellowſhip of King's College with it, and was made Doctor of Laws upon the Prince of Tuſcany's viſiting Cambridge in the beginning of the year 1667, he being then under Keeper of

tion, and frequently ſupported the proofs of the Chriſtian Religion by falſe reaſons, has attacked with his whole force this ſtory of Tertullian, cited by Euſebius with ſo much triumph. However, Biſhop Pearſon rejects the opinion of Monſieur le Fevre, and affirms, that Tertullian's relation ought to be of great weight, ſince he might have taken it from the Regiſters of the Senate. He obſerves, that this refuſal of the Senate may be conſidered as a piece of flattery, ſince Tiberius having rejected the title and rank of a God, the Senators thought it was doing him honour, not to raiſe any perſon above him. The Fathers have ſpoken in another way. St. Chryſoſtom particularly has diſplayed his eloquence upon this point. He aſſerts, that all this was managed by Providence, which had determined, that the Goſpel ſhould ſpread over the whole earth, without the aſſiſtance of the ſecular powers; and would not permit that Chriſt ſhould be placed among Gods, who had been deified by men.

In the firſt diſſertation concerning the ſucceſſion of the primitive Biſhops of Rome, our Author obſerves, that it is certain, that the Fathers of the third and fourth, and even the fifth century, inſiſted greatly upon the argument of the ſucceſſion of the Biſhops, in oppoſition to the Heretics. They boaſted of an uninterrupted ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles; that by this ſucceſſion it was the ſame flock, which they had fed in the ſame paſtures; that the branches, which had been cut off and ſeparated from the body of the tree, that is, the Sects divided from the Chriſtian Communion, had withered away at a diſtance. For this reaſon, large Churches were ſo ſollicitous in preſerving the names and memory of their Biſhops.

We have but two catalogues of thoſe of Rome; one of which was handed down by the Greeks, and the other by the Latins. Learned men follow follow them promiſcuouſly; but our Author is of opinion, that theſe catalogues are only fit to miſlead us. To begin with that of Euſebius, which is the moſt antient; he aſſerts, that it cannot be exact for this reaſon, that in the *Dypticks*, whence it was taken, the time of the death of the Biſhops is not ſet down. The Biſhops of Rome, eſpecially in the firſt Century, did not make a figure enough to draw upon them any attention. So that we find nothing certain till after Pope Fabian, who in the middle of the third Century appointed ſeven notaries to collect exactly the names of the Martyrs and the circumſtances of their Martyrdom. The other Churches were obliged to follow this example, becauſe the Hereticks endeavoured to interrupt the ſucceſſion of the Biſhops, in order to break the chain of the Apoſtolical Tradition. For in theſe ages, which ſtill ſmoked with the blood of our Saviour, it was not difficult to aſcend to the ſource of the opinions, which ſprang up in the Church, and to aſcertain the ſucceſſion of a Doctrine as well as that of the Biſhops.

As it is certain, that there were Biſhops at Rome from the very beginning, it ſeems that the principal difficulty conſiſts in diſcovering the firſt Origin. St. Irenæus, who is followed by all antiquity, ſays, that St. Peter and St. Paul founded the Church at Rome. Henry Valeſius owns, that St. Paul contributed to it by his labours there; but he cannot allow, that he was Biſhop of that city. However, St. Epiphanius having obſerved, that St. James was the firſt Biſhop of Jeruſalem, the moſt antient of all the Churches, ſays, that *St. Peter and St. Paul were Biſhops of Rome*. It is undoubted, that St. Paul was at Rome; but with regard to St. Peter, there is not the leaſt trace in Scripture. On the contrary, a great many able writers have denied, that he ever went to Rome. *Salmaſius*, who was an eminent advocate for this opinion, affirms, that St. Peter went from Antioch to Babylon, where there was a prodigious number of Jews; and that the name of Babylon, which was afterwards given to Rome, gave occaſion to the notion that he was Biſhop of that city. But Biſhop Pearſon maintains, that we ought not to oppoſe the voice of all antiquity; that the Fathers ſaid, that St. Peter was at Rome, before the myſtical explication of Babylon was introduced; and that the city of Babylon, whither St. Peter went, was not ſituated in Aſſyria, but Egypt, whence that Apoſtle might eaſily go to Rome. The Biſhop's principal deſign is to conclude, that St. Peter having been the firſt Biſhop of Rome, Epiſcopacy is of Apoſtolick Inſtitution. For this reaſon he vehemently oppoſes *Salmaſius*, who aſſerts, that the Apoſtles left no Biſhops behind them in the Churches, which they had erected. He ſhews, that this would be to accuſe the primitive Church of having forged catalogues of Biſhops, and to have made uſe of fraud; which is overthrowing the truth of hiſtory, and the idea which we ought to have of the purity of thoſe ages. To return to *Euſebius*, the Biſhop remarks ſeveral others, which had eſcaped that writer in the catalogue, which he has given us of the Biſhops of Rome; and among the reſt one relating to the Pontificate of Xiſtus, which Euſebius makes to have continued eight years in his *Chronicon*, and eleven years in his *Hiſtory*. But beſides this contradiction, neither of the dates can be true; for he ſhould have left room for Pope Stephen, whoſe Pontificate would be ſwallowed up by the too long duration of that of Xiſtus. The Latin catalogue is not more certain, according to our Author. Though it has paſſed under the name of Pope Damaſus, who lived in the fourth Century, the Author of it is not known; and it formerly bore the title of *Geſta Pontificalia*. *Blondel* however has honoured it with his favourite compliment, by ſaying it was written *with a Sun-beam*. *Iſidorus Mercator* has followed it in forging his Decretals, which he aſcribes to Pope Damaſus, in order to give them the more authority. But Biſhop Pearſon obſerves, that the ſtyle is too barbarous, and there appears in it too groſs an ignorance of the Ceremonies of the Church, to be written by Pope Damaſus. In ſhort, that notwithſtanding the air of antiquity, which the Author has endeavoured to give it, it is a work forged in the ſixth Century, and continued by *Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius*. Conſequently it is neceſſary to draw up another Chronology of the Biſhops of Rome, by correcting the errors of thoſe above-mentioned. This is the deſign of the *Second Diſſertation*; but it is a taſk of great difficulty. For if any one Pope is omitted, it is neceſſary, in order to reſtore him to his proper place, to ſhorten or carry higher the pontificate of others. If on the contrary there be a Pope too much, it is neceſſary to have our eyes every where, and to diſtribute the years of him, whom we exclude, in ſuch a manner, as may not interfere with any one certain circumſtance in the hiſtory. Our Author remarks firſt, that *Cletus* and *Anacletus*, who are commonly conſidered as two different Popes, are the ſame perſon; that is, by cutting off two ſyllables of the name of *Anacletus*, there have been made two perſons of one. This, according to Biſhop *Pearſon*, is an error in Chronology; which is the ſource of many others, and has occaſioned *Baronius* to fall into a very conſiderable anachroniſm.

The Biſhop obſerves likewiſe, that *Linus* did not ſucceed St. Peter, but that he was placed in that See by St. Peter and St. Paul, who would not fix themſelves in one ſingle Church; and that he died even before the Apoſtles. Some have maintained, that *Linus* and *Cletus* were appointed together to govern the Church of Rome with an equal authority. This is affirmed in the catalogue of Pope Damaſus, againſt which our Author has declared ſo ſtrongly; and it is alſo the ſentiment of *Ruffinus* and *Beda*. Whence *Blondel* and *Salmaſius* has concluded, that in the firſt and pureſt antiquity the Preſbyters governed the Church, with this only difference between them, that the eldeſt preſided. Biſhop *Pearſon* aſſerts, that this equality

of his Majeſty's Library at St. James's. He died in the ſummer of the year 1670, being then, as it was vulgarly reported, a Roman Catholick. He was a man of excellent learning, and particularly ſkilled in the Greek language, and was a great traveller (*k*).

(*k*) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 1160. 2d edit.

was not known to any of the Fathers, whoſe Epiſcopal Throne muſt have been ſubverted, if it were true, that the authority was divided among the Preſbyters, and that there was no other pre-eminence among them than that of age. He then reſumes the Chronology, and affirms, that *Clement* died in 83; and thus deſtroys the computation of *Baronius* and Father *Petavius*, who repreſent him as living till the year 110. and 111. He anſwers, or rather Mr. *Dodwell* for him, the three objections, which might be urged againſt this Chronology. The firſt is, that *Clement* ſuffered martyrdom under the Emperor Trajan, who did not begin his reign till the year 98.

Mr. *Dodwell* obſerves, that this martyrdom is not a point very certain; and that the name of Pope *Clement* has been confounded with *Clement* the Conſul, who indeed was a Martyr. This is an honour, which has been done to ſeveral Popes, who however died in peace. The ſecond is, that *Clement* gave the vail to a Virgin named *Domitilla*, about the end of the reign of Domitian, which fell in the year 95. To ſolve this difficulty, Mr. *Dodwell* makes a very curious digreſſion, to ſhew, that the ceremony of vailing Virgins was not in uſe at that time; and he concludes, that the ſtory of *Domitilla's* receiving the vail from Pope Clement is a mere imagination, contrary to the hiſtory of thoſe times. Biſhop Pearſon in his Chronology of the firſt Popes follows that of *Eutychius*; and obſerves, that *Clement* dying in 83, he was ſucceeded by *Evariſtus*, *Alxeander*, *Sixtus*, and *Teleſphorus*, the laſt of whom died in 112, according to the Biſhop, whereas the Chronologers commonly make his pontificate extend to the year 152. He ſhews, that *Baronius* is groſly miſtaken in aſſerting, that *Evariſtus* died under the Emperor Hadrian, ſince all the Martyrologies prove the contrary. However, the Roman Martyrology imports, that *Alexander*, the ſucceſſor of *Evariſtus*, died under the Emperor Trajan. *Baronius* has erazed the name of Trajan, in order to inſert that of Hadrian. He proves this difference of thirty years, which is to be found between his Chronology and that of others, from divers circumſtances drawn from Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. The Latins affirm that *Anicetus* ſucceeded *Hyginus*; and the Greeks, that it was *Pius*. Our Author defends the opinion of the Greeks; and he urges, that the Epiſtles of Pope *Pius*, in which we find the word *Maſs*, and which *Baronius* ſtyles *Golden Epiſtles*, are ſpurious, becauſe this pretended Pius is here repreſented as the ſucceſſor of *Anicetus*. He proves afterwards, that *Anicetus* was not raiſed to the See of Rome till 142, becauſe Polycarp came to Rome under his Pontificate. Now Irenæus, who wrote his treatiſe of Hereſies in 180, declares, that ſeveral perſons had already ſucceeded Polycarp, who conſequently had ſuffered Martyrdom about the year 147, at the age of 87 years. Soter died in the year 170, after having held the See of Rome eight whole years, according to Euſebius and ſeveral others. But Baronius having drawn up another plan of Chronology, thought proper to retrench above five years of the Pontificate of *Soter*. Biſhop Pearſon ſhews here, that the Martyrdom of this Pope is very doubtful in other Martyrologies (4). T.

(4) See *Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Savans*, Mois de Janvier 1688, Art. 1.

PECKIUS (PETER), born at Zirckzee in Zealand in the year 1529, took his Degree of Doctor of Law at Louvain, in the year 1553, and after he had been there Regius Profeſſor of the *Paratitla*, he was appointed Profeſſor of the Canon Law in the year 1562. He gained ſuch a reputation by his Lectures and by his Works [*A*], that in the year 1586 he was promoted to the Office of Counſellor in the ſupreme Council of Mechlin. He died there July the 16th, 1589; his corps was carried to Louvain to be interred there in St. Michael's Church, where his widow and his children cauſed a monument to be raiſed for him, with an epitaph (*a*) engraved upon it, which Aubertus le Miré and Melchior Adam have tranſcribed (*b*). His ſon PETER PECKIUS was Chancellor of Brabant, and Counſellor of State. He gained a great reputation by his prudence and eloquence in his embaſſies to the Emperor Matthias, and to King Henry IV. He wrote ſeveral Latin Poems, and amongſt others, *Votum pro ſtudiis Humanitatis*, which has been printed. He died in the year 1625 (*c*).

(*a*) See Valerius Andreas, p. 755. *Bibliotb. Belgicæ.*

(*b*) See Melchior Adam, *in Vit. Juriſc.* p. 302.

(*c*) Valerius Andreas, *Bibliotb. Belgicæ*, p. 756.

[*A*] *His works.*] Men eſteem particularly his Treatiſes *de Teſtamento Conjugum*, *de Jure Siſtendi*, and *de Juris Canonici Regulis* (1). There are ſeveral editions of his writings; and there was a complete edition of them publiſhed in the year 1647. His Commentary *ad Tit. de Nautæ*, &c. printed at Louvain in the year 1556, and at the Hague, in the year 1603, was reprinted in the year 1647, with very good notes written by Arnold Vinnius The two former editions abounded with errors of the preſs (2). Vinnius added to it, *Leges Navales & Jus Navale Rhodiorum*, in Greek and Latin. After this edition, there was one publiſhed at Amſterdam, in the year 1668, in 8vo: to which they have added a Summary, or an Index of the Contents, and ſome other things; but the Correctors of the preſs have acquitted themſelves very indifferently of their duty.

(1) See Melchior Adam, *in Vitis Juris conſultorum*, p. 303.

(2) That which was printed in the year 1645, in the collection of all Peckius's works, does not leſs abound with errors of the preſs.

☞ PEIRCE (JAMES), an eminent Diſſenting Miniſter, was born in the year 1674 (*a*), at Wapping in London, of parents who lived in good faſhion, and left a good reputation behind them for ſobriety and works of charity (*b*). By his mother, who died laſt, when he was about ſeven years old, he, with a brother and ſiſter, who were both older than himſelf, was committed to Mr. Matthew Mead, a famous Diſſenting Miniſter at Stepney, as his Guardian, at whoſe houſe he lived for ſome time after his mother's death, and was taught by the ſame tutors Mr. Mead kept for his own ſons, one of whom was Mr. John Neſbit, afterwards an Independent Miniſter in London. He was afterwards by Mr. Mead's direction put to other Grammar ſchools, and at laſt ſent to Utrecht in Holland, where he had his academical inſtitution, and ſtudied under Witſius, Leydecker, Grævius, Leuſden, De Vries, and Luyts, and was well known to the celebrated Mr. Hadrian Reland, who was then his fellow ſtudent, and afterwards when he was Profeſſor correſponded by letter with Mr. Peirce. The latter part of his time abroad our Author ſpent at Leyden, where he attended Perizonius and Noodt eſpecially, hearing Gronovius, Mark and Spanheim occaſionally; and from ſome of theſe Profeſſors in both Univerſities he afterwards received very obliging letters. After he had ſpent above five years in theſe two places, he lived privately in England, for ſome time at London,

(*a*) Mr. Joſeph Hallet, Jun. in his ſermon on Mr. James Peirce, tells us, *that at his death, March 30th, 1726, he was in the 53d year of his age.*

(*b*) See Mr. Peirce's poſtſcript to his *Remarks upon the account of what was tranſacted in the Aſſemby at Exon*, London 1719, in 8vo.

London, among his relations, and for ſome time at Oxford, where he lodged in a private houſe, and frequented the Bodleian Library. After this at the deſire of his friends, he preached an evening Lecture on the Lord's-Days at the Meeting-houſe in Miles-Lane London, and occaſionally in other places, without intereſting himſelf in the diſputes then on foot between the Preſbyterians and Independents. With the Miniſters of the former ſort he became well acquainted; and at the end of two years, upon their earneſt ſollicitations, he ſettled at Cambridge, they themſelves ſubſcribing liberally for his encouragement there, where he was treated with great reſpect and civility by many Gentlemen of the Univerſity (*c*). In 1713 he was removed to a Congregation at Exeter, where he continued till the year 1718, when a controverſy ariſing among the Diſſenters about the explication of the Trinity, three articles were propoſed to him, and Mr. Joſeph Hallet, ſenior, another Diſſenting Miniſter in Exeter, in order to be ſubſcribed; which both of them refuſed, and were ejected from their Congregation [*A*]; upon which there was a new Meeting opened March 15, 1618-9, in that city, of which Mr. Peirce continued Miniſter till his death, which happened March 30, 1726, in the 53d year of his age. He was interred in St. Leonard's Church-yard near that city [*B*]. His Funeral Sermon was preached April the 3d following by Mr. Joſeph Hallet jun. on *John* xiii. 17. and printed at London 1726, in 8vo [*C*]; in which he was reſtrained by Mr. Peirce himſelf from beſtowing any encomiums on him (*d*); but Mr. Hallet obſerves in a Letter communicated to us (*e*), that "he was a man of the ſtricteſt virtue, exemplary piety, and great "learning; and was exceedingly communicative of his knowledge. He would con- "deſcend

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) See Mr. Hallet's *Sermon, preached upon occaſion of the death of the Reverend and learned Mr.* James Peirce, p. 16.

(*e*) By Mr. Matthew Wilkins, and dated at Exeter, July 31, 1738.

[*A*] *Three articles were propoſed to him, and Mr. Joſeph Hallet, Senior, another Diſſenting Miniſter of Exeter, in order to be ſubſcribed, which both of them refuſed, and were ejected from their congregation.*] Mr. Peirce has given a particular account of this whole affair in *Caſe of the Miniſters ejected at Exon*, printed at London 1719, in 8vo. The ſecond of the articles propoſed to them to be ſubſcribed was this: *That the denying the true and proper Divinity of the Son of God, viz. that he is one God with the Father, is an error of that nature* [that is, an error, that is a ſufficient foundation for the people to withdraw from the communion of their Miniſters holding it] *contrary to the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, and the common Faith of the Reformed Churches.* With regard to this article, "I told them, ſays Mr. Peirce (1), that I would "own that *Chriſt and the Father were one*, becauſe he "ſaid it. They aſked, if I would own they were *one* "*God?* I anſwered, if they would turn me to the "text where 'twas ſaid ſo, I would own it; but I "had over and over declared, I would ſubſcribe no "religious teſts at all, that were not expreſſed in "ſcripture words: that if they made it a religious "teſt, that *three and two made five*, I would refuſe "to ſubſcribe it. And I gave this reaſon for my "ſtiffneſs, that I verily believed, that the worſt miſ-"chief had been done the Church of God, by im-"poſing unſcriptural Creeds and Teſts upon men; "and that now God had ſtirred up a noble ſpi-"rit in man, in whom we little expected it, to "plead againſt impoſitions; and therefore, I could "not in conſcience tamely give up the liberty "they were ſo bravely defending." In another piece (2) he tells us, that he changed his former notions about the Trinity, *by reading Dr.* Clarke's Scripture Doctrine; *a book*, ſays he, *written with ſuch ſtrength and clearneſs, that I only wonder all that read it are not convinced, and that I did not myſelf ſooner diſcover what he has, I think I may ſay, demonſtrated to be the Doctrine of the Bible.*

(1) *Caſe of the Miniſters ejected at Exon*, p. 11. 4th edit.

(2) Security of Truth, without the Aſſiſtance of Perſecution or Scurrility; being an Anſwer to Mr. Enty's *Truth and Liberty conſiſtent and maintained*, p. 7. See likewiſe *The Weſtern Inquiſition*, p. 8.

[*B*] *Interred in St. Leonard's Church-yard, near that city.*] The following epitaph was intended to have been inſcribed upon a ſtone over his grave, but refuſed by the Rector of the Pariſh (3).

H. S. E.
JACOBUS PEIRCIUS,
Clari Nominis Theologus;
Qui ingenio perſpicaci limatoq; judicio
Tantam Eruditionem feliciter conjunxit
Ut utrum eximiis naturæ dotibus,
An induſtriæ ornamentis magis conſpicuus eſſet,
In dubio reliquiſſe videatur.
Juvenis ſtudiorum cauſa Ultrajectum ſe contulit;
Unde poſt quinquennium domum reverſus,
Indefeſſo labore atq; diligentiâ,
Omni ferè literarum genere mentem implevit,
Quo ad Theologiæ cognitionem ſubſidii aliquid
Sibi comparare poſſet.
Tantâ igitur optimarum Artium ſcientiâ inſtructus
Cunctas ſacri muneris partes fideliſſimè præſtitit,
Tam accuratis Concionibus quam ſcriptis eruditis
Plurimum celebratus.
Veritatis autem exquirendæ ſemper ſtudioſiſſimus,
Cum in nonnullis tandem accidit ut ſententiam mutaret,
Pari prudentiâ & integritate ſe geſſit;
Nam ut alios ea celare ſedulo curavit,
Dum illorum intereſſe ut ſcirent haud credidit,
Sic cum primum vulgare neceſſarium judicavit,
Nullo ſuo commodo aut incommodo adduci potuit,
Quo minus publicè profiteretur.
Hinc in quorundam offenſionem forte incidens,
Quibuſcum antea concorditer vixerat,
Cum reliquam vitæ partem jam magis privatam,
Sibi vero haud minus laborioſam,
Neq; aliis minus utilem tranſigere ſtatuerat,
Sacris Literis explicandis ſe præcipuè addixit,
Cui præclaro operi cum quatuor annos impenderat,
Partibus quibuſdam editis, quæ ingenii
Et Doctrinæ perpetua erunt monumenta,
Lethali morbo correptus pie placidèq; deceſſit
III *Kal. Aprilis A. D. M.DCC.XXVI.*
Ætatis ſuæ LIII.

(3) See Dr. Benjamin Avery's *Preface*, to Mr. Peirce's *Fifteen Sermons*, p. 5 & *ſeqq.* edit. London 1728, in 8vo.

The Rector was then requeſted, that he would give leave to have the following words inſcribed on the tomb; viz. *Here lyes the reverend, learned, and pious Mr.* JAMES PEIRCE; but he would not conſent to it. At laſt the following inſcription was allowed to ſtand; *Mr.* JAMES PEIRCE's *Tomb*, 1726. But in Mr. Peirce's meeting, a monument is erected to his memory, with the following epitaph on it:

This Monument was erected
By mournful Friends,
As a laſting Teſtimony of their high Regard
To the Memory and Honour
Of the reverend, pious, and learned Mr. JAMES PEIRCE;
A moſt worthy and endeared PASTOR OF THIS CHURCH,
A rational, judicious, and affectionate Preacher;
A very laborious and ſagacious Interpreter of the holy Scriptures;
A ſincere Lover and ſtrenuous Defender of Truth;
A courageous Sufferer while living
For maintaining the Doctrines of the Goſpel
Of Chriſt,
And for aſſerting the Liberties of Chriſtians;
And after death denied a juſt Encomium
On his Tomb in Leonard's Church-yard
By the Rector of the Pariſh.
The great, good Man, departed hence
In Peace,
March the 30th, 1726,
In the 53d Year of his Age.

[*C*] *His funeral Sermon, &c.*] In this ſermon is quoted the following paſſage from the preamble to Mr. Peirce's will: "I do ſincerely and humbly commend

" deſcend to converſe on ſubjects of learning with young men, in whom he found " any thirſt after uſeful knowledge; and in his diſcourſing with them would be ex- " tremely free, and treat them as if they had been his equals in learning and years." We ſhall give a catalogue of his writings in the note [*D*].

PEIRESC

" mend my ſoul to God, whenever he ſhall pleaſe " to call me out of this troubleſome and litigious " world; profeſſing my ſteady belief in one God, " the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; and " in that one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, in whom, as my " only Saviour, I have fixed my truſt, and through " whoſe atonement and interceſſion alone, I deſire " and expect to find mercy with that God, whom I " have greatly offended, even while I have endea- " voured to ſerve him with that ſincerity, which, I " truſt, he will accept: profeſſing likewiſe my ſin- " cere belief of the Chriſtian Religion, as it is con- " tained in the holy Scriptures, which I have la- " boured, in the uprightneſs of my heart, and with " all plainneſs, to preach; and thanking God with " my Soul, that he has enabled me to reſiſt the temp- " tations I have met with, eſpecially of late, to " corrupt the word of God, and offer violence to my " own conſcience; and declaring now, under the " moſt ſerious and ſolemn view of death and eter- " nity, that my conſcience reproaches me not for the " part I have acted in the controverſy concerning " the Trinity, but that I can review my publick be- " haviour relating to it, with a confidence, whereof, " I truſt, I ſhall not be aſhamed in the day of judg- " ment; and thanking God, that he has honoured " me to ſuffer reproach for the ſake of his truth and " a good conſcience towards him."

[*D*] *We ſhall give a catalogue of his writings in the note.*] I. Philoſophical. *Exercitatio Philoſophica de Homoeomeria Anaxagorea.* Utrecht 1692. II. On the controverſy between the Church of England and the Diſſenters. 1. *Eight Letters to Dr.* Wells, London 1706 and 1707. 2. *Conſideration on the ſixth Chapter of the* Abridgment of the London Caſes, *relating to Baptiſm and the ſign of the Croſs.* London 1708. 3. *Vindiciæ Fratrum Diſſentientium in Angliâ.* London 1710, in 8vo. 4. *An Enquiry into the preſent duty of a Low Churchman.* London 1711, in 8vo. 5. *Vindication of the Diſſenters.* London 1717, in 8vo. 6. *A Letter to Dr.* Bennet, *occaſioned by his late treatiſe concerning the Nonjurors Separation,* &c. London 1717, in 8vo. 7. *Preface* to *the Preſbyterians not chargeable with King Charles's death.* Exeter 1717, in 8vo. 8. *Defence of the Diſſenting Miniſtry and Ordination,* in two parts. London 1718, in 8vo. 9. *The Diſſenters Reaſons for not writing in behalf of Perſecution. Deſigned for the Satisfaction of Dr.* Snape, *in a Letter to him.* London 1718, in 8vo. 10. *Intereſt of the Whigs with relation to the Teſt-Act.* London 1718, in 8vo. 11. *Reflections on Dean* Sherlock's Vindication of *the Corporation and Teſt Acts.* London 1718, in 8vo. 12. *Charge of miſrepreſentations maintained againſt Dean* Sherlock. London 1719, in 8vo. 13. *Loyalty, integrity, and ingenuity of High Church and the Diſſenters compared.* London 1719, in 8vo. III. On the Controverſy about the Ejectment at Exeter. 1. *The Caſe of the Miniſters ejected at Exon.* London 1719, in 8vo. 2. *Defence of the Caſe.* London 1719, in 8vo. 3. *Animadverſions on the true Account of the Proceedings at Salter's Hall: with a Letter to Mr.* Eveleigh. London 1719, in 8vo. 4. *A Second Letter to Mr.* Eveleigh, *in anſwer to his* Sober Reply. Exeter 1719, in 8vo. 5. *A Letter to a ſubſcribing Miniſter in Defence of the* Animadverſions, &c. London 1719, in 8vo. 6. *Remarks upon the Account of what was tranſacted in the aſſembly at Exon.* London 1719, in 8vo. 7. *An Anſwer to Mr.* Enty's *Defence of the Aſſembly.* London 1719, in 8vo. 8. *The Weſtern Inquiſition.* London 1720, in 8vo. 9. *The Security of truth, in Anſwer to Mr.* Enty. London 1721, in 8vo. 10. *Inquiſition-honeſty diſplayed.* London 1722, in 8vo. IV. On the Doctrine of the Trinity. 1. *A Letter to a Diſſenter in Exeter.* London 1719, in 8vo. 2. *Plain Chriſtianity defended,* in four parts. London 1719, 1720, in 8vo. 3. *Thirteen Queries propounded to the Rev. Mr.* Walrond, in an *Appendix* To the Innocent Vindicated. London 1719, in 8vo. There was an Anſwer to theſe *Queries* printed in 1721, under the title of, *An Anſwer to ſome Queries printed at Exon, relating to the Arian Controverſy,* and aſcribed to Dr. Daniel Waterland. Mr. Peirce had ſome thoughts of writing a Reply, but changing his purpoſe, Mr. Joſeph Hallet, jun. wrote a Defence of them, printed at London 1736, in 8vo. with this title: *The Truth and Importance of the Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation demonſtrated: in a Defence of the late learned Mr.* Peirce's thirteen Queries, *and a Reply to Dr.* W——'s, *and a Gentleman's Anſwer to them,* &c. 4. *Propoſitions relating to the Controverſy concerning the Trinity, in a Letter to the Rev. Mr.* Enty. London 1720, in 8vo. 5. *An Anſwer to a Pamphlet entitled,* Texts of Holy Scripture compared, *&c. London* 1721, *in* 8vo. 6. *A Reply to Mr.* Enty's *late Piece, entitled,* Truth and Liberty conſiſtent, *&c. London* 1721, *in* 8vo. V. Commentaries on the Scripture. *A Paraphraſe and Notes on the Epiſtle of St. Paul to the Coloſſians. With an Appendix upon* Epheſ. iv. 8. *London* 1725, *in* 4to. In the Dedication to Sir Peter King, Lord Chief Juſtice of the Common Pleas, our Author obſerves, that he was " indebted to the great Mr. Locke " more than to any man, for what underſtanding " I have, *ſays he,* in St. Paul's Epiſtles, and his ad- " mirable Rules and Examples I have, the beſt I " could, endeavoured to follow." And in the Preface he ſays, " that St. Paul's Epiſtles have always " been eſteemed a noble part of the New Teſtament; " but as we are told, and every one who reads them " knows, there are in them *ſome things hard to be* " *underſtood,* 2 Pet. iii. 16. they therefore have done " good ſervice to the Chriſtian Religion, who have " by their writings made this part of the holy Scrip- " tures more eaſy and intelligible. Mr. *Locke,* has " in my judgment, done more this way than any " man; and indeed he had a head admirably turn- " ed for the tracing and diſcovering the profound " and intricate diſcourſes and intentions of ſo cloſe a " reaſoner, who yet abounds with all manner of " figures and long digreſſions. I am not the only " perſon, who have often lamented his not applying " himſelf ſooner to this ſtudy, and that we ſhould " have his *Paraphraſe* and *Notes* only upon five of " the Epiſtles; but we have reaſon to be thankful " for them, not only for the light they give to " thoſe Epiſtles, but the uſe they may be of in help- " ing us to underſtand all the reſt. I have in the " preſent work endeavoured to imitate this great " man. . . . . The reaſon why I choſe firſt to ſtudy " this Epiſtle was partly becauſe it was not one of " thoſe Mr. Locke had explained, and therefore a " Comment upon it in his way ſeemed to be wanted. " but to be ingenuous, my chief reaſon was, becauſe " Mr. *Locke* had admirably cleared the Epiſtle to the " *Epheſians,* which being in deſign, method, and " expreſſion, very like to this to the *Coloſſians,* I " concluded his work would yield me much aſſiſtance " in mine. For I reſolved from the firſt to transfer " whatever he had ſaid on that Epiſtle, that was to " my purpoſe, into my work on this. And that I " may not appear a plagiary in not owning by whom " I profit, I acquaint the reader, that I have kept " to my reſolution, and have often borrowed his " words, even where I have not named him; and " this I have the rather done, that he may read " with the more attention, ſince otherwiſe he may " not know whom he is reading, Mr. *Locke* or my- " ſelf. I would not be thought a bare tranſcriber " from what I have now ſaid. I have ſtudied the " Epiſtle through and through with the greateſt ap- " plication I was able; and there were ſome parts, " wherein I could have no help from Mr. *Locke,* or " any one elſe, to my ſatisfaction; upon which, at " my firſt ſetting about the work, and long after, I " deſpaired of ſaying any thing, but that I did not " underſtand them. I can however now ſay, I have " found no great reaſon upon the whole to ſpeak " much in that manner, but have ſatisfied myſelf " about moſt of thoſe paſſages, that ſeemed moſt " difficult." 2. *A Paraphraſe and Notes on the Epiſtle of St.*

PEIRESC (NICHOLAS CLAUDIUS FABRI, LORD OF) Counſellor in the Parliament of Aix, was born in Provence (*a*), December the 1ſt, 1580. I might add many particulars to thoſe which Moreri relates of him; but the little ſpace I have left, with regard to the letters of the alphabet which follow P, obliges me to ſuppreſs ſeveral articles, and to be very ſhort in many others. I ſhall only obſerve that no man was ever more uſeful to the Republick of Letters than our Peireſc. He was, if one may ſay ſo, the Attorney General of that Commonwealth: he uſed to encourage the Authors; he furniſhed them with hints and materials; he employed his income in cauſing the moſt ſcarce and moſt uſeful Manuſcripts to be either bought, or tranſcribed. His literary correſpondence extended to all the parts of the world [*A*]: philoſophical experiments, the curioſities of nature, the productions of art, antiquity, hiſtory, the languages, were all equally the ſubjects of his cares, and of his enquiries. You will meet with a particular account of this in his life, written elegantly and learnedly by Peter Gaſſendi [*B*]. It may be of ſome uſe to obſerve that this man, who was ſo famous throughout all Europe, and whoſe death was lamented by ſo many Poets, and in ſo many Languages [*C*], and put the humoriſts at Rome into a pompous mourning (*b*), was unknown to ſeveral perſons of his own nation,

(*a*) In the village of Beaugencier, which Gaſſendi calls in Latin *Belgenſerium*.

(*b*) See the rem. [*C*].

St. Paul to the Philippians. London 1725, in 4to. 3. *A Paraphraſe and Notes on the Epiſtle of St. Paul to the Hebrews: with Diſſertations on ſeveral Texts of Scripture.* London 1727, in 4to. VI. *Theological.* 1. *An Eſſay in favour of giving the Euchariſt to Children.* London 1728, in 8vo. 2. *Fifteen Sermons, and a Scripture Catechiſm.* London 1728, in 8vo. T.

[*A*] *His literary correſpondence extended to all the parts of the world.*] I have been acquainted by a letter from Monſieur the Abbot Nicaiſe (1), that Monſieur Thomaſin Mazaugues (2), Counſellor in the Parliament of Aix, has by him ten thouſand letters, which were found among Monſieur Peireſc's papers, that he made a choice of them; and that there are many which this celebrated Senator received from Holſtenius, from Father Kircher, from the Cavalier del Pozzo, from Salmaſius, from Selden, from Camden, from Pignorius, from Gualdo, from Meſſieurs Du Puy, from Monſieur Rigaut, and from ſeveral other learned men, all which would make an handſome volume in 4to, which might be publiſhed with this Title, *Epiſtolæ Virorum Eruditorum quæ extant ad Peireſkium.* You will meet with ſome curious particulars relating to theſe letters, in the beginning of the *Menagiana*, 2d edition. Here follows a paſſage from Balzac, which will not be beſide my purpoſe. " I am of your opinion, as to the great and " noble encomium you beſtow on your friend: if you " will give me leave to make uſe in French of an " expreſſion borrowed from the Greek, I would add, " that we have loſt by the death of that eminent man, " *a piece of the Shipwreck of antiquity, and the relicks of* " *the golden age.* All the virtues of the heroic times had " taken ſanctuary in that noble ſoul. The general " corruption had no influence on his ſound conſtitu- " tion; the evil that touched him could not ſtain him. " His generoſity was not limited by the ſea, nor con- " fined on this ſide the Alps: it ſpread its fa- " vours and kindneſs every where; he received thanks " from the remoteſt parts of Syria, and even from " the top of Mount Libanus. With a moderate eſtate " he had the ſoul of a great Lord, and though he " did not enjoy the friendſhip of Auguſtus, yet he " was a Mecænas (3)." Here follows another paſſage. *The late Monſieur de Malherbe was one of his intimate friends; he mentioned him ſometimes to me, but only as a man, who was extremely curious, a great lover of news, and of hiſtorical accounts, a great inquirer after medals, and manuſcripts, a man who loved to make acquaintances in foreign countries, and a great admirer of all the Doctors of Leyden* (4).

[*B*] *His life written . . . . by Peter Gaſſendi.*] That work is very much eſteemed: however, ſome pretend that ſeveral things in it have not been accurately told (5). I imagine this relates to the paſſages, in which Salmaſius is mentioned. A Phyſician of Caſtres (6), who has made a collection of ſome particulars, of which Gaſſendi ſaid nothing, forgot on the other hand to inſert in his collection ſeveral elogies of Monſieur Peireſc, which Colomiés has inſerted in his *Gallia Orientalis* (7).

[*C*] *His death was lamented . . . . in ſo many languages.*] Naudé will furniſh me with the whole Commentary on this text. " (8) I wiſh . . . I could hear " you talk a little of that famous academy of the " *Humoriſts*, where, as Monſieur the Baron de *Rians* " ſaid one day, they had celebrated the funerals of " his Uncle, the Abbot and Counſellor Peireſc, in " above forty different languages . . . . (9). You " may judge how much that academy is eſteemed at " Rome, ſince that ornament of France, that great " Protector of men of letters, that man of an immenſe " learning, would become a member of it; and as " he had honoured that famous academy by his name, " ſhe would alſo, in return, celebrate his memory by " ſuch funeral honours, which ſhe is uſed to pay on- " ly to thoſe who had governed her, and even only " on account of their uncommon virtue and learn- " ing." Hereupon Naudé quotes Gaſſendi, who relates, that beſides the funeral oration, which was delivered in Latin by Monſieur Bouchard, they alſo recited there ſeveral elogies of the deceaſed, in Italian, Latin, and Greek verſe (10); after which Naudé obſerves, that the Baron de Rians, *who mentions* 40 *languages*, and Gaſſendi, *who mentions but three, are both in the right; for*, ſays he (11), *Monſieur Peyreſk's praiſes were celebrated in the academy, and in the preſence of the Cardinals, only in three languages. But they inſerted many more afterwards, in the collection that was made and printed at Rome, with the title Pangloſſy, ſive generis humani Leſſus in funere delicii ſui Nicolai Claudii Fabricii Peireſcii*, or the Lamentation of Mankind, on the death of its darling Nicholas Claudius Fabri Peireſc, *which contains really the elogies of that great man, in forty languages, I had almoſt ſaid, in as many different characters. Whence* Scipio de Grammond, *who aſſiſted at that ceremony, and who died ſome time after at Venice, took an opportunity to write the following lines, in order to teſtify how honourable that Pangloſſy was, both to Monſieur Peireſc, and to the city of Rome.*

Indus, Arabs, Medus, Gallus, Germanus, Etruſcus,
Anglus, Idumæus, Sarmata, Grajus, Iber,
Et quicunque venit gelido de cardine, & uſto,
Eoiſque plagis, occiduiſque ſonus;
Omnes Fabricio concordi voce parentant,
Qui norat proprios reddere cuique ſonos.
Proh ſuperi! quanta eſt Romana potentia, quæ nunc
Tot populis, & tot gentibus ora aperit.
Romana verè nunc clauditur orbis in urbe,
Cui tam multifido competit ore loqui.

i. e. " The Indian, the Arabian, the Mede, the " Frenchman, the Italian, the Engliſhman, the Idu- " mean, the Sarmatian, the Greek, the Iriſhman, " and they who live towards the northern, or towards " the ſouthern pole, they who came from the eaſt " or from the weſt, all celebrate the obſequies of " Peireſc, who could ſpeak to every one of them " in their own language. Good God! how great is " the power of Rome, which opens the mouth of ſo " many nations. We may truly ſay now, that the " whole world is collected within the walls of Rome, " where ſo many languages are now ſpoke."

Balzac ſhews ſome contempt for that *Pangloſſy* (12). " What does Signor John James (13) mean, with his " frightful title of *Pangloſſy?* To make up the num- " ber of forty, there muſt be twenty-three languages,

(1) Dated from Dijon, Feb. the 21ſt, 1696.

(2) Who is mentioned above in the rem. [*B*] of the artic. MARTELLIUS. *He did me the honour to write to me, February the 4th, 1699, a letter which contains a moſt particular account of this, which I would have added to this remark* [*A*], *if I had not thought that the publick will find it in the Preface to that choice Collection of Letters, before the 2d edit. of this Dictionary be finiſhed. That Collection is printing at Geneva.*

(3) Balzac, *Lettre à Mr. l'Huillier.* It is the 2d of the 2d book of the 1ſt part of his *Choice Letters*, or *Lettres Choiſies*, p. 48 of the Dutch edit.

(4) Ibid. *Lettre* 13, to Chapelain, Liv. 2. p. m. 73.

(5) *Multa per-peram neſcio quo fato, in vita Peireskii à Gaſſendo relata, alias fortaſſe docebimus.* Clementius, *in* Vita Salmaſii.

(6) Peter Borel. His *Auctarium ad Vitam Peireſcii*, was printed at the Hague, in the year 1655.

(7) p. 175, &c.

(8) Naudé, *Dialogue de Maſcurat*, p. 138.

(9) Ibid. p. 139.

(10) *Et carmina quidem in defuncti laudem Italice, Latine, Græce recitarunt lectiſſima totius urbis ingenia: funebrem vero orationem copioſam ſane, & elegantem pronunciavit Joannes Jacobus Buccardus delectus ad id muneris.* Gaſſendi *in* Vita Peireskii, lib. 6. p. m. 349.

(11) Naudé, *Dialogue de Maſcurat*, p. 141.

(12) They are in the wrong to call it *Pandegloſſie* in Moreri, and then to put *Leſſas* inſtead of *Leſſus* in the editions printed in Holland.

(13) That is to ſay, *Bouchard*, who made the funeral oration, where he ſtyles himſelf *Joannes Jacobus Buccardus.*

nation, though men of merit and learning [*D*]. He died June the 24th, 1637. The Aſtrologers had foretold that he would have a wife and children, and yet he was never married [*E*].

" which Scaliger was unacquainted with, and the " ſoul of Parnaſſus muſt have been commended in " the gibberiſh of the people of Biſcay, and of Lower- " Britany. This muſt have made a ſad muſick on " your Parnaſſus. It is letting the Barbarians into " that ſacred place, and being as guilty as thoſe who " ſhewed the way into Italy to the King of Sweden's " predeceſſors (14)." See alſo what he obſerves in two other letters, to the ſame Monſieur Chapelain (15).

(14) Balzac, *Letter* 26, to Chapelain, Liv. 4.

(15) The 28th of the 4th book, and the 1ſt of the 5th.

[*D*] *He was unknown to ſeveral perſons of his own nation, though men of merit and learning.*] Balzac furniſhes me with the proof of this aſſertion. " Would " you think Monſieur de la Rochefoucaud never " heard any thing of our Monſieur Peireſc, and that " many other perſons, who are neither Barbarians " nor ignorant, were not better acquainted with " him? You ſee by this, that he had a good reputa- " tion, but that it is the Italian Signor, who un- " dertook to make it great, and that his Pangloſſy is " rather an effect of his ſolicitations, than a volun- " tary reſpect which the ſeveral nations reſolved to " pay to his memory (16)." Here follows another paſſage from the ſame Author. *I am fully perſuaded of Monſieur Peireſc's merit, but it was of his reputation I ſpoke; and you know that there is a* Donum Famæ, *which all the learned do not enjoy, and which makes them, who enjoy it, known not only to the Senate, and to the Order of the Knights, but alſo to the common people, and day-labourers* (17).

(16) Balzac, *Lettre* 1, of the 5th book to to Chapelain, p. 205, 206.

(17) Idem, *Lett.* 4, of the ſame book, p. 212.

[*E*] *The Aſtrologers had foretold that he would have a wife and children, and yet he was never married.*] Gaſſendi, the moſt formidable adverſary of all thoſe people, could not fail to laſh them on this occaſion, for, having ſet down the day and hour of his Hero's birth, he adds, *Quod attingo ſolum, ne videar circa temporis circumſtantiam non fuiſſe ſatis diligens; non verò ut faciam hariolandi anſam conjectoribus, quò jam poſt viri obitum, certiùs quàm antè, fata retexant. Etenim mirum dictu eſt, quàm multa mentiti Aſtrologi fuerint, ſeu annos ſpectes, quibus non vixit; ſeu uxorem, & liberos, aliaque, quibus caruerit; ſeu cætera multa, quæ eſt conſequutus* (18), *i. e.* " I hint this on- " ly, that I may not be thought neglectful with re- " gard to the circumſtances of time, but not with " a deſign to give the Diviners an opportunity to " conjecture again, and to unfold his deſtiny with " more certainty now he is dead, than they could do " before. One cannot but wonder at the many fal- " ſities the Aſtrologers foretold of him, either with " regard to the number of years he was to live, " or to his wife and children, and other things, " which he never had, or with regard to a great ma- " ny more, which he obtained." We muſt then correct the paſſage in the *Menagiana*, where we meet with theſe words. " Monſieur Peireſc left by " his will an hundred volumes to Monſieur Gaſſen- " di, which he was to chooſe out of his whole li- " brary. But the ſon refuſed to execute his father's " laſt will, till he was forced to it by a ſentence " from the Court of Juſtice (19)."

(18) Gaſſendus, *in vita Peireskii*, lib. 1. *circa init.*

(19) Menagiana, p. 2. of the firſt Dutch edit. This miſtake has been corrected in the 2d edition.

PELIAS, the ſon of Neptune by Tyro the daughter of Salmoneus, was nurſed by a Mare (*a*). He reigned in Theſſaly very unjuſtly; for having uſurped the Throne, he maintained himſelf on it either by putting to death, or by perſecuting thoſe who had a right to the Crown [*A*]. He did not dare to uſe violence againſt his nephew Jaſon, who went and claimed from him his father's Crown (*b*). He choſe rather to evade that claim by propoſing to the young Prince a religious expedition, which was very proper to gain him a very great reputation [*B*]. It was the conqueſt of the golden Fleece. Jaſon undertook that expedition. A report being ſpread that it proved fatal to him, Pelias became

(*a*) Ælian. *Hiſt.* lib. 12. cap. 42.

(*b*) Pindar. Ode 4. Pythior.

[*A*] *Having uſurped the throne, he maintained himſelf in it, either by putting to death, or by perſecuting thoſe who had a right to the crown.*] The Kingdom belonged to Æſon, and not to Pelias, as appears from their Genealogy. Æſon was the ſon of Cretheus (1), whoſe father was Æolus (2). But Pelias was the ſon of Neptune (3), and of a daughter of Salmoneus, Cretheus's brother (4). I add, that Jupiter had given the Kingdom to Æolus, both for him and his poſterity.

Τῶν ποτε
Ζεὺς ὤπασε λαγέτᾳ
Αἰόλῳ, καὶ παισὶ τιμάν.

Quod (Regnum) *olim Jupiter dedit populorum duci Æolo & liberis* ut eſſet illis *decus* (5). So that according to the laws of ſucceſſion, it belonged, not to Pelias, who was deſcended from Æolus only by his mother, but to Æſon, who deſcended from him in the male line. Obſerve, that Æſon and Pelias were brothers by the mother's ſide; for Tyro, Salmoneus's daughter, having got two twins, Pelias and Neleus by Neptune (6), married her uncle Cretheus, by whom ſhe got three ſons, Æſon, Amythaon, and Pheres (7). It is plain, that Pelias having aſcended the throne by the excluſion of Æſon, was an uſurper. Æſon and his wife feared him to ſuch a degree, that they did not dare to educate their ſon Jaſon, but as ſoon as he was born, they had him carried ſecretly into Chiron's cave, and publiſhed that he was dead; and they performed all the ceremonies of the funeral, the better to impoſe on the tyrant (8). By that means they ſaved their child's life. But they could not ſecure themſeves againſt Pelias's cruelty; for he forced Æſon to drink the blood of a bull, and gave orders to put Amphinome, Æſon's wife, to death, and cauſed their ſon Promachus to be killed (9). This happened during the journey of the Argonauts, and was occaſioned by a falſe report which had been ſpread of their death. Obſerve that Amphinome, having taken ſanctuary with Pelias's houſhold Gods, and made a thouſand imprecations againſt him, ſtabbed herſelf (10); others ſay ſhe hanged herſelf (11). I do not mention Pelias's cruelty againſt Sidero, Tyro's mother-in-law (12): he killed her on the very altar of Jupiter: it was to revenge his mother Tyro, who had been very ill uſed by that ſtep-mother. Τελειωθέντες δὲ ἀνηγώρισαν τὴν μητέρα, καὶ τὴν μητρυιὰν ἀπέκτειναν σιδήρῳ (13). Κακωμένην γὰρ γνόντες ὑπ' αὐτῆς τὴν μητέρα, ὥρμησαν ἐπ' αὐτήν. Ἡ δὲ φθάσασα, εἰς τὸ τῆς Ηρας τέμενος κατέφυγεν. Πελίας δὲ ἐπ' αὐτῶν τῶν βωμῶν αὐτὴν κατέσφαξε. Καὶ καθόλου διετέλει τὴν Ἥραν ἀτιμάζων. *Qui* (Pelias & Neleus) *cum ad juſtam integramque ætatem perveniſſent, agnita matre, novercam, quòd ejus opera parentem male affectam percepiſſent, facto in eam impetu occiderunt: quæ, tametſi intra Junonis templum confugere antevertiſſet, eam tamen Pelias ſuper aram ipſam jugulavit; & in omnibus rebus Junonem negligebat* (14). The Author, who acquaints us with this, adds a particular, which it will not be improper to relate here; it is, that Pelias and Neleus, though twins, lived at variance together; that Neleus was forced to yield, and to go and dwell in another place. Ἐφασίασον δὲ ὕστερον πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ Νηλεὺς μὲν ἐκπεσὼν, ἦκεν εἰς Μεσσήνην, καὶ Πύλον κτίζει. *At qui poſtea inter ſe diſcordiam exercere non deſierunt. Neleus demum regno pulſus Meſſenam commigravit, & Pylo urbe condita, &c* (15). Diodorus Siculus mentions this diſunion of the two brothers, and obſerves, that Pelias having obtained the city of Iolcos, and the adjacent country, raiſed an army, and led it into Peloponneſus (16). Pauſanias relates, that Neleus made his eſcape out of Iolcos, becauſe he dreaded Pelias (17).

(1) Apollodor. lib. 1. p. m. 45.

(2) Idem, ibid. p. 27.

(3) Idem, ibid. p. 45.

(4) Idem, ibid. p. 27, 43.

(5) Pindar. Pythior. Ode 4. p. m. 341.

(6) Apollodor. lib. 1. p. 43.

(7) Idem, ibid. p. 45.

(8) Pythior. Ode 4. p. 341.

(9) Diodor. Siculus, lib. 4. cap. 51. p. m. 241. See alſo Apoll. *Bibliotb.* lib. 1. p. 69.

(10) Idem, ibid.

(11) Apollodor. Ibid.

(12) Diodorus Siculus, lib. 4. cap. 70. p. 257. calls her thus, whereby *Meziriac ſur les Epitres d'Ovidie*, p. 541. has corrected ſeveral paſſages.

(13) Read Σιδηρῳ according to Meziriac's correction, which is approved by Monſieur *le Fevre* of Saumur, in his notes on Apollodorus, p. 268.

(14) Apollodor. *Bibliotb.* lib. 1. p. 45.

(15) Idem, ibid.

(16) Diodor. Siculus, lib. 4. cap. 70. p. 258.

(17) Pauſan. lib. 4. p. 112.

[*B*] *He propoſed to* Jaſon *a religious expedition, which was very proper to gain him a very great reputation.*] Numberleſs Authors aſſert with one accord, that he favoured

became more bold in his cruelties (*c*). He was puniſhed for it by the artifices of Medea; his own daughters cut his throat, ſhe having given them hopes that by that means they would make him grow young again (*d*). He deſired ſo ardently that ſhe would do him that ſervice, that he told her, *I give you leave to flee me alive, if you can but put me again in the condition of a youth* (*e*). Some ſay that ſhe did not really reſtore youth to him. Cicero is one of them, nor do I think that he miſtook the one for the other deſignedly, as Muretus imagines [*C*]. Jaſon behaved very generouſly towards Pelias's daughters, and left

(*c*) See the rem. [*A*].

(*d*) See Diodorus Siculus, lib. 1. cap. 52, &c.

(*e*) See Varro's words in the rem. [*C*].

favoured the deſign of the Argonauts, only becauſe he imagined it would be a proper method to get rid of Jaſon, whoſe merit he dreaded. Let us quote only Valerius Flaccus; the paſſage is ſomewhat long, but no matter for that, ſince it will acquaint the Reader with another particular, namely, the extent of that Tyrant's dominions.

Hæmoniam primis Pelias frænabat ab annis:
Jam gravis, & longus populis metus: illius omnes,
Ionium quicunque petunt: ille Othryn & Hemum,
Atque imum felix verſabat vomere Olympum.
Sed non ulla quies animo, fratriſque paventi
Progeniem, divûmque minas: hunc nam fore regi
Exitio vateſque canunt, pecudumque per aras
Terrifici monitus iterant: ſuper ipſius ingens
Inſtat fama viri, virtuſque haud læta tyranno.
Ergo anteire metus, juvenumque exſtinguere pergit
Æſonium: letique vias, ac tempora verſat (18).

(18) Valer. Flaccus, *Argon.* lib. 1. ver. 22.

If I am not miſtaken, Pindar is the only Author, who tells us, that Pelias would make religion to be concerned in that undertaking, and encouraged his nephew by that noble motive (19). *Here follows the ſubſtance* of that great Poet's *diſcourſe*; I ſhall make uſe of Meziriac's words. *Jaſon being twenty years old, came out of Chiron's cave, and returned into his father Æſon's houſe, where he was viſited by a great many perſons of his relations, amongſt whom were his uncles Pheres and Amythaon, and his firſt couſins Acaſtus and Melampus. He ſpent five whole days in feaſts and entertainments, and in diverting himſelf in their company: and the ſixth day he went with the whole company, and preſented himſelf to Pelias, and required him to ſurrender the Kingdom to him, which was his by law. Pelias ſeeing him ſo well attended, was obliged to give him fair words; he anſwered that he was ready to yield the Kingdom to him; but that he adviſed him to undertake firſt an expedition which would be as pious as glorious; namely, to go to Colchis, to appeaſe the Ghoſt of Phryxus, and to bring the golden Fleece back from Theſſaly: for the Ghoſt of Phryxus appeared often to him in the night time, admoniſhing him to ſend ſome men to Colchis, to call three times upon his ghoſt on his tomb, and to bring back the golden Fleece; and that having conſulted the Oracle upon this, Apollo commanded him the ſame thing. He added that had it not been for his great age, he would have undertaken that voyage himſelf; but that Jaſon had no lawful pretence to be excuſed from it; ſince he was in the prime of his age, ſuch an age, in which the love of glory ought to have more power over his mind, than a vain ambition to reign. Upon the whole he promiſed and moſt ſolemnly ſwore to him, that he would reſign him the Crown the moment he was returned home* (20).

(19) See Benoit on Pindar, Ode 4. Pyth. p. 355.

(20) Mezriac, *ſur les Epitres d'Ovide*, p. 542, 543. This diſcourſe of Pindar, is in the 4th Ode of the *Pythic*.

[*C*] *Cicero is one of them; I do not think that . . . . . deſignedly, as Muretus imagines.*] Let us make Monſieur Menage perform here the office of a Commentator (21). "This Fable of Æſon's being reſtored to "youth by Medea's enchantments, is fully related in "the 7th book of Ovid's Metamorphoſes. But what "Ovid relates of Æſon in that book, Plautus in his "Pſeudolus (22) makes a Cook aſſert it of Pelias.

(21) Menage, *Obſervations ſur Malherbe*, p. 349, 359.

(22) It is the 80th verſe of the 2d Scene of the 3d Act, p. m. p. 541.

"*Quia ſorbitione faciam ego te hodie meâ,*
"*Item ut Medea Peliam concoxit ſenem;*
"*Quem medicamento & ſuis venenis dicitur*
"*Feciſſe rurſus ex ſene adoleſcentulum;*
"*Item ego te faciam.*

i. e. "I ſhall give you a ſoop which will reſtore you "to youth, as Medea is ſaid to have done to old "Pelias, whom ſhe boiled with herbs and medica"ments, and by her art ſhe made him become from "an old man a youth; the ſame I ſhall do to you."

"Cicero ſays the ſame thing in the perſon of "Cato the elder, in his dialogue on old age: *Quò "quidem me proficiſcentem haud ſane quis facile retraxe"rit, nec ſi tanquam Peliam recoxerit.* i. e. *To which "as I advance forwards, no man can call me back, "though he ſhould boil me up, as Medea did Pelias.* "And yet, if we may believe Ovid and Apollodo"rus, Pelias was not reſtored to youth by Medea. "He was, at Medea's inſtigation, murdered by his "daughters, who imagined they could reſtore him "to youth, after the ſame manner as Medea had "made an old ram become young again. Muretus "in the tenth chapter of the ſixth book of *Variæ "Lectiones*, imagined that Plautus and Cicero de"ſignedly affected that miſtake of names: Plautus "under the character of a Cook, *who was not uſed to "read the Metamorphoſes*, and Cicero under the cha"racter of an old man, whoſe memory failed him "often: and in this he has been followed by Came"rarius, Scioppius, Freherus, and by ſeveral other "Criticks. For my part, I am fully perſuaded that "Plautus and Cicero were in earneſt, and what they "ſay of Pelias was aſſerted by ſome antient "Authors, whom they followed, as Ovid followed "ſome others." Monſieur Menage adds, that *what Ovid relates of Æſon, Jaſon's father, Pherecydes and Simonides had aſſerted of Jaſon himſelf, as we learn from the argument or ſummary account prefixed to Euripides's Medea:* Φερεκύδης δὲ καὶ Σιμωνίδης φασὶν, ὡς ἡ Μηδεία ἀνιψήσασα τὸν Ἰάσονα, νέον ποιήσει. . . . . *So that ſome antient Author had probably wrote, that Pelias was reſtored to youth by Medea, as well as his brother Æſon. And Plautus and Cicero followed the account of that Author, as Ovid followed the account of the Author of the Poem, entitled,* Νόστοι, *that is to ſay,* the returns *for we find in the argument of the Medea mentioned above, that that Author related the ſame particulars concerning Æſon in that Poem, which Ovid mentions in his Metamorphoſes.*

I cannot imagine, that Plautus aſſerted a falſity on purpoſe to keep up the *decorum*, or the probability proper to a play; though it ſhould be ſaid an hundred times over and over, that it is in the character of a cook upon the ſtage to falſify hiſtory. But I can leſs ſtill believe what is ſuppoſed with regard to Cicero, that he imagined the *decorum* required of him that he ſhould make Cato's memory fail him, who was a very grave man. It is better therefore to charge Cicero himſelf with the miſtake, if it be really a miſtake: and this is alſo one of Muretus's anſwers. *Tale aliquid hic quoque comminiſcendum eſt: nam aut decorum id & conſentaneum Catoni credidit, quod & memoria vacillare γηροβοσκὸν ἰῶν, & interdum habet aliquid gravitatis in magnis viris minus accurata fabularum & talium rerum cognitio: aut hoc quoque inter μνημονικὰ Ciceronis ἁμαρτήματα numerandum eſt* (23). It is hardly poſſible to refute Monſieur Menage's aſſertion: for the antients differ ſo much in their accounts of the mythological adventures, that it is by no means improbable but ſome related that Pelias was really reſtored to youth. But, ſome will object, if he received that kindneſs from Medea, it muſt have been before ſhe fell out with Jaſon: but what probability is there, that before that time ſhe would have beſtowed ſo great a favour on the murderer of her huſband's father and mother? This objection is weak; for moſt of the Authors ſuppoſe that Pelias did not put Jaſon's father to death. The moſt common tradition is, that Æſon, Jaſon's father, was reſtored to youth by Medea, and ſome Authors aſſert that he died in the quiet poſſeſſion of his Kingdom, and left Pelias guardian to his ſon (24). We have ſeen (25), that Pelias ſwore ſolemnly, that he would reſign the Kingdom as ſoon as Jaſon ſhould be returned home, Why ſhould we not think, that there were ſome Authors, who aſſerted that he kept his word? If it be ſo, there is no difficulty in maintaining

(23) Muret. *Variar. Lection.* lib. 6. cap. 10. p. m. 983.

(24) *Scholiaſtes Homeri in Odyſſ.* lib. 12. He quotes Pherecydes. See *Meziriac ſur les Epitres d'Ovide*, p. 535.

(25) In the paſſage from Pindar, above, quotation (20).

left even the Kingdom to that Uſurper's ſon [*D*].

ing that Medea reſtored him to youth at Jaſon's requeſt. However, it is very certain that there are ſtill ſome proofs extant, by which it appears that he wiſhed paſſionately ſhe would do him that kindneſs. Conſult Diodorus Siculus (26) in the paſſage where he relates how Medea, acting like a Fanatick, and making people believe that ſhe came from the country of the Hyperboreans, with a deſign to make Pelias and his Kingdom happy, perſuaded that Prince, that ſhe was commanded to reſtore him to youth. But above all read theſe words of Varro. *Peliam Medeæ permiſiſſe ut ſe vel vivum degluberet, dummodo redderet puellum* (27), i. e. "Pelias gave Medea leave "to flee him even alive, if ſhe could but make him "young again." Let us obſerve that Pelias's Obſequies were celebrated with great pomp, and that Jaſon was one of the hero's who diſputed the prize in the funeral games of that ceremony (28). Is not this a proof that Pelias was reconciled with his Nephew before he died? It is ſomewhat ſtrange that ſhe ſhould be ſaid to have reſtored her huſband Jaſon to youth, for he was very young when he married her: and if ſome years after ſhe had the vexation to ſee him ready to marry another wife, it was becauſe ſhe began to grow old (29). The tradition of this woman's reſtoring Jaſon to youth is owing perhaps to a *lapſus calami*, or a ſlip of the pen, either of an author, or a tranſcriber. If inſtead of Αἴσων ſome wrote Ἰάσων, by this miſtake the ſon and the huſband were placed in the room of the father and father-in-law; I mean in the room of the good old man Æſon, whom Medea reſtored to youth. This falſe ſpelling would be nothing elſe but the tranſpoſition of one letter: I own that one is more ſubject to make ſuch a tranſpoſition in printing, than in writing; but yet authors and tranſcribers are not ſo free from it, as it were to be wiſhed. One might therefore have ſome reaſons to think, that they who have aſſerted that Medea reſtored Jaſon to youth, grounded their aſſertion on ſome book, in which, thro' a miſtake, Ἰάσων crept in, inſtead of the word Αἴσων. One cannot pretend this with regard to the writer quoted by Monſieur Menage (30); for it appears from the whole connexion of his diſcourſe, that he ſpeaks of Jaſon's being made young again. I believe that Monſieur Menage would have quoted Lycophron, if he had remembred theſe words: καὶ λέβητι δαιδρυθεὶς δέμας ὐκ ἀσμένως ἔμαρψεν ἐρράθη σκύτος. *His body being boiled in a kettle, he did not go unpuniſhed for taking the golden Fleece* (31). Whereupon Canterus made this note: *Jaſonem à Medea recoctum fuiſſe notum eſt.* i. e. "It is well known, that Jaſon was boiled "young again by Medea."

Obſerve that if a woman had the gift aſcribed to Medea, ſhe would uſe it chiefly with regard to her huſband. So that upon the whole, I ſhould not think it ſo ſtrange, that Medea ſhould be ſaid to have reſtored to the vigour of youth, not only Bacchus's nurſes and their huſbands (32), Æſon, her father-in-law, Pelias, Æſon's brother, but alſo her own huſband Jaſon. What is more ſurprizing is, that ſhe forgot herſelf; why would ſhe ſuffer that people could tell her, *Medice, cura te ipſum*, i. e. "Phyſician, "heal thyſelf." Since you reſtore others to youth, why do not you get rid of your own old carcaſs? This would be as uſeful at leaſt to you, as the making your huſband young again. I ſhall cloſe this remark with taking notice of a miſtake of Aldus Manutius the younger. He aſſerted that Pelias was Jaſon's father (33).

[*D*] *He behaved very generouſly towards Pelias's daughters, and left even the Kingdom to that Uſurper's ſon.*] Pelias had three daughters, and Jaſon married them all very advantageouſly: Alceſtis the eldeſt of all was married to Admetus: the ſecond was called Amphinome, and had Andremon for her huſband: the third married Canas, King of the Phocæans, and ſon of . . . . * (34). Diodorus Siculus obſerves (35), that Jaſon ſettled Acaſtus, Pelias's ſon, on his father's throne, and yet he had related a little before, that Pelias having no ſon was afraid of being unthroned by his brother (36). Let it not be urged, to clear him, that he obſerves that the fabulous accounts abound with variations: he obſerves it only, that he may not be blamed, if it be found that he does not always agree with other Authors. Καθόλου γὰρ τοὺς παλαιοὺς μύθους οὐχ ἁπλῆ οὐδὲ συμπεφωνημένην ἰσορίαν ἔχειν συμβέβηκε. Διόπερ ὀ χεὴ θαυμάζειν ἐάν τινα τῶν ἀρχιολογουμένων μὴ συμφώνως ἅπασι τοῖς ποιηταῖς καὶ συγγραφεῦσι συγκρίνωμεν: *In priſcis enim fabulis nulla omninò ſimplex & per omnia ſibi conſentiens eſt hiſtoria. Haud ergò mirandum eſt, ſi in antiquitatibus illis recenſendis cum Poëtis & ſcriptoribus aliis non ubique nobis conveniat* (37). But I think he did not pretend this obſervation was to clear him, in caſe he ſhould contradict himſelf: he had been to blame, if he had had ſuch a thought. Let us boldly aſſert therefore, that he deſerves to be a little cenſured upon this account: for he ought not to have adapted in page 233, the opinion of thoſe, who ſaid Pelias had no ſon; and in page 243 a quite contrary opinion. He ſhould at leaſt have told us, that ſome aſſerted one thing, and others another. He was in the right to obſerve that his accounts did not agree with thoſe of other writers: we have an inſtance of it here; for we find in Apollodorus (38), that Alceſtis was married in Pelias's life time with Admetus, who had formed the difficult conditions which Pelias required of thoſe who courted her (39). Apollodorus gives him four daughters, and names them one after another (40). Hyginus (41) gives him five daughters, and tells us their names. Pauſanias relates that this Prince's daughters, being diſconſolate for the misfortune they had to kill him, whilſt they intended to reſtore him to youth, left their country and retired into Arcadia, where they died and were buried (42). That Author ſpeaks of their tomb, and adds, that none of the Poets he had read, mention their names, but that the painter Micon put the names of Aſteropea and Antinoe on their pictures. He obſerves elſewhere (43) that one of them was called Alceſtis in the repreſentation of Pelias's Obſequies. I wonder that he had not read the works in which Apollodorus and Diodorus Siculus found the names of theſe daughters, or that he had not read at leaſt theſe two Authors. Let us obſerve that Pelias's wife was named Anaxibia, and that ſhe was the daughter of Bias (44). Others call her Philomacha, and ſuppoſe her the daughter of Amphion (45).

(26) Diod. Sic. lib. 4. cap. 52, 55. See alſo Hygin. cap. 24.

(27) Varro, *in Marcipore* apud *Nonium Marcellum*, v. *puellos*. p. m. 158.

(28) Pauſan. lib. 5. p. 165.

(29) Diod. Sic. lib. 4. cap. 55. p. 244.

(30) The Author of the *Argument of Euripides's Medea.*

(31) *Lycophron*, ver. 1313.

(32) Æſchylus, *in* Nutricibus Bacchi, *apud Autorem Argumenti* Medeæ Euripidis.

(33) Aldus Manutius, P. F. on Ciceron. de Senectute, *ſub fin.*

* There is a line or two omitted here in the original.

(34) Extracted from Diodorus Siculus, lib. 4. cap. 54. p. 243.

(35) Idem, ibid.

(36) Idem, ibid. cap. 41. p. 233.

(37) Diod. Sic. lib. 4. p. 172. edit. Henr. Stephani, 1559.

(38) Apollod. lib. 1. p. 51. Hygin. cap. 51.

(39) He required that they ſhould bring him a chariot drawn by a lion, or by a wild-boar. Apollodor. ibid.

(40) Apollod. ibid. p. 45.

(41) Hygin. cap. 24.

(42) Pauſan. lib. 8. p. 245.

(43) Idem, lib. 5. p. 165.

(44) Apollod. lib. 1. p. 45. Hygin. cap. 14. p. m. 44. & cap. 51. p. 98.

(45) Idem, Ibid.

PELIAS was the name of a ſpear (*a*), which was made a preſent of to Peleus on his wedding day (*b*) [*A*]. He uſed it in battles, and gave it to his ſon Achilles, who rendered it extremely famous (*c*). It was ſo heavy that none but himſelf could dart it (*d*). It was made of an Aſh-tree, which Chiron cut on Mount Pelion (*e*). See Pliny (*f*).

(*a*) Ovidius, *Metam.* lib. 13. & *alibi.*

(*b*) Scholiaſt. Homeri, *in Iliad.* lib. 16. ver. 140.

(*c*) Idem, Ibid.

(*d*) Homer. ibid.

(*e*) Idem, ibid.

(*f*) Plin. lib. 16. cap. 13. p. m. 248.

[*A*] *It was the name of a Spear, which was made a preſent of to Peleus on his wedding-day.*] In Homer it is only an epithet taken from the place, where Chiron cut the Aſh-tree. Πηλιάδα μελίην; *Peliadem fraxinum* (1). Πηλιὰς μελίη; *Pelias fraxinus* (2). *The Pelian Aſh-tree*, or *the Aſh-tree of Pelias*. The Latins turned that Epithet into a proper name.

(1) Homer. *Iliad.* lib. 16. ver. 143.

(2) Idem, ibid. lib. 21. ver. 277.

PELISSON (PAUL) was one of the fineſt genius's of the 17th Century. The ſame motive which prompted me to be very conciſe in the article of Menage, will make me not ſwell the preſent article to any length (*a*). All I could ſay with regard to the particular

(*a*) The Elogium and Abſtract of Peliſſon's Life, are inſerted in ſeveral new books which are ſpread in all countries, as the *Mercure Galant*, the *Journal des Savans*, *Mercure Hiſtorique*, *Lettres Hiſtoriques*, &c.

cular honour which the French Academy did Peliſſon [*A*], and of the applauſes he merited during the proſecutions which he ſuffered under, for having been in Mr. Fouquet's ſervice; all this, I ſay, and ſeveral other particulars of his life, are ſtill freſh in the memory of every reader. It would be equally ſuperfluous to take notice of what was called in France, his application to the grand affair: the complaints and jokes made by the Proteſtants on that occaſion are univerſally known. The publick are perhaps not ſo well acquainted with a circumſtance, of the truth of which ſome perſons have aſſured me, which is, that he wiſhed the great buſineſs of converſions had been always carried on in the method which had been purſued for many years, without having recourſe to dragooning; a courſe that will be had in everlaſting deteſtation by all men of probity and honour, of all countries and religions. He had been, for many years, writing a large controverſial volume on the Sacrament, but had not time to finiſh it. Some little part of this was publiſhed after his death [*B*]; and we therein ſee the ſubtlety of his genius, which was all he could put into it. The like ſubtlety is ſeen in his reflections or diſputes, or controverſies in religious matters [*C*], in which he did not forget to take notice of that, which the Church of Rome pretends to be the mighty Stumbling-block of the Proteſtants, I mean the difficulties which ariſe from the way of examination or enquiry. This Stumbling-block, I ſay, if it be one, is rather that of Rome than that of Geneva, as I obſerved in another place [*D*]. I alſo ſpeak of it in the note; and will obſerve, by the way,

[*A*] *The particular honour which the French Academy did Peliſſon.*] " The FRENCH ACADEMY having de- " ſired to hear, in a full aſſembly, this work (1) " read to them, it being at that time only in manu- " ſcript; they ſome time after decreed, of their own " accord, in honour to the Author, that the firſt " place which ſhould be vacant in the Academy, " ſhould be beſtowed on him; and that in the mean " time, he ſhould be impowered to come to all the " meetings, and give his vote, as an Academician; " with the following clauſe, that the like favour " could not hereafter be indulged any perſon, upon " any conſideration whatever." This paſſage is extracted from the hiſtory of the French Academy (2): they are followed by the compliment of thanks which our Author delivered in that aſſembly, the 30th of December, 1652.

(1) i. e. *The Hiſtory of the French Academy.* This work of Peliſſon has been always looked upon as a maſter-piece. See Baillet, *Jugemens des Savans, ſur les Critiq. Hiſt.* num. 134.

(2) p. 369. Paris edit. 1672, 12mo.

[*B*] *Some little part of* his work on the Sacrament.] See the extract which Mr. Beauval gives of it, in his Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned (3), and that of Couſin (4).

(3) For Auguſt 1694. p. 513 & *ſeq.*

(4) In the 20 *Journal des Savans*, for 1694.

[*C*] *His reflections on the diſputes or controverſies in religious matters.*] The firſt part of this work was printed at Paris, in two volumes, 12mo, 1686. See the extract which was given of it in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (5). The year after, the Author reprinted with the addition of a new tome, entitled, *An Anſwer to the Objections from England and Holland: or, of the Authority of great numbers in the Chriſtian Religion.* See the Journal des Savans (6). Some time after, he added another tome more, divided into four parts, and entitled, *The Chimeras of Mr. Jurieu: a general Anſwer to his paſtoral Letters of the ſecond year, in oppoſition to the Book of Reflections, and a ſhort Examination of his Prophecies.* The Reader will eaſily figure to himſelf, the advantages which ſo ſubtle a man muſt neceſſarily gain over a chimerical interpreter of the Revelations. All theſe works of Peliſſon have been re-printed in Holland. See the *Acta eruditorum* (7). They form the three firſt parts of the Reflections or Diſputes about Religion. The fourth part was publiſhed at Paris, in 1692, and entitled, *Concerning Toleration in Religion. Some Letters of Mr. Leibnitz, with Mr. Peliſſon's Anſwers* *. The following note is in the margin of the firſt page. *Theſe objections were made by Mr. Leibnitz, whoſe merit is ſufficiently known. They were ſent to France by the Ducheſs of Hanover, to the Abbeſs of Maubiſſon her ſiſter. It was not known at that time, by whom they were written.* Even thoſe perſons who know, by numberleſs proofs, the extent of Mr. Leibnitz's genius, cannot ſufficiently admire how it was poſſible for him to write ſo correctly in French, as the objections in queſtion are writ. But he is one of thoſe extraordinary men, who find no limits in the ſphere of human merit; they fill every part of it.

(5) For July 1686. art. 1. See alſo *Journal des Savans*, of April 29, 1686.

(6) Of April 12, 1688, p. 540, Dutch edit.

(7) For Nov. 1689. p. 564; and in the *Supplement*, Tom. 1. p. 609.

* See rem. [*H*], of the article LEIBNITZ (GODEFROY WILLIAM DE)] Rem. by the Tranſl.

[*D*] *The way of examination . . . is rather* the ſtumbling block *of the Church of Rome, than that of Geneva, as I obſerved in another place.*] If my Readers peruſe the article of NICOLLE (8), they will find that this Doctor, after objecting great difficulties, could not anſwer thoſe which were made to him. To have proceeded according to order, he ought to have anſwered the objections which were retorted upon him, and cleared the way or method of authority. The rubbiſh which had been thrown up there, called immediately for the utmoſt efforts of his hands; and yet he put off this affair till a farther time, and even did not dare to engage his word for it, in a poſitive manner. Here follow his words (9). *To conclude, as Mr. Jurieu treats in his book of two principal queſtions, the firſt concerning the ſyſtem of the church, the other concerning the analyſis of the faith; my intention, in this treatiſe, is to apply my ſelf only to the former, by annexing the conſequences which bear a relation to it, and which Mr. Jurieu treats in ſeveral places, and particularly in his third book. We ſhall afterwards ſee, whether it be equally advantageous to treat of the analyſis of faith. But the queſtion, with regard to the Church, is of that importance, as to be examined ſeparately, and in a work by itſelf: and this I have propoſed to do here.* Great numbers of people imagined, that this diviſion was made with artifice. One of the two pieces was taken, and the other left; the reaſon of which was, the one promiſed, at leaſt, that the victory would be diſputed; whereas the other threatned an inevitable defeat; whence ſome concluded, that Nicolle was very ſenſible that the way of authority is a mere chimera. Others, who were wiſer, contented themſelves with believing, that he did not doubt but this was the way which God had pointed out to the ſimple, tho' there is no poſſibility of anſwering thereby the objections raiſed by the Proteſtants: ſo that his ſilence ought not to be conſidered as proof of his hypocriſy, but as an effect of that prudence, which will not permit the Catholicks to inform Hereticks, that ſome important truths cannot be well maintained againſt the objections raiſed by adverſaries. I ſhall not pretend to judge of the ſtate of another man's heart; and therefore will not preſume to ſay, that Nicolle was not perſuaded of the truth of what he ſays in one of his books; " God " has not, according to the ſcriptures, only given up " the material world to the diſputes of men; but, " from a much more dreadful effect of his juſtice, " he has even, in ſome meaſure, abandoned the di- " vine myſteries to them, and the ſacred truths which " he has revealed to them, by permitting them to " be expoſed to their contradiction; to become the " ſubject of their conteſts; and that ſome raſh So- " phiſts ſhould inſolently ridicule them in their diſ- " courſes and writings. One cannot, indeed, en- " tirely ſay of this kind of diſputations, what the " wiſe man ſays of thoſe, which have natural things " for their object, viz. that men can never diſcover, " by their utmoſt enquiries, the truth of them: " *Mundum tradidit diſputationibus eorum, ut nunquam* " *inveniant opus quod operatus eſt.* It is certain, on " the contrary, that it nevertheleſs appears, and even " ſhines out, through the clouds which men endea- " vour to ſpread, in order to darken it; and that " perſons of an humble, ſincere, and intelligent caſt " of

(8) Rem. [*C*].

(9) Nicolle, *de l'Unite de l'Egliſe*, at the end of the Preface.

way, that ſome perſons are of opinion, that few or none make uſe of the way of examination, properly ſo called, though it be much talked of. I even do not know whether it might not be aſſerted, that the obſtacles to a juſt examination do not reſult ſo much from the

" of mind, will diſcover it amid thoſe intricate queſ-
" tions and falſe ſubtilties, with which others endea-
" vour to ſurround it (10)." This ſignifies, that the controverſy about the way of authority, and the way of examination, is not one of thoſe things, which God has abandoned to the diſputes and conteſts of men, without permitting them ever to diſcover what he has done. Now ſome perſons imagine, that Nicolle believed the contrary in his own mind. He had a numberleſs multitude of mighty objections to the way of examination: he knew that they are retorted againſt the way of authority; and that new ones are added to them, which it would be impoſſible for him to ſolve. He therefore thought, that the way by which we are to diſcern revealed truths, is directly like the works of nature, in which God permits us to argue, without permitting us ever to diſcover the myſtery of them (11). Once again, I will not be ſo raſh as to judge of the conſciences of other men.

Peliſſon did not ſucceed better than Nicolle, in the defenſive part. I own that it was not very difficult for him to deſtroy the diſtinction between the examination of attention, and the examination of enquiry or diſcuſſion, and ſome others; but at laſt he was non-pluſſed, as well as his brethren, when he was to ſolve the objection retorted upon him, and remove the difficulties ariſing from the way of authority: inſomuch, that we may here repeat, that it had been better for both churches, to have never debated that queſtion (12). *No method can be of more pernicious conſequence, than that of Mr. Nicolle. For, in a word, could he once perſuade mankind that it is impoſſible to diſcover truth by the way of examination, as he endeavours to do with all his might, he would ſoon ſee that he has laboured at nothing but to eſtabliſh ſcepticiſm, and conſequently to deſtroy religion. Every one would then argue after this manner. It is impoſſible to diſcover truth by the way of examination. This Mr. Nicolle has convinced us of. It is plain, that this cannot be found out by the way of authority, and this is much more certain than the reſt. What other courſe can one take, than to give up, once for all, the hopes of ever knowing that truth, which ſo many perſons are in ſearch of, and which one would conclude no man can find? This effect reſults naturally from Nicolle's method, whence we may infer, that it is highly pernicious: for, in a word, nothing can be more oppoſite to religion than ſcepticiſm. It is a total extinction, not only of faith, but of reaſon; and nothing can be a greater impoſſibility, than to reclaim thoſe who have run to ſuch exceſſes* (13). Theſe are the words of *a man of great learning and abilities* (14), who has been long uſed to meditation, is a profound maſter of the art of reaſoning, and has made ſeveral new objections to Nicolle. For he not only ſhews, that, in order to employ the way of authority in a prudent manner, we muſt firſt know which is the church that is poſſeſſed of authority; but alſo that Nicolle's reaſons would lead us neceſſarily to the doctrine of probability in its utmoſt extent. This laſt doctrine would be very contrary to Nicolle, who has ſo ſolidly oppoſed the doctrine of probability. The other point includes a vaſt number of diſcuſſions or enquiries. We cannot diſcover where the authority reſides, but by examining what are the ſigns or characteriſticks of the church which poſſeſſes it. *We muſt know the exact number of theſe characteriſticks: we muſt know, not only that there are ſo many, but that there are no more* (15). We muſt know whether thoſe who compute an hundred, are more rational than ſuch as count fifteen, or twelve, or ten, or ſix, or only four. When the number of theſe characteriſticks are fixed, we muſt examine whether they ſuit the Romiſh rather than the Greek church. All this requires great pains, and a laborious ſeries of enquiries; ſo that, by endeavouring to avoid the way of examination, we return to it neceſſarily.

[" Where Bayle ſays, after Mr. de la Placette, that
" the way of *authority*, for putting an end to diſpu-
" ters in religion, a way which Nicolle and Peliſſon
" have well maintained, *is fit only to baniſh a certainty
" with regard to faith, and to eſtabliſh ſcepticiſm*, he
" contradicts himſelf, and oppoſes the Synod of Dort,
" to which he declares himſelf, in ſeveral places, at-
" tached. *The Proteſtant Church*, ſays Bayle, rem. *D* of
" the article Maimbourg, *cannot be blamed for having
" eſtabliſhed an order, without which it is* IMPOSSIBLE
" *for any ſociety to ſubſiſt. There* MUST BE, *in all ſo-
" cieties,* A TRIBUNAL *to pronounce or determine,
" WITHOUT APPEAL, on the diſputes of particular
" perſons, and which may be impowered to inflict* PU-
" NISHMENTS *on ſuch as refuſe to ſubmit; for other-
" wiſe it* WOULD NOT BE POSSIBLE *to remedy any
" diſorder, nor prevent* DISPUTES *from being carried on
" perpetually.* Therefore, only the way of authority,
" and of a tribunal judging, without any appeal
" from it, is capable of remedying the diſorders
" which ariſe from diſputes, and to prevent their
" being carried on for ever. Now why does Bayle,
" who aſſerts this here, (and aſſerts it juſtly,) advance
" the direct contrary, in order to overthrow the ar-
" guments of Nicolle and Peliſſon, that the way of
" authority *is fit only to baniſh certainty, with regard
" to faith*, &c. * ? "]

There is reaſon to fear, that a third party may ſtart up, who will teach, that men are not led to the knowledge of true religion, either by the way of authority, or by the way of examination, but ſome by education, and others by grace. Education, without grace and examination, does but barely perſuade. Grace with education, and ſometimes without education or examination, or with a ſuperficial examination, perſuades to ſalvation. *Gratia Dei ſum quod ſum*, (By the grace of God, I am what I am,) ought every orthodox believer to ſay. I am orthodox and *through grace* (16), *and that not of myſelf; it is the gift of God, not by my works*, by re-ſearches, by enquiries, *that no man may glory*. Let the examination be eaſy, or at leaſt poſſible; let it be difficult, or even impoſſible; one very certain circumſtance is, that no man makes uſe of it (17): moſt people cannot read; among ſuch as do read, moſt of them never read the works of their adverſaries; and know the arguments of the other party only by the fragments or extracts from them, which they meet with in their Authors. Theſe fragments exhibit but imperfectly, and in a very weak manner, the pretenſions of the contrary party. To diſcover the ſtrength of the objections, we muſt conſider them when placed in their ſyſtem; and connected with their general principles, their conſequences and dependencies. Therefore, to examine the ſentiments of an adverſary, we muſt not barely compare the anſwer of our Authors with the objection alledged by them; this would be like judging of the force of a wheel, by the bare effects it may produce, when ſeparated from its machine or engine. This cannot be called the way of examination, but in an abuſive ſenſe. As for ſuch Doctors as look into the works of their adverſary, theſe employ the utmoſt exertions of their genius; not in enquiring whether he is in the right, but to diſcover if he is in the wrong, and to invent anſwers. They look upon whatever anſwers they invent as good ones, becauſe they ever continue firmly perſuaded that he is an Heretic. This too cannot be called examination, but in an abuſive ſenſe. The firſt thing a perſon ought to do, in order for a thorough examination, would be to be in doubt, with regard to his own religion: but he would imagine he offended God, ſhould he form the leaſt doubt on that head; he would conſider this doubt as a fatal ſuggeſtion of the devil: a man, therefore, does not put himſelf into the frame or ſtate, into which that man ſhould put himſelf, who was deſirous of diſcerning orthodoxy from heterodoxy: a perſon muſt, according to St. Auſtin, lay aſide or diveſt oneſelf of the ſuppoſition, that we are already in poſſeſſion of the truth. *Ut autem facilius miteſcatis, & non inimico animo vobiſque pernicioſo mihi adverſemini, quovis judice me impetrare à vobis oportet, ut ex utraque parte omnis arro-*

(10) *Préjugez légitimes contre les Calviniſtes*, in the Preface.

(11) *Mundum tradidit diſputationibus eorum, ut nunquam inveniant opus quod operatus eſt.* Salomon, *in* Eccleſiaſte, cap. 3. ver. 11.

(12) See rem. [D] of the art. NICOLLE.

(13) La Placette's *Treatiſe on Conſcience*, p. 377. He had ſaid p. 370. *That nothing can be falſer, nothing more pernicious, than this objection of Nicolle's: that it turns upon ſuppoſitions which are moſt certainly repugnant to truth; and that it is of no uſe but to deſtroy a certainty in matters of faith and morality, and to eſtabliſh a general Scepticiſm in religion.*

(14) Formerly a Proteſtant Miniſter in Bearn, and now in Copenhagen.

(15) La Placette, *Traite de la Conſcience*, p. 372.

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 970.

(16) See St. Paul's *Epiſtle to the Epheſians*, chap. 2. ver. 8 and 9.

(17) Obſerve, that this is the diſcourſe, not of the Author of this book, but of the third part I hinted at, who may ſtart up. This muſt be obſerved in ſeveral other places.

the mind's being unfurniſhed with knowledge, as its being over-run with prejudices [*E*]. It would be unjuſt to charge the Proteſtants with being the authors of the reports which were ſpread, viz. that Peliſſon refuſed to make a confeſſion of his ſins in his laſt ſickneſs.

gantia deponatur. Nemo noſtrum dicat jam ſe inveniſſe veritatem: ſic eam quæramus, quaſi ab utriſque neſciatur. Ita enim diligenter & concorditer quæri potuit, ſi nullâ temerariâ præſumtione inventa & cognita eſſe credatur (18), i. e. "But that you may be the more eaſily ſoftened, and not write againſt me with a rancorous ſpirit, which would be hurtful to yourſelves; it is neceſſary for me to deſire, that pride and prejudice may be laid aſide by both parties. Let not either party ſay that he has already found out the truth; but let us ſearch after it, in ſuch a manner, as though it were not known to either. For thus it may be ſought for, carefully and mutually; unleſs by raſh preſumption, we imagine that it is already found out and known." Thoſe that ſay, that a corruption of heart hinders a Heretic from finding out the truth, are frequently miſtaken, if they mean that a propenſion to drunkenneſs, fornication, and other corporeal pleaſures, or that pride, avarice, &c. miſlead his judgment (19); but they do not miſtake, if they mean that prejudice prevents his diſcovering juſt and valid proofs. Such a man examines the reaſons of the orthodox, in a firm perſuaſion that he has truth on his ſide; and that he would offend God, ſhould he imagine that the proofs of the contrary party have any ſolidity in them. He thinks that he acts as a faithful ſervant of God, if he looks upon theſe reaſons as ſophiſms or fallacies, and if he employs the whole ſtrength of his mind, to find out anſwers; and he cannot believe that his anſwers are bad, ſince, in his opinion, they combat error, and are intended for the ſupport of truth. He commits a miſtake, if he imagines that he has thoroughly examined the ſyſtem of the other party. But I would aſk any one, whether the orthodox have not the like perſuaſion, when they examine or enquire into the cauſes of Hereticks? Both parties act like people engaged in a law-ſuit: theſe never look upon the arguments of their opponents as ſolid; it is to no purpoſe that they read over and over the parchments written on that account, they conſidering them as meer wrangling; and even after they have been condemned by inferior and ſuperior Judges, they ſtill fancy themſelves in the right, and would appeal to another Tribunal, if there was one. Whence ariſes all this? Does not it proceed from their examining all things, with a prepoſſeſſion that juſtice is on their ſide? Nothing is more capable of convincing us of the uſeleſſneſs of an impartial examination, than what happens every day to news-mongers. They are firmly perſuaded, that the party which they eſpouſe, has juſtice on its ſide; and are paſſionately deſirous that it ſhould be victorious. They would be grieved to the ſoul, ſhould a ſhining light dart on their eyes, and prove evidently to them the juſtice and good fortune of the contrary party. This is the effect of thoſe paſſions. They, in reading the manifeſto's and relations of the enemy, look upon them as ſo many falſhoods; how probable ſoever his reaſons may be, they reject them; they apply their whole minds to conſider what anſwer may be made to them. Now, whilſt they attend to the ſpecious appearances of the anſwer, and no ways attentive to the bright ſide of the objection, they never acquire any other knowledge, but ſuch as flatters their prejudices. If ill news comes, they are incredulous; they invent an hundred reaſons to prove it falſe, and employ their utmoſt efforts on that occaſion. If good news be brought, their credulity is boundleſs (20); the weakeſt appearances are, by them, conſidered as a ſtrong proof; they do all in their power to ſtrengthen thoſe appearances; they baniſh all contrary appearances from their imagination; and in this manner they ſpend the year without trouble or diſquietude, thanks to their induſtry, which removes all diſagreeable objects, and creates daily, in their fancy, ſome delightful chimæra or another. Nothing but an indiſputable evidence is able to undeceive them; and were they to examine their own minds with deep attention, they would be obliged to confeſs, that they content themſelves with reaſons which they would deſpiſe, were they alledged in favour of the enemy. Muſt it not be confeſſed, that if we do not examine more carefully the arguments on both ſides, in religious matters, than thoſe which relate to publick news, this does not deſerve the name of examination? And muſt it not be confeſſed, that the ſame ſpirit which commonly prevails in ſuch news-mongers as are extremely zealous for a party, prevail in moſt perſons who are very zealous for their religion? A news-monger is grieved when a battle is loſt, and highly delighted when advice is brought that the battle is won: for this reaſon he exhauſts all the ſtrength of his genius, to convince himſelf that the battle is won; and if indiſputable proofs of the contrary are not given; if there are three probabilities to alledge, for the gaining of the victory, an oppoſition to ten or twelve probabilities for the loſs, he is convinced that it is won. A man is not leſs pleaſed in religious diſputes, when he imagines that an adverſary is defeated; and as much grieved when he ſees him triumph. Thus, on both ſides, the uneaſineſs which men endeavour to avoid, and the pleaſure they ſtrive to procure themſelves, prevent their examining things with equity, and make them uſe double weights and double meaſures.

(18) Auguſt. *contra Epiſt. fundam.* cap. 3.

(19) See the *Philoſophical Commentary* on *contrainlesd'entrer*, part 2. chap. 10. p. 548 & *ſeq.* and part 4. p. 217 & *ſeq.*

REFLECTIONS on the prepoſſeſſions of News-mongers.

(20) Obſerve, that there is another kind of News-mongers; perſons who are ingenious in tormenting themſelves; who believe what they fear, and not what they wiſh.

Such are the things we may apprehend a third party advance, aſſerting the right, and denying the fact: aſſerting that men ought to conduct themſelves by the way of examination, and that nevertheleſs no one makes uſe of that way. However this be, the difference proves very great in the event: for, whereas thoſe who are in an error, would perhaps become orthodox, were they not already perſuaded of their being ſo; the orthodox, perhaps, preſerve themſelves from hereſy, becauſe they are firmly prepoſſeſſed with the notion that they are orthodox.

[*E*] *The obſtacles to a juſt examination reſults from* the mind's *being over-run with prejudices.*] There is no great need of a Commentary, after what the reader has juſt now read. The examples of perſons engaged in law-ſuits, and of news-mongers, is very well adapted to ſhew, that a man who is both judge and party, is not very able to diſcern truth from falſhood. Two ſtrong reaſons forbid men to act in both thoſe characters at one and the ſame time: the one is, becauſe they would be too apt to determine in their own favour, though they ſhould be conſcious of their acting unjuſtly: the other is, that he would be inclined to think himſelf in the right, even when the juſtice of the cauſe of his opponent might be eaſily diſcovered. In religious diſputes every man is judge and party; for theſe do not examine the reaſons of their adverſaries with a ſceptical mind. They would think themſelves guilty of a crime, were they to put themſelves in ſuch a ſituation: they therefore examine things with a firm perſuaſion, that the religion which they profeſs is the only true one. In this manner it is plain that ſuch perſons have almoſt the ſame paſſions and prejudices with the news-mongers above-mentioned. Three probabilities on the ſide of our prejudices gain the advantage over ten or twelve on the other: the reaſon of which is, our mind attends with infinitely greater pleaſure to ſuch probabilities as pleaſe, than towards ſuch as give uneaſineſs. This reflection is confirmed by Nicolle. *How infinite ſoever the diſpoſition may be between God and his creatures, between things temporal and things eternal; men nevertheleſs prefer daily the moſt inconſiderable pleaſures and the moſt trifling worldly advantages to God and eternal bleſſings: and that becauſe they have a quick ſenſe of thoſe advantages and pleaſures; and, on the contrary, have but a weak conception of God and eternal things. It is in the ſame manner that the mind ſuffers itſelf to be captivated by the vaineſt glimmerings, and the moſt trifling reaſons.* For this purpoſe it need *but apply itſelf intenſely to them: for this application makes it ſee nothing but them; and employs it ſo entirely, that no other reaſons are allowed acceſs to it. Moſt queſtions ought to be determined no other way, but by comparing the arguments on both ſides; and it is almoſt always raſhneſs, to determine or pronounce upon hearing*

(b) He wrote an anonymous book, entitled, *Melange de divers Problemes*, printed at Paris in 1647, 12mo. See Peter Borel's *Antiquities of Caſtres*.

ſickneſs [*F*]. His eldeſt brother died young, and had been an author (*b*). ["He "was fifty years of age at leaſt, he dying in 1647, and had publiſhed a work in 1647. "Now we do not ſay of a man who died at fifty, that he died young *."] Several illuſtrious perſons ſprung from this family [*G*].

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 971.

I ought

thoſe only of one party. But how eaſily may one miſtake in ſuch a compariſon, or not proceed in it with ſincerity! How many perſons have not a compaſs of mind ſufficient to comprehend ſo many particulars at once? If they apply themſelves to the conſideration of one reaſon or argument, they forget the reſt, and therefore do not compare them truly. It is their preſent application that determines them, and their paſſions that make them apply; and conſequently their inclination, not their underſtanding is the principle of their perſuaſion. The moſt dreadful circumſtance in this is; that as, on the one hand, it is ſo eaſy for men to fall into error and illuſion; it is, on the other hand, extremely difficult for them to extricate themſelves from it, and this, becauſe they are not ſenſible of the defects which plunged them into it; and having no other ſpiritual eyes to diſcover them, they judge of themſelves, as well as of others, by thoſe very eyes which are diſeaſed. Ita fit ut animus de ſe ipſo tum judicet, cum id ipſum quo judicat ægrotet (21). Obſerve particularly, 1. That in certain caſes the truth which diſpleaſes is ſo manifeſt, that it is impoſſible for us to miſtake it. 2. That there are ſome law-ſuits and controverſies, in which it is ſo difficult to diſcover truth from falſhood, that the moſt impartial Judges, and even the moſt able Scepticks, know not which to declare for. It is therefore true, that prejudices and paſſions do not blind us on all occaſions; and that the difficulties of examination ariſe ſometimes from the objects themſelves.

(21) Nicolle, Preface to *Prejugez legitimes*, p. * 4. Dutch edit.

[*F*] *It would be unjuſt to charge the Proteſtants with being the authors of the reports which were ſpread, that Peliſſon refuſed to make a confeſſion of his ſins in his laſt ſickneſs.*] Several perſons after reading the Rotterdam Gazette of Monday the 16th of February 1693, imagined that the whole piece inſerted in it, relating to Peliſſon, had been forged in the ſame city; and that the author of the Gazette in queſtion, was forced, from prudential reaſons, to publiſh that piece. This opinion was not true in all reſpects; it being certain that many letters had been ſent from France to Holland, in which it was affirmed, that all Paris was highly offended at the manner, in which Peliſſon had refuſed to make a confeſſion of his ſins. So that the following paragraph in the News-paper, *Mr. Peliſſon died yeſterday, having refuſed to let any perſon ſpeak to him about religious matters, and without receiving the ſacrament or confeſſing his ſins* (22), was not invented by the famous and ſorry news-writer who was ſuſpected on that occaſion. This article was grounded on ſeveral letters which had been ſent from France. But, will it be objected, were not thoſe letters writ by ſome Proteſtants in Paris? I can ſay nothing as to that; all I know is, that the Roman Catholicks of Paris firſt ſpread this report, and murmured on that account. Mademoiſelle de Scuderi, who had contracted an intimate friendſhip with Mr. Peliſſon, was grieved at this report; and deſired the Biſhop of Meaux to inform her of the true ſtate of that affair, and accordingly that Prelate wrote a letter, which was publiſhed. Some other pieces were publiſhed in France and Holland; and not long after no farther mention was made of it. An undoubted circumſtance is, that Peliſſon died without receiving the ſacrament or confeſſing his ſins. There were three kinds of opinions, as generally happens on this occaſion. Peliſſon's friends affirmed, agreeably to the account given by the Biſhop of Meaux, that he had ſent for a confeſſor; but that a defluxion choaked him before the hour appointed for the confeſſor was come. His enemies put the worſt conſtruction poſſible on all theſe circumſtances, whilſt neutral perſons contented themſelves with ſaying, that this whole affair was to be left to the ſearcher of hearts, and only affirmed the fact, *viz.* that Peliſſon had not made any confeſſion. As for the reſt, they cenſured thoſe who publiſhed, that HE DIED, *having refuſed to let any perſon ſpeak to him about religious matters* (23); for this ſuppoſes that ſome perſons came to diſcourſe with him about religion, and that he refuſed to hear them; which particular (ſay they) is abſolutely falſe. They add, that many pious perſons have put off confeſſion, and receiving the ſacrament, in their ſickneſs, either from a belief that they were not ſo near their end as they really were; or becauſe it was not proper, on account of their domeſtick concerns, that they ſhould be thought ſo near their end (24). Such delays, in which conſcience has nothing to do, may be the cauſe of a man's dying without confeſſion. However this be, a Roman Catholick will no doubt be alledged, in oppoſition to Peliſſon (25). The work in queſtion was printed at Paris, with his Majeſty's licence, in 1694: and the following paſſage is found in page 223. of Tome II. *The religion of Paul Peliſſon was variouſly talked of. Some ſay, he had none at all; that he was only a time-ſerver; and that, in his opinion, the religion of the Prince, and that which was moſt ſubſervient to his ambition, was always the beſt. Others thought him a Proteſtant in his heart; and others again, that he was a ſincere Catholick. A certain circumſtance is, that he had profeſſed both thoſe religions in different periods of his life, and diſcovered a zeal for both: but in his expiring moments, he did not profeſs any openly; for he would not receive the ſacraments of the Romiſh Church, nor dared to own himſelf a Proteſtant; but perſiſted, to the laſt, in a deep ſilence, the cauſes of which are known only to God* (26). But thoſe, who know that this paſſage is not in the Paris edition, will not dare to produce this teſtimony. I know that the Dutch edition contains many particulars, which de Riencourt never dreamt of. It is to be obſerved, that the Dutch edition has the following words in the title, *Printed at Paris for Claude Barbin, in the Court of Juſtice*, 1694, with his Majeſty's licence. Will any man, who may meet with this book in a library forty years hence, know that it is a ſpurious edition? Will they not ſeriouſly believe, that the entire book was publiſhed at Paris by a corrector of accounts? And if any one ſhould object to them, that his edition does not mention that profound ſilence, that refuſal of the ſacrament, *&c.* (27), and that they corrupt publick hiſtory; will they not produce a copy which will ſhew, to the eyes of as many witneſſes as can be required? PRINTED AT PARIS FOR CLAUDE BARBIN, *&c.* Will they take the pains to get able perſons appointed to examine and compare the editions? Certainly no: every man will be led by his own prejudice; and look upon that edition which he does not like as the ſpurious one. Hence it appears, how difficult it is for men to guard againſt error, in the midſt of ſo much gloom, which ſpreads, before-hand, on future times. Our predeceſſors took as much pains to ſeduce us, as we now do to ſeduce poſterity. And if ſome men preſume to corrupt an author's works, in his life time, what man can prove that the manuſcripts of the Fathers of the Church have been ſpared? Who can affirm but that ſome perſons ſuffered perſecution, in order to carry on the trick of a falſifier of libraries?

(22) Rotterdam Gazette, for Feb. 16, 1693. under the article of Paris, 9 February.

(23) Citation (22) above.

(24) Paſcal having confeſſed, in his laſt ſickneſs, alarmed his friends, and made his Phyſicians accuſe him of fear. This made him ſay, "I would willingly have received the Sacrament; but "ſince I find "that people are "ſo much ſurpriſed at my "confeſſion, I "am afraid they "will be more "ſo: and therefore I had better delay it." And the pariſh Prieſt being of the ſame opinion, he did not receive the ſacrament. See his *Life*, p. 43. Whilſt this ſheet is re-printing, in January 1701, we are told, in the *Dutch Gazettes*, that Mr. Roſe, Secretary of the Cloſet, and Lieutenant-general Stoupe, died at Paris without receiving any of the ſacraments: and no one infers from hence, that they were not good Catholicks. It is obſerved in the *Menagiana*, that ſome ſick perſons delay making their wills, and their confeſſions, as an ill omen.

(25) Mr. de Riencourt, Collector of Accounts.

(26) Riencourt, *Hiſt. de Louis* XIV. p. 224.

(27) For he would not partake of the ſacraments of the church of Rome. Riencourt, *Hiſt. de Louis* XIV. p. 224.

[*G*] *Several illuſtrious perſons have ſprung from this family.*] "From the family of the Peliſſon deſcend- "ed *Raymond Peliſſon*, firſt Preſident at Chambery: "*Peter Peliſſon*, ſecond Preſident in the ſame town. "*Thomas Peliſſon*, Quarter Maſter of the Troop of "Gendarmes of Guy de Maugiron, Governor of "Chambery, and Grand Provoſt of Dauphiné: "*Benoiſt* (Benedict) *Peliſſon*, ſole Recorder civil and "criminal of the Parliament of Dauphiné, an hun- "dred and twenty years ago; an employment, ſo "very conſiderable, that it is now divided into nine, "each of which is worth eleven thouſand crowns: "*John Peliſſon* of Condrieu, Principal of the College "of Tournon, who drew up an epitome of the Latin "Grammar, which *Deſpautier* has enlarged (28); and "firſt compoſed a Latin Grammar and its Rules, "with the inſtitutions of children in a College, "printed at Lyons 1530, in 16°. by Tribaut Payen, "according to *du Verdier*, in his Bibliotheque Fran- "coiſe.

(28) This Author, ſo well known in the ſchools in France, is there called *Deſpautere*, and not *Deſpautier*. He was ſo far from having enlarged John Peliſſon's work, the latter abridged *Deſpautere*. See the Epitome of Geſner's *Bibliotheque*.

(c) In the art. CALVIN, rem. [F] in the margin, citat. (20).

I ought not to have omitted, that this Preface to Sarazin's works is a maſter-piece. It muſt be added to the three or four Prefaces I have already mentioned (c); and it highly deſerves the encomiums which Coſtar has beſtowed upon it (d).

(d) Coſtar, *Lettres* 268, and 278, of part 1.

" coiſe. He alſo wrote the Elogium of Cardinal du " Tournon, printed at Lyons, by Gryphius, in 1534, " 4to. I could take notice here of a great number " of illuſtrious men ſprung from that antient family " within thoſe four hundred years, who have been " conſpicuous both in the field and the Courts of " Juſtice, with the illuſtrious families into which they " married; and ſpeak of one *Lewis Peliſſon*, whoſe " great learning has been honourably mentioned by " Preſident Faber, in his treatiſe *De erroribus pragmat*, and in that *De Conjecturis*, Chap. X. As " likewiſe of *Peter* and *John James Peliſſons*, Coun- " ſellors in the Parliament of Toulouſe, and in the " Chamber of the Edict of Caſtres, perſons eminent " for their learning; the former of whom was ſo " good a cheſs-player, that an Italian, who was ex- " ceedingly well ſkilled in that game, and who was " looking for as good a player as himſelf, having " played with him, without knowing who he was, " and loſing the game, cried; *O c'l diabolo, o il " Signor Peliſſonono*, i. e. This is either the Devil or " Mr. Peliſſon. . . . . The family of the *Peliſſons* is " alſo deſcended by the females, from that of du " Bourg (29), which is famous for the great Anne " du Bourg, Counſellor in the Parliament of Paris, " and by Anthony *du Bourg*, Chancellor of France " under Francis I. and from that of the *Cavaignes*, " (whoſe heirs they have been) and of Preſident *Man- " ſencal*. . . . . I would ſay more, had not *John " Peliſſon* wrote a book profeſſedly on the praiſes of " *Raymond Peliſſon*, and of the city of Chambery, " printed at Lyons by Gryphius (30)." The Author, from whom I have tranſcribed this long paſſage, informs us elſewhere (31), that Claude Peliſſon was *Knight of the Order of St. John of Jeruſalem, two hundred years ſince* (32); and that the Peliſſons *ſprang from an Engliſhman, Attorney General to the Prince of Wales, when he was in Guyenne.*

(29) See *The Hiſtory of the French Academy*, p. m. 61.

(30) Peter Borel, *Threſor des Antiquitez Gauloiſes & Francoiſes*, p. 233.

(31) Ibid. p. 377.

(32) This work of Peter Borel was printed in 1655.

(a) Moſt of the particulars of this article, are extracted from a paper of Dr. Robert Hooke, who tranſcribed them from a manuſcript of John Aubery, Eſq;

☞ PELL (JOHN), an eminent Engliſh Mathematician in the 17th Century (a), was ſon of Mr. John Pell, and Grandſon of Mr. John Pell of Southwyke in Suſſex, and was deſcended of an antient family in Lincolnſhire. His mother was of the family of the Hollands in Kent. He was born at Southwyke, of which place his father was Miniſter, March 1, 1610-11. His father died when he was but five or ſix years old. He was educated in Grammar-learning at the Free-ſchool of Stenning, a Market-town in Suſſex, under Mr. John Jefferies; and at thirteen years of age went to Trinity College in Cambridge as good a ſcholar as moſt Maſters of Arts in the Univerſity; and though he underſtood the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages extremely well, yet he never ſtood at any Election of Scholars or Fellows of his College. His perſon was handſome; and the habit of his body ſtrong; and therefore ſcarce ever uſing recreations, he proſecuted his ſtudies with great vigour. In 1630 he took the Degree of Maſter of Arts, and the year following was incorporated of the Univerſity of Oxford. In 1632 he married Ithamaria, ſecond daughter of Mr. Henry Reginolles of London, by whom he had four ſons and four daughters. Beſides the languages he was now Maſter of the Arabick, Italian, French, Spaniſh, and High and Low Dutch. In December 1643, he went to Amſterdam, where he was appointed Profeſſor of the Mathematicks next after *Martin Hortenſius*, and read with great applauſe publick Lectures upon Diophantus, as his learned Collegue Gerard John Voſſius teſtifies in his book *De Scientiis Mathematicis* (b), where he ſtyles him a *perſon of various Erudition, and a moſt acute Mathematician.* In 1646 the Prince of Orange ſent for him to be Profeſſor of Philoſophy and Mathematicks in the *Schola Illuſtris* at Breda, founded that year by his Highneſs. The year following he publiſhed at Amſterdam in 4to, *Controverſia cum Chriſtiano Longomontano de verâ Circuli Menſura* [A]; and in 1651 his *Idea of Mathematicks*, addreſſed to *Samuel Hartlib*, Eſq; was printed at London in 12°. at the end of Mr. John Dury's *Reformed School* [B]. While he lived at Breda, he had for his pupil William Lord Brereton, who was ſent thither by his Grand-

(b) Cap. 10.

[A] *Publiſhed at Amſterſtam in 4to*, Controverſia cum Chriſtiano Longomontano de vera Circuli Menſurâ.] Monſieur Baillet mentions this diſpute between *Longomontanus* and our Author, in the following paſſage (1). " Monſieur *Des Cartes*, *ſays he*, was " drawn into an engagement with the Chief Mathe- " maticians of Europe, partaking in the famous con- " troverſy, which aroſe that year [1645] between " *Longomontanus* and *Pell*, about the ſquaring of the " Circle. . . . . *Longomontanus* . . . . had undertaken " to demonſtrate the quadrature of the Circle, a rock, " on which the greateſt genius's have hitherto ſplit; " nor was he more ſucceſsful in his attempt than o- " thers before him, notwithſtanding the high opi- " nion, which he had entertained of his labour. " Mr. *John Pell*, an Engliſhman, Profeſſor of Ma- " thematicks in the College of Amſterdam, imme- " diately diſcovered a great deal of falſe reaſoning " in it; and * ſeeing that the point of the difficulty " conſiſted in the proof of one ſingle theorem, he " firſt made the demonſtration of it by himſelf, and " reſolved to propoſe the thing to all the ableſt Ma- " thematicians of his acquaintance, and deſired their " opinion of it. They who examined it † and ſent him " their demonſtrations, were Meſſieurs *Roberval, le " Pailleur, Carcavi, Mydorgius*, and Father *Merſen- " nus*, who was returned from his travels into Italy " about the beginning of July; Sir *Charles Caven- " diſh*, and Mr. *Hobbes* of England, *John Adolphus " Taſſius*, a Mathematician of Hamburgh, *John " Lewis Wolzogen*, a free Baron of Auſtria, Gentle- " man of the Bedchamber to the King of Poland, a " Carteſian in Philoſophy, and a Socinian in Reli- " gion; Father *Bonaventure Cavalieri*, an Italian, " Profeſſor of the Mathematicks in Bologne; *Golius*, " Profeſſor at Leyden, and ſome other Dutch Mathe- " maticians. Monſieur *Des Cartes* likewiſe ſent to " Mr. *Pell* a ſhort demonſtration upon the ſame ſub- " ject, which ſerved much to authorize what he had " advanced againſt *Longomontanus*."

(1) *Vie de Des Cartes*, Tom. 2. p. 274. ad ann. 1645.

* *Vit. Hobbian. Auctar.* p. 15 and 16.

† Lipſtorp. *Specim. Philoſ. Cartes.* p. 14.

[B] *In* 1651 *his* Idea of Mathematicks, *addreſſed to* Samuel Hartlib, *Eſq; was printed at London in* 12*mo. at the end of Mr.* John Dury's Reformed School.] This little Volume is entitled, *The Reformed School; and the Reformed Librarie Keeper, by* John Durie. *Whereunto is added*, 1. *An Idea of Mathematicks.* 2. *The Deſcription of one of the chiefeſt Libraries, which is in Germanie, erected and ordered by one of the moſt learned Princes in Europe.* Our Author's *Idea of Mathematicks* in Latin, is printed in Mr. Hooke's *Philoſophical Collections*, N°. V. p. 127. & ſeqq. with the following pieces, *viz.* 1. A cenſure upon it by Father *Merſennus*, dated November 1, 1639, to whom it had been ſent by Mr. *Theodore Haak*, in October that year. 2. Mr. *Pell's* anſwer to *Merſennus's* Cenſure, dated at London 21 November 1639. 3. *Merſennus's*

Grandfather George Earl of Norwich, and made a great progreſs in Algebra under our author. In 1652 Mr. Pell returned to England; and in 1654 was ſent by Cromwell, then Lord Protector, to the Proteſtant Cantons of Swiſſerland, where he chiefly reſided at Zurich, with the title of *Ablegatus*, but afterwards had orders to continue there with that of *Reſident*. June 23, 1658, he took his leave of the Cantons at Zurich in a Latin ſpeech; and returned to England ſo ſhort a time before Cromwell's death, that he had no opportunity of ſpeaking with him. In his Negotiations abroad he did no ill ſervice to the intereſts of King Charles II. and the Church of England. March 31, 1661, he was ordained Deacon by Dr. Robert Sanderſon, Biſhop of Lincoln; and in June following was ordained Prieſt by the ſame Prelate. The ſame year he was preſented by Dr. Gilbert Sheldon, Biſhop of London, to the Rectory of Fobbing in Eſſex, ſituated in ſo unhealthful a place, that ſeven Curates have died there in the ſpace of ſixteen years. In 1663 he was preſented to the Rectory of Laindon with the Chapel of Bartelſdon annexed, in the ſame county. Upon the promotion of Biſhop Sheldon to the See of Canterbury, he became one of his domeſtick Chaplains, being then Doctor of Divinity; "and expected ſoon after, *ſays* Mr. Wood (*c*), to be made a Dean; but not being a perſon of activity, as others who mind not learning are, could never riſe higher than a Rector. "The truth is, he was a ſhiftleſs man as to worldly affairs, and his tenants and relations "dealt ſo unkindly with him, that they cozened him of the profits of his Parſonages, "and kept him ſo indigent, that he wanted neceſſaries, even paper and ink, to his dying "day." He was caſt into the King's Bench-Priſon for debt. In March 1682 he was invited by Dr. Whiſtler to live in the College of Phyſicians, where he continued till June;

(*c*) *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 253, 2d edit.

ſennus's Reply, dated 10 December, 1639. 4. Des Cartes's judgment and approbation of Mr. *Pell's Idea*, dated February 8, 1640. As the Engliſh copy of this *Idea* is very rare to be met with, we ſhall give the reader a large account of it. He obſerves to Mr. Hartlib, that the ſum of what he had heretofore written or ſpoken to that Gentleman concerning the *Advancement of the Mathematicks*, is this; that as long as men want *will*, *wit*, *means*, or *leiſure*, to attend thoſe ſtudies, it is no marvail if they make no great progreſs in them: to remedy which our Author conceives theſe means not to be amiſs.

I. To write a *Conſiliarius Mathematicus*, anſwering to theſe three Queſtions.

Qu. 1. What *fruit* or *profit* ariſeth from the ſtudy of the Mathematicks?

Qu. 2. What *helps* are there for the attaining this profitable knowledge?

Qu. 3. What *order* is to be obſerved in uſing theſe helps?

To this purpoſe it ſhould contain,

1. A plain and popular Diſcourſe of the Extent of the Mathematicks, with the profit that redounds, firſt to the ſtudent himſelf, and then to the country, wherein there are many ſuch grounded artiſts.

2. A *Catalogue* of Mathematicians and their works in this order:

1. A Synopſis of all the ſeveral kinds of mathematical Writings, either extant in print, or acceſſible Manuſcripts in publick Libraries, with ſeveral numbers ſet to every kind.

2. A Chronological Catalogue of all Mathematicians names, that ever were of note, according to the order of the years, when any of their works were firſt printed.

3. A Catalogue of the Writings themſelves, in the order of years, in which they were printed in any language. And this ſhould be contrived thus: firſt, the year of our Lord, and then the names of all the mathematical books printed that year in any country or language, after the uſual manner of catalogues; but 1. adding the Volume, that is, not only what fold (4to. 8vo. *&c.*) but alſo the number of leaves, that we may eſtate the bulk of the book. 2. Prefixing before the title the year, to which you muſt look back to know either when it was written, or when it was laſt before printed in that or any other language. 3. Setting in the margin after the title, firſt, the year, wherein it was the next time printed; ſecondly, the number of references to the Synopſis in the firſt page; by which numbers one may preſently run over all the books of one ſort, of this or that particular ſubject. 3. A Counſel directing a ſtudent to the beſt books in every kind, in what order, and how to read them; what to obſerve, what to beware of in ſome Mathematicaſters, how to proceed and keep all.

4. A *Paræneſis*; firſt, to all thoſe, who have means and leiſure, and a wit not unapt for theſe ſtudies, to ſet upon them in regard, 1. Of their profitableneſs to the ſtudent and to mankind. 2. Of that more refined pleaſure of hunting out hidden truths, wreſtling with difficult problems, and getting the victory; and ſo much the rather, becauſe, 3. Of the great facility, that is now in that ſtudy, by reaſon of the many helps to ſpare much labour, time, and coſt, which our Forefathers were forced to ſpend. Secondly, to all thoſe, who have underſtanding to eſtimate the worth of theſe ſtudies, and wealth, wherewith to purchaſe themſelves laſting honour by the wiſe diſpenſing of it, to take more notice of this ſort of ſtudents, and to encourage them, ſetting apart the choiceſt of them to perfect the inventions, to which their genius leads them. Eſpecially, to all Princes and States whom it concerns to take a courſe, 1. That their Dominions may be better furniſhed with this ſort of ſtudies: 2. That the way may be made leſs laborious and coſtly. 3. That *Mathematica Ingenia* may be diſcovered and aſſiſted.

To which end it would be good;

II. To erect a publick Library, containing all thoſe books, and one inſtrument of every ſort, that hath been invented, with ſufficient revenue;

1. To buy one copy of all thoſe, that ſhall be printed yearly in other countries. And,

2. To maintain a Library-keeper of great judgment, to whom it may belong, 1. To peruſe all books of ſuch ſubjects to be printed within that country; and ſuppreſs whatſoever is not according to art, that learners be not abuſed; and to admoniſh the writers, if they being nothing but ſtale ſtuff. 2. Upon his credit to approve excellent inventions, and impartially to commend the inventors to the rewarders. 3. To receive, record, and place one printed copy of every book ſo peruſed, ſent into the Library, well bound at the Author's or Bookſeller's charge. 4. To reſolve any ſtudent, that enquires about any problems, whether it hath been done already or no, fearing leſt he ſhould *actum agere*, and therefore perhaps ſuppreſſing ſome invention, which he hath light upon, but doubts, it is old, and to be found in ſome of the books of that Library. 5. To receive, *&c.* all ſuch Manuſcripts, as ſhall be brought thither by way of gift, legacy, or the like. 6. To maintain correſpondence with ſuch as himſelf in other countries, to know what is printed there. 7. To take notice of all his countreymen, that are fit to be teachers. 8. To keep a catalogue of all ſuch workmen as are able and fit to be employed in making mathematical inſtruments and repreſentations, working upon wood, magnets, metals, glaſſes, *&c.* 9. To give teſtimonial, after examination, to all ſorts of practiſers, as pilots, maſters, landmeters, accomtants, *&c.* of their ſpeculative ability and practical dexterity,

June; and then was obliged by his ill ſtate of health to a Grandchild of his living in St. Margaret's Church-yard Weſtminſter. He died in Dyot-Street in the Pariſh of St. Giles's in the Fields, in the houſe of Mr. Cothorne, Reader of that Church, on Saturday December 12, 1685; and was interred at the expence of Dr. Richard Buſby, Maſter of Weſtminſter-ſchool, and Dr. John Sharp, Rector of St. Giles's, in the Vault under that Church,

dexterity, that thoſe, that have occaſion to uſe ſuch men, be not abuſed by unable undertakers, to their exceeding great damage.

By the *Catalogue* men muſt be informed, in that multitude of books, with which the world is now peſtered, what the names are of thoſe books, that tend to this ſtudy only. In the *Library* they might find the books themſelves, read them, and if they liked them, know whither to ſend to buy them. Beſides, any, whether foreigners or others, might have recourſe thither, and learn what helps that country would afford them in theſe ſtudies.

And this is the beſt courſe that I can think on, ſays our Author, for the making uſe of *ſuch helps as we have already*. If men deſire *better helps*, let them employ fit artiſts,

III. To write and publiſh theſe *three new treatiſes*;

1. *Pandectæ Mathematicæ*, comprehending as clearly, orderly, thriftily, and ingenuouſly as may be, whatſoever may be gathered out of all thoſe mathematical books and inventions, that were before us, or that may be inferred as conſectaries thereon; citing, at the end of every period or propoſition, the antienteſt Author, in which it is found; and branding all later Writers, if they be taken ſtealing or borrowing without acknowledgment, or (which is worſe) expreſsly arrogating to themſelves any other man's inventions. This would bring that *great library* into far leſs room, to the ſaving of more *Labour*, *Time*, and *Coſt*, to all Students, than men can yet well imagine. But becauſe this alſo would be too great and cumberſome to carry about us, let there be compoſed

2. *Comes Mathematicus*, comprehending in a pocket-book (and therefore as briefly as may) the uſefulleſt tables, and the precepts for their uſe, in ſolving all problems, whether purely mathematical, or applied to ſuch practices as men's various occaſions may require.

And laſtly, that in this kind of learning alſo, we be no longer tied to books, let there be compoſed

3. *Mathematicus* αὐτάρκης, or, an Inſtruction, ſhewing how any Mathematician, that will take the pains, may prepare himſelf ſo, as that he may, though he be utterly deſtitute of books or inſtruments, reſolve any mathematical problem, as exactly as if he had a complete library by him.

" And this is the *idea*, *continues our Author*, which " I have long framed to myſelf, according to my " faſhion, with whom this paſſeth for an undoubted " truth, that the ſureſt way to come to all poſſible " excellence in any thing, is to propoſe to ourſelves " the perfecteſt ideas, that we can imagine; then to " ſeek the means tending thereto as rationally as " may be; and to proſecute it with indefatigable " diligence; yet, if the *idea* prove too high for us, " to reſt ourſelves content with approximation.

" As for the preſent *idea*, I am ſo far from counting it *merely-impoſſible*, that I ſee not why it might " not be performed by one man, without any aſſiſtants; provided that he were neither diſtracted " with cares for his maintenance, nor diverted by " other employments.

" The excellency of this work makes me wiſh " mine own nation the honour of firſt undertaking " and perfecting this deſign. And I conceive I have " ſome reaſon to hope that it will be ſo. For " though I know few or none, that are willing " to promote deſigns of this nature, yet can I " not therefore be perſuaded, that this Kingdom " is ſo deſtitute of learned Nobility and Gentry, " that there can be found none to countenance " and advance this part of learning, even in this " way, if they could ſee it poſſible and likely to be " effected.

" As for the *library* and *catalogue*, there can be " no doubt but that they may be eaſily had, if mo- " ney be not wanting. Nor is it unlikely, that di- " vers of this nation (if they be ſet apart for it) are " able to compoſe the other *three new treatiſes*. For " though I know no ſuch, yet I perſuade myſelf " there may be found amongſt us, men able to incoun- " ter all the difficulties, and to endure all the la- " bour, that they muſt needs meet with in the raiſ- " ing of ſo great a fabrick. And I the rather be- " lieve, that there are many ſuch, becauſe for mine " own part, notwithſtanding the want of counſel " and helps in that ſtudy, and the innumerable di- " verſions and diſtractions that I have had, I am " nevertheleſs come to ſuch a confidence of my un- " derſtanding the depth of that ſtudy, that, were " I to pen thoſe *Pandects*, I ſhould lay heavier laws " upon myſelf, than I have already mentioned; " namely, firſt to lay down ſuch an exact method or " deſcription of the proceſs of man's reaſon in inven- " tions, that afterwards it ſhould be imputed merely " to my negligence and diſobedience to my own " laws, and not to their inſufficiency, if from my " firſt grounds, ſeeds, or principles, I did not, in an " orderly way, according to that preſcribed method, " deduce, not only all that ever is to be found in our " anteceſſors writings, and whatſoever they may " ſeem to have thought on, but alſo all the mathe- " matical inventions, theorems, problems, and pre- " cepts, that it is poſſible for the working wits of " of our ſucceſſors to light upon; and that in one cer- " tain unchanged order, from the firſt ſeeds of ma- " thematicks, to their higheſt and nobleſt applica- " tions, as well as to the meaneſt and moſt ordinary. " Not ſetting them down at random, as they come in " my head, as thoſe before us have done; ſo that " they ſeem to have light upon their problems, and " the ſolution of them by chance, not to have found " them by one perpetual, conſtant, invariable pro- " ceſs of art. Yet ſuch an art may men invent, if " they accuſtom themſelves, as I have long done, to " conſider, not only the *uſefulneſs* of men's works, " and the *meaning* and *truth* of their writings, but " alſo how it came to paſs, that they fell upon ſuch " thoughts, and that they propoſed to themſelves " ſuch ends, or found out ſuch means for them." *Were theſe* Pandects *thus made and finiſhed, I ſuppoſe it is manifeſt, that by their orderly, rational, and uniform completeneſs, above all that hath been hitherto written, they would ſpare after-ſtudents much labour and time, that is now ſpent in ſeeking out of books, and diſorderly reading them, and ſtruggling with their cloudy expreſſions, unapt repreſentations, different methods, confuſions, tautologies, impertinencies, falſhoods by paralogiſms and pſeudographemes, uncertainties, becauſe of inſufficient demonſtrations,* &c. *beſides much coſt alſo, now thrown away upon the multitude of books, the greater part whereof they had perhaps been better never to have ſeen.*

And it may be, ſome would like the method of that work ſo well, as to extend it farther, and apply it to other ſtudies; in ſpeculation imitating this my warineſs, that no falſhood be admitted, and no truth omitted; and for practice inuring themſelves, any ſubject being propounded, to determine the number of all the problems, that can be conceived concerning it; and any problems being propounded, demonſtratively to ſhew either all the means of its ſolution, or the impoſſibility of it; and if ſo, then whether it be not yet or not at all poſſible.

Men eaſily ſee how to contract theſe Pandects into a pocket-book for their ordinary uſe; but ſo to lay them up in their heads, as to need no book at all (according to that Deſideratum *of mine, to have a* Mathematicus αὐτάρκης) *will perhaps ſeem utterly impoſſible to moſt; no man, that ever I heard of, having propoſed ſuch a ſcope to himſelf before. But perhaps they will conceive it more poſſible, if it pleaſe them to ſuſpend their judgments, till they have conſidered what means may be uſed to fortify the imagination, to prompt the memory, to regulate our reaſon, and what effects may be produced by the uniting of theſe means, and the conſtant exerciſing them.*

For mine own part, the conſideration of the incomparable excellency, unſtained pleaſure, unvaluable profitableneſs,

Church, called the Rector's Vault. Beſides the books above-mentioned, he wrote ſome others [C].

bleneſs, and undaunted poſſibility of this whole deſign, hath prevailed ſo far with me, that notwithſtanding all the diſcouragements that I have met withal, I have done more towards it than a bare Idea.

[C] *Beſides the books above-mentioned, he wrote ſome others.*] He publiſhed without his name an *Exercitation concerning Eaſter*, printed in 1664, in 4to. He drew up *A Table of ten thouſand ſquare numbers, namely, of all the ſquare numbers between* 0 *and an hundred Millions, and of their ſides and roots, which are all the whole numbers between* 0 *and ten thouſand. With an Appendix concerning the endings or laſt figures of all ſquare numbers.* London 1672, folio. He publiſhed his *Inaugural Oration* made at his entering upon his Profeſſorſhip at Breda. He demonſtrated the *ſecond* and *tenth Books* of *Euclid*, which piece was in manuſcript in the Library of the Lord Brereton of Cheſhire; as likewiſe *Archimedes's* Ψαμμίτης, and the greateſt part of *Diophantus's* ſix Books of Arithmetick. He alſo made great alterations and additions to *Rhonius's Algebra*, printed at London 1668, in 4to. under the following title: *An Introduction to Algebra, tranſlated out of the High Dutch into Engliſh, by* Thomas Brancker, *M. A. Much altered and augmented, by* D. P. [i. e. Dr. Pell.] *Alſo a Table of odd numbers leſs than one hundred thouſand, ſhewing thoſe that are incompoſit, and reſolving the reſt into their factors or coefficients,* &c. *ſupputated by the ſame* Tho. Brancker. Mr. Brancker in his *Preface*, dated at Whitegate in Cheſhire, April 22, 1668, writes thus: "The title-page ſays that "this book was a *Tranſlation*, but hath been *much* "*altered.* If any man deſire to know what the al- "terations are, and why they are made, he may do "well to compare it with the original; a printed "copy whereof may be had at Francfort in Ger- "many by any that enquires there for it by this title: "*Algebra Rhonii Germanicè: Tiguri apud Bodmerum,* "1659, in 4to. The copy, which I have, was * Mr. F. T. "given me *anno* 1662, by a good friend *, who "then told me he much deſired to read it in ſome "language that he underſtood: I then promiſed him "to Engliſh it. As ſoon as my leiſure permitted, I "corrected it according to the printed catalogue of "*Errata*, and then began the tranſlation. When it "was finiſhed, I deſired to ſee it printed, and got "it licenſed May 18, 1665, with the name of *An* "*Introduction to Algebra*; and ſo without any altera- "tion, either in the precepts or examples, ſave only "the correction of many miſtakes, it was ſent to "the preſs, with order to reprint the ſix leaves of "his *Table of Incompoſits* preciſely as they ſtand there. "A little after I heard that there was at that time Dr. J. P. "in London, a perſon of note, very worthy to be "made acquainted with my deſign, before I made "any farther progreſs in the impreſſion. Being ad- "mitted to ſpeak with him, I found him not only "able to direct me, but alſo very willing ſo to do, "ſo far as his leiſure would admit. He gave me "divers cautions concerning the work; he ſhewed "me the way of making the Table of Incompoſits, "of examining it, and of continuing it as far as I "would. He encouraged me to extend it to an "hundred thouſand; telling me, that by that time "that I had calculated and printed that Table, he "hoped to be at leiſure to review ſome of Monſieur "*Rhonius's* Problems, and to work them anew, and "that he would ſend them to me, with leave to pub- "liſh them or to keep them by me. I had finiſhed "and printed that Table, as alſo twelve ſheets of "the book itſelf, before he ſent me his alterations. "They begin with Probl. 24. p. 100. All from "thence to the end in his work; as pag. 79, 80, "81, 82, which he ſent laſt of all. So that inſtead "of the firſt 124 pages of *Rhonius*, this hath juſt "twice as many. Inſtead of theſe 8 or 9 ſheets re- "maining in *Rhonius*, how much ſhall be hereafter "publiſhed, I will not adventure to foretel, becauſe "of the uncertainty of life, health, leiſure, and of "the acceptance, which this ſhall find amongſt the "lovers of theſe ſtudies, to whom this might have "been more acceptable, if it had been wholly void "of preſs-faults." Soon after the publication of this book, Dr. *John Wallis* wrote the following letter to Mr. *John Collins*, F. R. S. communicated to us by *William Jones*, Eſq; F. R. S.

"SIR,

"I ſend you here incloſed what in my letter by "the laſt poſt I promiſed; which is the reſult of my "Examen of Mr. *Branker's Table of incompoſite Num-* "*bers.* I do not pretend to have made it ſo exact, but "that ſome errors may poſſibly have eſcaped mee. "You ſee I have increaſed Mr. *Branker's* Catalogue "of *Amendments*, p. 198. by a pretty conſiderable "number. Yet was my Examen in the performance "but ſlight, though upon ſuch grounds, as if accu- "rately perſued, are demonſtrative enough. But ſo "to do, would have taken up more time than I was "willing to employ about it. Yet, as it is, I believe that "many errors have not eſcaped mee. I think it pro- "per enough to print, in one ſingle leaf to be ad- "joined to Mr. *Branker's* book, this Catalogue as I "have here drawn it up; unleſs you think fit to "tranſmit it firſt (or a copy of it) to Mr. *Branker*; "that if he have ſince diſcovered any miſtakes, which "I have miſſed, theſe may be added to theſe. One "or two of thoſe, which I have inſerted, are no "other then ſuch faults as the preſſe made by rea- "ſon of ſome letters not appearing (being overtopped "by their neighbours) and which poſſibly in all co- "pies may not appear to be faults, or ſuch as might "have no ill influence, (as at number 31001, and num- "ber . . . 47 and 6'0701;) but I find hee had led "mee the way in ſome others of the like nature at "number 29599, 58901, 466 . ., 641 . ., 659 . .; "and it can do no hurt. In his Catalogue I find the "number 60779 miſ-written for 60799; and at "number 91793, 17 is written inſtead of 13, (the "latter of which he takes notice of in the *Errata* "at the beginning, but not of the former. The "reaſon why I took this pains myſelf, and give you "this trouble, is becauſe it is ſo very requiſite, that "a table of this nature ſhould bee accurate; where "the ſenſe or concomitants give ſo little help to diſ- "cover an error, and the whole certainty thereof "(unleſs a man be at the pains to calculate anew "upon every occaſion) depends upon the credit and "care of the calculator. And Mr. *Branker* having "been at the pains to calculate ſo large a table, I "would not have it blemiſhed or made unuſefull for "want of ſuch a Catalogue of Amendments. This "is all I ſhall trouble you with upon this occaſion, "reſting

"Your Friend to ſerve you,

"*John Wallis.*"

"I have received the books you ſent, and thank "you."

PENELOPE, daughter of Icarius, brother of Tyndarus King of Lacedæmonia, was Ulyſſes's wife; and became ſo famous for her chaſtity, that ſhe is propoſed as an example to this day, and is become proverbial. It is related that Ulyſſes obtained her for his wife by the good offices of Tyndarus (*a*), in return for ſome good counſel he had given him (*b*). Others ſay that he won her in a race; Icarius having declared to thoſe who were ſuitors to him for his daughter, that he would beſtow her on the ſwifteſt runner (*c*), and Ulyſſes was the man. He therefore may be compared to perſons who run in purſuit of a benefice, and who get themſelves poſſeſſed of it, by their having the ſwifteſt horſes. He could never be prevailed upon to live in Lacedæmonia, as his father-in-

(*a*) Apollodorus, *Bibliotb.* lib. 3. p. m. 217, 218.

(*b*) See in the article HELENA, (in the text) citat. (*a*), the advice ſhe gave to Tyndarus, with regard to Helena's marriage.

(*c*) Pauſan. lib. 3. p. 93.

in-law desired; but set out for Ithaca again, and was followed by his wife. Her behaviour, when her father, who was in pursuit of both, overtook them in the road, deserves particular notice [*A*]. Our new married couple had a very tender affection for each other, so that Ulysses did all that lay in his power, to prevent his going to the Siege of Troy (*d*): however, all his stratagems were defeated, and he was forced to quit his dear wife, who had brought him a son. It was twenty years before he saw her again. During this long absence, she was addressed by a great number of suitors [*B*], who urged her to declare her mind; but she eluded their addresses [*C*], till the return of her husband, who

(*d*) See the art. ULYSSES.

[*A*] *Her behaviour, when her father, who was in pursuit of both, overtook them in the road, deserves particular notice.*] Icarius, not having been able to persuade his son-in-law to live in Lacedæmonia, endeavoured to obtain his daughter's consent that she would reside there; but his entreaties could not prevail with her so far, as to make him so great a sacrifice, as is, the preferring her father's house to that of her husband. She therefore set out for Ithaca, with Ulysses. Her father finding they had eloped, got into his chariot, ran after, and overtook them; and again conjured his daughter to stay. Ulysses, quite tired with this importunity, told Penelope, that, in case she would follow him willingly, this would delight him much; and yet, if she chose rather to go back to Lacedæmonia, he would not hinder her. Tho' Penelope did not return any answer, and only let down her vail, yet Icarius discovered the dictates of her soul, and saw very plainly, that she was desirous of following her husband. He consented to it, and caused a statue of Modesty to be set up in that place. Ὀδυσσεὺς δὲ τέως μὲν ἠτίχετο, τέλος δὲ ἐκέλευε συνακολουθεῖν Πηνελόπην ἐκοῦσαν, ἢ τὸν πατέρα ἐλομένην ἀναχωρεῖν ἐς Λακεδαίμονα. Καὶ τὴν ἀποκρίνασθαί φασιν οὐδέν, ἐγκαλυψαμένης δὲ πρὸς τὸ ἐρώτημα, Ἰκάριος τὴν μὲν, ἅτε δὴ συνιεὶς ὡς βούλεσθαι ἀπιέναι μετὰ Ὀδυσσέως, ἀφίησιν· ἄγαλμα δὲ ἀνίδρυται Αἰδοῦς. ἐνταῦθα γὰρ τῆς ὁδοῦ προήκουσαν ἤδη τὴν Πηνελόπην λέγουσιν ἐγκαλύψασθαι. *Ulysses tandem victus hominis importunitate, puellæ optionem dedit, vel se ut sequeretur, si id mallet; vel cum patre Lacedæmonem rediret: ibi illam ajunt nihil sanè respondisse, sed faciem tantum velasse: Icarium cùm sibi probè nosse videretur, quid illa animi haberet, ut cum Ulysse abiret, permisisse: signum vero pudoris ea in viæ parte dedicasse; quò Penelope, cum faciem velavit, pervenerat* (1). We here have some strong characteristicks of a woman of virtue. Reason requires a wife to follow her husband, and nature requires it. Nevertheless, if it be left to her choice, either to go with her husband, or to stay with a father, who passionately desires it, she ought to be seized with a bashfulness that stops her voice, and shews, only by signs, the resolution she intends to take. The modesty and decency of her sex, will not permit her to declare her mind boldly and without blushing. Icarius was somewhat unreasonable; he requiring such a preference, as cannot be reconciled, either with the laws of nature, or the connubial rights. As instruction is conveyed in every part of God's word, it has been observed, that the Psalmist does not employ many arguments, to persuade a young woman, that she must prefer her husband's house to that of her father. It would be to no purpose to expatiate on arguments, to persuade such a circumstance; and for this reason, the sacred Spirit contents itself with promising that young woman, that she will be happy in children, and gain her husband's affection (2).

(1) Pausan. lib. 3. p. 104.

(2) Psalm 45. according to Marot's translation.

Escoute fille en beauté nonpareille,
Enten à moi, & me preste l'oreille:
Il te convient ton peuple familier,
Et la maison de ton pere oublier.
Car nostre Roi, nostre souverain Sire,
Moult ardemment ta grand' beauté desire:
Doresnavant ton Seigneur il sera,
Et de toi humble obeïssance aura.
(3). . . . . .
Ne plains donc pas de quitter pere & mere,
CAR *en lieu d'eux mariage prospere*
Te produira beaux & nobles enfans,
Que tu feras par tout Rois triomphans.

" But thou, O royal bride, give ear,
" And to my words attend;
" Forget thy native country now,
" And every former friend.
" So shall thy beauty charm the King,
" Nor shall his love decay;
" For he is now become thy Lord,
" To him due reverence pay.
. . . . . .
" Thou, in thy royal father's room,
" Must princely sons expect;
" Whom thou to diff'rent realms may'st send,
" To govern and protect. TATE and BRADY.

(3) It is here promised, that rich presents should be made her, and that she should be clothed magnificently; but this promise did not offer any thing new to a daughter of the King of Egypt. See the whole passage which I omit.

This Psalm is exceedingly beautiful, even when abstracted from its mystical sense, and considered merely as a piece of poetry. But here is a much more beautiful translation, than the old French of Clement Marot is now.

Tuque adeo regina audi; & rem pectore conde:
Nec mea dicta nega placidas demittere in aures:
Jam nunc & patriam & patrem oblivisce're, jam nunc
Ex animo caros penitus depone propinquos:
Unum oculis specta, unum animo complectere regem:
Regem oculis animoque, tuo qui pendet ab ore,
Unius & pulchris defixus vultibus hæret.
Hunc dominum agnosce, & supplex venerare: nec ille
Officio, studioque tibi concedet,
. . . . . ,
Neu desiderio nimium tangare tuorum
Virgo, tibi dulcem patrisque & matris amorem
Leniet adnascens sobolis generosa propago:
Quos regere imperio terras, totumque per orbem
Adspicies populos sceptris frænare superbos (4).

(4) Psalm 45. translated by Buchanan.

[*B*] *She was addressed by a great many suitors.*] Here follow the words of a learned Commentator. *The number of Penelope's suitors, according to Homer, amounted to* 108; *since he says,* Odyssey 16*th, that there were* 52 *from the island of Dulichium,* 24 *from the island of Samos,* 20 *from the island of Zacynthus, and* 12 *from Ithaca; all which numbers added together, make just* 108. *Eustatbius, in his Commentary on the first* Odyssey, *enlarges that sum considerably; he saying that, according to the opinion of some persons, they amounted to* 300 (5). Meziriac makes this remark, to justify the translation of these words of Ovid, *quid . . . alios referam,* which he explains *I omit above one hundred.* Here follows the whole passage from Ovid (6).

(5) Meziriac on Ovid's *Epist.* p. 101.

(6) Ovidius, *in Epist. Penelopes ad Ulyssem.*

Dulichii, Samiique, & quos tulit alta Zacynthos,
Turba ruunt in me luxuriosa proci.
Inque tua regnant nullis prohibentibus aula,
Viscera nostra tuæ dilacerantur opes.
Quid tibi Pisandrum, Polybumque, Medontaque dirum (7),
Eurimachique avidas, Antinoique manus,
Atque alios referam? quos omneis turpiter absens
Ipse tuo partis sanguine rebus alis.
Irus egens pecorisque Melanthius author edendi
Ultimus accedunt in tua damna pudor.

(7) Meziriac, p. 100, shews, that we must read, *Quid tibi Pisandrum, Polybum, Amphimedontaque dirum.*

" From Crete and Samos, Rhodes and Zant set out,
" To court me come a wild, unruly rout;
" Who revel in your house without controul,
" And eat and waste your means, our blood and soul.
" Of Medon, Polybus, Pysander, fell
" Eurimachus, alas! why should I tell?
" With many more, (you sadly out o'th' way)
" Feed here, and on your substance let them prey,
" The beggar Irus, and that goat-herd clown
" Melanthius, range and rummage up and down.
RYMER.

[*C*] . . . *she eluded their addresses.*] " Homer re-
" lates,

who deſtroyed them all. Great applauſes are juſtly beſtowed on her caution, in refuſing to treat Ulyſſes as her huſband, till ſhe was perfectly ſure that he was Ulyſſes [*D*]. Tho' her virtue has been celebrated by the greateſt Poet in the world, and by a numberleſs multitude of writers, yet ſlander has preſumed to attack it. Some ſay, that the reaſon why her gallants had not the laſt favour, was, becauſe they choſe to fare well at Ulyſſes's coſt, rather

" lates, in the ſecond and nineteenth Odyſſey, that " Penelope, to free herſelf from the importunity of " her ſuitors, declared to them, that ſhe would not " marry, till ſhe had finiſhed a piece of linen cloth " ſhe was weaving, to make a winding-ſheet for La- " ertes her father-in-law, when he ſhould die. In " this manner ſhe amuſed them for the ſpace of three " years, without ever finiſhing her web; becauſe " ſhe unravelled in the night, what ſhe had wove " in the day, which gave riſe to the proverb, Pene- " lope's web, employed, when works, which are " never ended, are ſpoken of (8)." This is Mezi- " riac's Commentary on the following lines of Ovid:

(8) Meziriac, on Ovid's *Epiſt.* p. 40.

Nec mihi quærenti ſpatioſam fallere noctem,
Laſſaret viduas pendula tela manus (9).

(9) Ovidius, *in Epiſt. Penelopes ad Ulyſſem.*

" Nor ſhould this pains to paſs the evenings take,
" And work and weave, ev'n till my fingers ake.

RYMER.

[*D*] . . . *till ſhe was perfectly ſure he was Ulyſſes.*] *Meziriac*, after the paſſage which I cited elſewhere (10), in which we find that Helena was deceived by the ſimilitude of features between Paris and her huſband, informs us of what follows. *Euſtathius obſerves*, on the 23d Odyſſey, that *Penelope believed much more prudently; for though ſhe imagined ſhe had ſome knowledge of Ulyſſes, ſhe yet would not indulge him the leaſt fondneſs, nor lye with him, till he had informed her of a great number of particulars, and ſhewn her ſeveral tokens, to aſſure her that he was truly her huſband, and that ſhe could not be miſtaken* (11). This caution uſed by Penelope ought to ſerve as a rule in every ſuch conjuncture; and, if a woman ſhould commit adultery, for not taking time ſufficient to come to the truth, it would be juſt to cenſure her. This is obſerved by Mr. Baſnage, in a fine work publiſhed by him. *Let us ſuppoſe*, ſays he (12), *a woman, who, in a tranſport of love for her real huſband, runs eagerly to a man whom ſhe takes to be him; this woman has no deſign to commit a miſtake; her eagerneſs cannot be blamed; it is lawful and juſt, if it is directed to her true huſband; in a word, her ignorance is involuntary, and merely the effect of a tender fondneſs. Nevertheleſs, if the woman in queſtion had been embraced by an adulterer, can we make an excuſe for her? Will ſhe feel no confuſion, when ſhe reflects on her warmth and precipitation? Will not theſe condemn her?* The Author of the critique on Maimbourg is of the ſame opinion, or very near it. I add this reſtriction, becauſe he hints, if ſuch a woman does not refuſe to enquire into things, from ſome blame-worthy motive, ſhe ought to be excuſed. Here follow his words (13). " I take it for granted, that if a wo- " man, deceived by the reſemblance there ſhould " be between her true huſband and another man, " ſhould grant this man all the privileges of the " marriage bed, her chaſtity would not ſuffer by it. " Though many may ſwear this is a paradox; I af- " firm, and repeat it again, ſuch a woman would " not do her huſband any real injuſtice; and he " would be the moſt unjuſt man upon earth, ſhould " he charge her with defiling the conjugal bed; but " this provided ſhe had not aſſiſted to impoſe upon " herſelf. For, if the impatience of recovering a " huſband made her overlook all the ſuſpicions ſhe " might entertain at the ſight of a man who ſhould " reſemble her huſband, and preſent himſelf under " that title; if, through the fear of not taſting, " without remorſe, the connubial pleaſures, ſhe ſhould " forbear to examine him thoroughly; in a word, " if ſhe ſhould believe him to be her huſband, be- " cauſe ſhe wiſhes him to be ſuch, for the reaſons I " hinted at; ſilencing every thing which might per- " mit her to doubt of it; I ſhould greatly leſſen the " good opinion I had entertained of her merit; and " will freely own, that I ſhould not blame her huſ- " band very much, were he to look upon her only " as half chaſte, and conſider her honour as very " fickle and unſtable . . . . (14)." Two men very " ſeldom reſemble one another ſo perfectly, but they " differ in ſomething or other; whence we may in- " fer, that a woman, who ſuffers herſelf to be im- " poſed upon, conducts herſelf very ſuperficially. " But excuſes are not wanting even on this occaſion; " for where do we hear of wives, who ſcruple to ad- " mit their huſbands, after ſome months abſence, " unleſs they firſt prove themſelves to be their huſ- " bands? When they come into their bed-chambers " in the duſk of the evening, before candles are " lighted, do they not go up to them; and are they " not ready to indulge them in every kind of complai- " ſance, without making any farther enquiry? Does " any one blame them for this? If they are not " blamed, why ſhould any cenſure be thrown on an " unhappy woman, impoſed upon by an impoſtor, " who ſhould have had all the indications of a huſ- " band, ſo far as could be diſtinguiſhed in a dark- " iſh room? It is plain, that if ſuch a one is blamed, " we ought to blame all wives, who behave in this " manner towards their true huſbands; for right " reaſon bids us not judge of things according to the " event; and, in the preſence of God, two actions " which reſult from the ſame cauſe, do not change " their ſpecies, though the one ſucceeds by accident, " and the other ſhould, by accident, be attended " with unhappy conſequences." To ſolve this difficulty, we muſt ſay, that every perſon, who acts raſhly, is to blame, whether evil does, or does not, reſult from it. Every perſon, to act conformably to the dictates of reaſon, ought to examine thoroughly all he does. I will take notice, occaſionally, of a precaution of Seneca. He affirms, that a man who knows his wife, at the ſame time that he imagines ſhe is another man's wife, commits adultery, but that the wife is innocent. But he does not reverſe the propoſition: he does not ſay that a man, who ſhould know another man's wife, upon the ſuppoſition that it was his own, would not ſin. I ſhall here inſert Seneca's words: they will prove that Jacob did not commit adultery the firſt time he knew Leah; but that Leah was guilty of that crime, from her being perfectly ſenſible that ſhe was not Jacob's wife (15).

(14) Ibid. p. 285, 286.

To return to Penelope. Thoſe who have read a certain paſſage of the *Hexameron ruſtique*, will perhaps imagine, that her precautions do not deſerve very much to be admired, becauſe Ulyſſes made himſelf ſuſpected, by the great eagerneſs with which he attempted to enjoy her. *What makes me judge that Homer intended to employ this beautiful artifice here, is, the impatience with which he repreſents Ulyſſes (in the twenty third book) and his eagerneſs to enjoy his wife. She had ſcarce time enough to know him again, and had hardly ſpoke three words to her, but he bluntly, and in the utmoſt tranſports, bids her nurſe Euriclea to get a bed ready for them* (16). Theſe are the words of La Mothe le Vayer, Author of the *Hexameron ruſtique*. This, will it be ſaid, ſuggeſts to us, that Penelope miſtruſted this eagerneſs; and imagined, that the only reaſon why this man was ſo eager, was, from his fear that the diſcovery of his impoſture would fruſtrate his deſires. Without examining what may be objected to this reaſoning, I ſhall content myſelf with one obſervation. La Mothe le Vayer is miſtaken, and does not underſtand the paſſage he hints at in Homer. Had he duly examined this part of the Odyſſey, he would have known that Ulyſſes did not deſire to have a bed prepared for him to lye with Penelope. He only deſired that a bed might be got ready for himſelf to lye down upon, ſince his wife did not vouchſafe to come near him, and treated him in a very cruel manner. His words are as follow:

(10) In the article HELENA, citat. (59).

(11) Meziriac, on Ovid's *Epiſt.* p. 438.

(12) Baſnage, *Traite de la Conſcience*, Tom. 1. p. 85. Amſterdam edit. 1696.

(13) *Nouvelles Lettres de l'Auteur de la Critique Generale de Maimbourg*, p. 277, 278.

(15) *Si quis cum uxore ſua tanquam cum aliena concumbat, adulter erit, quamvis illa adultera non ſit. Aliquis mihi venenum dedit, ſed vim ſuam remixtum cibo perdidit: venenum illud dando, ſcelere ſe obligavit, etiamſi non nocuit. Non minus latro eſt, cujus telum oppoſita veſte elapſum eſt. Omnia ſcelera etiam ante effectum operis, quantum culpæ ſatis eſt, perfecta ſunt.* Seneca, *de Conſtantia Sapientis*, cap. 7. p. m. 683.

(16) *Hexameron ruſtique*, p. m. 104, 105.

rather than lye with his wife [*E*]. Other Authors ſay, that they really enjoyed her, and that the God Pan was the fruit of their amours [*F*]; but ſome writers think it better to affirm,

Δαιμονίη, πῆ σοί γε γυναικῶν θηλυτεράων
Κῆρ ἀτίμαζον ἔθηκαν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες.
Οὔ μὲν γάρ κ' ἄλλη ὧδε γυνὴ τελέσειε θυμῷ
Ἀνδρὸς ἀφιξαίη, ὃς οἱ κακὰ πολλὰ μογήσας
Ἔλθοι εἰκοστῷ ἔτεϊ ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν.
Ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι μαῖα σθένος ἔμβαλε θάρσυνον τε,
Λέξομαι. ἡ γὰρ τῆγε σιδήρεον ἐν φρεσὶ θυμός (17).

(17) Homer. Od. lib. 23. ver. 166.

" And oh! my Queen! he cries, what power above
" Has ſteel'd that heart, averſe to ſponſal love?
" Canſt thou, Penelope, when Heaven reſtores
" Thy loſt Ulyſſes to his native ſhores?
" Canſt thou, oh cruel! unconcern'd ſurvey
" Thy loſt Ulyſſes on this ſignal day?
" Haſte Euryclea, and diſpatchful ſpread
" For me, and me alone, th' imperial bed.
" My weary nature craves the balm of reſt,
" But Heav'n with adamant has arm'd her breaſt."
POPE.

Penelope's coldneſs to Ulyſſes ſhocked Telemachus, and he cenſured his mother on that account with as much freedom as if he had ſpoke merely to a ſiſter: *Wretched mother*, ſays he (18), *you are mercileſs; no wife would behave in the manner you do towards a huſband. Your heart is ſtill harder than a ſtone.* Homer cannot be accuſed of committing a fault againſt the rules of probability; it being common enough for grown lads to ſpeak in ſuch terms: but then he ought not to have copied nature ſo faithfully, and ſhould have put reſpectful words into Telemachus's mouth.

(18) Ibid. ver. 97.

[*E*] *The reaſon why her gallants had not the laſt favour, was, becauſe they choſe to fare well at Ulyſſes's coſt, rather than lye with his wife.*] Horace ſuppoſes, that Tireſias gave to Ulyſſes no other reaſon for Penelope's chaſtity. If your Patron *loves women, do not wait till he ſhall intreat you: run to meet him, and offer him your Penelope with a gay and contented countenance.* Such was the advice which was given Ulyſſes, and here follows his anſwer: *How! think you I could make Penelope conſent to this; Penelope, whoſe conduct was ſo prudent and virtuous, that the long continued addreſſes of all her lovers have never been able to make the leaſt impreſſion.* Tireſias anſwers: *This was becauſe the young fellows, who frequented her houſe, did not care to beſtow much money; and were not ſo ſolicitous about their paſſion, as about eating and drinking. This is the reaſon why your Penelope was ſo prudent. But had ſhe once had to do with an antiquated lover, and divided the profits with you; this would have been ſo delicate a morſel, that ſhe would have been forced from it, with as much difficulty, as a wound from a bloody ſhin* (19). Dacier, who tranſlated thoſe lines of Horace in the manner related above, makes the following Commentary on them. Tireſias gives Ulyſſes no other reaſon for his wife's chaſtity than the avarice of her woers. And a circumſtance, which makes this whimſical enough, is its being grounded on a complaint which Penelope herſelf makes in the 18th book of the Odyſſes. *She tells them that they are very unjuſt; and that when ſeveral rivals court a woman with an intention to marry her, they offer ſacrifices at their own expence; and treat and beſtow valuable preſents on the friends of their miſtreſs, inſtead of eating up her ſubſtance.* They were nettled at this reproach: and therefore one ſent her a gown, another a necklace, a third earings, a fourth a bracelet, &c. But till then, (and this was a long time after the converſation which Ulyſſes is ſuppoſed to have here with Tireſias) they had not once thought of making her the leaſt preſent. It is therefore no wonder that they had ſuch little ſucceſs in their addreſſes to her: and I require no other proof to ſhew the falſity of what other Authors aſſert, *viz.* that ſhe had favoured them all (20). I have cited (21) ſome verſes of Ovid, which ſhew that Penelope's ſuitors uſed to riot moſt immoderately in her houſe.

(19) *Scortator erit, cave te roget: ultro Penelopen facilis potiori trade: putaſne, Perduci poterit tam frugi, tamque pudica, Quam nequiere proci recto depellere curſu? Venit enim magnum donandi parca juventus, Nec tantum Veneris, quantum ſtudioſa culinæ. Sic tibi Penelope frugi eſt: quæ ſi ſemel uno De ſene guſtarit, tecum partita lucellum Ut canis à corio nunquam abſterrebitur uncto.* Horat. Sat. 5. lib. 2. ver. 75. *Nos numerus ſumus & fruges conſumere nati Sponſi Penelopes.* Id. Ep. 2. lib. 1.

(20) Dacier's notes on Horace, Tom. 7. p. 421. Dutch edit.

(21) In the rem. [*B*].

(22) Lucius Joannes Scoppa Parthenopæus, *Collectaneorum*, lib. 1. cap. 32. This book was printed in 1507.

[*F*] *Other Authors ſay, that they really enjoyed her; and that the God Pan was the fruit of their amours.*] Some modern Authors have taken a pleaſure in compiling falſe teſtimonies on this ſubject. Lucius Joannes Scoppa (22) cites, in the firſt place, the following paſſage from the Priapeia.

Ad vetulam tamen ille (23) *ſuam properabat: & omnis*
Mens erat in cunno Penelopeia tuo.
Quæ ſic caſta manes, ut jam convivia viſas:
Utque ſututorum ſit tua plena domus.
E quibus ut ſcires quicunque valentior eſſet,
Hæc ea ad arrectos verba locuta procos:
Nemo meo melius nervum tendebat Ulyſſe:
Sive illi laterum, ſeu fuit artis opus.
Qui quoniam periit, modo vos intendite: qualem
Eſſe virum ſciera, vir ſit ut ille meus.
" Swift to his old Penelope he flew,
" Reſolv'd to claſp her in his longing arms.
" Such her chaſte life, that oft ſhe us'd to riot
" With wanton ſparks in his polluted houſe.
" To know the proweſs of theſe jovial blades,
" When warm they woo'd her, each ſhe thus addreſt:
" None better bent a bow than my Ulyſſes,
" Whether by ſtrength or art I cannot ſay.
" Now he is dead, let each his efforts try,
" That I may chooſe an active, vigorous huſband."

(23) *i. e.* Ulyſſes.

And then he cites the following words of Acron (24), *Penelope meretrix fuit, quæ amatores ſuos ſua pulcritudine luxurioſos reddebat*, i. e. " Penelope was a whore, " who, by her beauty, fired her lovers with a looſe " paſſion." After this he adds, that Lycophron the Poet ſays (25); *Penelopen concubitum omnium procantium paſſam, ex eorum uno genuiſſe filium nomine Pana: quod cum reditu cognoviſſet Ulyſſes ſtatim abiit ad inſulam Cortinam, & ibidem obiit*, i. e. " Penelope having ſport- " ed with all her gallants, had a ſon, named Pan, by " one of them; which, when Ulyſſes knew at his " return, he inſtantly went to the iſland Cortina, and " died there." He proceeds, and affirms that Duris of Samos related as follows: *Penelopen proſtituto pudore conſuetudinem cum omnibus procis habuiſſe: unde natus Pan qui caprinis pedibus* Tragoſceles *vocabatur*, i. e. " Penelope proſtituted her honour, and " engaged in a wanton commerce with all her gal- " lants; and from theſe intrigues ſprung Pan, who " was called Tragoſceles, becauſe he was born with " goat's feet." Francis Floridus (α) Sabinus wrote a chapter on this ſubject (26). He thinks it ſtrange that Petrarch (27) ſhould have believed Homer, in favour of Penelope, after having been ſo equitable as to reject, in Dido's favour, the authority of Virgil. He obſerves that theſe two Poets have been equally ſucceſsful; the one, in making Penelope paſs for a woman of virtue, though ſhe was unchaſte; the other, in making Dido be conſidered as a lewd woman, though ſhe was ſtrictly virtuous. He obſerves that Penelope was named βασσάρα καττωμύσσα by Lycophron, and he does not approve of Tzetzes's contradicting that Poet. *Duris Samius antiquus ſcriptor, cujus Plutarchus Pliniuſque aliique non pauci egregii ſcriptores mentionem faciunt, idem aſſeruit, ut Joannes Tzetzes Lycophronis interpres ait, quamvis eum communi Græciæ cauſſæ favens mentiri dicat. Illam vocem* καττωμύσσαν, πορνεύσαν, *hoc eſt ſcortantem exponens. Inquit autem:* Νῦν δὲ βασσάραν λέγει τὴν Πηνελόπην, καττωμύσσαι δέ, ἀντὶ τοῦ πορνεύσαι. Δῆρις γὰρ ὁ σάμιος ἐν τῷ περὶ ἀγαθοκλέους, φησὶ αὐτὴν συγγίνεσθαι πᾶσι τοῖς μνηστῆρσι, καὶ γενέσθαι τὰ τραγοσκέλη παῖδα. ὅπερ οὐκ ἀληθεύει, ὁ γὰρ ἐμὸς καὶ ἄλλης παιλάτος· καὶ ἕτερος δέ πῶν θεὸς καὶ ὑὸς ἱππίου (28), *i. e.* " Duris the Samian, an an- " cient writer, who is mentioned by Plutarch, Pliny, " and ſeveral other famous Authors, aſſerts the ſame " thing, as John Tzetzes the interpreter of Lyco- " phron relates, though he ſays that he told a lie, to " favour the common cauſe of Greece. He explains " the following word καττωμύσσαι, πορνεύσαι, that " is whoring. His words are as follow: *He now* " *calls Penelope* Baſſaram καττωμύσσαι, *that is, a* " *whore. For Duris the Samian, in his book on Aga-* " *thocles, ſays, that ſhe lay with her gallants; and that* " *ſhe brought forth Pan who had goat's feet.* But this " is not true; he being the ſon of Mercury and ano- " ther Penelope; and there was another who was ſon " to Jupiter and Hybris." He is of opinion that Homer, by this exerciſe of the bow which Penelope

(24) Acron. in 2 *Epiſt.* Horat. lib. 1.

(25) Lycophron does not ſay ſo.

(α) It ſhould be *Francis Fleuri*: at leaſt it is in this manner that Rabelais, book 5. chap. 19. cites this Author, who was his contemporary. REM. CRIT. [" This is a ve- " ry bad correc- " tion: the " true name of " this Italian " was *Florido*, " and Rabelais " was in the " wrong to tran- " ſlate it into " French by the " word *Fleuri*."] From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 971.

(26) It is the 2d of book 3. of *Lectionum ſubciſivarum*, of Franciſcus Floridus Sabinus.

(27) In an Italian poem, entitled, *i Triumfi*, which title he borrowed (according to Floridus) from a Greek Poet, who, according to Lactantius, lib. 1. cap. 11. *Divinarum Inſtitutionum*, had writ a book, entitled, *Triumphus Cupidinis.*

(28) Floridus Sabinus, *Lect. ſubciſivar.* lib. 3. cap. 2.

proposed

affirm, that she conceived Pan when Mercury, under the form of a goat, forcibly cropt her virgin-flower [G]. It is a pretty general opinion, that finding it impossible for them to

proposed to all her gallants, meant the amorous congress, and the trial she desired to make of their strength. *Quid verbis opus est? cum & ipse Homerus, cujus præconio Penelopes laus constat, ex suis operibus id colligi posse voluerit? An forte ille propositus procis arcus aliud significat quam eam, ut juvenum vires experiretur, id præcipue certamen quo se juvenes exercerent delegisse? At hoc quidem vel ex eo patet, quod his verbis* νευρὴν ἐντανύσαι, *id est* nervum intendere, *ad id quod volebat exprimendum, accommodatis admodum, frequenter utitur* (29), i. e. "What need I employ many words? "Since Homer himself, on whose credit Penelope's "praise depends, would have this inferred from her "own actions. Could the exercise, which she pro- "posed to the young men, (that of the bow) signify "any other than this; that she was desirous of mak- "ing a trial of their strength, in that combat in which "young men love chiefly to exercise themselves? "And this is evident from his often employing the "words to *bend the bow*, which is extremely well "adapted to express his meaning." He pretends that Ovid, having guessed the true meaning of Homer, intimates to us, that Penelope put her gallants to this trial (30): *Nam & Ovidius Homerum idem innuisse vult, cum ait libro primo Amorum,*

(29) Idem, ibid.

(30) Idem, ibid. This passage of Ovid is in Eleg. 8. of book 1. *Amorum.*

Penelope vires juvenum tentabat in arcu;
Qui latus argueret, corneus arcus erat.

i. e. "For Ovid will have Homer mean the same, "when he says in book I. *Amorum*;

"Virtuous Penelope is said t' have try'd
"With a strong bow, each lusty lover's side."

SEDLEY.

He does not omit the passage of Horace, nor that of the Priapeia which I have cited above; and he concludes with the testimony of Herodotus (31).

Dempster cites many Authors, but without accuracy. Being to prove that Pan was the son of Mercury and Penelope; *Ex adulterio eum susceptum à Mercurio, matre Penelope* (32); and that Mercury assumed the form of a goat when he enjoyed the woman in question (whence Pan's feet resembled those of a goat) he cites two Epigrams from the Anthologia (33), and a passage from Ausonius (34), which says only that Pan's were so formed; but not that this was owing to the shape which his father assumed when he lay with Penelope. Is it not ridiculous to employ such authorities? He says that Lysander, an antient Historian, relates the same thing as Duris, with regard to Penelope's lewd life; and he adds that Tzetzes (35) relates that Ulysses, unable to bear the infamous riotings which were carrying on in his house, returned to Circe, and was killed by his son Telemachus; and that Pausanias informs us that Ulysses repudiated his wife, because of her adulterous practices; and retired to Sparta, and a little after to Mantinea, where he died. Dempster ascribes to the husband what Pausanias relates only of the wife (36). To conclude, he says we may judge of the adulterous practices of Penelope by the presents she accepted, and her marrying her husband's murderer: not to mention that, to prevent her being mistaken in her choice, she discovered, by a very good proof, he who was the most vigorous of her sparks. *Probaturque impudicitia ex eo,* quod à procis munera acceperit, *quod meretricii animi certissimum argumentum,* Homer, *Lib.* 18. *Odyss.* & mariti sui Ulysses interfectori nupsit, *ex quo connubio natus Italus Jul. Hygin. fab. capit.* 127. *Ei ob id, ipse Ulysses apud Sabinum poëtam in responsoriis Epistolis:*

Tot juvenes inter, tot vina liquentia semper,
Hei mihi! quid credam? pignore casta manes?

..... *Et procorum habito delectu, ut fortiori, valentiorique posset concumbere, arcu tentabat singulos. Auctor incertus Priapeiorum carminum* (37). i. e. "This cir- "cumstance proves her lewdness, *viz. her accepting* "*presents from her wooers*, which is an infallible in- "dication of a lewd turn of mind; and *from her mar-* "*rying the murderer of her husband Ulysses*, from which "marriage sprang Italus. For this reason, Ulysses says "as follows, in the responsory Epistles, by Sabinus "the Poet:

"Whilst thus you riot midst so many youths,
"Alas! can I believe you still are chaste?

..... "And being to make choice of a lover, in "order to choose the lustiest and strongest of her "gallants, to lye with, she tried the strength of each "with a bow. See the uncertain Author of the "Priapeia." We may rely more on Meziriac's quotations. Some Authors (a), says he (38), *relate that Penelope, during the absence of Ulysses, made a trip in her honour, and brought forth the God Pan: but these Authors are divided into two opinions. Some say that Pan was the son of Mercury and Penelope. Of this opinion is Herodotus,* Lib. II. *Plutarch in the treatise of Oracles that ceased. The Scholiast of Pindar in the arguments of the Pythicks (Pythian games). Probus on the 4th Eclogue of Virgil: Lucian in the Dialogue of Pan and Mercury, and the Scholiast of Theocritus on the 7th Idyllium: But the two last add, that Pan* (39) *engaged in the amorous congress, under the form of a goat, with Penelope, whence Pan was born with goat's horns and feet. . . . . Others say that Penelope prostituted herself to all her gallants; and that, from their blended seed, sprang the God Pan. Thus Lycophron calls Penelope* βασσάραν σιμῶς κασσωρύσσαν, a whore, committing fornication honourably. Tzetzes says on this subject, Δῆρις ὁ Σάμιος, &c. (40). . . . *Certain Scholias which are not yet printed, on the Flute of Theocritus, mention the two opinions, saying that Pan, according to some, was the son of Mercury and Penelope, and according to the rest, of Penelope and all her gallants* (41). I am to observe that Claudius du Verdier (42) is very much offended at Lycophron. He cannot pardon him for saying that Penelope prostituted herself; a circumstance he refutes by his own Scholiast, and the following lines from Ovid:

(38) Meziriac on Ovid's *Epist.* p. 117. (a) Meziriac has omitted to enumerate among these Authors, Cicero, lib. 3. cap. 56. *de Nat. Deor.* REM. CRIT.

(39) It should be Mercury.

(40) See the sequel of this passage, citat. (28)

Penelope mansit, quamvis custode careret,
Inter tam multos intemerata procos.

"Penelope, tho' left without a guard,
"She yet was spotless midst so many wooers."

(41) Add to this the following words of Barthius in Statium, Tom. 1. p. 334, 335. *Quam* (Penelopen) *cum omnibus procis rem habuisse scripserunt, & inde natum* Panem, *nomine à multis Patribus ducto. Scholiastes Theocriti in Idyllium* (A). Τὸν Πᾶνα εἰ μὲν λέγεταν υἱὸν Πηνελόπης, καὶ πάντων τῶν μνηστήρων, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο λέγεσθαι καὶ Πᾶνα.

[G] *When Mercury, under the form of a goat, forcibly cropt her virgin-flower.*] This story is related in Lucian, with this remarkable circumstance, that Mercury forgot his having atchieved this feat. Pan went to him, in order to get himself acknowledged or owned, but finding himself received with a scornful countenance, he produced his proofs. Do not you remember, says he, your having formerly ravished a young Lady of distinction in Arcadia? What signifies your biting your nails, and humming and hawing? It was Penelope, Icarius's daughter. She told me, that my goat's horns and feet proceeded from your having concealed yourself under the form of that animal, in order to enjoy her. By Jove, replied Mercury, I do remember, in some little measure, my having done something of that kind (43). This is a very surprizing slip of the memory. The instances of Divine forgetfulness, alledged by the defender of Voiture, are not so strange as this. Costar relates that Jupiter's memory failed him on some occasions. *I have now forgot*, says he (44), the *name of the Deity, who had so much trouble to make him recollect the wonderful expedient he had formerly hit upon, to reconcile two decrees of fate which evidently contradicted one another: and, by the way, it was on this occasion he took so much pains, that he was all over sweat; and from this sweat cabbages sprung.* I do not know whether some Authors have said, that he sometimes forgot his amorous conquests. They indeed were so numerous, that his memory might have been at a stand on that occasion; and yet I believe we know not one instance of his forgetfulness on that head. Mercury might be cited for that purpose. I am to observe,

(42) Claudius Verderius, *Censura in Auctores*, p. 45.

(43) Νὴ Δία μέμνημαί ποτέ σε τοιοῦτόν τι πεποιηκότα. *Per Jovem memini me tale quiddam fecisse.* Lucian. *in Deor. Dialog.* Tom. 1. p. 176.

(44) Costar, *Defense de Voiture*, p. m. 116.

(31) Ἐκ ταύτης γάρ, *inquit de Penelope loquens,* καὶ ἑρμέων λέγεται γένεσθαι ὑπὸ ἐλλήνων ὁ πᾶν. *i. e.* ex hac enim & Mercurio Pan à Græcis genitus dicitur. Idem, ibid. The passage of Herodotus is in chap. 145. book 2.

(32) Dempsterus, *in Paralipomenis ad Antiquitates Romanas Rosini*, lib. 3. cap. 2. p. m. 432.

(33) The 84th and 85th, of chap. 12. book 4.

(34) Auson. *Eidill.* 3. *Mosella*, ver. 174. in the Amsterdam edit. of Ausonius 1671. It is *Eidyll.* ver. 172.

(35) In Lycophron.

(36) See the rem. [I].

(37) Dempsterus, *in Paralipom. ad Antiq. Rom. Rosini*, lib. 3. cap. 2. p. 443.

to enjoy the Miſtreſs, they attacked her female attendants, and debauched them [*H*]. The inhabitants of Mantinea uſed to ſay, that ſhe died in their city [*I*]. Thoſe who affirm, that the reaſon why Homer applauded her ſo much, was, becauſe he deſcended from her, do not argue very juſtly [*K*]. The reader will ſee in the remark where I treat of this, that Penelope ſurvived Ulyſſes, and married again. I ſhall make particular mention of the

ſerve, by the way, that Coſtar had taken this ſtory from Rabelais, his antagoniſt reproaching him with it. *I found this*, ſays he (45), *a very cold ſweat; and Rabelais, from whom you ſtole ſo ingenious a thought, might have formerly paſt for an excellent buffoon, but he now makes very few laugh.*

(45) Girac, *Reponſe a la Defenſe de Voiture*, p. 92.

[*H*] *They attacked her female attendants, and debauched them.*] This we may read in the Odyſſey; in which we alſo read, that after Ulyſſes had put to death his wife's gallants, he commanded that ſuch female ſervants as had diſhonoured his houſe by their lewdneſs, ſhould be beat to death with ſwords; but Telemachus, judging them to deſerve a more ignominious death, gave orders for their being hanged.

Θωϊμίτναι ξίφεσιν ϛυγνήκεσιν, ἰσόσε πασῶν
Ψυχὰς ἐξαφίλοισθε, κὴ ἐκλελαθοιτ' Ἀφροδίτης
Τὴν ἄρ' ὑπὸ μνηστῆρσιν ἔχον, μίσγοντό τε λάθρῃ (46).
. . . . . .
Τοῖσι δὲ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν.
Μὴ μὲν δὴ καθαρῷ θανάτῳ ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἑλοίμην
Τάων αἳ δὴ ἐμῇ κεφαλῇ κατ' ὀνείδεα χεῦαν,
Μητέρι θ' ἡμετέρῃ, παρά τε μνηστῆρσιν ἴαυον.
Ὣς ἄρ' ἔφη, κὴ πεῖσμα νεὸς κυανοπρῴροιο, &c. (47).

(46) Homerus, *Odyſſ.* lib. 22. ver. 443.

(47) Idem, ibid. ver. 461.

" Drive to yon court without the palace wall,
" And the revenging ſword ſhall ſmite them all.
" So with the ſuitors let them mix in duſt,
" Stretch'd in a long oblivion of their luſt.
. . . . . .
" Thus, thus, the prince; to theſe ſhall we afford
" A fate ſo pure, as by the martial ſword?
" To theſe, the mighty proſtitutes to ſhame,
" And baſe revilers of our houſe and name? &c.
POPE.

It is remarkable, that, of fifty female attendants, only twelve abandoned themſelves to their miſtreſs's gallants (48). I muſt not omit an obſervation of Ariſtotle, that thoſe who quitted philoſophy, to devote themſelves to other ſciences, acted like Penelope's lovers. Some think this thought not very juſt. *Cum Ariſtoteles* NIMIO *philoſophiam ſtudio complectebatur, aſſerere non dubitabat eos qui reliquas artes conſectarentur, hanc vero negligerent, eſſe Penelopes procis ſimiles, qui ut Homerus, cum domina potiri nequiviſſent, ad ancillas divertebant* (49), *i. e.* " As Ariſtotle applied himſelf " too intenſely to the ſtudy of philoſophy, he declared, that thoſe who devoted themſelves to other " ſciences, and neglected this, acted like Penelope's " gallants, who, according to Homer, becauſe they " could not enjoy the miſtreſs, had recourſe to the " maids." This is a lame compariſon: for the perſons in queſtion, did not prefer the maids to the miſtreſs, like thoſe who neglect philoſophy, to apply themſelves to other ſtudies: the only reaſon why they courted the maids was, becauſe their miſtreſs had given them a repulſe. Plutarch ſays, that Bion made uſe of this compariſon. Ἀσϛείως δὲ κὴ Βίων ἔλεγεν ὁ φιλόσοφος, ὅτι ὥσπερ οἱ μνηϛῆρες τῇ Πηνελόπῃ πλησιάζειν μὴ δυνάμενοι, ταῖς ταύτης ἐμίγνυντο θεραπαίναις. οὕτω κὴ οἱ φιλοσοφίας μὴ δυνάμενοι κατατυχεῖν, ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις παιδεύμασι τοῖς ἠδιόνος ἀξίοις, ἑαυτοὺς κατασκιλτεύουσι. *Urbanum eſt etiam Bionis philoſophi dictum, qui ajebat, ſicut Penelopes proci quum non poſſent cum Penelope concumbere, rem cum ejus ancillis habuiſſent: ita qui philoſophiam nequeunt apprehendere, eos in aliis nullius pretii diſciplinis ſeſe conterere* (50).

(48) Τὰν δώδεκα πᾶσαι ἀναιδείης ἐπίβησαν, Οὔτ' ἐμέ τινα ϛέργουσαι οὔτ' αὐτὴν Πηνελόπειαν. *Harum duodecim omnes impudentiæ ſe dediderunt, Neque me honorantes, neque ipſam Penelopen.* Idem, ibid. ver. 424.

(49) Lucius Joannes Scoppa, *Collectaneorum*, lib. 1. cap. 32.

(50) Plutarchus, *de Liberis educandis*, p. 7. C.

[*I*] *The inhabitants of Mantinea uſed to ſay, that ſhe died in their city.*] Pauſanias (51) furniſhes me with the proof I want; and I will employ Meziriac's words, which are a faithful tranſlation. *Pauſanias deſcribing one of the roads which went from the city of Mantinea, to Orchomenus*, ſays as follows; *On the right hand ſide of the road, we ſee a bank, or little riſing ground, which the Arcadians relate to have been Penelope's ſepulchre; but what they relate, does not agree with the poem called* Threſprotides; *for there it is ſaid, that Penelope, after Ulyſſes was returned from Troy, had a ſon by Ulyſſes, who was named Ptolyporthes; whereas the people of Mantinea affirm, that Ulyſſes having demonſtrative proofs, that Penelope had invited her gallants to her houſe, turned her out of his houſe; and that ſhe went, firſt to Sparta, and a little after to Mantinea, and there died* (52).

(51) Lib. 8. p. 247.

It is affirmed, Tom. 1. of the Chevræana (53), that Pauſanias *ſays that Ulyſſes, being returned from Troy*, Penelope, *who had indulged her gallants the laſt favour, was delivered of a ſon called* Polyporthes (54); *that her huſband repudiated his lewd wife in the moſt ignominious manner*, &c. It is plain, Pauſanias does not ſay this. Of two traditions mentioned by him, the one advantageous, the other diſadvantageous to the Lady's memory; that which was advantageous declared, that Ulyſſes, after his return from Troy, had had that ſon by Penelope; but Chevreau pretends, that Pauſanias relates that her ſparks got this child, and that ſhe was divorced on account of her ſcandalous conduct on that occaſion.

(52) Meziriac, on Ovid's *Epiſt.* p. 116, 117.

(53) p. 388. Dutch edit.

(54) It ſhould be *Ptolyporthes.*

[*K*] *Thoſe who affirm, that the reaſon why Homer applauded her ſo much, was, becauſe he deſcended from her, did not argue very juſtly.*] Meziriac, having related what ſome Authors ſay, with regard to this Lady's lewdneſs, propoſes an objection to himſelf, and refutes it in the following manner (55). *As to what might be objected to all thoſe Authors, that it is not probable that Homer ſhould have propoſed as a true mirrour of chaſtity, and beſtowed ſo many applauſes on a lewd woman, and who, of all women, merited cenſure, two very good anſwers may be given. The firſt, that Homer, who, in the opinion of many perſons, lived in the time of the Trojan war, fell diſtractedly in love with Penelope; and, for her ſake, reſided a very conſiderable time in Ithaca, as Hermeſianax affirms, in his Athenæus, lib.* 12. *chap.* 8. *and therefore it is no wonder that he ſhould appear ſo fond of ſinging the praiſes of Ulyſſes and Penelope. It may be anſwered, ſecondly, that ſome are of opinion, that Homer deſcended from Ulyſſes, being the ſon of Telemachus and Polycaſte, or Epicaſte, Neſtor's daughter. Thus, in a little Greek book, entitled, the Combat, or the Diſpute between Homer and Heſiod, we find that the Emperor Adrian, enquiring of the Prieſteſs of Apollo, the country where Homer was born, and who were his father and mother, the following anſwer was made him.*

(55) Meziriac, on Ovid's *Epiſt.* p. 118.

Ἀγνωϛὸν μ' ἔρεαι γενεὴν κὴ πατρίδα γαῖαν
Ἀμβροσίᾳ ϛεμμῆνος. ἔδος δ' Ἰθακήσιός ἐϛιν.
Τηλέμαχος δὲ πατὴρ, κὴ Νεϛορίη Ἐπικάϛη
Μήτηρ, ἣ μιν ἔτικτε βροτῶν πολὺ πάνσοφον ἄνδρα.

" From me you'd know the long-concealed extraction
" Of that immortal warbler, and his country;
" In Ithaca, Telemachus begot him;
" The charming Epicaſte, Neſtor's daughter,
" Was mother to this wiſeſt of mankind.

Theſe two anſwers are weak; for if Homer had lived a conſiderable time in Ithaca, to wooe Penelope, he muſt be ranked among thoſe gallants whom he has ſpoke ſo much ill of; for, unleſs he had joined them, he muſt have made a very poor figure, and would even have been expoſed to many dangerous affronts. Thoſe young ſparks would not have permitted one man to make love to Penelope, without conſulting them. Add to this, that a Poet, who ſhould have a paſſion for a woman, would hardly make that woman's huſband the hero of a poem. Farther, had Homer known that Penelope proſtituted herſelf to ſo great a number of gallants, his paſſion for her would have prompted him to aſperſe her, ſo far from its being the motive to prompt him to beſtow ſo many elogiums on her. Jealouſy, ſpite, and the ſhame of having loved a woman who had diſhonoured herſelf, and not made any diſtinction between him and a crowd of worthleſs ſuitors, would have ſtrongly prompted him to aſperſe her. In fine, I obſerve,

the praiſe with which Auſonius crowned her [*L*].

obſerve, that we muſt not have recourſe to any other reaſons but the following: Ulyſſes was the hero of the poem; it was therefore neceſſary that his wife ſhould appear there as a heroine, at leaſt as an honeſt woman. It would be a violation of the moſt eſſential rules, not to ſuppreſs all the ſhameful actions committed by the wife of his hero. Meziriac adds, *that Ulyſſes having been murdered by Telegonus, Minerva adviſed Telemachus, Penelope and Telegonus, to carry his dead body to Circe, in the iſland of Ææa, and to bury it there: and that Telegonus, by the advice of the ſame Goddeſs, married Penelope, and Telemachus married Circe: that from Telemachus and Circe ſprung Latinus, from whom the Latins were ſo called: but that, from Telegonus and Penelope, came Italus, who gave his name to Italy* (56). Theſe are noble counſels, and highly worthy of Minerva. If Penelope followed them, I ſhould look upon thoſe as moſt worthy of credit, who declare her to have been extremely kind to her wooers, than ſuch as repreſent her ſo faithful to her huſband. It had been a crime to have married the involuntary murtherer of Ulyſſes; but ſhe would have done worſe than this, if Hyginus may be credited; ſhe would have married Ulyſſes's ſon.

(56) Meziriac, on Ovid's *Epiſt.* p. 119. He cites Hyginus, cap. 127; and he had ſaid that, according to Euſtathius on the 16th Odyſſey, *The Colophonian who wrote the Returns, ſays, that, at laſt, Telemachus married Circe, and Telegonus married Penelope.*

(57) *Intemerata pracis, & tot ſervavi per annos, Oſcula vix ipſi cognita Telemacho* Auſonius, *Epigramm.* 135. p. m. 83.

(58) Balzac, *Entretien* 39. p. m. 372.

[*L*] *I ſhall make particular mention of the praiſe with which Auſonius has crowned her* (57).] I will here tranſcribe a paſſage from Balzac's converſation (58). "Penelope's kiſſes were ſcarce known to her "ſon Telemachus, becauſe her ſon was not her "huſband, for whom ſhe reſerved all her kiſſes. "The Marquis of Montauzier was pleaſed with "theſe words, and I was perſuaded they would pleaſe "him. But you ſay, that he is reſolved to know "what author I had them from; and he is abſolutely "determined to know them from me, without your "aſſiſtance. . . . . Thoſe expreſſions, which pleaſe a "man, all whoſe pleaſures are chaſte, is the tranſlation, or rather the paraphraſe of the following "verſe, which a Latin poet (59) formerly imitated "from a Greek poet;

"*Oſcula vix ipſi cognita Telemacho.*

"I might add to the paraphraſe, which is ſhort, a "Commentary which is of no great length; and "I am inclined to do it, ſince you invite me to "ſpeak." This Commentary is as follows: *Mary de Medicis, whom we know to have been as chaſte as the poets repreſent their Penelope, was alſo like Penelope in this. Could you believe, that, during the four years of her regency, ſhe did not once kiſs the King her ſon? I was told this by an old Courtier of that age, who took the liberty to obſerve to her, that thoſe outward marks of affection, were neceſſary to procure the love of others, and particularly of children, becauſe they commonly are leſs moved by effects than appearances* (60).

(59) See here the ſame kind of policy employed by Balzac, as that I mentioned citat. (45). of the art. GONTAULT (Charles de): he does not name Auſonius, purpoſely to give the greater idea of his learning.

(60) Balzac, *Entretien* 39. p. 374.

☞ PENN (WILLIAM), an eminent Writer among the Quakers, was ſon of Sir William Penn [*A*] by Margaret his wife, daughter of John Jaſper, of Rotterdam in Holland, Merchant, and was born in the Pariſh of St. Catharine's near the Tower of London, on the 14th of October 1644 (*a*), and educated at a School at Chigwell in Eſſex, "where, at eleven years of age, ſays Mr. Wood (*b*), being retired in a chamber "alone, he was ſo ſuddenly ſurprized with an inward comfort, and (as he thought) an "external Glory in the room, that he has many times ſaid, that from that time he had "the Seal of Divinity and Immortality, that there was alſo a God, and that the ſoul of "man was capable of enjoying his Divine Communications." Afterwards he went to a private ſchool on Tower hill, and had likewiſe the advantage of a domeſtick tutor. In 1660 he was entered a Gentleman-Commoner of Chriſt Church in Oxford, and in October that year was matriculated as a Member of the Univerſity and a Knight's ſon (*c*). Here Mr. *Penn*, (who had before received an impreſſion from the preaching of one *Tho. Loe*, a Quaker) with ſome other ſtudents withdrew themſelves from the national method of worſhip, and held private meetings for the exerciſe of Religion, where they preached and prayed among themſelves. This giving great offence to the heads of the Colleges, our Author, though but ſixteen years of age, was fined for Nonconformity; but continuing ſtill zealous in his religious exerciſes, was at length expelled his College (*d*) Upon his return home he was ſeverely treated by his father on the ſame account, who at laſt turned him out of doors; but his paſſion afterwards abating, he ſent him to France in company with ſome perſons of Quality, where he continued a conſiderable time, and returned well ſkilled in the French language, and accompliſhed with a moſt polite and courtly behaviour. About the year 1666 his Father committed to his care and management a conſiderable eſtate in Ireland, which occaſioned his reſidence in that Kingdom; and by the preaching of *Tho. Loe* above-mentioned at Cork, was prevailed on to embrace the Religion of the Quakers, whoſe meetings he conſtantly frequented; in one of which at Cork in November 1667, he, with many others, was apprehended and impriſoned there, but, upon writing a letter

(*a*) *Life of William Penn*, p. 1. prefixed to the firſt volume of his works, edit. London 1726, in fol. And Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 1050. 2d edit.

(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) Wood, ibid.

(*d*) *Life*, p. 1, 2. Mr. Wood ſays, that he ſtaid two years at Chriſt-Church.

[*A*] *Sir* William Penn.] We have an account of him in his epitaph upon his monument in Redcliff church in Briſtol, which is as follows. "To the "juſt memory of Sir WILLIAM PENN, Knt. and "ſometimes General, born at Briſtol (1), *Anno* 1621, "ſon of Captain *Giles Penn*, ſeveral years Conſul for "the Engliſh in the Mediterranean; of the *Penns* "of Penns lodge in the county of Wilts, and thoſe "*Penns* of *Penn* in the county of Bucks, and by his "mother from the *Gilberts*, in the county of So"merſet, originally from Yorkſhire: addicted from "his youth to maritime affairs: he was made Captain "at the years of twenty-one, Rear-Admiral of Ire"land at twenty-three, Vice-Admiral of Ireland at "twenty-five, Admiral to the Straits at twenty"nine, Vice-Admiral of England at thirty-one, "and General in the firſt Dutch war at thirty-two. "Whence returning *anno* 1655, he was made a "Parliament-Man for the town of Weymouth; 1660 "made Commiſſioner of the Admiralty and Navy, "Governor of the town and fort of Kingſale, Vice-"Admiral of Munſter, and a Member of that Pro"vincial Council; *anno* 1664, was choſen Great "Captain-Commander under his Royal Highneſs, "in that ſignal and moſt evidently ſucceſsful fight "againſt the Dutch fleet. Thus he took leave of "the ſea, his old element, but continued ſtill his "other employs, till 1669, at what time, through "bodily infirmities contracted by his care and fatigue "of public affairs, he withdrew, prepared, and "made for his end; and with a gentle and even "gale in much peace arrived, and anchored in his "laſt and beſt port at Wanſtead, in the county of "Eſſex, the 16th of Sept. 1670, being then but "forty-nine years and four months old. To his name "and memory his ſurviving Lady hath erected this "remembrance."

(1) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 1050, ſays, at *Myney* in *Wiltſhire.*

[*B*] *Writing*

letter to the Earl of Orrery [*B*] was ſoon diſcharged. His father being informed of his inclination to Quakeriſm, ſent for him to England, and finding him inflexible to all arguments to the contrary [*C*], turned him out of doors a ſecond time; though his anger was not carried ſo far, but that when our Author was impriſoned for being at the meetings of the Quakers, he would privately uſe his intereſt to procure his diſcharge. About the year 1668 he became a publick preacher among the Quakers (*e*); and the ſame year publiſhed his firſt piece, entitled, *Truth exalted* [*D*], and ſoon after, another, called, *The Guide miſtaken* [*E*], and a third, entitled, *The Foundation miſtaken* [*F*]. This year he was committed cloſe priſoner to the Tower of London, where he wrote ſeveral treatiſes, particularly his *No Croſs no Crown* [*G*]; and being diſcharged after ſeven months impriſonment, in September 1669 went to Ireland, where he preached among the Quakers, and wrote ſome pieces [*H*]. In 1670 the Conventicle Act, prohibiting the meetings of Diſſenters

(*e*) *Life*, p. 2, 3, 4.

[*B*] *Writing a Letter to the Earl of Orrery.*] It was as follows.

" To the Earl of *Orrery*, Lord Preſident of *Munſter*.

" The occaſion may ſeem as ſtrange as my cauſe " is juſt; but your Lordſhip will no leſs expreſs your " charity in the one, than your juſtice in the other. " Religion, which is at once my crime and my inno- " cence, makes me a priſoner to a Mayor's malice, " but mine own freeman; for being in the aſſembly " of the people called *Quakers*, there come ſeveral " Conſtables backt with Soldiers, rudely and arbi- " trarily requiring every man's appearance before " the Mayor; and amongſt others violently haled " me with them. Upon my coming before him, he " charged me for being preſent at a *tumultuous* and " *riotous* aſſembly; and, unleſs I would give bond " for my good behaviour, who challenge the world " to accuſe me juſtly with the contrary, he would " commit me. I aſked for his authority, for I hum- " bly conceive, without an Act of Parliament, or " an Act of State, it might be termed too much " officiouſneſs. His anſwer was, *A Proclamation in* " *the year* 1660, and new *Inſtructions* to revive that " dead and antiquated order. I leave your Lordſhip " to be Judge, if that Proclamation relates to this " concernment. That only was deſigned to ſuppreſs " Fifth-monarchy killing ſpirits; and ſince the " King's Lord-Lieutenant, and yourſelf, being fully " perſuaded the intention of theſe called *Quakers*, by " their meetings, was really the ſervice of God, have " therefore manifeſted a repeal by a long continuance " of freedom, I hope your Lordſhip will not now " begin an unuſual ſeverity, by indulging ſo much " malice in one, whoſe actions favour ill with his " neareſt neighbours; but that there may be a ſpee- " dy releaſement to all, for attending their honeſt " callings, with the enjoyment of their families, " and not to be longer ſeparated from both.

" And though to diſſent from a national Syſtem " impoſed by authority, renders men Hereticks, yet " I dare believe your Lordſhip's better read in reaſon " and theology, than to ſubſcribe a maxim ſo vulgar " and untrue; for imagining moſt viſible conſtitu- " tions of religious government, ſuited to the nature " and genius of a civil empire, it cannot be eſteem- " ed Hereſy, but to ſcare a multitude from ſuch en- " quiries, as may create diviſions fatal to a civil " policy; and therefore at worſt, deſerves only the " name of diſturbers. But I preſume, my Lord, the " acquaintance you have had with other coun- " tries, muſt needs have furniſhed you with this in- " fallible obſervation, that diverſities of faith and " worſhip, contribute not to the diſturbance of any " place, where moral unanimity is barely requiſite " to preſerve the peace. It is not long ſince you " were a good Solicitor for the liberty I now crave; " and concluded no way ſo effectual to improve or " advantage this country, as to diſpenſe with free- " dom in things relating to conſcience; and, I ſup- " poſe, were it riotous and tumultuary, as by ſome " vainly imagined, your Lordſhip's inclination, as " well as duty, would entertain a very remote opi- " nion. My humble ſupplication therefore to you " is, that ſo malicious and injurious a practice to in- " nocent Engliſhmen, may not receive any counte- " nance or encouragement from your Lordſhip; for " as it is contrary to the practice elſewhere, and a " bad argument to invite the Engliſh hither; ſo, " with ſubmiſſion, will it not reſemble that clemency " and Engliſh ſpirit, that hath hitherto made you " honourable.

" If in this caſe I may have uſed too great a li- " berty, it is my ſubject; nor ſhall I doubt your " pardon, ſince by your authority I expect a favour, " which never will be uſed unworthy an honeſt man, " and

" Your Lordſhip's faithful, *&c.*

" *W. P.*"

[*C*] *Finding him inflexible to all arguments to the contrary.*] The Writer of his *Life* (2) prefixed to his *Works*, tells us, that *his Father finding him too fixt to be brought to a general compliance with the cuſtomary compliments of the times, ſeemed inclinable to have born with him in other reſpects, provided he would be uncovered in the preſence of the King, the Duke, and himſelf. This being propoſed, he deſired time to conſider of, which his Father ſuppoſing to be with an intention of conſulting his friends, the Quakers, about it, he aſſured him, that he would ſee the face of none of them, but retire to his chamber till he ſhould return him an anſwer. Accordingly he withdrew, and having humbled himſelf before God with faſting and ſupplication, to know his heavenly mind and will, he became ſo ſtrengthened in his reſolution, that returning to his father he humbly ſignified, that he could not comply with his deſire.*

(2) p. 4.

[*D*] *His firſt piece, entitled,* Truth exalted.] The whole title is as follows. *Truth exalted: in a ſhort but ſure teſtimony againſt all thoſe Religions, Faiths, and Worſhips, that have been formed and followed in the darkneſs of Apoſtacy; and for that glorious light, which is now riſen and ſhines forth in the Life and Doctrine of the deſpiſed* Quakers, *as the alone good old way of life and ſalvation. Preſented to Princes, Prieſts, and People, that they may repent, believe, and obey. By* William Penn, *whom Divine Love conſtrains in an holy contempt to trample on Egypt's Glory, not fearing the King's wrath, having beheld the Majeſty of him, who is inviſible.*

[*E*] The Guide miſtaken.] It is an Anſwer to Mr. John Clapham's Book, entitled, *A Guide to the true Religion.*

[*F*] The Sandy Foundation ſhaken.] It was printed in 4to, with this title: *The Sandy Foundation ſhaken: Or, Thoſe ſo generally believed and applauded Doctrines of One God ſubſiſting in three diſtinct and ſeparate perſons, the impoſſibility of God's pardoning ſinners without a plenary ſatisfaction, the juſtification of impure perſons by an imputative Righteouſneſs, refuted from the authority of Scripture-Teſtimonies and right Reaſon. By* William Penn, *jun. and builder on that foundation which cannot be moved.* This book is written againſt Mr. *Thomas Vincent*, a Preſbyterian Miniſter.

[*G*] *His* no Croſs no Crown.] It was printed in 1669 in 4to. and reprinted in 1681 in 8vo. with this title: *No Croſs no Crown: A Diſcourſe ſhewing the Nature and Diſcipline of the holy Croſs of Chriſt; and that the denial of ſelf and daily bearing of Chriſt's Croſs is the alone way to the reſt and kingdom of God. To which are added the living and dying teſtimonies of many perſons of fame and learning, both of antient and modern times, in favour of this treatiſe.* In two parts.

[*H*] *Wrote ſome pieces.*] Among others he wrote *A Letter to the young Convinced*, publiſhed in his works.

[*I*] *Being*

ſenters under ſevere penalties, he was committed to Newgate in Auguſt that year for preaching in Grace-Church-ſtreet, and being tried for the ſame, with Mr. William Mead, at the Seſſions held at the Old-Baily, in Sept. following, they were acquitted by the Jury [*I*]. Sept. 16 the ſame year his father died, and being perfectly reconciled to him, left him both his paternal bleſſing and a plentiful eſtate (*f*). About this time he held a publick diſpute at Weſt-Wicomb Buckinghamſhire, concerning the univerſality of the Divine Light, with Mr. Jeremiah Ives, an eminent Baptiſt Preacher. This winter he publiſhed his *ſeaſonable Caviat againſt Popery* [*K*]. February 5, 1670-1, he was committed to Newgate for preaching at a Meeting in Wheeler-ſtreet in London; and during his impriſonment, which continued ſix months, wrote ſeveral treatiſes [*L*]. After his diſcharge he went over into Holland and Germany. In the beginning of the year 1672 he married Gulielma Maria, daughter of Sir William Springett, formerly of Darling in Suſſex, who had been killed during the Civil Wars at the Siege of Bamber; and ſoon after his marriage he ſettled with his family at Rickmerſworth in Hartfordſhire. The ſame year he publiſhed a piece, entitled, The *Spirit of Truth vindicated* [*M*], and another againſt *Reeve* and *Muggleton* [*N*], and ſome other tracts in that and the following years [*O*]. In

(*f*) Ibid. p. 4—35.

[*I*] *Being tried .... with Mr.* William Mead, *at the Seſſions held at the Old-Baily in September following, were acquitted by the Jury.*] An account of this trial was publiſhed in 1670 in 4to. under this title: *The People's antient and juſt Liberties aſſerted, in the trial of* William Penn *and* William Mead, *at the Seſſions held at the Old-Baily in London, the firſt, third, fourth, and fifth of September* 1670, *againſt the moſt arbitrary procedure of that Court.*

The Preface to the Reader begins thus: "If ever "it were time to ſpeak or write, it is now, ſo many "ſtrange occurrences requiring both. How much "thou art concerned in this enſuing trial, where "(not only the priſoners, but) the fundamental laws "of England have been moſt arbitrarily arraigned, "read, and thou mayſt plainly judge. Liberty of "Conſcience is counted a pretence for Rebellion; "and religious aſſemblies, routs and riots; and the "defenders of both are by them reputed factious "and diſaffected. *Magna Charta* is *Magna Far*—— "with the Recorder of London; and to demand "right, an affront to the Court. Will and power "are their *Great Charter*; but to call for England's, "is a crime, incurring the penalty of their Bale-"dock and naſty hole; nay, the menace of a gag "and *iron ſhackles* too. The Jury, though proper "Judges of law and fact, they would have over-"ruled in both, as if their verdict ſignified no more, "than to echo back the illegal charge of the bench. "And becauſe their courage and honeſty did more "than hold pace with the threat and abuſe of thoſe, "who ſate as Judges, after two days and two "nights reſtraint for a verdict, in the end were "fined and impriſoned for giving it." Soon after this there was publiſhed a pamphlet, ſaid to be written by Sir *Samuel Starling*, Lord Mayor of London, who had been ſeverely reflected on in this trial, and printed at London 1671, in 4to, with this title: *An Anſwer to the ſeditious and ſcandalous pamphlet, entitled,* The Tryal of W. Penn and W. Mead, at the Seſſions held at the Old Baily, London, the 1, 3, 4, 5 of Sept. 1670. *contained in four Sections. Sect.* I. *The Deſign of the Rebellious Pamphlet diſcovered.* II. *The Scandals againſt the then Lord Mayor, Sir* Thomas Bloodworth, *and Sir* John Hovel, *Recorder, anſwered.* III. *The Juſtice and Honour of that Court vindicated, by a true and impartial Relation of that whole Tryal.* IV. *The fining of that Jury, that gave two contrary verdicts, juſtified, to prevent a failure of Juſtice in London. Written by* S. S. *a Friend to Juſtice, and Courts of Juſtice.* The Author of this piece owns (3) that the Recorder ſpoke thus upon the Trial: "Till "now I never underſtood the reaſon of the policy "and prudence of the *Spaniards*, in ſuffering the "*Inquiſition* amongſt them. And certainly it will ne-"ver be well with us, till ſomething like unto the "*Spaniſh Inquiſition* be in England." Mr. Penn wrote an anſwer to this, entitled, *Truth reſcued from Impoſture, or a brief Reply to a meer Rhapſody of Lies, Folly, and Slander, but a pretended* Anſwer to the Trial of W. Penn and W. Mead, *&c. writ and ſubſcribed,* S. S.

(3) p. 29.

[*K*] *His* ſeaſonable Caveat againſt Popery.] The whole title is, *A ſeaſonable Caveat againſt Popery; or, A Pamphlet, entitled,* An Explanation of the Roman Catholick Belief, *briefly examined.*

[*L*] *During his impriſonment, which continued ſix months, wrote ſeveral treatiſes.*] He wrote his *great Caſe of Liberty of Conſcience debated and defended by the Authority of Reaſon, Scripture, and Antiquity,* London 1670, in 4to. *Truth reſcued from Impoſture,* mentioned in the note (*I*). *A cautionary Poſtſcript,* to his book, called, *Truth exalted. A ſerious Apology for the Principles and Practiſes of the People called* Quakers, *againſt the malicious Aſperſions, erroneous Doctrines, and horrid Blaſphemies of* Thomas Jenner, *and* Timothy Taylor, *two Preſbyterian or Independent Preachers, in their book, entitled,* Quakeriſm anatomiz'd.

[*M*] *A piece entitled,* The Spirit of Truth vindicated.] The whole title is: *The Spirit of Truth vindicated againſt that of Error and Envy, unſeaſonably manifeſted in a late malicious Libel, entitled,* The Spirit of the Quakers tried, *&c.*

[*N*] *Another againſt* Reeve *and* Muggleton.] It was entitled, *The new Witneſſes proved old Hereticks: or, Information to the ignorant; in which the Doctrines of* John Reeve *and* Lodowick Muggleton, *which they ſtile Myſteries never before known, revealed, or heard of, from the foundation of the World, are proved to be moſtly antient Whimſies, Blaſphemies, and Hereſies, from the Evidence of Scripture, Reaſon, and ſeveral Hiſtorians. Alſo an Account of ſome Diſcourſe between* L. M. *and myſelf, by which his blaſphemous, ignorant, and unſavoury Spirit is clearly and truly manifeſted, in Love to the immortal Souls of thoſe few, who are concerned in the belief of his Impoſtures. By a living true Witneſs to that one eternal Way of God, revealed in the Light of Righteouſneſs,* W. Penn. London 1672, in 4to. In this book our Author confutes the following notions of *Reeve* and *Muggleton, viz.* 1. "That God "is not an infinite ſpirit in every place at all times; "but is in the ſhape of a man; and that man, in "reſpect of his body, is the image of God. 2. That "God did not create the heavens and earth out of "nothing, but the ſubſtance was with God from "eternity. 3. That the ſoul of man is generated "and begot by the man and woman with the body; "and that the body and ſoul are inſeparable. "4. That the body and ſoul go to the duſt, and riſe "together at the general reſurrection. 5. That God "deſcended with his body in the ſhape of a man, "and diſſolved himſelf into the Virgin's womb, and "ſo brought forth himſelf a man, who, after he "had lived to ſuch an age, was crucified, and really "died, or ceaſed to be either God or man, for three "days and nights. 6. That God from all eternity, "without any other inducement than his own plea-"ſure, hath decreed ſome for ſalvation, and ſome "for damnation; contrary to which, all their obe-"dience or rebellion ſhall be in vain, to alter his "determination."

[*O*] *And ſome other tracts in that and the following years.*] He wrote, *Plain-dealing with a traducing Anabaptiſt: or, three letters writ upon occaſion of ſome ſlanderous Reflections given and promoted againſt* William Penn, *by one* John Morſe. London 1672, in 4to. *A Winding-ſheet for* Controverſy ended. London 1672. in 4to. in anſwer to Mr. Henry Hedworth's *Controverſy*

In 1677 he travelled into Holland and Germany, in order to propagate the Principles of Quakeriſm; and had frequent converſations with the Princeſs Elizabeth [P] daughter of the Queen of Bohemia, and ſiſter to the Princeſs Sophia, grandmother to his preſent Majeſty (g). In 1678 and the following year he publiſhed ſeveral Tracts [Q]. In 1681 King Charles II. in conſideration of the ſervices of our Author's father, and ſundry debts due to him from the Crown at the time of his deceaſe, by letters patents dated March the 4th, 1680-1, granted Mr. Penn and his heirs, that Province lying on the Weſt ſide of the River Delaware in North America, formerly belonging to the Dutch, and then called the new Netherlands. The name was now changed by the King in honour of our Author, whom and his heirs his Majeſty made abſolute Proprietors and Governors of that countrey. Upon this he publiſhed a *Brief Account of the Province of Penſylvania* [R], with the King's patent, and their papers relating thereto, deſcribing the country and its produce, propoſing an eaſy purchaſe of lands and good terms of ſettlement for ſuch, as were inclined to remove thither: many ſingle perſons and ſome families out of England and Wales went over, and having made and improved their plantations to good advantage, and begun to build the city of *Philadelphia*, the Governor, in order to ſecure the new planters from the native Indians, appointed Commiſſioners to confer with them about land, and confirm a league of Peace (h), by whom he ſent a letter to the Indians [S]. He drew up likewiſe

(g) Ibid. p. 35——115.

(h) Ibid. p. 115——121.

verſy ended. The propoſed Comprehenſion ſoberly and not unſeaſonably conſidered. London 1672, in 4to. Quakeriſm *a new nick-name for old Chriſtianity; being an Anſwer to a book, entitled,* Quakeriſm no Chriſtianity, *ſubſcribed by* J. Faldo. *In which the Riſe, Doctrine and Practice of the abuſed* Quakers *are truly, briefly, and fully declared and vindicated, from the falſe Charges, wicked Inſinuations, and utmoſt Oppoſition made by that Adverſary.* 1672, in 8vo. *The Invalidity of* John Faldo's Vindication *of his book, called,* Quakeriſm no Chriſtianity: *being a Rejoinder in the Defence of the Anſwer, entitled,* Quakeriſm a new Nick-name for old Chriſtianity; *wherein many weighty Goſpel-Truths are handled, and the diſingenuous Carriage of that Adverſary is obſerved, for the information of moderate Enquirers.* 1673, in 8vo. *Wiſdom juſtified of her Children, from the Ignorance and Calumny of* Henry Hallywell, *in his book called,* An Account of Familiſm, as it is revived and propagated by the Quakers. 1673, in 8vo. *Reaſon againſt Railing, and Truth againſt Fiction: being an Anſwer to two pamphlets, entituled,* A Dialogue between a Chriſtian and a Quaker; *and the* Continuation of the Dialogue, &c. *by one* Thomas Hicks, *an Anabaptiſt Teacher.* 1673, in 8vo. *The Counterfeit Chriſtian detected, and the real Quaker juſtified, againſt the vile Forgeries, groſs perverſions, black Slanders, plain Contradictions, and ſcurrilous Language of* Tho. Hicks, *in his* Third Dialogue, *called,* The Quakers condemned. *By way of Appeal to all ſober people, eſpecially thoſe called Anabaptiſts in and about the City of London.* 1674, in 8vo. *A juſt Rebuke to one and twenty learned and reverend Divines, ſo called; being an Anſwer to an abuſive Epiſtle againſt the People called* Quakers. London 1674, in 4to. *Urim & Thummim: or, the Doctrines of Light and Perfection maintained, againſt the oppoſite Plea of* Samuel Grevil, *a pretended Miniſter of the Goſpel, in his un-goſpel-like Diſcourſe againſt a Book, entitled,* A Teſtimony of the Light within, *antiently writ by* Alexander Parker. 1674, in 4to. *The Spirit of Alexander the Copper-Smith, juſtly rebuked: or, An Anſwer to a late Pamphlet, entitled,* The Spirit of the Hat, or the Government of the Quakers. *Judas and the Jews combined againſt Chriſt and his Followers; being a Rejoinder to a late nameleſs Reply, called,* Tyranny and Hypocriſy detected, *made againſt a Book, entitled,* The Spirit of Alexander the Copper-Smith, rebuked. *The Chriſtian Quaker, and his divine Teſtimony ſtated and vindicated, from Scripture, Reaſon, and Authority.* 1673, in folio. *A Diſcourſe of the general Rule of Faith and Practice, and Judge of Controverſy.* 1673. *A Letter to the Council and Senate of Embden.* 1674, in 4to. *Naked Truth needs no Shift: or, an Anſwer to a libellous Sheet, entitled,* The Quakers laſt Shift found out. 1674. *A Return to* John Faldo's *Reply, called,* A Curb for Will. Penn's Confidence. 1674. *A Treatiſe of Oaths. containing the ſeveral mighty Reaſons, why the People called* Quakers *refuſe to ſwear; and thoſe confirmed by numerous Teſtimonies of Gentiles, Jews, and Chriſtians, both Fathers, Doctors, and Martyrs.* London 1675, in 4to. *England's preſent Intereſt conſidered, with Honour to the Prince, and ſafety to the People. In anſwer to this one Queſtion,* "What is moſt fit, eaſy, and ſafe "at this juncture of affairs to be done, for quieting "of differences, allaying the heat of contrary inte- "reſts, and making them ſubſervient to the intereſt "of the Government, and conſiſtent with the proſ- "perity of the Kingdom?" London 1675, in 4to. *Saul ſmitten to the Ground; being a brief, but faithful Narrative of the dying Remorſe of a late living Enemy to the People called* Quakers, *and their Faith and Worſhip.* London 1675, in 4to.

[P] *In* 1677, *he travelled into Holland and Germany, in order to propagate the principles of Quakeriſm, and had frequent converſations with the Princeſs* Elizabeth.] He publiſhed an account of his travels at London, in 8vo. The Princeſs Elizabeth wrote ſeveral letters to him, which are printed in that account.

[Q] *In* 1678, *and the following year, he publiſhed ſeveral tracts.*] *A brief Anſwer to a falſe and fooliſh Libel, called,* The Quakers Opinions, *for their ſakes that writ it and read it.* 1678, in 4to. *To the Children of Light in this Generation.* London 1678, in 4to. *A brief Examination and State of Liberty ſpiritual, both with reſpect to Perſons in their private Capacity, and in their Church-Society and Communion.* 1678. *An Addreſs to Proteſtants of all Perſuaſions, more eſpecially the Magiſtracy and Clergy, for the promotion of Virtue and Charity.* London 1679, in 4to. A *Preface* to the Works of Mr. *Samuel Fiſher. England's great Intereſt in the Choice of a new Parliament; Dedicated to all her Freeholders and Electors.* 1679. *One Project for the Good of England, that is, our Civil Union is our Civil Safety: humbly dedicated to the Great Council, the Parliament of England.* London 1679, in folio.

[R] A brief Account of the Province of Penſylvania.] It was printed 1681, in folio, and re-printed in 1682, in 4to.

[S] *By whom he ſent a letter to the Indians.*] It was as follows.

London the 18th of 8th Month, 1681.

"My Friends,

"There is a great God and Power, that hath "made the world, and all things therein; to whom "you and I, and all people, owe their Being and "Well-being, and to whom you and I muſt one day "give an account for all that we do in the world. "This great God hath written his law in our hearts, "by which we are taught and commanded to love "and help, and do good to one another, and not to "do harm and miſchief one unto another. Now "this great God hath been pleaſed to make me "concerned in your part of the world, and the King "of the country where I live, hath given me a great "Province therein. But I deſire to enjoy it with "your love and conſent, that we may always live to- "gether as neighbours and friends. Elſe what "would the great God do to us, who hath made us "not to devour and deſtroy one another, but to live "ſoberly and kindly together in the world? Now I "would have you well obſerve, that I am very ſen- "ſible of the unkindneſs and injuſtice that hath been "too much exerciſed towards you by the people of "theſe parts of the world, who have ſought them- "ſelves, and to make great advantages by you, "rather

wiſe the fundamental Conſtitutions of Penſylvania in twenty four articles [*T*]. In November 1681 he was elected Member of the Royal Society (*i*). In 1682 he publiſhed *The Frame of the Government of the Province of Penſylvania* [*U*]; and in Auguſt that year embarked for that country, where he continued about two years [*W*], and returned to England in Auguſt 1684. Upon the Acceſſion of King James II. to the Throne, he was taken into a great degree of favour with his Majeſty, which he had enjoyed, while that King was Duke of York; but this expoſed him to the imputation of being a Papiſt, from which he vindicated himſelf [*X*]. In 1685 he publiſhed *A Defence of the Duke of Buckingham's Book of Religion and Worſhip from the Exceptions of a nameleſs Author*; and in 1686 *A Perſuaſive to Moderation to Diſſenting Chriſtians, in Prudence and Conſcience, humbly ſubmitted to the King and his great Council*; and in 1687 *Good Advice to the Church of England, Roman Catholicks, and Proteſtant Diſſenters; in which it is endeavoured to make appear, that it is their Duty, Principle, and intereſt, to aboliſh the Penal Laws and Teſts.* Upon the Revolution our Author's great intereſt at Court having made him ſuſpected of diſaffection to the Government, he was examined before the Council, December 10, 1688, and obliged to give ſecurity for his appearance in the firſt day of the next Term; which he did, and then was continued on the ſame ſecurity to Eaſter Term following, on the laſt day of which he was diſcharged. In 1690 he was again examined before

(*i*) Wood, col. 1051.

" rather than to be examples of juſtice and goodneſs " unto you, which I hear hath been matter of trou- " ble to you, and cauſed great grudgings and animo- " ſities, ſometimes to the ſhedding of blood, which " hath made the great God angry. But I am not " ſuch a man, as is well known in my own coun- " try. I have great love and regard towards you; " and I deſire to win and gain your love and friend- " ſhip by a kind, juſt, and peaceable life; and the " people I ſend are of the ſame mind, and ſhall in " all things behave themſelves accordingly. And if " in any thing any ſhall offend you, or your people, " you ſhall have a full and ſpeedy ſatisfaction for " the ſame, by an equal number of juſt men on " both ſides, that by no means you may have juſt " occaſion of being offended againſt them. I ſhall " ſhortly come to you myſelf, at what time we may " more largely and freely confer and diſcourſe of " theſe matters. In the mean time I have ſent my " Commiſſioners to treat with you about land, and a " firm league of peace. Let me deſire you to be " kind to them and the people, and receive theſe " preſents and tokens, which I have ſent you as a " Teſtimony of my good will to you, and my reſo- " lution to live juſtly, peaceably and friendly with " you.

" I am,

" Your loving friend,

" *W. Penn.*"

His friendly and pacific manner of treating the Indians produced in them an extraordinary love and eſteem for him and his people, ſo that they have maintained a perfect amity with the Engliſh in Penſylvania ever ſince. And it is obſervable, that upon renewing the treaty with the late Governor, Sir William Keith, Bart. in 1722, they mention the name of *William Penn* with great gratitude and affection, ſtyling him *a good man*; and as their higheſt compliment to Sir William uſe this expreſſion, *We eſteem and love you as if you were* William Penn *himſelf* (4).

(4) See *The Hiſtorical Regiſter*, for the year 1723, No. 30. p. 107, 108.

[*T*] *He drew up . . . the fundamental conſtitutions of Penſylvania, in twenty-four articles.*] The firſt of theſe articles is as follows. *In reverence to God, the Father of lights and ſpirits, the Author as well as Object of all divine knowledge, faith, and worſhip, I do for me and mine, declare and eſtabliſh, for the firſt fundamental of the Government of this country, that every perſon, that doth or ſhall reſide therein, ſhall have and enjoy the free poſſeſſion of his or her faith and exerciſe of worſhip toward God, in ſuch way and manner as every ſuch perſon ſhall in conſcience believe is moſt acceptable to God. And ſo long as every ſuch perſon uſeth not this Chriſtian liberty to licentiouſneſs, or the deſtruction of others, that is to ſay, to ſpeak looſely and profanely, or contemptuouſly of God, Chriſt, the holy Scriptures, or Religion, or commit any moral evil or injury againſt others in their converſation; he or ſhe ſhall be protected in the enjoyment of the aforeſaid Chriſtian liberty, by the Civil Magiſtrate.*

[*U*] *In* 1682, *he publiſhed* The Frame of the Government of the Province of Penſylvania.] This contained twenty-four articles, ſomewhat varying from the *Conſtitutions* abovementioned, together with certain other laws, to the number of forty, agreed on in England by the Governor, and divers Freemen of the Province: of which laws, one was as follows: *That all perſons living in this Province, who confeſs and acknowledge the one almighty and eternal God to be the Creator, Upholder, and Ruler of the world, and that hold themſelves obliged in conſcience to live peaceably and juſtly in civil ſociety, ſhall in no-wiſe be moleſted or prejudiced for their religious perſuaſion or practice in matters of faith and worſhip; nor ſhall they be compelled at any time to frequent or maintain any religious worſhip, place, or miniſtry whatſoever.*

[*W*] *In Auguſt that year, he embarked for that country, where he continued about two years.*] In a letter to a perſon, who had reflected upon him, he ſhews, that his aim in eſtabliſhing the colony had been directed more to the public good, than his own private intereſt. The letter is printed in his *Life*, p. 124.

[*X*] *Expoſed him to the imputation of being a Papiſt, from which he vindicated himſelf.*] Dr. Tillotſon, among others, having entertained a ſuſpicion of him, and let fall ſome expreſſions to that purpoſe, Mr. Penn wrote the following letter to him.

" Worthy friend,

" Being often told, that Dr. *Tillotſon* ſhould ſuſ- " pect me, and ſo report me a Papiſt, I think a " Jeſuit; and being cloſely preſſed, I take the liber- " ty to aſk thee, if any ſuch reflection fell from " thee. If it did, I am ſorry one I eſteemed ever " the firſt of his robe, ſhould ſo undeſervedly ſtain " me, for ſo I call it; and if the ſtory be falſe, I " am ſorry they ſhould abuſe Dr. *Tillotſon*, as well as " myſelf, without a cauſe. I add no more, but " that I abhor two principles in religion, and pity " them who own them: the firſt is, *Obedience upon* " *authority without conviction*; and the other, *De-* " *ſtroying them that differ from me for God's ſake.* Such " a religion is without judgment, though not with- " out teeth. Union is beſt, if right; elſe charity; " and, as *Hooker* ſaid, *The time will come, when a* " *few words ſpoken with meekneſs, and humility, and* " *love, ſhall be more acceptable than volumes of contro-* " *verſies, which commonly deſtroy charity, the very beſt* " *part of true religion*; I mean, not a charity that " can change with all, but bear all, as I can Dr. " *Tillotſon*, in what he diſſents from me, and in this " reflection too, if ſaid, which is not yet believed by

" Thy true Chriſtian friend,

Charing-Croſs, 22d of the 11th Month, 1685-6.

" *W. Penn.*"

Dr. Tillotſon's anſwer was as follows.

" Honoured Sir, January 26th, 1685.

" The demand of your letter is very juſt and rea- " ſonable, and the manner of it very kind; there- " fore

before the Council upon an accuſation of holding correſpondence with the late King James II. and was held upon bail for ſome time, but diſcharged in Trinity Term the ſame year. He was attacked a third time, and his name inſerted in a Proclamation dated July the 18th the ſame year; but was diſcharged in the laſt day of Michaelmas-Term. He deſigned now to go over a ſecond time to Penſylvania, and publiſhed propoſals in print for another ſettlement there; and had ſo far prepared for his voyage, that an order for a Convoy was granted him by the Secretary of State, which was prevented by a freſh accuſation againſt him, backed with the oath of one William Fuller, who was afterwards declared by the Parliament *a Cheat* and *Impoſtor*. A warrant being granted for Mr. Penn's apprehenſion, which he narrowly eſcaped at his return from George Fox's burial,

" fore in anſwer to it be pleaſed to take the follow-
" ing account. The laſt time you did me the fa-
" vour to ſee me at my houſe, I did, according to
" the freedom I always uſe, where I profeſs my
" friendſhip, acquaint you with ſomething I had
" heard of a correſpondence you held with ſome at
" Rome, and particularly with ſome of the Jeſuits
" there. At which you ſeemed a little ſurprized,
" and after ſome general diſcourſe about it, you
" ſaid, you would call on me ſome other time, and
" ſpeak farther of it. Since that time I never ſaw
" you but by accident and in paſſage, where I
" thought you always declined me; particularly at
" Sir *William Jones's* chamber, which was the laſt
" time, I think, I ſaw you + upon which occaſion I
" took notice to him of your ſtrangeneſs to me, and
" told him what I thought might be the reaſon of
" it, and that I was ſorry for it, becauſe I had a
" particular eſteem of your parts and temper. The
" ſame, I believe, I have ſaid to ſome others, but to
" whom I do not ſo particularly remember. Since your
" going to Penſylvania, I never thought of it, till
" lately being in ſome company, one of them preſſed
" me to declare, *Whether I had not heard ſomething of*
" *you, which had ſatisfied me, that you were a Papiſt?*
" I anſwered, *no, by no means.* I told him what I
" had heard, and what I ſaid to you, and of the
" ſtrangeneſs that enſued upon it; but that this ne-
" ver went farther with me, than to make me ſuſ-
" pect there was more in that report, which I had
" heard, than I was at firſt willing to believe; and
" if any made more of it, I ſhould look upon them
" as very injurious both to Mr. *Penn* and myſelf.
" This is the truth of that matter; and whenever
" you will pleaſe to ſatisfy me, that my ſuſpicion of
" the truth of that report I had heard was ground-
" leſs, I will heartily beg your pardon for it. I do
" fully concur with you in the abhorrence of the two
" principles you mention, and in your approbation
" of that excellent ſaying of Mr. *Hooker's*, for which
" I ſhall very highly eſteem him. I have endea-
" voured to make it one of the governing principles
" of my life, never to abate any thing of humanity
" or charity to any man for his difference from me
" in opinion, and particularly to thoſe of your per-
" ſuaſion, as ſeveral of them have had experience.
" I have been ready upon all occaſions to do all of-
" fices of kindneſs, being truly ſorry to ſee them ſo
" hardly uſed; and though I thought them miſtaken,
" yet in the main I believed them to be very honeſt.
" I thank you for your letter, and have a juſt eſteem
" of the Chriſtian temper of it, and reſt

" Your faithful friend,

" *Jo. Tillotſon.*"

This occaſioned Mr. *Penn* to write another letter to Dr. *Tillotſon*, which was as follows.

" Worthy Friend,

" Having a much leſs opinion of my own memory
" than of Dr. *Tillotſon's* truth, I will allow the fact,
" though not the jealouſy. For beſides that I can-
" not look ſtrange where I am well uſed, I have ever
" treated the name of Dr. *Tillotſon* with another re-
" gard. I might be grave, and full of my own bu-
" ſineſs. I was alſo then diſappointed by the Doc-
" tor's; but my nature is not harſh, my education
" leſs, and my principles leaſt of all. It was the
" opinion I had of the Doctor's moderation, ſimplicity,
" and integrity, rather than his parts or poſt, that
" always made me ſet a value upon his friendſhip, of
" which perhaps I am better judge, leaving the lat-
" ter to men of deeper talents. I blame him no-
" thing, but leave it to his better thoughts, if in my
" affair his jealouſy was not too nimble for his cha-
" rity. If he can believe me, I ſhould hardly pre-
" vail with myſelf to endure the ſame thought of
" Dr. *Tillotſon* on the like occaſion, and leſs to ſpeak
" of it. For the Roman correſpondence, I will free-
" ly come to confeſſion: I have not only no ſuch
" thing with any Jeſuit at Rome (though Proteſtants
" may have without offence) but I hold none with
" any Jeſuit, Prieſt, or Regular in the world, of that
" communion. And that the Doctor may ſee what
" a novice I am in that buſineſs, I know not one
" any where. And yet when all is ſaid, I am a Ca-
" tholick, though not a *Roman*. I have bowels for
" mankind, and dare not deny others what I crave
" for myſelf, I mean, liberty for the exerciſe of my
" Religion; thinking faith, piety, and providence,
" a better ſecurity than force; and that if truth
" cannot prevail with her own weapons, all others
" will fail her. Now though I am not obliged to
" this defence, and that it can be no temporizing
" now to make it; yet that Dr. *Tillotſon* may ſee
" how much I value his good opinion, and dare own
" the truth and myſelf at all times, let him be
" confident, I am no Roman Catholick, but a Chriſ-
" tian, whoſe Creed is the Scripture, of the truth of
" which I hold a nobler evidence, than the beſt
" Church-authority in the world; and yet I refuſe
" not to believe the porter, though I cannot leave
" the ſenſe to his diſcretion; and when I ſhould, if
" he offends againſt thoſe plain methods of under-
" ſtanding God hath made us to know things by,
" and which are inſeparable from us, I muſt beg his
" pardon, as I do the Doctor's for this length, upon
" the aſſurance he has given me of his doing the
" like upon better information; which that he may
" fully have, I recommend him to my *Addreſs to*
" *Proteſtants* from page 133 to the end, and to the
" four firſt Chapters of my *no Croſs, no Crown*; to
" ſay nothing of our moſt inceremonious and un-
" worldly way of worſhip, and their pompous cult;
" where at this time I ſhall leave the buſineſs, with
" all due and ſenſible acknowledgments to thy
" friendly temper, and aſſurance of the ſincere wiſhes
" and reſpects of

" Thy affectionate and real friend,

Charing-Croſs, the 29th of the 11th Month, 1686.

" *W. Penn.*

Mr. *Penn*'s third letter to Dr. *Tillotſon* was as follows.

Charing-Croſs 27th of the 2d Month 1686.

" Worthy Friend,

" This ſhould have been a viſit; but being of opi-
" nion, that Dr. *Tillotſon* is yet a debtor to me this
" way, I choſe to provoke him to another letter by
" this, before I made him one. For though he was
" very juſt and obliging, when I laſt ſaw him; yet
" certainly no expreſſions, however kindly ſpoken,
" will ſo eaſily and effectually purge me from the
" unjuſt imputation ſome people caſt upon me in his
" name, as his letter will do. The need of this he
" will better ſee, when he has read the incloſed,
" which coming to hand ſince my laſt, is, I preſume,
" enough to juſtify this addreſs, if I had no former
" pretenſions. And therefore I cannot be ſo wanting
" to myſelf, as not to preſs him to a Letter in my juſt
" defence; nor ſo uncharitable to him, as to think
" he ſhould not frankly write what he has ſaid, when

burial, January 16, 1690. Upon this he concealed himſelf for two or three years, and during his receſs wrote ſeveral pieces [*Y*]. In the latter end of the year 1693, through the

" he has ſaid, when it is to right a man's reputa-
" tion, and diſabuſe the too credulous world. For
" to me it ſeems from a private friendſhip to be-
" come a moral duty to the public; which, with a
" perſon of ſo great morality, muſt give ſucceſs to
" the reaſonable deſire of

" Thy very real friend,

" *William Penn.*"

Dr. Tillotſon wrote the following anſwer.

" Sir, April the 29th, 1686.
" I am very ſorry, that the ſuſpicion, which I
" had entertained concerning you, of which I gave
" you the true account in my former letter, hath oc-
" caſioned ſo much trouble and inconvenience to
" you: and I do now declare with great joy, that I
" am fully ſatisfied, that there was no juſt ground
" for that ſuſpicion; and therefore, I do heartily
" beg your pardon for it. And ever ſince you were
" pleaſed to give me that ſatisfaction, I have taken
" all occaſions to vindicate you in this matter; and
" ſhall be ready to do it to the perſon that ſent you
" the incloſed, whenever he will pleaſe to come to
" me. I am very much in the country, but will
" ſeek the firſt opportunity to viſit you at Charing-
" Croſs, and renew our acquaintance, in which I
" took great pleaſure. I reſt

" Your faithful friend,

" *Jo. Tillotſon.*"

In 1688, William Popple Eſq; Secretary of the Plantation-Office, wrote Mr. Penn a letter, dated Octob. 20th, in which he repreſented to him the reflections caſt upon him as a Promoter of the proceedings of the Court. To this Mr. Penn wrote a long anſwer, dated at Teddington, Octob. 24th, 1688; in which he writes thus. *I ſay ſolemnly, that I am ſo far from having been bred at St.* Omer's, *and having received Orders at* Rome, *that I never was at either place, nor do I know any body there; nor had I ever correſpondency with any body in thoſe places; which is another ſtory invented againſt me. And as for my officiating in the King's Chapel, or any other, it is ſo ridiculous, as well as untrue, that beſides, that no body can do it but a Prieſt, and that I have been married to a woman of ſome condition above ſixteen years, which no Prieſt can be, by any diſpenſation whatever; I have not ſo much as looked into any Chapel of the Roman Religion, and conſequently not the King's, though a common curioſity warrants it daily to people of all perſuaſions. And once for all, I do ſay, that I am a Proteſtant Diſſenter, and to that degree ſuch, that I challenge the moſt celebrated Proteſtant of the Engliſh, or any other, on that head, be he Layman or Clergyman, in public or in private. For I would have ſuch people know, it is not impoſſible for a true Proteſtant Diſſenter to be dutiful, thankful, and ſerviceable to the King, though he be of the Roman-Catholic Communion. We hold not our property or protection from him by our perſuaſion; and therefore his perſuaſion ſhould not be the meaſure of our allegiance. I am ſorry to ſee ſo many, that ſeem fond of the Reformed Religion, by their diſaffection to him, recommend it ſo ill. . . . But ſome may be apt to ſay,* Why not any body elſe, as well as I? Why muſt I have the preferable acceſs to other Diſſenters, if not a Papiſt? *I anſwer, that I know not that it is ſo: but this I know, that I have made it my province and buſineſs; I have followed and preſſed it; I took it for my calling and ſtation, and have kept it above theſe ſixteen years; and, which is more (if I may ſay it without vanity or reproach) wholly at my own charges too. To this let me add, the relation my father had to this King's ſervice, his particular favour in getting me releaſed out of the Tower of London in* 69, *my father's humble requeſt to him upon his death-bed to protect me from the inconveniencies and troubles my perſuaſion might expoſe me to, and his friendly promiſe to do it, and exact performance of it from the moment I addreſſed myſelf to him: I ſay, when all this is conſidered, any body, that has the leaſt pretence to good-nature, gratitude, or generoſity, muſt needs know how to interpret my acceſs to the King.*
" Perhaps ſome will be ready to ſay, This is not all,
" nor is this yet a fault; but that I have been an
" Adviſer in other matters diſguſtful to the King-
" dom, and which tend to the overthrow of the Pro-
" teſtant Religion, and the Liberties of the People.
" A likely thing indeed, that a Proteſtant Diſſenter,
" who from fifteen years old, has been at times, a
" ſufferer in his father's family, in the Univerſity,
" and by the Government, for being ſo, ſhould de-
" ſign the deſtruction of the Proteſtant Religion. This
" is juſt as probable as it is true, that I died a Jeſuit
" ſix years ago in America. Will men ſuffer ſuch
" ſtuff to paſs upon them? Is any thing more fool-
" iſh as well as falſe, than that becauſe I am of-
" ten at *Whitehall*, therefore I muſt be the Author
" of every thing that is done there, that does not
" pleaſe abroad? But ſuppoſing ſome ſuch things to
" have been done, pray tell me, if I am bound to op-
" poſe any thing, that I am not called to do? I ne-
" ver was a Member of a Council, Cabinet, or Com-
" mittee, where the affairs of the Kingdom are
" tranſacted. I have had no Office or Truſt, and
" conſequently nothing can be ſaid to be done by
" me, nor for that reaſon could I lie under any teſt
" or obligation to diſcover my opinion of public
" acts of State; and therefore, neither can any ſuch
" acts, nor my ſilence about them, in juſtice, be made
" my crime. Volunteers are blanks and cyphers in
" all Governments. And unleſs calling at White-
" hall once a day upon many occaſions, or my not
" being turned out of nothing (for that no Office is)
" be the evidence of my compliance in diſagreeable
" things, I know not what elſe can with any truth
" be alledged againſt me. However, one thing I
" know, that I have every where moſt religiouſly ob-
" ſerved, and endeavoured in converſation with per-
" ſons of all ranks and opinions, to allay heats, and
" moderate extremities, even in the politics. It is
" below me to be more particular; but I am ſure it
" has been my endeavour, that if we could not all
" meet upon a religious bottom, at leaſt we might
" upon a civil one, the good of England, which is
" the common intereſt of King and People; that
" he might be great by juſtice, and we free
" by obedience, diſtinguiſhing rightly on the one
" hand between duty and ſlavery, and on the o-
" ther between liberty and licentiouſneſs. But alas!
" I am not without my apprehenſions of the cauſe
" of this behaviour towards me, and in this I per-
" ceive we agree; I mean, my conſtant zeal for an
" *impartial Liberty of Conſcience.* But if that be it,
" the cauſe is too good to be in pain about. I ever
" underſtood that to be the natural right of all men;
" and that he that had a religion without it, his re-
" ligion was none of his own. For what is not the
" religion of a man's choice, is the religion of him
" that impoſes it; ſo that liberty of conſcience is
" the firſt ſtep to have a religion. This is no new
" opinion with me: I have writ many Apologies
" within the laſt twenty years to defend it, and that
" impartially. Yet I have conſtantly declared, that
" bounds ought to be ſet to this freedom; and that
" morality was the beſt; and that as often as that
" was violated, under a pretence of conſcience, it
" was fit the Civil Power ſhould take place. Nor did
" I ever once think of promoting any ſort of li-
" berty of conſcience for any body, which did not
" preſerve the common Proteſtancy of the Kingdom,
" and the antient Rights of the Government; for
" to ſay the truth, the one cannot be maintained
" without the other."

[*Y*] *During his receſs, wrote ſeveral pieces.*] A *Preface* to *Robert Barclay's Works*, and another to thoſe of *John Burnyeat*, both printed in 1691. *Juſt Meaſures: being an Epiſtle of Peace and Love, to ſuch Profeſſors of Truth, as are under Diſſatisfaction about the Order practiſed in the Church of Chriſt.* Printed in 1692. *A Key, opening the Way to every Capacity, how to diſtinguiſh the Religion profeſſed by the People called* Quakers, *from the Perverſions and Miſrepreſentations of their Adverſaries. With a brief Exhortation to all Sorts of People, to examine*

the intereſt of the Lord Ranelagh, Lord Somers, and Sir John Trenchard, he was admitted to appear before the King and Council, where he repreſented his innocence ſo effectually, that he was acquitted. In February 1693-4 his wife Gulielma Maria died. In 1694 he wrote a *Preface* to *George Fox's Journal* [*Z*], and a *Viſitation to the Jews* [*AA*]. In 1695 he wrote a Defence of his *Key* againſt a nameleſs Author [*BB*]. The ſame year he preſented to the Houſe of Commons a paper upon occaſion of a bill to excuſe the Quakers from ſwearing. March 5, 1695-6, he married Hannah, the Daughter of Mr. Thomas Callowhill, and Grand-daughter of Mr. Dennis Holliſter, a Merchant of Briſtol, by whom he had four ſons and one daughter. In April 1696, his eldeſt ſon by his former wife, named Springett, died at Warminghurſt in Suſſex of a conſumption in the 21ſt year of his age. The ſame year he publiſhed his Treatiſe, entitled, *Primitive Chriſtianity revived in the Faith and Practice of the People called* Quakers; and a piece againſt Mr. George Keith, who had left the Quakers, entitled, *More Work for* George Keith. In 1697 there being a Bill depending in the Houſe of Lords againſt Blaſphemy, he preſented to the Houſe *A Caution requiſite in the Conſideration of that Bill*, in which he adviſed, that the word *Blaſphemy* might be ſo explained, as that no ambiguous interpretation might give occaſion to malicious perſons to proſecute under that name whatever they ſhould be pleaſed to call ſo. After which the Houſe thought fit to drop the Bill. In April 1698 he ſet out from Briſtol, where he then lived, for Ireland [*CC*]. The next Winter reſiding at Briſtol, he in conjunction with Mr. Benj. Coole, wrote a Book, entitled, *The Truth of God, as held by the People called* Quakers, *farther cleared from Miſtakes*, &c. In Auguſt 1699 himſelf with his wife and family embarked for Penſylvania [*DD*], whence he returned to England in December 1701. Upon Queen Anne's Acceſſion to the Crown, he was in great favour with her, and often at Court; and for his conveniency took lodgings at Kenſington, where he wrote *More Fruits of Solitude: being a ſecond Part of Reflections and Maxims relating to the Conduct of human Life.* After this he removed to Knightſbridge, where he reſided for ſome years. About this time *A Bill to prevent occaſional Conformity* being brought into the Houſe of Commons, he wrote a Sheet, entitled, *Conſiderations upon the Bill againſt occaſional Conformity.* In 1706 he removed with his family to a convenient houſe about a mile from Brentford, where he lived ſome years. In 1707 he was involved in a Law-ſuit with the Executors of a perſon, who had been formerly his Steward; but his cauſe (though many thought him aggrieved) was attended with ſuch circumſtances, that the Court of Chancery did not think proper to relieve him; upon which account he was obliged to live in the Old-Baily within the Rules of the Fleet ſome part of this and the following year, till the matter in diſpute was accommodated. In 1710 the air of London not agreeing with his declining conſtitution, he took an handſome Seat at Ruſhcomb near Twyford in Buckinghamſhire, where he reſided the remainder of his life. In 1712 he was ſeized at diſtant times with three ſeveral fits, ſuppoſed to be apoplectick, by the laſt of which his underſtanding and memory were ſo impaired as to render him incapable of publick action for the future. He died July 30, 1718, in the ſeventy fourth year of his age, and was interred Auguſt the 5th following at Jordans in Buckinghamſhire, where his former wife and ſeveral of his family had been buried. Dr. Henry More in the ſecond Tome of his *Philoſophical Works* (*k*), obſerves, that our Author in his *No Croſs no Crown* has treated the ſubject of a future Life and the Immortality of the Soul with a force and ſpirit equal to moſt Writers. And in a Letter of his to Mr. *Penn*, concerning Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper, and ſome uſages of the Quakers (*l*), he remarks, that he had peruſed ſome of Mr. Penn's writings, and *met with ſeveral excellent paſſages in them, that are very expreſſive of a vigorous Reſentment and Experience of what appertains to Life and Holineſs.* Mr. Edmund Elys, ſome time Fellow of Baliol College in Oxford, and afterwards a Nonjuror, in a *Second Letter* to the Author of an *Anſwer* to Mr. *Penn's Key*, printed in 1697, ſpeaks thus of Mr.

(*k*) p. 748.

(*l*) *Ward's Life of Dr. H. More*, p. 311 & *ſeqq.* edit. London 1710. in 8vo.

examine their Ways and their Hearts, and turn ſpeedily to the Lord. Printed in 1692. There have been at leaſt twelve editions of this piece. *An Eſſay toward the preſent Peace of Europe.* Printed twice in 1693. *Some Tracts of Solitude, in Reflections and Maxims relating to the Conduct of human Life.* Printed in 1693.

[*Z*] *In* 1694, *he wrote a* Preface *to* George Fox's Journal.] This *Preface* was afterwards re-printed under the following title: *A brief Account of the Riſe and Progreſs of the People called* Quakers: *in which their fundamental Principle, Doctrines, Worſhip, Miniſtry, and Diſcipline, are plainly declared, &c.*

[*AA*] A Viſitation to the Jews.] It was publiſhed by way of Appendix to Mr. John Tomkins's *Harmony of the Old and New Teſtaments.*

[*BB*] *In* 1695, *he wrote a Defence of his* Key *againſt a nameleſs Author.*] This Defence was publiſhed under this title; *A Reply to a pretended Anſwer, by a nameleſs Author, to* W. Penn's Key; *in which the Principles of the People called* Quakers, *are farther explained and confirmed.* By William Penn.

[*CC*] *In April* 1698, *he ſet out from Briſtol, where he then lived, for Ireland.*] Sometime after his arrival in Ireland, Mr. John Plympton, a Baptiſt, having publiſhed at Dublin, a paper entitled, *A Quaker no Chriſtian*, Mr. Penn publiſhed an Anſwer, entitled, *The Quaker a Chriſtian*; and a paper, entitled, *Goſpel Truths held by the People called* Quakers, and re-printed the 8th and 9th chapters of his *Primitive Chriſtianity revived.* Having in a viſit to the Biſhop of Cork, preſented him with one of his pieces called *Goſpel Truths*, the Biſhop publiſhed ſome Exceptions to it; which occaſioned Mr. Penn, after his return to England, to reply in *A Defence of a Paper, entitled,* Goſpel Truths, *againſt the Exceptions of the Biſhop of* Cork's *Teſtimony.*

[*DD*] *In Auguſt* 1699, *himſelf, with his wife and family, embarked for Penſylvania.*] While he was in that country, ſome perſons in England taking advantage of his abſence, endeavoured to undermine both his and other proprietary Governments, under the pretence of advancing the prerogative of the Crown;

Mr. *Penn* : " I intreat you to conſider how great a multitude in this Kingdom have pro-
" voked the wrath of God by calumniating this Gentleman, clamouring againſt him as
" if he was a Papiſt, yea a Jeſuit. Is it Popery to aſſert, that *The principal Rule of*
" *Faith to a ſincere Chriſtian is that, which Almighty God has written in the Hearts of*
" *all Men?* This the People called *Quakers* do affirm, and in this I fully concur with
" them ; and I ſay, for want of a due belief of this, *The whole World lieth in Wickedneſs.*"

and a bill for that purpoſe was brought into the Houſe of Lords. His friends, the Proprietors and Adventurers then in England, immediately repreſented the hardſhip of their caſe to the Parliament, ſoliciting time for his return to anſwer for himſelf; and accordingly preſſed his coming over as ſoon as poſſible ; with which he ſeeing it neceſſary to comply, ſummoned an Aſſembly to meet at Philadelphia, to whom on the 15th of Sept. 1701, he made a ſpeech, declaring the reaſons for his return ; and the next day took ſhipping for England, and arrived there about the middle of December. After his return, the bill, which through the ſolicitations of his friends had been poſtponed the laſt Seſſions of Parliament, was wholly laid aſide. T.

PERAXYLUS. This is the name aſſumed by *Arnoldus Arlenius* in order to expreſs in Greek his country (*a*). He was a very ſtudious man, a great Grecian, and ſearched with incredible pains for old manuſcripts. Thuanus (*b*) ſpeaks of him under the year 1561, and declares, that though he could not diſcover the place and day of Arlenius's death, he thought he ought to fix at that time. He obſerves that this learned man had devoted all his ſtudies to the publick good, and that poſterity would always be indebted to him for the edition of Joſephus publiſhed by him in Greek from an excellent manuſcript of Don Diego de Mendoza, Embaſſador of Charles V. at Venice. He adds, that we find there only the books againſt Appion, and that Arlenius leaving Don Diego, when that Nobleman went from Venice, retired to Baſil, and exerciſed his talents there ſome years, and made a good uſe of Henry Stephens's labour. It will be neceſſary to ſee what Mr. Teiſſier ſays [*A*]. The Tranſlator of Thuanus has rendered that paſſage of him in a negligent manner [*B*]. I have at laſt diſcovered, that the publick had miſtaken for works already printed, the hopes which Geſner had given with regard to ſome works of Arlenius [*C*]. I am ſurpriſed that Swertius and Valerius Andreas knew nothing of Peraxylus. He was better known in Italy than in the Low Countries. See in what manner he is applauded by Corradus [*D*].

(*a*) A village of Campine, ſituated beyond a little river, which paſſes through Boiſleduc, and is called Déeſe.

(*b*) *Sub fin.* lib. 28.

In order to ſhew more clearly how much pains he took in ſearching after manuſcripts, and promoting of polite learning, I ſhall mention what he did with relation to Plato [*E*]. I might

(1) Teiſſier, *Additions aux Eloges tirez de Mr. de Thou*, 1. p. 214.

(2) *De Poet. ſui temporis*, lib. 2.

[*A*] *What Mr. Teiſſier ſays* (1.)] He quoting Gyraldus (2), obſerves that Arlenius *wrote fine epigrams in Greek and Latin, and that he would have excelled in poetry, if he had not applied himſelf to more ſerious ſtudies.* He adds, without citing any authority, that the printed works of Arlenius are the following tranſlations: *Dionis Coccæi Romanæ Hiſtoriæ libri duodecim. Olympiodori Philoſophi Platonici & Peripatetici Commentarii ad Ariſtotelis Commentaria. Sermones quidam ex Plutarcho de moribus à nemine antehac verſi. Plurimæ Orationes Chryſoſtomi, Theodoreti, & aliorum S. S. Patrum antea non viſæ. Lycophronis Alexandram ſive Caſſandram, & Iſaaci Tzetzis in eam Commentaria edidit & recognovit.*

(3) The Frankfort edition of 1625, ſays Artenius.

[*B*] *The tranſlator of Thuanus, has rendered that paſſage of him in a negligent manner.*] He has tranſlated *Arnoldus Arlenius* (3,) *Arnaud (Arnold) de Lens.* He ſays, that this Arnaud was called Praxylus, from a name he had aſſumed to himſelf; and that the manuſcript he made uſe of for the edition of Joſephus, belonged to Diego Auſtado Mendoſſe (Mendoza). 1. On what grounds does he pretend, that *Arlenius* and *de Lens* are the ſame name? 2. Why does he omit the reaſon for aſſuming the name *Peraxylus*, which Thuanus had expreſſed? *Trans Dieſam amnem qui Silvam ſeu Boſcum-Ducis alluit vico ignobili natus, indeque nomine ingenioſe ab ipſo effecto Peraxylus nuncupatus.* 3. Why does he change *Peraxylus* into Praxyle? 4. Who does he mean by his Diego *Auſtado?* Why did he not ſay Hurtade? My Readers will pleaſe to take notice, that I don't charge him with any of the errors, which may ariſe from the careleſneſs of the Printers, and that I have not ſeen his tranſlation any where but in Teiſſier's book.

[*C*] *The public had miſtaken for works already printed, the hopes which Geſner had given, with regard to ſome works of Arlenius.*] I have conſulted Father Labbe, Dr. Cave, and du Pin, in thoſe places where they give us a catalogue of St. Chryſoſtom's works ; and there met with the names of a great number of Tranſlators, but could never find Arnoldus Arlenius : nor did I meet with it in the Authors who treat of the editions and tranſlations of Dion. This almoſt convinced me, that Arlenius never printed the tranſlations mentioned by Teiſſier. Now in ſearching for the cauſe of this error, I find that it muſt be thrown entirely on Geſner's Epitomizers. He aſſerts in a poſitive manner (4), that Arlenius tranſlated ſome treatiſes on morality from the Greek of Plutarch, which no one, at that time, had tranſlated into Latin ; that he alſo tranſlated 22 books of Dion Cocceius's Roman Hiſtory ; Olympiodorus's Commentaries on Ariſtotle's Meteors (5), and ſome Sermons and Treatiſes of Chryſoſtom, Theodoret, &c. When I go as far back as Geſner, I find that the abovementioned tranſlations had been only expected. *Expectamus*, ſays he (6), *ab Arlenio noſtro, ſi Deus vitam extenderit, quoſdam ex Plutarcho, &c.* i. e. " We ex-
" pect from Arlenius, if God prolongs his life,
" ſome pieces from Plutarch, &c." The Epitomizers of Geſner ſay indeed, that Arlenius tranſlated thoſe books, but they don't ſay that thoſe tranſlations were publiſhed. They only ſay, that he cauſed Lycophron, with Tzetzes's Commentaries, to be printed at Baſil, anno 1545 ; and afterwards Joſephus in the ſame city (7), with a preface, but not accompanied with a tranſlation.

(4) *Epit. Bibl. Geſneri*, p. m. 80.

(5) We muſt read *ad Ariſtotelis meteora*, and not *ad Ariſtotelis commentaria.*

(6) *Bibliothecæ*, folio, 92 *verſo.*

(7) Geſner ſays, that *Joſephus* was publiſhed in 1544.

[*D*] *See in what manner he is applauded by Corradus.*] He writes of him as follows (8). *Ita quidem* (poſtulabantur interpretationes Epiſtolarum Ciceronis) *ut Arnoldus Arlenius homo eruditiſſimus ex Germania ad me Regium uſque venerit, & me ſuo, Joannis Opporini, Joannis Strathii, Magni Gruberi, aliorumque doctiſſimorum hominum nomine ſit hortatus, eas ut primo quoque tempore foras darem*, i. e. " So that (the notes on
" Tully's Epiſtles were deſired) Arnoldus Arlenius,
" a man of profound erudition, came to me from
" Germany as far as Reggio, and exhorted me, in
" his own name, and thoſe of John Opporinus,
" John Strathius, Magnus Gruberus, and other very
" learned men, to publiſh them with all poſſible diſ-
" patch."

(8) In *Quæſtura*, p. 100. Lugd. Batav. 1667.

[*E*] *I ſhall ſpeak of the great pains he took with Plato.*] We have ſeen elſewhere (9), that Simon Grynæus took great pains in preparing a better edition of the works of this Philoſopher. This edition is

(9) In the rem. [*B*] of the article GRYNÆUS (Simon).

(c) In the rem. [C]. I might have complained (*c*) of the Abridgers of Geſner for not mentioning his edition of Polybius [*F*].

is that of Baſil, *apud Joannem Valderum* 1534. Peraxylus compared it from beginning to end with ſeveral manuſcripts; and by that means corrected above a thouſand conſiderable errors, which conſiſted either of omiſſions, tranſpoſitions, alterations, or ſuperfluous words. His lucubrations were made uſe of, in the edition of Plato's works printed at Baſil, *apud Henricum Petri*, in 1556, folio, under the direction of Mark Hopper, who beſtowed great elogiums on Peraxylus. *Vir ille*, ſay he (10), *virtutibus & præſtanti doctrina clarus*, ARNOLDUS ARLENIUS, *ad eruendos, vindicandos, & reſtaurandos bonos autores diis ita volentibus, quaſi natus, nactus .... in Italia quædam manuſcripta Platonis exemplaria, conferre cum iis Vualderianum (cui & Aldinum reſpondebat) cœpit*; i. e. "ARNOLDUS ARLENIUS, a man renowned for his "virtue and excellent erudition, and ſent, as it "were, by Providence, to bring forth, and reſtore "valuable Authors; having found .... in Italy, "ſome manuſcript copies of Plato, undertook to col"late them with Valderus's copy, to which that of "Aldus anſwered." Having pointed out ſome of the errors which had been corrected, he adds, that he did not do this to leſſen the fame of thoſe who had publiſhed the former editions; but only to give the more advantageous idea of the new edition, and Peraxylus's merit; *Et ut magnum hoc* ARLENII *noſtri ſtudium, cura, & diligentia innoteſcat, collaudeturque, quam bonis promovendis literis, inque lucem producendis abditis & reconditis authoribus, jam ab annis aliquot multis indefinenter impendit, nullis vel ſumptibus vel laboribus parcens: pro quo ſane viri hujus indefatigabili ſtudio tota literatorum cohors maximas merito gratias agere, & vitam ei longævam ab omnis boni largitore Deo precari debet*; i. e. "And to point out and applaud the "great labour, care and diligence, which Arlenius "has beſtowed ſucceſſively, for a great many years, "for the advancement of uſeful literature, and bring"ing to light Authors that had been hid, he "ſparing neither expence or labour on that occaſion; "for which indefatigable toil, all the learned in ge"neral are bound to give him the greateſt thanks; "and to beſeech God, from whom all bleſſings "flow, to indulge him a long life." In fine, he ſpeaks of the manuſcripts which Peraxylus had diſcovered, and which would be of uſe, to give a very fine edition of the antient Commentators of Plato. *Idem ille noſter* ARLENIUS, *pro ardenti ſuo ſtudio & amore quo erga bonas literas, earundemque cultores quaſi flagrat, præter ingentem aliorum plane novorum librorum ſarcinam, etiam aliquot Græcorum commentariorum in noſtrum hunc philoſophum tomos, nobiliores Italiæ bibliothecas ſcrutando nactus eſt, eademque ſocero meo Henricho Petri tradidit*; i. e. "The ſame Arlenius, "from his ardent inclination and love, with which "he burns, as it were, for ſound learning, and "thoſe who cultivate it, beſides a great multitude "of other books, quite new, has procured, by "ſearching the fineſt libraries in Italy, ſome vo"lumes of Greek Commentaries made on this Phi"loſopher; and has put them into the hands of "Henry Petri, my father-in-law."

(10) Marcus Hopperus, *Epiſt. Dedicat. Oper.* Platonis.

[*F*] *His edition of Polybius.*] It is that of Baſil, *per Johannem Hervagium*, 1549, folio. It is greatly preferable to the preceding, which was publiſhed at Haguenau, in 1530, by John Secerius, under the direction of Vincent Obſopæus. The latter contained only the five firſt books of Polybius, with Nicholas Perrot's Latin tranſlation (11). That of Peraxylus contains likewiſe almoſt the ſixth book, and an epitome (12) of the 12 preceding books, copied from the library of Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, who had procured it from the library of Janus Moſchus, in the iſland of Corfu (Corcyra) (13). Beſides, it is more correct; for Peraxylus compared the Greek text of the Haguenau edition with ſeveral manuſcripts; and corrected and ſupplied a great many paſſages. Hervagius printed the Greek ſeparately, and afterwards Perrot's Latin verſion, reviſed by Muſculus; and the Latin tranſlation of the epitome of the 12 ſucceeding books, done by the ſame Muſculus.

(11) It was not over againſt, but apart, at the end of the book.

(12) They are rather extracts than an epitome.

(13) See the dedication of Arnoldus Peraxylus Arlenius, (in this order he ranks his names there) to Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, prefixed to his edition of *Polybius*.

☞ PERCIVAL, an antient and noble family, originally called to Parliament in Ireland, as Baron Percival, by Writ of Summons the 13th of Edward I. created Baronet 1660; Baron Percival of Burton, and Baron Percival 15th of March 1714-5; Viſcount Percival of Kanturck, December 1722; and Earl of Egmont in July 1733. We ſhall give ſome account of this family in Note [*A*]. The Arms of the Earl of Egmont are quarterly;

[*A*] *We ſhall give ſome account of this family in the note.*] The name of it is, in all probability, derived originally from that of *Percie*, which flouriſhed ſo long under the title of Northumberland, in England. It is conjectured, that the laſt ſyllables of this name was added to the other, on account of the ſcite of the poſſeſſion of a branch of that houſe; the termination *val* ſignifying, in old French, a valley. This ſuggeſtion ariſes, not only from the agreement of the names, but the ſimilitude of the arms of both houſes. Thoſe of the family of *Percie*, antiently here in England, and ſtill in Normandy, being *Sable a Chief indented Or*, as thoſe of *Percival* are *Argent a Chief indented Gules*, which were charged with three croſs Patees of the firſt, upon the expedition of Sir *Richard Percival* to the Holy War, in the ſame manner as the ſame Croſſes were added upon the like occaſions to the arms of Berkeley, and many other families. Sir Thomas St. George affirms, the family of Percival to have been eminent in rank in Normandy 200 years before the Conqueſt; which carries it up as far as the invaſion of that country by Rollo the Dane, firſt Duke of that Province. But it is indubitably and lineally traced for ſeven centuries, and diſtinguiſhed by a deſcent in blood through different channels, of the earlieſt and greateſt families of the old Nobility, from moſt of the Sovereign Houſes ſubſiſting now in Europe, deriving itſelf in this manner no leſs than ſeven times from *Gundred* and *Adelheid*, two daughters of William the Conqueror, twice from King Henry I. the only ſon of that Prince, who left legitimate iſſue, and thrice from Joan of Acres, daughter to King Edward I. It may boaſt alſo of a reiterated deſcent from Henry I. King of France, grandſon of Hugh Capet, Founder of the line now reigning in that Kingdom, and through theſe from the Imperial Houſe of Charlemagne, from Eva, daughter of Mac Morough, King of Leinſter in Ireland, from Leoline, Prince of Wales, and from Malcolm Canmore, King of Scotland, by his wife Margaret, the ſiſter of Edgar Athelin, ſole heireſs of the Saxon line in England. This great deſcent is fully proved by the moſt authentic and inconteſtable authorities; but the only branch, that now remains of this family, is that of the Earl of *Egmont*, the elder and principal Houſes being long ſince extinguiſhed (1). It appears evidently from record, that there were two families (2), which came into England with William the Conqueror in 1066, to whom the name of *Percival* was common. One of theſe continued long; of very great conſideration among the Barons of the early times, under the title of *Somery*; and the other has flouriſhed ſtill more, and continued longer under the different names of *Percival* and *Lovell*; from whom deſcended the Earls of Yvery in Normandy, the Barons *Lovell* of Caſtle-Kary in the County of Somerſet; the Barons *Lovell* of Tichmarſh and Minſter-Lovell, afterwards advanced to the higher honour of a Viſcount by Richard III. the Baron *Morley*, a younger brother of the Houſe of Tichmarſh, ſo honoured by his marriage with the Heireſs of Morley in the Reign of Henry VII. the *Percivals* Barons of Ireland in the Reigns of Edward I. and II. the preſent family of the

(1) A brief account of the family of PERCIVAL, communicated by the Right Honourable John Lord Viſcount Percival.

(2) Battle Abbey-Roll, in Hollenſhead.

quarterly ; 1ſt and 4th Percival Argent, on a Chief indented Gules, 3 Croſs Patees of the 1ſt being the Arms aſſumed by Sir Richard Percival in the Holy War ; 2d and 3d antient Percival and Lovel Or, crueile of Croſs Croſlets, a Lyon rampant Azure, being the

the Earls of *Egmont*; and all the other houſes of any note now exiſting of the ſame name in theſe Kingdoms (3).

(3) Brief Account, *ubi ſupra*.

The firſt anceſtor of this family, concerning whom we have any poſitive teſtimony, was *Robert* Lord of Breherval in Normandy, who lived before the Conqueſt, and held the Caſtle of Yvery in that Dutchy by the ſervice of three Knight's fees (4), of William de Bellmonte, Earl of Breteuil, Pacy, Conſtantin, and Yvery. This Robert left three ſons, *Aſcelin*, *Gouel*, and *William*. Aſcelin the eldeſt ſucceeded his father, and is ſometimes called *Aſcelin Gouel*, and *Gouel de Percheval*. He came over in the army of the Conqueror, an Officer of great Rank, being rewarded with many large Manors in England, particularly thoſe of Caſtle-Kary, Weſton Gordein, Stawell, *&c.* in the County of Somerſet. He married *Iſabella*, natural daughter of the Earl of Breteuil, who, in default of legitimate iſſue, became Heireſs in part of her father; and Aſcelin Gouel de Percheval was eſtabliſhed in the Earldom of Yvery by Henry I. King of England, in the year 1119, ſoon after which he died. From his marriage with Iſabella the 24th deſcent, and in the direct male is John the preſent Earl of Egmont. Aſcelin left ſeven ſons, and a daughter married to Radulfus Rufus; but as to the ſons, we have recovered only the names of three, *Robert*, *William*, and *Roger*. *Robert* dying without iſſue was ſucceeded by his brother *William*, who married Elizabeth ſiſter to Waleran Earl of Mellent in Normandy, and to the Earl of Leiceſter in England; by whom he had five ſons, *Waleran*, *Ralph*, *Henry*, *William*, and *Richard*. Waleran died without iſſue. From *Ralph* deſcended the Barons of Caſtle-Kary; as the Barons of Tichmarſh and Minſter-Lovell did from *William*. Richard, the fourth ſon, retaining the name of *Percival*, delivered it down to his deſcendants. He went a Commander to the Holy War in 1190 with King Richard I. and left three ſons, *Robert*, *Richard*, and *Hamelin*. Robert dying without iſſue was ſucceeded by his younger brother Sir *Richard Percival*, ſecond of that name, who was a Knight with his Father in the Holy War, and left three ſons, *Robert*, *Hugh*, and *John*. Robert the eldeſt going over to Ireland in 1265, became a Baron of that Kingdom; but that title was extinguiſhed in his grandſon Thomas, who died without iſſue. *Hugh*, the ſecond ſon of Sir Richard Percival, dying without iſſue, was ſucceeded by his youngeſt brother *John*; who left three ſons, *John*, *Roger*, and *Aſcelin*. Sir *Roger* the eldeſt married Joan de Breteſche, Daughter of Sir John de Breteſche, deſcended from the antient Counts of Guiſnes in Flanders, from whom likewiſe ſprung the Veres, Earls of Oxford in England, and the Dukes of Bournonville in France. Sir Roger Percival, dying about the year 1297, left two ſons, *John* and *Richard*, who was a Prieſt. Sir John, ſecond of that name, left two ſons, *John* and *Walter*; the elder of whom dying without iſſue was ſucceeded by his brother. Sir *Walter* dying in 1348 left two ſons, *John* and *Ralph*; the latter of whom ſucceeded his elder brother in the eſtate, and dying in 1384 left two ſons, *Ralph* and *John*. *Ralph* (the ſecond of that name) dying about the year 1412 left two ſons, *Richard* and *Walter*. Richard the third of that name dying about the middle of the reign of Henry VI. left two ſons, *Ralph* and *Thomas*. Ralph (the third of that name) dying April the 8th 1477, left three ſons, *Richard*, *John*, and *Ralph*, and a Daughter *Joan*. *Ralph* his third ſon left a ſon *Thomas*, who was ſucceeded by his ſon *David*, who dying in 1534, left a daughter named Blaſſe, and three ſons, *James*, *George*, and *Thomas*. *James* the eldeſt dying without iſſue, was ſucceeded by his next brother *George*, who married Elizabeth, daughter of Edward Bamfyld, Eſq; by whom he had a daughter and three ſons, *Richard Bamfyld*, and *Thomas*, of whom the two youngeſt died without iſſue. *Richard* the eldeſt having been guilty of many extravagancies, and married contrary to the approbation of his father, and being abandoned by him, travelled into Spain, where he ſtaid ſeveral years, and acquired a thorough knowledge of the Spaniſh tongue. Returning home he found his father ſtill in the ſame reſolution, and abſolutely determined not in the leaſt to contribute to his ſupport. This obliged him to apply to the Lord Burghley, who took him into his own houſe, where he employed him in the moſt ſecret tranſactions of State. Not long after, in 1586, the Spaniards making vaſt preparations for that great Armada, with which they two years afterwards invaded England, the world being ignorant upon what quarter the ſtorm would fall; a pacquet of letters in cypher was thrown overboard by a Spaniſh veſſel, and recovered by an Engliſh ſhip, which gave her chace. The letters were brought to the Lord Burghley, and laid by him before the Queen and Council, and no one there being able to decypher them, this Lord Burghley recommended *Richard Perctval*, as the only proper perſon he knew, both on account of his fidelity, which he had experienced, and his knowledge of the Spaniſh tongue, which he had learned abroad. To which the Queen agreeing, he was immediately ſent for, and the pacquet put into his hands by the Queen herſelf. The next morning he returned it to the Council, and preſented the letters decyphered and fairly tranſcribed in Latin, Spaniſh, and Engliſh. This was the firſt certain intelligence of the real intention of the Spaniards, which was afterwards more fully explained by a letter written to the Pope by the King of Spain, of which Sir Francis Walſingham obtained a copy out of the Pope's cloſet, by means of a Prieſt his Spy. The importance of this diſcovery was ſuch, and the expedition of the perſon employed in it ſo grateful to the Queen, that ſhe inſtantly ordered him a penſion of 800 Marks a year, which he enjoyed all his life after, and ſoon rewarded him farther with a place in the Duchy-Court of Lancaſter, worth 400 *l. per ann.* more. Sir Robert Cecil, ſecond ſon to the Lord Burghley, afterwards Earl of Saliſbury, being made Maſter of the Court of Wards, he was appointed by him Secretary of that Court, a place worth above 2000 *l. per. ann.* After which he was made Remembrancer of the ſame, and one of the Commiſſioners for executing the office of Receiver General; beſides which he obtained a great number of grants of wardſhips and leaſes of eſtates in ward to a great value. At this time his father obſerving the great advancement of his fortunes, took him into his favour again; and dying ſoon after left him his eſtate. Upon the death of the Earl of Saliſbury in 1612, he loſt all his employments; but upon the ſettlement of the Court of Wards in Ireland ſoon after, he was made Regiſter of that Court, and ſettled in that Kingdom. He died September 4, 1620, in the 69th year of his age, and by his ſecond wife Alice, Daughter of John Sherman, Eſq; left two Sons, *Walter* and *Philip*. *Walter* dying without iſſue in 1624, was ſucceeded by his brother *Philip*. This Sir Philip was Regiſter of the Court of Wards in Ireland, Chief Prothonotary of the Common Pleas, Keeper of the Records, Clerk of the Crown, Eſcheator of Munſter, Cuſtomer of Dublin, and General Feodary of Ireland. He held alſo ſeveral other employments of great profit, and grants of Wardſhips to an immenſe value; beſides which in the year 1641, when the Rebellion broke out in Ireland, he was poſſeſſed of an eſtate in land of 62000 acres, the Rent-Roll of which was 4000 *l. per. ann.* excluſive of his eſtate in England, which ſtill was conſiderable. Going over to England in 1642, he was appointed by the Parliament Commiſſary General of the Army; and upon his return into that Kingdom, Commiſſary General of the Victuals, and Provider General of the Horſe, having alſo a Command in the Army at the ſame time conferred upon him. He was a Member of the Long Parliament for the Borough of Newport in Cornwall; and died November 10, 1647, in the 48th year of his age. He married Catharine, Grand-daughter to Sir William Uſher, Knight,

(4) *Script. Norm. per Du Cheſne, Feoda Norm.*

the Arms of Aſcelin Gouel de Percival, Earl of Yvery in Normandy, and of the Barons Lovel of Kary in the County of Somerſet, the elder Branch of this Family.

Knight, by whom he had four ſons, *John*, *Arthur*, *George*, and *Richard*, of whom *Arthur* and *Richard* died young; and four daughters. The eldeſt ſon Sir *John* went over with Henry Cromwell to Ireland, where he recovered his eſtate; and was perfectly well acquainted with the intereſt of that Kingdom, and very ſerviceable to the Proteſtant intereſt in time of Oliver Cromwell. At the Reſtoration he was ſworn of the Privy Council of Ireland, and created a Baronet, and in 1662 choſen Knight of the Shire for the county of Cork; and the whole buſineſs of the Act of Settlement in Ireland, under which all the eſtates of that Kingdom are now held, was in a manner committed to him and the Lord Broghill, afterwards Earl of Orrery. May 26, 1664, he was appointed one of the Council of Trade; and in 1665 created by Act of Parliament Regiſter of the Court of Claims. He died November 1, 1665, in the 36th year of his age, and left iſſue by his wife Catharine, ſiſter of Sir Robert Southwell in the County of Glouceſter, Knight, four ſons, *Philip*, *Robert*, *John*, and *Charles*, and two Daughters, *Catharine* married to Sir William Moor in the County of Cork, Bart. and *Helena* to *Daniel Deering*, Eſq; ſon to Sir *Edw. Deering* of Surrenden in Kent, Bart. Of the ſons *Charles* the youngeſt died an infant; *Robert* the ſecond was murdered young; *Philip* the eldeſt ſucceeded his father; but dying Sept. the 11th, 1680, without iſſue, was ſucceeded by his brother Sir *John Percival*, who died April the 29th, 1686, in the 26th year of his age. He married Catharine, daughter of Sir Edward Deering, of Surrenden in Kent, Bart. by whom he had three ſons, *Edward*, *John*, and *Philip*; and two daughters, *Elizabeth* and *Mary*, both of whom died infants. Of the ſons, Sir *Edward*, the eldeſt, though but ſix years, was treated with great rigour by the Popiſh faction in Ireland; for at the revolution in 1688, notwithſtanding his youth, and the impoſſibility of his having done any thing to incur the juſt diſpleaſure of any Government, he was outlawed, and his eſtate (as far as it could be forfeited, being ſettled upon his other brother) confiſcated during his life to the Crown. But he recovered it upon the acceſſion of King William and Queen Mary, having ſuffered above 40000 *l.* by that revolution. He dying November the 9th, 1691, was ſucceeded by his next brother *John*, now Earl of Egmont, who in the reign of Queen Anne, was twice Knight of the ſhire for the county of Cork in Ireland, and one of the Members of the Privy Council; in which poſt he was continued by King George I. who upon his acceſſion to the throne, in 1714, created him Baron Percival of Burton, in the county of Cork; and in 1727, Viſcount Percival, of Kanturk, in the ſame county. Upon the acceſſion of King George II. he was ſtill continued a Member of the Privy Council; and being a Member of Parliament for the Borough of Harwich in Eſſex, was appointed Recorder of the ſame Borough. In 1733, he was created Earl of Egmont, an old ſeat of this family, in the county of Cork. He married Catharine, ſiſter to Sir Philip Parker, of Arwarton, in the county of Suffolk, Bart. by whom he had three ſons and four daughters, *John*, *Philip*, and *George*, and *Catharine*, *Mary*, *Mary* and *Helena*; of whom *John* the eldeſt, and *Catharine* and *Helena*, are now living; the reſt died infants. Of the daughters, the Lady *Catharine* married *Thomas Hanmer*, of Fenns, in the county of Flint, heir to Sir Thomas Hanmer, Bart. but he dying without iſſue, April the 1ſt, 1737, ſhe is now a widow. The Lady Helena is yet unmarried. *John*, now Lord Viſcount *Percival*, the only ſurviving ſon, is Member of Parliament for the Borough of Dingle in Ireland; and upon the 15th of February, 1737, married the Lady Catharine Cecil, ſecond daughter of James, late Earl of Saliſbury, by whom he has one ſon, named *John-James*, from his two godfathers, the Earls of Egmont and Saliſbury. H.

PEREIRA (GOMEZIUS), a Spaniſh Phyſician, lived in the 16th Century. He valued himſelf upon a ſpirit of contradiction, for he affected to attack the beſt eſtabliſhed Doctrines, and maintain Paradoxes. He was highly delighted with the liberty of Philoſophizing; he made a full uſe of it, and even carried it to an extreme. The *Materia prima*, with which Ariſtotle's followers made ſo much noiſe, was one of the monſters which he propoſed to deſtroy [*A*]. What he ſubſtituted in the room of this matter was not at all better than what he baniſhed *(a)*. He treated Galen very ſeverely with regard to the Doctrine of Fevers. But what was moſt aſtoniſhing in his Paradoxes was, that he taught that beaſts are machines, and rejected the ſenſitive Soul aſcribed to them. The Reader may

(a) See rem. [*A*].

[*A*] *The* materia prima . . . *was one of the monſters he propoſed to deſtroy.*] Arriaga, one of the moſt ſubtle Schoolmen of the 17th century, informs us of the objections that were made to our Pereira on that ſubject, and the weakneſs of ſome of his objections. *Recentiores nonnulli referunt quendam Gomeſium Pereiram in ſua Antoniana Margarita, negantem omnino materiam primam: contra quem plura congerunt argumenta, quæ oportet examinare, ne rem certam incertis ſuadeamus rationibus* (1). . . . *Hæc argumenta non urgent Gomeſium* (2); i. e. "It is affirmed by ſome Moderns, "that Gomez Pereira, in his Antoniana Margarita, "quite denies the *materia prima:* a great number of "arguments are produced againſt him, which it will "be neceſſary for us to examine, leſt we ſhould "ground a certainty upon uncertain reaſons or ar"guments. . . . But Gomez is no ways perplexed "with thoſe reaſons." It was objected to him, among other particulars, that if his doctrine was true, it would not be lawful to venerate the bones or relicks of Saints; for, after their death, there would not remain any matter which had belonged to them. This is one of the five objections, which he might have reſolved very eaſily, if Arriaga may be credited, who obſerved that this Philoſopher's doctrine or opinion was not underſtood (3). Hence he thinks it incumbent on him, to give a faithful account of it, and he afterwards oppoſes it with ſome other arguments. Pereira, ſays he, was not ſo wrong-headed, as to aſſert that forms are not received in a ſubject, and that man was compoſed only of a ſoul. He only ſaid, that the ſubject, to which ſouls and other ſubſtantial forms are united, is compoſed of the four elements, and not a *materia prima*; and he aſcribed the ſame ſimplicity to the elements, which is aſcribed to the *materia prima* in the ſchool of Ariſtotle. *Fatetur hic Author libentiſſimè, in homine (& idem eſt de aliis mixtis) ultra formam ſubſtantialem dari aliquod ſubjectum recipiens illam formam: neque enim tam amens erat hic Author, ut in homine & animantibus nihil aliud præter animam agnoſceret, & poſt mortem illius nihil remanere doceret quod eſſet veneratione dignum in Sanctis, & in quo manerent plura accidentia, quæ prius fuerant in homine vivo, putaretque cadavera nihil eſſe reale, ſed apparens & deludens ſenſus noſtros, vel ſaltem nihil illorum antea fuiſſe, quo ſatisfacit ferè omnibus argumentis in oppoſitum. Verum in hoc recedit hic Author à vera & recepta ſententia, quod illud commune ſubjectum non dicit eſſe materiam primam, ſed ex quatuor elementis unitis, & inter ſe permixtis putat coaleſcere. Elementa autem ipſa omnino adſtruit ſimplicia, ſicut nos materiam primam vel formam ſubſtantialem dicimus eſſentialiter ſimplicem* (4). According to Arriaga, the third of the five objections was pretty ſtrong againſt this doctrine of Pereira; for it proved, that one of the elements produced from another was a thing made naturally out of nothing. Pereira was not much perplexed with this; he aſſerting, that ſome creatures have the power of creating, which opinion of his Arriaga approved (5).

(1) Rod. de Arriaga, *Diſputat. 2. Phyſica*, ſect. 1. p. m. 217.

(2) Ibid. p. 218.

(3) *Hæc argumenta non urgent Gomeſium, multo aliter opinantem de entibus naturalibus quam iſti Authores cenſeant.* Ibid.

(4) Rod. de Arriaga, *Diſputat. 2. Phyſica*, ſect. 1. p. m. 218.

(5) *Reſpondet Gomeſius falſum eſſe nullam creaturam poſſe creare, nec facile hanc ſolutionem redargues ut infra patebit.* Idem, ibid.

may ſee all theſe particulars in a book entitled by him *Antoniana Margarita* [*B*]. It is pretended that Mr. Des Cartes ſtole from him the paradox concerning the ſoul of brutes, and that Pereira was not the inventor of it. It is proper to ſee what is found on this ſubject in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* [*C*]; and I muſt not omit taking notice, that

[*B*] *The book entitled by him*, Antoniana Margarita.] He alludes, in this title, to his father's and mother's name. Don Nicholas Antonio ſpeaks as follows of the work in queſtion. *Antoniana Margarita, opus Phyſicis, Medicis, ac Theologis utile & neceſſarium*, Medinæ Campi 1554, folio. *Francofurti deinde* 1610. . . Item, *novæ veteriſque Medicinæ experimentis & evidentibus rationibus comprobatæ primam partem, ſive Antonianæ Margaritæ ſecundam, quæ quidem Medica eſt poſt priorem illam Philoſophicam.* Hæc ſcilicet pars de *Febribus* tractat, cujus febris eſſentiam, cauſas, & ſpecies eſſe uſque in hæc tempora ignota dilucide (uti Author ipſe ait) demonſtrat, *Galenumque non dolo ſed ignorantia extæcatum potiſſimum ſuis de hac re ſcriptis medicis poſteris impoſuiſſe evidenter docet* (6); i. e. "Antoniana "Margarita, a work uſeful and neceſſary to Naturaliſts, Phyſicians and Divines, was printed at Medina del Campo, anno 1554, in folio, and afterwards at Frankfort, anno 1610. . . . Likewiſe "the firſt part of Phyſic antient and modern, proved "by experiments and manifeſt arguments, or the "ſecond part of Antoniana Margarita, which indeed relates to Phyſic, as the firſt does to Philoſophy. *For this part treats of fevers, whoſe nature, "cauſes and kinds he evidently ſhews, (as this Author "himſelf ſays) to have been quite unknown hitherto*; "and ſhews plainly, that Galen impoſed, not through "fraud, but ignorance, on poſterity, in his compoſitions on this ſubject." An anonymous Author wrote againſt him, in Spaniſh, anno 1556 (7). The *Antoniana Margarita* is grown a very ſcarce book. It was in Mr. Briot's library, which was ſold at Paris in 1679, where Mr. Faure bought it for two Louis d'ors, who ſhewing it me, ſaid, that he did not think he ſhould have purchaſed it ſo cheap. I believe that this book, and Mr. Faure's whole library, is now in the Archbiſhop of Rheims's library.

(6) Nicol. Antonius, *Bibloth. Scriptor. Hiſpaniæ*, Tom. 1. p. 414.

(7) *Adverſus hanc ſcripſit Anonymus Hiſpanum opuſculum ita nuncupatum*, Endecalogo contra Antoniana Margarita, *Medinæ Campi* 1556. 8. Id. ib.

I find in the Bibliotheque of Writers who were Phyſicians (8), that our Pereira's name was *George Gomez*; and that his *Antoniana Margarita, in qua omnium pene morborum diſcurſus proponuntur*, (in which moſt diſeaſes are treated of) was printed at Medina (9), by Anthony Graſbeet, anno 1554 and 1587; and that he publiſhed, in the ſame city, anno 1558, another folio work, entitled, *Nova veraque Medicina Chriſtiana ratione comprobata*. Konig has publiſhed ſome conſiderable errors concerning this Author. *Bruta*, ſays he (10), *ſenſu prædita eſſe opere operoſo & 30 annis elaborato, cui titulus* Antoniana Margarita, *oſtendere conatus eſt*; i. e. "He endeavoured to prove, "in a book entitled *Antoniana Margarita*, the "compoſing of which coſt him 30 years of prodigious pains, that brutes have ſenſitive ſouls."

(8) *Lindenius renovatus*, p. 328.

(9) *Methymnæ Duelli.* Ibid.

(10) Konig, *Bibliotb. vetus & nova*, p. 619.

Every one that peruſes this, will not gueſs that the particle *non* (not) was omitted after *prædita* (endued); and thoſe who do not perceive this, will look upon it as a riddle, or laugh at it. Such might look upon Pereira as the moſt crazy wretch living, ſince he was ſo ſilly as to torment himſelf for thirty years together, to prove that brutes have a ſenſitive ſoul. Thoſe who gueſs the omiſſion, will not avoid falling into error, but will be apt to believe, that the only deſign or aim of this Spaniſh Phyſician, in this work of thirty years, was to prove that brutes have no ſenſation: but this is only a ſmall part of the work in queſtion. *Ex eo*, continues Konig, *omnia* Carteſium *hauſiſſe quæ de brutorum anima commentatus eſt*, Olaus Borrichius in Epiſtola quadam aff. *i. e.* "Olaus "Borrichius aſſerts, in a certain letter, that Des "Cartes copied from that work, all he writ relating "to the ſouls of brutes." This alſo is a falſity. We ſhall ſoon ſee that Des Cartes did not believe brutes had ſouls, before he ever heard that there was ſuch a man as Pereira. At leaſt it is certain, that our Spaniard's work could ſuggeſt only this thought, in general, to Des Cartes, of rejecting a belief with regard to the ſenſation of brutes. Every thing beſides is peculiar to the French Philoſopher, and does not reſult either from the hypotheſes or explications of Pereira. Nicholas Antonio has not ſpoke of the anſwer to the objections of Palacios, publiſhed by Pereira in 1555.

[*C*] *What is found on this ſubject, in the* Nouvelles de la republique des Lettres.] "The moſt cunning "perſons would have laid a wager, that no man "could ever have been ſo ſtupid as to maintain "the contrary (11). And yet there was one in the "laſt century, who dared to maintain this paradox, "in a country where no one could poſſibly have ſuſpected that ſo new a doctrine would have taken "birth. The Reader will ſoon know my meaning, "if I only add, that it was a Spaniſh Phyſician who "publiſhed this doctrine at *Medina del Campo*, in "1554, in a work, the compoſing of which took "him up thirty years, and which he entitled *Antoniana Margarita*, in honour of the names of his "father and mother. Who could ever have thought "that Spain, where the freedom of the mind is leſs "tolerated, than that of the body in Turky, ſhould "give birth to a Philoſopher, who would be ſo raſh "as to advance, that animals have no ſenſation? "This is ſo extraordinary a circumſtance, that it "juſtly deſerved to be mentioned in this place; and "it would not be juſt to omit the name of this able "man, who firſt advanced (at leaſt that we know of) "this unheard of paradox. His name was *Gomez Pereira*, and he lived in the laſt century, and not in "the twelfth, as was ſaid by *Abbot de Gerard*, a "Doctor of Divinity, in his *Conferences on the Philoſophy of Courtiers*. This Gomez Pereira was ſtrongly attacked by *Michael de Palacios*, a Divine of Salamanca; and anſwered him as vigorouſly, without once receding from what he had advanced, "that *brutes are mere machines*. However, he had "no followers, ſo that his doctrine died with him. "People did not honour him ſo far as to dread him; "ſo that he was ſcarce more known to our age, "than if he had never been born; and it is very "probable that Des Cartes, who did not read much, "had never heard of him. Some nevertheleſs "think, that he borrowed from this Spaniſh Phyſician, the opinion he entertained, with regard to "brutes; for, by ſuch an aſſertion, they think to "deprive him of the glory of the invention, which "is ſo much conqueſt gained over him (12). Some time after, there was publiſhed in the abovementioned *Nouvelles de la Republique, &c.* an extract of a letter, which the Author had received from Paris; and which contained, among other particulars, the following words: *It is not true, as you aſſert, in page 23, that the opinion of Des Cartes, with regard to the ſoul of brutes, was ſtarted but in this age; for there were diſputes of this antiently, as appears from the following paſſage of St. Auſtin*, de quantitate animæ, chap. 30. Quod autem tibi viſum eſt non eſſe animam in corpore viventis animantis, quamquam videatur abſurdum, non tamen doctiſſimi homines quibus id placuit DEFUERUNT, neque nunc arbitror DEESSE (13); *i. e.* "With regard to your opinion, "that the body of a living brute is not informed "with a ſoul; though it may be thought abſurd, "nevertheleſs, ſome very learned men have been of "that opinion, and, I believe, there are ſome at "this time." The Author received another letter, which informed him that this opinion of Des Cartes was much older than St. Auſtin. This letter was writ by Mr. du Rondel, and the extract from it was publiſhed in the *Nouvelles, &c.* for October 1684. I will copy it here; and, for my Readers ſatisfaction, will ſet down in the margin, the books in which the authorities quoted may be found (14). "It was not only in St. Auſtin's time, that men "doubted with regard to the ſouls of brutes; but "alſo under the Cæſars, that is above three hundred "years before that Father of the Church was born. "The Stoicks uſed to ſpeak of nothing elſe, ſo far "as to aſſert in their ſchools, that there is only a reſemblance between our actions and thoſe of brutes; "and that there is a nature in men and brutes which "differ abſolutely one from the other. My Reader "muſt

(11) *i. e.* That beaſts have no ſenſation.

(12) *Nouv. de la Republ. des Lettres*, for March 1684, article 2. p. 20 *& ſeq.* Furetier, in all probability, had copied from hence, all that we find in page 27, of the *Furetieriana*, Bruſſels edit. Read there, *Antoniana* for *Antonima*.

(13) *Nouv. de la Republ. des Lettres*, for Auguſt 1684, article 1, p. 555, 556.

(14) Ibid. for October 1684, article 11, p. 838 *& ſeq.*

that a falſity is affirmed there with regard to the date of this opinion of Mr. Des Cartes.

" muſt not ſuppoſe that they ſaid this only of certain " actions, of which we have little or no ſenſation, " ſuch as digeſtion, ſanguification, conception, &c. " but they alſo underſtood it of the ſtrongeſt, the " moſt vehement, and the moſt ſenſible paſſions. A " Lion, according to them, was not angry, though " he tore to pieces whatever came in his way in the " amphitheatre. Theſe ſaid that his blood ferment- " ed and boiled in him, it being inflamed, un- " luckily or otherwiſe, by certain objects which " were repugnant to the nature of that animal. *Im-* " *petus habent feræ, rabiem, feritatem, incurſum; iram* (15) Seneca, lib. 1. *de Ira*, cap. 3. " *quidem non magis quàm luxuriam* (15). i. e. Savage " beaſts have violence, rage, fierceneſs, and will " attack; but then he cannot ſay that they are more " ſuſceptible of anger than of luxury. If you aſk " the cauſe of this; it is, Sir, becauſe a Lion whom " Seneca ſaw, happened to ſave the life of a crimi- " nal, without pretending that he ſhould be obliged " to him for it, nor from any propenſion to do a " good action: *Quia nec voluit facere, nec bene faci-* (16) Idem, *de Benef.* lib. 2. cap. 19. " *endi animo fecit* (16). Beſides, if brutes had been " ſuſceptible of anger, they alſo would have been " ſuſceptible of forgiveneſs. Now as clemency is an " effect of reaſon, and as brutes are uninformed " with it, theſe Stoicks concluded that brutes are not " ſuſceptible of anger nor of any other paſſion. " *Iraſci non magis ſciunt quàm ignoſcere; & quamvis* " *rationi inimica ſit ira, nuſquam tamen naſcitur, niſi* " *ubi rationi locus eſt. Tota ferarum ut extra, ita in-* " *tra, forma humanæ diſſimilis eſt* (17). i. e. They are (17) Idem, *de Ira*, lib. 1. cap. 3. " as incapable of being angry as of pardoning; " and though anger be an enemy, or repugnant to " reaſon, yet it is never found but where there is " room for reaſon. The whole exterior as well as " interior of brutes is unlike the human form. But, " Sir, a Cynick ſaid this above three hundred years " before the Stoicks of Rome. He believed and " taught in expreſs words, that brutes are not endued " with ſenſation nor knowledge. Is it not pity " that Pereira did not know all this? He would " have made great uſe of it againſt thoſe, who ac- " cuſed him of publiſhing a ſtrange novelty, and " would have laughed at the great erudition of his " antagoniſts. Here follow the words of the Cy- " nic in queſtion: διὰ δὲ τὸ, he ſpeaks of brutes, τὰ " μὲν ψυκτότητι, τὰ δὲ πλεοναςμῷ τῆς ὑγρασίας μηδὲ " διανοεῖσθαι μητὲ αἰσθάνεσθαι (18), *That they cannot* (18) Plut. *de Placit. Philoſ.* lib. 5. cap. 19. p. m. 909. " *be ſuſceptible of knowledge or ſenſation, becauſe of the* " *groſſneſs of their conſtitution, and their too great abun-* " *dance of moiſture.* But I do not pretend to warrant " this reaſoning of Diogenes." In the *Nouvelles de la Republique* for April 1685, is a recantation of the firſt extract. Peruſe what follows. *The perſon who had obſerved to us, that St. Auſtin declares that, in his time it was aſſerted that brutes have no ſouls, has lately wrote to us, that having conſulted the* 30*th book* De Quantitate Animæ, *where he was told this was ſaid, he found nothing in it that bears the leaſt relation to Gomez Pereyra. So that my obſervation is true ſtill, in this reſpect*, viz. that no one, before Gomez Pereyra, had taught that brutes are machines. *All that remains would be to enquire, whether the paſſages of Mr. du Rondel, quoted in the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres *for October, prove what he pretends* (19). Theſe (19) *Nouv. de la Repubi. des Lettres*, for April 1685, p. 435. latter expreſſions obliged Mr. du Rondel to collect ſeveral proofs. He intended to communicate them to me, but they were miſlaid, ſo that he could only recover what follows of them.

(20) Mr. du Rondel, in a little piece with which he was pleaſed to favour me in March 1696. I added the marginal quotations.

(20) " It is certain that Diogenes could not be- " lieve that brutes were informed with ſouls, ac- " cording to the principles of his phyſicks, and to " the end of his morality. There are, according to " him, Beings and half Beings. The former are " what they are by their own eſſence; and the latter " can be ranked with the former, either by partici- " pation or imitation, as the Cynicks ſpeak. The " ſecond was of two kinds. Some imitate the mind, " and incline to a circular motion; whilſt others " imitate the ſoul, and move in a ſtrait line: τὰ μὲν " Νοῦν μιμεῖται κ) κύκλῳ κινεῖται, τὰ δὲ ψυχὴν ἐπ' εὐ- " θείας. By the expreſſion circular motion, you will " preſently gueſs that he muſt mean the cœleſtial " Orbs. It is ſo, but eſpecially the milky way, to " which the Cynicks, as well as other Philoſophers, " aſcribed the origin of the paſſions, ἀφ' οὗ τὸ παθητὸν " ἴρχισθαι σῶμα. But, according to the manner " in which the antients deſcribed the deſcent of ſouls " thro' thoſe circles, it was impoſſible that brutes could " be ſuſceptible of any true paſſions. For a ſoul, " paſſing through the ſphere of Jupiter, imbibed " ambition; and in like manner it imbibed indo- " lence in that of Saturn, haughtineſs in that of " Mars, a thirſt of gain in that of Mercury, &c. " (21) .... So that, as we do not obſerve the like (21) See Macrobius, *in Somnium Scipionis*, lib. 1. cap. 12. " paſſions in brutes, at leaſt in the ſame manner as " we obſerve them in men, they neceſſarily muſt not " have been informed with ſouls (the uſual ſeat of the " paſſions) or that their paſſions were fictitious or " counterfeit, or ſomething like thoſe of men, by " a fortuitous imitation. For this reaſon the Cy- " nicks ranked brutes among ſuch bodies as moved " in a direct line, that is, among ſuch heavy bodies " as tend towards the center. And indeed the na- " ture of brutes is always the ſame, and ever keeps its " uſual determination. There is not the leaſt diffe- " rence or variety in their employments. They are " all condemned to the ſame rule; and their capa- " city extends little farther than to lodge and feed " themſelves. For this reaſon it was ſaid of them, " that all their inclinations were groveling, heavy, " and baſe; and that nature had formed them pur- " poſely to bend towards the earth. *Prona ſunt, &* " *ex ipſa quoque ſuſpiciendi difficultate à ſuperis receſſe-* " *runt, nec ullam divinorum corporum ſimilitudinem ali-* " *qua ſui parte meruerunt, nihil ex mente ſortita ſunt,* " *& ideò ratione caruerunt, duo quoque tantum adepta* " *ſunt, ſentire vel creſcere*, ſays Macrobius (22), with (22) Idem, ibid. cap. 14. p. m. 55. " the following reſtriction of Virgil,

" *Quantum non noxia corpora tardant,*
" *Terrenique habetant artus*——

" (becauſe that adds he) *in animalibus hebeſcit uſus ani-* " *mæ* DENSITATE *corporis*, which ſeems to be tranſ- " lated from Diogenes, who ſays that *animals are not* " *capable of ſenſation or knowledge, becauſe of the* DEN- " SITY *and abundance of their moiſture.* See Plutarch, " *Lib.* V. *Chap.* XX. Macrobius, I ſay, ſeems to " have tranſlated Diogenes; and this may be reaſo- " nably ſuppoſed, becauſe he employs the ſame " word: but I am not very ſure whether Virgil, " with his *noxia corpora* (23), had in view what Dio- (23) Virgil. *Æn.* lib. 6. ver. 731. " genes ſays afterwards, *that brutes are like madmen* " *deprived of reaſon:* διακεῖσθαι τοῖς μεμηνόσι, παρεπ- " ταικότως τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ: for though *noxia* implies " hurt and loſs, nevertheleſs μεμηνόσι ſeems to ſig- " nify more: and therefore a Cynic Commentator, " to make us fully conceive this, explains it by the " image of perſons poſſeſſed with the devil. He " affirms that, when ſouls quit bodies and ſearch for " another habitation, if they meet only with bodies " in which reaſon never reſided, the ſouls follow and " haraſs them, and never animate them, as they do " organized bodies deſigned for their reſidence, ὥσπερ " οἱ τιλησκότες ἡμᾶς Δαίμονες. . . Theſe, you will ſay, " are Platonic ideas, which don't agree very well " with our notion of the doctrine of the Cynicks. " This is not my fault. It is Saluſt the Cynic ſays " this; and beſides, Diogenes was not ſo averſe to " the Platonick principles as is naturally imagined. " One Tiberianus tells us in his Socrates, that Dio- " genes had ſeized on the whole philoſophical patri- " mony of Plato: *Memores Platonis ſententiæ, cujus* " *hæreditatem Diogenes Cynicus invadens, nihil ibi* " *plus* * *aureâ linguâ invenit.* i. e. Calling to mind " the ſaying of Plato, whoſe patrimony being ſeized " by Diogenes the Cynick, he found nothing more " in it than a golden tongue.

* It is the art of living well. This paſſage from Tiberianus, is cited with reference to Virgil's *Golden Bough*.

" But what I ſay with regard to Diogenes, will " be ſtill more evident by the end of his morality. " According to him, a man, who would live as he " ought to do, ought to be inſenſible; and though " this may ſeem ſtrange and even impoſſible, yet this " Philoſopher muſt have attained to that philoſophi- " cal State, the antients being too poſitive in that cir- " cumſtance to be miſtaken. I know not whether " he made uſe of Chiron's precepts for this purpoſe, " which are mentioned by Maximus Tyrius: nor " can I ſay whether it was from the rules of Antiſ-

Cartes [*D*]. If this Doctrine be a very ſtrange one, we are not to be ſurprized; of all phyſical objects there is none more abſtruſe or perplexing than the ſoul of brutes. The extreme opinions upon this ſubject are either abſurd or very dangerous; the medium, which ſome have endeavoured to keep, is not to be ſupported. I hope that I ſhall be excuſed in the liberty, which I am going to take, in exhauſting my Collections with regard

" thenes, the Author of the Apathy: but *as he was* " *an Angel of Jupiter, ſent to men to teach them good* " *and evil,* as Epictetus declares; it is my opinion " that he was guided wholly by the dictates of his " own mind. As it was his cuſtom to ſay, that *we* " *muſt oppoſe reaſon to the paſſions, courage to fortune,* " *and nature to cuſtoms*; he, at laſt, reſolved to fol- " low the deſign or intention of nature; and ima- " gined that a man, in order to be a genuine child " of that tender mother, ought to reſemble brutes, " who are ſo natural, ſo faithful an image of her, " in the places of their birth. Diogenes therefore " embraced that opinion, and practiſed it by po- " verty, faſting, and the contemplative life, which " he had the honour to invent. It is related that " Alexander the Great, when upon the point of " conquering India, and already ſure of his deſtiny, " had the courage to wiſh to be Diogenes: ſo great- " ly he envied a life of ſecurity and repoſe! ſo far " the life of the Cynicks ſeemed to him ſuperior to " nature! *Diſputare cum Socrate licet, dubitare cum* " *Carneade, cum Epicuro quieſcere, hominis naturam* " *cum Stoicis vincere, cum* CYNICIS EXCEDERE (24). " i. e. A man may diſpute with Socrates, doubt with " Carneades, lead an undiſturbed life with Epicurus, " conquer nature with the Stoicks, and SURPASS IT " WITH THE CYNICKS. To ſay the truth, this inſen- " ſibility is an odd kind of State, to which no one " has attained without paying very dear for it: *Iſtuc* " *nihil dolere, non ſine magnâ mercede contigit, immani-* " *tatis in animo, ſtuporis in corpore* (25). i. e. This " ſtate of inſenſibility is not acquired but at a very " great price, *viz.* the utmoſt hardneſs of heart " or mind, and ſtupor of body: however, it is a " ſtate that is very well adapted to the calamities of " this life: and what man among the Heathens but " would have been very glad to have had it ſaid of " them, what was ſaid of certain nations whom you " knew? *Victui herba, veſtitui pelles, cubile humus.* " *Id beatius arbitrantur, quam ingemere agris, illabo-* " *rare domibus, ſuas alienaſque fortunas ſpe metuque ver-* " *ſare. Securi adverſus homines, ſecuri adverſus Deos,* " *rem difficillimam aſſecuti ſunt, ut illis ne voto quidem* " *opus ſit,* i. e. They feed on herbs, are clad with " ſkins, and lye on the ground. This they look " upon as a more happy life than to toil in the fields, " to labour and build houſes, and to be troubled " with hopes and fears about their own poſſeſſions " and thoſe of other people. Being thus ſecure " both againſt men and the Gods, they have attained " a very difficult point, viz. the not having occaſion " ſo much as to wiſh for them."

(24) Seneca, *de Brevitate Vitæ*, cap. 14. p. m. 711.

(25) Cicero, *Tuſcul. Quæſt.* lib. 3.

Had I an opportunity of often obliging my readers with ſuch rare, ſuch profound pieces of borrowed erudition, what an ornament would it be to this Dictionary! But I will now cite (26) ſome paſſages from Ariſtotle, whence one would be apt to conclude, that he looked upon brutes as mere machines.

(26) In the rem. [*H*].

[*D*] *I muſt not omit taking notice that a falſity is affirmed in* the Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *with regard to the date of this opinion of Des Cartes.*] " As Gomez Pereira did not draw his pa- " radox from its true principles, nor ſaw into the " conſequences of it, Des Cartes may have found it " firſt in a philoſophical way. 'Tis nevertheleſs very " probable, that he diſcovered it without ſearching " for it. He, in all probability, began and ended " his meditations without once thinking about the " ſouls of brutes and without laying aſide the opi- " nion he had entertained of it from his infancy; " and it was but by conſidering the conſequences of " his principle, with regard to the diſtinction of " thinking and extended ſubſtances, that he perceiv- " ed that the knowledge of brutes deſtroyed the " whole œconomy of his ſyſtem. Nay, perhaps this " objection was made to him, before he thought of " this difficulty. Mere neceſſity therefore made him " aſſert that brutes have no ſenſation. Had it been " poſſible for him to have defended his principles " without this, he could never have attacked an opi- " nion, which not only appeared indiſputable to eve- " ry one, but which is enforced with an utmoſt in- " vincible evidence (27)." To know if this Author is miſtaken, we muſt add to this paſſage the illuſtration he gave on that occaſion, as we find it at the cloſe of the Preface, which was publiſhed at the ſame time with the paſſage which wanted to be cleared up. *I ſaid in the ſecond article of the Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, that Mr. Des Cartes,* in all probability began and ended his meditations without once thinking about the ſouls of brutes, and without laying aſide the opinion he had entertained about it from his infancy. *This would be an error in point of fact, if I ſpoke of his ſix famous meditations, which were dedicated to the Sorbonne, and againſt which ſo many objections were ſtarted; for the Treatiſe on* the Method, *printed in* 1637, *at the head of theſe ſix meditations, ſhews evidently that Des Cartes already believed that brutes have no ſouls. I therefore declare, that by Des Cartes's meditations, I did not mean thoſe which he dedicated to the Sorbonne. My meaning is, that he probably completed the building a new ſyſtem in his imagination, without once thinking of the ſenſitive ſoul of brutes. Now I do not doubt but that he had quite finiſhed, in his mind, his work, before he publiſhed his method* (28). But this Author, notwithſtanding this explication, is certainly miſtaken; for this Hypotheſis of the *Automata* is one of Des Cartes's oldeſt ſpeculations, as is evident from the proofs which Baillet has given of this. He ſpeaks as follows (29): *To ſuppoſe that thoſe works of Des Cartes were writ in the year* 1619, *is ſuppoſing his opinion, with regard to the* ſoul of brutes, *above twenty years older than his adverſaries, and ſome learned men before them had endeavoured to fix it. When theſe people ſhall be told, that this opinion was found in the works written in his youth, they will perhaps no longer ſay,* " that he began and ended his meditations without " once thinking about the ſouls of brutes, and with- " out laying aſide the opinion he had entertained of " it from his infancy. *They will no longer think that* " it was but by conſidering the conſequences of his " principles, without the diſtinction of thinking and " extended ſubſtances, that he perceived that the " knowledge of brutes deſtroyed the whole œconomy " of his ſyſtem." *Theſe people will not longer be perſuaded, that the obligation he lay under of anſwering the objections which were made to him on that account, ſuggeſted a thought, for which he was beholden to nothing but the freedom of his thoughts. It was not yet incumbent upon him to aſſert that brutes have no ſenſation, ſince he had not the gift of foreſeeing what would happen to him twenty years after. He had not, at that time, any principles to ſave or defend, as he had not yet eſtabliſhed any for the new Philoſophy: at leaſt he had not peruſed, at that age, either St. Auſtin, Pereira, or any Author from whom he might have borrowed that opinion with reſpect to the ſoul of brutes. Des Cartes, five or ſix years after, being returned from his travels to Paris *, revealed that opinion to ſome of his friends; and gave them to underſtand, that he could not believe that brutes were any thing but mere machines. So that thoſe who will find a difficulty in aſcribing this ſentiment to him ſo early as the year* 1619, *will more readily believe that this opinion occurred to his mind not later than the year* 1625. *They perhaps will not refuſe to believe Des Cartes himſelf* †, *who ſays that it occurred to him fifteen or ſixteen years before he publiſhed his metaphyſical meditations. By the way, Paſcal extends this opinion with regard to the Automata more than any other part in Des Cartes's philoſophy.* Mr. Baillet was ſo extremely polite, that he refuted the Author of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* without naming him; and, on the contrary, named him, when he mentioned a thought, which appeared to him praiſe worthy. This, in ſome meaſure, is an exceſs of ceremony prejudicial to the liberty enjoyed in the commonwealth of letters: this is

(27) *Nouv. de la Republ des Lettres*, for March 1684. p. 22.

(28) Ibid. at the cloſe of the Preface.

(29) Baillet, *Vie des Cartes*, Tom. 1. p. 51, 52.

* See the manuſcript letter of Iſaac Beeckman, to Father Merſenne, in 1631, whence it is judged, that long before this, he had imparted to his friends in Paris, his opinion, with regard to the *Automata*, long before.

† Compare the manuſcript treatiſes *Thaumantis Regia*, compoſed in his youth; and another he cites in his *Method*, as written long before, with the letters of Tome 3. p. 63. of Tome 2. p. 9, 37, 230.

regard to the opinions of the antients and moderns concerning the nature of the ſoul of brutes [*E*]. Many perſons will think I ſay too much; but learned men will be of opinion,

is introducing into it works of ſupererogation, every man ought to be allowed to name thoſe whom he refutes; it is enough that ſuch a one forbears all churliſh, rude, and injurious expreſſions.

I alſo will quote this other paſſage from Baillet, it relating to the ſame ſubject. "Many are of opinion, that "Des Cartes had borrowed the famous opinion with "regard to the ſoul of brutes, from Gomez Pereira. . . "But we may very much doubt, whether Des Cartes "ever heard of this Pereira; and whether his book, "which has always been pretty ſcarce, ever fell into "the hands of a man, who cared ſo little for books "and reading as our Philoſopher. But all uncer-"tainty in this affair will at once be removed, ſince "Des Cartes had not ſeen Pereira's book, the year "after the publication of his metaphyſical Medita-"tions *; and had already made known his opi-"nion with regard to the ſouls of brutes, upwards "of fifteen or twenty years before, as has been ob-"ſerved in the firſt book of this hiſtory. Beſides, "as Mr. Bayle † has very well obſerved, as Pereira "did not draw his paradox from its true princi-"ples, and not having foreſeen the conſequences of "it; Des Cartes may very probably have been the "firſt who diſcovered it in a philoſophical way. By "the way, Pereira was not the inventor of this Doc-"trine; for, in St. Auguſtin's time **, it was de-"bated by men of very great learning, as an opi-"nion which had a great number of Partizans, not-"withſtanding the palpable abſurdity the vulgar "found in it. This Doctrine was of greater an-"tiquity than St. Auſtin, than even Seneca and the "firſt Cæſars ††, according to Mr. du Rondel's ob-"ſervation, who traces it as far back as the Stoicks "and Cynicks (30)."

* He ſent word to Father Merſenne, that he had never ſeen that book, MS. letter, dated 23d June, 1641.

† *Nouv. de la Republ. des Lettres*, 1614 Tom. 1. p. 22.

** Tom. 2. p. 12. *Nouv. de la Republ. des Lettres*, Auguſtin, cap. 30. *de Quantitate Animæ.*

†† *Nouv. de la Republ.* Ibid. p. 291.

(30) Baillet, *Vie de Des Cartes*, Tom. 2. p. 537.

[*E*] *With regard to the opinions . . . . concerning the nature of the ſoul* of brutes.] Moſt of the antient Philoſophers have taught, that this was a rational ſoul; and conſequently they muſt have ſuppoſed that it differed only more or leſs from that of men. Anaxagoras ſuppoſed the difference to conſiſt in this, that men can explain their reaſonings or arguments, and that brutes cannot explain theirs. Ἀναξαγόρας πάντα ζῶα λόγου ἔχειν τὸν ἐνεργητικὸν, τὸν δ' οἱονεὶ νοῦν μὴ ἔχειν τὸν παθητικὸν, τὸν λεγόμενον τοῦ νοῦ ἑρμηνέα. *Anaxagoras omnia animalia habere mentem agentem: non item patientem, qui eſt mentis quaſi interpres* (31). Pythagoras and Plato did not differ much from this opinion; ſince they ſaid, that the ſoul of brutes, though really rational, does nevertheleſs not act according to the dictates of reaſon, from their being denied the faculty of ſpeech, and the ill proportion of their Organs (32). It were to be wiſhed that Plutarch, who could expatiate ſo nobly on ſubjects whenever he pleaſed, had not been ſo conciſe on this occaſion: but though his expreſſions be ever ſo laconic, we cannot entertain any doubt with regard to Pythagoras's doctrine. It is plain enough that, according to this Philoſopher, the ſoul of brutes does not differ ſubſtantially from the ſouls of men; for he taught the tranſmigration of ſouls, *i. e.* that they paſſed indiſcriminately from the body of a man into that of an animal, or from the body of an animal into that of a man. Few doctrines have had more followers than this. I believe that no Philoſophers have ſpoke more advantageouſly of the ſoul of brutes than Porphyry. He aſcribed to them, not only reaſon, but alſo the faculty of making their reaſoning underſtood: and he was of opinion that ſome perſons underſtood their language; and that man ſurpaſſes them only in this particular, that his reaſoning is more refined. *Porphyrius*, Lib. III. *De abſtinentia ſtatuit naturam omnibus animantibus, quibus ſenſum & memoriam dedit, rationem quoque, imò & orationem, tam internam quàm externam, tribuiſſe: additque, Apollonium Tyanæum, Melampum, Tireſiam, & Thaletem, brutorum ſermones dijudicaſſe atque intellexiſſe: quos nihil mirum ſi non intelligamus ipſi, qui plurimarum etiam nationum linguam minimè callemus. Aſſerit itaque bruta rationem participare, neque per eam ab illis hominem ſimpliciter diſtingui; ſed quòd homini perfectum rationis acumen inſit, illis imperfectum* (33). i. e. "Porphyry in his third "book relating to abſtinence, is of opinion, that "nature has beſtowed on all animals, to whom it "gave ſenſation and memory, reaſon, and likewiſe "ſpeech, as well internal as external: and adds, "that Apollonius Tyanæus, Melampus, Tireſias and "Thales diſcovered and underſtood the language of "brutes; which it is no wonder we do not under-"ſtand, as we are ſo little ſkilled in the language of "moſt nations. He aſſerts therefore that brutes "have ſome portion of reaſon, and that they are "not merely diſtinguiſhed from men by that faculty; "but only becauſe reaſon is more perfect in them "than in brutes." He proves this by arguments and authorities; and cites Empedocles, Plato, and Ariſtotle. *Confirmat iſtiuſmodi dogma in primis ex mutua ſignificatione, qua inter ſe bruta utuntur, quod in avibus potiſſimum apparet, quæ ſibi occinunt vicisſimque reſpondent. Deinde, ex admirabili ſolertia, curaque in futurum proſpiciendi, utilia conſectandi, declinandi adverſa. Præterea, teſtimonio Empedoclis & Platonis, atque etiam Ariſtotelis, quos idem cenſuiſſe, ex eorum dictis ſcriptiſque haberi ait* (34). i. e. "He confirms that opinion, in "the firſt place, from the informations which brutes "communicate reciprocally to one another, which is "ſeen eſpecially in birds, who ſing to, and reply al-"ternately to each other. Then, from their won-"derful apprehenſion and ſagacity, and their great "foreſight, in purſuing whatever may be of advan-"tage, and ſhunning every thing hurtful. Thirdly, "from the teſtimony of Empedocles, Plato, and even "Ariſtotle, whom he declares to have had the ſame "opinion, as both their ſayings and writings evi-"dently ſhew." Thoſe who alledge theſe words, think that Ariſtotle is not quoted to the purpoſe (35). They pretend that he aſcribed to brutes only an image or copy of reaſon; and they laughed at that pretended language which Tireſias, Melampus, *&c.* were ſaid to underſtand; on which occaſion they obſerve that a Rabin has followed the error of Porphyry, and believed that Solomon underſtood that language. *Quod item addebat Porphyrius, bruta inter ſe colloqui, & à quibuſdam intelligi, non ita eſt, etſi ita eſſe crediderit quidam ex Hebræis doctoribus, teſte Abulenſi ad capit. 3. libr. 3. Regum, quæſt. 11. aſſerens, eorum voces percalluiſſe Salomonem* (36). It perhaps would not be very eaſy for them to ſhew, that their Ariſtotle eſtabliſhed a ſubſtantial diſtinction between the ſouls of men and thoſe of brutes; for it would not be a good proof to ſay that he did not believe brutes are guided by reaſon; ſince it is certain that children and mad people are informed with a ſoul like to that of the moſt rational perſons; and that moſt brutes ſeem to diſcover a greater portion of reaſon than children of a year old and madmen. One might therefore believe, that Ariſtotle acknowledged only a greater or leſs difference between the ſoul of brutes and that of men, *i. e.* that the difference of the organs, according to him, occaſioned the ſoul of man to reaſon with eaſe and ſubtlety, and that of brutes reaſoned only after a confuſed manner. This might be confirmed by the opinion of thoſe, who declare, that he did not believe the immortality of the ſoul (37).

One circumſtance muſt be obſerved, *viz.* that the antients, when they quitted the poetical or oratorial ſtyle, did not acknowledge a true or eſſential difference between the human ſoul and matter. I do not ſpeak of groſs, heavy, palpable matter; but of that which the Chymiſts call ſpirits, which is as eſſentially body and matter, and dirt and fleſh can be. They therefore muſt have believed, that the ſouls of men differed from that of brutes only in a greater or leſs degree, and according to different gradations of ſubtilty; and conſequently they muſt have ſuppoſed, that the bare formation or ſtate of the Organs is the reaſon why reaſon does not diſplay itſelf in brutes as in men. Galen was doubtleſs of this opinion, he not believing that ſouls are incorporeal: he did not diſtinguiſh them from the natural heat and the harmony of the conſtitution (38). I am ſenſible that many have aſſerted that the ſoul of man deſcended from Heaven: but this does not prove that they thought the ſoul immaterial (39). Beſides, the Stoicks taught, that

(31) Plutarch, *de Placit. Philoſoph.* lib. 5. cap. 20. p. 298.

(32) Οὐ μὴν λογικῶς ἐνεργήσας παρὰ τὴν δυσπραξίαν τῶν σωμάτων καὶ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν τὸ φρασικόν. *Non tamen ea agere ſecundum rationem, idque fieri ob incommodum corporum temperamentum & quia loquela deſtituuntur.* Idem, ibid. p. 909.

(33) *Conimbricenſes in Phyſic.* Ariſtotel. lib. 2. cap. 9. Quæſt. 3. Art. 1. p. m. 225.

(34) Ibid.

(35) *Quod autem aſſerebat Porphyrius, ex Ariſtotelis doctrinâ colligi, exiſtimaſſe illum bruta ratione pollere; falſum eſt: niſi rationem ſumat pro rationis imitatione, quam ſolam brutis quibuſdam Ariſtoteles attribuit, tum loco citato.* (that is to ſay, lib. 4. *de Hiſt. Animal.* cap. 9.) alſo Tome 1. Metaphyſic. cap. 1. ibid. Art. 3. p. 227.

(36) Ibid.

(37) Pomponatius aſſerted this ſtrongly. See La Mothe le Vayer's *Diſcourſe on the Immortality of the Soul.* It is in Tom. 4. of his works, edit. in 12mo.

(38) See the book entitled, *Nic. Nancelii Trachyeni Noviodunenſis de Immortalitate Animæ Velitatio adverſus Galenum*, printed at Paris, in 1587. 8vo.

(39) See rem. [*R*] of the art. LUCRETIUS the Philoſopher.

nion, that I do not ſay a quarter of what they could produce upon this ſubject. They will judge thus alſo with regard to other places, where I have been a little prolix. I ſhall

that all ſouls, indiſcriminately, flowed from the ſame ſource. *Perſuaſum iis, à Deo, id eſt Mundi animâ, animam hanc eſſe. Laërtius* * : Τὰς τῶν ὅλων ψυχὰς μέρη εἶναι τὰς ἐν τοῖς ζῴοις. Animæ univerſi, partes eſſe animantium Animas. *Omniumne animantium? omnium: ſed aliæ aliis magis participant, ut ſunt corpora & inſtrumenta. Eſt Socraticum* † : Mundi animam, fontem animarum omnium eſſe. *Sed illam, quæ ratione uteretur, cognatam & participem, imò jam partem divinitatis eſſe. Plutarchus:* ** Ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ μετασχοῦσα τοῦ λογισμοῦ, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐτέρα τοῦ Θεοῦ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μέρος, οὐδ' ἐκ' αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ αὐτοῦ γέγονεν: Anima mentis & ratiocinationis conſors, non opus ſolum Dei; ſed & PARS eſt; neque ab ipſo, ſed ex ipſo eſt facta. *Enimverò etiam aliæ (hac ratione) partes Dei, id eſt mundanæ animæ: ſed iſta ſcilicet eximiè, & quæ proximè vim naturamque ejus referret* (40). Could they therefore believe, that the ſouls of brutes were deſtitute of ſenſation? I do not think they believe this; and if Seneca ſaid ſo in the paſſages cited by the learned Mr. du Rondel, he has manifeſtly confuted himſelf in others. Whoever peruſes his laſt epiſtle, will find that he denies brutes only reaſon, wiſdom, true goodneſs, felicity, but not ſenſation: *In quo non poteſt beata vita eſſe, nec id poteſt quo beata vita efficitur: beata autem vita bonis efficitur: in muto animali non eſt quo beata vita efficitur: ergo in muto animali bonum non eſt. Mutum animal* SENSU *comprehendit præſentia: præteritorum reminiſcitur, cùm id incidit, quo ſenſus admonetur: tanquam equus reminiſcitur viæ, cùm ad initium ejus admotus eſt. In ſtabulo quidem nullæ viæ, quamvis ſæpè calcatæ, memoria eſt. . . . . Nec illud nego, ad ea quæ videntur ſecundùm naturam, magnos eſſe mutis animalibus impetus & concitatos, ſed inordinatos ac turbidos. Nunquam autem aut inordinatum eſt bonum, aut turbidum. Quid ergo, inquis, muta animalia perturbatè & indiſpoſitè moventur? Dicerem illa perturbatè & indiſpoſitè moveri, ſi natura illorum ordinem caperet: nunc moventur ſecundùm naturam ſuam. Perturbatum enim id eſt, quod eſſe aliquando & non perturbatum poteſt. Sollicitum eſt, quod poteſt eſſe ſecurum. Nulli vitium eſt, niſi cui virtus poteſt eſſe. Multis animalibus talis ex ſuâ naturâ motus eſt. Sed ne te diu teneam, aliquod erit bonum in muto animali, erit aliqua virtus, erit aliquid perfectum: ſed quale? nec bonum abſolutè, nec virtus, nec perfectum. Hæc enim rationalibus ſolis contingunt, quibus datum eſt ſcire, quare, quatenus, quemadmodum. Ita bonum in nullo eſt, niſi in quo ratio* (41). i. e. "That "wherein life cannot be rendered happy, cannot do "thoſe things which make life happy: but life is "made happy in the good: there is nothing in "brutes by which life is made happy; conſequently "there is no goodneſs in brutes. A brute compre- "hends the preſent by ſenſation; and recollects "things paſt, when any thing occurs which calls up "that ſenſation: as a horſe, when led to the begin- "ning of a road, will remember it: but when he "is in the ſtable, he does not remember any thing "of the road, how often ſoever he may have tra- "velled in it. . . . . Nor do I deny, but that brutes "are ſtrongly excited by nature, to thoſe things they "ſee; but then thoſe tranſports are inordinate and "confuſed. Now whatever is inordinate and con- "fuſed cannot be good. Here you aſk: are brutes "moved or excited in an inordinate and confuſed "manner? To this I anſwer, that they would be "moved inordinately and confuſedly, were they, by "nature, ſuſceptible of order: now they are moved "or prompted according as nature excites them. For "that is confuſed, which is capable of being ſome- "times not confuſed. That is ſolicitous or anxious "which may be undiſturbed. Nothing is vicious "but what may have virtue. Brutes have ſuch "emotions naturally. But to dwell no longer on "this ſubject; there will be ſome goodneſs, ſome "virtue, ſome perfection, in a brute: but of what "kind is this? It is not abſolute goodneſs, virtue, or "perfection. Theſe are only the portion of rational "creatures, who are able to know wherefore, how "far, in what manner. Conſequently nothing can "have goodneſs but what is endued with reaſon." Seneca lays down a principle, which ſhews in what ſenſe he ſays elſewhere, that brutes are not prompted to anger, and are incapable of conferring a benefit. He ſuppoſes that a nature, which is not ſuſceptible of the two contraries or oppoſites, is not ſuſceptible of either: whence he concludes, that as brutes are not capable of acting agreeably to order, and according to the rules of reaſon, and being incapable of virtue; they therefore do not perform any thing that can be called irregular, irrational, or a vicious action. For this reaſon he does not call the violence or fury of lions, anger: for, according to the Stoicks, the paſſions are vices, and conſequently no being can be ſuſceptible of them, but what poſſeſſes virtue and reaſon, and which is capable of attaining to the perfection of the wiſe man. See the remark [*I*]. In another epiſtle (42), he lays it down in the ſtrongeſt manner, as a principle, that brutes are endued with ſenſation. He could not have expreſſed himſelf more clearly, had he been of the opinion of our ſchoolmen. He goes even farther than they; for he aſſerts that they are conſcious of their ſenſation. *Qualis ad nos pervenit animi noſtri ſenſus, quamvis naturam ejus ignoremus, ac ſedem, talis ad omnia animalia conſtitutionis ſuæ* SENSUS. *Neceſſe eſt enim id* SENTIANT, *per quod alia quoque* SENTIUNT, *neceſſe eſt* SENSUM *ejus habeant, cui parent, à quo reguntur. Nemo non ex nobis intelligit eſſe aliquid, quod impetus ſuos moveat: quid ſit illud, ignorat: & conatum ſibi eſſe ſcit: quid ſit, aut unde ſit, neſcit. Sicut infantibus, ſic quoque animalibus, principalis partis ſuæ* SENSUS *eſt, non ſatis dilucidus, non expreſſus* (43). i. e. "Such a ſen- "ſation as we have of our ſouls, though we know "not its nature and ſeat, ſuch a ſenſation all brutes "have of their own conſtitution or frame of body. "It is neceſſary they ſhould FEEL, or be conſcious, "of that by which they FEEL other things: they "muſt neceſſarily have a SENSATION of him, to "whom they pay obedience, and by whom they are "governed. Every one of us is ſenſible, that there "is ſomething which excites our impulſes or paſ- "ſions: but what that is, that we know not: we "are conſcious to ourſelves that we have an inclina- "tion or impulſe: but with regard to what it is, or "whence, that we know not. Brutes, as well as in- "fants, have a SENSE or conſciouſneſs of their prin- "cipal parts, but not ſufficiently clear and evident." Herein he only writes purſuant to the principles of his Sect. It is the property of brutes, according to the Stoicks, to deſire their own preſervation, and to be ſenſible that nature recommends them to themſelves. Τὴν δὲ πρώτην ὁρμὴν φασι τὸ ζῶον ἴσχειν ἐπὶ τὸ τηρεῖν ἑαυτό, οἰκειώσης αὐτῷ τῆς φύσεως ἀπ' ἀρχῆς· καθά φησιν ὁ Χρύσιππος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Περὶ τελῶν, πρῶτον οἰκεῖον λέγων εἶναι παντὶ ζώῳ τὴν αὐτοῦ σύστασιν, καὶ τὴν ταύτης συνείδησιν. *Primam autem hanc animantis appetitionem fuiſſe dicunt, ſeipſum tuendi atque ſervandi, naturâ ſibi ipſum ab initio conciliante, ut Chryſippus ait in primo De finibus, primum proprium cuique animanti dicens ſui ipſius fuiſſe commendationem, hujuſque conſcientiam* (44).

With regard to the Cynicks (45), the paſſage of Plutarch quoted by du Rondel, ſays expreſsly, that, according to Diogenes, brutes have no ſenſation. I ſhould be glad to ſee the doctrine of this Philoſopher a little more at length; for what Plutarch informs us of it, is very obſcure; the beginning and end deſtroying what he had ſaid in the middle. They partake of the underſtanding; that is the beginning. They are affected in much the ſame manner as madmen, that is the end. But are not the moſt raving madmen endued with ſenſation? Had they been compared to perſons troubled with a lethargy or apoplexy, there would have been ſome connexion in what he advances. However this be, I'll tranſcribe the whole paſſage. Διογένης, μετέχειν μὲν αὐτὰ τοῦ νοητοῦ καὶ ἀέρος, διὰ δὲ τὸ τὰ μὲν πυκνότητι, τὰ δὲ πλεονασμῷ τῆς ὑγρασίας, μήτε διανοεῖσθαι, μήτε αἰσθάνεσθαι, προσφερῶς δὲ αὐτὰ διακεῖσθαι τοῖς μεμηνόσι, παραπλησίκοτος τῷ ἡγεμονικῷ. *Diogenes, rationis & aëris partem ea percipere, ſed vel ob craſſitiem vel ob abundantiam humoris neque intelligere neque ſentire: ac ferè affecta eſſe eo modo quo ſunt inſanientes, qui de mentis exiverunt poteſtate* (46). Whatever might be the doctrine of Diogenes on this

* In Zen.

† Apul. de Dogm. Plat.

** Quæſt. Platonic.

(40) Lipſius, *Phyſiolog. Stoicorum*, lib. 3. Diſſert. 8. p. m. 984.

(41) Seneca, Epiſt. 124. p. m. 477.

(42) It is the 121ſt, in which he proves the following Theſes, *omnibus animalibus eſſe conſtitutionis ſuæ ſenſum.*

(43) Seneca, Ep. 121. p. 467.

(44) Diogenes Laert. *in Zenone*, lib. 7. num. 85. p. m. 416.

(45) I expreſs myſelf in this manner, upon the ſuppoſition that Diogenes, whoſe opinion Plutarch has related, is the Cynic, concerning which ſee the rem. [*D*], of the article DIOGENES of Apollonia.

(46) Plut. *de Placit. Philoſ.* lib. 5. cap. 20. It is thus, according to Amyot's verſion. Diogenes ſays, *that brutes, indeed, have ſome* UNDERSTANDING; *but that becauſe of the groſſneſs and denſity of their conſtitutions, and of the abundance of their moiſture, they are not endued either with ſpeech, reaſon, or ſenſation, any more than madpeople, becauſe their brain is diſordered, and have not a free uſe of their reaſon.*

ſhall afterwards make ſome reflections [*F*]. I ſhall obſerve, that Voſſius did not know that any Author beſides Pereira had aſſerted that brutes have no ſenſation [*G*]. The reader

this head, it is certain, that there are many more among the antients who oppoſe, than who declare for it. Plutarch wrote a treatiſe, purpoſely to ſhew, that brutes are endued with reaſon (47). The work, in which he enquires, whether terreſtrial animals are more induſtrious than thoſe of the aquatic kind (48), is writ in the ſame view. I ſhall extract an obſervation from thence, which appears to me important. The Author attempting to refute thoſe who aſſert, that as there are rational animals, there alſo muſt be irrational ones, aſſerts that, by a parity of reaſoning, it might be aſſerted that there muſt be animals who have no ſenſation, as there are ſome who poſſeſs that faculty. I am to obſerve, that he ſuppoſes no one had ever made this laſt diviſion of animals before. He gives it as the example of a tenet, which no one had ever been allowed to advance. This argument is what is called *reductionem abſurdum*. His words are as follow: Εἰ δέ τις ἀξιοῖ μὴ κολοβὸν εἶναι τὴν φύσιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἔμψυχον φύσιν ἔχειν, τὸ μὲν, λογικὸν, τὸ δὲ, ἄλογον· ἕτερος ἀξιώσει τὴν ἔμψυχον φύσιν ἔχειν· τὸ μὲν, φανταστικὸν, τὸ δὲ, ἀφανταστικόν. καὶ τὸ μὲν, αἰσθητικόν· τὸ δὲ, ἀναίσθητον· ἵνα δὲ τὰς ἀντιζύγους ταύτας καὶ ἀντιθέτους ἕξεις καὶ στερήσεις περὶ ταυτὸν ἡ φύσις ἔχοι μέσον οἷον ἰσορροπήσασ· εἰ δὲ ἄτοπον· ὁ ζητῶν τῷ ἐμψύχῳ τὸ μὲν, αἰσθητικὸν, τὸ δὲ, ἀναίσθητον εἶναι. καὶ τὸ μὲν, φαντασιούμενον, τὸ δὲ, ἀφανταστούμενον. ὅτι πᾶν τὸ ἔμψυχον αἰσθητικὸν εὐθὺς εἶναι καὶ φανταστικὸν πέφυκεν. εἰ δὲ ὅτως ἐπιεικῶς ἀπαιτήσει τὸ μὲν λογικὸν εἶναι τῷ ἐμψύχῳ, τὸ δὲ ἄλογον (49). *i. e.* "But if any one ſhould obſerve or require, that "in order to prevent any defect in nature, ſome animals muſt neceſſarily be endued with the rational "faculties, and others irrational; others will be "found, who will affirm with equal right, that ſome "animals muſt be endued with the faculty of perception, and others be deprived of it; that ſome "muſt have ſenſation, and others have no ſenſation; in ſuch a manner, that nature, at the ſame "time, may have privations oppoſite to thoſe habits "or faculties. But if it ſhould be abſurd to obſerve "this, becauſe every animal is endued both with "the faculty of ſenſation and perception; it conſequently will not be juſt to obſerve or alledge, "that ſome animals are endued with reaſon, and "that others are irrational." A little after, he refutes the Stoicks, by a remark of equal ſtrength. Brutes, ſays he, have no paſſions; their deſires are not deſires, but ſomething like deſires, &c. What would you reply then, ſaid he to them, if any one ſhould take it into his head to teach, that they neither ſee nor hear; and that their ſight is, as it were, ſight? Οὐκ οἶδα τί χρήσονται τοῖς λέγουσι μηδὲ βλέπειν μηδὲ ἀκούειν, ἀλλ' ὡσανεὶ βλέπειν αὐτὰ, καὶ ὡσανεὶ ἀκούειν· μηδὲ φωνεῖν, ἀλλ' ὡσανεὶ φωνεῖν· μηδὲ ὅλως ζῆν, ἀλλ' ὡσανεὶ ζῆν. *Neſcio quid reſponſuri ſint iis, qui animalia etiam non videre, non audire, non vocem emittere, ſed quaſi videre, quaſi audire, quaſi vocem edere, denique omnino non vivere, ſed duntaxat quaſi vivere dicerent* (50). This ſhews that Plutarch was perſuaded, that no Philoſopher had ever rejected the ſenſitive ſouls of brutes; and conſequently, he muſt have underſtood Diogenes's opinion, in a manner different from what we underſtand the doctrine of Pereira.

To prevent my being too prolix, I will refer the ſequel of the compilation to another place (51).

[*F*] *I ſhall afterwards make ſome reflections.*] I will poſtpone them to the article RORARIUS.

[*G*] *Voſſius did not know, that any Author beſides Pereira, had aſſerted that brutes have no ſenſation.*] He obſerves, that there are ſome Philoſophers, who made no diſtinction between thought and ſenſation. The concluſion from thence muſt have been, either that brutes were endued with reaſon (52), or that they had no ſenſation (53). The laſt propoſition, adds he, did not pleaſe any one, that I know of, among the Antients, but it has been maintained in the 16th century by Gomez Pereira. *Hoc conſtituto, conſequitur, vel beſtias non habere ſenſum, cum non habeant rationem; vel eas, cum ſenſu præditæ ſint, etiam rationales eſſe. Prior ſententia, quod ſciam, veterum placuit nulli. Sed avorum noſtrorum temporibus amplexus illam fuit Gometius Pereira, Philoſopus ac Medicus Hiſpanus, in opere triginta à ſe annis elaborato; quod, ab Antonii, & Margaritæ, parentum ſuorum, nominibus,* Antonianam Margaritam *inſcripſit. Eandemque opinionem tuetur in Margaritæ hujus Apologia, qua Objectionibus Michaëlis à Palacios, Theologi Salmanticenſis, reſpondet. Utrobique docet, (ut verbis ejus inſiſtam)* illos motus brutales, quicunque in brutis viſuntur, non fieri à brutis videntibus, aut audientibus, aut guſtantibus, ſeu per quemcumque alium ſenſum exteriorem, ſeu interiorem, vitaliter ſenſificè immutatis: ſed vel ab ſpeciebus objectorum inductis in eorum organis, noſtris ſenſitivis ſimilibus, cum præſentia ſunt ſequenda, vel fugienda: vel à phantaſmatis, cum hæc abſunt. *Nimirum cenſet ea, quæ nos facultati ſenſitivæ tribuimus, proficiſci à quadam ſympathia, & antipathia: quemadmodum enim ſuccinum trahit paleas, magnes ferrum; ſic muta animantia trahi à ſpeciebus rerum amicarum: à natura quippe hanc vim eſſe inditam rebus, ut non omnia moveat, ſed res certas: itaque, re amica præſenti, maxillas animantis natura moveri ad illam recipiendam: re præſenti inimica, eaſdem natura refugere cibum, planeque adverſari. Quod ſi natura voluiſſet ſenſum mutis dare animantibus, daturam etiam fuiſſe mentem: at ea ſic habitura fuiſſe animas indiviſibiles, eoque à corpore ſeparabiles* (54); i. e. "This being agreed, "it follows, either that brutes are not endued with "ſenſation, ſince they have no reaſon; or, that "they are endued with reaſon, ſince they have ſenſation. I don't remember that the former propoſition pleaſed any one among the antients. But in "the age of our grandfathers, it was maintained by "Gomez Pereira, a Spaniſh Philoſopher and Phyſitian, in a work, in the compoſing whereof he em-"ploy'd thirty years, and which he entitled, *Antoniana Margarita*, from the names of his father and "mother. The ſame doctrine is defended by him in "his apology of the juſt-mentioned *Margarita*, "wherein he anſwers the objections of a Divine of "Salamanca, named Michael de Palacios: he aſſerts, "in both thoſe works (to employ his own expreſſions) "*that thoſe brutal motions which are ſeen in brutes, are "not performed by brutes which ſee, hear or taſte, nor is "any alteration produced in them, by any other external "or internal ſenſe, with regard to life and ſenſation: "but they ariſe from the images of objects imprinted on "their organs, like to our ſenſitive organs, when things "preſent are to be followed or ſhunned; or by phantaſms in the abſence of theſe.* He is of opinion, "that thoſe things which we aſcribe to a ſenſitive "faculty, reſult from a certain ſympathy and antipathy; for in like manner as ſtraws are attracted "by amber, and iron by the load-ſtone, ſo brutes "are attracted by the images of things which de-"light: nature having endued things with the following power, not to move all, but ſome particular things: thus, when a thing that pleaſes is pre-"ſent, the animals jaws are, by nature, moved "to receive it; but when a thing which diſpleaſes is "preſent, they are prompted, by nature, to refuſe "and hate food. But if it had been the deſign of "nature to beſtow ſenſation on brutes, ſhe would "likewiſe have beſtowed underſtanding; and, in "this manner, they would have had indiviſible ſouls, "which conſequently would have been ſeparable "from the body." Weigh well two points, the one, that he did not explain the motions of animals, from mechanical principles, but by the occult qualities of ſympathy and antipathy; the other, that he rejected the ſenſitive ſoul, from his believing that a thing which is material, diviſible and mortal, is capable of ſenſation; whence he concluded, that if brutes had a ſoul endued with ſenſation, it is not corporeal. When he was deſired to call to mind the actions of brutes, thoſe of a dog, for inſtance, he anſwered, that it was not neceſſary they ſhould proceed from a ſenſitive faculty, ſince otherwiſe the Ariſtoteleans would be in the wrong, not to aſcribe to the exertions of a rational ſoul, ſo many actions reſembling thoſe of men, which a dog performs. He had the art to take advantage of the weak ſide of the

(47) Περὶ τοῦ τὰ ἄλογα λόγῳ χρῆσθαι. *Bruta animalia ratione uti.*

(48) Πότερα τῶν ζώων φρονιμώτερα, τὰ χερσαῖα ἢ τὰ ἔνυδρα. *Terreſtriane an aquatilia ſint callidiora?*

(49) Plutarch, *de Solertia Animalium*, circa init. p. m. 960. *C.*

(50) Idem, ibid. p. 961. *E.* A tranſlation, according to Amiot, is given in the remark [*I*].

(51) In the art. RORARIUS.

(52) Voſſius, *de origine & progreſſu Idololatriæ*, lib. 3. cap. 41. p. m. 939.

(53) See Francis Valeſius, *de ſacra Philoſophia*, cap. 55. p. m. 279, where he has a ſtroke, by the by, againſt Pereira, but without naming him.

(54) Voſſius, *de Idololatr.* lib. 3. cap. 41. p. 939.

reader will ſee in the ſame remark the opinion of our Spaniard pretty fully repreſented. It would be to no purpoſe to endeavour to ſearch in Ariſtotle for the ſeeds or principles of Des Cartes's Doctrine [*H*]; and it would be to as little purpoſe to refer us to the 4th book of Cicero's Tuſculan queſtions, and to the teſtimony of Porphyry, Proclus, &c. There is no reſemblance or conformity [*I*] between the Doctrine, which ſuppoſes brutes to

cauſe of his adverſaries. This is the uſual ſhift, (and a ſucceſsful one it is) of thoſe who maintain abſurdities (55). *Ictus hoſce levi amictu exire ſe poſſe Pereira arbitratur. Putat enim, ut nos non ideo rationem tribuimus beſtiis, quia tam multa actibus faciant ſimillima humanis: ita neque iis adſcribendum eſſe ſenſum, etſi, quæ agant, ſimillima ſint actibus animæ ſenſitivæ. Nec eo movetur, quòd tam diſſimiles ſint animarum actus, imò contrarii prorſus: quia, ut ait, natura etiam pro rebus, in quas agit, contraria operetur. Unde Poëta* (56):

(55) Idem, ibid.

(56) Virgil, *Eclog.* 8. ver. 80.

Limus ut hic dureſcit, & hæc ut cera liqueſcit,
Uno eodemque igni.

Sed longum eſſet omnia ex opere tam operoſo hominis & acuti & docti adferre pro ridicula ſententia, quam diximus. i. e. "Pereira imagines that it will be an eaſy "matter for him to ward off theſe blows: for he is of "opinion that, as we do not aſcribe reaſon to brutes, "becauſe of the great umber of actions, very much "reſembling thoſe of men, which they perform; "ſo neither are we to aſcribe ſenſation to them, "though their actions reſemble greatly thoſe of a "ſenſitive ſoul. Nor is he puzzled, upon its being "objected to him, that the actions of ſouls are ſo "very diſſimilar, nay quite contrary: becauſe (as he "obſerves) nature produces contrary effects in pro-"portion to the thing it works upon: whence the "Poet ſays;

"As fire this figure hardens, made of clay;
"And this of wax with fire conſumes away.
DRYDEN.

"But I ſhould be too prolix, were I to extract, from "this voluminous work in queſtion, all that this in-"genious and learned man ſays, in favour of the "ridiculous opinion above-mentioned." I thought that my readers would be very well pleaſed to find here a ſpecimen of our Spaniard's genius and doctrine.

[*H*] *It would be to no purpoſe to endeavour to ſearch, in Ariſtotle, for the ſeeds or principles of Des Cartes's Doctrine.*] Father Pardies endeavoured to find them there. *It will perhaps not be uſeleſs*, ſays he (57), *to examine ſome paſſages in Ariſtotle, to ſee whether, in ſo great a Philoſopher, we may not meet with ſomething which might give a ſanction to an opinion, which in this age appears ſo new and extraordinary.* He then extracts the following paſſage from the 9th chapter of the book *De Spiritu*. "We may conceive, with "very little difficulty, that heat is an effect of na-"ture: but it is difficult to comprehend, how the "nature of bodies can ſo uſefully manage heat, and "employ it, as an inſtrument, to give to every thing "what it ought to have naturally: and imprint on "each of them its peculiar characteriſtick with as "much juſtneſs as if thoſe bodies were endued with "knowledge and reaſon. And * it is certainly not "poſſible, that all theſe things ſhould be done in "this manner without knowledge and the direction "of reaſon: but on the other hand, it does not ap-"pear how we can aſcribe to material Beings the "faculty of knowing. We cannot in any manner "aſcribe all this artifice to the force of fire, of ſpi-"rits, or the moſt ſubtile bodies: but alſo to ſay, "that there is ſome principle in thoſe bodies, which "has the faculty of knowing, this exceeds our utmoſt "admiration. And we have equal cauſe to wonder, "when we conſider the ſoul itſelf of brutes, ſince "it is of the ſame nature with fire and ſpirits." *It appears from this paſſage*, ſays Father Pardies (58), *that Ariſtotle was fully ſenſible of the difficulties which would ariſe in aſcribing knowledge to bodies and brutes. But what he has here propoſed only by way of admiration, he ſeems to have affirmed expreſly in another place, where, ſpeaking of brutes, he writes expreſly as follows* †. Of all animals man only is endued with the faculty of thinking. *Homo unus ex numero animalium omnium vim obtinet cogitandi.* . . . . . And though the reſt of animals have memory, and are capable of order or diſcipline, yet man only has the talent to remember. *From theſe words, which Ariſtotle has repeated verbatim elſewhere* **, *one would think that he had aſcribed knowledge to brutes, ſince he aſcribes to them memory; and that if he deprives them of knowledge, it is of that kind of knowledge only which is attended with a peculiar reflection in deliberations, and in the enquiries we make to recall things to our minds. But it is certain that Ariſtotle has diſtinguiſhed in another manner memory and reminiſcence; for, according to him, memory conſiſts only in an* image ††, and a repreſentation imprinted on the ſubſtance of that part of the body in which common ſenſe reſides, in much the ſame manner as figures are repreſented, by the impreſſion of ſeals on wax; *ſo that, to remember ſome things*, is to have the figures of all the things thus repreſented *. *Whereas reminiſcence implies alſo a certain perception of the mind, whereby*, when we call any thing to mind, we know that we recal ſomething to mind: *which is common to all thoughts in general, ſince it is impoſſible to think without knowing that we do ſo. So that as Ariſtotle ſaid brutes have no memory, and that man only has the faculty of remembering; we muſt not wonder that he ſaid alſo, that of all animals, man only is endued with the faculty of thinking. This Philoſopher muſt therefore have ſuppoſed that brutes had no real thoughts. It remains only, after this, that Ariſtotle ſhould acknowledge that brutes are mere* automata, *and move only mechanically, and by the help of ſprings prepared for that purpoſe. And this alſo he declared clearly; for thus he ſpeaks, where he explains the manner in which the motion of brutes is performed.* As thoſe machines, ſays he †, called *Automata*, when they are moved ever ſo little after a certain manner, perform inſtantly their motions by the force or power of unbent or looſened ſprings: in like manner animals move, having bones and nerves, as ſo many inſtruments, diſpoſed by the induſtry of nature, which produce the ſame effects in them, as pieces of wood and iron produce, with their ſprings in machines. *He ſays the ſame elſewhere.* It may be, *ſays he* **, that in brutes, one thing moves another, and that their bodies are like thoſe wonderful *automata*: for indeed, they are compoſed of members which have the quality or faculty even when they are at reſt, *to be able to make certain motions the inſtant they are determined to them: and as, in the machines in queſtion*, there is no occaſion for ſome perſon to touch them at the very time they are performing their motions, provided they were touched before; *ſo the ſame may be ſaid of animals.*

(57) Ignatius Gaſton Pardies, *on the Knowledge of Brutes*, num. 69. p. m. 136.

* *V. Interpretem Latinum hujus loci.*

(58) Pardies, *de la Conoiſſance des Betes*, num. 71. p. 140.

† *Hiſt. animal.* cap. 1.

* Ibid.

† *De Animal. motione*, cap. 7.

** *De gen. anim.* cap. 1. *poſt med.*

Theſe paſſages do great honour to Ariſtotle. They ſhew, 1. That he knew the mechaniſm, which nature practiſed in the bodies of animals, and exerciſed daily in them. 2. That he knew how inconceivably difficult it was to ſuppoſe that matter thinks. But he never aſſerted, either as a certain thing, or as a ſuppoſition, that brutes do not think: he has not diveſted them of thought, taking that word in the ſame ſenſe with the Carteſians: but in taking it in a peculiar ſenſe, for what is called meditation, reflection, deliberation. It is not probable that he defined memory in the manner which Pardies affirms he did; for, according to that definition, there is no difference between imagination and memory. Beſides, brutes will never be machines, ſo long as they ſhall be able to form the image of an abſent object; that is, what memory implies, according to the explanation even of Father Pardies. To conclude, the Jeſuit had no reaſon to oppoſe the criticiſm made on the tranſlator of Ariſtotle (59). Βουλεύεσθαι is a kind of thought, and not thought in general; ſo that tho' man only were capable of the βουλεύεσθαι, as Ariſtotle declares, it yet would not follow that he is the only thinking Being.

(59) By Scaliger. See Pardies, *on the Knowledge of Brutes*, num. 72. p. 140.

[*I*] *It would be to as little purpoſe to refer us to the fourth book of Cicero's Tuſculan queſtions.* . . . . . *There*

to be machines, and what is ſaid by thoſe antient writers.

PEREZ

is no reſemblance or conformity between the doctrine which ſuppoſes them to be machines, and the relations of thoſe antient Authors.] A learned Prelate who has writ againſt Des Cartes, charges him with having advanced no doctrine but what is found in the Authors who preceded him. Here follow his proofs with reſpect to the doctrine of the ſoul of beaſts. *Quid hoc eſt vero, quod* * *apud Ciceronem legimus, beſtias ſimile quiddam facere perturbationum animi, in perturbationes non incidere, quod hæ eveniant ſolum ex aſpernatione rationis. qua carent beſtiæ? quid aliud, inquam, ſuadet hoc nobis, quam beſtias mera eſſe automata? nam ſi perturbationibus carent, neque herum diligit canis, neque lupum ovis reformidat: imo, nec cibum appetunt, nec dolorem fugiunt, nec mortem timent; ſed ex coacto cæcæ materiæ motu id facere videntur quod non faciunt. Scribit conceptis verbis* † *Plutarchus credidiſſe Diogenem brutas animantes neque intelligere, neque ſentire: quod & confutavit* ** *Porphyrius. Sciſcit* †† *Proclus animalia tantum rationalia anima eſſe prædita; additque decretum eſſe à Platone animam vere eſſe eam quæ ratione polleat, cætera ſimulacra animarum. At nemo doctrinam hanc vel tradidit apertius, vel fuſius propugnavit, quam Gometius Pereira* (60). i. e. "What does that expreſſion mean, which we read in Cicero, that brutes do ſomething which is like to the paſſions of the mind; but that they are not ſuſceptible of paſſions, becauſe theſe proceed from the deſpiſing of reaſon, of which brutes are not poſſeſſed? What, I ſay, can this infer, but that brutes are mere machines? For in caſe they are without paſſions, a dog cannot love his maſter, nor a ſheep fear the wolf: nay, they cannot crave food, fly from pain, fear death; but from the neceſſary impulſe or motion of blind matter they ſeem to do what they really do not. Plutarch declares in expreſs terms, that Diogenes thought that brutes have neither underſtanding nor ſenſation; but this Porphyry refuted. Proclus aſſerts, that none but rational animals have ſouls: and adds, that it was aſſerted by Plato, that that is truly the ſoul which is endued with reaſon, and that the reſt are only images of ſouls: but no man has taught this doctrine more openly, or defended it more at large than Gomez Pereira." We here have four authorities; thoſe of Cicero, of Plutarch, of Porphyry, and Proclus. Let us examine them one after another, without making any mention of Pereira, of whom this learned Prelate ſpeaks in the laſt words of his remark; let us leave him, I ſay, ſince we have ſpoke ſufficiently of him in the remarks preceding this.

I. The paſſage from Cicero is not a good proof, it containing nothing but the diſtinction which the Stoicks made uſe of, and which the reader may have ſeen above (61). They affirmed, that the paſſions and reaſon were two contrary things; and conſequently that they could have but one and the ſame ſubject; they therefore could be found only in rational animals, and conſequently were not found in brutes. *Illud animorum corporumque diſſimile eſt, quod animi valentes morbo tentari non poſſunt, corpora poſſunt. Sed corporum offenſiones ſine culpa accidere poſſunt, animorum non item, quorum omnes morbi & perturbationes ex aſpernatione rationis eveniunt. Itaque in hominibus ſolum exiſtunt. Nam beſtiæ ſimile quiddam faciunt, ſed in perturbationes non incidunt* (62). i. e. "There is the following difference between ſouls, or minds, and bodies, that ſound or healthy minds cannot be affected with diſorders, which bodies may. But bodily diſorders may happen without the leaſt crime; but it is different with regard to the mind, all whoſe diſorders and paſſions are owing to the deſpiſing of reaſon. They therefore exiſt only in men: brutes do ſomething that reſembles men, but they are not incident to paſſions." Thus Cicero repreſents part of the ſubtilties of the Stoicks with regard to the doctrine of the paſſions (63). His expreſſions do not imply in any manner, that the Stoicks deprived animals of thoſe ſentiments which we love, hatred, anger, &c. They acknowledged that brutes do ſomething like what men do, who fall into a paſſion, devote themſelves to pleaſure, are preyed upon by fear, or any other paſſion; but they pretended that this ſtate was not really love, hatred, anger; or, in general, a paſſion in brutes; for, to be ſuch (ſay theſe) brutes muſt have fallen into it from a contempt of reaſon. Now they are irrational, and conſequently reaſon is not their rule; they do not perform any thing which has a tendency, either to deviate from that rule, or to conform to it. Since therefore the paſſions ariſe in men becauſe they deviate from reaſon, which is their rule or ſtandard; and ſince their nature conſiſts in being contrary or oppoſite to reaſon which they ought to follow; we muſt conclude that what paſſes in, or happens, with regard to beaſts, are not paſſions, though they reſemble paſſions. This is the reſult or ſcope of the ſubtilties of the Stoicks. It is properly a diſpute merely about words; and, at leaſt, it is very certain they did not deny, but that what the other Philoſophers called anger, love, or fear, in brutes, was a real ſenſation. They did not deny but that a dog knew his maſter, and a ſheep knew a wolf, as things which it was neceſſary for them to ſhun. I will not exhibit a collection of proofs, which would ſet this point in the cleareſt light. It will ſuffice to ſay, that thoſe who have laboured moſt to refute ſuch things as were paradoxical in the ſyſtem of the Stoicks, never charged them with reducing beaſts to the condition of Automata. But would they have ſpared them, had they advanced ſuch a doctrine?

II. The paſſage in Plutarch has been examined above (64). The reader may have objected, that it is obſcure, and formed of inconſiſtent parts. I add, that we diſcover clearly therein a ſtrong oppoſition between the doctrine of Diogenes and that of Des Cartes. According to the former, brutes conſiſt of body and ſoul; and if their ſoul has no actual ſenſation or ratiocination, it is becauſe the groſsneſs of their organs, and the abundance of their humours or moiſture reduces them to the condition of madmen. But Des Cartes does not allow any ſenſitive principle in brutes; he makes them conſiſt wholly of matter, and ſuppoſes them to be a body without a ſoul. I am to obſerve, that if the doctrine of Diogenes were probable in any reſpect, it would be ſo only with reſpect to oxen, ſwine, &c. but it ſeems ridiculous, when we apply it to ſwallows, flies, bees, and ants, whoſe organs are infinitely more delicate and leſs moiſt than thoſe of men.

III. I muſt expatiate more on the paſſage from Porphyry. The learned Prelate in queſtion affirms, that this Philoſopher has refuted the aſſertions of Diogenes with regard to brutes, *viz.* that they are uninformed with underſtanding or ſenſation: but it is certain that Porphyry does not refute any one, who had ſaid that they are inſenſible. His ſilence on that head is a direct proof that no perſon had ever yet ſtarted ſuch a paradox; for as nothing is more contrary to the ſcope or deſign of Porphyry in that work, he would certainly have refuted that hypotheſis. He was attempting to prove, that we ought not to feed upon the fleſh of animals; there appeared to him many inconveniences in this cuſtom, and in particular as it was introducing cruelty (65). He collected all ſorts of anſwers to the objections of his adverſaries. Now what objection could be ſo ſtrong, as to ſuppoſe that brutes have no ſenſation? Is it not certain that were this once eſtabliſhed, there would not be more cruelty in killing an ox than in pulling up a turnep (66)? Here follows another conſideration, which makes me believe, that Porphyry had not once heard of the paradox, which it is pretended he refuted. He lays it down as a principle univerſally acknowledged, that brutes are endued with ſenſation (67), and he infers this conſequence from it, *they therefore are rational* (68); and he finds in that conſequence the moſt ſpecious arguments he can alledge in favour of his opinion. He propoſes the following objection himſelf; *ſince the animal nature includes ſome rational Beings, it alſo muſt include irrational ones* (69); and he makes the ſame anſwer as Plutarch, or rather copies word for word, three or four pages from that Author, but without naming him. The things he ſtole from him contain in particular, what the reader may have ſeen above in the remark [E] (70).

* *Ciceron. Tuſcul.* lib. 4.

† Plutarch, *De placit. Philoſ.* lib. 5. cap. 20.

** *Porphyr. De abſt. ab anim.* lib. 3.

†† *Procl. in Platon. Philoſ.* lib. 3. cap. 1.

(60) Petrus Daniel Huetius, *Cenſ. Philoſophiæ Carteſianæ*, cap. 8. p. 208. edit. Paris 1689.

(61) Rem. [E].

(62) Cicero, *Tuſcul* lib. 4. fol. m. 267. C.

(63) *Habet ea, quæ de perturbationibus enucleate diſputant Stoici, quæ logica appellant, quia diſſeruntur ſubtilius.* Idem, ibid.

(64) Citat. (46).

(65) Porphyr. *de Abſtinentia*, lib. 3. cap. 20. p. 125. edit. Cantab. 1655. See alſo chap. 19. p. 122.

(66) I do not deny but that this would accuſtom men to ſhed blood; and incline him to be leſs compaſſionate, and more ſavage and barbarous towards his fellow creatures.

(67) Porphyr. *de Abſtinentia*, lib. 3. cap. 21. p. 125.

(68) Idem, ibid. cap. 1. p. 101. & cap. 21, 22. & *alibi.*

(69) Idem, ibid. cap. 7. p. 109.

(70) Citations (49) (50)

(70). Theſe are two paſſages which ſhew demonſtratively, that, in that age, all the Philoſophers in general believed there was no ſuch Being as an inſenſitive animal. Amyot has tranſlated the firſt paſſage ſo ill, that it is impoſſible to underſtand any part of it, but has ſucceeded better in the ſecond. I ſhall tranſcribe his very expreſſions, and will obſerve below, why I infert them in this place. "And as to "thoſe who ſpeak ſo ſtupidly and ſo impertinently, as "to affirm that animals neither delight, are not angry, nor fear, that the ſwallow does not make "any proviſion, and the bee has no memory; but "that the ſwallow only ſeems to have foreſight, the "lion ſeems to be angry, and the hind to quake for "fear: I cannot think what anſwer they will be "able to make to thoſe who ſhould object to them; "that we alſo ſhould ſay, that they neither ſee nor "hear, nor have a voice; and that they only ſeem "to ſee and have a voice: in a word, that they do "not live, but only ſeem to live; for to aſſert the "one, would be as repugnant to the cleareſt evi-"dence, as to affirm the other (71)." I tranſcribed this paſſage, to ſtrengthen the conſequence I drew from it, *viz.* that the doctrine of the *automata* or machines was conſidered in that age, not as a doctrine which had ever been ſtarted, but as a doctrine which the Stoicks were not able to refute, if any perſon ſhould take it into his head to employ that objection, to defeat them with their own weapons. Plutarch, (will it be ſaid) and Porphyry, make uſe of the word λέγουσι, which is the participle of the preſent tenſe. There conſequently were ſome perſons who made this objection to the Stoicks. I anſwer, that the French tranſlator of Plutarch, as the reader has juſt now ſeen, agrees in that particular with Xylander (72), who has proved by the learned Holſtenius (73), that the λέγουσι ought to be taken in the future conditional tenſe. This is allowable according to the rules of Grammar, and Hiſtory requires it in this place; for Plutarch and Porphyry, thoſe great ſticklers for the reaſon of brutes, would doubtleſs have diſputed againſt the doctrine of the Automata, had they known there was, or had been, any ſuch opinion. Now they do not ſay a word of this.

(71) Plutarch, *What Animals are the moſt wary*, p. m. 472, according to Amyot's verſion, Geneva edit. 1621. 8vo.

(72) The Latin Tranſlator of Plutarch.

(73) In his Latin tranſlation of *Porphyry de Abſtinentia.*

IV. As to Proclus, it is true, he aſſerts, that, according to Plato, the rational ſoul is perfectly a ſoul, and that the other ſouls are but images, or repreſentations of ſouls; but, at the ſame time, he ſays, that they partake of knowledge and life, and that rational animals are not the only ones which partake of underſtanding; but that all other animals endued with imagination, memory, and ſenſation, partake of it alſo. Is not this teaching very evidently, that brutes have a ſenſitive ſoul; ſuch, in a word, as the followers of Ariſtotle deſcribe it? Though this paſſage of Proclus be ſomething prolix, I yet will tranſcribe the whole, in order that my Readers may not entertain any doubt, with regard to the ſenſe in which it is to be taken; and that they may be ſure it could not ſerve as a prelude to the Carteſian doctrine, with regard to brutes. Καὶ ὅλως πολλαχῇ δῆλός ἐστι καὶ ὁ Πλάτων ψυχὴν τὴν λογικὴν εἶναι τιθέμενος, τὰς δὲ ἄλλας, εἴδωλα ψυχῶν καθόσον εἰσὶ καὶ αὗται νοεραὶ καὶ ζωτικαὶ, μετὰ τῶν ὅλων παράγουσαι τὰς περὶ τὰ σώματα ζωάς· τὸ δὲ μόνον τὰ λογικὰ ζῶα μετέχειν συγχωρήσομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ὅσα γνωσικὴν ἔχει δύναμιν· φαντασίαν λέγω, καὶ μνήμην, καὶ αἴσθησιν· ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ ἐν Φιλήβῳ Σωκράτης, ἐπὶ τὴν νοερὰν ἄγει τὰ τοιαῦτα πάντα σπεύδων. *Deinque multis in locis conſtat & ipſum Platonem ſtatuere illam ratione præditam animam*, veram eſſe *animam*, *alias verò, animarum* eſſe *ſimulacra, quatenus ſunt & illæ intellectuales & vivificæ, cum ipſis univerſis producentes illas, quæ circa ipſa corpora*, & in ipſis corporibus ſunt. *Concedemus autem non ſolum animalia ratione prædita participare Mentem: ſed etiam alia, quæcumque cognoſcendi facultatem habent. Phantaſiam* autem *dico, & memoriam & ſenſum. Quoniam & illa Socrates, qui in Philebo* diſputans *introducitur, hujuſmodi omnia ad intellectum rerum ſeriem reducit* (74). That my Readers may the better underſtand this, I ſhall obſerve, that in Plato's doctrine, there was ſuch a difference between the ſoul and underſtanding, as is not unlike the difference which the Peripateticks ſuppoſe there is between the genus and ſpecies. The Platonicks aſſerted, that four things which preceded one another, viz. eſſence, life, underſtanding, and the ſoul, were prior to bodies; that life partakes of eſſence, the underſtanding partakes of life and eſſence; and that the ſoul partakes of underſtanding, life, and eſſence, and has alſo reaſon as its peculiar nature. This is what would be called in ſchools, the ſpecific difference of the ſoul. Τεττάρων τοίνυν τούτων ὄντων πρὸ τῆς σωματικῆς ὑποστάσεως αἰτίων, οὐσίας, ζωῆς, νοῦ, ψυχῆς, ψυχὴ μὲν ἀπάντων μετέχει τῶν πρὸ αὐτῆς, τοῦ μὲν λόγου, καίτοι τὴν ἰδιότητα λαχοῦσα, τοῦ δὲ νοῦ, καὶ τῆς ζωῆς, καὶ τοῦ ὄντος, ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπερουσίων αἰτίων. *Cum igitur hæ quatuor cauſæ ſint ante corpoream hypoſtaſin, Eſſentia, Vita, Mens, Anima, Anima quidem, particeps eſt omnium eorum, quæ ſunt ante ipſam, ipſam quidem rationem, ſecundum ſuam proprietatem ſortita, Mentem vero, & Vitam, & ipſum Ens ab antiquioribus cauſas* adepta (75). In this manner the ſoul might concur or conſpire four ways in the diſpoſing of all poſterior Beings: it extends its influence to bodies, inaſmuch as it exiſts: it extends it to plants, inaſmuch as it lives; and to brutes, inaſmuch as it partakes of the underſtanding, and to the firſt natures, ſuſceptible of reaſon, with the reſt of the attributes, inaſmuch as it is rational. With regard to the underſtanding which had preceded the ſoul, and is the fulneſs of life, and even of being; it influences, after three manners, the œconomy of the univerſe. It illuminated, by its ſpecific virtue, all that is endued with the faculty of knowledge (76); and it concurred in communicating life to a greater number of things, and eſſence to all that Being has formed. Brutes were ranked in the claſs of creatures, which received the irradiation of its virtue. This is evident from the words which Proclus employs, where he ſpeaks of what the ſoul does, inaſmuch as it partakes in the underſtanding. Καὶλὰ μὲν τὸ ὂν τὸ ἑαυτῆς, τὰ πάντα ὑφίστησι καὶ μετέχει σωμάτων· καὶλὰ δὲ τὴν ζωὴν, πάντα τὰ λεγόμενα ζῆν, καὶ μετέχει τῶν φυτῶν. καὶλὰ δὲ τὸν νοῦν, πάντα τὰ γνωσικὴν ἔχοντα δύναμιν, καὶ μετέχει τῶν ἀλογωτάτων. *Secundum quidem ipſum ipſius Animæ Ens, omnia* (conſtituit) *vel uſque ad ipſa corpora. Secundum vero vitam, omnia quæ vivere dicuntur, & uſque ad ipſas plantas. Secundum vero Mentem omnia quæ cognitione præditam facultatem habent, & uſque ad ipſa maxime bruta* (77).

(74) Proclus, *in Platonis Theologiam*, lib. 3. cap. 1. p. 128. edit. Hamburg 1618. folio. *Ex verſione Æmilii Porti.*

(75) Idem, ibid. p. 129.

(76) Νῦς . . . πρῶτος διακοσμεῖ τὰ πάντα, τὰς μὲν νοερὰς ἰδιότητος ἅπασι, τοῖς γνωσικοῖς ἐλλάμπων τὴν συνάμιν. *Mens . . . . trifariam omnia digerit ipſius quidem intellectualis proprietatis facultatem omnibus cognoſcendi vim habentibus per ſuam illuminationem largiens.* Idem, ibid.

(77) Idem, ibid.

Nothing could be eaſier than to collect authorities, which would prove evidently, that when Plato ſaid the ſoul of brutes is the image of a ſoul, he did not thereby mean to deprive them of ſenſation. See Plotinus, chap. 11. of book 1. of the 1ſt Ennead. Conſider alſo the following paſſage from a modern Platonic Philoſopher (78). *Irrationalem animam Platonici non tam ſubſtantiale aliquid, quam accidentale quiddam eſſe putant, quaſi rationalium* VESTIGIUM *animarum, in quo* SENSUS *quidem ſint, ſed per diverſa corporis inſtrumenta diviſi atque patibilis*; i. e. "The Platonic Phi-"loſophers are of opinion, that the irrational ſoul is "not ſo much a ſubſtance as an accident; the TRA-"CES, as it were, of rational ſouls, wherein indeed, "the SENSES are but divided and paſſive, by the va-"rious organs of the body." I have given elſewhere (79) the analyſis of ſome paſſages in the 25th diſſertation of a Platonic Philoſopher, who points out very clearly, what it is that diſtinguiſhes the ſoul of brutes from the human ſoul; but he is contented with depriving brutes of ſouls, and ſuppoſes them to be endued with ſenſation (80).

(78) Marcilius Ficinus, *in Compendio in Timæum Platonis*, cap. 41. p. m. 1038. *Operum Platonis.*

(79) In the rem. [L], of the art. PAULICIANS.

(80) Ἄλογον, ἄρρενα, ἀλληλοφθόρον, ἀνόητον θεοῦ ἀρετῆς ἄμοιρον ὑπ' αἰσθήσεως σφετέρας βοσκόμενον καὶ δημαγωγούμενον, ἰσχύειν μὲν τοῖς σώμασι, ἀμηχανεῖν δὲ τῷ λογισμῷ. *Sine ratione aut prudentia: ita ut alterum in perniciem alterius natum, improvidum, divinæ virtutis expers, ſoloque ſenſu in diem gauderet & duceretur: corporis viribus excellerit, intellectu autem nihil poſſet.* Maxim. Tyrius, p. 238.

PEREZ (JOSEPH), in Latin *Perezius*, a Spaniſh Monk, and Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of Salamanca, applied himſelf very vigorouſly to the illuſtrating of the Hiſtory of Spain, eſpecially with relation to the Benedictine Order. He publiſhed (*a*) Eccleſiaſtical Diſſertations in 1688, in which he refuted certain things advanced by Father Papebroch in his *Prolegomena* to the *Acta Sanctorum* for the Month of April: he thought him too rigid with reſpect to the acts of St. Eleutherius; but he confeſſed it was but juſt to ſuppreſs ſeveral apocryphal pieces, which have been publiſhed concerning the

(*a*) In Latin, at Salamanca.

the Saints [*A*]. It was not long (*b*) ſince he died (*c*).

(*b*) I write this in September 1697.

(*c*) Extracted from Father Papebroch's Anſwer, *ad Exhibitionem Errorum*, Art. 11. num. 232, 233.

[*A*] *He thought Father* Papebroch *too rigid, with regard to the acts of St. Eleutherius; but he confeſſed that it was but juſt, to ſuppreſs ſeveral apocryphal pieces which have been publiſhed concerning the Saints.*] Saint Eleutherius, Biſhop of Ecane (1), and Saint Anthia his mother, were greatly renowned in the Greek Church, after that their relicks were conveyed, under the Emperor Arcadius, from Rome to Conſtantinople. Their acts were written by Leontius and Theodulus, who, as we are told, lived in that age: however, Father Papebroch is not of that opinion, he conſiders them as ſuppoſititions, and gives a great many reaſons for his opinion. Nevertheleſs, he publiſhed them under the 18th of April. Father Perez thought his criticiſm too ſevere, for which reaſon, he endeavoured to refute it; but at the ſame time applauds the prodigious pains the Jeſuits take who publiſh the *Acta Sanctorum*, and reject many of them. *Pleraque enim (fatendum eſt) Sanctorum acta*, ſays he, *circumferebantur, partim apertè falſa, partim tenebris denſiſſimis obſita quæ ab doctiſſimis patribus admodum falce juxta & face egere videbantur* (2); i. e. "It "muſt be confeſſed, (ſays he,) that a great num- "ber of acts of the Saints were publiſhed, ſome "whereof were manifeſtly falſe, and others obſcure "to the laſt degree, which, in the opinion of the moſt "learned Fathers, wanted to be purged in the moſt "ſevere manner." The public have at laſt been obliged to own, that Melchior Canus gave a very juſt idea of the legendary writers, when he ſaid that the lives of the antient Philoſophers had been writ with more judgment than thoſe of the Chriſtian Saints. They are now more ſtrictly examined; the acts of the new Saints are not larded with ſo many abſurd particulars; it is nevertheleſs certain, that the Writers are ſtill a little negligent on that head. Here follows the ſequel of a paſſage which I cited elſewhere (3); *but the moſt diverting circumſtance, Goody, (ſays an Attorney's wife of St. Germain's pariſh) is, that going to the Church of the bare-footed Carmelites, I heard a hawker crying about, the life and miracles of Madam Sta. Thereſa. I bought one of them, in order to gain the indulgences. But being returned home, my huſband began to read it, and was ſurpriſed to find that Sta. Thereſa had two fathers, the firſt, King Bermudes, and the ſecond, Alonzo Sanchez de Cepede* (4). This converſation is ſuppoſed to have been held on occaſion of the canonization of St. Thereſa, in 1622. The Author of this piece was not a Proteſtant, he ſaying many bitter things againſt thoſe who profeſs that religion.

(1) A city of Italy.

(2) Extracted from Daniel Papebroch, *in Reſponſione ad exhibitionem Errorum*, p. 303, 304.

(3) In the rem. [CC] of the article HADRIAN VI.

(4) *Caquet de l'Accouchée, ſeconde Journée*, p. 7.

PERGA or PERGE, a city of Pamphylia, on a very high place, near which town a Temple of Diana was built (*a*). It was very antient, and had in great veneration: and though the Epheſian Diana ſurpaſſed that of Perga, the latter had nevertheleſs a conſiderable ſhare in the devotion of nations (*b*). An Aſſembly was held there every year (*c*); on which occaſion we may certainly ſuppoſe that the hymns were ſung, written in honour of that Goddeſs, compoſed by Damophila, contemporary with Sapho; and which was ſtill ſung in the time of Apollonius Tyanæus (*d*). The Diana of Perga, Περγαία Ἄρτεμις, is mentioned on ſeveral Medals (*e*). This was one of the cities in which St. Paul preached the Chriſtian Faith (*f*). The famous Geometrician Apollonius Pergæus (*g*), who wrote a Treatiſe in Conic Sections, was born in it. It is now in a poor condition; its Archiepiſcopal See being transferred to Attalia (*h*), one of the fourteen cities which was formerly under its juriſdiction. Perga is eight miles from the Sea.

(*a*) Strabo, lib. 14. p. 459.

(*b*) *Pergæ fanum antiquiſſimum & ſanctiſſimum Dianæ ſcimus eſſe, id quoque à te nudatum & ſpoliatum eſſe, ex ipſa Diana quod habebat auri detractum atque ablatum eſſe dico.* Cicero, *in Verr.* Orat. 6.

(*c*) Strabo, lib. 14. p. 459.

(*d*) See Philoſtratus, *in ejus Vita*, lib. 1.

(*e*) Spanhemius, *de præſt. & uſu Numiſm.* p. 782.

(*f*) *Acts of the Apoſtles*, chap. 13, 14.

(*g*) I have given that article.

(*h*) Baudrand, *Geograph.*

PERGAMUS, a city of Aſia in Myſia, became very famous under the Monarchs who ſucceeded Philæterus. It was very advantageouſly ſituated [*A*], and was at firſt a Fortreſs built on a Mountain (*a*). Lyſimachus, one of Alexander's Succeſſors, depoſited his treaſures in it, and gives the Government of it to one, who, taking the advantage of the ſituation of affairs, ſeized upon them [*B*], as will be ſeen hereunder. The magnificent

(*a*) Strabo, lib. 13. p. 428, 429.

[*A*] *It was very advatageouſly ſituated.*] Particularly by the great commodiouſneſs of the rivers near it. *Longeque clariſſimum Aſiæ Pergamum quod intermeat Selinus, præfluit Cetius profuſus Pindaſo monte* (1); i. e. "The river Cetius, whoſe ſource is in mount Pin- "daſus, flows by Pergamus, the moſt famous city "of Aſia, and Selinus runs through it." Theſe are Pliny's words. I wonder he did not mention the Caicus, another river which flowed near Pergamus, and the only one mentioned by Strabo, where he deſcribes that city. Παραῤῥεῖ δ' ὁ Κάϊκος καὶ τὸ Πέργαμον διὰ τῆς Καΐκου πεδίου προσαγορευομένου, σφόδρα εὐδαίμονα γῆν διεξιὼν, σχεδόν τοι καὶ τὴν ἀρίστην τῆς Μυσίας (2); *i. e.* "The river Caicus flows by Pergamus, "through a very fruitful plain, called Caicus, and "alſo flows through the beſt part of Aſia."

(1) Plinius, lib. 5. cap. 30. num. 611.

(2) Strabo, lib. 13. p. 429.

[*B*] *One . . . ſeized upon them.*] The perſon I mean was Philetærus. He had been an eunuch from his infancy, and that by an accident. His nurſe, who had carried him to a funeral, was crowded ſo prodigiouſly by the ſpectators, that the child's teſticles were ſqueezed to pieces. Συνέβη γὰρ ἔν τινι ταφῇ θέας οὔσης, καὶ πολλῶν παρόντων, ἀπωληφθεῖσαν ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ τὴν κομίζουσαν τροφὸν τοῦ Φιλέταιρον ἔτι νήπιον, συνθλιβῆναι μέχρι τοσοῦδε, ὡς τε πηρωθῆναι τὸν παῖδα· ἦν μὲν δὴ εὐνοῦχος. *Nam ſpectaculo quodam funebri, in magna hominum frequentia, nutrix eum geſtans etiamnum infantem in turba hominum deprehenſa, adeò fuit oppreſſa, ut pueri etiam colliderentur genitalia. Erat ergo eunuchus* (3). So good an education was beſtowed upon him, that he was capable of exerciſing the moſt exalted employments; and he muſt neceſſarily have been reputed an honeſt man, ſince Lyſimachus entruſted him with the Government of the fortreſs, in which he had depoſited all his treaſures. Philetærus was very faithful to his truſt, till he was ſtrongly attacked by the calumny of Arſinoe, Lyſimachus's wife. From that time he began to withdraw himſelf from the allegiance he owed to that Prince; and to take ſuch meaſures as might maintain him in the independance he intended to uſurp. Affairs were then in ſuch a ſituation, as were greatly advantageous to him. Lyſimachus, oppreſſed with domeſtic diviſions, was obliged to put to death his ſon Agathocles: notwithſtanding which, he was oppreſſed by Seleucus Nicator, and at laſt murdered by the treachery of Ptolomy Ceraunus. Philetærus, during theſe diviſions, ſecured himſelf in the poſſeſſion of Pergamus; he employed artifice, and amuſed that party which he thought the moſt formidable, with vain words and compliments; ſo that, for twenty years, he was poſſeſſed of the caſtle and treaſures of Lyſimachus. His nephew Eumenes (4) was his heir; and enlarged his power by the conqueſts of ſeveral places round Pergamus. He won a battle near Sardis, againſt Antiochus the ſon of Seleucus, and died after having reigned twenty two years (5). Attalus, his firſt Couſin and Succeſſor, aſſumed the title of King. See the following article. Chronologers fix the beginning of Philetærus's reign to the year of Rome 468. He lived to fourſcore years of age (6). Some ſay that his mother was named Boa; that ſhe was a Paphlagonian by birth, a Courtezan by profeſſion, and a Minſtrel (7). He was born at Teium ſtanding on Pontus Euxinus (8).

(3) Ibid. p. 428.

(4) The ſon of Eumenes, brother to Phileterus.

(5) Extracted from Strabo, lib. 13. p. 428, 429.

(6) Lucianus, *in Macrobiis.*

(7) Athen. lib. 13. p. 577.

(8) Strabo, lib. 12. p. 374.

nificent Library [C] ſet up by the Kings of Pergamus, and Æſculapius's Temple [D] were the principal ornaments of that city. The reader will find in Moreri, that the inhabitants of it built a Temple in honour of the Emperor Auguſtus, and the city of Rome;

[C] *The magnificent Library.*] I will begin the following remark with a paſſage from Lomeier: *Attalus & Eumenes Pergami Reges nobilem bibliothecam conquiſitis undique ſupra ducenta millia exemplaribus, in hædinis pellibus, quæ ab hoc loco pergamenæ dictæ ſunt, deſcriptis, conſtruxiſſe feruntur* (9). i. e. "It is related "that Atticus and Eumenes, Kings of Pergamus, "built a noble Library, having collected upwards of "two hundred thouſand volumes from all countries, "in kid's ſkins, which were called, from this coun- "try, *Pergamenæ* or Parchment." He quotes Chap. II. Book XXV. of Pliny, but we there meet only with the following words: *An priores cœperint Alexandriæ & Pergami Reges qui bibliothecas magno certamine inſtituere non facile dixerim.* i. e. "I am not "ſure, whether the Monarchs of Alexandria and "Pergamus, who ſtrove to rival one another in the "ſetting up Libraries, firſt began to do this." This quotation from Pliny is therefore not juſt. This Author indeed informs us, in another part of his work, that the People of Pergamus found out the art of preparing ſkins to employ them inſtead of paper. *Mox æmulatione circa bibliothecas regum Ptolemæi & Eumenis, ſupprimente chartas Ptolemæo, idem Varro membranas Pergami tradidit repertas* (10). We are informed in this paſſage, that the emulation between the Kings of Egypt and Pergamus, who ſhould compoſe the fineſt Library, made the Egyptian Monarch forbid the exportation of paper, which gave occaſion to the invention of parchment. It will be proper to quote St. Jerom in this place. *Chartam*, ſays he (11), *deſuiſſe non puto, Ægypto miniſtrante commercia, & ſi alicubi Ptolemæus maria clauſiſſet, tamen Rex Attalus membranas à Pergamo miſerat, ut penuria chartæ pellibus penſaretur. Unde & Pergamenarum nomen ad hunc uſque diem, tradente ſibi invicem poſteritate, ſervatum eſt.* i. e. "It is my opinion that there was no want of "paper, as Egypt traded with other nations; and in "caſe Ptolemy had ſhut up the harbours any where, "yet King Attalus had ſent ſkins from Pergamus, to "ſupply the want of paper: whence it has pre- "ſerved, to this age, the name of *Pergame-* "*na* or Parchment." As to the number of books mentioned by Lomeier, we muſt have recourſe to Plutarch (12), who ſays that Mark Anthony made a preſent to Cleopatra of the Library of Pergamus, in which were two hundred thouſand volumes. Father Jacob, in his treatiſe on Libraries, page 28. Part I. affirms very falſely that Strabo ſays, that the Library in queſtion contained two hundred and eighty thouſand volumes. The Sieur le Gallois (13) aſſerts ſtill more falſely, that Pliny declares them to have been ſtill more numerous. Lipſius ſtarts a difficulty unworthy of himſelf with regard to Plutarch's words. Strabo, ſays he (14), who wrote under Tiberius, affirms that the Library of Pergamus was then ſubſiſting in the ſame condition in which King Eumenes ſet it up. Conſequently it had not been removed to Alexandria, in order to be preſented to Cleopatra; or we muſt ſuppoſe that Auguſtus, who undid moſt things that Mark Anthony had done, had it carried back to Pergamus; or that after it had been loſt under Mark Anthony, another had been ſet up exactly like it. This is what we call *modum in ſcirpo quærere*, (ſeeking a knot in a bull-ruſh) for Strabo does not mean, that the People of Pergamus were ſtill poſſeſſed of the Library or other ornaments with which Eumenes had embelliſhed it; but only that it had not been increaſed ſince the reign of Eumenes. This Prince, ſays he, put it into the ſtate, in which we now ſee it. This is the ſenſe of the Greek text (15): Καλλωπίσας δ' ὅτο τὴν πόλιν, καὶ τὸ Νικηφόριον ἄλσο καλλιφύτευσε, καὶ ἀναθήμασι, καὶ βιβλιοθήκας, καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τοσόνδε καλλονίαν τῆ Περγάμῳ τὴν νῦν ἥσαν ἐκεῖνο προσεφιλοκάλησε. *Hic urbem adornavit, & lucum Nicephorium conſevit, ac donaria & bibliothecas & habitationis locum in Pergamo tantum quantus hodieque eſt conſtituit luculenter* (16). Lipſius's objection againſt Vitruvius is better grounded. *Reges Attalici magnis philologiæ dulcedinibus inducti cum egregiam bibliothecam Pergami ad communem delectationem inſtituiſſent, tum item Ptolemæus, infinito zelo cupiditatiſque incitatus ſtudio, non minoribus induſtriis ad eundem modum contenderat Alexandriæ comparare* (17). Theſe are Vitruvius's words, the plain import of which is, that Ptolemy Philadelphus (18) adorned the city of Alexandria with a noble Library, in emulation of that which the Kings of Pergamus had ſet up in the capital of their Dominions. Lipſius finds very juſtly an error in this paſſage. The Alexandrian Library was ſet up before the Kings of Pergamus, who founded Libraries, were born. But this does not deſtroy what Pliny ſays with reſpect to the emulation between Ptolemy and Eumenes; for no doubt but the King of Egypt, who was contemporary with Eumenes, was greatly ſorry to find, that the King of Pergamus was founding a Library, which might eclipſe the glory of that of Alexandria. I am to obſerve, that the emulation between the Monarchs in queſtion, gave occaſion to a great number of frauds with regard to books, as Galen obſerves. *Scribit Galenus, Comment. 1. in lib. Hippocr. de natura hum. inter Alexandriæ & Pergami reges contentionem fuiſſe, quis plura veterum volumina compararet. Tum vero multos ab hominibus pecuniæ avidis falſis auctorum nominibus libros inſcriptos eſſe, quo vetuſtatis plurimum iis & auctoritatis accederet* (19), i. e. "We are told by Galen, that an emulation aroſe "between the Kings of Alexandria and Pergamus, "which of them ſhould procure the greateſt number "of volumes of antient Authors. On this occaſion "books, by many perſons greedy of money, were "falſely aſcribed to Authors, in order to give "the greater weight to them, and make them be "judged of the greater antiquity." I have juſt now read in an excellent work (20), that *many people think that the Kings of Pergamus began to* adorn *their city* with a Library; and *that Attalus formed his Library twenty two years before that of Alexandria.* I do not criticiſe the Author of this book; for what he affirms, *viz.* that this is believed, is doubtleſs true with regard to great numbers of people: many people may ſuppoſe this: all I ſay is, that they are miſtaken. The firſt King of Pergamus, who was named Attalus, was born ſome years after the death of Ptolemy Philadelphus, who founded the Alexandrian Library. The Author adds, in the book in queſtion (21), that *the Library of the Kings of Pergamus was brought to Rome.* I wiſh he had cited an authority for this.

[D] . . . . *and Æſculapius's Temple.*] This Deity is ſirnamed *Pergameneus* in Martial (22); and it is related by a Roman Hiſtorian, that when an enquiry was made in Rome, after thoſe Aſylums which were not truly ſuch, the proofs of the Æſculapius of Pergamus were found valid. *Conſules ſuper eas civitates quas memoravi, apud Pergamam Æſculapii compertum aſylum retulerunt: ceteros obſcuris ob vetuſtatem initiis niti* (23). i. e. "The Conſuls who preſided over the "cities, I took notice, declared, that an Aſylum of "Æſculapius was found in Pergamus; but that, as "to the reſt, they depended wholly on uncertain tra- "ditions." A man who reads this paſſage in Tacitus, may very probably call to mind the enquiry, which it is ſo neceſſary to make, from time to time, with regard to titles of Nobility. But the enquiry made with regard to falſe aſylums was of much greater importance. So great an abuſe, in this article, was crept into the Grecian cities, that the Magiſtrates found it impoſſible to put the laws in execution, in their due rigour: debtors and criminals of every kind had their ſeveral aſylums, where they were protected by the populace, who thought it a duty incumbent on them, as if it had been an article of Religion. *Crebreſcebat enim Græcas per urbes licentia atque impunitas aſyla ſtatuendi: complebantur templa peſſimis ſervitiorum, eodem ſubſidio obærati adverſum creditores, ſuſpectique capitalium criminum receptabantur. Nec ullum ſatis validum imperium erat coërcendis ſeditionibus populi, flagitia hominum ut cærimonias deum protegentis* (24). To put a ſtop to this evil practice, an order was iſſued out, commanding all cities, in which were privileged temples, to ſend to Rome the proofs or authorities for their

(9) Lomeier, *de Bibliothecis*, cap. 6. p. 96.

(10) Plin. lib. 13. cap. 11. p. m. 78, 79.

(11) Hieronym. *Epiſt. ad Chrom. Jovin. & Euſeb.*

(12) Plutarch. *in Vita Marci Antonii.*

(13) Gallois, *Traite des Bibl.* p. 27.

(14) Lipſius, *Syntagm. de Bibliothb.* cap. 4.

(15) Strabo, lib. 13. p. 429, 430.

(16) Thus theſe words ought to have been tranſlated, and not as Lipſius, *de Bibliothecis*, cap. 4. *Eumenes urbem inſtruxit, & donariis ac bibliothecis, uti nunc eſt, eleganter excoluit.* Le Sieur Le Gallois, *Traite des Bibl.* p. 27. makes uſe of all theſe reflections of Lipſius, without naming him.

(17) Vitruvius, *in Præfat.* lib. 7.

(18) Vitruvius's words, as they are connected, can be underſtood only of Ptolemy Philadelphus.

(19) Harduinus: in Plin. lib. 35. cap. 2. p. 175.

(20) Jaquelot, *de l'Exiſtence de Dieu*, p. 126.

(21) Ibid. p. 127.

(22) Martial. *Epigr.* 17. lib. 9.

(23) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 3. cap. 63. ad ann. 775.

(24) Idem, ibid. cap. 60.

Rome (*b*); and that Galen was born there. It alſo gave birth to ſeveral other renowned perſons, whoſe names are found in Strabo (*c*). Add to them Oribaſius, Phyſician of Julian the Apoſtate (*d*).

(*b*) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 4. cap. 37. *Cum divus Auguſtus ſibi atque urbi Romæ templum apud Pergamum ſiſti non probibuiſſet.*

(*c*) Strabo, lib. 13. p. 429, 430.

(*d*) Eunapius, *in Vita Oribaſii.*

their being Aſylums (25). Some of theſe cities being conſcious of the uſurpation, gave it up (26). Many others relying on antient traditions, or the ſervices they had done to the Romans, ſent deputies. Accordingly the Senate admitted them to audience; but being at laſt tired out with their idle tales, and the factions which were formed, they referred this enquiry to the conſuls. *Auditæ aliarum quoque civitatum legationes. Quorum copia feſſi patres, & quia ſtudiis certabatur conſulibus permiſere, ut perſpecta jure, & ſi qua iniquitas involveretur, rem integram rurſum ad Senatum referrent* (27). The Conſuls did not act with great rigour on this occaſion, but admitted ſeveral titles of Nobility though grounded wholly on Chimæras: as for inſtance, they admitted, as an authentick proof, what the Epheſians affirmed to them, that the Olive-tree, on which Latona leaned, when ſhe was delivered of Apollo, was ſtill extant. *Eſſe apud ſe Cenchrium amnem, lucum Ortygiam, ubi Latonam partu gravidam & oleæ quæ tum etiam maneat adniſam, edidiſſe ea numina, deorumque monitu ſacratum nemus* (28). i. e. "That near them was the river Cenchrius, "and the grove Ortygia, where Latona being with "Child, and leaning upon an olive-tree which ſtill "remains there, was delivered of thoſe Deities; "and that the grove was conſecrated by the com-"mand of the Gods." The Judges or inſpectors would not be leſs indulgent, in caſe orders ſhould be given for every pariſh to exhibit the proofs of their ſeveral devotions and relicks. It is well known with what blindneſs the Heathens aſſerted their traditions; nevertheleſs people will not open their eyes, and thereby diſcover the ridiculouſneſs of the ſtories that are told in all places, which boaſt a privileged devotion.

(25) *Igitur placitum ut mitterent civitatis jura, atque legatos.* Idem, ibid.

(26) *Quædam quod falſo uſurpaverant ſponte omiſere: multæ vetuſtis ſuperſtitionibus, aut meritis in populum Romanum fidebant.* Idem. ib.

(27) Idem, ibid. cap. 63.

(28) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 3. cap. 61.

Polybius furniſhes as good a reflection as this. Pruſias having vanquiſhed Attalus entered into Pergamus (29), and went and offered Æſculapius a pompous ſacrifice, after which he returned to his camp. The next day he cauſed all the Temples to be plundered, and he himſelf took the Statue of Æſculapius on his ſhoulders (30), to which he had ſacrificed victims, and whoſe aid he had invoked the day before. Polybius calls this the action of a frantick mad wretch. Ἅμα μὲν θύειν καὶ διὰ τοῦλον ἐξιλάσκεσθαι τὸ θεῖον προσκυνοῦντα καὶ λιπαροῦντα τὰς τραπέζας καὶ τοὺς βωμοὺς ἐξάλλως, ὅπερ ὁ Προυσίας ἐποίει ποιεῖν, γονυπετῶν καὶ γυναικίζόμενον· ἅμα δὲ ταῦτα καὶ λυμαίνεσθαι καὶ διὰ τῆς τοῦλου καλαφθορᾶς τὴν εἰς τὸ θεῖον ὕβριν διαλίθισθαι, πῶς ἐκ ἂν εἴποι τις εἶναι θυμοῦ λυτοῦντος ἔργα καὶ ψυχῆς ἐξεστηκυίας τῶν λογισμῶν (31). i. e. "For to ſacrifice victims, and "implore the Gods to be propitious; to adore every "altar and ſtone, in a poſture of the loweſt humilia-"tion, and with a womaniſh ſuperſtition, as was "Pruſias's cuſtom; and in the mean time to demo-"liſh the ſame temples, and by ſo doing affront the "Gods; what man will deny but that this is acting "like a raving mad-man?" I am ſure that Polybius would have ſpoke in leſs harſh terms of thoſe, who ſhould have plundered temples, without having invoked the Deities to which they were conſecrated. What he relates, that Pruſias entered Pergamus, is conſiſtent with what Diodorus Siculus tells us, viz. that this Prince giving up all hopes of being ever able to take Attalus priſoner, plunder'd the temple of Nicephorus, which was not far diſtant from the city (32). But here, (will ſome ſay) is an argument that is ſtill ſtronger againſt Polybius. King Eumenes, in his ſpeech to the Senate of Rome, declares expreſsly, that he was beſieged in Pergamus, and that he was ſo fortunate as to prevent the taking of that city. *Quod miſerrimum eſt in bello, obſidionem paſſus ſum, Pergami incluſus cum diſcrimine ultimo ſimul vitæ regnique, liberatus deinde obſidione, cum alia parte Antiochus, alia Seleucus circa arcem regni mei caſtra haberent, relictis rebus meis tota claſſe ad Helleſpontem L. Scipioni Coſ. veſtro occurri, ut eum in trajiciendo exercitum adjuvarem* (33); *i. e.* "I ſuſtained a ſiege, which is the moſt "calamitous diſaſter that can befal a man in war; "being ſhut up in Pergamus, where my life and "Kingdom were expoſed to the greateſt hazard; "and being afterwards freed from the ſiege, not-"withſtanding that Antiochus was encamped on one "ſide of my capital, and Seleucus on the other; ne-"vertheleſs, abandoning all my own affairs, I failed "with my whole fleet to the Helleſpont, there to "meet your Conſul Scipio, in order to aſſiſt him in "the tranſportation of his army." I anſwer, that neither Polybius nor Diodorus Siculus ſpeak of what was done under King Eumenes. They ſpeak of a ſiege of Pergamus, poſterior to the time we are ſpeaking of; and ſuſtained by Attalus Philadelphus, againſt Pruſias King of Bithynia. See Appian (34).

(29) Προυσίας μετὰ τὸ νικῆσαι τὸν Ἄτταλον, μετὰ τὸ παρελθεῖν πρὸς τὸ Περγαμον. *Pruſias victo Attalo, Pergamum ingreſſus.* Polybius, *in* Excerptis à Valeſio, *editis*, p. 169.

(30) An excellent piece of ſculpture by Phylomachus, περιττῶς ὑπὸ φυλομάχου κατεσκευασμένον. Idem, Ibid. Diodor. *in* Excerptis à Valeſio, *editis*, p. 336, calls it *Phyromachus.* This is the name of an excellent Sculptor, who flouriſhed in the 120th Olympiad, according to Pliny, lib. 34. cap. 8.

(31) Polyb. *in* Excerptis à Valeſio, *editis*, p. 169.

(32) Diodorus Sicul. *in* Excerptis à Valeſio, *publicatis*, p. 336. He obſerves, that Pruſias carried off all the Gods from it, and in particular Æſculapius.

(33) T. Livius, lib. 37. cap. 53.

(34) Appianus, *in* Mithridat. *circa init.*

PERGAMUS (ATTALUS KING OF), ſucceeded the year of Rome 512, his Couſin Eumenes [*A*], who had ſucceeded Philetærus their uncle. He aſſumed the title of King which they had not taken [*B*]; and he imagined he might do this without being thought arrogant, after the glory he had acquired in gaining a battle againſt the Gauls (*a*). He made an alliance with the Romans (*b*), at a time when they were in great want of ſuch a friend; for beſides that they were to oppoſe Hannibal in Italy, they alſo were obliged to fight againſt Philip King of Macedon, who had declared himſelf their enemy. Attalus engaged in the intereſt of the Romans with great vigour, and continued firm in it till his death. He undertook a journey to Athens, purpoſely to prejudice the King of Macedon,

(*a*) See the rem. [*B*].

(*b*) In 542. See Livy, lib. 26. p. m. 451.

[*A*] *He ſucceeded . . . . his couſin Eumenes.*] Philetærus had two brothers; the eldeſt was named Eumenes, and the other Attalus. The ſon of the latter had the ſame name with his father, and ſucceeded Philetærus. Attalus's ſon was named Attalus, and ſucceeded Eumenes (1). Had Father Labbe read Strabo attentively, he would not have cited him, as having related, that Attalus was *the brother* and *ſucceſſor of* Eumenes (2). This error has been copied by Moreri (3). I am ſurprized that Menage did not take notice of an error in Diogenes Laertius, which Valeſius had cenſured (4). This Hiſtorian of the Philoſophers affirms, that Eumenes was Philetærus's ſon (5). Now he ſhould have ſaid nephew, in which quality he is mentioned by Strabo and Athenæus. I cite the words of the latter, becauſe they inform us of a curious particular, viz. that this Eumenes killed himſelf with drinking. ὑπὸ μέθης ἀπέθανεν Ευμένης ὁ Περγαμηνὸς ὁ φιλεταίρου τοῦ Περγάμου βασιλεύσαντος ἀδελφιδοῦς, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Κτησικλῆς ἐν τρίτῳ χρόνων (6). *Eumenes Pergamenus Philetæri* (7), *qui Pergami regnavit ex fratre nepos, ebrietate periit ut refert Cteſicles libro tertio de temporibus.* I am to obſerve, that Athenæus has alſo employed elſewhere (8) the ſame word βασιλεύσας, where he ſpeaks of Philetærus.

(1) Strabo, lib. 13. p. 429.

(2) Labbe, *Chronologue Francois*, Tom. 2. p. 300. at the year of Rome 512.

(3) Under the word *Eumenes.*

(4) Henri. Valeſius, *Not. ad Excerpt. Polyb.* p. 19.

(5) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. *in* Arceſilao. num. 48.

(6) Athen. lib. 10. p. 445.

(7) It is *Attali* in Dalechamp's Verſion.

(8) Athen. lib. 13. p. 577.

[*B*] *He aſſumed the title of King, which they had not taken.*] Strabo ſays this expreſsly. Ἀνηγορεύθη βασιλεὺς ἤτοι πρῶτον νικήσας Γαλάτας μάχῃ μεγάλῃ (9); *i. e.* "The firſt time he was ſaluted King, was, af-"ter he had overcome the Gauls in a mighty battle." Polybius had made the ſame aſſertion before (10): Νικήσας γὰρ μάχῃ Γαλάτας, ὁ βαρύταλον καὶ μαχιμώταλον ἔθνος, ὃν τότε καλὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν, ταύτην ἀρχὴν ἐποιήσαλο, καὶ τότε πρῶτον αὐτὸν ἐδείξε βασιλέα; i. e. "For having "vanquiſhed in battle the Gauls, who were then the "moſt terrible and martial people in Aſia, he firſt "aſſumed, publickly, the title of King." Livy is of the ſame opinion: *Victis deinde prælio uno Gallis, quæ tum gens recenti adventu terribilior Aſiæ erat, regium aſcivit nomen cujus magnitudini ſemper animum æquavit*

(9) Strabo, lib. 13. p. 429.

(10) Polyb. lib. 18. *in Excerpt. Valeſianis*, p. 103.

Macedon, and great honours were done him by the Athenians [C]. He went a ſecond time into Greece, when upwards of ſeventy years of age, in order to procure ſome allies for the Romans, in oppoſition to the Macedonian Monarch (c). He made a ſpeech to the Thebans, in ſo ſtrong and forcible a manner [D], to perſuade them to engage in this alliance, that having exerted himſelf more than was proper for a man of his age, he was ſeized with a giddineſs or defluxion, which prevented his making an end of his harangue. He fainted away in the middle of his ſpeech; and embarking a few days after, returned to Pergamus, where he died (d) a little after, having reigned forty four years (e), having lived ſeventy two years (f). This Prince had ſhewn a great affection for the Philoſophers (g), and who made ſuch a uſe of his riches as was worthy a man of honour, and a great ſoul. He was faithful to his allies, lived in very good harmony with his wife [E], and gave a very good education to his four ſons (h). He was ſucceeded by Eumenes the eldeſt of them. He was of an infirm conſtitution; but poſſeſſed a magnanimity of ſoul, which compenſated for the weakneſs of his body. He was fired with an ardent thirſt for glory, was generous, and was extremely liberal to ſeveral Grecian cities as well as particular men. He enlarged very much the bounds of his dominions, and that merely by his induſtry and prudence. He kept his brothers ſo well to their duty [F], that they concurred with him in

(c) Livy, lib. 23. p. 610.

(d) The year of Rome 556.

(e) Livy, lib. 23. p. 610. Polyb. *in Excerpt. Valeſianis*, p. 103.

(f) Polyb. ibid.

(g) See the art. LACYDES.

(h) *Ex eodem* Polybio, *in Excerpt. Valeſianis*, p. 103.

æquavit (11). In my opinion, theſe three teſtimonies are preferable to the authority of Juſtin, and that of Diogenes Laertius, for, 1. Juſtin commits an error, which proves, that he had not made an exact enquiry into this matter. He ſays that Eumenes was King of Bithynia. This is what might be alledged by thoſe who ſhould refuſe to believe, that our Attalus was the firſt who aſſumed the title of King. Is not Eumenes his predeceſſor, might theſe ſay, ſtyled King by Juſtin the Hiſtorian (12)? But here I would anſwer; Did he command in Bithynia? Did he not command in Pergamus? Can Juſtin clear himſelf, unleſs he has recourſe to ſome Criticks who read *Nicomedes* for *Eumenes*, in the paſſage in queſtion? 2. As Diogenes Laertius does not treat hiſtorically of Pergamus, and mentions Eumenes only by accident, we cannot ſuppoſe that he enquired carefully, whether that Prince had aſſumed the title of King. He was contented with knowing that Eumenes enjoyed the ſupreme authority in Pergamus, which made him employ an expreſſion, which ſignifies royalty. He ſays (13), that Eumenes having loaded Arceſilaus with benefits, was the only Monarch to whom that Author dedicated books. The above-cited paſſage of Athenæus ought not to be objected to me. We there find that Philetærus reigned in Pergamus; but that does not imply that he actually aſſumed the title of King. Read the modern Hiſtorians of the Duke of Savoy, of the Electors of Bavaria or Brandenburg, &c. and we ſhall often find the words *reign* and *to reign*, which implies no more than an authority exerciſed under the name of Duke or Elector. The medals, which give the title of King to Philetærus, according to Goltzius (14), are a ſtronger proof againſt Strabo, in caſe they are not ſuppoſititious. Thoſe which Spanhemius deſcribes, do not give him that title (15). By the way, Attalus gained his victory over the Gauls, the laſt year of the 134th Olympiad (16). This was the year of Rome 512.

(11) T. Livius, lib. 32. p. m. 610.

(12) *Rex Bithyniæ Eumenes.* Juſt. lib. 27. cap. 3.

(13) Ἐχορήγει αὐτῷ πολλὰ Εὐμένης ὁ τῆ φιλέλλαιρε· διὸ καὶ τούτῳ τῶν ἄλλων βασιλέων προσεφώνει. Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 38.

(14) See Valeſius, *Notis ad Excerpta Polybii*, p. 19.

(15) Ezech. Spanhem. *de præſt. & uſu Numiſmat.* p. 468.

(16) Valeſius, *Not. ad Excerpta Polybii*, p. 19.

[C] *Great honours were done him by the Athenians.*] The whole city, men, women, and prieſts, in their ſacerdotal veſtments, went out to meet him. They almoſt forced the Gods to pay him the ſame honours. I am obliged to Livy for this thought. *Rex Piræeum, renovandæ firmandæque cum Athenienſibus ſocietatis cauſa trajecit. Civitas omnis obviam effuſa cum conjugibus ac liberis, ſacerdotes cum inſignibus ſuis intrantem urbem, ac dii propè ipſi exciti ſedibus ſuis exceperunt* (17). He obſerves, that Attalus thought it more ſuitable to his dignity, to communicate his propoſals in writing, than to expoſe his modeſty to the neceſſity of diſplaying, himſelf, the ſervices he had performed, and to receive innumerable applauſes from a flattering people. The Hiſtorian expreſſes this admirably: *In concionem extemplò populus vocatus, ut Rex quæ vellet, coràm ageret: deinde ex dignitate magis viſum, ſcribere eum, de quibus videretur: quàm præſentem aut referendis ſuis in civitatem beneficiis erubeſcere, aut ſignificationibus acclamationibuſque multitudinis, aſſentatione immodica pudorem onerantis* (18). War was reſolved upon againſt Philip King of Macedon. It was then the Romans, in honour of Attalus, propoſed to add a new tribe, to the ten antient ones, and to call it Attalis. *Ingenti conſenſu bellum adverſus Philippum decretum. Honores regi primùm Attalo immodici, deinde & Rhodiis habiti: tam primùm mentio illata de tribu, quam Attalida appellarent, ad decem veteres tribus addenda* (19).

(17) T. Livius, lib. 31. p. 572.

(18) Idem, ibid.

(19) Idem, ibid. p. 573.

[D] *He made a ſpeech to the Thebans, in ſo ſtrong and forcible a manner.*] This is ſo ſingular an incident, that it deſerves to be read in Plutarch's words (20): Καὶ μέντοι παρελθὼν ὁ Τίτος, ὡς οὐκ ἔφων τὴν πόλιν, ἔπειθεν ἐλέσθαι τὰ Ῥωμαίων, Ἄτταλος σὺν βασιλέως συναγορεύοντος αὐτῷ καὶ συνεξορμῶντος τοὺς Θηβαίους. ἀλλ' Ἄτταλος μὲν, (ὡς ἔοικεν) τῷ γήρᾳ προθυμότερον ἑαυτὸν τῷ Τίτῳ ῥήτορα παρασχεῖν φιλοτιμούμενος, ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ λέγειν προσπεσόντος ἰλίγγου τινὸς ἢ ῥεύματος, ἄφωνον τὴν αἴσθησιν ἐπιληφθεὶς ἔπεσεν, καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον εἰς πλοῖον ἀναχθεὶς εἰς Ἀσίαν ἀποκομισθεὶς ἐτελεύτησεν; i. e. "Upon this Titus (21), as though he had not "taken the city, made a ſpeech to them, exhorting "them to join with the Romans; Attalus alſo ex- "citing the Thebans to do the ſame. But Attalus, "by ſtriving to outdo Quintius, exerting himſelf too "much, in my opinion, for a perſon of his years, was "ſeized with a giddineſs or defluxion in the midſt of "his ſpeech, and fell down; when being carried "on board a ſhip, and ſailing into Aſia, he died a "few days after." The reader may ſee in Livy (22) the manner, in which Eumenes the ſon of Attalus repreſented this accident to the Romans; after diſplaying, in few words, the ſervices which his father had done for the Commonwealth of Rome.

(20) Plutarchus, *in Vita Flaminii*, p. 372. B.

(21) i. e. Titus Quintius Flaminius, who was then Conſul.

(22) T. Livius, lib. 37. cap. 53.

[E] *He . . . . lived in very good harmony with his wife.*] She was a native of Cyzicus, of Plebeian extraction, and named Apollonias. The title of Queen was beſtowed on her, and ſhe preſerved it till her death, not by the arts employed by Courtezans (23), but by her modeſty, probity, prudence, and gravity. She bore a tender affection to her four ſons, and continued to love them as long as ſhe lived, though ſhe out-lived her huſband many years. This obſervation is not ſuperfluous; it happening but too frequently, that Queen Dowagers form cabals and factions, in prejudice of their children. King Attalus her ſon paid her great honours. It was a delightful ſight to the inhabitants of Cyzicus, to ſee him and his brother conduct their mother by the hand to all the temples, and other places of the city. For this unnumbered bleſſings were beſtowed upon them (24). It would not be a matter of ſo much ſurprize, to ſee, in this age, ſuch a ſpectacle in the Weſtern parts of the world.

(23) Οὐχ ἑταιρικὴν προσφερομένη πιθανότητα. *Non meretriciis illecebris.* Polyb. *ubi infra.*

(24) Polyb. *in Excerpt. à Valeſio*, 113, 114.

[F] *He kept his brothers ſo well to their duty.*] Polybius, where he gives us the character of Eumenes, obſerves, as the finiſhing ſtroke of his perfections, that this Prince conducted himſelf ſo prudently towards his brothers, that they proved the inſtruments of the ſecurity of his reign; and adds, that this is rarely ſeen. Ἀδελφοὺς ἔχων τρεῖς καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν καὶ πρᾶξιν πάνυ τούτους συνέσχε πειθαρχοῦντας αὐτῷ, καὶ δορυφοροῦντας καὶ σώζοντας τὸ τῆς βασιλείας ἀξίωμα. τοῦτο δὲ σπανίως εὕροι τις ἂν γιγνόμενον. *Fratres cum haberet tres & ætate & induſtria pollentes, eos in officio omnes continuit & morigeros cuſtodeſque regni ac dignitatis ſuæ habuit ſatellites. Quod raro admodum contigiſſe reperias* (25). He has reaſon to ſay, that this is a rare circumſtance (26). Hiſtory is filled with the cruel wars, which Princes have been obliged to carry on, either againſt their brothers or their own children; ſo that thoſe who reflect when they read, may form the following aphoriſm; *that a King*

(25) Idem, ibid. p. 169.

(26) Compare citat. (7), of the article DRUSILLA, daughter of Agrippina; and citat. (4), of the art. DRUSUS, ſon of Germanicus.

in promoting the happineſs of the people, and could never be prevailed upon to engage in any factious enterprizes (*i*). He continued inviolably attached to his alliance with the Romans, and reaped great advantages from thence. He himſelf brought a ſtrong fleet to Flaminius the Conſul, during the war againſt Philip King of Macedon (*k*). He excited the Romans to make war againſt Antiochus; and found by experience, that the principles on which his advice was grounded, were very juſt (*l*); for ſeveral Provinces of which Antiochus

(*i*) Idem, ibid. p. 166 & *ſeq.*

(*k*) Titus Liv. lib. 34. p. 632.

(*l*) See Liv. lib. 35. p. 651.

King who has brothers and children, finds it more difficult to govern his family than his kingdom. If he prevents civil wars from breaking out, this could not be effected without the moſt laborious and perpetual precautions; and if he does not prevent them, what toils will it coſt him to put an end to them? To what diſquietudes and dangers is he not expoſed? The policy of the Turks ſtrikes one with horror; it ſacrifices with the utmoſt inhumanity, to the reigning Monarch, the life or liberty of all his brethren. However, this is a neceſſary evil; for otherwiſe a wide extended Empire would be expoſed to the moſt horrid deſolations. See Chapter LXXXVIII. Vol. I. of Camerarius's hiſtorical Meditations. Be this as it will, let us not conſider as a felicity, but rather as an effect of the moſt conſummate prudence, ſuſtained by an exalted merit, the concord in which King Eumenes obliged his brothers to live. It was ſo much the more difficult to reſtrain them within the bounds of their duty, as they were ſurrounded with evil examples. Syria and Egypt were cruelly laid waſte by diſputes with regard to the ſucceſſion. The Royal Family in Macedon was embrued in blood from a jealouſy of power and authority. It was an execrable age. Nothing was ſeen but horrid attempts of brothers againſt brothers, and parents againſt children, or children againſt parents. Theſe examples might naturally tempt the King of Pergamus's brothers: and therefore their mother might juſtly think herſelf extremely happy, in ſeeing ſo delightful a harmony ſubſiſt between them. Ἀπολλωνίδα μὲν τὴν Κυζικηνὴν, Εὐμενοῦς δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως μητέρα, καὶ τρεῖς ἄλλους, Ἀτταλον καὶ Φιλεταίρου καὶ Ἀθηναίου, λέγουσι μακαρίζειν ἑαυτὴν ἀεὶ καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς χάριν ἔχειν, οὐ διὰ τὸν πλοῦτον, οὐδὲ διὰ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν, ἀλλ ὅτι τοὺς τρεῖς υἱοὺς ἑώρα τὸν πρεσβύταλον δορυφορουμένους, κἀκεῖνον ἐν μέσοις αὐτοῖς δοράτα καὶ ξίφη φερομένους, ἀδεῶς διαιτώμενον (27). i. e. "It is related that Apollonias of Cyzicus, the mother of King Eumenes, and that of three ſons more, Attalus, Philetærus, and Athenæus, would frequently declare herſelf to be happy, and give thanks to the Gods, not on account of wealth or ſovereignty, but becauſe ſhe ſaw her eldeſt ſon guarded by his three brothers; and becauſe he continued, without the leaſt fear, in the midſt of them, though they were armed with ſwords and ſpears." Attalus, the eldeſt of the three brothers, who did not ſway the ſcepter, had a greater ſhare in the Government than his other two brothers. I own that he diſcovered a great affection for his brother Eumenes on many occaſions. Knowing that he was under great affliction at the conduct of the cities of Peleponneſus (28), he did all that lay in his power to engage them to give him ſatisfaction (29). He gave the name Eumenia to a city, in honour of Eumenes (30). In a word, he was named *Philadelphus*; and yet the King entertained a ſuſpicion of him, and that very juſtly, as will appear from Livy. This Hiſtorian relates that, after the conqueſt of Macedon, (31), Attalus, who had done great ſervices to the Romans in that famous expedition, came to Rome flushed with ſecret hopes to ſupplant his own brother; and that he would have diſcovered the whole intrigue, had he not been perſuaded from it by the Phyſician who accompanied him. Now this Phyſician had been given him by Eumenes, with orders to watch all Attalus's motions. He was properly the ſpy of the King, whoſe ſuſpicion was juſtly grounded. *Suberat & ſecreta ſpes honorum præmiorumque ab ſenatu, quæ vix ſalva pietate ejus contingere poterant. Erant enim quidam Romanorum quoque non boni authores, qui ſpe cupiditatem ejus elicerent: eam opinionem de Attalo & Eumene Romæ eſſe, tanquam de altero Romanis certo amico, altero nec Romanis, nec Perſi fido ſocio. Itaque vix ſtatui poſſe, utrum quæ pro ſe, an quæ contra fratrem petiturus eſſet, ab ſenatu magis impetrabilia forent: adeò univerſos omnia & huic tribuere, & illi verò negare. Eorum hominum (ut res docuit) Attalus erat, qui quantum ſpes ſpopondiſſet cuperent, ni unius amici prudens monitio velut frænos animo ejus geſtienti ſecundis rebus impoſuiſſet. Stratius cum eo fuit medicus, ad idipſum à non ſecuro Eumene Romam miſſus ſpeculator rerum, quæ à fratre agerentur, monitorque fidus ſi decedi fide vidiſſet. Is ad occupatas jam aures ſolicitatumque jam animum cùm veniſſet, aggreſſus tempeſtivis temporibus rem prope prolapſam reſtituit* (32). i. e. "He flattered himſelf with ſecret hopes of receiving honours and rewards from the Senate, a circumſtance that was not very conſiſtent with the dictates of conſcience. For he had ſome Romans (evil Counſellors) who flattered his hopes, by obſerving to him, that he was conſidered at Rome as a falſe friend to the Romans; but that Eumenes was not thought to be a frightful ally either to the Romans or to Perſes. For this reaſon it was not eaſy to tell, whether the Senate would be more ready to grant, what he intended to aſk in his own favour, or againſt his brother's intereſt: ſo much the Romans, in general, were prompted to give all things to the one, and refuſe the other. Attalus (as was proved by experience) was one of thoſe men who have an earneſt deſire to poſſeſs what they wiſhed for, if the ſage admonition of a friend had not curbed, as with a rein, the tranſports of his mind in proſperity. He was attended by Stratius the Phyſician, who had been ſent to Rome by Eumenes, who ſuſpected Attalus's conduct; and therefore had put Stratius as a ſpy over him, in order that if Attalus ſhould ſwerve from his duty, he might ſend him a faithful account of it. This Phyſician applied to him at a time when he was forming intrigues; and doing this in a lucky hour, he recovered affairs that were almoſt ruined." I ſhall not tranſcribe the ſolid reaſons, which the Phyſician employed to keep Attalus to his duty. I will only obſerve, that they deſerved to be read in Livy, and that very probably this reaſon was not the leaſt affecting. He repreſented to him, that King Eumenes was old and childleſs; and conſequently that he might ſoon ſucceed him as the lawful heir (33). The reader is to know, that Eumenes's ſon was not then legitimated. Not above three or four years before, certain things had paſt, which ſhewed that Attalus's heart was divided between fraternal love and ambition. King Eumenes having been dangerouſly wounded by two ſtones thrown at him near Delphi, had cauſed himſelf to be conveyed to the iſland of Egina. On this occaſion his wounds were dreſſed with ſo much privacy, that ſcarce one perſon knew that he was living, whereby a report of his death was ſpread univerſally. Attalus gave credit to it ſooner than became a kind brother. He ſpoke, in the ſtyle of a King, to his ſiſter-in-law, Eumenes's wife; and to the Governor of the Citadel. In a word, he diſcovered too haſty a deſire to ſucceed him. Eumenes was not ignorant of this; and tho' he was determined to ſuffer this without ſhewing the leaſt reſentment, he yet could not forbear reproaching his brother, the firſt time he had an opportunity of ſpeaking to him, for the ſurprizingly impatient deſire he ſhewed to marry the Queen. Livy ſays no more; but the truth is, if other authors may be credited, Attalus really lay with the Queen (34). *Compotem jam ſui regem, amici poſtero die deferunt ad navem: inde Corinthum, à Corintho per Iſthmi jugum navibus traductis* (35), *Æginam trajiciunt. Ibi adeò ſecreta ejus curatio fuit, admittentibus neminem, ut fama mortuum in Aſiam perferret. Attalus quoque celerius quàm dignum concordia fraterna erat, credidit. Nam & cum uxore fratris, & præfecto arci, tanquam jam haud dubius regni hæres, eſt locutus. Quæ poſtea non fefellere Eumenem: & quanquam diſſimulare & tacitè habere id patique ſtatuerat, tamen in primo congreſſu non temperavit, quin uxoris petendæ præmaturam feſtinationem fratris objiceret. Romam quoque fama de morte*

(27) Plutarchus, *de fraterno amore*, p. 480. *C.*

(28) They had thrown down, by a public decree, all the ſtatues of Eumenes. Polyb. *in Excerpt.* p. 133.

(29) Polyb. ibid.

(30) Stephanus, *voce* Εὐμένια.

(31) In 585.

(32) Tit. Liv. lib. 45. p. 877.

(33) *Haud ambiguum propediem regnaturum eum infirmitate ætateque Eumenis eſſet nullam ſtirpem liberum habentis.* (*Nec dum enim agnoverat eum, qui poſtea regnavit.*) *Quid attineret vim afferre rei ſua ſponte mox ad eum adventuræ?* Idem, ibid.

(34) Idem, lib. 42. p. 815.

(35) Here we have a remarkable incident. They conveyed a ſhip, by land, from one Gulph of Peloponneſus to another. This has been done on other occaſions.

Antiochus was diſpoſſeſſed after the battle of Magneſia, were beſtowed on him (*m*) [G]. He alſo excited the Romans to declare war againſt Perſeus King of Macedon (*n*), and, for this purpoſe, undertook a journey to Rome. At his return from Delphi, were he intended to make a ſacrifice, he was dangerouſly wounded by ſome Aſſaſſins whom Perſeus had ſuborned (*o*). However, he did not die of his wounds; but a report of his death reached as far as Pergamus. He concealed in ſome meaſure the reſentment he entertained againſt his brother Attalus, who had diſcovered too eager a deſire to ſucceed him (*p*). He did not join in the war againſt Perſeus (*q*), and ſome Authors ſay the Romans harboured a ſuſpicion with regard to his fidelity. I muſt not omit that he loſt a battle at ſea, by a ſtratagem of Hannibal [H], and had like to have loſt his life on that occaſion,

(*m*) It was fought the year of Rome 563.

(*n*) Idem, Liv. lib. 42. p. 813.

(*o*) Idem, ibid. p. 815.

(*p*) See the rem. [F].

(*q*) Livius, lib. 44. p. 853.

Eumenis perlata eſt. Plutarch has made this the ſubject of a panegyrick both with regard to Eumenes and to Attalus. It was neceſſary to give it that turn, becauſe he was writing a treatiſe on brotherly friendſhip, in which the Royal Family of Pergamus was to be ſet as a good example, after what he had related before concerning the mother of the four brothers (36). With regard to myſelf, I take Livy's account to be more probable. Here follows Plutarch's relation. "Advice being brought, that he was coming "from the ſea-coaſt towards the city, to conſult the "oracle of Apollo, they attacked him from behind; "and threw ſome great ſtones at him which fell on "his head and neck. He was ſo ſtunned with the "blow, that he fainted away. He therefore was "thought to be dead, and a report of this was "ſpread every where, inſomuch that ſome of his "ſervants and even friends flew as far as the city of "Pergamus to carry that news, affirming that they "themſelves had been ſpectators of this accident. "Upon this Attalus, his eldeſt brother, a worthy "man, who had always ſhewn greater loyalty and "fidelity to his brother than any other perſon, was "not only proclaimed King, and crowned with the "royal diadem; but alſo married Stratonice, his "brother's wife, and lay with her. But afterwards, "when news was brought that Eumenes was alive "and returning to his dominions, he took off his "diadem; and reſuming the javelin which he "uſed to carry before his brother when he was one "of his guards, he went out to meet him with the "reſt of the guards, on which occaſion the King received him with great humanity; and ſaluted the "Queen in the moſt honourable manner, and embraced her with the utmoſt tenderneſs: living many years "after, without making the leaſt complaint, or harbouring the leaſt ſuſpicion, he died, and left his "Kingdom, with his conſort, to his brother Attalus. But how did Attalus behave after his death? "He would not bring up any of the children which "Stratonice his wife had brought him, and he had "ſeveral by her; but educated his deceaſed brother's ſon, till he came to man's eſtate, and then he "himſelf ſet the royal diadem on his head, and "gave him the title of King (37)."

(36) See the rem. [E].

(37) Plutarch, *On paternal love*, p. 273, (in the Greek and Latin edit. it is p. 489.) The above tranſlation is according to Amyot's verſion.

[G] *Several Provinces, of which Antiochus was diſpoſſeſſed after the battle of Magneſia, were beſtowed on him.*] After that this Prince had been forced to accept of the Peace, on ſuch conditions as the Romans thought proper to impoſe, all the allies of the Romans endeavoured to get a ſhare of his ſpoils. Their demands were heard, and the following anſwer was made them. *Decem legatos more majorum ſenatum miſſurum ad res Aſiæ deſceptandas, componendaſque: ſummam tamen hanc fore, ut cis Taurum montem quæ intra regni Antiochi fines fuiſſent Eumeni attribuerentur, præter Lyciam Cariamque, uſque ad Mæandrum amnem, ea civitatis Rhodiorum eſſent. Cæteræ civitates Aſiæ, quæ Attali ſtipendiariæ fuiſſent, eædem Eumeni vectigal penderent: quæ vectigales Antiochi fuiſſent, eæ liberæ atque immunes eſſent* (38). i. e. "That ten Commiſſioners, after the cuſtom uſed by their forefathers, "ſhould be ſent by the Senate to enquire into and "ſettle the affairs of Aſia: that the reſult however "ſhould be this; that Eumenes ſhould have that "country which Antiochus had poſſeſſed on this ſide of "Mount Taurus; and that the Rhodians ſhould poſſeſs all that lay on the other ſide of Lycia and Caria, as far as the River Meander. That the other "cities of Aſia, which had paid tribute to Attalus, "ſhould pay the like tribute to Eumenes: but that "ſuch, as had paid tribute to Antiochus, ſhould be "free and pay no tribute." It would not be neceſſary, after ſo expreſs a teſtimony, to hear Cicero; I nevertheleſs will cite him, to point out an error he has committed: *Antiochum illum magnum*, ſays he (39), *majores noſtri magna belli contentione terra marique ſuperatum intra montem Taurum regnare juſſerunt: Aſiam, qua illum multarunt, Attalo, ut is regnaret in ea, condonaverunt.* i. e. "Our anceſtors having overcome "Antiochus the Great, in a dreadful war carried on "both by ſea and land, made Mount Taurus the "confines of his dominions; and beſtowed on King "Attalus that part of Aſia, of which they had diſpoſſeſſed him." Cicero commits a miſtake with regard to that King's name, to whom the Romans made ſo noble a preſent, it being Eumenes and not Attalus. I know not whether any Commentator has obſerved this miſtake (40); but I have juſt now conſulted two, who, inſtead of remarking it, have committed another error. ATTALO, ſays Manutius (41), *Eumenes fratri qui eam poſtea populo Romano moriens teſtamento legavit.* Another ſays, ATTALO *Pergami Regi qui moriens populum Romanum fecit hæredem* (42). Now it is falſe to aſſert, that Attalus, brother of Eumenes, received from the Romans thoſe Provinces of which Antiochus was diſpoſſeſſed; and it is as falſe to aſſert, that he reſtored them to the people of Rome by his will. It was Attalus the ſon of Eumenes who made the Romans his heir. Father Abram commits another error. He imagines that Cicero ſpeaks of Antiochus Epiphanes, and that this Antiochus was vanquiſhed by Lucius Scipio (43); but he is miſtaken. Antiochus Epiphanes did not reign till after Seleucus Philopater, ſucceſſor to Antiochus the Great; and it was even Antiochus the Great that triumphed, under the command of Lucius Scipio. By the way, Manutius's error is only a copy of that of Valerius Maximus. *Liberalis populus Romanus magnitudine muneris, quod Attalo regi Aſiam dedit dono. Sed Attalus etiam teſtamenti æquitate gratus, qui eandem Aſiam populo Romano legavit* (44). i. e. "The Romans ſhewed great "liberality, in beſtowing Aſia on King Attalus: and "Attalus, on the other ſide, diſcovered great equity "and gratitude, in bequeathing Aſia to the Romans."

(38) T. Livius, lib. 37. cap. 55. See the paſſage of Strabo, which I ſhall cite in the remark againſt Moreri.

(39) Cicero, *in Oratione, pro Sextio*, p. m. 92.

(40) See the laſt lines of this rem.

(41) Paul. Manutius, *in Orat. Ciceronis pro Sextio*, p. 93.

(42) Nicol. Abramus, *in eamd. Orat.* p. 100.

(43) *Antiochum Epiphanem ſive illuſtrem de quo auſpiciis Luc. Scipionis Aſiatici ſuperato Appianus in Syriacis, &c.* Idem, ibid.

(44) Valerius Maxim. lib. 5. cap. 2. num. 3. *in Extern.*

I am to obſerve, that when I drew up this article, Grævius's edition of Tully's orations was not then publiſhed. It has ſince appeared (45). I conſulted it, and peruſed over again all that the reader has ſeen above, before I gave it to the printers; and find that the errors of Father Abraham, Manutius, and Cicero, had been taken notice of by Grævius. See page 78, 79, of Volume V.

(45) i. e. in 1699.

[H] *He loſt a battle at ſea by a ſtratagem of Hannibal.*] Antiochus finding it would be impoſſible for him to protect Hannibal againſt the Romans, who required him to be delivered up, adviſed him to fly. Accordingly Hannibal retired to the iſland of Crete, and afterwards to the Court of the Bithynian Monarch, Pruſias, whom he prevailed with to infringe the peace which the Romans had concluded between him and our Eumenes. This rupture was, at firſt, attended with ill conſequences with regard to Pruſias, he being defeated in a battle on land; and forced to attempt a naval engagement (46), which he won, and that by the following ſtratagem. Hannibal filled a great number of earthen veſſels with ſerpents of every kind, and gave orders for throwing thoſe pots into the enemy's ſhips. This order being followed, a victory was gained, occaſioned by the terror with which this great number of ſerpents filled Eumenes's ſailors. *Cum Pruſias terreſtri bello ab Eumene victus eſſet, & prælium in mare tranſtuliſſet, Annibal novo commento auctor victoriæ fuit. Quippe omne ſerpentium*

(46) Juſtin, lib. 32. cap. 4.

occaſion, which was at the time that he was engaged in war with Pruſias King of Bithynia. He died in a very advanced age [*I*], *anno* 596. leaving ATTALUS's brother guardian of his ſon, and of the Realm (*r*). His brother Attalus, ſtrictly ſpeaking, ſwayed the ſceptter till he died. He opened his regency with a glorious action, the reſtoring of Ariaratus to the Kingdom of Cappadocia (*s*). He ſignalized himſelf by ſeveral other actions (*t*), and died *anno* 616, after which ATTALUS, his ward, reigned ſingly. The latter is ſirnamed Philometor [*K*]. He was a great lover of huſbandry [*L*]. and even wrote books on that ſubject. He was of a very cruel diſpoſition (*u*). He ſent rich preſents to Scipio when he was laying ſiege to Numantia [*M*], and died very ſoon after, about *anno* 621; and

(r) Strabo, lib. 13. p. 420.

(s) Polyb. *in Excerpt. Valeſian.* p. 168.

(t) See the rem. on the errors of Moreri.

(u) See the rem. [*L*].

ſerpentium genus in fictiles lagenas conjici juſſit, medioque prælio in naves hoſtium mittit. Id primum Ponticis ridiculum viſum, fictilibus dimicare, qui ferro nequeant. Sed ubi ſerpentibus repleri naves cœpere, ancipiti periculo circumventi, hoſti victoriam ceſſere (47). Cornelius Nepos relates this more at large; and obſerves, that Hannibal's chief view was to kill Eumenes, and for this purpoſe it was neceſſary to find out the ſhip he was on board of (48). Eumenes's ſhip was diſcovered, by ſending out a ſhip-boat, upon pretence of delivering a letter to him; after which Hannibal commanded them to level their fury chiefly againſt that of Eumenes, which they accordingly did; and would have taken it, had he not eſcaped by crowding all the ſail poſſible. The reſt of the ſhips of Pergamus fought very gallantly; but the ſerpents which they threw into them obliged them to ſail away (49). Advice of this being brought to the Romans, they ſent Embaſſadors into Aſia, to pacify thoſe Princes, and to demand Pruſias to deliver up Hannibal to them; but he prevented this by poiſoning himſelf (50). This was about the year 570.

(47) Idem, ibid.

(48) *Claſſiarios convocat* (Hannibal) *hiſque præcipit, omnes ut in unam Eumenis regis concurrant navem, à ceteris tantum ſatis habeant, ſe defendere. Id facile illos ſerpentium multitudine conſecuturos. Rex autem qua nave veheretur, ut ſcirent ſe facturum: quem ſi aut cepiſſent, aut interfeciſſent magno his pollicetur præmio fore.* Cornelius Nepos, *in Vita Hannibalis*, p. m. 369.

(49) Idem, ibid.

[*I*] *He died in a very advanced age.*] He lived fourſcore and two years according to Lucian. Ἄτταλος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς φιλάδελφος, τῶν Περγαμηνῶν ὃς ἐτος βασιλεύων, πρὸς ὃν καὶ Σκηπίων ὁ τῶν Ρωμαίων στρατηγὸς ἀφίκετο, δυὸ καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα ἐτῶν ἐξέλιπε τὸν βίον (51). i. e. "Attalus, ſirnamed Philadelphus, King of Perga-"mus, to whoſe aid the Roman General came, "died aged fourſcore and two years." I do not doubt but that Lucian has committed an error on this occaſion. The Roman General he ſpeaks of is doubtleſs Lucius Scipio Aſiaticus who defeated Antiochus. Now Attalus was not reigning at that time.

(50) Juſtin and Cornel. Nepos, *ubi ſupra.*

(51) Lucian. *in Macrobiis*, p. 637. Tome 2. edit. Salmur.

[*K*] *He was ſirnamed* Philometor.] "Becauſe of "the great affection he bore his mother, which how-"ever was the cauſe of his death; for as he was "digging a Sepulchre for her, the heat of the ſun "threw him into a fit of ſickneſs, and he died in "ſeven days (52)." In order that the reader may know whence Dacier copied this particular, I ſhall quote a paſſage from Juſtin: *Matri deinde ſepulchrum facere inſtituit, cui operi intentus morbum ex ſolis fervore contraxit, & ſeptima die deceſſit* (53). His mother's name was Stratonice (54), and ſhe was daughter of Ariarathes King of Cappadocia; and was married to Eumenes a little after the victory which the Romans gained over Antiochus at Magneſia (55). By the way, ſince Strabo (56), Appian (57), and ſeveral other Authors give him the ſirname of Philometor, I fancy that Plutarch, from a ſlip in his memory, gives him that of Philopater (58). It is in the life of the Gracchi, but in other places he calls him *Philometor*. See the paſſage cited by me in the following remark. Volaterranus had told pretty exactly the particulars which relate to the Kings of Pergamus, but he ſpoils all as to the laſt. He affirms that he is called Philometor by way of irony: *Is Philometor ex ſcelere per antiphraſin cognominatus eſt quod matrem interfecerit* (59). i. e. "He was ſirnamed Philometor, "ironically, from his wickedneſs, becauſe he mur-"thered his mother." What is worſe is, he cites Juſtin, as relating that this Prince having ſecretly murthered his mother, and afterwards his wife, let his hair and beard grow, to conceal his crime. Now Juſtin ſays the very reverſe.

(52) Dacier, *Remarques ſur l'Ode* 1. *du* 1 *Livre d'Horace*, p. m. 14.

(53) Juſtin, lib. 36. cap. 4. p. m. 537.

(54) Strabo, lib. 13. p. 429.

(55) Liv. lib. 38. p. 733.

(56) Strabo, lib. 13. p. 429.

(57) Appian. *in* Mithridat.

(58) Plutarchus, *in vita Gracchor.* p. 830.

(59) Volaterannus, lib. 13. p. m. 497.

[*L*] *He was a great lover of huſbandry.*] This was not from a diſpoſition of nature, but ſeems to have been the effect of melancholy. He had put to death ſeveral illuſtrious perſons (60), after which he was ſeized with the deepeſt grief. He covered himſelf, as it were, with ſackcloth and aſhes; after which he entirely abandoned all affairs in general, and employed himſelf wholly in the culture of his garden. Nevertheleſs, he continued as cruel as before; for he took a delight in raiſing the moſt venomous plants, diſtilled the juices from them, which mixing afterwards with ſalutary remedies, he uſed to ſend them as preſents to his friends. Here follows my Author (61). *In Aſia rex Attalus florentiſſimus ab Eumene [illegible] patruo acceptum regnum, cædibus amicorum, & cognatorum ſuppliciis, fœdabat, nunc matrem anum, nunc Beronicem ſponſam, maleficiis eorum necatas confingens. Poſt hanc ſceleſtam violentiæ rabiem, ſqualidam veſtem ſumit: barbam capillumque in modum reorum ſummittit: non in publicum prodire, non populo ſe oſtendere, non domi lætiora convivia inire, aut aliquod ſignum ſani hominis habere, prorſus ut pœnas pendere manibus interfectorum videretur. Omiſſâ deinde regni adminiſtratione, hortos fodiebat, gramina ſeminabat, & noxia innoxiis permiſcebat, eaque omnia veneni ſucco infecta, velut peculiare munus, amicis mittebat.* i. e. "In Aſia, Attalus, a moſt flouriſhing "Monarch, having received a Kingdom from his "uncle Eumenes *, polluted it by the maſſacre of "his friends, and the puniſhment of his relations; "he ſometimes falſely charging them with making "away with his mother an antient woman, and "with Berenice his conſort. After perpetrating theſe "horrid deeds, he put on rags, ſuffered his hair and "beard to grow after the manner of criminals; did "not appear in publick, nor ſhew himſelf to the "people; did not live with any ſplendor at home, "or do any action like a man who is in his ſenſes; "ſo that one would have concluded, that he did pe-"nance to the manes of thoſe he had ſlain. After-"wards, quite laying aſide the reins of government, "he ſpent his time in digging and ſowing in his "gardens: he mixed ſalutary and venomous herbs "together, and ſteeping them in poiſon, uſed to "ſend them as rare preſents to his friends." To theſe I will add the following words of Plutarch. Ἄτταλος ὁ Φιλομήτωρ ἐκπίνει τὰς φαρμακώδεις βοτάνας, οὐ μόνον ὑοσκύαμον καὶ ἰλλέβορον, ἀλλὰ καὶ κώνειον καὶ ἀκόνιτον καὶ δορύκνιον αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς βασιλικοῖς σπείρων καὶ φυτεύων, ὁπῶς τε καὶ καρπὸν αὐτῶν, ἔργον πεποιημένος εἰδέναι καὶ κομίζεσθαι καθ' ὥραν (63). i. e. "Atticus Philometor uſed to raiſe "poiſonous herbs; not only henbane and hellebore, "but alſo hemlock, wolfſbane, dorycnion, himſelf "ſowing and planting them in the royal gardens; "he endeavouring to gather them in their reſpective "ſeaſons, and to diſcover their ſeeds, fruits and "juices." Attalus changed this employment, and applied himſelf to the melting of metals (64). His books in the ſubject of huſbandry were not unknown to Varro (65), Pliny (66), and Columella (67). Father Hardouin obſerves that this Prince, according to the teſtimony of Galen, underſtood all kinds of drugs or phyſick, and wrote books on that ſubject. *Haud diverſum ab eo puto Attalum eſſe eum, quem Medicum appellat Plinius in indice l.* 32. & 33. *cum hunc ipſum Pergamenorum regem, omnis generis medicamentorum perquam ſtudioſum fuiſſe Galenus affirmet, l.* 1. κατὰ γένη, *c.* 13. *p.* 657. & *l.* 1. *de antidotis c.* 1. *p.* 865. *De medicinis ex animalibus ſcripſiſſe, l.* 10. *de facult. ſimp. medic. c.* 1. *p.* 275 (68). i. e. "In my opinion, this "Attalus is not different from him, who is called (by "Pliny) the Phyſician; ſince he affirms, that the "King of Pergamus in queſtion was greatly ſkilled "in all kinds of drugs." Menage aſcribes to another, what relates to the gardens of this Attalus (69).

(60) See the *Excerpta Diodori Siculi*, publiſhed by Henry Valeſius, p. 370.

(61) Juſtin, lib. 36. cap. 4. p. 537.

(62) Juſtin is miſtaken, it ſhould be *ab Attalo.*

* It ſhould be *Attalus.*

(63) Plutarchus, *in* Demetrio, p. 897, *D.*

(64) *Ab hoc ſtudio, ærariæ artis fabricæ ſe tradit ceriſque fingendis, & ære fundendo procudendoque oblectabatur.* Juſtin, lib. 36. cap. 4. 537.

(65) He ſpeaks of it, chap. 1. book 1. *de Re Ruſtica.*

(66) Plin. lib. 18. cap. 3.

(67) Columella, lib. 1. cap. 1. but inſtead of *Attalus & Philometor*, read *Attalus Philometor.* See Father Hardouin *in Indice Plinian*o, p. 100.

(68) Harduinus, ibid.

[*M*] *He ſent rich preſents to Scipio, when he was laying ſiege to Numantia.*] I have read this only in Tully. *Quo in loco Dejotarum talem erga te cognoviſti, qualis Rex Attalus in Africanum fuit, cui magnificentiſſima dona, ut ſcriptum legimus, uſque ad Numantiam miſit ex Aſia, quæ Africanus inſpectante exercitu accepit* (70),

(69) See the rem. [*B*] of the art. LACYDES.

(70) Cicero, *in Oratione pro Rege Dejotaro*, p. m. 647.

and having no children, appointed the Romans his heirs (x). Ariſtonius, the baſtard of Eumenes, laughed at this will; ſet himſelf up the lawful ſucceſſor, and even won ſome battles (y); but was conquered and taken priſoner the year of Rome 623 (z). Thus ended the Kingdom of Pergamus, which roſe to great power in a ſhort time, and whoſe ſplendor and magnificence were ſo great, that they became proverbial [N]. I muſt take notice of ſome errors of Moreri [O].

(x) Florus, lib. 2. cap. 20. & *multi alii.*

(y) Juſtinus, lib. 36. cap. 4.

(z) Idem, ibid.

i. e. "In which place, Dejotarus behaved with the "ſame generoſity towards you, as Attalus did with "regard to Scipio Africanus, to whom, as it is re-"lated, he ſent moſt magnificent preſents out of A-"ſia, as far as Numantia, which Africanus received "in preſence of the army." What was Father Abram thinking of, when he ſaid that Livy does not agree with Cicero (71)? On this occaſion he cites a paſſage of the 58th book of Livy (72), in which it is ſaid, that Scipio, having received great preſents from Antiochus, ſhewed them to the whole army, and ordered the Quæſtor to enter them into his account-book. Could Cicero ſpeak of the Scipio who overcame Antiochus?

(71) Abramus, *Commentar. in Orat. Cic. pro Dejotaro*, p. 441.

(72) We have only 45 books of Livy.

[N] *The ſplendor and magnificence of* Pergamus *became proverbial.*] Peruſe the Commentators on the following words of Horace.

Attalicis conditionibus
Nunquam dimoveas, ut trabe Cypria
Myrtoum pavidus nauta ſecet mare (73).

(73) Horat. Ode 1. lib. 1. ver. 12.

"And hopes of wealth, and world of gain,
"Shall never tempt him from the plain;
"Or draw his fearful ſoul to ride
"In feeble ſhips, and ſtem the tide. CREECH.

Conſider alſo the following verſes of Propertius.

Nec mihi tunc fulcro ſternatur lectus eburno,
Nec ſit in Attalico mors mea nixa toro (74).
Attalicas ſupera veſtes, atque omnia magnis,
Gemmea ſint ludis, ignibus iſta dabis (75).

(74) Propertius, *Eleg.* 13. lib. 2. See alſo *Eleg.* 32. of the ſame book.

(75) Idem, *Eleg.* 17. lib 3. See alſo *Eleg.* 5. lib. 4.

"Nor let bright ivory the bedſtead form;
"Nor my cold corps lye on a ſplendid bed.
"Tho' thou in gems and richeſt ſilks ſhouldſt ſhine,
"Yet theſe, alas! muſt be a prey to flames.

(76) See the notes Variorum, on Virgil's *Georg.* lib. 3. ver. 20.

It is ſaid that hangings were not known in Rome, till thoſe of Attalus, which he bequeathed to the Romans, were carried thither (76). Servius affirms (77), that they were invented in the court of the Kings of Pergamus, and were called *auæa, ab aula Attali* (78). But he is miſtaken in this laſt aſſertion, the Romans calling hangings from the Greek αὐλαίαι (79). However this be, the Attalic hangings were famous. *Quid illa Attalica, tota Sicilia nominata, ab eodem Heio peripetaſmata emere oblitus es* (80)? i. e. "Why did you forget to purchaſed of Heius, thoſe "gold hangings, which are called Attalic in all parts "of Sicily?" King Attalus firſt invented gold embroidery; *aurum intexere in eadem Aſia invenit Attalus Rex* (81). Conſider the following paſſage of Silius Italicus.

(77) *Ideo* aulæa *dicta ſunt quod primum in aula Attali, Regis Aſiæ, qui populum Romanum ſcripſit hæredem inventa ſunt.* Servius, *in Æn.* lib. 1. ver. 697.

(78) Servius, *in hæc verba* Georg. lib. 3. ver. 25. *Purpurea intexti tollunt aulæa Britanni.*

Quæ radio jactat Babylon, vel murice picto,
Læta Tyros, quæque Attalicis variata per artem,
Aulæis ſcribuntur acu (82).

(79) See Plutarch. *in vita Themiſtoclis.*

(80) Cicero in Verrem, lib. 6. folio m. 70, *B.*

(81) Plin. lib. 8. cap. 48. p. m. 232. He ſays, chap. 3. book 33. *Attalicis jampridem aurum intexitur inventio regum Aſiæ.*

(82) Silius Italicus, lib. 14. p. m. 636.

"Whate'er proud Babylon boaſts of its loom,
"Or the proud Tyrian of his purple dye:
"Or the rich and far-fam'd Attalic tapeſtry.

Pliny makes frequent mention of the exceſſive high price which King Attalus paid for good pictures (83).

(83) Plin. lib. 7. cap. 38. and 34 and 35.

[O] *I muſt take notice of ſome errors of Moreri.*] My animadverſions relate to the Dutch edition. 1. It is falſe to aſſert, that Attalus, the firſt of that name, *extended his conqueſts, in Aſia, as far as mount Taurus.* It was under Eumenes, that the Kingdom of Pergamus has this extent, and that by the liberality of the Romans; for before this it was a petty ſtate, as I will now prove. Συνεπολέμησε δὲ καὶ οὗτος (Εὐμένης) Ῥωμαίοις πρός τε Ἀντίοχον τὸν μέγαν, καὶ πρὸς Περσέα. καὶ ἔλαβεν ὑπὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἅπασαν τὴν ὑπ' Ἀντιόχῳ τῷ ἐντὸς τοῦ Ταύρου. Πρότερον δ' ἦν τὰ περὶ Πέργαμον ὑ πολλὰ χωρία μέχρι τῆς Θαλάττης τῆν καλὰ τὸν Ἑλαΐτην κόλπον, καὶ τὸν Ἀδραμυττηνόν (84); *i. e.* "This Eumenes was likewiſe "an ally of the Romans, in the wars againſt Antiochus "the Great and Perſeus; and the Romans gave him "all that Antiochus had poſſeſſed of Aſia, on the hi-"ther ſide of Taurus. Till then, only a few places "had been ſubject to the Kings of Pergamus, as far as "the ſea, near the bay of Elæa and Adramyttium." Father Labbe led Moreri into thoſe errors, he citing thus with regard to Attalus; "*Juſtin* 27. *Livy* 34. "*Polybius* 5. where he ſays, that he extended his "conqueſts in Aſia, as far as mount Taurus (85)." I did not find this in the 5th book of Polybius; but only that Attalus, during the war againſt Achæus, forced the inhabitants of many cities to declare in his favour. Now we do not call this conqueſts: it does not appear that theſe cities, after his return to Pergamus, were ſubject to him. 2. He ſhould not have contented himſelf with the quotation of Father Labbe's three Authors, ſince they take no notice of the friendſhip of the four brothers, *which is generally propoſed as a pattern for the union and harmony that ought to reign between brothers.* He ought to have cited Plutarch for this, as Father Labbe did (86). 3. Attalus's wife, the mother of thoſe four brothers, was called Ἀπολλωνὶς (87). He therefore ought not to have called her *Apollonie*, but *Apollonis* or *Apollonide*. 4. The article of the ſecond Attalus is a very poor one. He there begins with ſaying, *that he was firſt ſent by his brother Eumenes to Rome in* 596, *where the Senate indulged him in all he requeſted.* This is a mere tranſcript of Father Labbe (88). This Attalus was upwards of threeſcore at the time mentioned there; and conſequently his hiſtory ought not to have began there, conſidering the many memorable acts he had performed before. 5. I am of opinion, that he was not his brother's Embaſſador in Rome anno 596, and believe that the periods were confounded. The journey he made to Rome, after the laſt King of Macedon was taken priſoner, about the year 584, has been transferred to the year 596. 6. It is abſurd to cite Polybius *lib.* 5. and Juſtin *lib.* 36. ſince they make no mention of this Attalus. I am to obſerve, that Polybius's hiſtory did not extend as far as the year of Rome 596. 7. Attalus, the third of that name, was ſirnamed *Philometor* and not *Philopater.* This error is alſo found in Father Labbe (89). But the circumſtance that moſt deſerves blame, is, his having introduced, between theſe three Attalus's, an Attalus Philadelphus, without taking notice that this is not a new Attalus. The omiſſion of this notice, makes the Reader imagine, that this *Attalus Philadelphus* differs from the other three, and yet he is the ſame perſon with Attalus the ſecond. We will ſee whether his article be juſt. 8. He does not there diſtinguiſh the actions performed by him before he was King, from thoſe he atchieved under his brother's reign; every Reader may very juſtly ſuppoſe, that every particular related was done by Attalus, after he was appointed Guardian of his nephew, with the *Title of King.* Now this is falſe. 9. It was not he who *ſuſtained the ſiege of Pergamus* againſt *Antiochus.* The Reader has heard (90) that King Eumenes was in Pergamus during the ſiege. 10. He did not make war againſt Perſeus King of Macedon; but he ſhould have ſaid, that he aſſiſted in this war, in quality of ally of the Romans. 11. Neither Strabo nor Appian, whom he cites, ſay that Attalus took Pruſias priſoner; 12. Nor that he ſent preſents to Scipio Æmilianus before Numantia. 13. Nor that he loſt his life by the treachery of Attalus his nephew; for he died before Scipio went to Numantia.

(84) Strabo, lib. 13. p. 429.

(85) Labbe, *Chronol. Franc.* Tome 2. p. 300. ad ann. Rom. 512.

(86) Labbe, ibid. p. 336. ad ann. 556.

(87) Strabo, lib. 13. p. 429.

(88) Labbe, p. 365. ad ann. 596.

(89) Ibid. p. 391. ad ann. 621.

(90) In the laſt remark, towards the cloſe of the preceding art.

PERIANDER, tyrant of Corinth. He was reckoned among the ſeven wiſe men of Greece; but it had been better to place him among the moſt wicked men that ever lived: for

for he altered the conſtitution of his country [*A*], oppreſſed the liberty of it, and ſeized upon the ſovereign power (*a*): and to maintain himſelf in his uſurpation, he put the moſt conſiderable men in the city to death, thinking they were capable to reſtore the antient conſtitution of their country (*b*). On a ſolemn Feſtival he deprived all the women of their jewels, and employed them in the making of a golden ſtatue, which he had vowed (*c*) [*B*]. He committed inceſt with his own mother [*C*]; he kicked his wife to death, though ſhe was with child; he had his concubines burnt, becauſe their calumnies had exaſperated him againſt his wife: he was ſo angry with his ſecond ſon (*d*), for lamenting his mother's death, that he baniſhed him from his houſe, and diſinherited him. He formed an abominable ſcheme of revenge againſt the inhabitants of Corcyra; which was his ſending their young boys (*e*) to King Alyattes, to be caſtrated: and when he knew that the ſhip in which thoſe innocent young victims were, put into the harbour of Samos, and that theſe youths were preſerved from the misfortune he deſigned them, he was ſo vexed at it, that he died with grief. He was then about fourſcore years old (*f*). Some ſay that he lay with his wife after ſhe was dead [*D*]; a brutality, which is not much leſs ſhocking and horrid

(a) Diog. Laert. lib. 1. num. 98.

(b) Herodotus, lib. 5. cap. 92. p. m. 324.

(c) Diog. Laert. lib. 1. num. 96.

(d) His name was LYCOPHRON; ſee his article, in which I relate what Herodotus obſerves of him.

(e) Diog. Laert. does not limit the number of them. Herodotus, lib. 3. cap. 48. ſays, *three hundred choſen out of the beſt families of the iſland.*

(f) Extracted from Diog. Laert. *in vita Periandri*, lib. 1.

[*A*] *He altered the conſtitution of his country.*] Diogenes Laertius aſſerts it poſitively. Οὗτος πρῶτος, ſays he (1), δορυφόρους ἔσχε, καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰς τυραννίδα μετέστησε. *He is the firſt who was ſurrounded with guards, and changed the Commonwealth into a Monarchy.* Aldobrandinus obſerves upon theſe words, that if we may credit Ariſtotle, we muſt aſcribe to Periander the invention of moſt of the means, by which tyranny is eſtabliſhed and ſupported (2). *Omnium autem earum rerum, quæ ad tyrannidem faciunt conſtituendam & conſervandam, auctorem fuiſſe Periandrum Cypſeli filium, tum aliis locis, tum præcipue eodem, lib. 5. polit. ait cap.* 11. Τούτων, inquit, τὰ (3) πολλὰ φασι καθαιρῆσαι Περίανδρον. Monſieur Menage, on the ſame words of Laertius, quotes Suidas, who aſſerts, that Periander had 300 guards about him, and that he forbad the Corinthians to keep footmen, and to live in idleneſs. He was continually inventing ſomething to keep them, and he fined thoſe whom he met with ſitting in the publick ſtreets; he feared leſt they ſhould contrive ſomething againſt him. We muſt however obſerve, that Herodotus does not aſcribe the firſt eſtabliſhment of tyranny to him, but to Cypſelus, who having reigned very cruelly at Corinth during thirty years, left his whole authority to his ſon Periander. Τυραννεύσας δὲ ὁ Κύψελος, τοιοῦτος δή τις ἀνὴρ ἐγένετο· πολλοὺς μὲν Κορινθίων ἐδίωξε, πολλοὺς δὲ χρημάτων ἀπεξέρησε, πολλῷ δ' ἔτι πλείους τῆς ψυχῆς. *Cypſelus having obtained the ſovereign power, proved ſuch a tyrant, that he made the Corinthians ſuffer many vexations, for he fined many of them, and put a great many more to death* (4). Periander was at firſt leſs ſevere than his father, but he proved much more cruel afterwards.

(1) Diog. Laert. *in Periandro*, num. 98. lib. 1.

(2) Aldobrandinus, in Diog. Laert. ibid.

(3) Aldobrandinus ought not therefore to have made uſe of the word *omnium* (*all thoſe means*) the very words he quotes from Ariſtotle (who ſays but *many of thoſe means*) refute him.

(4) Herodot. lib. 5. cap. 92. p. 324.

[*B*] *The golden Statue which he had vowed.*] Take notice of a very remarkable proof of the diſorder in which the falſe religions leave the heart and the mind: they do not reform men's inclination to evil. See here Periander, who makes vows, and who dares not neglect to fulfill them, even when he wants money (5). He believes therefore that there are Gods, he believes a providence, and yet he defiles himſelf with an inceſt, with ſpilling innocent blood, he kills his wife, &c. Let us ſpeak of the diſorders of the mind. This ſame tyrant does not dread the puniſhment of his inceſts, and his murders, but he fears that the Gods would puniſh him ſeverely, and load him with misfortunes, if he did not conſecrate a maſs of gold, which he had promiſed them. Nay, what is worſe ſtill, he imagines that though he accompliſhes his vow only by the means of a moſt unjuſt robbery, which makes all the women of Corinth deſperate, yet the Statue of gold, which he conſecrates, will be acceptable to the Gods, and preſerve him from thoſe evils, which they would have made him ſuffer, had he not offered the Statue he had vowed. If you except the violence offered to a woman's chaſtity or to her conſcience, there is no injury more grievous to honeſt women, than to rob them of their ornaments. The paſſion of being well dreſſed and adorned with jewels, was always very ſtrong in the fair ſex. Φιλόκοσμον *genus femineum eſt: multaſque etiam inſignis pudicitiæ, quamvis nulli virorum, tamen ſibi ſcimus libenter ornari* (6). . . . . *Ut taceam de inaurium pretiis, candore margaritarum, rubri maris profunda teſtantium, ſmaragdorum virore, cerauniorum flammis, hiacynthorum pelago, ad quæ ardent & inſaniunt ſtudia matronarum* (7). i. e. "Womankind loves finery: and even many women of an eminent modeſty love to "dreſs, though not for the men, yet to pleaſe themſelves. . . . . Not to mention coſtly ear-rings, white "pearls fetched from the bottom of the Red-Sea, "ſhining emeralds, ſparkling rubies, and bright "jacinths, of which the Ladies are extremely fond." I obſerve this only with a deſign to render the tyrannical temper of the pretended wiſe man of Greece more odious. See the remark [*D*].

(5) Ἔφορος, ἱστορεῖ ὡς εὔξαιτο, εἰ νικήσειν Ὀλύμπια τεθριππῳ, χρυσᾶν ἀνδριάντα ἀναθεῖναι. νικήσας δὲ, καὶ ἀπορῶν χρυσίου, &c. i. e. "Ephorus relates, that he "(Periander) vowed to conſecrate a golden ſtatue to "the Gods, if "he won the "Olympic "games, and "having won "it, but wanting "money, &c." Diog. Laert. lib. 1. num. 96. p. 60.

(6) Hieron. *Epiſt. ad Gaudentium, de Pacauiæ inſtitut.* p. m. 268.

(7) Idem, *Epiſt. ad Demetriadan, de Servanda Virginitate*, p. 291.

[*C*] *He committed inceſt with his own mother.*] Her name was Cratea (8). Some aſſert (9), that as ſhe would not refrain the violence of her paſſion, ſhe propoſed to her ſon to lie ſecretly with a woman, who was paſſionately in love with him, but who would not be known. He conſented to it, and thus lay with his mother without being aware of it: for Cratea got into the bed where the pretended Miſtreſs, whom ſhe had mentioned to her ſon, was to be. This intrigue continued a long while upon the ſame footing; but at laſt Periander was reſolved to know who that woman was, he had ſo often enjoyed. He concealed ſome perſon in the room, and when his mother was going to bed, he came to her with a flambeau in his hand. He would have killed her immediately, had he not been prevented by a genius who appeared to him. After that time he lived like a mad man, he became cruel, and put many perſons to death. As for Cratea ſhe made heavy complaints againſt her deſtiny, and killed herſelf. Others do not relate the ſtory ſo: they confeſs indeed (10), that Periander's converſation with his mother was kept very ſecret; but not, that he was ignorant of his lying with his mother. They aſſert that he liked the ſport extremely well, and was angry only becauſe his inceſt was diſcovered; he vented his anger upon his ſubjects, and acted ever after like a tyrant.

(8) Diog. Laert. lib. 1. num. 96.

(9) Parthenius, *in Eroticis*, cap. 17.

(10) Ariſtippus, *apud Diogen. Laertium*, lib. 1. num. 96. p. 60.

After his mother was killed, he diſcontinued to worſhip the Goddeſs Venus, and to offer ſacrifices to her; but at laſt he began to worſhip her again, becauſe of ſome dreams, which his wife Meliſſa had. This is what Plutarch obſerves in the beginning of his Banquet of the ſeven wiſe men. He ſuppoſes that on the day of that entertainment Periander began again to ſacrifice to that Goddeſs.

[*D*] *Some ſay that he lay with his wife after ſhe was dead.*] Here follows one of Herodotus's ſtories; he relates it where he mentioned the unjuſt uſage which the women of Corinth met with under Periander's reign. This tyrant ſent to conſult the oracle of the dead, about a certain depoſit. His wife Meliſſa appeared, and declared that ſhe would by no means reveal that ſecret; for I am very cold, ſaid ſhe, I am quite naked, the garments with which I have been buried are of no uſe to me, becauſe they have not been burnt. And to prove, continued ſhe, that what I ſay is true, I need only to obſerve, that Periander put his bread into a cold oven. Periander being acquainted with this diſcourſe, it appeared very true to him, becauſe he remembred, that he had lain with Meliſſa, even after ſhe had given up the ghoſt (11). Ταῦτα δὲ ὡς ὀπίσω ἀπηγγέλθη τῷ Περιάνδρῳ, πιστὸν γὰρ οἱ ἦν τὸ συμβόλαιον, ὃς νεκρὰ εἰδυῖη Μελίσσῃ ἐμίγη. *Hæc Periandro renunciata, ob illud argumentum fidem fecere, quod ipſe cum Meliſſa quamvis defuncta coierat*

(11) Herodot. lib. 5. cap. 92.

horrid than that of the Lydian King, who ate his wife up [*E*]. There are ſome Authors (*g*) ſilly enough to reckon that action of Periander among the remarkable inſtances of conjugal love. He reigned forty four years, according to Ariſtotle (*h*), or forty, according to Diogenes Laertius (*i*). He flouriſhed towards the 38th Olympiad (*k*). Moreri has made ſome miſtakes [*F*].

We meet in a work of Heraclides with ſome particulars, which are not diſhonourable to Periander. If he would not ſuffer the inhabitants of Corinth to keep men-ſervants, he forbad *coierat* (12). He had it therefore proclaimed that all the women of Corinth ſhould come into the Temple of Juno. They obeyed, and dreſſed themſelves in their fineſt attire, as it were for an holiday. But the guards who were hid in the Temple, ſtripped them all without exception; miſtreſſes and ſervants were all uſed alike. All their clothes were burnt on Meliſſa's tomb. That woman was the daughter of Procles, tyrant of Epidaurus, and by her mother's ſide ſhe was related to great Lords, who reigned almoſt throughout all Arcadia (13). An Author quoted by Athenæus, does not give us ſo high a notion of Meliſſa's quality: he aſſerts that Periander fell in love with her (14), as he ſaw her once giving ſome workmen drink (15).

[*E*] *The Lydian King, who eat his wife up.*] The Sieur de Rampalle, deſigning to prove that the corruption of morals is not greater in our age, than it was formerly, quotes among other inſtances of intemperance, the voracity of Maximinus, of Albinus, of Phagon, and of Aſtidamas, and then he adds, that *Cambyſes ſupped one night upon his wife* (16). He is miſtaken as to the name; for I do not think it can be proved that any King of Lydia was ever called Cambyſes: and after all that is not the name of him, who devoured his wife. His name was Cambles. He was a great eater and a hard drinker. The Hiſtorian who mentions him, hints, that he committed that crime without being ſenſible of it; and that he was not apprized of his inhumanity, but when he found his wife's hand in his mouth, as he awaked. He killed himſelf when he came to know the world was acquainted with what he had done. Ξάνθος δὲ ἐν τοῖς Λυδιακοῖς, Κάμβληα φησὶ τὸν βασιλεύσαντα Λυδῶν πολυφάγον γενέσθαι καὶ πολυπότην, ἔτι δὲ γαστρίμαργον. τοῦτον οὖν πολλὰ νυκτὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα καταπρεπῆ γήσαντα καταφαγεῖν. ἔπειτα πρωὶ εὑρόντα τὴν χεῖρα τῆς γυναικὸς ἐν αὑτῷ ὄντα ἐν τῷ στόματι, ἑαυτὸν ἀποσφάξαι μὴ βουλόμενον τῆς πράξεως γινομένης. *Xanthus in Lydiacis narrat Cambleta Lydorum olim regem, edacem, bibacem, guloſum fuiſſe, noctuque uxorem ſuam in fruſta diſſectam voraſſe: deinde craſtino manè, repertâ conjugis manu, quæ ad ejus os hæſerat, re cognitâ, & in vulgus ſparſa, ſeipſum jugulaſſe* (17). I can hardly believe but this is much like thoſe old women's ſtories, in which giants and men-eaters are ſo much mentioned.

[*F*] *Moreri has made ſome miſtakes.*] I ſhall not take notice of his omiſſions; every one may know them by comparing his article of *Periander* with mine. I. He reckons wrong when he aſſerts that Periander began his reign *in the 38th Olympiad*, and died in the 48th, having reigned forty four years. He might have ſaid this, if Periander had ſucceeded his father in the beginning of the 38th Olympiad, and was dead towards the end of the 48th Olympiad. But if this were the caſe Moreri ought to have explained it more accurately. II. He ſhould not have quoted Euſebius; for he does not ſay that Periander reigned forty four years. He places the beginning of his reign under the 1ſt year of the 38th Olympiad, and the end (18) under the 1ſt year of the 48th Olympiad. I find a very groſs blunder in theſe words of Scaliger. *Obiit* (Periander) *anno ultimo Olympiadis* 48. *Tyrannidem obtinuit annos* 40. *auctore Laërtio. Ergo ejus initium an. primo Olympiadi* 38. *ut hic rectè aſſignatum* (19). i. e. "Periander died the laſt year of the "48th Olympiad. He reigned 40 years according "to Laertius: the beginning therefore of his reign "is truly placed, as it is done here, under the firſt "year of the 38th Olympiad." It is falſe, that according to Euſebius Periander died the laſt year of the 48th Olympiad. And if Euſebius had placed that Prince's death under that year, he would not agree with Diogenes Laertius, who makes him reign but forty years. Scaliger is more accurate five pages lower (20). III. *Periander did* not *anſwer to thoſe, who aſked him why he kept the ſovereign power, that it was as dangerous to reſign it, as to loſe it.* That anſwer is equivocal, and obſcure: it is falſe in all thoſe caſes, in which men loſe the ſupreme authority with their lives: for they who loſe it thus, do not run any danger afterwards. It ought to have been ſaid that he anſwered, it was as dangerous to reſign the tyrannical power of one's own accord, as to be deprived of it by one's enemies. We have not in French the privilege of ſpeaking obſcurely: we muſt take care not to expoſe ourſelves to cenſure, much more than the antients were obliged to do. I obſerve this becauſe I tranſcribe the words of the original. Πότε ἐρωτηθεὶς διὰ τὶ τυραννεῖ, ἔφη, ὅτι καὶ τὸ ἑκουσίως ἀποστῆναι, καὶ τὸ ἀφαιρεθῆναι, κίνδυνον φέρει. *Being aſked once, why he continued to act the tyrant, he anſwered, becauſe it is dangerous both to reſign it willingly, and to be deprived of it* (21). IV. To what purpoſe is Soſicrates (22) quoted, who ſays not a word of what is contained in the article of Periander, and whoſe opinion even differs from that which is followed there with regard to that tyrant's age? He ſuppoſes that he died forty one years before the 49th Olympiad (23). I know very well that by altering the pointing, his opinion may be almoſt reconciled with Euſebius's (24). But did Moreri know this? And muſt Authors be quoted according to ſuch readings as are diſputed? They only may do it, who have given notice that they follow the correction of ſuch or ſuch a Critick. Here follow Balzac's words, which relate to Periander's anſwer. *There is no leſs danger in reſigning the ſupreme power, than in uſurping it. Phalaris * was ready to abdicate, but he would have a God for his ſecurity, who would anſwer for his life, in caſe he reſigned his authority: and it has always been a general opinion that they, who riſe in arms againſt their country, or againſt their Prince, are in a manner under a neceſſity to do evil, becauſe they find it unſafe to do good. They dare not to become innocent, leſt they ſhould expoſe themſelves to the ſeverity of thoſe laws againſt which they have offended; they continue therefore in their crimes, becauſe they do not believe men would be ſatisfied with their repentance* (25). This was one of the maxims, which Mæcenas urged, when Auguſtus conſulted with him and with Agrippa whether or not he ſhould reſtore the Romans to their liberty. Agrippa, adviſed him to do it, and Mæcenas diſſuaded him from it. Let us tranſcribe here the learned Meibomius's collections. *Tangit Xiphilinus*, ſays he (26), *ex parte cauſſam, qua motus Mæcenas Auguſto ſuaſerit, ut imperium retineret.* Regnum nempe juſtum & legitime comparatum imprimis conducere rerum magnitudini *gubernandæ*: nec aliud diſcordantis patriæ remedium eſſe, quam ut ab uno, *ut loquitur Tacitus Ann. lib.* 4. *cap.* 9. *unumque Reip. corpus* unius præſidis nutu, quaſi anima & mente regatur, *ut monet Florus, lib.* 4. *cap.* 111. *Potior tamen, & altera cauſſa fuit, quam Suetonius adducit loco quem dixi* (27), *quod Auguſtum*, ſi privatus viveret, non ſine periculo fore *cenſeret. Eam etiam inculcat Zonaras; quod qui ſemel imperitarint, tuto privatam vitam agere nullo modo poſſint. Quo ſenſu jam olim Periander interrogatus, quur non deponeret imperium, reſpondit:* Quoniam per vim imperitanti, etiam ultro imperio abire periculoſum, *ut ex Xenophontis lib. de Memorabil. Socrat. refert Stobæus, Serm.* 41. *Quin & Mæcenas ipſa in Orat. apud Dionem, non alia ratione depoſitionem imperii Auguſto diſſuadet, quam quod oſtendat,* neminem Senatui populoque reddita Rep. ipſi parciturum, qui multos offenderit. Hos enim rerum ſummam ad ſe trahendo, id acturos, ut vel ſe ulciſcantur, vel ipſum ſibi adverſantem è medio tollant. *Docet id exemplis Pompeji, Julii Cæſaris, Marii, ac Sullæ: quos abdicata poteſtas vel peſſum dederit, vel peſſum datura fuiſſet, ſi diutius vixiſſent.* i. e. "Xiphilinus hints in part the "cauſe, which moved Mæcenas to perſuade Auguſtus to "keep the ſovereign power in his hands; namely, *that* "*the*

(*g*) Raviſius Textor, *in Officina*, lib. 5. cap. 3. under the title *de Amore conjugali*, p. m. 553. and ſeveral others after him.

(*h*) Ariſt. *Polit.* lib. 5. cap. 12.

(*i*) Lib. 1. num. 98.

(*k*) Ibid.

(12) Idem, ibid. p. m. 325.

(13) Diog. Laert. lib. 1. num. 94.

(14) Pythænetus, lib. 3. *de Ægina, apud Athen.* lib. 13.

(15) Ὠμοφάγοι τοῖς ἐργαζομένοις. *Operariis vinum miniſtrantem.* Ibidem.

(16) Rampalle, *que le monde ne va pas en empirant*, p. 94.

(17) *Athen.* lib. 10. cap. 3. p. 415.

(18) He mentions only the end of the Monarchical Government at Corinth; but it is the ſame thing with Periander's death.

(19) Scaliger, *Animadv. in Euſeb.* num. 889. p. m. 84. col. 1.

(20) Ibidem, num. 929. p. 89.

(21) Diog. Laert. lib. 1. num. 97.

(22) They have put Socrates in the ſecond edit. printed in Holland.

(23) *Apud Diogenem Laertium*, lib. 1. num. 95.

(24) See Menage *in Laertium*, lib. 1. num. 95. p. 55.

Of the DANGER to which Tyrants who abdicate, expoſe themſelves.

* *Phalar. in Epiſt.*

(25) Balzac, in the 45th chapter of his *Prince*, p. m. 33, 34.

(26) Joannes Henricus Meibomius, *in vita Mæcenatis*, p. 87, 88.

(27) That is to ſay in *Octavio*, cap. 28. Meibomius quotes cap. 29.

forbad them alſo to live voluptuouſly. This was no bad law. He laid no taxes on any one, and was content with the cuſtom ariſing from the ſale and from the importation and exportation of commodities. He hated the wicked, and cauſed all thoſe to be drowned, who carried on the trade of pimps (*l*). Laſtly, he eſtabliſhed a Senate, and ſettled the expence of thoſe who were to be Members of it (*m*).

(*l*) Thus I underſtand theſe words, τὰς προαγωγὸς πάσας καταπόντιοι. Cragius thinks the proſtitutes are meant here.

(*m*) Extracted from *Heraclides de Politiis*, p. 17. *editionis Cragii*, 1593, in 4to.

" *the juſt authority which he had lawfully acquired, was* " *neceſſary in order to govern ſo great a ſtate: and that* " *there was no other means*, as Tacitus ſpeaks, *to* " *ſuppreſs the diviſions of the country, than the Govern-* " *ment of* ONE, *who like the mind and ſoul of the whole* " *ſhould rule every thing according to his will and plea-* " *ſure*, as Florus obſerves. However, there was a- " nother and more weighty reaſon, which Suetonius " hints in the paſſage I have mentioned; namely, " *that* Auguſtus *would not be free from danger, if he* " *led a private life*. Zonaras urges the ſame argu- " ment, for he obſerves that a man who has once " reigned, cannot be ſecure in a private ſtation. " To the ſame purpoſe was Periander's anſwer: who " being aſked formerly, why he did not reſign the " ſupreme power, replied, *it is dangerous for a tyrant* " *to abdicate even of his own accord*, as Stobeus re- " lates from Xenophon. Nay, Mæcenas himſelf in " his oration, rehearſed by Dion, urges that very " reaſon to diſſuade Auguſtus from abdicating: he " repreſents to him *that if the Government of the* " *Commonwealth were reſtored to the Senate and the Peo-* " *ple, no man would ſpare him, who had exaſperated* " *many. For that they, arrogating the principal authority to* " *themſelves, would labour, either to revenge themſelves,* " *or to get rid of him, if he oppoſed them.* He proves " this by the examples of Pompey, Julius Cæſar, " Marius, and Sylla, whom the abdicating of the " ſovereign power did really ruin, or would have " undone, had they lived longer." We may add to this an anſwer of Solon. His friends thought it very ſtrange that he ſhould be frightened at the very name of a Monarch, and ſhould not dare to improve the opportunities he had to ſeize upon the Government. He anſwered (28), *It is true, a tyranny is a very fair ſpot, but it has no way to go out at.* No man has, I think, put this thought into a better light than Xenophon. He ſuppoſes a tyrant, who makes a moſt lively deſcription of the misfortunes which attend his condition; after which Simonides aſks him, why do you continue in it? Why do you not abdicate? Conſider well what he anſwers. The greateſt misfortune of tyranny is, that there are no means to reſign it. How can a tyrant, who has abdicated, return the ſums of money he has robbed? How can he indemnify thoſe he has put in priſon? How can he reſtore to life again ſo many perſons he has put to death? If a man has ever a juſt cauſe to hang himſelf it is when he is a tyrant. The Greek paſſage will charm thoſe who can underſtand it; let us therefore do them the pleaſure to tranſcribe it. Καὶ πῶς (ἔφη) ὦ Ἱέρων, εἰ ὕτω πονηρόν ἐϛι τὸ τυραννεῖν, κ᾽ τοῦτο συνίγνωκας, ὃν ἀπαλλάτ῀ ὕτω μεγάλα κακῶ; ὅτε σὺ ὅτε ἄλλος μὲν δὴ ὐδεὶς πώποτε ἐκὼν εἶναι τυραννίδ@ ἀφεῖτο, ὅσπερ ἂν ἅπαξ κτήσαιτο; Ὅτι (ἔφη) ὦ Σιμωνίδη, ταύτη ἀθλιώτατόν ἐϛιν ἡ τυραννίς· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπαλλαγῆναι δυνατὸν αὐτῆς ἐϛί. πῶς γὰρ ἄν τις ποτὲ ἐξαρκέσειε τύραννο@ ἢ χρήματα ἐκ τῶν ὅσους ἀφείλετο, ἢ δεσμοὺς ἀντιπαράσχοι ὅσους δὴ ἐδέσμευσεν, ἢ ὅσους καθέκτανε, πῶς ἂν ἱκανὰς ψυχὰς ἀντιπαράσχοιτο ἀποθανουμένας; ἀλλ᾽ εἴ πε᷈ρ τῷ ἄλλῳ, ὦ Σιμωνίδη, λυσιτελεῖ ἀπάγξασθαι, ἴσθι (ἔφη) ὅτι τυράννῳ ἔγωγε ἐυρίσκω μάλισα τοῦτο λυσιτελῶ ποιῆσαι. μόνῳ γὰρ αὐτῷ ὔτε ἔχειν ὔτε καταλέσθαι τὰ κακὰ λυσιτελεῖ. *Et qui fit, inquit Hieron, ut ſi adeo miſera res eſt tyrannidem gerere, idque te non fugit, non abjicias tam ingens malum? Neque tu, neque alius quiſquam unquam lubens tyrannidem depoſuit, ubi ſemel nactus eſt. Quoniam, inquit, ô Simonides, iſto nomine miſerrima eſt tyrannis, quòd ab ea non licet diſcedere. Quomodo enim quiſquam tyrannus unquam ſuffecerit ad pecuniam rependendam iis quos ſpoliavit *? aut quomodo vincula repenſet iis quos detruſit in vincula? aut quomodo reſtituet tot animas extinctas iis quos occidit? Sed ſi cuiquam alteri, ô Simonides, expedit laqueo finire vitam, ſcito, inquit, me compertum habere, ut id faciat nulli magis expedire quàm tyranno, quandoquidem huic uni mala nec retinere nec deponere expedit* (29). Dionyſius, the Tyrant, uſed to ſay, that rather than return on horſe-back to a private life, a man muſt ſuffer himſelf to be dragged to it by the feet. Livius relates this; but he adds another thought to it, which weakens the former, *ultima primis obſtant*, and which overthrows the whole ſubject I am treating here. You may judge of it, for I ſhall tranſcribe the whole paſſage. *Sed evocatum eum* (30) *ab legatis Demarata uxor, filia Hieronis, inflata adhuc regiis animis, ac muliebri ſpiritu, admonet ſæpe uſurpatæ Dionyſii tyranni vocis: qua pedibus tractum, non inſidentem equo relinquere tyrannidem dixerit debere. Facile eſſe momento quo quis velit, cedere poſſeſſione magnæ fortunæ: facere & parare eam, difficile atque arduum eſſe. Paululum ſumeret ſpacii ad conſultandum ab legatis: eo uteretur ad accerſendos ex Leontinis milites, quibus ſi pecuniam regiam pollicitus eſſet, omnia in poteſtate ejus futura. Hæc muliebria conſilia Andronodorus neque tota aſpernatus eſt, neque extemplò accepit* (31). i. e. " But his wife Demarata, Hieron's daughter, who " had ſtill a royal heart, and the ambition of a wo- " man, calling him (*Andronodorus*) aſide from the " Embaſſadors, put him in mind of the ſentence, " which Dionyſius the Tyrant uſed to repeat, that a " man ſhould chooſe to be dragged by the feet from " the throne, rather than run from it as it were on " horſe-back. It was an eaſy matter to abdicate an " high poſt whenever he pleaſed; but very hard and " difficult to riſe to it. That he ſhould deſire the " Embaſſadors to give him ſome time to conſult; " and that he ſhould take that opportunity to ſend " for ſoldiers from Leontium, and that if he promiſed " them a royal ſtipend, every thing would ſoon ſub- " mit to him. Andronodorus did not entirely reject " that advice of a woman, but he did not follow it " immediately." There is no need to ſuppoſe, that the ſecond maxim was alſo of Dionyſius; for in all likelihood it was of that ambitious woman, whom Livy makes to ſpeak here. Cicero obſerves, that it was impoſſible for that Tyrant to abdicate his power, and to reform his wicked life, without ruining himſelf (32).

* There is a ſentence omitted here; *quomodo ſatisfaciet iis quos in carcerem conjecit?*

(29) Xenophon, *in Hierone, ſive Tyrannico*, p. 533. edit. Henr. Staphani, 1581.

(30) That is to ſay, Andronodorus, who was entreated at Syracuſe, to abdicate the exorbitant power, which he had uſurped.

(31) T. Livius, lib. 24. cap. 22.

(32) *Atque ei ne integrum quidem erat ut ad juſtitiam remigraret civibuſque libertatem & jura redderet. His enim ſe adoleſcens improvida ætate irretierat erratis, eaque commiſerat ut ſalvus eſſe non poſſet ſit ſanus eſſe cœpiſſet.* Cicero, *Tuſcul.* 5. cap. 21. *i. e.* " It was not " poſſible for " him to return " to the practice " of juſtice, and " to reſtore to " his citizens " their liberty " and their " laws; for in " his youth he " had intricated " himſelf in ſo " many crimes, " and done ſuch " things, that he " could not have " been ſafe, had " he began to be " wiſe."

(28) Καλὸν μὲν εἶναι τὴν τυραννίδα χωρίον, οὐκ ἔχειν δὲ ἀπόδασιν. *Præclarum fundum tyrannidem eſſe, ſed non habere exitum.* Plutarchus, *in* Solone, p. 85.

PERIBÆA, the daughter of Alcathous King of Megara, the wife of Telamon King of Salamina, and the mother of Ajax. See the remark [*C*] of the article TELAMON.

PERICLES, was one of the greateſt men that ever flouriſhed in Greece. His Anceſtors both by the father and the mother's ſide were very illuſtrious. He was educated with all the care imaginable, and beſides other maſters, he had for his tutors Zeno Eleates, and Anaxagoras, two of the moſt eminent Philoſophers, who taught at Athens. He learnt from the latter, among other things, to fear the Gods without ſuperſtition [*A*], and

[*A*] *He learnt from* Anaxagoras *to fear the Gods without ſuperſtition.*] The people at Athens were alarmed without reaſon, as ſoon as there appeared ſome uncommon phænomenon in the air. They imagined it was a ſign of the Gods anger. The Philoſopher Anaxagoras freed Pericles from that fear, by explaining to him the natural cauſes of thoſe meteors. Thus he inſpired him with a more reaſonable devotion, which was not diſturbed by ſuperſtitious fears, and made him hope with an eaſy mind for the bleſſings of Heaven. Οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα τῆς Ἀναξαγόρου συνουσίας ἀπέλαυσε Περικλῆς. ἀλλὰ κ᾽ δεισιδαιμονίας δικεῖ γενέσθαι καθυπέρτερο@, ὅση πρὸς τὰ μετέωρα θάμβο@ ἐργάζεται τοῖς αὐτῶν τὰ τούτων τὰς αἰτίας ἀγνοοῦσι, κ᾽ περὶ τὰ θεῖα δαιμονῶσι κ᾽ ταραττομένοις δι᾽ ἀπειρίαν αὐτῶν. ἦν ὁ φυσικὸς λόγο@ ἀπαλλάττων, ἀντὶ τῆς φοβερᾶς κ᾽ φλεγμαινούσης δεισιδαιμονίας, τὴν ἀσφαλῆ

and to account for the eclipſes by a natural cauſe, which proved once very ſerviceable to the Athenians [*B*]. Men were unjuſt enough to ſuſpect him of Atheiſm, becauſe he had

φαλῆ μεῖ' ἐλπίδων ἀγαθῶν εὐσεβείαν ἐνεργάζεσθαι. *Nor were theſe the only advantages, which Pericles had of Anaxagoras's acquaintance, and keeping him company: but he ſeemed alſo to be advanced by his inſtructions far above that ſuperſtition, whatever it is, which as to meteors, and the like ſtrange appearances, does with frightful apprehenſions poſſeſs the minds of people, who are ignorant of the true cauſes, by which ſuch effects are naturally produced, and are mad as if the Devil were in them, and in a great agony and diſorder, upon occaſion of theſe divine prodigies, by reaſon of their ignorance, and want of ſkill about them: which ignorance natural reaſon diſcharging and freeing men from, inſtead of a dreadful and unquiet troubleſom ſuperſtition, works in them a free and generous devotion, together with good hopes and kindly aſſurances* (1).

(1) Plutarchus, *in Pericle*, p. 154 *F.* We make uſe here of the Engliſh tranſlation by ſeveral hands, printed at London 1683, in 5 vol. 8vo. vol. 1. p. 515.

A REFLECTION on the doctrine of Preſages.

What Plutarch relates immediately after this paſſage, deſerves to be quoted. They brought one day to Pericles a ram's head which had only one horn. The ram was born at a country houſe of Pericles. Lampon the Diviner declared it was a ſign that the power of the two factions, which then divided the city of Athens (2), would fall entirely into the hands of him in whoſe ground this prodigy happened. Anaxagoras went another way to work: he diſſected the monſter, and finding the ſkull leſs than it ſhould have been, and of an oval figure, he explained the reaſon why that ram had but one horn, and why it grew out of the midſt of the forehead. That method of accounting for prodigies was very much admired: but ſoon after, Lampon was admired in his turn, when Thucydides's faction was brought under, and the whole authority came into Pericles's hands. Whereupon the Hiſtorian obſerves, that the Diviner and the Philoſopher might both be in the right, the one for hitting upon the effect, and the other for finding out the cauſe. It was the Philoſopher's buſineſs, adds he, to explain whence and in what manner that ſingle horn was produced; but it was the Diviner's office to declare why it had been made, and what it portended. For they who aſſert, that the prodigy is deſtroyed, as ſoon as the natural cauſe of it is found out, do not take notice that they render artificial ſigns uſeleſs, as well as the celeſtial. The lights of watch-towers, the ſun-dials, &c. depend from ſome cauſes, which act according to certain rules, and yet they are deſigned to ſignify ſome things. This is the moſt ſpecious and ſtrongeſt argument that can be urged to ſupport the common opinion which Anaxagoras intended to refute. A natural phænomenon may be a prodigy or a ſign of ſome future evil, notwithſtanding the Philoſophers are capable to account for it. For though they may explain it by the efficacy of the ſecond cauſes, yet it is poſſible that it was deſigned to portend ſome things. Is not the light of watch-towers explained by natural cauſes? But does this prevent them from being a direction to Pilots for the courſe they are to take? Let us confeſs then, that Plutarch defended the common opinion, as learnedly as it could be done. The finding out the efficient cauſe, does not exclude the final cauſe; it does even ſuppoſe it neceſſarily in any action directed by an intelligent Being. What may then be the ground of the Philoſophers aſſertion, when they maintain, that the eclipſes, being natural conſequences of the motion of the planets, cannot be a preſage of the death of a King, and that the overflowing of rivers, being a natural effect of heavy rains, or of the melting of the ſnow, cannot portend a ſedition, the dethroning of a Prince, or ſuch other publick misfortunes? I anſwer to this queſtion, that their aſſertion is grounded on this, namely, that the effects of nature, cannot be prognoſticks of contingent events, unleſs ſome particular intelligent Being deſign them for that end. It is plain that the laws of nature, being left to follow their general courſe, would never have raiſed watch-towers, and would never have lighted fires on thoſe towers for the uſe of Pilots. It was neceſſary that men ſhould be concerned in it, it was neceſſary that their particular wills ſhould apply the power of bodies after a certain manner, relating to the end they propoſed. On the other hand it is plain, that the laws of nature, being left to follow their general courſe, could never produce meteors, or the overflowing of rivers, in order to give notice to the inhabitants of a country, that within two or three years, there will ariſe a ſedition, which will overturn their conſtitution. It is plain, that a particular intelligence muſt form thoſe meteors, or cauſe thoſe great floods, that they might prove ſigns of a change in the Government. Now, theſe are things for which Natural Philoſophy cannot account. For what depends from the particular will of a man, or of an angel, is not the object of a ſcience. Philoſophy cannot explain the cauſes of it. Whence it follows, 1. That an effect, for which natural Philoſophy accounts, is no preſage of a future and contingent event, and 2. that ſuch a preſage is not a thing that can be explained by the laws of nature. Plutarch therefore could not reaſonably aſſert, that the Diviner and the Philoſopher were both in the right, the former hitting the final cauſe, and the latter the efficient cauſe, unleſs he ſuppoſed that ſome particular genius or ſpirit diſpoſed that ram's ſkull after ſuch a manner, that the brain growing narrower, and terminating in a point over againſt the middle of the forehead, might produce but one horn, and make it come forth from that part. He muſt alſo ſuppoſe that that genius modified the ram's brains after that manner, with a deſign that the city of Athens ſhould have notice, that the faction of Pericles would oppreſs Thucydides's faction, and get the whole authority. But ſuch a ſuppoſition being inconſiſtent with the ideas, which teach us, that none but God knows the contingent events, cannot be admitted; ſo that we cannot believe the vulgar opinions about preſages, unleſs we admit alſo, that God produces in a miraculous manner, and by a particular will, all the natural effects which are taken for prognoſticks. According to that ſuppoſition, the miracles, properly ſo called, would be almoſt as frequent as the effects of nature; which is a monſtrous abſurdity. Do not forget to obſerve, that if God had a mind to perform a miracle, in order to let the Athenians know, that one of their parties would be ſuppreſſed, he would have had no occaſion to make that ram's ſkull narrower. He would have produced the horn in the middle of the forehead, without altering any thing in the brains; and this would have made the prodigy appear the better. However it be, I hope no man will find fault with me, for making ſome reflections on a thought of Plutarch, which is ſpecious enough to make moſt of the Readers imagine it is well grounded.

(2) That of Pericles, and that of Thucydides, the ſon of Mileſius.

[*B*] —— *and to account for the eclipſes by a natural cauſe, which proved once very ſerviceable to the Athenians.*] Let us tranſcribe a paſſage from Plutarch; it relates to a naval expedition in the beginning of the Peloponneſian war. "And now the veſſels having "their complement of men, and Pericles being gone "aboard the Admiral of his own galley, it happened that the ſun was in an eclipſe, and it grew dark "on a ſudden, to the extreme affrightment of them "all, looking upon it as a diſmal token, and an unlucky ill boding omen. Wherefore Pericles perceiving the pilot or ſteerſman ſeized with a great "fear, and at a ſtand what to do, he took his cloak, "and put it before the man's face, and muffling him "up in it, that he could not ſee, he aſked him, whether he did imagine there was any dreadful thing, "or great hurt in this, that he had done to him, or "whether he thought it was the ſign of any hurt? "He anſwering, no; why, ſaid he, and what does "that differ from this, only that that, which has "cauſed that darkneſs there, is ſomething greater "than a cloak (3)?" Quintilian obſerves, that Pericles freed the Athenians of a very great fear at that time. *An verò cum Pericles Athenienſes Solis obſcuratione territos, redditis ejus rei cauſis, metu liberavit: aut cùm Sulpitius ille Gallus in exercitu L. Pauli de Lunæ defectione diſſeruit, ne velut prodigio divinitus facto militum animi terrerentur, non videtur eſſe uſus oratoris officio* (4)? i. e. "But do not you think that Pericles "performed the office of an Orator, when he freed "the Athenians from fear, by explaining to them the "cauſes of an eclipſe of the ſun, at which they were "terrified;

(3) Plutarch's *Lives*, vol. 1. *Life of Pericles*, p. 588. Mr. Bayle quotes Amyot's French Tranſlation, *Vie de Pericles*, p. 615, 616, of Vaſcoſan's edit. 1567, in 8vo.

(4) Quintil. *Inſtit. Orator.* lib. 1. cap. 10. p. m. 55.

had perfectly ſtudied the Doctrine of that Philoſopher [C]. He ſignalized himſelf by an undoubted courage, and by a moſt extraordinary ſtrength of eloquence (a), which was improved and ſupported by the knowledge of Natural Philoſophy; he knew ſo well how to ſuit the people's taſte according to the different times, that he gained almoſt as great an authority under a Republican Government, as if he had been a Monarch [D]. But

a) See the rem. D].

" terrified; and Sulpicius Gallius, when he diſcourſed " of the eclipſe of the moon before L. Paulus's army, " that the ſoldiers might not be frightened at it as " a prodigy?" Valerius Maximus does not ſuppoſe with Plutarch, that Pericles was aboard the fleet; he pretends that that lecture of aſtronomy was given at Athens. *Cùm obſcurato repentè ſole inuſitatis perfuſæ tenebris Athenæ ſolicitudine agerentur, interitum ſibi cæleſti denuntiatione portendi credentes; Pericles proceſſit in medium, & quæ à præceptore ſuo Anaxagora pertinentia ad ſolis & lunæ curſum acceperat, diſſeruit: nec ulterius trepidare cives ſuos vano metu paſſus eſt* (5). " When " the Athenians were under a great conſternation, " occaſioned by a ſudden eclipſe of the ſun, which " ſpread a great darkneſs over the whole city, the " people taking it for an omen from Heaven, which " portended their deſtruction, Pericles ſtept among " them, and diſcourſing of the courſe of the ſun and " moon, according to what he had learnt from his " maſter Anaxagoras, he taught his fellow-citizens " not to fear ſuch phænomena for the future." Frontinus pretends he explained the cauſe of thunder-bolts, and not the cauſe of eclipſes. *Pericles*, ſays he (6), *cùm in caſtra ejus fulmen decidiſſet, terruiſſetque milites, advocata concione, lapidibus in conſpectu omnibus colliſis, ignem excuſſit, ſedavitque turbationem, cùm docuiſſet ſimiliter nubium attritu excuti fulmen.* i. e. " A " thunder-bolt falling once in Pericles's camp, fright- " ened his whole army, whereupon he called his ſol- " diers together, and beating ſtones againſt one ano- " ther, he ſtruck fire out of them, and thus he re- " moved the ſoldiers fears, by repreſenting to them, " that the thunder-bolts were nothing elſe but the " claſhing of the clouds againſt one another, which " occaſioned the bolts to fly about."

(5) Valer. Max. lib. 8. cap. 9. num. 1 *Extern.*

(6) Frontin. Stratag. lib. 1. cap. 12.

If all the Generals of the Athenians had ſtudied under the Philoſoper Anaxagoras, the misfortune which the Athenian fleet met with before Syracuſe, would not have happened. It was ready to ſail away; but an eclipſe of the moon happening at that time, their General Nicias would not ſet out, which proved the ruin of the whole fleet. But let us hear Plutarch. " The moon fell eclipſed in the night, to the great " fright of Nicias, and of others, who for want of " experience, or out of ſuperſtition, are ſcared with " theſe appearances. That the ſun would be darken- " ed about the thirtieth day of the month, by the " moon going between, this even the ordinary peo- " ple now well enough underſtood; but the moon it- " ſelf to be darkened, how that could come about, " and how on the ſudden a broad full moon ſhould " loſe all her light, and ſhew ſuch various colours, " that was not eaſy to be comprehended: but they " concluded it to be ominous, and a ſign from God " of heavy calamities to enſue. For he who the firſt, " and the moſt plainly of any, and with the greateſt " aſſurance committed to writing, how the moon is " enlightened and overſhadowed, was Anaxagoras; " yet neither was he eminent, nor his notion much " taken notice of; but was looked upon as heterodox, " and kept ſecret, paſſing only amongſt a few, under " ſome kind of caution and confidence. For they " would not ſuffer Naturaliſts, and μετεωρολέχας, as " they then called them, that is, *ſuch as diſpute of things above*, as leſſening the divine power, by de- " ducing things from natural ſenſeleſs cauſes, and a " long chain of neceſſity, without any thing of pro- " vidence or a free agent. Hence it was, that Pro- " tagoras was baniſhed, and Anaxagoras caſt in pri- " ſon; Pericles had very much ado to procure his " liberty (7)." This paſſage from Plutarch may afford the reader matter for many reflections.

(7) Plut. *in Nicia*, p. 538. Mr. Bayle quotes Amyot's French Tranſlation, and we make uſe of the Engliſh Tranſlation by ſeveral hands, vol. 3. p. 459, 460.

[C] *Men were unjuſt enough to ſuſpect him of Atheiſm, becauſe he had ſtudied . . . . the Doctrine of Anaxagoras.*] I ſhall quote for this the authority of a weighty Writer. Ἤκουσε δὲ διδασκάλων, Ἀναξαγόρου μὲν ἐν φιλοσόφοις, ὅθεν, φησὶν Ἀντυλλος, καὶ ἄθεος πρῶτα ἐνομίσθη, τῆς ἐκεῖθεν, δεισίας ἐμφορηθείς. *He ſtudied under ſeveral maſters, and learnt philoſophy under Anaxagoras; whence, as Antyllus aſſerts, he began to be looked upon as an Atheiſt, becauſe he applied himſelf particularly to that Philoſopher's Doctrine* (8). See a paſſage from Plutarch towards the end of the remark [O]. Here follows one from Diodorus Siculus. Διόπερ ἐκκλησίας συνελθούσης περὶ τούτων, οἱ μὲν ἐχθροὶ τοῦ Περικλέους ἔπεισαν τὸν δῆμον συλλαβεῖν τὸν Φειδίαν, καὶ αὐλῇ τοῦ Περικλέους καθηγόρων ἐπροσυλίαν· πρὸς δὲ τούτοις Ἀναξαγόραν τὸν σοφιστὴν διδάσκαλον ὄντα Περικλέους, ὡς ἀσεβοῦντα εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς ἐσυκοφάντουν δ' ἐν ταῖς καθηγορίαις καὶ διαβολαῖς τὸν Περικλέα, διὰ τὸν φθόνον, σπεύδοντες διαβαλεῖν τὴν τ' αὐθρὸς ὑπεροχήν τε καὶ δόξαν. *The people being called together, thoſe who envied Pericles endeavoured to perſuade them to ſeize Phidias, and to proſecute Pericles for ſacrilege. They accuſed alſo Anaxagoras, the Sophiſt, who had been Pericles's tutor; they charged him with impiety towards the Gods; and endeavoured to involve Pericles in the ſame crimes and accuſations, for their only deſign was to darken his reputation, and to undermine his authority* (9). That Author adds, that Pericles found no better method to drive that ſtorm off, but by involving the Republick into a conſiderable war; for he was well acquainted with the people's genius and temper (10). They value a great man, when they labour under a difficult war. But the comforts of peace making them indulge themſelves in ſloth and idleneſs, they give a looſe to their jealouſies and ſuſpicions, and bring ſome criminal action againſt the ſame great man, who was their darling in time of war.

(8) Marcell. *in Vita Thucyd.*

(9) Diodorus Siculus, lib. 12. cap. 39. p. m. 433.

(10) Idem, ibid.

[D] *He gained almoſt as great an authority . . . . . as if he had been a Monarch.*] It was ſaid his eloquence procured him that power. *Pericles feliciſſimis naturæ incrementis, ſub Anaxagora præceptore ſummo ſtudio perpolitus & inſtructus, liberis Athenarum cervicibus jugum ſervitutis impoſuit: egit enim ille urbem, & verſavit arbitrio ſuo. Cumque adverſus voluntatem populi loqueretur, jucunda nihilominus & popularis ejus vox erat. Itaque veteris comœdiæ maledica lingua, quamvis potentiam viri perſtringere cupiebat, tamen in labris ejus hominis melle dulciorem leporem fatebatur habitare: itaque animis eorum, qui illum audierant, quaſi aculeos quoſdam relinqui prædicabat* (11). i. e. " Pericles, whom nature " adorned with the moſt happy talents, which he im- " proved with the utmoſt care under his tutor Anaxa- " goras, reduced the free Athenians to ſlavery. For " he governed the city according to his own will and " pleaſure. And even when he ſpoke againſt the " people's inclination, his voice was yet ſweet and " popular. So that though the ſlandering Authors of " the antient Comedy endeavoured to revile him, and " to render his power odious, yet they were obliged " to confeſs that his eloquence was ſweeter than ho- " ney, and that it left, as it were, a ſting in the " hearts of thoſe, who heard him." Valerius Maximus adds, that the only difference there was between Piſiſtratus and Pericles, was that the former exerted his tyranny by the force of arms, and the latter without it. *Quid enim inter Piſiſtratum & Periclem interfuit, niſi quod ille armatus, hic ſine armis tyrannidem geſſit?* In order to add more weight to that authority of Valerius Maximus, it muſt be obſerved, that he extracted from Cicero what he aſſerts here. *Quid Pericles! de cujus dicendi copia ſic accepimus, ut quum contra voluntatem Athenienſium loqueretur pro ſalute patriæ, ſeverius tamen id ipſum, quod ille contra populares homines diceret, populare omnibus, & jucunde videretur, cujus in labris veteres comici etiam quum illi maledicerent, quod tum Athenis fieri licebat, leporem habitaſſe dixerunt, tantamque in eo vim fuiſſe, ut in eorum mentibus qui audiſſent, quaſi aculeos quoſdam relinqueret. At hunc non declamator aliquis ad clepſydram latrare docuerat, ſed, ut accepimus, Clazomenius ille Anaxagoras vir ſummus in maximarum rerum ſcientia. Itaque hic doctrina, conſilio, eloquentia excellens, quadraginta annos præfuit Athenis, & urbanis eodem tempore, & bellicis rebus* (12). i. e. " What ſhall we ſay of Pericles? Whoſe elo- " quence we are told was ſuch, that when he ſpoke for

(11) Valerius Maximus, lib. 8. cap. 9. p. m. 699, 700.

(12) Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. 3. folio m. 95. B.

" for the preſervation of his country, even againſt " the inclination of the Athenians, his moſt ſevere " reflections againſt his countrymen, ſeemed popu- " lar, and were acceptable to all: the eminent co- " medians, even when they railed at him, *which* " *was then permitted at Athens*, owned, that there was " ſuch a ſweet, and yet ſtrong eloquence in his lips, " that his ſpeeches left, as it were, a ſting in the " hearts of thoſe who heard him. It was not ſome " idle declaimer, who taught him to bawl by the " clock: but, as we have it from good hands, he ſtu- " died eloquence under Anaxagoras the Clazomeni- " an, that celebrated man, admirably well verſed in " the moſt important ſciences. Thus Pericles, by " his eminent learning, prudence and eloquence, go- " verned the Republick of Athens forty years, both " in civil and military affairs." We have here a proof of what I ſhall have to obſerve concerning the great liberty, which the comic Poets took againſt Pericles. Their ſatyrical ſtrokes give a greater weight to the encomiums they could not refuſe him with regard to his eloquence. If you have a mind to know the name of the Poets, who have commended it, you have only to conſult Cicero; he tells us, that Eupolis aſſerted that the Goddeſs of Perſuaſion had her ſeat on Pericles's lips (13), and that this man's eloquence left an agreeable ſting in the hearts of his audience. *Non quemadmodum de Pericle ſcripſit Eupolis, cum delectatione aculeos etiam relinqueret in animis eorum à quibus eſſet auditus* (14). Diodorus Siculus (15), and Pliny the younger, have tranſmitted down to us the very words of that comic Poet. *Nec me præterit ſummum oratorem Periclem ſic à comico Eupolide laudari,*

Πρὸς δὲ γ' αὖ τούτῳ τάχ' ἡ
Πειθώ τις ἐπικάθηλο τοῖσι χείλεσιν.
Οὕτως ἐκήλει, κἠ μόνος τῶν ῥητόρων,
Τὸ κέντρον ἐγκαταλέλοιπε τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις (16).

i. e. " I know that that eminent Orator Pericles was " thus commended by Eupolis. *The Goddeſs of Per-* " *ſuaſion ſits on his lips. He moves by his ſweet eloquence,* " *and he alone, of all the Orators, leaves a ſting in the* " *hearts of his hearers.*"

You will meet in the Scholiaſt on Ariſtophanes with theſe ſame lines of Eupolis, and with ſome others, which precede them, and contain an encomium on Pericles's eloquence, an eloquence, which pleaſed, which raiſed admiration, and which was dreaded. *Hujus ſuavitate maxime hilaratæ ſunt Athenæ, hujus ubertatem & copiam admiratæ, ejuſdem vim dicendi terroremque timuerunt* (17). It pleaſed by its ſweetneſs, it raiſed admiration by its copiouſneſs, and ſtruck with terror by its ſtrength. Let us not therefore think it incredible, that it ſhould have made Pericles reign in the midſt of a Republick. His words have been compared with thunder. *Qui* (Pericles) *ſi tenui genere uteretur, nunquam ab Ariſtophane Poëta fulgurare, tonare, permiſcere Græciam dictus eſſet* (18). *i. e.* " If " Pericles's eloquence had been but indifferent, Ari- " ſtophanes the Poet would never have ſaid of him, " that he darted lightning, that he thundered, that " he put all Greece into a confuſion." This paſſage of Cicero has been paraphraſed by Pliny the younger. *Adde, quæ de eodem Pericle comicus alter, ὑσραπ', ἐβρόντα, ξυνεκύκα τὴν ἑλλάδα. Non enim amputata oratio & abſciſſa, ſed lata, & magnifica, & excelſa tonat, fulgurat, omnia denique perturbat ac miſcet* (19). i. e. " Add " to this, what another comic Poet obſerves of the " ſame Pericles. *He darts lightning, he thunders,* " *he puts all Greece into a confuſion.* For his elo- " quence was not ſhort and conciſe, but full, magni- " ficent and elevated, it thundered, lightned, and " put all into diſorder and confuſion." The firſt time Cicero publiſhed his book, he aſcribed theſe words to Eupolis; but he acknowledged his miſtake in another work. *Mihi quidem gratum, & erit gratius ſi non modo in libris tuis ſed etiam in aliorum per librarios tuos Ariſtophanem repoſueris pro Eupoli* (20). i. e. " This " will be acceptable to me, and more ſtill, if you " get your Tranſcribers to put *Ariſtophanes* inſtead of " *Eupolis*, not only in your own copies, but alſo in " thoſe of others." We meet only with lightning and thunder in the quotation from Ariſtophanes, but we ſhall find even thunder-bolts, if we conſult Plutarch. *The comedies*, ſays he, *of the then Maſters of the ſtage, who both in good earneſt, and out of merriment too, let fly many ſhrewd words at him, do plainly ſhew that he got that appellation of* Olympius, *upon the account of his being an able ſpeaker, by ſaying that he thundered, he lightned, when he harangued the people, and that he carried a dreadful thunder-bolt in his tongue.* I make uſe of Amyot's tranſlation *, and I put the Greek words in the margin (21). The Author adds an anſwer of Thucydides, which does very much confirm this. *When Archidamus, the King of the Lacedæmonians, aſked him, whether he or Pericles were the better wreſtler, he made this anſwer; When I, ſaith he, have thrown him, and given him a fair fall, he by ſtanding out in the denial, ſaying that he had no fall, gets the better of me, and perſuades people into a belief of what he ſays, whether they will or no, though they ſaw the quite contrary.*

Let us not yet quit this ſubject of Pericles's eloquence. Some pretend he was the firſt who wrote his orations down before he delivered them. Πρῶτος γραπτὸν λόγον ἐν δικαστηρίῳ εἶπε, τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ χρωμένων. *He is the firſt who wrote down his orations, before he delivered them in the aſſemblies of the people; for they who lived before him uſed to ſpeak* ex tempore (22). Corradus is in the wrong to imagine that this ſignifies he uſed to read his orations (23). For an oration that is read, is not very proper to produce the effects, which are aſcribed to that Orator's eloquence. There were ſtill ſome orations of Pericles extant in Quintilian's time; but this learned Rhetorician, finding they did not anſwer that eminent man's great reputation, approved the opinion of thoſe, who looked upon them as a ſpurious work (24). *Cicero in Bruto negat ante Periclem ſcriptum quicquam quod ornatum oratorium habeat: ejus aliqua ferri. Equidem non reperio quicquam tanta Eloquentiæ forma dignum: ideoque minus miror, eſſe qui nihil ab eo ſcriptum putent: hæc autem quæ feruntur, ab aliis eſſe compoſita* (25). i. e. " Cicero obſerves in his *Brutus*, that before Pericles, " there was nothing writ, that had any thing of elo- " quence in it; but that there are ſome orations of " Pericles handed about: for my part, I do not think " they anſwer the great reputation of eloquence he " gained: ſo that I do not wonder ſome ſhould be- " lieve he left nothing in writing behind him, and " that what is handed about under his name, was " written by ſome other perſons." But there is no reaſon why an indifferent oration, delivered by an excellent Orator, ſhould not charm all thoſe who hear it. Action alone does almoſt all. See the remark [C], of the article NARNI. Let us cloſe this remark, by a paſſage from Thucydides, which acquaints us, that Pericles having the art to reſtrain the Athenians when they were too bold, and to raiſe their courage, when they were not ſtout enough, was really the King of a titular Republick. Ὁπότε γὲν αἴσθοιτό τι αὐτοὺς παρὰ καιρὲν ὕβρει θαρσοῦντας, λέγων καταπλήσσων ἐπὶ τὸ φοβεῖσθαι. κὴ διδιότας, αὖ ἀλόγως, ἀντικαθίση πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸ θαρσεῖν, ἐγίγνετό τε λόγῳ μὲν, δημοκρατία, ἔργῳ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρὸς ἀρχή. *Whenever he found the Athenians ready to attempt ſomething too boldly, he deterred them from it by his threatning eloquence; but when he perceived they began to fear, he raiſed their courage again. So that the name of the Commonwealth was indeed ſtill ſubſiſting, but the ſovereign power was really in the hands of that moſt eminent man* (26). Plutarch has admirably well paraphraſed this paſſage of Thucydides (27): he adds to it, very properly, what Plato obſerves concerning the power of eloquence; he takes alſo notice, that the Poets ridiculed the Republick, for granting ſo great a power to one man only, and exhorted Pericles to bind himſelf by an oath not to oppreſs the people. Αὐτὸν δ' ἀπομόσαι μὴ τυραννήσειν κελεύοντες, ὡς ἀσυμμέτρου πρὸς δημοκρατίαν κὴ βαρυτέρας περὶ αὐτὸν οὔσης ὑπεροχῆς. ὁ δὲ Τηλεκλείδης παραδεδωκέναι φησὶν αὐτῷ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους πόλεών τε φόρους, αὐλάς τε τὰς πόλεις, τὰς μὲν δοῦναι, τὰς δ' ἀπολύσαι· λαίνα τείχη, τὰ μὲν οἰκοδομῆσαι, τὰ δὲ αὖθις πάλιν καταβαλεῖν, σπονδὰς, δύναμιν, κράτος, ὑφήνασθαι, πλοῦτόν τ' εὐδαιμονίαν τε. *They demanded of him to abjure the exerciſing an arbitrary power, as one whoſe grandeur and eminence were diſproportionable to, and incompatible with a popular Government, and grown to be a grievance not to be endured in a free ſtate. Farther, Teleclides ſaith, that the Athenians had betrayed and ſurrendered up to him both the cuſtoms and impoſts of their ſubject cities, and the cities themſelves, ſo as to bind up ſome, and to let looſe others: and ſtone-walls to build up what he pleaſed, and again to throw them down: leagues of alliance, the intereſt and ſtrength*

(13) Πειθὼ *quam vocant Græci, cujus effector eſt Orator, hanc Suadam appellavit Ennius. Ejus autem Cethegum medullam fuiſſe vult, ut quam deam in Periclis labris ſcripſit Eupolis ſeſſitaviſſe, hujus hic medullam noſtrum oratorem fuiſſe dixerit.* Idem, *in Bruto*, p. m. 104. *i. e.* " Ennius " called the " Goddeſs of " Eloquence " *Suada*, whom " the Greeks " called *Peitho*. " He aſſerts that " the Orator " Cethegus was " the very mar- " row of her; " ſo that where- " as Epolis " wrote that " that Goddeſs " ſat on Peri- " cles's lips, En- " nius ſays, that " our Orator " was the mar- " row of that " ſame God- " deſs."

(14) Idem, ibid. p. 62.

(15) Died. Sicul. lib. 12. cap. 40. p. m. 434.

(16) Plin. *Epiſt.* 20. lib. 1. p. m. 60.

(17) Cicero *in Bruto*, p. 91.

(18) Idem, *in Oratore*, folio m. 118, *B.*

(19) Plin. *Epiſt.* 20. lib. 1. p. 61.

(20) Cicero ad Atticum, *Epiſt.* 6. lib. 12. p. m. 301, 302.

* We follow the Engliſh tranſlation of *Plutarch's Lives, by ſeveral hands*, vol. 1. p. 520.

(21) Αἱ μέντοι κωμῳδίαι τῶν τότε διδασκάλων σπουδῇ τι πολλὰς καὶ μικρὰ γέλωτος ἀφυκτότων φορὰς εἰς αὐτὸν, ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ μάλιστα τὴν παρρησιαν γενέσθαι δηλοῦσι, βροντᾶν μὲν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀστράπτειν ὅτε δημηγορεῖν, δεινὸν δὲ κεραυνὸν ἐν γλώσσῃ φέρειν λεγόντων. *At comœdiæ, quod qui ea tempeſtate docebant eas, & ſerias & ridiculas voces in eum multas ejacularentur, traxiſſe ex vi dicendi eum oſtendunt hoc cognomen* (Olympii) *Tonare enim & fulminare concionantem, & vehemens eum in linguâ fulmen dicebant gerere.* Plutarchus, *in Pericle*, p. 156, *B.*

(22) Suidas, *in* Περικλῆς.

(23) Corradus, *in Brutum Ciceronis*, p. 77.

(24) Plutarch, *in Pericle*, p. 156, *B.* obſerves, that Pericles left nothing in writing behind him, but popular decrees or ordinances.

(25) Quintil. *Inſtit. Orator.* lib. 3. cap. 1. p. m. 115.

(26) Thucydides, lib. 2. p. 141. edit. Francof. 1614, in folio.

(27) Plut. *in Pericle*, p. 161.

But yet he could not escape the satyrical strokes of the comic Poets [*E*]. They traduced him on several accounts; and especially with regard to his love for Aspasia. His dissoluteness with the women was one of the vices with which he was chiefly charged (*b*). He

(*b*) See the rem. [*G*].

strength of the nation, their peace, and their wealth, and good fortune (29).

(29) Idem, ibid.

Let us not forget to observe, that with an uncommon strength of genius, he applied his knowledge in Philosophy most happily, to add a lustre to his eloquence. The high speculations, and the deep mysteries of Natural Philosophy and Metaphysicks, with which he had adorned his mind by Anaxagoras's lectures, would have been an obstacle in the way of many others, who had aimed at the glory of great Orators, whereas he met therein with an admirable substance, which added a wonderful strength to his orations. Plato acquaints us with this particular, his expressions are lofty and sublime, they cannot but extremely please those who understand Greek. Πᾶσαι ὅσαι μεγάλαι τῶν τεχνῶν, προσδεῖσθαι ἀδολεσχίας καὶ μετεωρολογίας φύσεως πέρι. τὸ γὰρ ὑψηλόνουν τοῦτο καὶ τὸ πάντη τελεσιουργικὸν ἔοικεν ἐνταῦθόν ποθεν εἰσιέναι. ὃ καὶ Περικλῆς πρὸς τῇ εὐφυΐᾳ εἶναι ἐκτήσατο. προσπεσὼν γάρ, οἶμαι, τοιούτῳ ὄντι Ἀναξαγόρᾳ, μετεωρολογίας ἐμπλησθεὶς, καὶ ἐπὶ φύσιν νοῦ τε καὶ ἀνοίας ἀφικόμενος (ὧν δὴ πέρι τὸν πολὺν λόγον ἐποιεῖτο Ἀναξαγόρας) ἐντεῦθεν εἴληχεν ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν λόγων τέχνην τὸ προσφορον αὐτῇ. *In order to succeed in every considerable art, a man ought to be well versed in Dialecticks, and in Natural Philosophy. For they exalt the mind, and give it a certain strength to succeed in every thing. With these sciences Pericles improved the sharpness of his genius. For as he conversed familiarly with Anaxagoras, who studied those things with application, he applied himself also to the contemplation of nature, and learnt to know wherein wisdom and folly consisted (on which subjects Anaxagoras reasoned fully) so that he could from thence borrow lucky hints, which he inserted into his discourses, as he thought it proper* (29). Tully, who had, I think, this passage of Plato in his mind, did not express the whole sublimity of it. *Pericles*, says he (30), *primus adhibuit doctrinam, quamquam tum nulla erat dicendi, tamen ab Anaxagora Physico eruditus exercitationem mentis à reconditis abstrusisque rebus ad causas forenses popularesque facile traduxerat, hujus suavitate, &c* (31). i. e. "Pericles is the first who made use of learning, tho' "there were yet no art of eloquence in his time. But "being taught by Anaxagoras, the Natural Philo- "sopher, he could easily, from the contemplation of "hidden and abstract subjects, apply his mind to "civil or political affairs, by the sweetness of his "eloquence, &c."

(29) Plato, *in Phædro*, p. m. 1237, *A. B.*

(30) Cicero, *in Bruto*, p. m. 72, 73.

(31) You will find what follows above, citat. (17).

[*E*] *He could not escape the satyrical strokes of the Comick Poets.*] Cratinus, Teleclides, Eupolis, Plato, the Comick Poet, and Dexippus railed at him. Plutarch does not only observe it, but he transcribes also their own words (32). Monsieur le Fevre of Saumur observes (33), that Cratinus *was resolute and bold in his writings, and that his free style did not spare even the first Officers of the Commonwealth, and the great and* Olympian *Pericles*. Let us see also what he relates in another place. "Hermippus did something, which "St. Augustin was no doubt unacquainted with. "That great Doctor, who was not so well skilled in "the Greek tongue, as one may imagine, and who "studied the *Subject of Grace* with more application "than the History of Greece, and the Comic Poets, "says somewhere in his *City of God*, that the licen- "tiousness of the stage was never so great as to abuse "Pericles, but that Terence did not scruple to abuse "Jupiter himself. (The passage is to be met with "in his Eunuch). But he is mistaken; for Hermip- "pus wrote verses against Pericles (34)." There never was a more unjust censure than this; for it is false that St. Augustin asserts what this Critick of Saumur charges him with. He has quoted a long passage, in which the great Pericles's fate is lamented, for not being spared by the Poets who wrote for the Stage. *Quid autem hic senserint Romani veteres, Cicero testatur in libris, quos de Republica scripsit, ubi Scipio disputans ait, Nunquam comœdiæ nisi consuetudo vitæ pateretur, probare sua theatris flagitia potuissent. Et Græci quidam antiquiores vitiosæ suæ opinionis quandam convenientiam servaverunt, apud quos fuit etiam lege concessum, ut quod vellet comœdia nominatim, vel de quo vellet, diceret. Itaque sicut in eisdem libris loquitur Africanus, quem illa non attigit, vel potius quem non vexavit, cui pepercit? Esto: populares homines improbos, in repub. seditiosos, Cleonem, Cleophontem, Hyperbolum læsit. Patiamur, inquit, etsi hujusmodi cives, à censore melius est quam à Poëta notari: sed Periclem, cùm jam suæ civitati maxima autoritate plurimos annos domi & bello præfuisset, violari versibus, & eos agi in scena non plus decuit, quàm si Plautus, inquit, noster voluisset, aut Nævius, Publio & Cneo Scipioni, aut Cæcilius Marco Catoni maledicere. Deinde paulò post nostræ, inquit, contrà duodecem tabulæ cum perpaucas res capite sanxissent, in his hanc quoque sanciendam putaverunt, si quis actitavisset, sive carmen condidisset, quod infamiam faceret, flagitiumve alteri. Præclarè. Judiciis enim ac Magistratuum disceptationibus legitimis propositam vitam, non Poëtarum ingeniis habere debemus, nec probrum audire, nisi ea lege ut respondere liceat, & judicio defendere. Hæc ex Ciceronis quarto de Republica libro ad verbum excerpenda arbitratus sum, nonnullis propter faciliorem intellectum vel prætermissis, vel paululum commutatis* (35). i. e. "What the opinion of the Romans upon this "matter was, appears from Tully's book concern- "ing the Commonwealth, where he makes Scipio "argue thus: the Comick Poets would never have "been able to gain applause for the slanders they "uttered on the stage, had it not been a customary "thing in those times. The antient Greeks acted "indeed in some manner coherently with their erro- "neous opinion: for it was permitted by law to the "Comick Poets, to say what they pleased, and to "lash whom they pleased. And accordingly, as the "same Scipio Africanus observes in the same books, "whom did they not ridicule, or rather, whom did "they not slander, whom did they spare? But what? "They lashed their wicked countrymen, or sediti- "ous citizens. This may indeed be suffered; tho' "it were better, says he, that such men be noted "by the publick censor, than by the Poets. But "that Pericles, who had governed his country for "several years with a sovereign authority both in "civil and military affairs, should be slandered in "Plays acted upon the Stage, this, says he, was as "indecent and unbecoming, as if our countryman "Plautus, or Nævius, had attempted to traduce "Publius and Cnæus Scipio, or as if Cæcilius had "ridiculed M. Cato. And, adds he a little lower, "though our twelve tables made but very few crimes "capital, yet they made it capital for any man to "act or to write a play, to another's reproach or dis- "grace. This is admirably well: for every one's "life must be subject to the lawful enquiries of the "Magistrates, and not to the Poet's fancies, nor is "it proper that any one should be reproached unless "he be at liberty to answer for himself and to de- "fend himself in a legal manner. This I thought "proper to transcribe word for word from Tully's "fourth Book of the Commonwealth, having only "omitted or altered a few words, that the Reader "might the better understand the whole." That blunder of Monsieur le Fevre should teach all Authors to mistrust their memory, and never to assert any thing without consulting again the books, in which they remember to have read it. He had read in St. Augustin, that the Romans would not have suffered their Comick Poets to traduce Scipio, though they suffered Terence to ridicule Jupiter: his memory failed him, he put Pericles instead of Scipio, and by that alteration he thought himself well grounded to ridicule St. Augustin. Let us see that Father's reflections; they are noble and very judicious: he charges the Roman Law-givers with a very considerable defect: they would not suffer their Poets to speak ill of the Magistrates, but they gave them leave to ridicule the Gods. *At Romani, sicut in illa de Repub. disputatione gloriatur Scipio, probris & injuriis Poëtarum subjectam vitam famamque habere noluerunt, capite etiam punire sancientes tale carmen condere si quis auderet. Quod erga se quidem satis honestè constituerunt, sed erga Deos suos superbè & irreligiosè. Quòs cùm scirent non solùm patienter, sed etiam libenter Poëtarum probris maledictisque lacerari, se potius hujuscemodi injuriis indignos esse*

(32) Plutarch. *in Pericle*, p. 153, 154, 160, 165, 170.

(33) *Vie des Poëtes Grecs*, p. m. 90.

(34) Ibid. p. 81, 82.

(35) Augustinus, *de Civitat. Dei*, lib. 2. cap. 9. p. m. 166.

He bore patiently to be thus reviled [F], and he might have been thought happy, had he not been expoſed to other misfortunes. But he experienced the malignity of fortune in many reſpects, particularly with regard to his own private family (c) [G]; for he

(c) Taken from Plutarch's *Life of Pericles.*

(36) Idem, ibid. cap. 12. p. 180, 181.

(37) *Nec à vobis ſaltem iſtum meruerunt honorem, ut quibus expellitis à vobis, eiſdem ab his legibus propulſaretis injurias. Majeſtatis ſunt apud vos rei, qui de veſtris ſequius obmurmuraverint aliquid regibus. Magiſtratum in ordinem redigere, Senatorem aut convitio proſequi, ſuis eſſe decretis periculoſiſſimum pœnis. Carmen malum conſcribere, quo fama alterius coinquinetur & vita, decemviralibus ſcitis evadere noluiſtis impune: ac ne veſtras aures convitio aliquis petulantiore pulſaret, de atrocibus formulas conſtituiſtis injuriis. Soli Dii ſunt apud vos ſuperi inhonorati, contemptibiles, viles: in quos jus eſt à vobis datum, quæ quiſque voluerit dicere: turpitudinum jacere, quas libido confinxerit atque excogitaverit, formas.* Arnob. lib. 4. p. 150, 151. i. e. "The "Gods do not "deſerve that "honour from "you, that you "ſhould ſecure "them againſt "ſlander, by the "ſame laws by "which you "ſecure your-"ſelves againſt "it. It is treaſon "among you to "hint the leaſt "thing againſt "your Kings. "You have de-"creed penal-"ties againſt "thoſe, who "pretend to "teach the Ma-"giſtrates their "duty, or who "abuſe a Sena-"tor. To write "a poem againſt "any one's con-"duct or repu-"tation, is made "capital by the "Decemvirs "laws. Nay, to "ſay the leaſt "thing againſt "any of you, is "puniſhable. "The Gods a-"lone are con-"temned, deſ-"piſed, and re-"viled, they a-"lone may be "ridiculed, and "repreſented "under the moſt "ſhameful "forms, that "can be ima-"gined."

(38) Plut. *in Pericle*, p. 165, *D.*

eſſe duxerunt, ſeque ab eis etiam lege munierunt, illorum autem iſta etiam ſacris ſolennitatibus miſcuerunt. Itane tandem Scipio laudas, hanc Poëtis Romanis negatam eſſe licentiam, ut cuiquam opprobrium infligerent Romanorum, cum videas, eos nulli Deorum peperciſſe veſtrorum? Itane pluris tibi habenda eſt exiſtimatio veſtræ curiæ, quàm Capitolii, imò Romæ unius quàm cæli totius: ut linguam maledicam in cives tuos exercere Poëtæ etiam lege prohiberentur, & in Deos tuos ſecuri, tanta convicia nullo Senatore, nullo Cenſore, nullo Principe, nullo Pontifice prohibente jacularentur? Indignum videlicet fuit, ut Plautus aut Nævius Publio & Cneo Scipioni, aut Cæcilius M. Catoni maledíceret: & dignum fuit, ut Terentius veſter flagitio Jovis optimi maximi adoleſcentium nequitiam concitaret (36). i. e. " But the Romans, as " Scipio boaſts in that ſame book of the Common-" wealth, would not ſuffer the Magiſtrates life or " reputation to be expoſed by the ſlanders and re-" proaches of the Poets, making it capital for any " one who ſhould dare to write ſuch Poems. This " was indeed wiſely decreed with regard to them-" ſelves; but then their conduct towards the Gods " was in that reſpect ſcornful and irreligious. For " though they knew that the Poets were not only " quietly, but even with pleaſure ſuffered to abuſe " and ridicule the Gods, they thought ſuch an uſage " was unbecoming with regard to themſelves, and " provided againſt it by a law, but they ſuffered it " with regard to the Gods even in their ſacred ſo-" lemnities. Why then, Scipio, do you commend your " laws, for denying the Roman Poets the liberty of " abuſing any of the Romans, when you ſee they " ſpare none of your Gods? Do you make more ac-" count of your Senate-houſe, than of your Capitol, " nay, of Rome alone, than of all Heaven? That " you ſhould even by a law provide againſt your " Poets traducing their Fellow-Citizens, whilſt they " may freely abuſe your Gods, no Senator, no Cen-" ſor, no Prince, no Prieſt oppoſing it? It was for-" ſooth undecent for Plautus or Nævius to revile " Publius and Cnæus Scipio, or for Cæcilius to ſlan-" der M. Cato; but it was well done of Terence, to " encourage young men to laſciviouſneſs, by the ex-" ample of the great and good Jupiter's Amours" Arnobius had already reproached the Heathens with the ſame fault. See the Margin (37); his words do well deſerve to be read.

[F] . . . . . *He bore patiently to be thus reviled.* We do not read, that any of the Poets, who abuſed him, was puniſhed for it. And yet it is very probable, that it had been an eaſy matter for a man, whoſe power was ſo great, to have puniſhed thoſe men's audaciouſneſs. They offended him in the moſt tender part: for they repreſented Aſpaſia as an imprudent and laſcivious Concubine: they repreſented her thus, I ſay, even on the Stage. Ἐν δὲ ταῖς κωμῳδίαις Ὀμφάλην νέα καὶ Δηϊάνειρα καὶ πάλιν Ἥρα πρόσαγορεύεται. Κρατῖνος δ' ἀνδρικῶς παλλακὴν αὐτὴν εἴρηκεν ἐν τούτοις, Ἥραν τε τοὶ Ἀσπασίαν τίκτει, καὶ καλαπυγοσύνην παλλακὴν κυνώπιδα. i. e. " She was called in the " plays, the new Omphale, and Deianeira, and alſo " Juno. Cratinus ſtyles her poſitively an Harlot " in theſe lines: ſhe was delivered of Juno Aſpaſia, " an imprudent and obſcene Harlot (30)." This indolence was partly owing to policy; for if Pericles had attempted to ſilence the Poets, it would have opened the eyes of the Athenians with regard to a particular, which it was very much his intereſt to keep ſecret from them; they would have perceived that they had only the name of a Republican Government left, and that the whole power was really in the hands of one man. Nothing is more proper to prevent the people from taking notice, that their liberty is quite extinct, than the ſuffering them to rail with impunity againſt thoſe, who really poſſeſs the kingly power under ſuch names, as have nothing odious in them. It was therefore Pericles's intereſt to deſpiſe the licentiouſneſs of the Stage: but let us not aſcribe his patience only to his craft and policy; it was owing alſo to the greatneſs of his ſoul; for a man ſo brave and lively as he was would never have bore injuries with ſo much patience as he did, had he not had a moſt extraordinary ſtrength of mind. Read the following paſſage of his life. *It is reported, that there was once a bold villain, who abuſed him an whole day with opprobrious language, in a full aſſembly of the people, and affronted him with all the injuries he could think of: which Pericles bore patiently, without anſwering one word, diſpatching in the mean time ſome important buſineſs till the evening came, when he returned home quietly, without diſcovering the leaſt concern or paſſion, though that impudent fellow followed him all the way, with all the foul language he could rake up: and as Pericles was ready to get into his own houſe, it being then quite dark, he ordered one of his ſervants to take a link, and conduct that man ſafe home* (39). The greatneſs of his courage and patience appeared moſt eminently, in the beginning of the Peloponneſian war. The enemy was laying the country of Attica waſte; and as he was not in a condition to repulſe them, he provided only for the ſecurity of Athens. People murmured againſt him for that conduct; they wrote ſmart and ſatyrical poems againſt him; they ſlandered and even threatened him. He deſpiſed all thoſe railings and clamours, and continued to act with the utmoſt tranquillity, according to his own prudence and wiſdom. Ἐχρῆτο τοῖς αὑτῷ λογισμοῖς, βραχέα φροντίζων τῶν καλαβοώντων καὶ δυσχεραινόντων. καί τοι πολλοὶ μὲν αὐτῷ τῶν φίλων δεόμενοι προσέκειντο, πολλοὶ δὲ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἀπειλοῦντες καὶ καληγοροῦντες. πολλοὶ δ' ἤδοι ᾄσματα καὶ σκώμματα πρὸς αἰσχύνην, ἐφυβρίζοντες αὐτοῦ τὴν στρατηγίαν, ὡς ἀνανδρον καὶ προϊεμένην τὰ πράγματα τοῖς πολεμίοις. ἐπιφυόμενος δὲ καὶ Κλέων ἤδη διὰ τῆς πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ὀργῆς τῶν πολιτῶν πορευόμενον ἐπὶ τὴν δημαγωγίαν . . . . πλὴν ὑπ' ἀθύμου ἐκινήθη τῶν τοιούτων ὁ Περικλῆς, ἀλλὰ πράως καὶ σιωπῇ τὴν ἀδοξίαν καὶ τὴν ἀπέχθειαν ὑφιστάμενος. *Following the dictates of his own reaſon, he deſpiſed the vain clamours of thoſe who murmured and railed againſt him; though many of his friends were importunate with their prayers, and many of his enemies threatened him, and inveighed againſt him, many ſung ſatyrical poems, and abuſed him, as though his adminiſtration was too weak and remiſs, and he betrayed the Commonwealth to the enemies. Even Cleon himſelf, obſerving that the city was exaſperated againſt him, began to ridicule him, with a deſign to court the people's favour. . . . But nothing of all this moved Pericles in the leaſt. He bore envy and detraction with mildneſs and patience* (40). What a courage, what a conſtancy, what a ſtrength of mind do we not obſerve here!

(39) Amyot's French tranſlation of *Pericles's Life*, p. 554.

(40) Plut. *in Pericle*, p. 170, *D.* and *E.*

[G] *He experienced the malignity of fortune . . . with regard to his own private family.*] The wife he married was his relation; ſhe had already been married to Hipponicus, by whom ſhe had a ſon: Pericles had two by her, and grew weary of her, and ſhe for her part was not much pleaſed with him, ſo that ſhe conſented, without reluctancy, to marry the man he propoſed to her (41). I do not think the blame muſt be laid upon her alone; for Pericles behaved himſelf after ſuch a manner, as gave his wife a juſt occaſion to be angry: he was in love with other women; for not to mention Chryſilla (42), whom he loved perhaps when he was already married, it is certain that he kept Aſpaſia. He was ſo bewitched with her, that he married her, though ſhe had a bad reputation. They who wiſhed him no good, ſpread a thouſand reports abroad, which were very proper to exaſperate his wife's mind, nor were all their reports perhaps ill-grounded. They aſſerted, that Phidias, one of the moſt excellent Carvers in the world, and who was the general Surveyor of all the works which Pericles cauſed to be made for the ornament of the city, inticed Ladies to his houſe, with a pretence to ſhew them the works of the beſt Maſters, but in reality, with a deſign to debauch them, and to deliver them up to Pericles. Πάντα δ' ἦν σχεδὸν ἐπ' αὐτῷ, καὶ πᾶσιν ἐπισλάθει τοῖς τεχνίταις διὰ φιλίαν Περικλέους. καὶ τοῦτο τῷ μὲν φθόνον, τῷ δὲ βλασφημίαν ἤνεγκεν, ὡς ἐλευθέρας τῷ Περικλεῖ γυναῖκας εἰς τὰ ἔργα φοιτώσας ὑποδεχομένῳ τοῦ Φειδίου. δεξάμενοι δὲ τὸν λόγον οἱ κωμικοὶ, πολλὴν ἀσέλγειαν ἀυλοῦ κατεσκέδασαν, εἴς τε τὴν Μυσίππου γυναῖκα διαβάλλοντες, ἀνδρὸς φίλου καὶ ὑποστρατήγου τοῦ Περικλέους; εἴς τε τὰς Πυθαγγέλου καὶ Λάμπωνος

(41) Ibidem, p. 165.

(42) Αὐτὸς δὲ (ἴσως) ἐν τοῖς ἐλεγείοις ἐρᾷν μὲν ὁμολογεῖ Χρυσίλλης τῆς Κορινθίας, Τέλεος δὲ θυγατρὸς, ἧς καὶ Περικλέα τὸν Ὀλύμπιον ἐρᾶν φησι Τηλεκλείδης ἐν Ησιόδοις. *The ſame Ion confeſſes in his elegies, that he loved Chryſilla, the Corinthian, Teleus's daughter, with whom Pericles the Olympian was alſo in love, if we may believe Teleclides in his Heſiodi.* Athen. lib. 10. p. 436, *F.*

he was unhappy both in a wife, and in children. There is a reflection to be made on the ſlanders that were ſpread againſt him [*H*]. He died the third year of the Peloponneſian

λαμπρᾶς ὀρνιθοτροφίας, ὃς ἐταῖρος ὢν Περικλέους, αἰτίαν εἶχε ταῖς γυναιξὶν αἷς ὁ Περικλῆς ἐπλησίαζεν. *Omnia ferè hic ob Periclis neceſſitudinem curabat, artificibuſque præerat omnibus: id quod huic convitia, illi conflavit invidiam, quaſi ingenuas matronas, ad ſpectanda opera commeantes, in gratiam Phidias Periclis reciperet. Eos rumores excipientes comici, inſolentem laſciviam ei impegere, ac Menippi uxorem amici atque in bello legati improperavere, Pyrilampiſque avium vivaria, cui, quum familiaris Periclis eſſet, infligebatur, ipſum mulieribus quibus conſueſceret Pericles, ſubjicere pavones* (43). "The "comic poets making an advantage of thoſe reports, "abuſed him in the moſt outrageous manner, charging him with keeping the wife of Menippus, "who was his friend, and had been his Lieutenant in "the armies; they alſo aſſerted, that Pyrilampis, one "of his intimate acquaintance, kept curious birds, "and eſpecially peacocks (44), which he uſed to "ſend to the women with whom Pericles lay (45)." If Pericles was not well pleaſed with his wife, he was leſs ſatisfied ſtill with his eldeſt ſon, who was a very wicked youth: he was prodigal, and complained continually of his father's ſavingneſs: his complaints were louder ſtill, after he was married to a woman who uſed to ſpend high. He borrowed money in his father's name, and ſeeing that Pericles proſecuted the lender, inſtead of paying that ſum, he railed moſt bitterly againſt him. But let us make uſe of Amyot's words (46). "Young Xantippus, being "exceedingly exaſperated againſt his father, ſlandered him publickly throughout the city, relating by "way of ridicule, how he ſpent his time when he "was retired within his own houſe, and giving an "account of his converſations with the Sophiſts and "Teachers of Rhetorick; for as it happened once "in the publick games, that one of the champions, who ſtrove who ſhould dart a javelin beſt, "ſtruck and killed *out of wickedneſs* (47) one Epitimius, a Theſſalian (48), he went and told about, "that Pericles had been an whole day diſputing with "Protagoras the Rhetorician, whether the javelin, "or the man who darted it, or they who appointed "the game, were, according to ſound and ſtrict reaſon, to be accounted guilty of that murder. Further, Steſimbrotus writes, that the report which was "ſpead throughout the city, that Pericles kept his "*wife*, had been diſperſed by Xantippus himſelf; "and that the quarrel and miſunderſtanding between "the father and the ſon continued till his death, "without being ever made up." There is a very dark equivocation in that tranſlation of Amyot. *Pericles kept his wife.* Was it his own wife? Was it Steſimbrotus's? or was it Xantippus's? The firſt ſenſe, how ridiculous ſoever it be, agrees beſt of all with the rules of the French grammar. But it is not Plutarch's ſenſe: this Hiſtorian meant, that it was Xantippus, who publiſhed every where that his own wife had been debauched by Pericles: but one could never find it out, either by the Greek words of Plutarch, or by the Latin tranſlation: we muſt gueſs at it by another paſſage of the ſame Hiſtorian. He obſerves in page 160, that Pericles was accuſed of having had a criminal converſation with his daughter-in-law, and that Steſimbrotus was the perſon who charged him with that wicked action. Στησίμβροτος ὁ Θάσιος δεινὸν ἀσέβημα καὶ μυθώδεις ἐξενεγκεῖν ἐτόλμησεν εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ υἱοῦ κατὰ τοῦ Περικλέους. *Steſimbrotus of Thaſos charges Pericles with an horrid but falſe attempt againſt his own ſon's wife* (49). By the help of this paſſage we may underſtand the following, which otherwiſe would be a perfect riddle. Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις, καὶ τὴν περὶ τῆς γυναικὸς διαβολὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ξανθίππου φησὶν ὁ Στησίμβροτος εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς διασπαρῆναι. *Beſides this Steſimbrotus relates that his infamy with regard to his wife was ſpread by Xanthippus* (50). The vexation I ſhall now ſpeak of was but ſmall, if compared with that domeſtick grief: but it was not inconſiderable if it be conſidered by itſelf. Pericles had a Steward who regulated the whole expence of the family with ſo much thrift (51), that it had been impoſſible for the meaneſt citizens to avoid all ſuperfluous expences in their families with more care than was done in his. That great ſavingneſs made Pericles's ſon, and all the women in the houſe murmur and complain; and was not this a kind of misfortune to the maſter? We have ſome reaſons to imagine that Pericles did not think himſelf happy in loſing his eldeſt ſon, though he had no great ſatisfaction from him: for nature prompts us to chooſe rather the life than the death of a child, though he be undutiful. But we may be ſure that that great man was overwhelmed with grief, when the plague carried off his ſecond ſon, the only lawful child he had left. The conſtancy of his mind was not ſhaken by the death of his eldeſt ſon, nor by his ſiſters, nor even by that of moſt of his friends and relations: but he could not forbear ſhedding tears at this laſt misfortune (52). *His high ſpirit, and great ſoul never ſunk under the greateſt misfortunes; he was never known to weep, or to mourn at the funerals of any of his friends or relations, till the death of Paralus, the laſt of his lawful children. The loſs of this alone touched him home: and yet he endeavoured to keep up his natural conſtancy, and to preſerve his wonted ſedateneſs. But when he came to put a garland on the head of his departed ſon, grief overcame him upon beholding his face, ſo that he burſt out into tears, and cried bitterly, which he had* never *done before in all his life time* (53). This puts me in mind of an Egyptian King mentioned by Herodotus (54), and of an omiſſion of Valerius Maximus. *Pericles intra quatriduum duobus mirificis adoleſcentibus filiis ſpoliatus; iis ipſis diebus & vultu priſtinum habitum retinente, & oratione nulla ex parte infractiore concionatus eſt. Ille verò caput quoque ſolito more coronatum gerere ſuſtinuit, ut nihil ex vetere ritu propter domeſticum vulnus detraheret* (55). i. e. "Pericles having loſt in four days time two worthy "ſons in the prime of their age, harangued the people at that very time, without ſhewing any thing "altered in his countenance, nor was the ſtrength of "his eloquence abated in the leaſt. Nay, he bore "to have his head adorned with a garland as uſual, "ſo that his domeſtick grief did by no means make "him change any thing in his uſual behaviour."

I look upon Pericles's proceedings in favour of his baſtard ſon, as a conſiderable unhappineſs. He had enacted a law, which proved the ruin of many perſons, and then for the ſake of that baſtard he deſired to have it repealed; he obtained that favour only from the people's compaſſion for his misfortunes. Οὗτος ἓν δεινὸν τὸν κατὰ τοσοῦτον ἰσχύσαντα τὸν νόμον, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πάλιν διαλυθῆναι τοῦ γράψαντος, ἡ παροῦσα δυστυχία τῷ Περικλεῖ περὶ τὸν οἶκον, ὡς δίκην τινὰ διδωκότι τῆς ὑπεροψίας καὶ τῆς μεγαλαυχίας ἐκείνης, ἐπέκλασε τοὺς Ἀθηναίους· καὶ δόξαντες αὐτὸν νεμεσητά τε παθεῖν, ἀνθρωπίνως τε διοῦσθαι, συνεχώρησαν ἀπογράψασθαι τὸν νόθον εἰς τοὺς φράτερας, ὄνομα θέμενον τὸ αὐτοῦ. i. e. *It ſeemed a ſhocking thing, that a law, which had been executed againſt ſo many perſons, ſhould be repealed by the very ſame man who enacted it. But Pericles's domeſtick grief moved the Athenians (who looked upon his misfortunes as puniſhment for his pride and haughtineſs): They thought it was proper that men ſhould comfort him who was afflicted through the envy of the Gods: they ſuffered therefore that his baſtard ſon ſhould be regiſtered in his ward under his father's name* (56). A favour muſt be very unacceptable when it coſts ſo much. What a vexation is it for a man to think that a whole city will reflect upon his conduct, when after he had enacted a law of ſo great a conſequence, that it required part of the inhabitants ſhould be made a ſacrifice to it, I mean, that they be reduced to ſlavery, he petitions to have it repealed for his own private intereſt? By the law I ſpeak of it was enacted, that all they who were not born of an Athenian father and an Athenian mother, ſhould be reputed baſtards, according to which law near five thouſand citizens were ſold for ſlaves.

[*H*] *There is a reflection to be made on the ſlanders that were ſpread againſt him.*] That reflection is Plutarch's; it is deſigned to ſhew the uncertainty of hiſtory; it is one of the arguments urged for the *Epocha* or *Suſpenſion of Judgment*, maintained in the Syſtem of Hiſtorical Scepticiſm. Plutarch having related the ſlanders of the Poets againſt Pericles, and the moſt abominable calumny of Steſimbrotus, cries

(43) Plut. *in Pericle*, p. 160, C.

(44) Theſe birds were extremely dear at that time. See Athenæus, lib. 14. cap. 20. p. 654, 655.

(45) Amyot's Tranſlation of *Pericles Life*, 577.

(46) Amyot, ib. p. 617, 618.

(47) He ought to have ſaid *by miſchance*. See Girac, *Replique à Coſtar*, p. 438. The Greek word is ἀκουσίως, that is to ſay, *involuntarily*.

(48) Amyot did not underſtand his original here; he ſhould have ſaid, that Epitimius killed an horſe unawares. Ἵππον, ſays Plutarch, ἀκοντίῳ παταξάντος Ἐπιτιμίου τῶ φαρσαλίου ἀκουσίως καὶ κτείναντος. See Girac, ibid. where he banters Goſtar ſoundly. Obſerve alſo, that Plutarch calls *Epitimius a Pharſalian*, and not a *Theſſalian*, as Amyot does.

(49) Plut. *in Pericle*, p. 160, E.

(50) Idem, ibidem, p. 172, B.

(51) Idem, ibidem, 162.

(52) Amyot's tranſlation of the *Life of Pericles*, p. 618.

(53) This does not agree with what is obſerved of him, that he ſhed tears when Aſpaſia was proſecuted. See the rem. [*O*], quotations (174), (175).

(54) Lib. 3. cap. 14. He relates, that Pſammenitus did not lament the misfortune of his daughter, nor of his ſon, and that he cried, when he was a witneſs to one of his friend's unhappy fate. See ibidem, what he anſwered, when he was asked the reaſon of that conduct. See alſo Montagne's *Eſſays*, book 1. chap. 2.

(55) Valerius Maximus, lib. 5. cap. 10. See alſo Ælian. Var. Hiſt. lib. 9. cap. 4. Plutarch, *de Conſolat. ad Apollon.* p. 118. relates the ſame particular with Valerius Maximus, but he ſuppoſes one ſon died 8 days after the other.

(56) Plut. *in Pericle*, p. 172, E.

ponnesian war (*d*) after a long sickness, which had weakened his understanding [*I*]. And yet a little before he died he made a very good observation, which gave Plutarch an opportunity to make a judicious reflection on the nature of God [*K*]: but that Author went too

(*d*) Thucydides, lib. 2. p. m. 118. it was the 3d year of the 87th Olympiad.

out that it is very difficult to find out the truth. The contemporary Authors conceal or disguise it, some out of hatred and jealousy, others out of friendship and by a spirit of flattery. They who come after them are by the distance of the times prevented from knowing the truth of those events, which happened before. Οὕτως ἔοικε παντὶ χαλεπὸν εἶναι καὶ δυσθήρατον ἱστορία τἀληθὲς, ὅταν οἱ μὲν ὕστερον γιγνόμενοι τὸν χρόνον ἔχωσιν ἐπιπροσθοῦντα τῇ γνώσει τῶν πραγμάτων. ἡ δὲ τῶν πράξεων καὶ τῶν βίων ἡλικιώτις ἱστορία, τὰ μὲν φθόνοις καὶ δυσμενείαις, τὰ δὲ χαριζομένη καὶ κολακεύουσα, λυμαίνηται καὶ διαστρέφῃ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. *Tantæ molis est & difficultatis assequi ex historia veritatem, quum posteriores, antequam cognoscant res, præveniantur tempore: æqualis rerum gestarum & hominum historia partim invidia & odio, partim gratia & adulatione opprimat & pervertat veritatem* (57). Plutarch knew those difficulties by his own experience. He was obliged to observe that the cause of the Peloponnesian War was not much known (58). What then will be known? The reason why that cause was uncertain holds good in a thousand other occasions. Pericles's great reputation and power rendered him odious; this made slanderers invent an hundred false stories against him. They would at all events make him answerable for the misfortunes of that war. Some invented one thing, others another. What would you have a reader to believe amidst so many different slanders? The moment he had drawn the hatred of the multitude upon him, there arose several smart and satyrical wits, who offered up to that hatred, as it were to an evil genius, the victims they judged the most proper. Καὶ τί ἄν τις ἀνθρώπους σατυρικοὺς τοῖς βίοις καὶ πρὸς καλὰ τῶν κρειττόνων, βλασφημίας ὥσπερ δαίμονι κακῷ τῷ φθόνῳ τῶν πολλῶν ἀποθύοντας ἑκάστοτε, θαυμάσειεν. *Et quidem quis miretur, petulanti homines lingua, si maledicta in principes invidiæ multitudinis, tanquam malo dæmonio, assiduè consecraverint* (59). Now they knew of no offerings more proper than such injuries as were calculated to disgrace him. I am well pleased with Plutarch for making but little account of the pretensions of the Megarians (60), though they were supported by Aristophanes's authority. They were parties concerned against Pericles in that affair, and one may say of Aristophanes, and of all those comick Poets of those times, what has been lately observed of a modern Author (61), *that they are capable only to make us question the most evident truths, whenever they assert them.* If Plutarch lived at this time, he would assert, that our posterity will have all the trouble imaginable to judge of the true history of our age; for there are so many falsities published, and so many victims offered to the evil genius of the people's hatred and envy, that if the satyrical wits of Athens come to life again, they would think themselves but mere novices. And besides there are so many elogies published, that if the flatterers of that country rose from the dead, they would be convinced that they were but young beginners in point of flattery.

I remember a beautiful passage in Plutarch, in which Pericles is concerned (62). When a fact is certain, but the Author's intention is unknown, it is a most wicked and malicious conduct to pretend to ascribe it to bad motives. And yet this is what the comick Poets did. They asserted that Pericles kindled the Peloponnesian War for the sake of the Concubine Aspasia, and on Phidias's account, and by no means from a noble and brave ambition to humble the pride of the Peloponnesians, and to be in no manner behind-hand with the Lacedæmonians (63) They who, when they cannot deny but an action is commendable, rake into the intentions of the heart, and suppose they were bad, carry envy and malice to the highest degree. Ἐν μὲν γὰρ τοῖς εὐδοκιμοῦσιν ἔργοις καὶ πράγμασιν ἐπαινημένοις αἰτίαν φαύλην ὑπολάβῃσι, καὶ καλωγίαι ταῖς διαβολαῖς εἰς ὑποψίας ἀτόπους περὶ τῆς ἐν ἀφανεῖ προαιρέσεως τοῦ πράξαντος· αὐτῷ τὸ πεπραγμένον ἐμφανῶς ἐ δυνάμενοι· ψέγειν . . . . . σύδηλον ὅτι φθόνῳ καὶ κακοηθείας ὑπερβολῇ ἐ λέλοιπε. *Præclaris enim & laudatis factis atque rebus maligni causam qui subjiciunt vitiosam, calumniandoque in sinistris abducunt suspiciones de latente ejus qui rem gessit consilio, quando ipsum factum palam vituperare non possunt . . . . . hos liquet ad summam invidentiam & nequitiam nihil sibi feciſſe reliquum* (64). I would be glad to know whether Duris of Samos and Theophrastus ascribed to Aspasia the two wars which the Poets charged her with. Harpocration quotes them after the same manner as he does Aristophanes. Δοκεῖ δὲ δυοῖν πολέμων αἰτία γεγονέναι, τοῦ τε Σαμιακοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ· ὡς ἔστι μαθεῖν παρά τε Δύριδι τῷ Σαμίῳ, καὶ Θεοφράστῳ ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ τῶν πολιτικῶν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοφάνους Ἀχαρνέων. *She is thought to have been the cause of two wars, of the Samian, and of the Peloponnesian, as may be seen in Duris of Samos, in Theophrastus's fourth book of Politicks, and in Aristophanes's Acharnenses* (65). But who knows whether they asserted it positively, or related it only as the opinion of Pericles's enemies, and as that of the Poets?

(57) Idem, ibid. p. 160. *E.* N. B. The full sense of that passage is given in the words before it.

(58) Ibid. p. 169. *A.*

(59) Idem, ibid. p 160, *D.*

(60) They asserted, that the carrying off two Prostitutes belonging to Aspasia, determined Pericles to engage in that war. See hereunder, the rem. [*O*].

(61) The Author of the *Esprit de Mr. Arnauld*; (who was Monsieur Jurieu). See the art. ARNAULD, (Anthony), Doctor of the Sorbonne, quotation (64).

(61) Plut. *de Herodoti malignitate*, 855, *F.*

(62) Amyot's translation of this passage is very erroneous. *Whereas on the contrary*, says he, *it was neither out of ambition, nor out of obstinacy, but rather to humble the pride of the Peloponnesians, and not to be behind-hand with those of Lacedæmon.* The Greek words are, p. 856, *A.* ἡ φιλοτιμία τινὶ καὶ φιλονικία μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ ῥῆξαι τὸ φρόνημα Πελοποννησίων, καὶ μηδενὸς ὑφεῖσθαι Λακεδαιμονίων ἀθυμήσαντος.

(63) Idem, ibid. p. 160, *A.*

[*I*] *He died . . . . after a long sickness, which weakened his understanding.*] "The plague seized him, "not with sharp and violent fits as it did others that "had it, but with a dull and lingring distemper, "through various changes and alterations, leisurely "by little and little wasting the strength of his body, "and undermining the noble faculties of his soul. "So that Theophrastus in his Morals, having made "it a moot-point, whether men's manners change "with their fortunes, and their souls, being jogged "and disturbed by the ailings of their bodies, do "start aside from the rules of virtue, has left it "upon record, that Pericles, when he was sick, "shewed one of his friends that came to visit him "an amulet or charm, that the women had hung "about his neck; as much as to say, that he was "very sick indeed, when he would admit of, or in-"dure such a foolery as that was (66)." I have quoted the Greek words of Plutarch in the article DESBARREAUX (67). There must certainly be a mistake in the chapter where Ælian relates that Pericles, Callias, and Nicias, having spent all their estate, took a large glass of poison. It was the last time they drank one another's health, being determined not to live, after they could no longer live well (68). If Ælian's memory did not fail him, his transcribers must have wrote by mistake Pericles instead of Epicles: for we read in Athenæus, that Antocles and Epicles being determined to live together, and making every thing a sacrifice to voluptuousness and luxury, shortened their days with a glass of poison, when they found all their money was spent (69).

(64) Idem, ibid. p. 856, *A.*

(65) Harpocrat. *in* Ἀσπασία, p. m. 79.

(66) Amyot's translation of the *Life of Pericles*, p. 620, 621.

(67) Quotation (22).

(68) Κοινὴν τελευσαίαν πρότερον ἀλλήλοις προπίοντες ὥσπερ ἐν συμποσίῳ ἀνέλυσαν. They drank for the last time one another's health in a glass of hemlock, and from the table they removed to their grave. *Ælian Variæ Hist.* lib. 4. cap. 23.

(69) *Athen.* lib. 12. p. 537.

[*K*] *Plutarch . . . . makes a judicious reflection on the nature of God.*] Immediately after the words, which I have transcribed in the foregoing remark according to Amyot's translation, we meet with the following passage (70). "When he was drawing "near his end, the best of the citizens, and those of "his friends who were left alive, sitting about him, "were discourfing of his virtue and authority, how "great it was, and were reckoning up his famous "actions and atchievements, and the number of his "victories. For there were no less than nine tro-"phies, which he as their Chief Commander and "Conqueror of their enemies had set up for the ho-"nour of the City and State. These things they "talked of together among themselves, as though "he did not understand or mind what they said, "but had been utterly bereft of his senses. But he "had listned all the while, and given good heed to "all the passages of their discourse, and speaking out "among them, said, that he wondered they should "commend and take notice of those things in him, "which were as much owing to fortune, as to any "thing else, and had happened to many other "Generals in former times as well as to him; and "that at the same time they should not speak of "that, which was the most excellent and greatest "thing of all; for, said he, there never was any of "all my fellow-citizens that ever put on mourning "upon my account." Here follows Plutarch's reflection (71). *To me it appears that this one thing of him*

(70) Amyot, in his translation of the *Life of Pericles*, p. 621, 622.

(71) Ibid. p. 622, 623.

too far: he carried the notion of the ſupreme goodneſs too high, and pretended that it can never hurt; ſo that he choſe rather to aſcribe evil to another cauſe. This will give us room to conſider one of his proofs of Herodotus's malice, and what has been anſwered to it

him did make that otherwiſe childiſh and arrogant title they gave him, in nick-naming him Olympius, that is, the Heavenly or the Godlike, to be without envy and truly becoming him, I mean his kind and courteous carriage, and a pure and untainted unblemiſhed converſation in the height of power and place; according to thoſe apprehenſions and notions we have of the Gods (72) *themſelves in their kind, whom upon this account that they are naturally authors of all good things, and are not the authors of any evil, we do think worthy to rule and govern the world. Not as the Poets rudely fancy, who confounding us with their fooliſh unmannerly conceits and opinions, are taken tardy in their own poems and fictitious ſtories, when they call the place indeed wherein they ſay the Gods make their abode, a ſecure and quiet ſeat, free from all hazards and commotions, not troubled with winds, nor darkned with clouds, but at all times alike ſhining round about with a ſoft ſerenity and a pure light, inaſmuch as ſuch a tempered ſtation is moſt agreeable and ſuitable for a bleſſed and immortal nature to live in; and yet in the mean while do affirm, that the Gods themſelves are full of trouble, enmity, anger, and other paſſions, which no way become even men that have any underſtanding.* All that Plutarch obſerves here againſt the Poets is very reaſonable and very judicious; but all the reſt is of a deceitful beauty; they are envenomed flowers, which conceal a ſnake, *Latet anguis in herba.* Some will perhaps imagine, that I mean there are ſome hints here of Epicurus's falſe doctrine concerning the tranquillity the Gods enjoy, free from hatred and anger. But this is not my meaning: it is not the poiſon of Epicurus, but that of Manicheiſm, which Plutarch preſents us with here. We have obſerved elſewhere (73), that he declared himſelf openly for the doctrine of the two principles. He hints the ſame again in this place by his reflection on Pericles's anſwer. He does not aſſert, like Epicurus, that God enjoys the tranquillity of an idle Being; he aſcribes action and providence to him, but it is only a kind providence, which beſtows favours, and happineſs. It is not a providence, which is ſometimes angry, which chaſtiſes and puniſhes, which loads mankind with miſeries. He does not approve that Pericles ſhould bear the ſirname of Olympius, that is to ſay, the Heavenly, the Godlike, becauſe his eloquence lightned, thundered, and whirled thunderbolts, but becauſe he never uſed his credit to revenge himſelf, and never made any family wear mourning. Plutarch's taſte was not very common; there are numberleſs perſons who acknowledge Jupiter's divine nature in thunder and lightning (74), much more than in his diſtributing of favours. The Religious Ceremonies of the Heathens were much more deſigned to avert the misfortunes which were dreaded from above, than to obtain the bleſſings that might be expected from thence. And yet there was a general notion which prevailed among men, which was, that there is nothing more agreeable to the divine nature than to do good. The epithet of *moſt good* went always before that of *moſt great* when Jupiter was commended. *Sed ipſe Jupiter, id eſt juvans pater, quem converſis caſibus appellamus à juvando Jovem, à Poëtis Pater Divum, hominumque dicitur; à Majoribus autem noſtris Optimus, Maximus, & quidem antè Optimus, id eſt beneficentiſſimus, quàm Maximus: quia majus eſt, certeque gratius prodeſſe omnibus, quàm opes magnas habere* (75). i. e. "But even Jupiter himſelf, that is, "the helping Father, whom in the oblique caſes we "call *Jove*, from *juvare*, to help and aſſiſt, is by "the Poets ſtyled the Father of the Gods and men; "but by our Anceſtors the moſt good, and moſt "great; and the moſt good, that is the kindeſt and "moſt benevolent, before the moſt great; becauſe "it is greater, and even more acceptable, to be uſe-"ful to all, than to enjoy great riches." Conſult the remark [G] of the article JUPITER. Plutarch relates, that King Amaſis having ſeveral queſtions to ſolve, in which the ſuperlative was required, I mean, the higheſt degree of things, as for inſtance, what is the moſt antient, the moſt great, the moſt wiſe, the moſt beautiful, the moſt common, the moſt uſeful, the moſt pernicious (76)? anſwered with regard to the two laſt articles, *God and the Devil*, or *Demon*. Τὶ ὠφελιμώτατον; θεός· Τὶ βλαβερώτατον: δαίμων. *What is there moſt uſeful? God. What moſt pernicious? The Devil or Demon* (77). We may obſerve by the by, that we have here the Doctrine of the two Principles, and even what the Chriſtians aſſert of the Devil, or evil Spirit. I cannot tell whether any perſon ever took notice of theſe words, or of this notion of the Δαίμων of the Antients. But to return. The Philoſopher Antipater defined God an happy and immortal animal good towards men (78). There were no men whom people were more inclined to deify than thoſe who had invented ſome uſeful things. *Perſæus ejuſdem Zenonis auditor, eos dicit eſſe habitos Deos, à quibus magna utilitas ad vitæ cultum eſſet inventa, ipſaſque res utiles & ſalutares Deorum eſſe vocabulis nuncupatas: ut ne hoc quidem diceret, illa inventa eſſe Deorum, ſed ipſa divina* (79). i. e. "Perſeus, the "ſame Zeno's Diſciple, ſaid, that they were held "Gods, who invented ſomething of great uſe in "civil life, and theſe uſeful things were called by "the names of the Gods; ſo that he did not only aſ-"ſert they were inventions of the Gods, but even "themſelves Divine." This was the way to a deification, if we may believe Pliny. *Deus eſt mortali juvare mortalem, & hæc ad æternam gloriam via. Hac proceres iere Romani: hac nunc cæleſti paſſu cum liberis ſuis vadit maximus omnis ævi rector Veſpaſianus Auguſtus, feſſis rebus ſubveniens. Hic eſt vetuſtiſſimus referendi bene merentibus gratiam mos, ut tales numinibus adſcribantur. Quippe & omnium aliorum nomina Deorum, & quæ ſupra retuli ſiderum, ex hominum nata ſunt meritis* (80). i. e. "It is Godlike for a mortal man to re-"lieve another; this is the way to an everlaſting "glory. In that way the great Rulers of the Ro-"mans walked; in that road walks now with his "children, the greateſt Prince who ever lived, Veſ-"paſianus Auguſtus, who retrieves the affairs of the "State. The moſt antient method of rewarding "thoſe who deſerve well of the publick, is to admit "them among the Gods. For all the other Gods, "and the Stars themſelves which are reckoned a-"mong them, as I have obſerved before, come ori-"ginally from the good which men have done to "their fellow creatures." Others, explaining this after a more reaſonable manner, aſſerted that the Gods inſpired men with the invention of the arts.

Κεῖνοι γὰρ τέχνας πολυκερδέας ἀνθρώποισι
Δῶκαν ἔχειν, ἠὲ πᾶσαν ἐπιφροσύνην ἐδίδαξαν.

i. e. *The Gods themſelves inſpired men with their uſeful arts, and taught them wiſdom* (81).

Laſtly, it was ſaid that the beſt method to imitate the Gods was by doing good (82), and that a man never came nearer the Divine Nature, than when he ſaved another's life. *Homines ad Deos nulla re proprius accedunt*, ſaid Tully to Cæſar towards the end of his Oration in Ligarius's defence, *quam ſalutem hominibus dando. Nihil habet nec fortuna tua majus, quàm ut poſſis, nec natura tua melius, quàm ut velis conſervare quamplurimos.* i. e. "Men are never more like the "Gods than when they preſerve the lives of o-"thers. There is nothing greater in your happi-"neſs than the power you have to ſave many, nor "is there any thing more praiſe-worthy in your cha-"racter than in the inclination you have to ſave "them." Here follows what the Scythians repreſented to Alexander. If you be a God, you ought to do good to men, and not to rob them of their property. *Si Deus es, tribuere mortalibus beneficia debes, non ſua eripere* (83). All theſe notions of the antient Heathens are agreeable to ſound Divinity. There are an hundred paſſages in Scripture, which teſtify that God is infinitely more inclined to uſe mercy than ſeverity. Add to this that noble paſſage from Gregory of Nazianzen, who tells us that a man becomes a God to his neighbour, when he relieves him. Γίνου τῷ ἀτυχοῦντι θεὸς τοῦ ἐλέου θεοῦ μιμησάμενος· ἐδὲν γὰρ

(72) Καθάπερ τὸ τῶν θεῶν γένος ἀξιοῦμεν, αἴτιον μὲν ἀγαθῶν, ἀναίτιον δὲ κακῶν πεφυκὸς, ἄρχειν καὶ βασιλεύειν τῶν ὄντων, οὐχ ὥσπερ οἱ ποιηταί. *Sicut dignam arbitramur deorum gentem, quæ per ſe eſt propitia, & nullius autor mali, ut rebus præſit & moderetur, non ut Poetæ.* Plut. *in Pericle*, p. 173, C.

(73) In the art. MANICHEANS, rem. [C]. See alſo the rem. [G] of the art. PAULICIANS.

(74) *Cælo tonantem credidimus Jovem regnare.* Horat. Od. 5. lib. 3. *i. e.*
"His thun-
"d'ring proves
"that mighty
"Jove
"With won-
"drous force
"rules all above.
Creech.
Namque Dieſpiter Igni coruſco nubila dividens, &c. Idem, Od. 34. lib. 1. *i. e.*
"For angry
"Jove——
"ſhot through
"the Heav'n
"with pointed
"flame.
Creech.

(75) Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*, lib. 2. cap. 25.

(76) Compare this with what is obſerved above in the text of the art. PAULICIANS, towards the end, and quotation (133).

(77) Plut. *in Septem Sapientum Convivio*, p. 153, *A.*

(78) Ζήνων μακάριον καὶ ἄφθαρτον καὶ συμπτικὸν ἀνθρώπων. Plut. *de Repug. Stoic.* p. 1051.

(79) Cicero, *de Natura Deor.* lib. 1. cap. 15. Virg. *Æn.* lib 6. ver. 663, places them only in the Ælifian fields.
Inventas aut qui vitam excoluere per artes
Quique ſui memores alios fecere merendo.
i. e. "And
"ſearching wits
"of more me-
"chanick parts,
"Who grac'd
"their age with
"new invented
"arts.
"Thoſe who
"to worth their
"bounty did
"extend,
"And thoſe
"who know
"that bounty to
"commend.
Dryden.

(80) Plin. lib. 2. cap. 7. p. m. 143, 144.

(81) Oppian. lib. 2.

(82) Strabo, lib. 10. p. m. 322. I tranſcribe his words hereunder, quotation (85).

(83) Q. Curtius, lib. 7. cap. 8. num. 26. See Freinſhemius, *ibid.* where he quotes ſeveral ſentences to the ſame purpoſe.

it. That proof is grounded on that Hiſtorian's aſcribing a jealous temper, and envious

γὰρ εἶτώς ὡς τὸ εὖ ποιεῖν, ἄνθρωπε· ἔχει θεός. *Be a God to the unfortunate, by imitating God's mercy; for there cannot be any thing more Divine in a man than to do good to others* (84).

(84) *Nazianz. Orat. de Amore Pauperum.*

Strabo has limited that thought within narrower bounds. He pretends that a happy life, that is to ſay, which is ſpent in holy-days, in being merry, in philoſophizing, and in ſinging, is a better imitation of the Divine Nature, than the beſtowing of favours is. His words deſerve to be tranſcribed. Εὖ μὲν γὰρ εἴρηται κ τοῦτο, τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τότε μάλιστα μιμεῖσθαι τοὺς θεούς, ὅταν εὐεργετῶσιν· ἄμεινον δ' ἂν λέγοι τὶς ὅταν εὐδαιμονῶσι· τοιοῦτον δὲ τὸ χαίρειν, κ τὸ εὐφραίνειν, κ τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν, κ μουσικῆς ἅπτεσθαι. *It has indeed been well obſerved, that men imitate the Gods beſt when they do good to others. But yet it were more reaſonable to ſay, that it is when they live happy, which conſiſts in being merry, in faſting, in philoſophizing, and in playing upon inſtruments, or in ſinging* (85).

(85) Strabo, lib. 10. p. 322.

I have read in Sir Francis Drake's travels, that the inhabitants of new Albion took the Engliſh for Gods, and paid divine honours to them, becauſe *having ſhewed their wounds to them, they received ſalve and plaiſters from them, by which they were ſoon cured.* The Spaniards, on the contrary, were taken for Gods in America, becauſe of the miſchief they did with their canons. Their ſhip was taken for a bird, which carried them down from heaven upon earth (86). This ſhews, that two oppoſite things are proper to make God known unto men; the one is the power he has to hurt, which power he exerts ſo ſeverely; the other is the goodneſs with which he diſperſes a thouſand favours among mankind. It might be propoſed as a queſtion, whether of theſe two things make him better known. Tacitus pretends, that the Gods are more inclined to puniſh men, than to ſuffer them to live quietly. *Nec enim unquam*, ſays he (87), *atrocioribus populi Romani cladibus magiſve juſtis judiciis approbatum eſt, non eſſe curæ Deis ſecuritatem noſtram, eſſe ultionem.* i. e. "Never did it appear more plainly by "the great misfortunes of the Romans, and the juſt "judgments againſt them, that the Gods do not mind "our ſecurity, but only take care to puniſh us." A Journaliſt aſſerts, that the effects of goodneſs, are more extenſive than the effects of wrath. Here follow his words. *Of all God's perfections, his* goodneſs *would appear moſt evidently, if men knew how to reflect. What an effect of Goodneſs is it, not to have ordered things ſo, that all the neceſſary actions of life be attended with pleaſure, and to have made us capable to receive pleaſure a thouſand different ways? It is to no purpoſe to ſay, that we are ſtill more liable to grief and pain, this is not true; and if it were, yet we ought not for all that to be unmindful of God's great goodneſs, ſince it is eaſy for us to perceive, that the pleaſures we enjoy, flow from the Laws of Nature which he eſtabliſhed himſelf, and that on the contrary, moſt of our vexations are owing to the ill uſe we make of our reaſon. But it is not true, that man in this world ſuffers more evil, than he enjoys good; it is our ungratefulneſs, our pride, and our unſatiable temper, which make us ſpeak thus*; falſo queritur de natura ſua genus humanum; mankind complains of his fate without reaſon, *was very juſtly obſerved by a celebrated Hiſtorian in his preface to the Jugurthine War. Mankind is more happy than it deſerves; and it is literally true, that man has a thouſand pleaſures, againſt one pain; except perhaps a few unfortunate ſouls, which an Heathen would aſſert, were framed at a time when the Deſtinies were out of humour* (88). Obſerve by the by, that the difference he takes notice of, and which he accounts for by the ill uſe we make of our liberty, would not be capable to ſatisfy a difficult adverſary; for he would urge, that man's making an ill uſe of his reaſon to vex himſelf without a cauſe, is a great misfortune, which muſt abſolutely be taken into the account of our afflictions, ſo that if we pretend to make a compariſon between the good and the evil which Providence beſtows on mankind, we muſt reckon the evils which are owing to the weakneſs of our reaſon, as well as diſtempers, hunger, cold, *&c.*

(86) See *La Motbe la Vayer, Diſcours de l'Hiſtoire.*

(87) Tacit. *Hiſt.* lib. 1. cap. 3.

(88) *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for Aug. 1684. art. 6. p. m. 603, 604.

(89) *Si numeres anno ſoles & nubila toto,*
Invenies nitidum ſæpius eſſe diem. Ovid. Triſt. lib. 5. Eleg. 8. ver. 3. See the rem. [F] of the art. XENOPHANES.

Ovid obſerves, that there are more fine days in the year, than dark and cloudy days (89); we may alſo aſſert, that the days in which man is in health, are more numerous than thoſe in which he is out of order. But there is perhaps alſo as much evil in a fortnight's diſtemper, as there is good in fifteen months of good health: for a good is ſuch only, as much as it is perceived; now men do not much feel their own health, when they enjoy it without interruption. But take notice, that I conſider health here, only as ſeparated from the other pleaſures which it ſuffers us to enjoy. The Journaliſt I have mentioned, might have quoted a beautiful paſſage from Cicero, in which, after an accurate enumeration of the benefits which the plants and animals procure to men, he obſerves, that one would think Providence laboured to afford pleaſures to mankind, as though ſhe had been an Epicurean. *Ex quibus tanta percipitur voluptas, ut interdum Pronæa noſtra Epicurea fuiſſe videatur* (90). However it be, man is more inclined to acknowledge the character of the Divine Nature in the effects of goodneſs, than in the diſpenſation of puniſhments and misfortunes. The ſervices, which eminent men did their own country, have been looked upon as particular favours of Providence. *Multos præterea & noſtra civitas & Græcia tulit ſingulares viros, quorum neminem niſi juvante Deo talem fuiſſe credendum eſt . . . . nemo igitur vir magnus ſine aliquo afflatu divino unquam fuit* (91). i. e. "There have alſo "been moſt eminent men both in our Commonwealth "and in Greece, and we muſt believe that none of "them were ſuch, without God's aſſiſtance . . . ne"ver therefore was any man great, but by ſome "divine inſpiration." And Seneca aſſerts in general, that no man is virtuous or great, but by the aſſiſtance of Heaven. *Bonus vir ſine Deo nemo eſt. An poteſt aliquis ſupra fortunam, niſi ab illo adjutus, exſurgere? ille dat conſilia magnifica, & erecta. In unoquoque virorum bonorum,* (Quis Deus incertum eſt) habitat Deus. . . *Si hominem videris interritum periculis, intactum cupiditatibus, inter adverſa felicem, in mediis tempeſtatibus placidum, ex ſuperiore loco homines videntem, ex æquo deos: non ſubibit te veneratio ejus? non dices: iſta res major eſt altiorque, quàm ut credi ſimilis huic, in quo eſt, corpuſculo poſſit? Vis iſtuc divina deſcendit: animum excellentem, moderatum, omnia tanquam minora tranſeuntem, quicquid timemus optamuſque ridentem, cœleſtis potentia agitat. Non poteſt res tanta ſine adminiculo Numinis ſtare. Itaque majore ſui parte illic eſt unde deſcendit* (92). i. e. "No man can be good, without the aſ"ſiſtance of God. For is it poſſible for any one to "raiſe himſelf above the accidents of this life, un"leſs he be ſupported by him. He alone inſpires "noble and bold deſigns. In every good man *dwells* "*a God*; (but which God, is unknown) . . . . When "you behold a man undaunted in the greateſt dan"gers, unmoved by the paſſions, eaſy even in adver"ſity, unconcerned in the midſt of violent ſtorms, "looking down on men as it were from an exalted "place; and in a manner on a level with the Gods, "can you forbear revering him? Will you not ſay, "that which dwells in him is too great, too noble to "be thought of the ſame nature with the body. "Some Divine influence came down into it; a ce"leſtial power animates that excellent and moderate "mind, which overlooks every thing below as mean "and contemptible, and laughs at all we fear or deſire. "There could never be ſo great a ſoul, without "God's aſſiſtance. It muſt therefore by the greateſt "part of itſelf be there, from whence it came "down." As to evils, men uſed a thouſand ſhifts rather than charge the Gods with them: they imagined a fantaſtical Being, which they called fortune, and to which they aſcribed their misfortunes. They repreſented to themſelves I know not what Beings naturally miſchievous: and here we ſee Plutarch who declares that the Gods can do nothing but good. In another place he ridicules Chryſippus for aſcribing evil to the negligence and to the wickedneſs of the genius's, to whom Jupiter left the government of ſome things. Τὸ δὲ φαύλους δαίμονας ἐκ προνοίας ἐπὶ τὰς τοιαύτας ἐπιστασίας καθίσασθαι πῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἔγκλημα τῷ θεῷ, καθάπερ βασιλέως κακοῖς κ ἐμπλήκτοις σατράπαις κ ζηλήτοις δεικήτας ἐπιτρέποντος, κ πικροῖς; ὑπὸ τούτων ἀμελημένους κ παροινουμένους τοὺς ἀρίστους; κ μὴν εἰ πολὺ τὸ τῆς ἀνάγκης μίμικλαι τοῖς

(90) Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*, lib. 2. cap. 64. Compare together what David obſerves in Pſalm 8, concerning God's goodneſs in making the animals ſubſervient to the happineſs of mankind, and what Seneca aſſerts, *de Benefic.* lib. 4. cap. 5, 6, and 7. *uſque in delicias amamur.* i. e. "We are "beloved (by "the Gods) as "their dar"lings." I quote this more at length in the rem. [F] of the art. XENOPHANES.

(91) Cicero, ib. cap. 66.

(92) Seneca, Epiſt. 51. p. m. 236. See alſo Epiſt. 73. p. 305.

vious Spirit to the Divine Nature [*L*]. Valerius Maximus had committed a miſtake, which

τοῖς πράγμασιν, ὅτι κραῖῖ πάντων ὁ Θεὸς, ὅτι πάντα κατὰ τὸν ἐκείνου λόγον διοικεῖται. *But why ſhould not Jupiter be to blame for appointing bad genius's to perform theſe offices, ſince he acts like a King, who ſhould appoint bad and wicked Governors over his Provinces, and ſuffer the beſt men to be deſpiſed and ill uſed by them? But if a great many things be ſubject to fate, it follows that Jupiter's power does not extend to all, and that all things are not governed by his wiſdom* (93). In another place he charges an Hiſtorian (94) with a malicious impiety, for making Solon ſay, *Muſt you aſk me whether man be happy or not, me, I ſay, who know that the Gods are envious and turbulent?* Τοῖς δὲ Θεοῖς λοιδορουμένῳ ἐν τῷ Σόλωνι προσωπείῳ ταῦτα εἴρηκεν, ὦ Κροῖσε, ἐπισάμενόν με τὸ Θεῖον πᾶν ἐὸν φθονερόν τε καὶ ταραχῶδες ἐπαιφωτᾶς ἀνθρωπηίων περὶ πραγμάτων, ἃ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐφρόνεε περὶ τῶν Θεῶν, τῷ Σόλωνι προσῤῥιβόμενος, κακοήθειαν τῇ βλασφημίᾳ προσλίθησι. *Speaking evil of the Gods, under the character of Solon, ſince I knew, Cræſus, ſays he, that all the Gods are envious and tumultuous, why do you aſk me queſtions about human affairs? Thus he aſcribes his own opinion concerning the Gods to Solon, adding malice to his impiety or blaſphemy* (95). I am ſure he would have laughed at the mitigating gloſs of the antient Etrurian Prieſts. They gave Jupiter two kinds of thunderbolts, the one favourable, the other fatal, and they aſſerted that he never flung the latter but by the advice of the other Gods; but he uſed to dart the former of his own accord, without any one's advice. Plutarch would not be ſatisfied with this: he did not think that a goodneſs, ſuch as that of kind Princes, was ſufficient for God. Kind Princes take a delight in beſtowing favours themſelves, but they give their Miniſters the commiſſion to chaſtiſe. They make haſte to reward, but they are ſlow when they muſt puniſh (96); they do good with pleaſure, and harm with reluctancy. This is being like a father; but, once more, Plutarch would not have liked that gloſs of the Tuſcans, he would perhaps have ſaid of their Jupiter, what others obſerved of an Emperor (97), who very much perſecuted the Chriſtians, but would not begin the perſecution, without the advice of his Counſellors. *Placuit ergo amicorum ſententiam experiri. Nam erat hujus malitiæ. Cùm bonum quid facere decreviſſet, ſine conſilio faciebat, ut ipſe laudaretur. Cùm autem malum, quoniam id reprehendendum ſciebat, in conſilium multos advocabat, ut aliorum culpæ adſcriberetur quidquid ipſe deliquerat* (98). *i. e.* "He reſolved therefore to aſk the advice of his "friends. For ſuch was his wickedneſs, that when "he deſigned to do any good, he did it without con"ſulting any man, that he might have all the glory "of it to himſelf, but when he intended to do "ſome ill, knowing that it would be cenſured, he "called many perſons together to conſult them, that "others might be blamed, for what he himſelf had "done amiſs." This is the craft and artifice of an old Politician. I refer it to the judgment of Pope Pius IV. When he was preſſed to decide the diſpute about precedency between the moſt Chriſtian King's Embaſſadors, and thoſe of his Catholick Majeſty, he uſed evaſions and delays, and adviſed them at laſt to ſubmit to the determination of the ſacred College. He would not expoſe himſelf alone to the bad conſequences of the determination; he would even ſay with a joke, that he only followed Jupiter's example. *Ad extremum utrique occultè ſuadere ut ad ſacram Cardinalium Collegium cauſam integram remitterent: interea à publicis in Pontificio ſacello cæremoniis abſtinerent. Ratus eâ ratione ob diverſa Cardinalium ſtudia producendum infinitè judicium, ſe certè à ferendæ ſententiæ neceſſitate, atque adeò ab invidiâ ſubtrahendum. Nempe imitandum Principi Jovem facetè dicebat: qui (ut eſt vetus Etruſcorum diſciplinæ commentum) ex duplici fulminum genere, proſperum ipſe per ſe, at infauſtum adhibito Deorum conſilio contorquere ſolitus ſit* (99).

Thus then did the mind of man, which is too ſhallow to comprehend how the miſeries and crimes, which overflow the whole earth, can be reconciled with the notion of a Being infinitely good, run into the hypotheſis of the two principles. And that is what I had to ſay concerning Plutarch's obſervation.

I muſt add a word or two more. The Greek proverb (100), *I hold for a God every thing that maintains me*, miſleads men more than we are aware of. See the anſwer that was made to Philip de Comines (101), and that of a Chirurgeon to a Monk of St. Denys. "It is certain, that the pox was not known in "France, before the time of Charles VIII. the "greateſt part of that Prince's army died of it; be"cauſe the diſtemper being not yet known, it was "impoſſible to find remedies to cure it, which ſhews "it was not the leproſy. Neceſſity made men at laſt "find out a cure, by which a great many Chirurge"ons grew rich; one of whom being very grateful "for that happineſs, went one day to St. Denys, "and fell on his knees before Charles the Eighth's "ſtatue, to give him thanks. But a Monk telling "him he was miſtaken, and that it was not the "image of a Saint; hold your tongue, anſwered "he, I know very well what I am about, he is a "great Saint to me, ſince he made me get thirty "thouſand livres a year; it is therefore but juſt, "that I ſhall thank him for it (102)." The Author of the *Moyen de parvenir* does not ſuppoſe the ſum was ſo large, and he names the Chirurgeon. Here follow his words. *You put me mind of that Monk of St. Denys in France, who pretended to ſhew his learning, when he ſaw Maſter Thierry de Hiery on his knees before Charles the Eighth's ſtatue. Friend, ſaid the Monk to him, you are miſtaken, the image before which you are praying, is not that of a Saint. I know it very well, ſaid he, I am not ſuch a blockhead as you are, I know it is the figure of Charles* VIII. *for whoſe ſoul I pray, becauſe he brought the pox into France, which made me get ſix or ſeven thouſand livres a year* (103.) We muſt not cloſe this remark without quoting Virgil. He was very much inclined to deify his benefactors: his lands having been ſpared by a particular favour of Octavius, he ſtyled him a God.

O Melibœe Deus nobis hæc otia fecit:
Namque erit ille mihi ſemper Deus: illius aram
Sæpè tener noſtris ab ovilibus imbuet agnus (104).

"Theſe bleſſings, friend, a Deity beſtow'd:
"For never can I deem him leſs than God.
"The tender firſtlings of my woolly breed
"Shall on his holy altar often bleed. *Dryden.*

Honeſt Mathurin Cordier (105), by a pious fraud which is very pardonable, made his little ſchool-boys believe, that there was a great deal of devotion in theſe lines: he tranſlated them into French verſe, which begins thus:

Melibée ce bien vous vient d'un Dieu ſeul ſage.

"Theſe bleſſings a wiſe Deity beſtow'd.

This was not Virgil's meaning; he ſpeaks only of Auguſtus (106).

[*L*] *One of his proofs of Herodotus's wickedneſs, and what has been anſwered to it. That proof is grounded on that Hiſtorian's aſcribing a jealous temper . . . to the Divine Nature.*] See Plutarch's words, which I have tranſcribed above (107). I wonder he mentioned only Solon's anſwer to King Cræſus, and that he did not hint at leaſt, that many ſuch paſſages were to be met with in Herodotus. This would have ſtrengthened his charge againſt him, by giving the Reader to underſtand, that one could not juſtify that Hiſtorian, by urging that this little ſatyrical ſtroke againſt the Gods dropt unawares from his pen; it would have ſhewed that a man, who makes often the ſame reflection, muſt be deeply affected with the poiſon concealed under it, and be deſirous to ſpread it, and to infect his Readers with it. It is certain, that Herodotus has very often repeated the ſame maxim, which he makes Solon utter. See above (108) what he made Artabanus ſpeak; here follows what he ſuppoſes a King of Egypt wrote to Polycrates, Tyrant of Samos. *I hear with pleaſure, that a man, who is my friend, is happy. But I do not like your great proſperity, for I know how envious the Deity is.*

(93) Plut. *de Stoic. Repugn.* p. 1051. *D.*

(94) Herodotus.

(95) Plut. *de Malign. Herodoti*, p. 857, 858.

(99) *Sed piger ad pœnas princeps ad præmia velox, Quique dolet quoties cogitur eſſe ferox.* Ovid. *de Ponto*, lib. 1. Eleg. 2. ver. 123.

(97) Dioclefian.

(98) Lactantius, *de Mortibus Perſecutorum*, cap. 11. p. 99, 100, of Monſieur Bauldri's beautiful edit. See his notes, and thoſe of Columbus, ib. part 2. p. 287.

(99) Famianus Strada, Dec. 1. lib. 1. p. m. 175. See Seneca, *Nat. Quæſt.* lib. 2. cap. 41 & *ſeq.* Compare with this what has been obſerved above, quotation (96), and (97) of the article NESTORIUS.

(100) Τὸ γὰρ τρέφον με τοῦτ' ἐγὼ κρίνω Θεόν.

(101) See the art. GREGORY I. quotat. (54).

(102) Furetierana, p. 113, of the Dutch edit.

(103) *Moyen de parvenir*, p. m. 578, 579.

(104) Virgil. *Eclog.* 1. ver. 6.

(105) See his *Colloquies.*

(106) Compare the 19th line. *Sed tamen ille Deus qui ſit, da, Tityre, nobis.* "But tell me, "Tytirus, what "heavenly "power, "Preſerved your "fortunes in "that fatal "hour;" with line 43, &c. *Hic illum vidi juvenem, Melibœe, quotannis Bis ſenos cui noſtra dies altaria fumant. Hic mihi reſponſum primus dedit ille petenti: Paſcite, ut ante, boves, pueri, ſubmittite tauros.* "There firſt "the youth of "heavenly birth "I view'd, "For whom "our monthly "victims are re"new'd. "He heard my "voice, and "graciouſly de"creed, "My grounds "to be reſtor'd, "my flocks to "feed." *Dryden.*

(107) Quotat. (95).

(108) Quotation (7), of the art. ARTABANUS the ſon of Hyſtaſpes.

Ἐμοὶ αἱ σαὶ μεγάλαι εὐτυχίαι ἐκ ἀρέσκουσι, τὸ Θεῖον ἐπισταμένῳ ὡς ἔστι φθονερόν. *Tuæ magnæ proſperitates mihi non placent, qui intelligo,* QUAM INVIDUM NUMEN SIT (109). Henry Stephens, who vindicates that Hiſtorian as well as he can, with regard to ſeveral other imputations, does not ſpend his time in refuting Plutarch with regard to this charge. I have not found that he gives us any hint of his being acquainted with it. He has carefully collected together ſeveral maxims and obſervations of Herodotus, which may prove that he was piouſly orthodox with regard to providence; he even reckons among thoſe proofs a paſſage from the ſeventh book, in which Artabanus inſiſts very much upon the envious temper of the Gods. Artabanus repreſents the Deity as hurling his thunder-bolt only on great bodies (110): for, adds he, God takes a delight in depreſſing whatever is eminent. Φιλέει γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ ὑπερέχοντα πάντα κολούειν. *Gaudet enim Deus eminentiſſima quæque deprimere* (111). Hence it comes that a great army is beaten by a ſmall one, when God being envious (112) ſtrikes the ſoldiers with terror, or caſts his bolts about. Thus ſome have been brought to greater misfortunes than were conſiſtent with their dignity, becauſe God ſuffers none beſides him to have a greater opinion of themſelves. Διὶ ὧν ἰσφάλησαν ἀναξίως ἑωυτῶν· ὑπὲρ γὰρ ἐᾷ φρονέειν ἄλλον μέγα ὁ Θεὸς ἢ ἑωυτόν. *Propterea quidem ſecus ac dignitas ſua poſtulabat in calamitatem inciderant; quia Deus neminem alium quam ſeipſum ſinit magnifice de ſe ſentire* (113). This is one of the inſtances which Henry Stephens gives us of Herodotus's piety; a piety, ſays he, as great as it could be in a man, who was deſtitute of the light of the Goſpel. He pretends even that Herodotus's opinion of God's power and providence is the ſame which Chriſtians ought to hold; he aſſerts that it is impoſſible to ſay any thing more divine than what that Hiſtorian obſerved (114). *Multæ ſententiæ ſive γνῶμαι tum quas aliis locis adhibuit, tum quas narrationibus vel præfixit, vel tanquam Corollaria adjunxit, tanta illum pietate præditum fuiſſe teſtantur, quanta in hominem Chriſtianæ Religionis ignarum cadere poteſt: imo vero ea de divina potentia providentiaque ſenſiſſe, quæ Chriſtianum ſentire et deceat et oporteat. Hujuſmodi ſunt hæc in Thalia:* SED *profecto . . . Conſideremus et hæc in Polymnia* VIDEN *ut Deus* (115) . . *quid, obſecro, de divina potentia divinius iſtis dici potuit?* He quotes afterwards four Greek lines (116), which are to the ſame purpoſe with ſome of Horace (117), which he alſo quotes, and which ſignify that God can make the higheſt things the loweſt, humble the great, and exalt the mean: whence he infers that the commendations, which are beſtowed on that ſentence, are very well grounded; but that Herodotus goes farther ſtill, & *meritò quidem certè illam veteris Poëtæ ſententiam laudibus extollunt: ſed quanto tamen ulterius progreditur hic noſter hiſtoricus?* I cannot conceive what miſt Henry Stephens had before his eyes, which made him miſtake things a little. He ſees only their fair ſide, and takes no manner of notice of the moſt viſible defect. He is enchanted with the grand notion Herodotus gives of God's power, and does not perceive that a power can be but odious and defective, when it is directed by a jealouſy of another's happineſs. Herein lyes the ſtreſs of Plutarch's objection.

Camerarius, who attempted to vindicate Herodotus, before Henry Stephens undertook it, knew very well wherein the difficulty lay: but he found no other way to ſolve it but by evading it, and by ſtyling the chief point of the difficulty a mere cavil. *Nam quòd exagitat* (Plutarchus) *præclaram ſententiam de inſtabili & incerta fortuna rerum humanarum, quam Herodotus * Soloni attribuerit (cui quidem ſimiles & alibi leguntur) nimiæ ſapientiæ & pietati hominis concedatur: qui veritus ſit, ne ſi ita de Deo loquamur, ut humanus intellectus quæ dicuntur percipere poſſit, parum pii eſſe videamur. Cur ergo Deo oculos, manus, pedes, aures attribuimus? cur dicimus Deum iraſci? cur ulciſci? etiam vereri profectò, tentare, pœnitere, lætari, dolere.* πόῤῥω γὰρ λύπης καὶ χαρᾶς ἴδρυται τὸ Θεῖον: *ſine quibus illa ne intelligi quidem poſſunt. Quid Xenophon? (quo nemo fuit numinis colentior, nemo obſervantior, nemo impietatis erga Deum acrior hoſtis) nonne eandem ſententiam ponere non dubitavit in præclaro illo opere ſuo hiſtoriæ rerum Græcarum? Sic enim aut* †, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς δὴ, ὡς ἔοικε, πολλάκις χαίρει τοὺς μὲν μικροὺς μεγάλους ποιῶν, τοὺς δὲ μεγάλους μικρούς. *Hæc igitur ſacrilega eſt in Herodoto ſententia, quia ſecundum hominum intelligentiam* φθονερὸν *dixit eſſe* τὸ Θεῖον. *Sed hæc quàm ſint futilia quis non videt* (118)? i. e. "For Plutarch's cenſure of that noble ſentence "concerning the uncertain and changeable condition "of human affairs, which Herodotus aſcribes to Solon, "(though we meet with many ſuch ſentences in o-"ther Authors) that cenſure, I ſay, may be over-"looked, conſidering the man's great wiſdom "and his piety: for he feared leſt we ſhould ſeem "diſreſpectful towards God, if we ſpoke of him ſo "as to be underſtood by the mind of man. But "why then do we aſcribe eyes, hands, feet, and ears, "to God? Why do we ſay, that God is angry, and "that he revenges himſelf? or why indeed, that he "fears, that he tempts, that he repents, that he re-"joices, that he is ſorry? Why ſhould we ſay that "*the Divine Nature is not ſubject to grief nor to joy,* "without which the reſt cannot be underſtood? But "what ſays Xenophon? (than whom no man ever "revered and worſhipped the Deity more; nor was "a greater enemy of impiety.) Did he ſcruple in the "leaſt to aſſert the ſame opinion in his moſt noble "Hiſtory of Greece? For he ſpeaks thus: *God, it "ſeems, delights often, in raiſing them that are low, "and in humbling them that are high.* Is it therefore "a blaſphemous opinion in Herodotus to aſſert, that "according to human reaſon the *Deity is envious?* "But who does not ſee that theſe are mere cavils?" It is plain that Camerarius miſleads us here, for Herodotus was not cenſured for aſſerting that the condition of human things is very changeable; but he was blamed for maintaining that God's jealous temper is the cauſe of that inſtability; and in order to make men ſenſible of the inſtability of fortune, it is by no means neceſſary to urge a notion which repreſents the Deity as a Being, who envies men's happineſs. But farther; there is a very great difference between the things which other Authors, and even the Holy Scripture aſcribe to God, and the jealouſy, which Herodotus imputes to him. Eyes, hands, anger, repentance, joy, fear, may ſerve as ſo many images to repreſent to the people the conduct of providence; for we do not look upon theſe things as weakneſſes inconſiſtent with the character of an honeſt man, and of an excellent Prince. To be jealous of one's glory, not to ſuffer it to be uſurped, does not paſs for a fault among men; it is even thought to be a qualification becoming great Kings and Hero's: wherefore the Scripture does not ſcruple to aſcribe ſuch a jealouſy to God. But to be jealous of another's happineſs, to ruin men becauſe their proſperity makes us feel the ſtings of envy, is one of the moſt ſhameful qualities that can be conceived: the meaneſt handicrafts men could not bear to be charged with it. Few perſons can avoid that diſtemper, but none dare to confeſs they labour under it. We will indeed own moſt publickly that a noble emulation to equal or excel alone the merit and glory of great men animates us to honourable undertakings, but not that the jealouſy we entertain of a neighbour's proſperity engages us to promote his ruin. Camerarius does not therefore deſerve much to be excuſed for making uſe of the compariſons he urges. Xenophon's expreſſions are not much to the purpoſe, when quoted to vindicate Herodotus. For if they ſignify that God takes often a delight in turning things topſy-turvy, by bringing the great down to the condition of the little ones, and by raiſing the little ones to the condition of the great, if they ſignify, I ſay, that God does this for a diverſion and a paſtime, almoſt as Princes divert themſelves on the one hand, by having large animals killed in a bull-baiting, and on the other, by loading a lap-dog with kindneſs, they are as impious as Herodotus's expreſſions. This therefore would be juſtifying one impiety by another. But there is no neceſſity to take Xenophon's words in that ſenſe. They may be underſtood in a very reaſonable ſenſe, if we ſuppoſe that he meant, God delights in that frequent viciſſitude of conditions, becauſe his title of Judge and Father of mankind requires it of him (119). The great make an ill uſe of their power; their downfall muſt therefore be a leſſon to others; it muſt alſo prevent the evil they would have done, and comfort thoſe whom they oppreſſed. And ſince the condition of men is ſuch, that it is impoſſible they ſhould all be in the higheſt poſts at the ſame time, the dignities muſt circulate, and the common Father of mankind muſt diſpoſe

(109) Herodot. lib. 3. cap. 40. p. m. 178.

(110) Ibidem.

(111) Idem, lib. 7. cap. 10. p. 388. Valeſius, *in Ammian. Marcell.* lib. 14. cap. 12. p. 59. quotes this as though it were extracted from the 6th book of Herodot.

(112) Ἐπειάν σφι ὁ Θεὸς εθουνήσας. *Quoties Deus iis quibus invidet.* Ibid.

(113) Ibidem.

(114) Henr. Stephanus, *in Apologia pro Herodoto*, præfixa Editioni Latinæ Herodoti, Francof. 1595, in 8vo. p. 24, 25.

(115) He tranſcribes here what I have quoted from the 7th book of Herodot. chap. 10.

(116) From Heſiod.

(117) *Valet ima ſummis*
Mutare & inſignem attenuat
Deus,
Obſcura promens.
Horat. Od. 34. lib. 1.

* Clione, cap. 32.

† Hellenican. lib. 5.

(118) Joach. Camerarius, *Proœmio in Herodot.* p. 5. edit. Genev. 1618, in fol.

(119) Compare this with the remark [F] of the art. LUCRETIUS.

which muſt not be paſt unobſerved, and which will afford us an opportunity to ſet down here

poſe of them now in favour of ſome, and then in favour of others. The little ones muſt be raiſed in their turn, as the great ones muſt in their turn be depreſſed. Thus Xenophon intended probably to repreſent the matter; and not only to hint the idea of God's ſupreme authority over men's fortunes and conditions. It would not become the infinitely perfect Being to pull down the great ones, and to raiſe the little ones with no other deſign but to ſhew his power. There is no Prince but would be blamed, if only out of pride, and to exert his power, he applied himſelf to level mountains, to fill up valleys, to drain marſhes, and to overflow in other places ſandy plains. Publick utility muſt be the ſcope of ſuch undertakings, otherwiſe they are nothing but a vain oſtentation, and a tyrannical luxury: they are only a ſubject of offence, and of well grounded complaints. Read theſe words of Salluſt. *Nam quid ea memorem, quæ niſi iis, qui videre, nemini credibilia ſunt, à privatis compluribus ſubverſos montes, maria conſtructa eſſe? Quibus mihi ludibrio videntur fuiſſe divitiæ, quippe quas honeſte habere licebat, per turpitudinem abuti properabant* (120). i. e. "For why ſhould I mention thoſe things, "which non can believe, but they who were eye-"witneſſes to them? Namely, that many private "perſons have levelled mountains, and formed new "ſeas. In my opinion, they made only a ſport of "their riches, which though they may be honeſtly "enjoyed, yet they waſted them away as faſt as they "could." Read alſo theſe words of Suetonius concerning the Emperor Caligula. *In exſtructionibus prætoriorum atque villarum omni ratione poſthabita, nihil tam efficere concupiſcebat quam quod poſſe effici negaretur. Et jactæ itaque moles infeſto ac profundo mari, exciſæ rupes duriſſimi ſilicis, & campi montibus aggere æquati, & complanata foſſuris montium juga, incredibili quidem celeritate, cum moræ culpa capite lueretur* (121). i. e. "In the building of palaces and country-ſeats, he "had not the leaſt regard for reaſon, but wiſhed no-"thing more than to effect what was thought im-"practicable. High Fabricks were caſt into the "deep and raging ſea; rocks as hard as the hardeſt "flints were cut down; mountains made level with "the plains, and high hills built up in the fields; "all with an incredible ſpeed, for it was death not "to finiſh the work out of hand." And to add a modern inſtance to thoſe of antiquity, read the following paſſage, which relates to Monſieur Fouquet: *Fouquetus . . . . . Lucullianis ſumptibus naturam poſſeſſor domuit, & contumaciam ſitus repugnantem in delicias ſuas manſueſcere coegit nullo læſo, niſi ſe & arca Regia* (122). i. e. "Fouquet being immenſely rich, forced "nature herſelf at an expence, which Lucullus could "hardly have bore, and the ſituation of the place "not anſwering his deſign, he brought it to ſubmit "to his pleaſure, to no man's injury but his own, "and that of the King's Exchequer." I do not queſtion but Xenophon gave an orthodox ſenſe to the maxim he ſet down. He had made ſo good an uſe of his Profeſſor's (123) Lectures, that he was not capable to aſſert, that if God takes a delight in raiſing the little ones, and pulling down the great, it is only to divert himſelf, or to make a ſhew of his power. He believed, no doubt, that God did it only for the publick good of mankind, and conſequently Camerarius quoted him very impertinently in behalf of Herodotus, who was cenſured for charging God with a jealous temper, which was, according to him, the cauſe of the overturning of men's fortunes. Obſerve that it is no matter for the earth or for the rocks, whether they be in a vale, or in an elevated place: they are inſenſible bodies, all kinds of ſituations are equally good or indifferent to them. Water is neither more nor leſs happy, when it runs down in the channel of a river, than when it is made to ſpout out of a tube as high as the Sky. But the ruin of a King, the downfall of a Prime Miniſter, and ſuch other overthrowings of men's fortunes, overwhelm a very great number of perſons with grief. It would therefore be a leſs diſorder, to turn ſome parts of the earth topſy-turvy, only with a deſign to gratify one's fancy, or to make a ſhew of one's riches, than to ruin the great and mighty, with no other view than to divert one's ſelf, or to exert one's power. Whence you may infer that all they, who think judiciouſly, underſtand Xenophon's maxim in the ſenſe I have put upon it. They believe, no doubt, that the downfall of great men is an act of juſtice, in which the misfortune of ſome private perſons is balanced by the greater good which accrues to the publick.

The turn, which Valeſius gave to his vindication of Herodotus, is a little more ingenious than that of the other Apologiſts. See his Commentary on a paſſage, wherein Ammianus Marcellinus gives us the character of the Goddeſs Nemeſis. This Hiſtorian having mentioned the tragical end of ſome noted criminals, continues thus. *Hæc & hujuſmodi quædam innumerabilia ultrix facinorum impiorum, bonorumque præmiatrix aliquoties operatur Adraſtia (atque utinam ſemper) quam vocabulo duplici etiam Nemeſim appellamus. . . Hæc ut regina cauſarum, & arbitra rerum ac diſceptatrix, urnam ſortium temperat, accidentium vices alternans; voluntatumque noſtrarum exorſa interdum alio, quàm quò contendebant, exitu terminans, multiplices actus permutando convolvit. Eademque neceſſitatis inſolubili retinaculo mortalitatis vinciens faſtus tumentes incaſſum, & incrementorum detrimentorumque momenta verſans, ut novit, nunc erectas montium cervices opprimit & enervat; nunc bonos ab imo ſuſcitans, ad bene vivendum extollit* (124). i. e. "Theſe, and many ſuch other things, "does Adraſtia, who puniſhes the wicked, and re-"wards the good, ſometimes perform (would ſhe did "it always!) we call her alſo Nemeſis. . . . She, "as the Queen and Sovereign Judge and Diſpenſer "of all things, manages the urn of fate, making "men's fortunes to ebb and flow among them: "ſometimes ſhe directs the determination of our "will otherwiſe than we deſigned, and thus ſhe "brings many things ſucceſſively to paſs. She holds "alſo in her hand the undiſſolvible chain of neceſſity, "with which ſhe keeps under the vainly ſwelling "pride of mortal men, directing their happineſs, or "their miſery, according to her will and pleaſure, "now depreſſing and pulling down the exalted minds, "now raiſing the good from a low condition, and "encouraging them to the practice of virtue." You ſee here, that he ſuppoſes this Goddeſs preſides over the viciſſitudes of exaltation and humiliation, which are obſerved in the courſe of human affairs, and that it is ſhe who directs that game at ſee-ſaw, which I have mentioned ſomewhere (125), with regard to an anſwer of Æſop, which is much like Xenophon's maxim; but let us not forget to obſerve, that he ſuppoſes alſo, ſhe diſpenſes that alternate ſucceſſion with the utmoſt equity (126). Valeſius obſerves, 1. That ſhe is called Nemeſis, becauſe ſhe gives every one his due. 2. That Plato, in the 4th book of his Republic, ſtyles her the *Meſſenger* of Juſtice. 3. That Dio Chryſoſtomus, in his 64th oration, obſerves that Fortune, being conſidered as equitable, was called *Nemeſis*. Τὸ θεῖον τὸ ἴσον αὐτῆς Νέμεσις. *Æquitas ejus* (Fortunæ) *Nemeſis dicta eſt*. 4. That the antients aſcribed to God a certain power, which humbled the proud, and ruined all that was exalted. 5. That that power was called, either *Envy* Φθόνος, or *Indignation* Νέμεσις. 6. That there is a great affinity between Indignation or *Nemeſis*, and Envy, and that in the 2d book of Ariſtotle's Ethicks, *Nemeſis*, Indignation, is put between Envy, and the Vice which makes one rejoice at another's misfortune (127). 7. That this was the reaſon why Herodotus made Solon ſay, that all the Deities are envious, and Artabanus, that God is envious. *Artabanus apud eundem Herodotum in lib. 7. iiſdem verbis alloquitur Xerxem: ὁ δὲ θεὸς γλυκὺν γεύσας τὸν αἰῶνα, φθονερὸς ἐν ἀυτῷ ἰδρίσκεται ἐών.* At Deus qui ſuavi perfruitur ævo, invidus ipſe eſſe deprehenditur. *Quæ quidem Herodoti verba immeritò reprehendit Plutarchus* (128). 8. That Plutarch cenſured theſe words of Herodotus, without any reaſon (129); for if *Nemeſis (Indignation)* be aſcribed to God, why ſhould not *Envy* be alſo aſcribed to him? One of theſe vices is not meaner than the other among men: but when ſuch things are ſaid of God, they are ſuppoſed to be free from all defects, and one muſt put a favourable conſtruction upon them: otherwiſe, Plutarch himſelf would be proved guilty of the ſame

(120) Salluſt. *de Bello Catilin.* p. m. 28. See alſo p. 53. *in Catiline's Oration. Quis mortalium, cui virile ingenium eſt, tolerare poteſt illis divitias ſuperare, quas profundant in exſtruendo mari, & montibus coæquandis, nobis rem familiarem etiam ad neceſſaria deeſſe?* i. e. "Who, that "has a manly "heart, could "bear, that "they ſhould ſo "abound with "riches, as to "waſte them "away by build-"ing in the "very ſea, and "by levelling "mountains to "the ground, "whilſt we "want even the "neceſſaries of "life."

(121) Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 37.

(122) Priolus, *de Rebus Gallicis*, lib. 9. cap. 2. p. m. 320, 321.

(123) Who was *Socrates.*

(124) Amm. Marcellin. lib. 14. cap. 11. p. m. 59, 60.

(125) Above, rem. [I] of the art. of the 1ſt ÆSOP.

(126) *Jus quoddam ſublime numinis efficacis . . . ſubſtantialis tutela . . . quam Theologi veteres fingentes juſtitiæ filiam ex abdita quadam æternitate tradunt omnia deſpectare terrena.* Amm. Marcellin. lib. 14. cap. 11. p. 59. *i. e.* "Some "ſuperior law "of a powerful "Deity . . . or "an effectual "protectrix . . . "whom the an-"cient Divines "feigned was "the daughter "of Juſtice, "from ſome "hidden eterni-"ty, and whom "they ſuppoſed "to take notice "of all things "upon earth."

(127) *Ex Henrico Valeſio in Marcellin.* p. 59.

(128) Valeſius, *in Marcellin.* p. 60. You will ſee towards the end of this rem. why I tranſcribe this paſſage.

(126) Obſerve, that Valeſius's diſcourſe is not methodical: for Plutarch does not cenſure Artabanus's words, but thoſe of Solon, which Valeſius quotes, before he tranſcribes Artabanus's words.

here an aphoriſm of Politicks [*M*]. Cimon's ſiſter ventured one day to cenſure Pericles's conduct,

ſame ſin (of impiety), ſince he obſerved in the Life of Paulus Æmilius (130), Οὐδενὶ γὰρ δὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐπίφθονον, πλὴν εἴτι δαιμόνιον. . . &c (131); that is to ſay, according to Amyot's tranſlation. "Æmilius "was publickly commended, bleſſed and honoured "by all the world, and neither hated nor envied by "any honeſt man; unleſs there be ſome Deity, "whoſe proper office it be to thwart and leſſen al-"ways that happineſs, which ſeems too great and "exorbitant, and ſo to mingle the affairs of human "life, with a ſenſe of good and evil, that no man "be entirely free from misfortunes; but (as Homer "obſerves) they muſt be thought happy, to whom "fortune gave an equal ſhare of good and evil. "Which I obſerve, &c." You will meet with the reſt of this paſſage hereunder (132).

(130) Plut. *in Paulo Æmilio*, p. 273, F.

(131) *Ex* Valeſio, *in* Ammian. Marcellin. p. 59.

(123) After the quotation (135).

Let us make ſome obſervations on that apology of Herodotus, which Valeſius affords us. I obſerve in the 1ſt place, that all the heathen Authors, who aſcribe the functions of *Nemeſis* to the Deity, are not to blame: they who do it according to the notions we have ſeen in the paſſage from Ammianus Marcellinus, or according to that equality and equity mentioned by Dio Chryſoſtomus, aſcribe nothing to God, that is unworthy of him, or that wants to be freed from any moral imperfection. But there have been, I know not how many Poets, and Orators, and other perſons, who underſtood by *Nemeſis*, a peeviſh nature, whoſe greateſt delight was to ruin men's fortunes, and to ſpoil, by ſome croſs accidents, thoſe events which could give illuſtrious perſons the greateſt pleaſure. In that ſenſe, it were as impious to uſe the word *Nemeſis*, with regard to God, as to uſe the word φθόνος *envy*: ſo that Valeſius could not pretend to excuſe the latter by the former. I obſerve in the 2d place, that the chapter of Ariſtotle's Ethicks, to which he refers us, is nothing to his purpoſe. It is true, we find there, that there are three ſorts of Envy's, two in the extremities, and one in the middle. That which is in the middle, is called νέμεσις *Nemeſis*; it conſiſts in being ſorry that a man ſhould be happy, who does not deſerve it. The extremity *by exceſs* is called φθόνος, and conſiſts in being ſorry there ſhould be happy men; the extremity *by defect* is called ἐπιχαιρεκακία, and conſiſts in rejoicing at other people's misfortunes (133). This doctrine is not well grounded, and has been effectually refuted by the Commentator Euſtathius. He ſhews that a man, who rejoices at another's misfortune, is alſo ſorry for another's happineſs; and conſequently, that the paſſion called φθόνος, and the paſſion called ἐπιχαιρεκακία, belong both to the ſame perſon, and not the former to one, and the latter to another. They are not therefore two extremities, between which the paſſion called νέμεσις can be placed. But waving that controverſy, I ſhall only obſerve, that the popular ſtyle, which was uſed in matters relating to religion, did not admit of thoſe nice diſtinctions, which Ariſtotle made uſe of in treating of Ethicks, and which moſt part of the time are nothing but logical abſtractions. We ought not therefore to imagine, that the difference which that Philoſopher obſerved between νέμεσις Indignation, and φθόνος Envy, was the rule according to which the Goddeſs Nemeſis was thought to act by thoſe who dreaded her, and ſpoke of her conduct. Let us obſerve in the 3d place, that nothing could be more againſt the Apologiſt's deſign, than the uſe he pretended to make of Ariſtotle's Ethicks: for according to that Philoſopher, the word φθόνος ſignifies in general, the ſorrow occaſioned by another's proſperity; whether the happy perſon deſerve his happineſs or not. He who is ſubject to that paſſion is called φθονερὸς *envious* (134). He is worſe than him who is ſtyled νεμεσητικὸς, that is to ſay, who feels within his breaſt, what is called νέμεσις, the vexation occaſioned by the happineſs of the unworthy. Now it is certain, Herodotus gave God the epithet of φθονερὸς, and conſequently he is more to blame, according to Ariſtotle's doctrine, than if he had made uſe only of the word νέμεσις or νεμεσητικὸς. To quote the 2d book of Ariſtotle's Ethicks, is therefore affording proofs to Herodotus's accuſers, and not to his Apologiſts. Where then were Valeſius's thoughts? What was become of his wonted accuracy, ſince his deſign being to prove, that both φθόνος and νέμεσις, envy and indignation, are equally bad among men, he confirmed his opinion by that Philoſopher's doctrine? I maintain in the 4th place, that he was very much in the wrong to aſſert, that when envy, or ſuch other imperfections are aſcribed to God, they loſe their vicious quality, and muſt be favourably underſtood. This ought not to be extended to moral imperfections, or to that kind of defects which we judge to be inconſiſtent with the character of an honeſt man; ſuch are fraud, cruelty, perfidiouſneſs, and that kind of baſe envy, which cannot bear the proſperity of others, and makes a man perſecute all thoſe who excell. All the blaſphemies of the Poets, and all the impious doctrines on which the heathen religion was grounded, and which the fathers of the church have ſo effectually refuted, might be excuſed, if Valeſius's maxim were admitted: let us explode it therefore, and not ſpend our time in explaining Herodotus's expreſſions in a figurative ſenſe. Let us rather aſſert, that he took the word envy in an odious ſenſe. We ought to judge of this, as we do of the murmurs which the Heathens uttered againſt Heaven in their misfortunes. The evil they ſpoke of Fortune, the cruelty with which they charged the Gods, were not underſtood in a metaphorical ſenſe, but in a literal ſenſe. They intended to abuſe the Gods in words, juſt as they deſigned to abuſe them by their actions, when they ſtoned the temples; did the Romans purify the notion of cruelty, did they ſtrip it of ſomething vitious, when they murmured againſt Fortune at the time of Paulus Æmilius's triumph? Let us quote Plutarch's words, which follow immediately after thoſe we have tranſcribed above (135). They relate properly to the Goddeſs Nemeſis, or to that pretended divine property, which Herodotus called Envy. "This "I obſerve, becauſe Æmilius had four ſons, two "of whom were adopted into other families. . . . "the other two which he had by a ſecond wife, "and were yet but young, he brought up in his own "houſe. One of theſe died at fourteen years of age, "five days before his father's triumph: the other at "twelve, three days after: ſo that there was no "Roman without a deep ſenſe of his ſuffering, and "every one dreaded the cruelty of Fortune, that did "not ſcruple to bring ſo much ſorrow into a houſe "repleniſhed with happineſs, rejoicing, and ſacri-"fices, and to intermingle tears and complaints "with ſongs of victory and triumph." It is ſo true that the word Envy was taken in the moſt odious literal ſenſe, that there were ſome judicious men, who in order to oppoſe that impiety, ventured to aſſert plainly and expreſsly, that the Gods are not ſubject to that paſſion. We have mentioned above (130) the obſervation of a celebrated Platoniſt, and we meet in Stobæus with four lines of Phocylides, in which it is declared that there is no Envy among the Gods, ἄφθονοι ἁρανίδαι, &c. 5. I obſerve in the laſt place, that Plutarch cannot be guilty of the ſame fault with Herodotus, ſince he ſpeaks only doubtfully; he makes uſe of an *if*, and confines his obſervation to one certain God, whoſe particular commiſſion or office would be, to diſturb man's happineſs. Whereas Herodotus aſſerts, that all the Gods are jealous and turbulent. Let us infer from all this, that Valeſius's attempt to vindicate Herodotus, and to refute Plutarch's cenſure, did not prove very ſucceſsful.

(133) See Ariſtotle's *Ethicks*, b. 2. chap. 7. p. m. 19. and Andronicus's *Paraphraſe*, p. m. 410.

(134) Ὁ μὲν γὰρ νεμεσητικὸς, λυπεῖται ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀναξίως εὐπραγοῦσιν· ὁ δὲ φθονερὸς ὑπερβάλλων τοῦτο ἐπὶ πᾶσι λυπεῖται. He who is ſubject to indignation, grieves at the happineſs of thoſe who do not deſerve it: but the envious man, going farther, grieves at the happineſs of all whoever they be. Ariſtoteles, *ubi ſupra*.

He explains (137) a paſſage in Herodotus otherwiſe than I do. I give my Reader notice of it here, and I confeſs that his tranſlation is more literal than that of Laurence Valla, which I have followed (138). I ſcrupled a little to follow it; but conſidering on the one hand that Henry Stephens did not cenſure it, and on the other, that it made Herodotus argue more ingeniouſly, and more plainly, I preferred it before that which the learned Henry Valeſius followed. But I was perhaps in the wrong.

(135) After the Quotation (132).

(130) Quotat. (110), of the art. PAULICIANS.

(137) Above, Quotation (128).

(138) In the art. of ARTABANUS, ſon of Hyſtaſpes, quotation (7).

[*M*] Valerius Maximus's miſtake *will afford us an opportunity to ſet down here an Aphoriſm of Politicks.*] He obſerves, that Ariſtophanes, in one of his plays, brings Pericles in, coming from Hell, and decl r g, that

conduct, and was well paid for it. The anſwer he made her ſhews that he had a great preſence of mind [*N*]. I have given the reader hopes that he would meet here with the Hiſto-

that it is not proper to nurſe up a lion; but if he be nurſed up, and ſuffered to grow, he muſt be obeyed. *Ariſtophanis quoque altioris eſt prudentiæ præceptum, qui in comœdia introduxit remiſſum ab inferis Athenienſem Periclem, vaticinantem, non oportere in urbe nutriri leonem; ſin autem ſit alitus, obſequi ei convenire. Monet enim, ut præcipuæ nobilitatis & concitati ingenii juvenes refrænentur. Nimio verò favore ac profuſa indulgentia paſti, quò minus potentiam obtineant, ne impediantur: quòd ſtultum ſit, & inutile, eas obtrectare vires, quas ipſe foveris* (139). It is Æſchylus, and not Pericles, who ſays this in Ariſtophanes. Here follow that Poet's lines.

(139) Valer. Maxim. lib. 7. cap 2. num. 7. *in Externis.*

Οὐ χρὴ λέοντ' σκύμνον ἐν πόλει τρέφειν,
Μάλισθα δὲ λέοντα μὴ 'ν πόλει τρέφειν.
Ἢν δ' ἐκτραφῇ τις, τοῖς τρόποις ὑπηρετεῖν.

Catulum ne alas leonis in republica,
Ac maxime ipſum leonem ne alas ibi.
Quod ſi quis alitus; obſequendum moribus (140).

(140) Ariſtophanes, *in Ranis*, Act. 5. Sc. 4. p. m. 264.

This is Eraſmus's tranſlation: he obſerves, that Valerius Maximus quotes this paſſage (141), but he does not cenſure him for miſtaking Pericles for Æſchylus (142). He underſtood that ſentence better than Valerius Maximus did. The latter argues thus: ſince you raiſed a man, you ought to conſider his power as your own work: you would therefore be mad, if you endeavoured to deſtroy it; nay, you could not do it if you would. This is a wretched reaſoning. Nor was it ever the Poet's meaning. He meant, no doubt, that in order to avoid the misfortunes which ariſe from the oppoſition that is made to a power, which was ſuffered to become too great, it is better to give way to it, than to endeavour to refrain it. *Admonet ænigma*, theſe are Eraſmus's words (143), *non eſſe fovendam potentiam quæ leges poſſet opprimere: quod ſi forte talis quiſpiam extiterit, non eſſe è rep. decertare cum illo, quem nequeas niſi magno reip. malo devincere. Tyrannus aut ferendus eſt, aut non recipiendus.* Men commit a great fault in a Commonwealth, when they ſuffer a factious and enterprizing ſubject to get too great an authority: but it is a greater fault ſtill to oppoſe that man, after he was ſuffered to make himſelf Maſter. There are a thouſand grievances, which one ought to prevent, but when once they have got ground, it is often a leſſer evil to ſuffer them, than to attempt to redreſs them. They who undertake it, do almoſt always like Sylla, they uſe a remedy worſe than the diſtemper (144). An Hiſtorian obſerved very judiciouſly, that it were better to let the diſtempered and wounded Commonwealth alone, than to diſturb her by giving her remedies and attempting to dreſs her wounds. *Expediebat quaſi ægræ ſauciæque Reipublicæ requieſcere quomodocunque, ne vulnera curatione ipſa reſcinderentur* (145). I might quote an hundred things concerning the inconveniences of certain remedies, with which ſome perſons would cure publick evils: but this would look too much like a compilation of common-place topicks.

(141) Eraſm. *Adag.* 77. *Chil.* 2. *Centur.* 3. p. m. 451.

(142) Leopardus, *Emendat.* lib. 8. cap 12. and Pighius, *Comment. in hunc locum Val. Maximi*, cenſure Valerius Maximus for that blunder.

(143) Eraſ. *Adag.* 77. *Chil.* 2. *Centur.* 3. p. m. 451.

(144) *Ingratus L. Sylla, qui patriam durioribus remediis quam pericula erant, ſanavit.* Seneca, *de Beneficiis*, lib. 5. cap. 16.

(145) Florus, lib. 3. cap. 23. See Balzac's *Letters to Chapelain*, p. 106.

[*N*] Pericles's *Anſwer* to Cimon's ſiſter, *ſhews that he had a great preſence of mind.*] There was a great oppoſition between Pericles and Cimon, they being at the head of two different parties. The former got the better of the latter, and had him baniſhed (146). This was not the only advantage he gained: he contributed alſo to have Cimon recalled: this proof of his great credit, by which he did and undid things again, raiſed only the jealouſy of Cimon's family the higher: Pericles's victories added new ſtrength to that paſſion. So that Elpinice, Cimon's ſiſter, being diſpleaſed with the encomiums, which were beſtowed on Pericles's victories, had ſo little power over her anger, that ſhe could not forbear finding fault with his conqueſts; but he paid her off ſmartly, by repeating a line to her, the ſenſe of which was, do not paint, you are too old for it. But let us tranſcribe Plutarch's words according to Amyot's tranſlation (147). "Pericles therefore having conquered the city of Samos, returned to Athens, where he took care to have the remains of thoſe, who died in that war

(146) Plut. *in Pericle*, p. 156.

(147) Amyot, in his tranſlation of the *Life of Pericles*, p. 601, 602, of Vaſcoſan's edit. in 8vo.

"honourably buried, and he himſelf made a funeral "oration, as it is the cuſtom, in their commendation, "for which he was highly eſteemed and admired. "As he came down from the place, from which he "delivered his ſpeech, the other Ladies of the city "came and kiſſed his hands, and put garlands and "crowns on his head, as was uſually done to thoſe "who carried the prize at the publick games. But "Elpinice coming up to him, *Theſe are indeed great "deeds you have done*, ſaid ſhe, *which deſerve crowns "and garlands, to have loſt us brave and worthy men, "not in a war againſt the Medes, or the Phœnicians, "and Barbarians, as my brother Cimon does, but by "deſtroying a city of our own country and nation, and in "alliance with us.* To theſe words Pericles replied "gently with a ſmile this line from Archilochus.

"*Old as you are, you ſhould no longer paint* (148)."

(148) Ταῦτα τῆς Ἐλπινίκης λεγούσης, Περικλῆς μειδιάσας ἀπρέπεια, λέγεται τὸ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου πρὸς αὐτὴν εἰπεῖν, Οὐκ ἂν μύρρισι, γραῦς ἐὼν ἐπλάττου. *Sic fata Elpinice, ſubriſit Pericles, & ſubmiſſe hoc ei reſpondit Archilochi*, Quando anus es, ungi minus tibi convenit Plut. *in Pericle*, p. 167.

Could he ſay any thing more proper to mortify that Lady? There is another anſwer reported of Pericles, which is not ſo much to his honour. He was one of Cimon's accuſers in a capital affair. Elpinice came moſt humbly to make application to him, deſiring him not to prejudice her brother. *You are too old*, anſwered he, *to ſucceed in a ſuit of this kind.* Ἐλθούσης δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν τῆς Ἐλπινίκης ὑπὲρ δορυάλου, μειδιάσας εἶπεν, Ὦ Ἐλπινίκη, γραῦς, εἰ, ὡς πράγματα τηλικαῦτα διάσειν. *Elpinice coming to make humble application to him* (in her brother's behalf) *you are too old, ſaid he, with a ſmile, to undertake ſuch an affair as this is* (149). Does not this ſignify, if your youth could make me think, that by granting me the uſe of your body, you would requite the favour I might do your brother, I would ſerve him: but you are not of an age to make me wiſh for that proof of your gratitude; therefore you have nothing to expect from me? One may anſwer two things in Pericles's behalf: the firſt, that he did not ſpeak ſeriouſly: the other, that he meant only the contempt, which other perſons, whom Elpinice might endeavour to prevail upon, would have for her old age. A young and beautiful Lady who ſolicits a buſineſs, will get a thouſand things, which the prayers of an old woman can never procure. Plutarch obſerves, that notwithſtanding that anſwer, Pericles was very remiſs in proſecuting the charge againſt Cimon, and did it only for form's ſake. Others ſay that he liked Elpinice very well, and enjoyed her as a reward for the ſervices he did her brother. The words, I ſhall quote, acquaint us, that that woman was not very ſcrupulous, for ſhe lay with her own brother. Καὶ Κίμωνος δ' Ἐλπινίκη τῇ ἀδελφῇ παρανόμως συνόντος, εἴθ' ὕστερον ἐκδιδόντος Καλλίᾳ τῷ Φυγαδευθέντι, μισθὸν ἴλαβε τῆς καθόδου αὐτὸ ὁ Περικλῆς τὸ τῇ Ἐλπινίκῃ μιχθῆναι. *Cimon lying with his ſiſter Elpinice, which was againſt the laws, (he married her afterwards to Callias) and being condemned to baniſhment, Pericles procured his return, for which favour Elpinice ſuffered him to enjoy her* (150). Not to mention her proſtituting herſelf to a painter (151). Obſerve, 1. That Athenæus ſuppoſes, on Antiſthenes's authority, that Elpinice prevailed with Pericles to conſent to her brother's return, by granting him the laſt favour (152). 2. That according to Plutarch, ſhe received from Pericles the unkind anſwer about her old age, when ſhe was making application to him to favour Cimon in a criminal cauſe, before the time mentioned by Athenæus (153). It is proper to take notice of this; for if Plutarch had mentioned an application made to Pericles after Cimon's return, we might have reaſons to think, that Pericles was favourable to him, only with a deſign to requite his ſiſter's kindneſs. This is the opinion, to which the anſwer recorded by Plutarch would lead us. Elpinice remembring that her courteſy to Pericles determined him to conſent that Cimon be called back from his baniſhment, would again have made application to him, to deſire him not to declare againſt her brother who was proſecuted in a criminal cauſe: But Pericles would have anſwered her to this purpoſe. *Do not expect any thing from your application to me; you are not now the ſame you was, when the laſt favour you granted me, determined*

(149) Idem, ibid. p. 157, *F.*

(150) *Athen.* lib. 13. p. 189, *F.*

(151) To Polygnotus. See Plut. *in Cimone*, p. 480.

(152) *Athen.* lib. 13. p. 589, *F.*

(153) Plut. *in Pericle.* p. 157, *E.* See alſo the ſame in *Vita Cimonis*, p. 487, where he quotes Steſimbrotus, a contemporary Hiſtorian.

Hiſtory of the famous ASPASIA [O], and I ſhall keep my promiſe. See the remark [O]. I ſhall

mined me to do a kindneſs to your brother; you are now too old to requite my favours with yours. But, as I have already obſerved, Plutarch ſuppoſes that this anſwer was made before Cimon's baniſhment. However it be, Athenæus tells us, that our Pericles was very much inclined to love (154).

(154) Ἦν δὲ ὅτος ἀνὴρ πρὸς ἀφροδίσια πάνυ κατακεκμηκώς. *Fuit quidem ille ad Venerem multum propenſus.* Athen. lib. 13. p. 589, *F.*

[O] *I have given the Reader hopes, that he would meet here with the hiſtory of . . . .* ASPASIA.] This woman was of Miletus; ſhe followed the ſteps of Thargelia, who by her wit and beauty won the friendſhip of the chief men of Greece, who were in Ionia, and perſuaded them to ſupport the King of Perſia's intereſt (155). Aſpaſia was ſo learned, that Socrates himſelf uſed to viſit her, and take his friends to her houſe (156). Let us ſpeak more plainly, and obſerve that it was ſhe who taught him Rhetorick and Politicks. Ἀσπασία μέν τοι ἡ σοφὴ τῷ Σωκράτει διδάσκαλος τῶν ῥητορικῶν λόγων. *Aſpaſia, a wiſe woman, who taught Socrates Rhetorick* (157). Πλάτων ἐν τῷ Μενεξένῳ τὸν Σωκράτην παρ' αὐτῆς φησὶ μαθεῖν τὰ πολιτικά. *Plato aſſerts in his Menexenus, that Socrates ſtudied Politicks under her* (158). What is more wonderful ſtill is, that they who uſed to viſit her, took their wives along with them to her houſe, to hear her diſcourſes and lectures, though ſhe kept ſeveral courtezans at home. Τὰς γυναῖκας ἀκροασομένας εἰ συνήθεις ἦγον εἰς αὐτὴν, καίπερ ἐκ κοσμίου προεστώσαν ἐργασίας, οὐδὲ σιμνῆς ἀλλὰ παιδίσκας ἑταιρούσας τρέφουσαν. *(They who uſed her company) would carry their wives along with them to her, to hear her diſcourſe, though her employment was not very decent and creditable, ſince ſhe educated young girls at home to proſtitute them* (159). She was very well ſkilled in politicks, and Pericles was ſaid to adhere to her, becauſe ſhe underſtood the maxims of politicks admirably well. But there were alſo other cauſes of their intimacy. Love was one of them. Pericles did not care for his wife, and gave her up very willingly to another, after which he married Aſpaſia, and was paſſionately in love with her. The Hiſtorian (160) from whom I borrowed theſe particulars, relates, as a moſt remarkable proof of his love, a circumſtance which would at this time be looked upon as a moſt ridiculous proof. Pericles, ſays he, never went to the Senate, and never came back without ſaluting Aſpaſia with a kiſs. Αὐτὸς δὲ τὴν Ἀσπασίαν λαβὼν, ἔστεγξε διαφερόντως· καὶ γὰρ ἐξιὼν, ὡς φασι, καὶ εἰσιὼν ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς, ἠσπάζετο καθ' ἡμέραν αὐτὴν μετὰ τῆς καταφιλεῖν. *Aſpaſiam uxorem duxit, quam mire dilexit, nam, ſive rediret à foro, ſalutabat ſemper eam oſculo* (161). This Author did not perhaps take the true ſenſe of what he read upon that ſubject. I ſhould rather think, as it is hinted by the Author whom Athenæus (162) quotes, that Pericles uſed to viſit Aſpaſia twice a day, and that he kiſſed her when he came in, and when he went away. Which refers us to the time when he had not yet married her. It has been reported that he turned his wife out of doors, and that lodging with Aſpaſia, a Courtezan of Megara, he gave himſelf over to voluptuouſneſs, and ſpent a conſiderable part of his eſtate with that proſtitute (163). Περικλέα δὲ τὸν Ὀλύμπιον φησὶν Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Ποντικὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ ἡδονῆς, ὡς ἀπήλλαξεν ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας τὴν γυναῖκα, καὶ τὸν μεθ' ἡδονῆς βίον προείλετο, ᾧκει τε μετὰ Ἀσπασίας τῆς ἐκ Μεγάρων ἑταίρας, καὶ τὸ πολὺ μέρος τῆς οὐσίας εἰς ταύτην κατανάλωσε. *Periclem Olympium Heraclides Ponticus ſcribit, libro de voluptate, exacta domo uxore voluptati ſe tradidiſſe, cum Aſpaſia ſcorto Megarico* (164) *habitaſſe, & magnam rei familiaris partem in eam dilapidaſſe.* After Pericles's death ſhe kept company with a man of mean extraction, and raiſed him to the higheſt poſts in the Commonwealth (165). Which ſhews that her artful wit, and powerful eloquence, found nothing impoſſible. She muſt indeed have been well ſkilled in rhetorick, ſince ſeveral Athenians ſtudied that art under her. She gained ſo great a reputation, that Cyrus the younger gave the name of Aſpaſia to a miſtreſs whom he loved and eſteemed moſt particularly (166). Our Aſpaſia was the cauſe why the Republick of Athens attacked the Samians. They waged war with the Mileſians, on account of the city of Priene, to which both parties claimed a right. The Samians gained the victory. So that Aſpaſia, to ſerve her countrymen, deſired Pericles to perſuade the Athenians to declare againſt thoſe of Samos (167). It is alſo aſſerted, that ſhe was the cauſe of the war of Megara, which proved the beginning of the Peloponneſian war: and that ſhe was influenced by a very ſhameful motive. Some young Athenians having drank too freely, went to Megara, and carried away a famous proſtitute. The Megarians uſed repriſals, and took two Ladies of pleaſure belonging to Aſpaſia. This was the cauſe of her anger; this, they ſay, made her employ all her credit, to have the Megarians attacked, to which Pericles was of himſelf well enough inclined. Μεγαρεῖς δὲ . . . τὰς αἰτίας εἰς Ἀσπασίαν καὶ Περικλέα τρέπουσι, χρώμενοι τοῖς περιοίκοις καὶ δημόσιοι τούτοις ἐκ τῶν Ἀχαρνέων εἰσῳδίοις, Πόρνην δὲ Σίμαιθαν, ἰόντες Μεγάραθεν νεανίαι κλέπτουσι μεθυσοκότλατοι· καθ' οἱ Μεγαρεῖς ὀδύναις περφυσιγγωμένοι, ἀντεξέκλεψαν Ἀσπασίας πόρνα δύο. *But the Megarians---- threw the whole blame on Aſpaſia and Pericles, quoting thoſe celebrated and commonly known lines out of Ariſtophanes's play, called Acharnes.* " Some young men of " Athens, being fuddled, went to Megara, and ſtole " away a celebrated proſtitute, called *Simætha*. At " which the Megarians being exaſperated, came and " carried off two Ladies of pleaſure belonging to Aſ- " paſia (169)."

(155) Plut. *in Pericle*, p. 165.

(156) Idem, ib.

(157) *Athen.* lib. 5. p. 210. See alſo Lucian. *de Saltatione*, p. m. 923. Tom. 1.

(158) *Harpocration, Voce* Ἀσπασία.

(159) Plut. *in Pericle*, p. 165, C.

(160) Idem, ib.

(161) Idem, ib. D.

(162) Ἀντισθένης δὲ ὁ Σωκρατικὸς ἱστορῶν φησὶν αὐτὸν Ἀσπασίας, δὶς τῆς ἡμέρας εἰσιόντα καὶ ἐξιόντα ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἀσπάζεσθαι τὴν ἄνθρωπον. *Antiſthenes Socraticus narrat amatorem illum Aſpaſiæ, bis quotidie ſalutaturum ad eam introire, exireque inde ſolitum.* Athen. lib. 13. p. 589, *E.*

(163) Idem, lib. 10. p. 533.

(164) She was a Mileſian according to Plutarch; but Heraclides calls her perhaps a woman of Megara, becauſe ſhe had kept a bawdy houſe there before ſhe went to Athens.

(165) Plut. *in Pericle*, p. 165, *D.* See alſo Harpocration, *Voce* Ἀσπασία, and Valeſius's notes.

(166) See the rem. (C) of the art. CYRUS.

(167) Plut. *in Pericle*, pp. 165, 166, *cle*,

(168) Idem, p. 168, *E.*

Plutarch had done well to quote the two lines which follow theſe four; for they contain the concluſion which the Poet draws from that narration, and which is, that three harlots were the cauſe of the war which raged throughout all Greece (169).

Κἀντεῦθεν ἀρχὴ τῷ πολέμῳ κατερράγη
Ἕλλησι πᾶσιν, ἐκ τριῶν λαικασμάτων.
Hinc initium belli prorupit
Univerſis Græcis, ob tres meretriculas.

(169) Obſerve that Plutarch does not take this particular to be true. See the rem. [H] at the break, or *à linea.*

Athenæus, who has quoted theſe ſix lines from Ariſtophanes, had obſerved juſt before, that Aſpaſia's ſchool peopled the whole country with Ladies of pleaſure (170). Καὶ Ἀσπασία δὲ ἡ Σωκρατικὴ ἐπεπορεύσατο πλῆθη καλῶν γυναικῶν, καὶ ἐπλήθυνεν ἀπὸ τῶν ταύτης ἑταιρίδων ἡ Ἑλλὰς, ὡς καὶ ὁ χαρίεις Ἀριστοφάνης παρασημαίνεται λέγων τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν πόλεμον, ὅτι Περικλῆς διὰ τὸν Ἀσπασίας ἔρωτα, καὶ τὰς ἁρπασθείσας ἀπ' αὐτῆς θεραπαίνας ὑπὸ Μεγαρέων, ἀνερρίπισε τὸ κατὰ Μεγαρέων ψήφισμα τὸ δεινὸν (171). Dalechamp tranſlates this Greek paſſage thus. *Aſpaſia Socratica formoſas mulieres, & eas quidem multas, Athenis præbuit. Jam inde ſcortis abundavit Græcia, ut indicat facetus Ariſtophanes, Peloponneſiaci belli cauſſam explicans, nempe ob amorem Aſpaſiæ, & raptas à Megarenſibus ejus ancillas, Periclem decretum luctuoſum illud de bello Megarenſibus indicendo, velut ignem flabello, excitaſſe, & accendiſſe.* i. e. " Aſpaſia, " the Socratic, afforded many beautiful women to " the Athenians; ſo that ſince her time Greece a- " bounded with Ladies of pleaſure, as the facetious " Ariſtophanes hints, where he mentions the cauſe of " the Peloponneſian war: namely, that for Aſpaſia's " ſake, and on account of her maids carried off by " the Megarians, Pericles made that ſad decree, by " which it was reſolved to declare war againſt thoſe " of Megara, as though he had been ſtirring and " blowing the fire." Let us not forget to mention the two crimes, with which the Comedian Hermippus charged Aſpaſia; they were not bare ſlanders of the ſtage or of the comic writers: for Hermippus ſet up for her proſecutor before the Judges, according to all the forms of the law: he charged her with impiety, and with inticing women to her houſe for Pericles's pleaſure (172). I do not know whether or not it was pretended ſhe play'd the bawd after Pericles had married her: in which caſe her ſecond crime would be as extraordinary as the firſt: for it is almoſt as uncommon to ſee a woman who is a bawd to her own huſband, as it is to ſee one, who has no religion. Whilſt the cauſe was depending, Pericles employed ſo many prayers and tears with the Judges, that he got Aſpaſia cleared. He had no hopes to meet with the ſame ſucceſs with regard to Anaxagoras, who was alſo then charged with impiety, becauſe he accounted for the meteors by natural cauſes (173): he obliged him to retire from Athens, to eſcape the danger he was in. Ἀσπασίαν μὲν οὖν ἐξητήσατο πολλὰ πάνυ παρὰ τὴν

(170) *Athen.* lib 13. p. 570.

(171) Idem, ib. p. 569, 570.

(172) Ἀσπασία δίκην ἔφευγεν ἀσεβείας, Ἑρμίππου τοῦ κωμῳδοποιοῦ διώκοντος, καὶ προσκατηγοροῦντος αὐτῇ Περικλεῖ γυναῖκας ἐλευθέρας εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ φοιτώσας ὑποδέχεσθαι. *Aſpaſia violatæ religionis eſt rea facta, accuſatore comœdiarum ſcriptore Hermippo: objecit præterea eam liberas fœminas, quibus illudebat Pericles, recipere.* Plut. p. 169, *D.*

(173) Ψήφισμα Διοπείθης ἔγραψεν, εἰσαγγέλλεσθαι τοὺς τὰ θεῖα μὴ νομίζοντας, ἢ λόγους περὶ τῶν μετεώρων διδάσκοντας· ἀπειρηκότος εἰς Περικλέα δὶ' Ἀναξαγόρου τὴν ὑπόνοιαν. *Rogationem tulit Diopithes, nomina ut deferrentur eorum qui eſſe deos negarent, aut qui ſermones de rebus æthereis ſererent, ea ſuſpicione perſtringens Anaxagoræ cauſa Periclem.* Idem, ib.

I ſhall alſo make a collection of ſome errors relating to that woman [*P*]; nor ſhall I forget

τὴν δίκην, ὡς Αἰσχίνης φησὶν, ἀφεὶς ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς δάκρυα, καὶ δεηθεὶς τῶν δικαστῶν. Ἀναξαγόραν δὲ, φοβηθεὶς, ἐξέπεμψε καὶ προὔπεμψεν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως. *Pericles got Aſpaſia off by his prayers, for he ſhed a great many tears for her, whilſt the cauſe was pleading, as Æſchines writes, and thereby he prevailed upon the Judges to acquit her. But fearing for Anaxagoras, he ſent him out of the city* (174).

(174) Idem, ib. *E.*

Athenæus quotes another Author, who relates the ſame particular, and who obſerves alſo, that Pericles ſhed fewer tears when his own life was in danger, than he did when Aſpaſia was in danger of her life. Καὶ φευγούσης πολὺ αὐτῆς γραφὴν ἀσεβείας, λίγων ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, πλείονα ἐδάκρυσεν, ἢ ὅτε ὑπὲρ τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς οὐσίας ἐκινδύνευσεν. *Et cùm impietatis accuſata fuiſſet, orationem pro illa habuiſſe, effuſiùs lacrymantem, quàm cùm vitæ ac fortunarum periculum adiiſſet* (175). Monſieur le Fevre, in his lives of the Greek Poets, page 81, wraps up the charge brought in againſt Aſpaſia, under ſuch expreſſions, as every one cannot underſtand. *Aſpaſia*, ſays he, ... *deſerves that honour very well, ſince ſhe was the miſtreſs of a man, who was maſter of all Attica, and of all the iſles in the Ægæan ſea: ſince ſhe was the Juno of the Olympian Pericles: ſince ſhe wrote poems and orations: and ſince, laſtly, ſhe underſtood rhetorick as well as Prodicus and Gorgias the great* Cymbaliſt *of Greece. But ſhe knew ſomething elſe beſides, which I would never mention to you, were I not determined to give you ſome account of* HERMIPPUS, *the comic Poet, who lived at the ſame time with her. This Hermippus . . . . . wrote ſome verſes againſt Pericles, and charged even Aſpaſia with following a certain trade, which Pericles did not diſlike. What trade? This puzzles me. Let us ſee however, whether we cannot explain that obſcene ſubject with chaſte expreſſions. Let us obſerve, Sir, that ſhe did for Pericles, what Livia did for Auguſtus, when he was out of taſte, and the nights ſeemed too long to him.* What Monſieur le Fevre obſerves of Livia, is to be met with in Suetonius's Life of Auguſtus, chapter 71. *Circa libidines hæſit, poſtea quoque ut ferunt, ad virgines promptior, quæ ſibi undique* ETIAM AB UXORE *conquirerentur.* i. e. "At firſt "he did not ſeem to be much inclined to luſt; but "afterwards, as it is reported, he was more diſpo- "ſed to abuſe virgins, whom his *own wife* procured "him from every place." Amyot has given us, with great frankneſs, the full ſenſe of Plutarch's words: I ſhall tranſcribe the whole paſſage, that the Reader may know the whole crime with which Aſpaſia was charged: you will ſee that ſhe debauched, not ſlaves, or ſtrangers, but the noble Ladies of Athens. *About that time Aſpaſia was alſo charged with diſbelieving the Gods; her accuſer was Hermippus, a writer of comedies, who charged her alſo with being a bawd to Pericles, and receiving into her houſe citizen's wives, whom Pericles enjoyed. Diopithes propoſed at the ſame time a decree, that information ſhould be made againſt thoſe unbelievers, who gave no credit to things divine, and taught a new doctrine concerning meteors and other appearances in the ſky; thus ſtriking at Pericles through Anaxagoras's ſide* (176). See the remark [*C*].

(175) *Athenæus*, lib. 13. p. 589, *ex Antiſthene Socratico.*

(176) Amyot, in his tranſlation of the *Life of Pericles*, p. m. 608.

[*P*] *Some errors relating to* Aſpaſia.] Quintilian is miſtaken, where he mentions the queſtions, which were put to Xenophon's wife. She was aſked; *If your neighbour's gold were better than yours, which would you like beſt, your own or hers?* She anſwered, *hers. If her clothes and jewels were richer than yours, would you not like hers better than your own?* She replied, *yes. But if her huſband were better than yours, would you like him better than your own?* This queſtion made her quite aſhamed, and ſhe returned no anſwer. Cicero relates this (177); and obſerves expreſsly, that Aſpaſia put thoſe queſtions to Xenophon's wife. But Quintilian aſſerts that they were put to Aſpaſia, Xenophon's wife. *Ut apud Æſchinem Socraticum male reſpondit Aſpaſia Xenophontis uxor: quod Cicero his verbis tranſfert* (178). i. e. "As in Æſchines the Socratic's "work, Aſpaſia, Xenophon's wife, anſwers wrong; "which Cicero tranſlates thus." Voſſius criticiſed that blunder, and was miſtaken in his turn (179); for he imagined that Quintilian ſuppoſed there had been two Aſpaſia's (180). His blunder does not conſiſt herein, but in his thinking that the Aſpaſia mentioned in Cicero's book, was Xenophon's wife. Monſieur Colomiés has criticiſed that miſtake of Quintilian (181), and obſerved that Bruſonius followed it (182). I cannot think that this blunder is owing to any thing, but to the Tranſcriber. I believe that Quintilian wrote *apud Æſchinem Socraticum male reſpondit Aſpaſiæ Xenophontis uxor.* i. e. "In Æſchines "the Socratic's work, Xenophon's wife made a "wrong anſwer to Aſpaſia." Some almoſt half-learned Tranſcriber ſhall have taken it into his head, that we muſt read *Aſpaſia*, and imagined, that Quintilian gave us the proper name of Xenophon's wife. Obſerve, that when Aſpaſia, by her captious queſtion, had reduced the woman ſo far, that ſhe did not dare to anſwer, ſhe applied herſelf to the huſband, put the ſame queſtions to him, and made him bluſh at the third, reducing him alſo to have nothing to reply, after which ſhe gave them both a very judicous leſſon (183). The learned Leopardus did not know that Quintilian's book, ſuch as it is at preſent, occaſioned Bruſonius's blunder; he cenſures only that modern writer. *Idem Bruſonius*, ſays he (184), *eodem capite: Aſpaſia, inquit, Xenophontis uxor quum eſſet (ut muliebre ingenium eſt) rerum alienarum appetens atque invida, interrogata, ſi vicina tua, &c.* i. e. "The ſame Bruſonius in the ſame chapter, "ſays, that Aſpaſia, Xenophon's wife, being cove- "tous of other people's goods, and envious (as it is "the character of the women) was aſked, if your "neighbour's wife, &c." Here is a fault, which Leopardus did not cenſure. Bruſonius, upon no other authority but his own, ſuppoſes that Aſpaſia, Xenophon's wife, was covetous and envious. Where did he meet with that particular? Is it lawful to invent ſuch things? And to what purpoſe is his Parentheſis? Let me obſerve, that I communicated my correction of Quintilian's paſſage to a learned Humaniſt, who approved it, and ſhewed me a few days after in his edition of Quintilian *Variorum*, that Turnebius had already corrected the paſſage after the ſame manner.

(177) Cicero, *de Inventione*, lib. 1. folio m. 30, *A.*

(178) Quintil. lib. 5. cap. 11. p. m. 243.

(179) Voſſius, *Inſtitut. Orator.* lib. 3. cap. 5. p. m. 406.

(180) *Quintiliani lapſus in duabus Aſpaſiis.* Id. ibid. *in Indice rerum & verborum.*

(181) *Falſus eſt Fabius, quique eum ſecutus eſt Bruſonius in Apophthegm.* Colomeſius, Notis ad Quinctil. p. m. 224. Opuſculor.

(182) Here follow all that Author's titles. *L. Domitius Bruſonius, Contorſinus, Lucanus.* He has made a collection of *Apophthegms*, with this title, *Septem Facetiarum Libri.*

(183) See Cicero, *de Inventione*, lib. 1. folio 30, *A.*

(184) Leopardus, *Emendat.* lib. 12. cap. 13.

Suidas aſſerts erroneouſly that Pericles had two ſons by Aſpaſia, Xanthippus and Pericles: he had them by his other wife.

Lloyd robbed our Aſpaſia of a paſſage in Xenophon, which might have made her very proud: Lloyd, I ſay, who tells us that another Aſpaſia, wife to Cleobulus, is meant there. He is plainly miſtaken: for in the firſt place, the name of Xenophon's Dialogiſt is not Cleobulus, but Critobulus: in the ſecond place, Socrates, who is the other Dialogiſt, does not ſpeak of Critobulus's wife, but of Aſpaſia the Rhetorician, the learned woman: he aſſerts that ſhe would give Critobulus better precepts, than he, Socrates, could do. Συσήσω δέ σοι ἐγὼ καὶ Ἀσπασίαν ἢ ἐπιστημονέστερον ἐμοῦ σοὶ ταῦτα πάντα ἐπιδείξει. *Ego tibi exempli cauſa Aſpaſiam conſtituam, quæ doctius hæc omnia quam ego tibi monſtrabit* (185).

(185) Xenophon, *in Oeconomico*, p. m. 482.

A Commentator of Minutius Felix is not accurate in the words I ſhall ſet down here. *De Pythagora referunt Diogenes Laërtius*, Lib. VIII. *& Lucianus in Gallo eum dixiſſe ſe primum fuiſſe Æthalidem Mercurii filium, inde Euphorbum Panthi filium, mox Aſpaſiam nobile Periclis ſcortum, deinde Cratem Cynicum* (186). i. e. "Diogenes Laertius in his 8th book, and Lu- "cian in his *Cock*, relate, that Pythagoras ſaid he "was firſt Æthalides Mercurius's ſon, then Euphor- "bus Panthus's ſon, afterwards Aſpaſia Pericles's "whore, and then Crates the Cynick." Here then are three ſucceſſive removals of Pythagoras; he paſſed from Æthalides's body into that of Eupherbus, then into Aſpaſia's, and laſtly into Crates's. If the Commentator were accurate, we ſhould meet with this entire liſt both in Diogenes Laertius, and in Lucian: but we find but a part of it in one, and the reſt in the other. This is a bad way of quoting, which I reckon for the firſt miſtake of that Author. The ſecond is his giving us Diogenes Laertius's account erroneouſly; for that Author tells us Pythagoras boaſted he had been ſucceſſively Æthalides, Euphorbus, Hermotimus, Pyrrhus, Pythagoras. 3. He does not give us Lucian's account more accurately: for if he had tranſcribed it exactly, he would have ſaid that Pythagoras's ſoul was firſt in the body of Euphorbus, then in that of Pythagoras, then in Aſpaſia's, then in

(186) Ouzellus, *in Minutium Felicem*, p. 325, edit. 1672, in 8vo.

I forget Moreri's blunders [Q], nor thoſe of his Continuator, nor thoſe of another French

in Crates's; afterwards in that of a King, *&c.* and laſtly in that of a Cock. 4. To act reaſonably and with judgment he ought not to have quoted upon this ſubject an Author, who only banters, and takes a Century poſterior to Pythagoras: he ſhould have quoted thoſe only, who relate what Pythagoras uſed to ſay himſelf, when he mentioned how far he had been concerned in thoſe tranſmigrations of the Soul.

Moreri's blunders are not very numerous: I ſhall cenſure him with regard to one particular only, which is his aſſerting that *Aſpaſia was very well ſkilled in Philoſophy, and in Eloquence, and chiefly in Poetry.* I do not pretend to deny that woman's knowledge in Philoſophy, nor her eloquence: it is not in that reſpect I ſet up for a cenſurer of Moreri. I obſerve only that he was in the wrong to aſſert, that Poetry was the ſcience in which ſhe chiefly excelled. This is ſo falſe that there are good reaſons to queſtion whether ſhe ever wrote verſes. Athenæus is I think the only Author who might be quoted, if one would maintain that ſhe underſtood Poetry; but that Writer's authority is very weak in this reſpect: for he ſays only, that there were ſome lines, which were aſcribed to Aſpaſia (187), and publiſhed by Herodotus. To give an exact account of what ſhe excelled in, we muſt confine ourſelves to Rhetorick: herein lay her greateſt ſtrength. Pericles did not ſcruple to deliver the orations, which ſhe compoſed (188). She underſtood Politicks better than ſhe did Philoſophy, and ſince Pericles conſulted her about the art of Government, we ought not to wonder that ſome other great Politicians ſhould make a great account of a woman's advice. I have obſerved above that ſhe taught Socrates that ſcience.

[Q] *Moreri's blunders.*] I. I queſtion very much, whether the maſters who taught Pericles Philoſophy, were *jealous* of the *univerſal knowledge he acquired* in that ſcience. None of the three Authors, whom Moreri quotes (189), mention any thing of this. I have not met with that particular in any antient Author; yet I dare not aſſert that Moreri invented it. I obſerve only that his conſtant practice of quoting nothing but in a very general manner prevents me from calling many particulars downright falſities, and determines me to propoſe only a doubt. II. Since Plutarch aſſerts only that Pericles gained a victory over the Sicyonians at Nemea (190), why does Moreri ſay near *the great River* * *Nemea?* III. However it be, that river is not conſiderable enough to be called a great *River (un Fleuve)*. The following errors are in the Supplement. IV. Pericles *did not fortify the Iſthmus of Corinth with a ſtrong wall.* The Author of the Supplement has taken two things for one and the ſame, though they differ widely. Pericles cauſed to be built at Athens what was called *the long wall* (191). But to fortify the Iſthmus of Corinth was the buſineſs of the Peloponneſians rather than of the Athenians. V. Plutarch and Herodotus are not quoted to any good purpoſe. The latter does not mention either Pericles's apophthegms or his actions; and the other relates but a part of the particulars, which are rehearſed in the Supplement. The witty ſaying, *amicus uſque ad aras, friends as far as conſcience permits*, not being to be met with in the life of Pericles, it had been proper to quote the book where Plutarch mentions it (192). The article of Pericles's ſon is a very indifferent one. One cannot read it without imagining, that that man was the Commander in chief of the Athenian Fleet, which beat that of the Lacedæmonians near the iſlands, called *Arginuſæ. He did wonders in that expedition*, as we are told, *and burnt the enemy's fleet.* Thus an Author would have expreſſed himſelf, had he ſpoke of a man who was the only Commander. We had been told juſt before, that *the Athenians choſe him to take Alcibiades's place*; this is ſtill more capable to miſlead thoſe, who knew that Alcibiades was Captain General of the Athenians (193). The truth of the matter is, that they appointed ten Generals in Alcibiades's room, and that Pericles was one of theſe ten (194). Xenophon aſſerts it very poſitively, and he does not ſay that the Lacedæmonian Fleet was burnt, but only that it was beat, and that it retired, having loſt threeſcore and ten ſhips (195). Obſerve that it was not Pericles but Thraſybulus who commanded on the day the battle was fought (196): if it be objected, that it appears from this very Supplement to Moreri, that Pericles had Collegues, ſince we read there that *he was condemned to be beheaded with the ſeven other Captains of the army*; I anſwer that my cenſure is nevertheleſs well grounded. An Author, who contradicts himſelf by uſing inconſiſtent phraſes, does not well relate a ſtory; he only perplexes and miſleads his Reader. Here is another blunder. Suppoſe the laſt phraſe had undeceived the reader, who might otherwiſe have thought that Pericles was Commander in Chief, will not that ſame phraſe make him think that there were but eight Commanders in that Fleet? He will then be miſtaken, for there were ten of them. It is true there were but eight ſentenced to death: the Author of the Supplement ought therefore to have expreſſed himſelf thus, *he was condemned with ſeven other*, and not *with* the *ſeven other Commanders.* Xenophon obſerves that there were but ſix of them put to death, the other two being abſent (197). He or Diodorus Siculus ſhould have been quoted in the Supplement, and not Plutarch, who mentioned Pericles's ſon but occaſionally (198), and without giving a particular account of the cauſes of his puniſhment. They were ſo unjuſt, that there never was perhaps any thing ſo abominable done under the moſt abſolute Monarchs. Six Generals were put to death, who had gained the moſt glorious victory, which the Greeks ever won over thoſe of their own nation, and who had diſtinguiſhed themſelves on ſeveral other occaſions; they were put to death, I ſay, becauſe they had not buried thoſe who were killed in the battle; nor was there any regard had for what they urged in their own defence, which was, that they to whoſe care the burial was committed, were prevented by a great ſtorm from executing their commiſſion (199). Socrates, one of the judges of theſe Generals, oppoſed that unjuſt ſentence as much as lay in his power; but no account was made of his arguments (200). The manner, in which theſe brave men died, was very proper to make that piece of injuſtice more execrable ſtill. Diomedon ſpoke for them all: and inſtead of imprecations or complaints, inſtead of repreſenting their great ſervices, which were ſo ill rewarded, he wiſhed only that their death and puniſhment might prove fortunate to their country, and deſired the aſſembly to accompliſh the vows they had made to get the victory. Τὰ μὲν περὶ ἡμῶν κυρωθέντα συνενέγκαι τῇ πόλει· τὰς δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς νίκης εὐχὰς ἐπισωθῆναι ἡ τύχη κεκώλυκεν ἡμᾶς ἀποδῶναι, καλῶς ἔχον ὑμᾶς φρονῆσαι, καὶ τῷ Διὶ τῷ σωτῆρι καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ ταῖς σεμναῖς θεαῖς ἀπόδοῦναι· τοῦτοις γὰρ εὐξαμένοι, τοὺς πολεμίους καλῶναυμαχήσαμεν. *Quod in capita noſtra jam decretum eſt, id fauſtum ac felix civitati huic eveniat. At vota pro victoriâ Diis nuncupata, quia fortuna reddere nos prohibuit, vos accurare pium & honeſtum eſt. Jovi igitur ſervatori & Apollini & venerandis Deabus illa perſolvitote. Horum enim numine invocato hoſtes profligavimus* (201). The Hiſtorian, from whom I borrow theſe words, adds a reflection to them on the furious madneſs, which made the people commit that injuſtice; the people, I ſay, who were exaſperated by their Orators. Οὕτω δὲ ὁ δῆμος τότε παρεφρόνησε, καὶ παροξυνθεὶς ἀδίκως ὑπὸ τῶν δημαγωγῶν, τὴν ὀργὴν ἐπέσκηψεν εἰς ἄνδρας οὐ τιμωρίας ἀλλὰ πολλῶν ἐπαίνων καὶ στεφάνων ἀξίους. *Thus did the people rage, being ſo exaſperated by their Orators, againſt all right and reaſon, that they vented their fury on theſe men, who not only deſerved no puniſhment, but who merited all ſorts of praiſes, and the moſt glorious crowns* (102). But muſt ſuch men be ſtyled Orators? Has not an Orator been deſcribed under the character of *an honeſt man, who underſtands the art of ſpeaking, Vir bonus dicendi peritus* (103)? We ought not therefore to give the name of an Orator, or of a Preacher, to a factious, ſeditious, and wicked man, who makes an ill uſe of his eloquence and of the ſtrength of his lungs, to ſtir up the people to violent proceedings. We have obſerved in another place (204), that Thomas Hobbes having a mind to inſpire the Engliſh with a diſguſt of the Republican Government, undertook a tranſlation of Thucydides. This was a good thought enough; but he had done better ſtill, if he had compoſed a work of the

(187) Ἐντοῖς φερομένοις ὡς αὐτῆς εἶναι ἀπὸ Ἡρόδικος ὁ Κρατήτιος παρέθηκε. *In carminibus ipſi attributis, & ab Herodico Cratetio publicatis.* Athen. lib. 5. p. 219. *Gyraldus de Poetis Græcis*, p. 170. edit. 1696. aſſerts that Athenæus mentions ſome poems of Aſpaſia in other paſſages, which he, Gyraldus, does not quote. I have not time now to examine whether this be true or not.

(188) Plato, *in Menexeno*, p. m. 517.

(189) Plutarch, *in his Life*, Diodorus Siculus, lib. 12. Thucydides, lib. 1, 2, & *ſeq.*

(190) Ἐν δὲ Νεμέᾳ, *apud Nemeam.* Plut. *in Pericle*, p. 163, *D.*

* Le Fleuve.

(191) Μακρὸν τεῖχος, *longum murum.* Idem, ibid. p. 160, *init.*

(192) It is the treatiſe *de vitioſo Pudore*, p. m. 531. See alſo Aulus Gellius, lib. 1. cap. 3.

(193) See Plutarch, in *the Life of* Alcibiades, p. 210.

(194) See Xenophon, lib. 1. *de Geſtis Græcorum*, p. m. 259. See alſo Diodor. Siculus, lib. 13. cap 100.

(195) Xenophon, ibid. p. 262.

(196) Diodor. Siculus, lib. 13. cap. 97.

(197) Xenophon, lib. 1. *de Geſtis Græcor.* p. 265.

(198) Plut. *in Vita Periclis*, ſub fin. p. 172.

(199) See Xenophon, *de Geſtis Græcorum*, lib. 1. p. 263.

(200) See the *Life of Socrates*, written in French by Monſieur Charpentier, p. m. 168, &c.

(201) Diodor. Siculus, lib. 13. cap. 102. p. m. 533. it is p. 221, of the Greek and Latin edition, printed in the year 1604, in folio.

(102) Idem, ib.

(103) See Quintilian, lib. 12. cap. 1. p. m. 552.

(234) Above, in the article of HOBBES, in the Text, towards the beginning.

French Writer concerning Pericles [*R*]. This will give me an opportunity to make the reader take notice of the injuſtice and diſorders, which often prevailed at Athens under the Republican Government [*S*].

The

the domeſtick affairs of the Athenians. The hiſtory we have of that people is fit almoſt only to miſlead us. It ſtrikes us, becauſe it is ſet off to the beſt advantage; we are dazzled by the battles of Marathon, and of Salamine; by their armies by land and by ſea; by their conqueſts; by the riches of their citizens; by the pomp of their publick ſhows; by the ſtateline ſs of their publick buildings. All this makes us think that it is ſlavery to live under any other form of Government. But if we were to read an Hiſtory, in which all theſe things were but ſlightly touched upon, but which contained a particular account of their tumultuous aſſemblies; of the factions which divided that ſtate; of the ſeditions which ſhaked it; of the moſt illuſtrious ſubjects, who were perſecuted, baniſhed (205), or capitally puniſhed, at the mere fancy of a violent declaimer, we ſhould be perſuaded that that nation, who boaſted ſo much of her liberty, was really a ſlave to a ſmall party of men, whom they ſtyled Demagogues, and who led the people ſometimes one way, ſometimes another, according as they were ſwayed by their private paſſions, juſt as the waves roll now one way, and then another as the wind moves them (206). You would in vain look into Macedonia, which was a monarchy, for ſo many inſtances of tyranny as the hiſtory of Athens affords. But this is enough, or perhaps too much: the digreſſion is ſomewhat long. See the remark [*S*].

(205) *Hos libros tum ſcripſiſſe dicitur* (Thucydides) *quum à Rep. remotus, atque id quod optimo cuique Athenis accidere ſolitum eſt, in exilium pulſus eſſet.* Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. 2. folio 73, *D*. i. e. "It is "ſaid Thucydides wrote "theſe books "when he was "removed from "publick buſineſs, and baniſhed; which "was the cuſtomary fate "of every good "and honeſt "man at Athens."

(206) Compare this, with what is obſerved above, quotation (75) of the article EDWARD IV.

[*R*] The blunders *of another French Writer concerning Pericles.*] He has not prefixed his name to his work, which is a book printed at Paris in two volumes in 12mo, in the year 1669, entitled, *Hiſtoire generale de la Grece*, i. e. "A general Hiſtory of "Greece." We find there, that Phidias was charged *with having by him ſeveral ſums of ſacred money, which were given him by Pericles* (207). That the Athenians *accuſed Pericles of that ſacrilege*, and *charged his tutor Anaxagoras with being concerned in the ſame crime, and with having thus taught his pupil* (208). That Author did not well underſtand the Writer from whom he tranſcribed; for here follows what we read in Diodorus Siculus. Phidias was charged with embezzling a large ſum of money, to which Pericles was privy, who had ordered him to make a ſtatue of Minerva. Whereupon Pericles's enemies perſuaded the people to put Phidias in priſon, and to bring in an information againſt Pericles for ſuch a ſacrilege. They charged alſo Anaxagoras with impious doctrines, and involved Pericles in the ſame accuſation (209). One cannot deny but that an Hiſtorian who relates theſe particulars as the modern Author does, falſifies and miſrepreſents them conſiderably. Some pages lower he obſerves, that Pericles having delivered the funeral Oration, which is to be met with *in the ſecond book of Thucydides . . . . . was loaded with kindneſs and careſſes by the Athenian Ladies, who took him round the waiſt as he came down from the pulpit, kiſſed his hands, and crowned his head with flowers, as though he came triumphant from the Olympick Games* (210). This is miſtaking the times: the Oration of Pericles mentioned by Thucydides was delivered in commendation of thoſe who were killed in the beginning of the Peloponneſian War. But at that time the Ladies ſhewed no kindneſs to the Orator. If our modern Writer had carefully examined Plutarch whom he quotes, he would have known that Pericles was careſſed by the Ladies after the funeral Oration delivered to the honour of thoſe who died in the war againſt Samos (211). There paſſed about ten years between theſe two Orations (212). Let us take notice of another miſtake of that Author. Having related what happened in the two firſt Campaigns of the Peloponneſian War, he obſerves that Pericles being angry with the people for their reproaches, harangued the Council of Athens, and repreſented many things, which did not make a very deep impreſſion on the people's mind (213), ſince that *great man was fined* (214). *But*, adds the Hiſtorian (215), he was *again elected General of the army of Athens, which honour he did not enjoy long, ſince he died a year and an half after*. He muſt therefore have lived till the fifth year of the Peloponneſian War; and yet, according to Thucydides, who was very well acquainted with this (216), he died two years and an half after the beginning of that war. If that general Hiſtory of Greece was thus carefully examined throughout, I imagine we ſhould meet every where with ſuch blunders.

(207) *Hiſt. generale de la Grece*, Tom. 2. p. 390.

(208) Ibid. p. 391.

(209) Diodor. Siculus, lib. 12. cap. 39.

(210) *Hiſt. generale de la Grece*, Tome 2. p. 409.

(211) See the remark [*N*] quotation (147).

(212) The Samian war was carried on in the 84th Olympiad, and the Peloponneſian war began in the 87th Olympiad.

(213) *Hiſt. generale de la Grece*, Tom. 2. p. 413.

(214) Ibid. p. 415.

(215) Ibid. p. 416.

(216) Thucydides, lib. 2. p. m. 118.

[*S*] *The injuſtices and diſorders which often prevailed among the Athenians.*] See in the remark [*Q*] what I have obſerved upon this by way of digreſſion. I would add nothing to it, did I not know, that ſome perſons diſliked that digreſſion, and even aſſerted that I was the only perſon who ever made ſuch an obſervation. I muſt then ſhew them that they have not read much, and that the authorities that might be quoted are not much more favourable to them, than right reaſon. I ſay, reaſon, for can we have a good opinion of a Government in which the oppoſite factions of declaimers were a neceſſary evil? Ὁ μὲν οὖν Μελάνθιος εἴτε παίζων εἴτε σπουδάζων, ἔλεγε διασώζεσθαι τὴν Ἀθηναίων πόλιν ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ῥητόρων διχοστασίας καὶ ταραχῆς. οὐ γὰρ ἀποκλίνειν ἅπαντας εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν τοῖχον, ἀλλὰ γίνεσθαί τινα τῇ βλάπτοντι ἀνθιλκὴν ἐν τῇ διαφορᾷ τῶν πολιτευομένων. *Melanthius obſerves indeed, either out of joke, or ſeriouſly, that the Republick of Athens was preſerved from ruin by the oppoſite factions and ſeditions of her Orators. All did not run againſt the ſame wall; but there was in the oppoſition of intereſt among thoſe who governed, ſomething which prevented the downfal of the whole State* (217). Pray, compare together two paſſages in Ariſtotle, that in which he deſcribes the diſorders of Democracies, and that in which he obſerves how a democratical Government came to be eſtabliſhed at Athens. Compare theſe two paſſages, and you will find, that he muſt have looked upon the Government eſtabliſhed at Athens after the victories gained over the Perſians, as a downright tyranny. He obſerves, that ſince Solon put the whole authority into the hands of Judges choſen by the people, men began to flatter the people, as they uſe to flatter tyrants; that Ephialtes and Pericles leſſened the power of the Areopagus; and that the other Demagogues, following the example, eſtabliſhed the Democracy which prevailed at laſt. He pretends that Solon's intentions were not followed herein: but that the people's pride, after the glory they had gained in the war againſt the Perſians, and the bad qualities of the Demagogues produced thoſe effects (218). Here then he confeſſes that a Democracy was eſtabliſhed at Athens, that is to ſay, according to the deſcription he gives of that kind of Government in another paſſage of his work (219), a State in which every thing, even the laws themſelves, depend from the multitude ſet up as a tyrant, and governed by the flatteries of ſome declaimers. Is not the ſentence, which Boetius makes Philoſophy ſay, very much to the honour of the Athenians? *Si cujus oriundus ſis patriæ reminiſceris, non uti Athenienſium quondam, multitudinis imperio regitur, ſed εἷς κοίρανος ἐστὶν, εἷς βασιλεύς: qui frequentia civium non* DEPULSIONE *lætatur* (220). i. e. "If you remember "what country you are it is not, governed, like "Athens of old, by the multitude; it has but one "Prince, one King, who loves to have a great "number of citizens, and not to *baniſh* them." One can hardly meet with any thing more ſmart and ſatyrical againſt the people of Athens, than Julius Cæſar Scaliger's Verſes, which have been extremely approved by a learned Profeſſor of Hiſtory in the Univerſity of an Imperial City. I obſerve this, that the reader may ſee that a Profeſſor who was paid by a Republick, did not think himſelf under any obligation to have a regard for the Government of Athens. He does not only quote the invective of Scaliger the Father, but adorns it with commendations, and even corroborates it with inſtances, and with an apoſtrophe of Demoſthenes to Minerva. O Goddeſſes, ſays that Orator, as he was going into baniſhment, how comes it that you love ſo much three very miſchievous beaſts, the owl, the dragon, and the people? *Cum nulla cœna tam parca ſit, in*

(217) Plutarch, *de audiend. Poetis*, p. 20, C.

(218) Ariſtotel. *Politic.* lib. 2. cap. 12. p. m. 252.

(219) Idem, ib. lib. 4. cap. 4. p. 278.

(220) Boetius, *de Conſol. Philoſ.* lib. 1. p. m. 16. See Renatus Valinus's notes on that paſſage of Boetius.

The expedition againſt Samos, the motives of which I have hinted in one of my remarks (*e*), was of all Pericles's actions the moſt odiouſly miſrepreſented by the Writers, who put the worſt conſtruction upon it (*f*). Plutarch will acquaint you with this; but he has omitted an odious circumſtance, which he might have met with in Alexis of Samos's ſecond book concerning the limits of Samos. That Author obſerved, that the lewd women, who followed Pericles in that expedition, got ſo conſiderable a ſum of money, that they built at Samos the Temple of Venus, ſirnamed the Reeds, or of the Marſhes [*T*]. This was charging that General with taking but little care to have the Military Diſcipline ſtrictly obſerved.

(*e*) Above, quotat. (167).

(*f*) See Plutarch, in the *Life of Pericles*, p. 166, &c.

qua non hilaritatis poculum circumeat; propinabo ejus loco lepidiſſimos hoſce verſus Julii Scaligeri *de inſaniente* Athenienſium *vulgo:*

Nulla eſt, puto, Reſpublica nationè vera,
Commentitia, fictavè cogitatione,
Aut ſtultitiâ aut nequitiâ Atticâ priores.
Ita conſiliis flagitiiſque Demagogos
Tetris nugivoram excruciaſſe cerno plebem:
Fecem pelagi turbine turbulentiorem.
Juſtos opibus, patria & exuiſſe vita.

Nihil ſolemnius hoc poſtremo; & exemplo eſt Diomedon *apud* Valerium noſtrum, *qui* non meritum ſupplicium ductus nihil aliud locutus eſt, quam ut vota pro incolumitate exercitus ab ipſo nuncupata ſolverentur. *Fertur, cum* Demoſthenes *jam exulaturus urbe cederet, extenſis verſus arcem manibus exclamaſſe?* O Domina Polias *(ita Minervam cognominabat)* quid ita gaudes tribus moleſtiſſimis beſtiis, Noctua, Dracone, & Populo (221). *i. e.* "As there is never ſo moderate an "entertainment, but a merry glaſs goes round, I "ſhall afford you inſtead of it, theſe pretty lines of "Julius Cæſar Scaliger, concerning the raging multitude at Athens. *I do not think there ever was a "Commonwealth, either real, or fictitious, and imaginary, that came up to the Athenian in folly and wickedneſs. The Demagogues tormented the idle and ſilly "multitude by their wicked councils, and ſcandalous "deeds: the people, I ſay, who are more turbulent than "the waves of the ſea; and robs the beſt citizens of "their eſtate, their country, and their lives.* There "can be nothing more grave and ſolemn than this "laſt obſervation: which may be confirmed by an "inſtance from Valerius Maximus, who obſerves that "Diomedon, going to the place of execution, to "ſuffer a puniſhment, which he had not deſerved, "deſired nothing but that the people would perform "the vows he had made for the preſervation of the "army: and Demoſthenes, going into baniſhment, "and lifting up his hands towards the Temple, is "ſaid to have cried out, *Oh Minerva*, &c."

(221) *Chriſtophorus Adamus Rupertus, Diſſertat. in Valerium Maximum*, lib. 1. cap. 1. p. 33, 34. edit. Noriberg. 1663. What he obſerves of Demoſthenes, is to be met with in Plutarch, *in Vita Demoſthenis*, p. 858, *B*.

[*T*] *The lewd women . . . . . got ſo conſiderable a ſum of money, that they built . . . . . the Temple of Venus . . . . of the Marſhes.*] Athenæus is the Author who acquaints us with theſe particulars, Ἀλέξις δ' ὁ Σάμιος, ſays he, ἐν δευτέρῳ ὡρῶν Σαμιακῶν τὴν ἐν Σάμῳ Ἀφροδίτην, ἣν οἱ μὲν ἐν Καλάμοις καλοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ ἐν Ελειαλικαῖς φησὶν, ἑταῖραι ἱδρύσαντο αἱ συνακολουθήσασαι Περικλεῖ, ὅτε ἐπολιόρκει τὸν Σάμιον, ἐργασάμεναι ἱκανῶς ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας. *Alexis Samius libro ſecundo de Samiorum finibus ſcribit, ædem Veneris in Samo, quam in arundinibus quidam vocant, alii in paluſtribus, meretrices Periclem ſecutas, cùm obſideret Samum, ædificaſſe, ingenti quæſtu proſtituta forma ditatas* (222). Let us wonder here at the blindneſs of the mind of men; here we have conſcientious proſtitutes, who conſecrate to religious uſes a conſiderable part of the money they got by their abominable diſſoluteneſs. With whom can they more properly be compared than with thoſe receivers of a King's revenues, who, after they are grown rich by devouring the very ſubſtance of the people, build a ſumptuous Chapel, and adorn the great Altar of a Cathedral Church with their offerings

(222) Athenæus, lib. 13. cap. 4. p. 572.

Si l'on vient à chercher pour quel ſecret myſtere
Alidor à ſes frais bâtti un monaſtere,
Alidor, dit un fourbe, il eſt de mes amis,
Je l'ai conu laquais, avant qu'il fût Commis:
C'eſt un homme d'honneur, de pieté profonde,
Et qui veut rendre â Dieu ce qu'il a pris au monde (223).

(223) Boileau, Sat. 9. ver. 159.

"Theſe ſoft-mouth'd Satyriſts would thus declaim
"At M—r whoſe charity records his name.
"The Knight has known how needy wretches fare,
"His parents were, it ſeems, the Pariſh care.
"A Saint profound—To make his reck'ning ev'n,
"The wealth he ſtole from men, he gave to Heav'n."

Boileau's Works by ſeveral hands.

All the Heathens did not want judgment like thoſe of Samos. Do you think that the Emperor Alexander would have ſuffered the Courtezans of Rome to ſpend part of their gain in building a Temple?-He would not even ſuffer the tax that was laid on proſtitutes and pimps to be carried to his Exchequer, but ordered it to be employed in repairing the Amphitheatre, &c. *Lenonum vectigal & meretricum, & exoletorum in ſacrum ærarium inferri vetuit, ſed ſumptibus publicis ad inſtaurationem theatri, circi, amphitheatri, & ſtadii deputavit* (224).

(224) Lamprid. *in Alexandro Severo*, cap. 24. p. m. 917, 918. Tom. 1. *Hiſtor. Auguſtæ Script.*

PERIERS (BONAVENTURE DE), born in Bar on the river Aube in Burgundy, was Valet de Chambre to Margaret de Valois Queen of Navarre, and ſiſter of Francis I. (*a*). There is extant of his a volume of French Poems, printed after his death, in Lyons, by John des Tournes, anno 1544, 8vo: a tranſlation (*b*) of Terence's Andria (*c*), and ſeveral Tales in proſe, entitled, *Nouvelles Recreations* (*d*) [*A*]. I never ſaw his *Cymbalum*

(*a*) La Croix du Maine, *Biblioth.* Franc. p. 36.

(*b*) In French verſe.

(*c*) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, *Biblioth.* Franc. p. 131.

(*d*) La Croix du Main, *Biblioth. Franc.* p. 36.

[*A*] *There is extant of his . . . ſeveral . . . Tales . . entitled,* Nouvelles Recreations.] According to La Croix du Maine, the *two firſt Authors of this work were James Peletier du Mans, a Phyſician and Philoſopher; and Nicolas Deniſot, ſirnamed the Count of Alſinois* (1). Stephen Paſquier ſays otherwiſe, in a letter written by him to Tabourot, Sieur des Accords, Author of the Bigarrures. "I find, ſays he to him (2), "that in this ſecond edition, you aſcribe the recrea"tions of Bonaventure du Perier to James Pelletier. "You will excuſe me when I obſerve, that I be"lieve you have been miſinformed. I was one of "James Pelletier's moſt intimate friends, and he "made no ſcruple to impart his moſt ſecret thoughts "to me. I know the books which he told me were "written by him, but this he never once mentioned "to me. He was a true Poet, and very jealous of "his reputation; and therefore I am ſure that he "would not have diſowned it: this book being ſo "valuable, on account of the ſubjects it treats upon, "that it does not deſerve to be diſowned by its "Author, any more than the *Facetiæ*, in Latin, of "Poggius the Florentine. They were writ by Du "Perier, as alſo the book entitled *Cymbalum Mundi*, "which is written after the manner of Lucian; and "deſerves to be committed to the flames, with the "Author, if he were living." An undoubted circumſtance is, that this Author did not compoſe all the tales or ſtories which are in his *Nouvelles Recreations*. He could not have writ that which is the firſt in the edition, which Vouet has not mentioned. It is that of Roan 1606, printed by Raphael du Petit-Val. It is ſaid in the firſt ſtory, that this work is publiſhed very ſeaſonably, in order to furniſh the Ladies with a diverting work, during the Civil Wars which brought ſo many calamities upon the nation. Now

(1) *Biblioth. Franc.* p. 36. See alſo p. 193.

(2) Paſquier, *Lettres*, Liv. 8. Tom. 1. p. 493. Paris edit. 1619, 8vo.

Cymbalum Mundi, which is ſaid to be a very impious book [*B*]. He came to an unhappy end;

Now it was impoſſible that Du Perier ſhould have writ thoſe words; he dying long before the firſt civil wars of France. Here follows the judgment of that famous Divine. *Eum* (librum) *carptim percurrens, offendi nihil aliud eſſe quam* colloquia prava; *hoc eſt, narrationes & diſſertationes, meris morologiis, vanitatibus, obſcœnitatibus, nominis divini abuſibus refertas, quo quidem nemini niſi Epicureis (quibus voluptas ſummum bonum) placere poteſt. Et tamen librum cum auctore in cœlum tollit, quiſquis præfationem præfixit . . . . . ſuffecerit ex primâ novella quæ inſtar præambuli eſt, annotaſſe, quod dicat ſe libellum illum oportunè tunc edere, ut in mediis bellis civilibus & publicis calamitatibus habeant unde ſe oblectent imprimis matronæ & virgines, quas ad lectionem nominatim ſcurrilium quæ ibi occurrunt, contentioſe invitat. Summam autem & maximè convenientem huic vitæ noſtræ doctrinam eſſe:* Bene vivere & lætari: *quod poſtea interpretatur:* ridere (3). "Running my eye "over this book, I found it to conſiſt of nothing "but wicked dialogues; that is relations and diſſertations, filled with mere buffoonry, vanity, obſcenity, and profanations of the ſacred name of "God; and therefore it can be pleaſing to none but "Epicureans, who make pleaſure the chief good. "Notwithſtanding this, the perſon who wrote the "preface praiſes the book, and its Author, to the "ſkies. . . . . I will only obſerve from the firſt tale "or ſtory, which ſerves as the introduction, that he "ſays this book was publiſhed then very ſeaſonably; "that it might prove an entertainment, in the midſt "of the civil wars and publick calamities which then "reigned; particularly to Ladies and young Maidens, "who are exhorted, in the ſtrongeſt terms, to read "it, and eſpecially the ſcurrilities contained in it. "That the principal and beſt adapted doctrine, for "the conduct of this life is, to *rejoice and live well*, "which he afterwards explains, *to laugh*." Des Periers is not the only Author who wrote ſuch tales. The *neuf Matinées* (nine mornings) of the Seigneur de Cholieres are in the ſame caſt, *licentious* and *recreative*, and very obſcene. I believe that this book was firſt printed in 1685, at Paris, for John Richer, 8vo. with his Majeſty's licence.

(3) Gisb. Voetius, *Diſput. Theolog.* vol. 1. p. 200.

[*B*] *His* Cymbalum Mundi, *which is ſaid to be a very impious work.*] He wrote it *firſt in Latin*, and afterwards tranſlated *it into French, under the name of Thomas du Clevier, printed at Paris in* 1537. La Croix du Maine, who ſpeaks in this manner (4), affirms that it is a *deteſtable* work, and *filled with impieties*. The reader has ſeen above, that Stephen Paſquier formed the ſame judgment of it. I have found a ſort of epitome of this *Cymbalum Mundi* in du Verdier-Vauprivas's *Bibliotheque Francoiſe*; and as moſt of my readers cannot have recourſe conveniently to that Bibliotheque, they will be extremely glad to meet with the following extract from it. "Thomas du Clevier has tranſlated out of Latin in- "to French, a treatiſe, entitled, *Cymbalum Mundi:* "containing four poetical Dialogues, very antient, "jovial and facetious, printed at Lyons in 16°. by "Benedict Bonnyn 1538. I did not find any "thing that deſerved cenſure in this work, except "Ovid's Metamorphoſes, Lucian's Dialogues, and the "books on wanton ſubjects and fictions. In the firſt "Dialogue, the Author introduces Mercury, Bryphanes, and Curtalius, who meeting in an inn at "Athens, at the ſign of the white coal, where Mercury happened to come, being diſpatched from "" Heaven by Jupiter, who had given him a "book in order to get it bound: thoſe two knaves, "whilſt he went to divert himſelf, take out of a "pocket he had left on the bed this book; ſteal "it, and leave, in its place, another containing "all the love-intrigues and wanton tricks of Jupiter; "as when he aſſumed the form of a bull to carry off "Europa; when he metamorphoſed himſelf into a "ſwan, to viſit Leda; when he came under the "borrowed form of Amphytrion, &c. . . . . In the "ſecond Dialogue ſome Philoſophers are introduced, "ſearching for ſome pieces of the Philoſopher's "ſtone in the ſand of the Theatre, where, as they "formerly were diſputing about it, and Mercury "having ſhewed it them, the ſimpletons in queſtion "importuned him ſo much by their entreaties, that "not knowing on whom to beſtow it all, he broke "it to pieces, and beat it quite to duſt; and afterwards mixed it with the ſand, that every one "might have a little of it, bidding them look for "it very narrowly; and aſſuring them that, if they "found ever ſo ſmall a portion of it, they would do "wonders, ſuch as the tranſmutation of metals, "breaking the bars of doors, healing people who "are ſick; and obtain eaſily from the Gods whatever they might deſire, provided it was lawful and "what might happen naturally, as rain after fair "weather, flowers and mildew in ſpring, heat and "duſt in ſummer, fruits in autumn, cold and dirt in "winter: in all which the Author ridicules the idle "purſuits of Alchymiſts (5). . . . . In the third Dialogue he reſumes the ſubject of the firſt, with regard to the book ſtoln from the Author of all "thefts, entitled, *Quæ in hoc libro continentur: Chronica rerum memorabilium quas Jupiter geſſit antequam eſſet ipſe. Fatorum præſcriptum, ſive, eorum, quæ futura ſunt, certæ diſpoſitiones. Catalogus Heroum immortalium, qui cum Jove vitam victuri ſunt ſempiternam.* i. e. The contents of this book are as follow: Chronicles of the memorable acts atchieved "by Jupiter, before he had a being. An injunction "or decree of fate, or certain diſpoſitions of things "which will occur. A liſt of immortal heroes who "are to live eternally with Jupiter. Herein the "Author firſt laughs at the idolatrous Heathens, and "their falſe God Jupiter, as intimating that he never "exiſted; or that, if he did exiſt, he was a man, "and never performed any memorable acts, nor ſuch "as have been fictitiouſly aſcribed to him. By the "ſecond head of the title of the book, he laughs at "fate, and fatal neceſſity, and tacitly at judicial "Aſtrology. By the third, he laughs at thoſe who, "on account of their grandeur, conſider themſelves "as Gods. He afterwards introduces Mercury, diſcourſing of the commiſſions which each of the "Gods and Goddeſſes had given him, to deſcend to "the earth; and the ſame Mercury, by the power "or virtue of certain words which he mutters, makes "a horſe named Phlegon ſpeak and argue with his "groom. In the fourth and laſt Dialogue, two dogs "..... diſcourſe together about ſeveral whimſical "and merry particulars (6)." Du Verdier Vau-Privas does not ſeem to have found any poiſon in this work, but only a ridicule upon the Heathen Religion, *&c.* Moſt other readers are of opinion that Bonaventure des Periers, upon pretence of laughing at the religion of the Heathens, had attacked the true religion. Father Merſenne formed this judgment of it. This Author, ſays he, introduces the fables of Jupiter, Mercury, *&c.* intending merely to open a way for ridiculing the Catholick Faith, and rejecting the greateſt truths which we ſpeak and believe concerning God. *Per quas* (fabulas) *fidem catholicam irridere, & ea quæ de Deo veriſſima eſſe dicimus & credimus, rejicere velle videtur* (7). He declares that Bonaventure des Periers was only the tranſlator of the *Cymbalum Mundi*; and that he was a completely impious knave, *impiiſſimum nebulonem*, and that many perſons took him for an Atheiſt. Voetius, who had not ſeen this book, does not ſay that the Author was an Atheiſt; nay, he diſcharges him from any blemiſh of that kind, provided the *Cymbalum Mundi* is only a banter upon purgatory, and upon ſeveral other inventions of Chriſtians. He adds, that it is impoſſible a man ſhould inſinuate Atheiſtical or Epicurean Principles, in facetious pieces filled with fictions; and that ſuch artifices are employed by Authors, in order that they, in caſe of a proſecution, may have an opportunity of eſcaping. He adds that, in a Dramatic piece, entitled, *Iphigenie*, for inſtance, he may laugh at Hecate who had three ſeveral ſhapes; ridicule ſuch Deities as require human victims; and level as many cenſures as they pleaſe againſt thoſe Prieſts who exhort to ſuch ſacrifices. The deſign of ſuch a Dramatick Poet may be to burleſque the trinity and the paſſion of the ſon of God, and open a door to Deiſm or Mahomedan Socinianiſm; but he alſo may aſſert, in caſe it be neceſſary, that thoſe who conſi-

(4) *Biblioth. Franc.* p. 36, 37.

(5) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, *Biblioth. Franc.* p. 1177.

(6) Idem, ibid. 1178.

(7) Merſennus, *in Geneſim*, p. 669. *apud Voetium Diſputat. Theologic.* Tome 1. p. 199.

end; *he killing himſelf with a ſword, which, in the utmoſt height of madneſs and diſtraction, he thruſt into his belly* (e). Several Authors ſpeak of this action [C]. Allard ſays, that our Bonaventure's name was Perier; that he was born in the bailiwick of Ambrunois, and *wrote an Apology in verſe for Marot, when abſent, againſt Sagon, in* 1580 (f). It is certain, that he wrote this apology, but not in that year. He was dead before the year 1544.

(e) La Croix du Maine, *Biblioth. Franc.* p. 37.

(f) Allard, *Biblioth. de Dauphine*, p. 172.

der it in that view are ſlanderers, and that his only intention was, to ridicule the fables of the Heathens. Here follow Voetius's words, which ſeem to hint as if ſomething like this had been exhibited on the Stage in ſome city in Holland. *Quibus reponi poteſt: nihil vetare, quin Lucianum omneſque prophanos & impios poëtas atque antiquos literiones imitando quis ſubdole Atheiſmum, Epicureiſmum, Gentiliſmum hominum animis inſtillet; quamvis ſtylum ludicris ambiguitatibus, & jocis, item mimeſibus, proſopopœiis, &c. ita moderetur, ut ſi quis hæc ad examen revocet, colore aliquo eludere & elabi poſſit. Quomodo meminimus à Sceptico-Libertinis & Epicureis nebulonibus alicubi in Belgio omnem pietatem & fidem Chriſtianam dicteriis quibuſque apud homines traductam eſſe, exempli gratia, Tragœdia ſcribitur, & in theatro exhibetur tit.* Iphigenia: *in qua Ethnica illa, de Hecate triformi, de diis ſanguine humano, idque ex conſilio ſacerdotum, placandis perſtringuntur. Si quis pius metuat (ut quidem autores illos novit) eos myſterium Trinitatis, & redemptionis noſtræ per ſanguinem Chriſti velle deridendum proponere & ſic Epicureiſmo, Deiſmo, aut Turco-Sociniſmo viam munire: quomodo hoc evincet; cum promptum ſemper ſit effugium; rideri tantum fabulas Gentilium* (8).

(8) Voetius, *ubi ſupra.*

The reaſons of this Profeſſor in Divinity are very juſt. There are two ways of laughing at ſuperſtitions, the one very good, the other very bad. Such Fathers of the Church as have expoſed all the ridiculouſneſs of the falſe Deities deſerve great praiſe for ſo doing; for their aim was, to open the eyes of the Heathens, and confirm the faithful. They were not ignorant that, in inſpiring people with contempt and averſion for the religion of the Heathens, they ſtrengthened them in the true Faith, and furniſhed Chriſtians with good weapons to reſiſt perſecution. But Lucian, who has laughed ſo much at the falſe Deities of the Heathens, and given the utmoſt life and beauty to the deſcriptions he has exhibited of the impertinence and frauds of the religion of the Greeks, deſerves nevertheleſs to be deteſted; ſince, inſtead of being prompted to this from a good motive, his only view was, to indulge his ſcoffing temper, and open a way to his ſatyrical ſtyle; and has ſhewn no leſs indifference and averſion to truth than to falſhood. Here we have two patterns, that of the Fathers of the Church, and that of Lucian, whence we may form a rational judgment of ſeveral ſatyrs written in theſe latter ages, againſt abuſes in religion. Rabelais ought to be conſidered as the copiſt of Lucian, and I believe the ſame muſt be ſaid of Bonaventure des Periers; for I find the Proteſtants (9) were as much exaſperated againſt the *Cymbalum Mundi*, as the Roman Catholicks. It muſt only be obſerved, that there have crept into the Chriſtian Religion, a great number of abuſes, which reſemble ſo much the irregularities in the religion of the Heathens; that it is impoſſible to write any thing againſt the Heathens, without affording many devotees with a pretence to declare, that the Chriſtian Religion has been wounded through the ſides of that of the Heathens. It is the buſineſs of thoſe, who give occaſion for theſe reproaches, to examine, in their own conſciences, what was their real intention; and whether their only view was, to have the deſcription they give of the irregular practices of the Heathens, conſidered as the repreſentation of modern abuſes. Some Diſſenters, among the Engliſh, are accuſed of repreſenting, in very ſtrong colours, the corruptions of the antient Romiſh Clergy, in no other view, but to draw characters which might bring an odium on the preſent State of the Epiſcopalians. We are told in Milton's life (10), that his Hiſtory of England, till the reign of William the Conqueror, was printed in 1670, but not in the terms in which he wrote it; for the licenſers ſtruck out ſeveral paſſages, in which he related the ſuperſtition, pride, and artifices of thoſe Eccleſiaſticks who lived under the Saxon Kings: the licenſers imagining that the Clergy under Charles II. were ſtruck at through their ſides. It is added (11) that, Sir Robert Howard being told, that he was accuſed of having ſcourged, in a certain book, the Engliſh Clergy on the backs of the Heathen, and Popiſh Prieſts, he anſwered maliciouſly and craftily: *What buſineſs had they there* (12)?

(9) La Croix du Maine, whom I cited above, and Henry Stephens, whoſe words will be inſerted in the following rem.

(10) Toland's *Life of Milton*, p. 138.

(11) Ibid.

(12) The Reader will perhaps call to mind on this occaſion, the comedy entitled, *le Pedant joué*, where, when the Pedant is deſired to ranſom his ſon, he often asks, *What the Devil had he to do there?*

[C] *Several Authors ſpeak of this action.*] I ſhall quote only Henry Stephens (13): "I will not omit "Bonaventure des Periers, Author of a deteſtable "book, entitled, *Cymbalum Mundi*, who, notwithſtanding the ſtrictneſs with which he was watched, "(upon its being obſerved that he was in a deſpairing "condition, and intended to make away with himſelf) was found transfixed with his ſword, the handle of which he had fixed againſt the ground, "ſo that it went in at his breaſt and came out at his "back." See alſo John Chaſſanion, Chapter XXVI. Book I. of *memorable Hiſtories of the great and wonderful judgments and puniſhments inflicted by the Almighty* (14).

(13) Henry Stephens's *Apology for Herodotus*, chap. 18. *ſub fin.* p. m. 231. See alſo chap. 27. p. 309.

(14) Page 170. Geneva edit. 1586. 8vo.

PERIMEDE, a famous Sorceres, whom Theocritus equals with Medea and Circe (*a*), and who, according to the Scholiaſt in that Poet, was the ſame perſon with Agamede, mentioned in the Iliad. This Agamede was the eldeſt daughter of Augeas King of Elis (*b*) and wife of Mulius, a brave man, killed by Neſtor (*c*), who was very young at that time (*d*). I take notice of this circumſtance, in order to ſhew the time in which Perimede lived, if ſhe was not the ſame perſon with Agamede. It is thought Propertius ſpoke of Perimede [*A*].

(a) Theocr. Idyll. 2. ver. 16.

(b) Homer. Iliad. lib. 11. ver. 739.

(c) Idem, Iliad. 11. ver. 637 *& ſeq.*

(d) Idem, Ibid. ver. 683, 718.

[*A*] *It is thought Propertius ſpoke of Perimede.*] The MSS differ greatly in the paſſage relating to this ſubject; and therefore in ſeveral editions we read as follows.

Non hic herba valet, non hic nocturna Citeis
Non per Medeæ gramina cocta manus (1).

"Ceteis baleful weeds have no effect,
"Nor herbs by fam'd Medea boil'd.

Muretus having conſidered that Citeis ſignifies Medea, was of opinion, that Medea is not ſpoke of in the following verſe, and therefore thought it ought to be read as follows:

Non Perimedeæ gramina cocta manu.

"Herbs boiled by Perimede ſerve for nought.

and he obſerves, that Beroaldus found that reading in ſome antient manuſcripts (2). Grævius followed it in his edition of Propertius, as has alſo Broekhuſius, who approves of Muretus's reaſoning. I'll obſerve by the way, that inſtead of *cocta* he would read *lecta*, and that he confirms his conjecture in a very learned manner (3).

(1) Propert. lib. 2. Eleg 4.

(2) Muret. *Not's in Propertium*, Eleg. 4. lib. 2.

(3) See his excellent edition of *Propertius*.

☞ PERIZONIUS (JAMES), a very learned Writer in the 18th century, was deſcended of a family originally of Schutorp, a ſmall town in the county of Benthem, in Weſt-

Weſtphalia. His anceſtors took the name of *Voorbroek*, from an eſtate, which they had, ſituated in a low and marſhy place, as the Dutch word ſignifies. One of them thought proper to change this word for a Greek one of the ſame meaning, as he did by publiſhing a copy of verſes upon a marriage, which he ſubſcribed by the name of *Perizonius*, which continued among thoſe of the family, who applied themſelves to learning, whilſt the reſt, who followed other employments, kept their antient name. James Perizonius was the eldeſt of the children of Anthony Perizonius [*A*], Rector of the ſchool of Dam, and afterwards Profeſſor of Divinity and the Hebrew languages at Ham, and at laſt at Deventer. He was born at Dam, October the 26th, 1651; and ſtudied at Deventer, under Theophilus Hogerſius, then Profeſſor of Hiſtory and Eloquence, and Giſbert Cuper, who ſucceeded Hogerſius. He removed to Utrecht in 1671, where he attended the Lectures of Grævius. The year following, the war obliged him to leave that Univerſity, and return home. His father deſigned him for the ſtudy of Divinity, and the Miniſtry; but upon his death, which happened Nov. 1, 1672, our Author purſued his inclination for the ſtudy of Polite Learning, Hiſtory, and Antiquity. In 1674, peace being reſtored to the United Provinces, he went to Leyden, in order to continue his ſtudies under Theodore Ryckius, Profeſſor of Hiſtory and Eloquence in that city. Upon his return to Deventer, which was the place of his reſidence, ſince his father had been choſen Profeſſor of Divinity there in 1661, he applied himſelf more vigorouſly than ever to his ſtudy. After he had been for ſome time Rector of the Latin ſchool at Delft, he accepted the Profeſſorſhip of Hiſtory and Eloquence, which was offered him by the Curators of the Univerſity of Franeker, in 1681. In 1684, the Curators, by way of acknowledgment of his merit and learning, which made their Univerſity flouriſh, augmented his ſtipend with the addition of an hundred crowns. Theodore Ryckius, Profeſſor of Hiſtory and Eloquence, dying in 1690, he was offered the vacant Profeſſorſhip; but the Curators of Franeker engaged him to continue with them, by adding an hundred crowns more to his ſtipend. However, he left them in 1693, and went to Leyden, to fill the place of Profeſſor of Hiſtory and Eloquence, and the Greek language; in which employment he continued till his death. If we conſider the great number of books which he publiſhed [*B*], and the continual employments of his Profeſſorſhip, it muſt be allowed, that he was a perſon of indefatigable induſtry; eſpecially if we conſider, that he committed nothing to the preſs, without having reviſed and examined it with the utmoſt care. His exceſſive application to his ſtudies was the occaſion of the indiſpoſition which proved fatal to him. He was of a very delicate conſtitution, and took no care to ſtrengthen it by exerciſe; his ſpirits were exhauſted inſenſibly; and a ſlow fever, which never quitted him, at laſt put an end to his life, April 6, 1715. He was then ſixty three years and five months old. He was interred on the 12th of that month, in St. Peter's Church at Leyden. In his laſt Will, he appointed the linen, which ſhould be put upon him after his death, according to the cuſtom in Holland; and ordered, that after he ſhould expire, his body ſhould be dreſſed in his clothes, and ſet up in a chair, and a beard made for him; a circumſtance, which would appear ridiculous and unworthy of his character, if we do not conſider his deſign in it, which was, that Mr. de Moor, who had begun his picture, might finiſh it, in order that it might be placed over the manuſcripts and books, which he left to the library of the Univerſity. In his perſon he was well made, of a good mein, and a grave and ſerious air, but far from every thing which

[*A*] Anthony Perizonius.] He publiſhed at Deventer in 1669, in 12mo, a treatiſe under the following title: Ant. Perizonii *de ratione Studii Theologici Tractatus ad ejus Emendationem præcipue ſpectans: in quo de Artium, Philoſophiæ, Literarum, & Linguarum in S. S. Theologiâ uſu ac neceſſitate, Divinæ Scripturæ ſtudio, Verſionum nævis ac defectu, Novi Teſtamenti ſtylo, &c. copioſè diſputator.* He died at Deventer, November 1. 1672, in the 46th year of his age, after having been Profeſſor of Divinity and the Oriental Languages with great reputation for eleven years in that city. He left three ſons, *James*, *Chriſtian*, and *Gerard*, and one daughter named Aleide (1).

(1) See *Schulting's Funeral Oration on James Perizonius*; and *Hiſt. Critique de la Republique des Lettres*, Tom. 9. p. 400, 401.

[*B*] *The books which he publiſhed.*] They are as follow. 1. *Diſſertationum trias: quarum in primâ de Conſtitutione divinâ ſuper ducenda defuncti Fratris uxoris; ſecunda de Lege Voconia, fœminarumque apud Veteres Hæreditatibus; tertiâ de variis Antiquorum Nummis agitur.* Deventer 1679, in 8vo. 2. *Marci Tullii Ciceronis Eruditio.* Franeker 1681, in 4to. This is an inaugural Oration, which he pronounced, when he was inſtalled in his place of Profeſſor at Franeker, January 19, 1681. 3. *Diſſertatio de Auguſteâ Orbis Terrarum deſcriptione, & loco Lucæ eam memorantis.* Franeker 1682, in 4to. This Diſſertation is greatly eſteemed. It was reprinted in 1696, in 8vo. at the end of his other Diſſertations *De Prætorio, &c.* 4. *Diſſertatio Hiſtorica de duobus maximè inſignibus L. Flori locis.* Franeker 1684, in 4to. 5. *Animadverſiones Hiſtoricæ, in quibus quam plurima in priſcis Romanarum rerum, ſed utriuſque Linguæ Autoribus notantur, multa etiam illuſtrantur atque emendantur, varia denique antiquorum rituum eruuntur, & uberius explicantur.* Amſterdam 1685, in 8vo. 6. *Franciſci Sanctii Minerva, ſive de Cauſis Latinæ Linguæ Commentarius: cui accedunt Animadverſiones & Notæ Gaſparis Scioppii, & longè uberiores Jac. Perizonii.* Franeker 1687, in 8vo. It was reprinted in 1693 at Franeker, and in 1702 at Amſterdam, with great additions, and in 1714 in the ſame city, conſiderably enlarged. 7. *Diſſertatio Philologica, de origine, ſignificatione, & uſu vocum Prætoris & Prætorii, veroque ſenſu Loci ad Philippenſes* i. 13. Franeker 1687, in 4to. 8. *Diſſertatio Philologica de Prætorio Cæſarum ejuſque Præfecto.* Franeker 1688, in 4to. Our Author having in the preceding Diſſertation aſſerted, that when St. Paul ſaid, that his innocence was known to all the *Prætorium*, he did not mean the place, where juſtice was adminiſtered, but the Prætorian cohorts, or the Emperor's guard, which was encamped near Rome, *Ulric Huber*, a Senator and Profeſſor of Civil Law at Franeker, attacked this opinion in a little tract, entitled, *De Officio Præfecti Prætorio*; and it was in anſwer to this, that *Perizonius* wrote this ſecond Diſſertation, in which he has inſerted his antagoniſt's piece. Mr. Huber replied, and our Author rejoined in the following Tract:

which ſavoured of pedantry and affectation. He had the phyſiognomy of a man of ſenſe and genius. He had a great penetration, a ſolid judgment, and a firm and happy memory. He was affable, and agreeable in converſation, which he always choſe to turn upon ſubjects of literature and importance; and was ſo modeſt, that he never ſpoke of himſelf and his writings, except when he was aſked about them. He was zealouſly attached to the duties of religion, and in his laſt ſickneſs, behaved with the greateſt piety and reſignation to the will of God. He was never married, his inclination to ſtudy determining him to chooſe a ſingle life (*a*).

(*a*) See his *Funeral Oration*, pronounced by Mr. Schulting, Profeſſor of Civil Law at Leyden, May 30. 1715. *Hiſtoire Critique de la Republique des Lettres*, Tom. 9. p. 395 & *ſeq.* *Acta Eruditor*, Amm. 1716, p. 95. & *Nouv. Litter.* Tom. 1. p. 205.

Tract: 9. *Abſterſio cenſuræ Huberianæ in nuperas Reſponſiones Jacobi Perizonii ad Librum ſingularem Ulrici Huberi de Prætorio.* Franeker 1690, in 8vo. Perizonius reprinted theſe three pieces with others relating to the ſame ſubject, at Leyden 1696, in 8vo. 10. *De Origine & Naturâ Imperii imprimis Regii à libero & ſui juris Populo ſimpliciter delati.* Franeker 1689, in 4to. This diſcourſe was pronounced by him, when he quitted the place of *Rector Magnificus*. 11. *Specimen Errorum ſupra centum & viginti ex uno & primo Tomo Hiſtoriæ Civilis V. A.* Ulrici Huberi, *in uſum Academicæ Juventutis collectum. Præmiſſa eſt Præfatio Apologetica Dedicationi iſtius Tomi repoſita. Subjectæ Reſponſiones & Animadverſiones in nuperrimas Diſputationes Eunomicas.* Franeker 1693, in 8vo. 12. *De uſu atque utilitate Græcæ Romanæque Linguæ, Eloquentiæ, & Antiquitatis in gravioribus Diſciplinis* 1693. This is the Diſcourſe which he pronounced July 7, 1693, when he entered upon the Profeſſorſhip of Hiſtory, Eloquence, and the Greek language in the Univerſity of Leyden. 13. *Laudatio Funebris Mariæ* II. *Angliæ Reginæ ex authoritate Lugdunenſis Academiæ Curatorum & Civitatis Conſulum, dicta poſtridie Idus Martias* 1695. Leyden 1695, in 4to. 14. In 1696 he publiſhed three or four pieces under the name of *Valerius Accinctus* againſt *Peter Francius*, Profeſſor of Eloquence at Amſterdam. One of theſe pieces is entitled, *Epiſtola* ad P. Franciſcum Barbarum *de noviſſimo ejus Carmine ad Scurram Litterarium*, in 4to. 15. *Orationes duæ de Pace, quarum altera factam laudans dicta eſt ex auctoritate publicâ Academici Senatûs, A. D. 6. Eidus Novemb.* 1697. *Altera ad ſuadendum compoſita, quum Legati Principum & populorum undique Hagam & Delphos jam convenirent ad tentandas Pacis faciendæ rationes.* Leyden 1697, in 4to. 16. *Cl. Æliani Sophiſtæ Varia Hiſtoria ad MSS. Codices nunc primum recognita & caſtigata, & perpetuo Commentario, &c.* Leyden 1701, in 8vo. James Gronovius having attacked a paſſage in our Author's notes, the latter wrote in his defence the following books, which occaſioned ſome replies from Gronovius. 17. *Diſſertatio de Morte Judæ & verbo ἀπάγχεσθαι, in quâ explicantur & conciliantur loca, Matt.* xxvii. 5. & *Lucæ Actor.* i. 18. *ac vindicantur quæ ad Æliani Variam Hiſtoriam, L.* v. 8. *erant notata.* Leyden 1702, in 8vo. 18. *Reſponſio ad nuperam notitiam de variis Æliani aliorumque Auctorum locis.* Leyden 1703, in 8vo. *Reſponſio* II, *ad notitiam ſecundam de Lucæ Actorum* i. 18. & *variis Æliani aliorumque Auctorum Locis.* Leyden 1703, in 8vo. As this diſpute grew warm, the Curators of the Univerſity of Leyden interpoſed by their authority, and put a ſtop to it. 20. *Q. Curtius Rufus in integrum reſtitutus, & vindicatus per modum ſpeciminis à variis accuſationibus & immodicâ atq; acerbâ nimis Criſi V. C. Joannis Clerici.* Leyden 1703, in 8vo. Monſieur Le Clerc anſwered this book in his *Bibliotheque Choiſie, Tome* 3. *p.* 171 & *ſeqq.* 21. *Oratio de Fide Hiſtoriarum contra Pyrrhoniſmum Hiſtoricum.* Leyden 1703, in 4to. This diſcourſe was pronounced February 6, 1702, when he entered upon the Profeſſorſhip of Hiſtory. 22. *Æther Britannis & Batavis militans, ſeu propitium Dei numen manifeſta prorſus ratione illis præſens in rebus geſtis & victoriis anno* 1708, *in Belgicâ partis, ac Panegyricâ Oratione ex Auctoritate publicâ expoſitis.* Leyden 1709, in 4to. This oration was pronounced February 4. 1709. 23. *De Doctrinæ ſtudiis nuper poſt depulſam Barbariem diligentiſſimè denuò cultis & deſideratis, nunc verò rurſus neglectis ferè & contemptis.* Leyden 1708, in 4to. 24. *Rerum per Europam ſæculo ſexto decimo maximè geſtarum Commentarii Hiſtorici.* Leyden 1710, in 8vo. 25. *Origines Babylonicæ & Ægyptiacæ.* Leyden 1711, two volumes in 8vo. 26. *Diſſertatio de Ære gravi.* Leyden 1713, in 12mo. This book, which was deſigned againſt *Kuſter*, treats of the ſignification of *Æs grave*, among the antient Romans.

He left all his papers relating to his intended edition of *Pomponius Mela*, to Charles Andrew Duker. His notes upon *Turſellinus's Univerſal Hiſtory* were handed about in manuſcript. He had taken great pains upon *Valerius Maximus*, and cites his own notes on that Author, in his *Animadverſiones Hiſtoricæ, c.* 2. *p.* 67, *&c.* He had laboured likewiſe upon *Faber's Theſaurus* (2). T.

(2) See *Hiſt. Critique de la Republique des Lettres*, Tom. 9. p. 416, 422, 423, 424.

PEROT (NICHOLAS) in Latin *Perottus* *, born at Saſſoferrato in Italy, was one of the moſt learned men of the 15th century. He was deſcended from a family, which had formerly made a conſpicuous figure in the place of his birth [*A*]; but it was fallen into an eſtate of obſcurity, in ſome meaſure, as may be ſuppoſed from the narrowneſs of his circumſtances, and his being obliged to teach the Latin tongue, this being his firſt profeſſion (*a*). He was very ſucceſsful in teaching, ſo that pupils flocked to his ſchool. He drew up in a better order, and in a ſhorter method, the rudiments or accidence of the Latin tongue, and publiſhed it with theſe improvements, to the great advantage of his ſcholars. He afterwards went to Rome, and there applied himſelf very intenſely to the ſtudy of the Greek tongue. Being deſirous of ſhewing the publick the progreſs he had made

* His true name is *Perotti*.] Remark by the Tranſl.

(*a*) *Huic quum deeſſent opes, corporis vires municipali frugalitate, atque duritia conſtitutæ, perpetuis incubrationum vigiliis minime defuerunt. Juvenis in ludo pueros honeſtos docuit, &c.* Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 18. p. m. 45.

[*A*] *He was deſcended from a family, which had formerly made a conſpicuous figure in the place of his birth.*] It is ſaid, in the inſcription on the tomb-ſtone ſet up in his honour, anno 1624, that the city of Saſſoferrato was freed from tyranny by his anceſtors, and that it was indebted to them for the liberty and felicity it enjoyed (1). James Philip Thomaſini explains this particular. He relates (2), that whilſt Innocent VI. reſided in Avignon, thoſe cities of Italy which belonged to the patrimony of St. Peter, were expoſed to numberleſs calamities. Seditions were frequent in that country, and there was a tyrant in every town. Innocent VI. to remedy theſe diſorders, beſtowed the Government of this province on Cardinal Giles Albornoti, a Gentleman well ſkilled in the military art, and who, in other reſpects, was extremely well qualified for that poſt. Accordingly he made war on all thoſe petty tyrants who oppreſſed the country; and was extremely well ſeconded on this occaſion by ANDREW PEROT, and particularly in building the fortreſſes which are ſtanding in Saſſoferrato, whereby the ſecurity and peace of this province were ſo well eſtabliſhed, that thoſe who had tyrannized over it during a very long time, had no hopes of re-eſtabliſhing themſelves. This Perrot was father of JUSTINA PEROT, a Lady famous for her genius and love for learning. Petrarch had a great eſteem for her; and anſwered a ſonnet ſhe had addreſſed to him, and which is inſerted in the *Petrarcha redivivus* of Tomaſini (3). See alſo Menage's *Meſcolanze* (4). I am to obſerve, that Tomaſini calls this Lady JUSTINA DE LEVIS PEROTA, and ſays (5), that Andrew de Levis Perot, her father, was of the family of Levis, one of the nobleſt and moſt illuſtrious in France; and this extraction

(1) See Ughelli, *Ital. Sacr.* Tom. 7. p. 1169.

(2) Jac. Phil. Tomaſinus, *in Petrarcha redivivo*, p. 111.

(3) Page 111, 112.

(4) Page 279 & *ſeq.* of the Rotterdam edition, 1692.

(5) Tomaſinus, *in Petrarcha redivivo*, p. 110.

made in it, he, for that purpoſe, undertook to give a Latin verſion of Polybius, and his tranſlation was greatly eſteemed [*B*]. He engaged in another work, and introduced in

extraction is proved, not only by antient records, but alſo by letters which the Lords of that family had writ from France, to Rome, to Torquato Peroti, Chamberlain of Pope Urban VIII. They acknowledge in theſe letters, that he was deſcended from the ſame ſtock with them, *quibus* (litteris) *illum unius ſecum ejuſdemque radicis & familiæ ingenuè agnoſcunt* (6). If this may be depended upon, it muſt be confeſſed, that our Archbiſhop of Siponto was very well deſcended, the houſe of Levi being one of the moſt illuſtrious in France. I read in a book (7) printed at Paris in 1657, that it *comes originally from Levi, one of the twelve tribes of Iſrael, from whom the Virgin Mary iſſued, whom Meſſieurs de Vantadour* (8) *calls their couſin.* [" The noble extraction of Perot, found- " ed on the relation that is made of Andrew Perot, " is not proved in any manner, unleſs it had been " ſhewn that the particulars related of Andrew are " taken from Authors of credit, and that our Nicho- " las was of the ſame family as Andrew *."]

(6) Idem, ibid.

(7) Entitled, *The preſent State of France*, ſee p. 439.

(8) It is a branch of the houſe of Levi.

* From the remarks to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 971.

[*B*] *His tranſlation of* Polybius *was greatly eſteemed.*] He undertook it at the command of Pope Nicholas V. It was judged to be ſuperior to the verſions of Thucydides, Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch and Appian; and ſome envious perſons imagined, that it had been writ by an antient Author, and that Perot had ſtole it. *Non defuêre tamen ex æmulis, qui ejus auctoris traductionem antiquiſſimam fuiſſe, furtoque ſurreptam exiſtimarint, quòd Thucydidem, Diodorum, Plutarchum, & Appianum, clariſſima ingeniorum certamine converſos, unus Polybius egregia fide Latinus, æquabili, & prædulci Romani ſermonis puritate prorſus antecedat* (9). It is very probable that our Perot excelled the Tranſlators who had appeared ſome time before; and that his verſion was a maſter-piece, conſidering it was the work of a man who lived at a time when the ſtudy of learning was but reviving; but abſolutely ſpeaking, and even in compariſon of the Tranſlators of the 14th century, his tranſlation can ſcarce be looked upon as a tolerable one; and therefore Varillas could not have more flagrantly diſcovered his ignorance, in the *Belles Lettres*, than in the paraphraſe he has given us of the paſſage abovementioned from Paulus Jovius. " He attempted a tranſlation of Polybius, which he " performed in ſo beautiful a manner, that it was " doubted whether he was the Author of it; and " whether he had not found ſome old verſion of Po- " lybius, and printed it under his own name (10). . . " The perſon, who wrote his epitaph, had reaſon to " make it conſiſt only of the following words; here " lies the Tranſlator of Polybius; for if Perot was " really the Tranſlator of this work, none of thoſe, " who tranſlated the Greek Authors into Latin, can " be put in parallel with him, but are greatly " inferior to him (11)." How would this Writer have bluſhed, had he been ſhewn what Caſaubon ſays of this work of Perot? He does not deny but that this Tranſlator of Polybius was a man of learning, both in Greek and Latin, for the age he lived in (12); he alſo ſays, that Perot might be conſidered as a great ſcholar, conſidering the great ignorance with which he was ſurrounded; but charges him with having very ill diſcharged the commiſſion which Pope Nicholas V. had given him. *Jam ille eruditus Italus, quo ipſe* (Nicolaus Quintus) *uſus eſt interprete, partim ſæculi vitio, partim propria culpa, provinciam ſibi demandatam, ita geſſit malè, facilè ut appareat, non ob ſingularem aliquam eruditionem, in Græcis præſertim literis, Polybium interpretari fuiſſe juſſum; ſed quia nemo erat qui amplius ſciret, velut coclitem inter cæcos captum, qui in vacuam ſtationem pro tempore ſubſtitueretur* (13). It would be ridiculous to ſuppoſe, that Caſaubon ſpoke in this manner out of envy; for of what uſe could it be to him, to leſſen the glory of a Writer who had been dead an hundred years? eſpecially when we find him own, that ſuch parts of Polybius, as Perot underſtood, were ſo happily tranſlated, that they had all the air of an original. *Nicolaus Perottus*, ſays he (14), *Literarum Latinarum, quas perdiu docuit, exquiſitè, ut illa erant tempora, fuit peritus, & cumprimis curioſus. . . . Erat prætereà in hoc viro non vulgaris induſtria in* Græcis *ita vertendis (quæ quidem intelligeret) ut nullum perſæpè* Græci Idiomatis *in* Latinâ *ejus Verſione veſtigium appareret: quam interdum eſſe opus αὐτοφυὲς dicas, non alieni* Interpretationem. *Quòd ſi par fides reſponderet, inter excellentiſſimos* Interpretes *poterat ſine dubio* Perottus *recenſeri. Nemo enim illis temporibus* Italorum *erat, qui amplius* Græcè *ſciret, quàm hic* Interpres: *pauci qui tantum, quantum ille.* i. e. " Ni- " cholas Perot, was, for the age in which he lived, " extremely well ſkilled in, and ſtudious of the La- " tin tongue, which he taught a great many years. . . " He likewiſe had ſo uncommon a talent, in tranſ- " lating Greek (whenever he underſtood it) into " Latin, that very frequently not ſo much as the " leaſt traces of the Greek idiom can be diſcovered " in his Latin verſion; inſomuch, that one would " ſometimes ſuppoſe it to be an original, and not a " tranſlation. Had Perot been equally faithful, he " doubtleſs might have been ranked among the ex- " cellent Tranſlators: for none of the Italians, in " that age, underſtood the Greek better than he did, " and few ſo well." We therefore ought to believe him, when he cenſures the compoſition of this tranſlator. He affirms, that it is a copy which is ſo unlike the original, that Polybius is quite diſfigured in it. Nos *verò affirmamus*, Perottum *à fidelis* Interpretis *laude tantum abeſſe, quantum qui longiſſimè. Nullo enim pacto ferendus aut excuſandus eſt hic* Interpres, *homo* Bellicarum rerum & totius Tacticæ *adeo rudis & imperitus, ut qui in cæteris partibus* Hiſtoriæ Polybianæ *multa neſciret, in deſcriptionibus* Præliorum *omnia ignoraret, omnia peccaret; atque eâdem operâ tanto* Scriptori, *quod erat ferè præcipuum ejus decus adimeret. Omninò prælium nullum, facinus militare nullum, à* Polybio *fuerat paulò diligentiùs narratum, in quo graviſſima & momenti maximi peccata ab hoc* Interprete *non ſint admiſſa* (15). *i. e.* " With regard to my ſelf I affirm, that Perot " does not deſerve the leaſt applauſe as a faithful " Tranſlator. He is not to be excuſed in any man- " ner, being quite ignorant of military affairs, and " the art of drawing up forces, and unſkilled " in a great number of other things which occur in " that hiſtory: in the deſcription of battles he is eſ- " pecially ignorant, and therefore quite depraves this " Author's ſtyle, for which he is moſt famous. Not " a ſingle battle, not a ſingle military exploit, which " Polybius has related with great accuracy, but is " tranſlated in the moſt erroneous manner, by this " Writer.". He blames him, in other places, for inſerting, in his tranſlation, ſeveral words of Livy, inſtead of thoſe of Polybius; and for not tranſlating ſcarce ſo much as one ſingle period, without committing ſome miſtake (16). He goes on. *Non neſcimus fuiſſe olim, & nunc quoque eſſe quibus Perotti verſio, propter aliquam Latinitatis ſpeciem, mire arrideat. Sed quò iſta Latinitas ſi deeſt fides, abeſt veritas? Nihil dicam de locis infinitis quos propterea aut tranſiit, aut malè interpretatus eſt Perottus, quia vel codices erant corrupti, vel occurrebat dictio aut phraſis aliqua minus vulgaris: cujuſmodi multas ſanè habet Polybius. Verum ubi nihil erat ejuſmodi, quis ferat longè adeo ab auctoris ſui verbis diſcedentem? aut quis neget flagitium eſſe inſigne, tot locis verba, periodos, atque adeo pericopas integras è Livio deſumpſiſſe, & lectoribus Græcæ linguæ imperitis obtruſiſſe pro Polybianis? ubi fides? ubi pudor? in tanta igitur errorum omnis generis copia, ſingula velle perſequi, quod petiverunt à nobis nonnulli, ejus ſit hominis, qui vetus dictum velit tollere in lente unguentum* (17). i. e. " I " am not ignorant that there have been, and ſtill " are, ſome perſons who are greatly pleaſed with " Perot's tranſlation, from a certain beauty which " they fancy they ſee in it. But of what uſe is a " Latin ſtyle, if it has neither fancifulneſs nor truth? " I ſhall not take notice of a numberleſs multitude of " paſſages which Perot either omitted or falſly tran- " ſlated; either becauſe the manuſcripts were corrupt- " ed, or becauſe ſome uncommon phraſe or expreſſi- " on, of which there are a great number in Poly- " bius, occurred. But when there was nothing " of this kind, who could bear to find him depart ſo " much from the ſenſe of his Author? Or who will " deny but that it is a great crime to have frequent- " ly borrowed from Livy, ſo many words, periods,

(9) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 18. p. m. 46, 49.

(10) Varillas, *Anecd. de Florence*, p. 170.

(11) Ibid. p. 171.

(12) *Partem illius* (Polybii) *librorum aliquam nactus* (Nicolaus Quintus) *ejus in Latinum ſermonem transferendæ, viro Græcæ & Romanæ linguæ ut erat captus ejus ætatis non ignaro, munus delegavit.* Caſaub. *Epiſt. dedicat.* Polybii.

(13) Caſaub. ib.

(14) Idem, *in Præfat. ad Lectorem.*

(15) Idem, ibid.

(16) *Multa quidem in ſingulis fere periodis Perottus perperam interpretatur.* Idem *in Commentario in Polybium*, p. 112.

(17) Idem, ibid. p. 60.

in it all the treaſures of his erudition. This was a Commentary on Martial [*C*] ; but as he was raiſed to a very high employment, and a very exalted ſtation in the Church, he did not think it proper to publiſh this Commentary ; he looking upon it as beneath him, and no ways ſuitable to the decorum of his archiepiſcopal character, becauſe of the obſcenities which are found in Martial (*b*). This work was publiſhed after his death. Our Author had had a great ſhare in the beneficence and eſteem of Cardinal Beſſarion ; but it is ſaid that, through his imprudent conduct, he prevented his being raiſed to the Pontificate [*D*]. The Emperor Frederick III. preſented him in the city of Bologna with the poetical crown (*c*), and honoured him with the title of his Counſellor. That employment was much leſs real than the Government of Perugia and Umbria, which was beſtowed on

(*b*) Extracted from Paul Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 18. p. 45.

(*c*) Ughelli, *Ital. Sacr.* Tom. 7. p. 1168.

" and entire paragraphs ; and to have put them off, " on ſuch readers as are ignorant of the Greek " tongue, for thoſe of Polybius ? Where is the juſ- " tice and modeſty of this ? As therefore he is ſo full " of faults, of every kind, to point out every one of " them ſingly, as ſome perſons adviſed me to do, " would be beſtowing pains upon a thing that no " way deſerves." What would Varillas have ſaid, had his friends ſhewn him, that his opinion was ſo very oppoſite to that of ſo excellent, ſo learned, and ſagacious a critick as Caſaubon ? Had Varillas, the firſt time he preſumed to paſs raſh judgments like theſe, been reproved by ſuch means, ſuch a Critick would have done him great ſervice. I am to obſerve that Perot has not tranſlated all the books which are extant of Polybius : only the firſt five books of his hiſtory having been diſcovered at that time, and to theſe the Tranſlator confined his labours. The abridgment of the twelve following books, and the *Excerpta Legationum* were diſcovered ſince. Beſides this tranſlation Perot has alſo given one of Hippocrates's oath.

(18) It is only a Commentary on the *Spectacula* and the 1ſt book of *Epigrams of Martial.*

(19) In the text of this article.

[*C*] *A Commentary on Martial* (18)]. He entitled it *Cornucopiæ*. I have already (19) given the reaſon why he did not publiſh it : but it was publiſhed by his Nephew PYRRHUS PEROT, after the Author's death. He ſays in his preface, that he had added but very few particulars, except his having explained more at large ſome obſcene places which his uncle had but ſlightly touched upon. *Nihil fere de meo addidi, præterquam quod loca quædam, quæ ille, quoniam impuritate quadam atque obſcœnitate verborum caſtis ac pudicis auribus execrabilia viderentur, curſim breviterque tetigerit, ipſe latius expoſui* (20). From hence we may ſuppoſe, that M. Du Cange is miſtaken, when he ſays, that Nicholas Perot, Biſhop of Siponto, publiſhed in 1470, a large volume of Commentaries on the Latin tongue ; *Cui Cornucopiæ nomen indidit cum duobus ſingularum dictionum indicibus, Græco altero, altero Latino, qui juſti Dictionarii vicem præſtant* (21). It muſt be remembered that our Perot lived till the year 1480. Geſner obſerves, that the *Cornucopiæ* was printed at Venice by Aldus, and at Baſil by Curio and Valderus more than once, in folio. He omits the principal circumſtance, he not taking notice of this date of the firſt edition. I myſelf cannot tell it, and can only ſay, that the Straſburg edition of 1506 was preferable to the preceding one, or preceding ones ; and that of Venice of 1513 was more accurate than that of Straſburg (22). Geſner adds, that there is a great deal of learning in this work. *Plena Philologiæ & eruditionis variæ, ex optimis quibuſque veterum denſiſſima teſtimonia citans, multiplici cum ad rerum, tum ad vocabulorum cognitionem uſu* (23). i. e. " Abounding with various kinds of " erudition, and a very great number of citations from " the beſt of the antients ; and of a vaſt ad- " vantage for acquiring the knowledge both of things " and words." Perot is charged with copying what others had written, without once naming them. Martinius objects this to him, after proving his having ſtole a paſſage from Laurentius Valla ; and here follows what he obſerved in his Preface : *Ambroſius Calepinus . . . . judicio uſus barbara à Latinis ſegregavit, & auctoritate veterum verba ſua firmavit : rectius, quàm Perottus qui ſuum copiæ cornu diligenter quidem, at latenter, contexuit, ut eorum nomina à quibus ſua ſumpſerat, ferè ſubticeret* (24). i. e. " Ambroſe Calepin " . . . . . diſtinguiſhed the barbarous words from the " Latin in a judicious manner, and corroborated his " opinion by the authority of the antients : in which " he conducted himſelf with greater ſincerity than " Perot, who indeed compiled his *Cornucopiæ* with " diligence, but at the ſame time with ſecrecy ; he " ſuppreſſing the names of the greateſt part of the Au- " thors to whom he was indebted for his materials." Many people will be ſurpriſed to ſee, in this paſſage, Calepin's ſincerity preferred to that of Nicholas Perot ; great complaints having been made againſt Calepin, as being an impudent plagiary of Perot (15). " To be ſtill more circumſtantial with regard to the " conduct of Calepin, the reader muſt be told, that " not being a ſcholar, he had abſolutely no thoughts " of ſetting up for an Author, till having met with " Nicholas Perot's *Cornucopiæ* ; and being informed " that Perot ſeemed reſolved to diſown and give up " this fruit of his ſecular and profane ſtudies ; and " give up the title of father, upon the ſuppoſition " that that of Archbiſhop would have been diſho- " noured by it * ; he thought he might take ad- " vantage of Perot's diſtaſte ; and therefore reſolved " to inſert this work in his own, as though he had " been the Author of it. Floridus Sabinus † ſays " that he did this in a moſt wretched manner ; he " blending this *Cornucopiæ* with a vaſt quantity of " filthy traſh, gathered from the worſt Authors of " the moſt barbarous and ignorant ages. He adds, " that this contributed on one hand, to celebrate the " merit of Perot, and to make people enquire for " his original work ; and, on the other, to ſhew " the impertinence of Calepin, and the incorrectneſs " of his Dictionary. The ſame judgment is alſo " formed by the anonymous Author of the Apology " for the Latin Poets **, the German Author of the " *Bibliographia Curioſa* ††, and Leonardo Nicodemus, in his additions to Toppi *." [*D*] *Through his imprudent conduct he prevented . . . . Cardinal Beſſarion,* from being raiſed to the *Pontificate.*] This incident is related by Varillas. " It " is known, ſays he (26), that this Cardinal would " have been elected Pope after Paul II. had it not " been for the imprudence of Nicholas Perotty . . . . " who was one of the conclaviſts †. One evening " when Beſſarion was ſtudying, according to his uſual " cuſtom, without once minding the intrigues of his " Collegues ; three Cardinals, the heads of ſo many " cabals in the conclave, who at laſt had agreed to " elect him, went to his cell, and deſired to ſpeak " with him. Perotty ſuppoſed, that their only de- " ſign was, to ſue for his patron's vote ; and as he " knew him ſo well as to be perſuaded, that the ſoli- " citations of theſe Cardinals would not avail in this " particular, he therefore thought it would not be " proper to interrupt Beſſarion in his ſtudies ; for " which reaſon he refuſed abſolutely to admit them, " and to inform his patron that they wanted to " ſpeak with him. And the moſt whimſical cir- " cumſtance in this adventure was, that the more " Perotty was intreated, careſſed, conjured, and " threatned, the faſter he kept the door ſhut ; be- " cauſe he was confirmed ſtill the more in his chime- " rical ſuppoſition, that the only motive of their in- " ſiſting ſo much to come in, was, in order to ſue " for the only vote they wanted for the perſon whom " they had reſolved among themſelves to elect. The " conteſt laſted ſo long, that the patience of the " three Cardinals being at laſt quite exhauſted, they " ſaid among themſelves, that it would not be pro- " per to raiſe, to the Holy See, a man who not on- " ly would not think himſelf obliged to them for " his election, but would make them dependent " on the caprice of his domeſticks, whenever they " ſhould deſire to ſpeak with him. Spite and indig- " nation made them then take other meaſures ; and " as Cardinal Riairo ſtruck their fancy moſt at that " inſtant,

(20) Pyrrhus Perottus, *in Præfat.* Cornicopiæ, *apud* Geſner. *Bibliotb.* folio 523.

(21) Du Change, *Præf. Gloſſarii Latin.* p. 41.

(22) See Borrochius, *in Analectis ad Cogitata de Lingua Latina, in Appendice,* p. 42.

(23) Geſner, *Bibliotb.* folio 523.

(24) Matthias Martinius, *in Lexico Philolog. voce ſarcina.*

(25) Baillet, *Jugem. des Scavans,* num. 630 of the Latin Grammar. See alſo num. 303 of the Crit. Gram. Borrichius *ubi ſupra.* Citat. (22).

* Becauſe the Romiſh Clergy are not allowed to marry.] Rem. by the Tranſl.

† *Franc. Florid. Sab. Apolog.* lib. 1. p. 111.

** *Ap. Obert. Giffan.* p. 505. *item ap. G. M. Konig. Bibliotb. V. & N.* p. 153.

†† *Bibliogr. cur. Philologic. biſt.* p. 28.

* *In additionib. ad Bibliotb. Neapolit. Nic. Topp.* p. 184.

† *Conclaviſt,* is a domeſtic whom a Cardinal makes choice of to attend upon him, and is ſhut up in the conclave with him.] Rem. by the Tranſl.

(26) Varillas, *Anecd. de Flor.* p. 174, 175.

on Perot (*d*), and then the Archiepiſcopal See of Siponto (*e*), to which he was raiſed the 17th of October 1458 (*f*). He built a country houſe near Saſſoferrato, and named it *Fugicura* [*E*], implying it to be a retreat where he unbent himſelf after his fatigues, and paſſed his hours unvexed with cares. He died in that place (*g*) anno 1480. He had quarrelled with Domitius Calderinus [*F*]. He was endued naturally with a talent, which is very well adapted to make a man make a great progreſs in knowledge, which was, whenever he was told of any curious thing to which he was a ſtranger, he would devote himſelf to the finding of it out (*h*); would abandon the purſuit of every thing elſe, and even intrench upon the hours proper for ſleeping, to purſue it the more cloſely. TORQUATO PEROT, who was of the ſame family, Chamberlain to Pope Urban VIII. and Biſhop of Ameria, cauſed a monument to be ſet up in the great Church at Saſſoferrato, in 1624 (*i*), with a beautiful inſcription (*k*), wherein it is related, among other particulars, that the Popes Eugenius IV. Nicholas V. Calixtus III. and Pius II. had a great affection for him, eſpecially becauſe of the great ſervices he had done, in endeavouring to bring

(d) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 18. p. 45.

(f) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 18. p. 45.

(g) Idem, ibid.

(b) Volaterr. lib. 21. p. m. 776.

(i) Jovius, ibid.

(e) The modern name of this Archbiſhoprick is Monfredonia; but in Latin it is always *Archiepiſcopus Siponti-nus*.

(k) It is found entire in Ughelli, *Ital. Sacr.* Tom. 7. p. 1168.

" inſtant, they elected him Pope, though they had " agreed together before, not to give their votes " to any Monk, becauſe Riairo had been a Fran- " ciſcan Frier. The pleaſure which they ima- " gined would accrue to them, from the regret " which Cardinal Beſſarion would have, for his loſing " the Pontificate through his conclaviſt's fault, " prompted them to inform him of this whole tranſ- " action. Nevertheleſs, Beſſarion did not change " his countenance or behaviour towards them; but " contented himſelf with telling Perotty, that he had " prevented him from making him (Perotty) a Cardi- " nal." Few paſſages are better adapted than this, to ſhew the egregious liberty which this Writer took, to blend his whimſies and conjectures with the hiſtories which he extracted from other Authors. All this long account he has given us, is a paraphraſe of the following Latin paſſage of Paulus Jovius. *Paulo morte ſublato, in comitiis fatalis caſus tantæ ſpei Fortunam avertit. Ferunt enim tres ſummæ auctoritatis Cardinales, quum eo decreto, ut Pontificem ſalutarent, abditum in cella conclavis adiſſent, nec admitterentur à Nicolao Perotto janitore, quòd tum vir ineptus lucubranti parcendum diceret, uſque adeò ſtomachatos, ut ſeſe indignanter avertentes, reſponderent, Ergo nec prenſanti, nec roganti quidem, ſumma dignitas erit inculcanda: ut quum è cœlo ſuffragia expectet, ſuperbis demum ac ſtolidis janitoribus pareamus? ſtatimque ſuffragio Xyſto detuliſſe, quo repentè renunciato, adoratoque, Beſſarion dixiſſe fertur: Hæc tua, Nicolae, intempeſtiva ſedulitas, & tiaram mihi, & tibi galerum eripuit* (27). i. e. " Pope Paul hav- " ing left the world; a fatal accident, in the conclave, " deprived him (Beſſarion) of the exalted ſtation to " which he had flattered himſelf he ſhould be raiſed. " For it is related, that three Cardinals who had the " greateſt ſhare of authority, having formed a reſo- " lution to chooſe him Pope, came, according to his " call, to the conclave, where he was ſhut up: " being refuſed admittance by Nicholas Perot, the " door-keeper or conclaviſt, who was ſo ſtupid as to " tell them that they ought not to interrupt him " ſince he was ſtudying, the Cardinals in queſtion " were ſo much offended, that turning about with " indignation they ſaid, ſhall we force a man to ac- " cept of the Pontificate who neither was for, nor " deſires it; that when he expects votes from Hea- " ven, we at laſt may pay obedience to proud, ſilly " door-keepers? Saying this they immediately gave " their voices for Sixtus, who being inſtantly de- " clared Pope, and worſhipped; it is related that " Beſſarion ſaid as follows: Your unſeaſonable dili- " gence (O Nicholas) has deprived me of the Pontifi- " cal Crown, and yourſelf of a Cardinal's hat." I quote this Latin paſſage, in order that my readers, by comparing it with that of the French Author, may ſee the particulars he added to the Latin text were his original. He has given them what form he pleaſed, which is intolerable. Such Hiſtorians as write laſt ought not to embelliſh an incident, but ſhould relate it exactly in the ſame manner as they find it in Authors. It may be obſerved by the way, that if this French Writer had really read all the MSS. cited by him, (a circumſtance which is very much doubted); we nevertheleſs might naturally ſuppoſe that he publiſhed a thouſand particulars which were merely the product of his invention; for as he has preſumed to flouriſh on Paul Jovius, who is a printed Author; he conſequently thought he might be more at liberty to romance with regard to MSS. relations, which he has juſt pointed out in a very random manner. Gyraldus aſcribes Beſſarion's ill ſucceſs to another cauſe (28); but he alſo mentions what is related of Perot the conclaviſt; and is much more conciſe on this ſubject than Paul Jovius. Menage ſuppoſes, that Perot committed this blunder in the conclave when Paul II. was elected (29). But it is my opinion that we ought to credit, with regard to this particular, the two Italian Authors cited by me, rather than Menage (30).

(27) Jovius, *in Elog.* cap. 24. p. 57, 58.

(28) Gyrald. de Poet. *ſuor. tempor. Dialogo* 1. p. m. 551.

(29) Menag. Meicolanze. p. 280.

(30) Paulus Jovius, and Lilius Gregorius Gyraldus.

[*E*] *He built a country houſe near Saſſoferrato, and named it* Fugicura.] Moreri did not underſtand any part of this, and has altered it in ſuch a manner, that it is downright nonſenſe. Nevertheleſs, nothing can be plainer than the following words of Paulus Jovius: *Exceſſit è vita ſenex apud Sentinum in villa viridariis & fontibus peramœna, quam à pingui otio Fugicuram appellavit* (31). i. e. " He died in an ad- " vanced age at Saſſoferrato, at a country ſeat, which " the fountains and gardens rendered moſt delightful, " and which he called *Fugicura*, from the ſweet eaſe " and leiſure he enjoyed there." Moreri puts *Figurica* inſtead of *Fugicura*, even in the verſes of Myrteus quoted by him, and which turn on the alluſion of flying from cares.

(31) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 18. p. 46.

[*F*] *He had quarrelled with Domitius Calderinus.*] The paſſage, which I am going to quote from Alexander ab Alexandro, informs us of a particular, which Paulus Jovius has not taken notice of, and which he ought not to have omitted, *viz.* that Nicholas Perot read publick lectures to the youth of Rome. He and Calderinus explained, at the ſame time, ſome paſſages of Martial, and made it their endeavours to contradict one another, rather than explain that Poet. This occaſioned floods of injurious expreſſions and empty words; ſo that, after all, Martial's ſenſe was leſs underſtood than if they had ſaid nothing. *Nicolaus Perottus Sipontinus præſul, homo fuit accurato ingenio, & lectione multa exercitus: eum Domitius Calderinus, vir, ut in ea tempeſtate, doctus, & æmulatione doctrinæ, & morum diſſimilitudine oſum habebat: jurgiiſque & conviciis apud ſuos ſectatores plerunque inceſſebat, ſæpiuſque apud ſtudioſos in invidiam illum crimenque vocabat: & ut ſunt fere ingenia, in explicandis auctoribus ſi quid in controverſiam veniret, uterque potius, quo pacto diverſus ab altero diſſentiret, quam quid veræ lectionis eſſet, rimabatur. Cum autem in ſcholis Romæ eodem tempore Martialis apophoreta publice lectitarent, cujus hoc diſtichon fuit.* i. e. " Nicetus Perot, Archbiſhop " of Siponto, was maſter of a happy genius, and " vaſt reading, This Perot was hated by Domitius " Calderinus (a learned man for the age in which he " lived) which was owing to an emulation in learn- " ing and a diſſimilitude of manners. Accordingly " he often abuſed and reviled him to his followers, " and frequently made him odious to his pupils. " And accordingly, as it commonly comes to paſs " among ſcholars, whenever any conteſt happened " in explaining of Authors, both of them ſtrove to " wrangle and combat one againſt another, rather " than to ſearch for the true reading. As Martial's " Apophoreta (gifts given at banquets) were publickly " read by them, at the ſame time, in the ſchools at " Rome, a diſtich of which was thus;"

In precio ſcopas teſtatur palma fuiſſe,
Ocia ſed ſcopis nunc analecta dabunt.

bring about a reunion with the Greek Church, during the Council of Ferrara. The abovementioned Torquato intended to procure a new edition of the works of our Nicholas Perrot (*l*), which consiſt of tranſlations, letters, ſpeeches, and in Commentaries on Statius, Martial, &c. He deſigned likewiſe to publiſh the elogies of the illuſtrious men of Saſſoferrato. He compoſed ſome Italian verſes which were printed with thoſe of Anthony Brunus (*m*).

(*l*) Allatius, *in Apibus Urbanis.*

(*m*) Urbanis, Idem, ibid.

(32) Tiraquellus has the following note here, *Perottus in Cornucopia ſecus interpretatur, quam hic accuſatur.*

(33) Alexander ab Alexandro, *Genialium Dier.* lib. 4. cap. 21. p. 1157. edit. Lugd. Batav. 1673.

Ita iſtos verſus uterque interpretatus eſt (32), *ut poſt multa deblatterata verba, vix aliquem ſenſum illorum ex dictis elicere queas, cum modo mendum in verſu poſtremo fuiſſe alter aſſeveret, & pro otia, precium poni oportere, modo aſarota, non ab à privativa, ſed intentiva dicta eſſe affirmet: alter ita plevaque nugalia jurgiis & maledictis plena effundat, ut equidem ſingula enarrare & referre pigeat* (33). i. e. " Both gave ſuch an interpretation " of this diſtich, that after a deal of babbling, " ſcarce a word of ſenſe could be found in what ei- " ther of them ſaid; the one ſometimes aſſerting " that there was a fault in the latter line, and that " *pretium* ought to be put for *otia*; or affirming, " that *aſarota*, (a kind of pavements) was derived " from *a* intenſive, and not from *a* primitive: whilſt " the other invented a flood of impertinent trifling " ſtuff, to repeat every circumſtance of which would " be tedious." Here follows another paſſage, which informs us that Perot examined and criticiſed, in his Epiſtles, Caldrinus's Notes on Martial's Epigrams; and that Calderinus was accuſed of having ſtole from Perot. *Domitii Calderini in Martialem commentarios notans, quamvis ſuppreſſo nomine, & furta ex ſcriptis patrui ſui, ſubdit: Recognoſci autem furta facillime paterunt ex errorum multitudine, cujus commentarii ejus undique ſcatent, quorum bonam partem patruus meus duob. Epiſtolarum, Romanarum ſcilicet ac Peruſinarum, præclaris voluminibus oſtendit* (34). i. e. " Speaking of " Domitius Calderinus's Commentary on Martial, " (but not mentioning his name) and of his plunder- " ing his uncle's works, he adds, his thefts may be " ſoon found out, by the numberleſs multitude of er- " rors with which his Commentators abound: my " uncle pointed out a conſiderable part of thoſe in " his two fine volumes of Roman and Peruſian Epiſ- " tles." Angelus Sabinus, being engaged in a paper war with Calderinus, was aſſiſted by Perot. The latter was pointed at under the name of Fidentinus in Calderinus's writings, and the other under that of Protheus. See Gyraldus, Dialogue I. *de Poëtis ſuorum temporum* (35).

(34) Geſner. *Biblioth.* folio 523.

(35) Page 532. *Operum Gyraldi.* edit. Lugd. Bata. 1696.

PERROT (FRANCIS), Author of an Italian book refuted by Bellarmin. See the cloſe of the remark of the following article [*A*].

PERROT (NICHOLAS) Sieur d'Ablancourt, one of the firſt genius's of his age, was born in Châlons on the river Marne (*a*), April the 5th 1606 (*b*). He ſprung from a family which had made a conſpicuous figure in the Law [*A*], and the greateſt care was beſtowed on his education. He was *ſent to purſue his ſtudies, in the College of Sedan* (*c*); and he made ſo great an improvement by his maſter's inſtructions, that, *at thirteen years of age, he had gone through a courſe of claſſical learning* [*B*]. *His father then ſent for him home, and got him an able maſter, not only to go over his whole courſe of ſtudy with him, but alſo to give him ſome tincture of Philoſophy. After having continued theſe exerciſes about three years, he was ſent to Paris, where he ſtudied the law five or ſix months. At eighteen*

(*a*) And not at Vitry in Francois, as is affirmed in the *Menagiana*, p. 324. 1ſt Dutch edit.

(*b*) Ablancourt's *Life*, in Tom. 2. of Patru's works, Dutch edit. 1692. p. 334.

(*c*) Ibid. p. 335.

[*A*] *He ſprung from a family which had made a conſpicuous figure in the law.*] PAUL PERROT de la Salle his father, *famous for his works, both in proſe and verſe*, and who *had a hand in the Catholicon*, was grandſon of EMILIUS PERROT, Counſellor of Parliament, and ſon of NICHOLAS PERROT, Counſellor of the great Chamber. *He went through a courſe of ſtudies in Oxford, where he turned Proteſtant; and returning to France*, he retired to Chaalons, *where part of the Parliament of Paris was at that time, and of which his elder brother Cyprian* PERROT *was a Counſellor.* In Chaalons he married a Lady of noble extraction, Anne des Forges, who brought him Nicholas Perrot Sieur d'Ablancourt, and two daughters, the eldeſt whereof was mother of Mr. Fremont d'Ablancourt (1), whom I ſhall mention below (2). CYPRIAN PERROT, uncle of him whoſe article I am writing, was the father of JOHN PERROT, Preſident of the Inqueſts; who left a ſon named CYPRIAN PERROT, who was maſter of the Requeſts. The Perrots of Geneva, Father Paul's good Perrotto, my Lord Perrot who was in favour for ſome time with Queen Elizabeth, the *Perrots of Malmaiſon, one of whom was Provoſt of the Merchants, and the Princeſs of Conti's beautiful Perrot, are all of the ſame family.* Chriſtopher de Thou (Thuanus) firſt Preſident in the Parliament of Paris, married a Perrot. Chancellor Boucherat was grandſon of another Perrot, not to mention a great many alliances more with perſons of the long robe (3). Theſe particulars are extracted from a manuſcript letter. Ablancourt's life, written by Patru, may ſerve as a printed proof. It begins with the following words. " The family of the " Perrots has belonged during a long ſeries of years " to the Parliament, and allied to the moſt illuſtrious perſons of the long Robe (4)."

Thuanus (5) enumerates, among thoſe who were killed in the maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's day in Paris, DENYS PERROT (*a*), the very worthy ſon of EMILIUS PERROT, Counſellor in Parliament of Paris, and was illuſtrious for his probity as for his knowledge. The reader may ſee elſewhere (6) that I am of opinion that this Æmilius Perrot is the ſame perſon with him, who makes a very ſhining figure in Bunel's letters.

(1) Extracted from a letter which Mr. Fremont d'Ablancourt wrote to me, the 14th of April, 1693.

(2) In the rem. [*D*].

(3) Extracted from the ſame letter.

(4) Patru's works, Tom. 2. p. 334, Dutch edit. 1692.

(5) Thuan. lib. 52. p. m. 1077.

(*a*) In my copy of the *Memoirs of the State of France, under Charles* IX. are writ the following words, *Ex Libris Dionyſii Perroti* 1584. *Rem. Crit.*

(6) Rem. [*A*], of the article FERRET.

Father Paul's good Perotto, mentioned in the manuſcript letter, is doubtleſs the ſame FRANCIS PERROT mentioned in Book LXXXII. of Thuanus's Hiſtory (7), as Author of a piece, in which Pope Sixtus's bull againſt the King of Navarre is refuted. This piece was entitled, *Aviſo piacevole dato alla bella Italia* (8). " This book which Bellarmin refuted, is a cenſure " of the Court of Rome, but its ſtyle is ſo very beau- " tiful, that the Italians themſelves admired it. The " Author's name is Perrot, a native of France, who, " according to Thuanus's Hiſtory, under the year " 1585, accompanied, in his younger days, Gabriel " Aramont, his Majeſty's Embaſſador to Sultan Soly- " man. Coming afterwards to Italy, he got ac- " quainted with ſeveral perſons of eminence; and, " among other great men, with Father Paul, a Divine " of the Republick of Venice, and had a great af- " fection for him till his death. On the other hand, " the Italians had a particular eſteem for him; call- " ing him generally the true Iſraelite, becauſe of " his candour and gentleneſs. This Perrot tranſlated " likewiſe, into Italian, Du Pleſſis-Mornay's truth " of the Chriſtian Religion, printed at Saumur in " 1612. Among our French Writers who applaud " him are, Lewis des Maſures in his Latin Poems, " Hubert Languet in his letters to Sir Philip Sidney, " and Mr. de Liques in du Pleſſis's life (9)."

(7) P. m. 33. ad ann. 1585.

(8) Colomeſius, *Biblioth. Choiſie*, p. 20, 21.

(9) Page 13. He is there ſtyled *Lord of Mezieres, a Pariſian.*

[*B*] *At thirteen years of age he had gone through a courſe of claſſical learning.*] I would not make any remark on this occaſion, if I was not to correct a fault that is very common among the Writers of Panegyricks. They take pleaſure in ſurpaſſing each other in the matter of beſtowing praiſe, and by that means adulterate the truth. Richelet (10), not thinking it enough that Ablancourt completed his courſe of claſſical learning at thirteen years of age, adds philoſophy to that courſe. However, we may correct this error, as we have the life of that illuſtrious perſonage written by Patru; but if that by Richelet only

(10) Richelet, *Vie des Auteurs Francois*, p. 34. Dutch edit. 1699.

eighteen years of age he was admitted Advocate of Parliament, and frequented the bar (*d*): but he ſoon had a diſtaſte for it, and plainly diſcovered a diſinclination for the law. This diſpleaſed his uncle Cyprian Perrot, *Counſellor of the great Chamber* (*e*); however, he recovered his favour by quitting the Proteſtant Religion in which he was born. He abjured it at twenty years of age; but nevertheleſs could not be prevailed upon to acquieſce with his uncle's intention, *viz. to make him take orders, in hopes that he would one day become a very great preacher* (*f*). *He ſpent five or ſix years in ſuch diverſions as ſuit perſons of his age* (*g*); but without entirely neglecting *his ſtudies* (*h*). *It was then he wrote the Preface to the Honnête Femme, for his friend* Father du Boſc. Scarce was this Preface, *which is a maſter-piece in our language*, publiſhed, *but at twenty five or twenty ſix years of age, he had a deſire to return to the religion he had quitted* [C], *the impreſſions of which had never been perfectly erazed from his mind* (*i*). "That he might not do any thing raſhly, "he firſt began to ſtudy philoſophy, and afterwards divinity; and for that purpoſe choſe, "for his maſter, Mr. Stuart, a Scotchman, and Lutheran, but a very learned man. He "applied himſelf ſo very intenſely, that he uſed to ſpend twelve or fifteen hours a day "in ſtudy; and paſſed near three years in this manner, without hinting his deſign to "any perſon. . . . . He ſet out . . . . from Paris to go to Champagne, where he made a "ſecond abjuration in the Proteſtant Church of the village of Helme, near Vitry; and "very ſoon after he went to Holland, till the noiſe which his quitting his religion would "make was over. He was near a year in Leyden, where he learnt the Hebrew, and "contracted a friendſhip with Salmaſius. From Holland he went to England (*k*)." He returned to Paris, and after ſpending five or ſix weeks at Mr. Patru's, *he took an apartment near Luxemburg, and ſent for two of his nephews to come and live with him* (*l*) [D]. "He paſſed his days very agreeably; and though he devoted the greateſt part of his lei- "ſure to books, he nevertheleſs uſed to ſee company; and frequented the Ladies, and "all perſons of reputation for learning in Paris. Seldom a day paſſed but he went "to Meſſieurs Dupuy, that famous receſs where all perſons of an elegant taſte, and the "literati, uſed to meet (*m*). In September 1637, he was admitted a Member of the "French Academy with univerſal applauſe, a little after which he undertook a tranſlation "of Tacitus. . . . . But whilſt he was engaged in that laborious taſk he was forced to "leave Paris, to go into the country to look after his eſtate that was not conſiderable, and "which the wars leſſened daily. He therefore broke up houſe-keeping; and retired, "with his ſiſter, to his eſtate called Ablancourt, and lived there till his death. In the "beginning

(*d*) Ibid. p. 339.
(*e*) Ibid. p. 336.
(*f*) p. 336.
(*g*) Ibid.
(*b*) Ibid. p. 337.
(*i*) Ibid.
(*k*) Ibid. p. 338.
(*l*) Ibid. p. 339.
(*m*) Ibid.

only were extant, we ſhould at once give credit to whatever he ſays, and publiſh it as a kind of prodigy, for there were ſix claſſes or ſchools in Sedan. Scholars were removed only once a year, and the courſe of philoſophical ſtudies laſted two years at leaſt.

[C] *At twenty five or twenty ſix years of age, he had a deſire to return to the religion he had quitted.*] The continuator of Moreri, extracting this article of Ablancourt from Patru, has faultered on this occaſion. He did not take notice, that the Author of the original whence he copied, ſuppoſes three years between the deſign and the execution. He affirms that our Perrot quitted the Church of Rome at twenty five years of age; went to Holland, ſtayed near a twelvemonth at Leyden, and contracted a friendſhip with Salmaſius. His firſt error was the occaſion of his falling into a ſecond; he ſuppoſing that Ablancourt left Leyden before he was full ſix and twenty, that is, before the fifth of April 1632: but Salmaſius was not then in Leyden; he not coming to that city till the end of that year (11). It it ſcarce poſſible for a writer to miſplace an incident, without making a ſeries of chronological errors. ["Some neceſſary dates "are wanting here, for inſtance the following. Du "Boſc's *Honnête femme* was not finiſhed at preſs till "the 7th of February 1633, and Ablancourt wrote "the preface to it. *Scarce was this Preface*, ſays "Patru, copied by Bayle, *publiſhed, but* Ablancourt, "*at twenty five or twenty ſix years of age, had a de-* "*ſire to return to the religion (the Proteſtant) he had* "*quitted*, at twenty years of age. Inſtead of *ſaying* "*25 or 26 years of age*, it ſhould be *27 years*; ſince "it was after the month of February 1633. . . . . "Theſe dates are of ſome conſequence, becauſe Pa- "tru adds that Ablancourt, *that he might not do any* "*thing raſhly, firſt began to ſtudy philoſophy, and after-* "*wards divinity . . . . . and paſſed near three years in* "*this ſtudy. . . . . Afterwards he ſet out . . . . . from* "*Paris to go to Champaign, where he made a ſecond* "*abjuration*. Patru does not ſay in what year this hap- "pened, but according to his calculation, Ablancourt "would not have abjured the Romiſh Religion till "the beginning of the year 1636. The fact is, we "ought to ſubſtract almoſt the half of, *near three* "*years*; it being certain that Ablancourt abjured the "Romiſh Religion as early as 1634, leſs than eighteen "months after the publication of his preface to the "*Honnête Femme*. Here follows the proof of that "date. Ablancourt, after making this ſecond ab- "juration, went *preſently into Holland*, which muſt "have taken up ſome time. *He ſtaid near a twelve-* "*month in Leyden. . . . . From Holland he went into* "*England*. We are not told how long he ſtaid there, "however, he continued at leaſt ſome months. *He* "*afterwards returned to Paris*. Since therefore it "cannot be doubted but that he was in that city, "the beginning of the year 1636, we are forced to "conclude, that he had left France a very little af- "ter the middle of the year 1634. Hence it fol- "lows, that ſince he was not deſirous of returning to "the Proteſtant Religion till after February 1633, "it is falſe to aſſert that he *paſſed three years* in or- "der to inſtruct himſelf, *that he* might not do any "thing raſhly. . . . . The firſt work which Ablan- "court printed, after his return to Paris, was, his "tranſlation of the Octavius of Minutius Felix. He "finiſhed it before Auguſt 1636, and gave the copy "to Camuſat, who obtained a licenſe to print it, "the 3d of September following, and was finiſhed at "the *preſs the 24th of December of the ſame year* 1636. "Ablancourt dedicated this book to *Philander*, (Mr. "Conrart) with whom he had got acquainted "the beginning of that year; that Gentleman hav- "ing prompted him to engage in that tranſlation. "This proves what I have ſaid above, that Ablan- "court was returned to Paris the beginning of the "year 1636. He had been ſome time in that "city when he had got acquainted with Mr. Con- "rart *."

(11) Antonius Clementius, *in Vita Salmaſii*, p. 42.

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 972.

[D] *He ſent for two of his nephews to come and live with him.*] Theſe were his eldeſt ſiſter's ſons, and their names were Fremont. "No children ever "had a better education. The ſecond is dead; but "Mr. de Fremont d'Ablancourt, the eldeſt of the "two, has plainly ſhewn that education was beſtowed "upon him to good purpoſe. He wrote the dia- "logue of the letters of the Alphabet, and the Sup- "plement to the true Hiſtory, annexed to his uncle's "tranſlation

" beginning of his retirement into the country, he uſed to come pretty often to ſpend " the winter in Paris. . . . . But at laſt he quite left that city, and viſited it upon no other " account but to get his works printed (*n*). . . . . He had been troubled with the gravel " all his life time : and there was a time in which he could not either ride on horſeback " nor go in a coach, and was forced to make uſe of a cane in walking : but afterwards, " for exerciſe ſake, working in his garden, this leſſened his diſorder in a great degree, " and reſtored his ſtrength in ſome meaſure, inſomuch that he could ride in any kind of " vehicle, and even throw aſide his cane, which he nevertheleſs was forced to make uſe " of ſoon after. . . . . In the beginning of October 1664, he had ſo violent a fit of the " gravel, that he expected to die every moment : nevertheleſs his pain was aſſwaged " three or four days after (*o*), but it returned a little after, *and continued till his death. . . .* " *He ſubmitted very patiently to the tedious, acute pains with which he was then afflicted* " [*E*]. *He was viſited during the whole courſe of his ſickneſs by the Proteſtant Mini-* " *ſter of Vitry, and by Mr. du Boſc, a famous Proteſtant Miniſter of Caen,* " *then baniſhed to Chalons.*" *At laſt he died in the arms of his ſiſter and his nephew Ablan-* *court, the 27th of November, aged fifty eight years, eight (p) months, and twelve days (q).* [" He died the 17th of November 1664, in the fifty ninth year of his age *."] Moreri has given a catalogue of his works, the greateſt part of which conſiſt in tranſlations. The reaſon which made him chooſe to be a tranſlator rather than an Author, deſerves to be mentioned [*F*] ; as alſo the reaſon why he thought it neceſſary for Princes to under-ſtand Latin [*G*]. He never entered into the marriage ſtate ; *nor was of a very amorous complexion, and had a blunt way with him which did not very well ſuit the paſſion of love* (*r*).

(*n*) Ibid. p. 340.

(*o*) Ibid.

(*p*) It ſhould be ſeven.

(*q*) Ablancourt's *Life*, p. 342.

* Niceron, *Hommes illuſtres*, Tom. 6. p. 325.

(*r*) Ibid. p. 349.

" He " tranſlation of Lucian, which met with ſo favour- " able a reception from the publick. One of the " greateſt Princes of Europe invited him to educate " one of his ſons ; and the important employments " he has ſo worthily filled, are ſufficient proofs of " his genius and capacity (12)." Patru might here have added, the eſteem which Marſhal Turenne had for Fremont d'Ablancourt. It was that Marſhal who procured him that employment of Envoy to the King of Portugal in 1663 (13), and that of Reſident of France at Straſburg in 1675. Mr. Fremont returned to France after the death of his patron, and ſpent his days very happily, in the ſtudy of good Authors and the converſation of perſons of genius, till the laſt efforts of the perſecution obliged him to go in ſearch of liberty of conſcience in foreign countries. He made ſome ſtay in Groningen, after which he came and ſettled at the Hague, where he was highly eſteemed by the Prince and Princeſs of Orange ; had the honour of being appointed hiſtoriographer, and a handſome penſion ſettled on him. He died at the Hague about ſix or ſeven years ago (14). He was a man of merit, greatly zealous for the Proteſtant Religion, and who did not ſcruple to write a French Catechiſm. He knew a numberleſs multitude of particulars, which are extremely well adapted to converſation, and he delivered them in a graceful manner. As he diſcovered ſo much kindneſs and humanity in his behaviour, the publick were ſurpriſed at the peruſal of a little piece publiſhed by him againſt Amelot de la Houſſaye in 1686 (15). He was angry, and carried his paſſion to a much greater height, than could have been expected from a perſon of his gravity and years, who had left his native country for religion's ſake. Several perſons endeavoured to make his apology, by aſcribing this warmth to the regard he had for the memory of his dear uncle Ablancourt : but as the conteſt did not relate to his uncle's character, as a man of probity ; but only to enquire whether his tranſlation of Tacitus deſerved cenſure, inſtead of enjoying the high reputation to which it attained, I am of opinion that his apology might have been drawn up in more gentle terms. He publiſhed ſome dialogues in 1684, which are mentioned in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (16). A few days ſince (17) were publiſhed his Memoirs, containing the Hiſtory of Portugal, from the treaty of the Pyrenees in 1659, till the year 1668. They are very well worth reading.

(12) Patru's works, in Ablancourt's *Life*, p. 339.

(13) See Ablancourt's *Memoirs*, p. 127 *& ſeq.*

(14) I writ this in January 1701.

(15) See *Nouv. de la Republique des Lettres*, for Dec. 1686, p. 1460 *& ſeq.*

(16) Under March, in the catalogue of books juſt publiſhed. Numb. 4. p. 90 *& ſeq.*

(17) I writ this in January 1701.

[*E*] *He ſubmitted very patiently to the tedious, acute pains with which he was then afflicted.*] We do not meet with the following particular, which I ſhall here cite from the Menagiana (18), in Patru's relation. " Mr. d'Ablancourt . . . . . was ſtudying over " the oven, in the winter ſeaſon, at a paſtry-cook's " (19). Being about ſixty three years of age (20), " and tormented with the ſtone, of which his fa- " ther died, he was deſirous of coming to Paris, in " order to be cut for it ; but reflecting that it being " then the month of November, he ſhould be then " obliged to wait till the ſpring, and that this would " put him to great expence ; he formed a reſolution " to abſtain from eating, the ſooner to end his evils, " and put it in execution. However, being ſtrongly " exhorted to take ſome ſuſtenance, he ſuffered him- " ſelf to be perſuaded ; but it was too late, ſo that " he died." Patru would very probably have ſuppreſſed this circumſtance, though he had known it to be certainly true.

(18) *Menagiana*, p. 324, 325, of the 1ſt Dutch edit.

(19) See the *Menagiana*, p. 397.

(20) There is a miſtake here, he not living quite fifty-nine years.

There are certain things, which perſons chooſe to ſuppreſs entirely, rather than ſhew the falſity of them. They even often think, that it will be more advantageous to the memory of their friends, not to have it known that they have been aſperſed, than to publiſh the falſity of the calumnies ſpread againſt them. But there are ſome occaſions, in which they think it a duty incumbent on themſelves to inform the publick, that innocence has been cruelly abuſed. This part Mr. le Gendre acted with regard to d'Ablancourt. " Heaven permitted Mr. du Boſc to viſit " him, in his expiring moments, to undeceive the " world with regard to the falſe reports, which were " ſpread, and which even reached the King's ear, " as if he had left the world in a deſpairing condi- " tion. But this was a horrid calumny, which Mr. " du Boſc invalidated in his letters to Mr. Conrart, " who was ſo much the more afflicted at the injury " which was done to his friend's memory, as it af- " fected all the Proteſtants : thoſe who ſpread this " falſe report to his Majeſty, adding, that all the " Huguenots in general died in this frame of mind " (21)."

(21) Le Gendre, *Vie de du Boſc.* P. 37.

[*F*] *The reaſon which made him chooſe to be a tranſlator, rather than an Author, deſerves to be mentioned.*] " His genius reſembled very much that of Mon- " tagne ; and had he thought proper to have written " as an Author, he was not wanting in any of the " qualities which conſtitute ſuch a one. He was " poſſeſſed of a very fruitful imagination, and had " acquired a large ſtock of the moſt valuable erudi- " tion. But when any one ſpoke to him about this, " he would anſwer, that he was neither a Divine nor " Lawyer, and conſequently not qualified to com- " poſe pleading or ſermons. That the world was " filled with treatiſes on politicks ; that all diſcourſes " in morality were only ſo many repetitions from " Plutarch and Seneca ; and that, to ſerve one's " country, a man ought rather to tranſlate valuable " Authors, than to write new books, which ſeldom " publiſhed any thing new (22)."

(22) Patin, *Vie d'Ablancourt*, P. 345, 346.

[*G*] *The reaſon why he thought it neceſſary for Princes to underſtand Latin.*] He uſed to ſay, that it was proper they ſhould learn that tongue, *becauſe they thereby would learn, from the antients, ſeveral things which they otherwiſe could not be informed of : and ſee the virtuous and good men of antiquity condemning ſuch Princes, as are wanting in the duties of their function* (23). There is ſmartneſs in this thought, and a certain

(23) *Menagiana*, P. 389, 390.

" He ſlept, eat, and wrote indifferently at all hours either of the day or night: but after " he had worked about two hours, he uſed to unbend himſelf, either by walking or read- " ing ſome agreeable work; and after amuſing himſelf about half an hour he uſed to " return to his writing. He wrote a very bad hand, inſomuch that, in his later years, " he often could not read his own manuſcript." He drank but little wine, but had a " ſtrong head, and bore wine well, ſo that he was never injured by it (*s*). He was ſon " to a man who had compoſed an hundred thouſand verſes, and yet our Ablancourt could " never write two together (*t*)" He was delightful in converſation [*H*]. The hints of his friends were of great ſervice to him in correcting his compoſitions; but they might have been of ſtill greater advantage [*I*], had he not been ſo eager of returning back to his houſe in the country, whilſt his works were printing. *His manner of tranſlating did not pleaſe univerſally, though it was admired by all perſons of genius and learning of this age. He indeed ſometimes takes liberties* (*u*). He has apologized for this in his *Prefaces*, and *ſhewn*, that *he propoſed to himſelf the true idea of a good tranſlator, who ought to render the ſenſe of his original, without diveſting it of any parts of its ſtrength or graces. . . . . This is* what he *has ſo happily practiſed; and his lively and bold expreſſions are ſo far from ſervileneſs, that his tranſlations ſeem to be originals, and not tranſlations* (*x*). Such is the character that is given in his elogium; but ſome are of opinion that he took ſome improper liberties (*y*). He poſſeſſed a great fund of erudition, and applied himſelf in a very

(*s*) Ibid. p. 347.

(*t*) Ibid.

(*u*) Ibid. p. 345.

(*x*) Ibid.

(*y*) See Baillet, *Jugement des Savans, ſur les traducteurs Francois*, num. 950. Menage called Ablancourt's tranſlation of Tacitus, *The Faitbleſs Beauty*. Menagiana, p. 324. 1ſt Dutch edit.

tain luſtre which may dazzle and charm thoſe who do not go to the bottom of things, A ſatyrical ſtroke, ſtrongly expreſſed, gives a great beauty to a moral picture, and eſpecially when human grandeurs are the object of ſuch cenſure. This is the preſent caſe. Ablancourt's reflection impoſes upon us by that means, and draws its chief beauty from thence; but this is no more than an exterior beauty. Examine his aſſertion carefully, fathom it, and it will appear like gilded wood: it is mere outſide, a mere ſuperficial ornament. There is no ſuch nation, where learning flouriſhes, but tells their Princes, in their mother tongue, the truths they ought to know; and may inſtruct them as well in their duties as well as the Latin Authors. I would aſk in what manner the books of the antient Romans can furniſh leſſons to Princes in theſe latter ages? It is not by ſaying to them, *you have committed a great error, an act of injuſtice by ſuch and ſuch an action*. It is only by cenſuring the injuſtice and faults which were committed antiently. But are there books wanting, written in the modern languages, which exhibit the faults of Princes in the ſtrongeſt light? and which blacken the memory of thoſe who have ſwayed the ſcepter unjuſtly, either lately in foreign countries, or formerly in the very country where ſuch books are writ? To ſay nothing of ſermons or political pieces; let us only conſider the Hiſtorians, Mezerai for inſtance, who was contemporary with Ablancourt. I confeſs that he did not give the hiſtory of his own times; but he comes infinitely nearer to it than Livy, Tacitus, or any other of the antient Latin Authors; and he cenſures with great ſtrength and freedom, the evil adminiſtration of ſuch Kings of France as he treats of. Both themſelves and their Miniſters are, whenever truth requires, laſhed in his Hiſtory, as if they were ſo many little boys. Varillas takes the ſame liberty, though ſo great a flatterer of his contemporaries; and we generally find that thoſe who flatter moſt the tranſactions of the preſent times, cenſure moſt ſharply the faults of paſt times (24). Conſequently the reaſon given by Ablancourt, why Princes ought to underſtand Latin, is falſe. It is ſo much the worſe reaſon, as he could not but know, that for theſe three hundred years the compoſitions of the antient Romans have been tranſlating perpetually. And if he thought it of ſo much advantage to Princes to ſtudy that language, why did he himſelf furniſh them with ſo fair a pretence not to ſtudy it? They need only ſay, that his tranſlations diſpenſed them from it. His own actions deſtroyed therefore his theſis.

(24) See citat. (17), of the article of MARSHAL DE MARILLAC.

(25) Patru's *Life of Ablancourt*, p. 349.

(26) Vigneul de Marville is therefore in the right, when he ſays in his *Melanges* (*Miſcellanies*), p. 324. Tom. 1. that the Prince of Conde had ſome of thoſe Petits Maitres. His obſervation with regard to the origin and character of thoſe people is curious enough. Add to this what the Continuator of *la Bruyere*, or the *Modern Theophraſtus*, ſays of this, p. 322 & *ſeq.* of his *Nouveau Caracteres ſur les mœurs*, Dutch edit. See alſo Bordellon's *Diverſitez curieuſes*, part. 10. p. 359, Dutch edit.

[*H*] *He was delightful in converſation* (25).] " In " his younger days, no man could poſſibly be ſprightlier. He was all vivacity and wit; all which was " heightened with a certain turn, which is learnt only in the polite world . . . . . He preſerved his " gaiety of temper till his death. In the ſuburbs of " St. Germain, he got acquainted with all thoſe Noblemen who formed the Prince's court, and who " were then called the *Petits-Maîtres* (26). But he " was prodigiouſly careſſed by Monſieur de Colligny " and de la Mouſſaye. When any of them went to " Vitry or Châlons, or to ſome place that was not very far from the place where he lived, they always " ſent for him; and an entertainment would have " been nothing without Mr. Ablancourt. He had a " perpetual fund of diſcourſe at meals or in converſation. He ſpoke much, but never tired the hearers, what he ſaid being always new and agreeable. One would have concluded, that he had ſtudied all he ſaid, ſo pertinent were his ſtrokes of " raillery; but theſe were employed always to defend himſelf, without diſpleaſing any perſon. I ſhall confirm this by a paſſage from the *Menagiana*. *D'Albancourt uſed to ſay ſo many valuable and agreeable things in converſation, that Peliſſon ſaid, it was pity a Clerk was not always ſtanding by him, to write down all he ſpoke* (27).

(27) *Menagiana*, p. 525. 1ſt Dutch edit.

[*I*] *The hints of his friends were of great ſervice to him . . . . but they might have been of ſtill greater advantage.*] The following paſſage not only forms a conſiderable part of Ablancourt's character, and the hiſtory of his ſtudies, but will alſo be an inſtruction to other Authors, if they avoid ſuch things as are defective in this example. *At firſt he conſulted no one but Mr. Patru; but after he had got acquainted with Mr. Conrart and Mr. Chapelain, he conſulted them alſo; but eſpecially Mr. Conrart in concert with whom he uſed to reviſe all his works; and with ſo much the more pleaſure, becauſe he did not underſtand either Greek or Latain, and for that reaſon gave him leſs trouble. For, whenever he came to Paris to put any work to preſs, he wanted to get back as ſoon as poſſible; for which reaſon, whenever his friends uſed to ſtart any difficulties, he would defend his compoſitions with great warmth, and be almoſt angry; becauſe theſe difficulties gave him trouble, and conſequently delayed his return. And this temper gained ſo great an aſcendant over him, that, in the latter part of his life, and when he compoſed his laſt tranſlations, he did not conſult, at leaſt would not be directed by any perſon. Now this was not the effect either of preſumption or vanity; it was only haſte, and a too eager deſire to get rid of his burthen: for, whenever he had finiſhed a book at preſs, he would gladly receive any hints which might be given him; and even entreated his friends to favour him with their criticiſms, for the ſecond edition. On this occaſion it will be proper to mention a pretty remarkable particular. Hitherto he had reviſed all his works with Mr. Patru; but ever ſince his tranſlation of Arrian, the whole of which they examined together in eight or ten afternoons, he printed all the firſt editions of his books without communicating them to him, becauſe he gave him too much trouble. He did the ſame with regard to his verſion of Lucian; but after it was printed and publiſhed, he intreated this dear friend to reviſe it. This dear friend complied with his requeſt, and ſent him his remarks. Moſt of them were approved of by him; and as for thoſe which he would not agree to, he referred them to Meſſ. Conrart and Chapelain; when Mr. Patru joined with them, and then they ſettled, in concert, the ſeveral difficulties. For this reaſon, the ſecond edition, printed after theſe obſervations, is much more correct than the firſt* (28).

(28) Patru's *Life of Ablancourt*, p. 346, 347.

[*K*] *He*

very particular manner to the ſtudy of the bible [*K*]. Here follow his notions with regard to the immortality of the Soul [*L*]. See his elogium by Patru, from which I have extracted moſt of the above-mentioned particulars. It contains a great many more, which

[*K*] *He poſſeſſed a great fund of erudition, and applied himſelf in a very particular manner to the ſtudy of the bible.*] " He poſſeſſed a lively, penetrating " genius. Whenever he attempted to examine any " difficult point, he immediately ſaw through every part of it. He was well ſkilled in Philoſophy, " Divinity, Hiſtory, and Polite Literature in general. He underſtood Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian and Spaniſh. He had a perfect knowledge of " religion, and was more knowing in it, than was requiſite for his ſalvation. However, ſo great a variety of knowledge, ſo vaſt a fund of the deepeſt erudition, neither dulled his genius, nor confuſed or " clouded his judgment. He ſaw clearly into all " things, in antient as well as in modern Authors. " In the latter part of his life, he ſtudied ſcarce any " thing but the ſacred writings, and the relations " and hiſtories of America; but particularly the ſacred writings, which we may call his moſt tender, " his laſt amours. He had all the good Commentators on the Bible, whether general or particular: " and there was not a ſingle difficulty in it, but " was cleared by him, and with which he was thoroughly acquainted (29)." [*I am of opinion, that Patru has flattered Ablancourt too much, and every part of his panegyric appears to me ſtrained* *].

(29) Patru's *Life of Ablancourt*, p. 348, 349.

* From the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 972.

[*L*] *Here follow his notions, with regard to the immortality of the ſoul.*] Having aſſerted in converſation, that *religion, not natural reaſon, teaches the immortality of the ſoul* (30), he drew up a diſcourſe, and ſent it to Mr. Patru to juſtify his opinion (31). He affirms in this diſcourſe, " That it is above the ordinary " ſtrength of our minds, to attain to a perfect knowledge of the ſoul; and there is not any reaſon " which can prove its immortality (32)." He mentions the chief of thoſe reaſons, and adds, that *they are good indeed to confirm, in that belief, a ſoul which is already enlightened by grace; but that they are not capable of ſatisfying a man, who is guided by no other light than that of nature.* He ſpeaks of (33) the blindneſs and ignorance of Philoſophers *in that matter*, and how confuſed Ariſtotle's doctrine is in that point; but obſerves that this is no wonder; *for that the light of the Goſpel had not yet illuminated the world; and that, as this truth is ſuperior to man's reaſon, it ſtood in need of a ſupernatural aid, in order to its being known* (34). . . . *You muſt confeſs*, ſays he (35), to his friend Patru, that *it is faith, not natural reaſon, which makes us Chriſtians; and that I may be allowed to ſay, (ſpeaking as a Naturaliſt) that the reſurrection is impoſſible, provided I believe that God, by his infinite power, can do things which are naturally impoſſible. I therefore ſpoke as I ought to have done, when I aſſerted, that human reaſon could not make me comprehend that our ſouls are immortal; but that the ſcriptures, and the revelations that God indulged to his church, had taught me this truth, which is the foundation of all our religion.* He then aſſerts, that his opinion is much better than it would be, were it grounded upon philoſophical proofs (36). " You believe the immortality of the " ſoul, becauſe your reaſon ſhews it you; and I, in " oppoſition to my ſenſe, believe our ſouls to be immortal, becauſe our religion commands me to believe in that manner. Conſider theſe opinions, " and you doubtleſs will confeſs that mine is greatly preferable. Yours is not ſo much as Catholic. . . . (37). As it is not ſufficient, in order for " our being virtuous, to do good actions, but our intentions muſt alſo be innocent, and our actions reſult from a laudable motive; in like manner it is " not ſufficient, in order for our being good Catholicks, not to doubt of any thing, which the church " enjoins us to believe; but we likewiſe muſt believe " as Chriſtians; and our faith ought to be the effect of humility, not of preſumption. . . . (38). " That man does not rely entirely upon God, who " depends upon reaſon with regard to ſuch things as " he will have us believe. If indeed our reaſon never deceived us, and we had a perfect knowledge " even of ſuch things as fall under our ſenſes, our " raſhneſs would perhaps be excuſable; and it would " not be ſurprizing, that not finding any thing here " below capable of fixing us, we therefore ſhould be " prompted to ſearch for things above us. But you " know better than I do, how far the knowledge " of mankind extends; and that there are ſo many " things in nature, in which Philoſophy is totally " blind, that we very juſtly diſtruſt our ſtrength and " reaſon. None but a Novice in Philoſophy, will " think that all kinds of queſtions may be eaſily reſolved. Thoſe who dive farther into the knowledge of things, meet with much greater difficulties. Frequently two contrary opinions are found " equally probable; and if they declare for one of " them, it is rather from inclination than reaſon. " Man cannot judge with certainty of any one " thing in the world; his reaſon commits miſtakes, " as does his ſenſes: we live in the midſt of doubts " and errors; and there are few certain truths here below, except ſuch as God hath revealed to his church. " View all the ſchools of the Philoſophers, examine " what is done, and what is taught in them; in " the one thou wilt find preſumption, in another " obſtinacy; but ignorance, error and weakneſs in " all. Our weakneſs is certainly of uſe, in order to " keep us to our duty . . . (39). If our reaſon is ſo " vaſtly weak, that the leaſt difficulties check its " progreſs; and that it is every moment miſtaken, " we muſt take great care not to truſt ourſelves to the " conduct of ſo blind a guide, and eſtabliſh our belief on ſo rotten a foundation. We muſt not rely on our arguments, but on him who made hea" ven and earth . . . (40). We ſhould always call " to mind, that we ought to believe in God, and " not in ourſelves; and that to make uſe of our " reaſon in divine things, would be acting like that " Cynic, who, not contented with the light of the " ſun, ſought for a good man, at noon-day, with a " candle."

(30) Patru's works, in Ablancourt's *Life*, p. 355.

(31) The whole is inſerted in Tom. 2. of Patru's works, p. 354 *& ſeq.*

(32) Ibid. p. 356.

(33) Ibid. p. 357.

(34) Ibid. p. 358.

(35) Ibid.

(36) Ibid. p. 361.

(37) Ibid. p. 362.

(38) Ibid. p. 363.

(39) Ibid. p. 364.

(40) Ibid. p. 365.

Des Cartes, and his moſt zealous followers, might object to certain particulars in ſome of the thoughts mentioned above; but this would be only as mere Philoſophers; for the inſtant they ſhould conſider themſelves as Chriſtians, they would entirely approve of Ablancourt's opinion. They are perſuaded that their proofs of the ſoul's immortality are demonſtrative: and therefore would have been diſpleaſed at his ſuppoſing, that the light of reaſon does not exhibit good proofs of this immortality: but after all, they would conſider him only as heterodox in philoſophy: and would confeſs that, as a Chriſtian, he was fully orthodox (41). Perſuaſion, grounded on the light of nature, ought to be conſidered in a Chriſtian, as eloquence in a philoſopher, embelliſhments in a Hiſtory, or beauty in a wreſtler or champion (42). Theſe are things, the privation of which is no great evil, though it is no diſadvantage to poſſeſs them. *A Philoſopho ſi afferat eloquentiam, non aſperner: ſi non habeat, non admodum flagitem* (43). i. e. " Was " a Philoſopher to ſhew eloquence, I would not diſ" dain it; but were he not to exhibit any, I would " not require it." It is an advantage, to be able to reconcile the truths of the Chriſtian Religion with the principles of the philoſophers; this is a happy effect that ought not to be neglected, but on the contrary, ought to be cultivated as much as poſſible; but we ſhould always be very ready to loſe it without any regret, whenever we are not able to extend ſo far as thoſe doctrines which are out of its reach; and which, from the nature of myſtery, are above the reach of our reaſon. Men ſhould be diſpoſed or affected with regard to that advantage, as wiſe men are with reſpect to fortune. If ſhe makes her favours permanent, wiſe men are very glad: but if ſhe takes her flight, they are not troubled at it. I praiſe her, ſays Horace, when ſhe reſides with me; but the inſtant I ſee her prepare to leave me, I return her the preſents ſhe gave, and wrap myſelf in my virtue.

(41) Compare this with rem. [*M*], of the art. DICEARCHUS.

(42) *Lucianus in libello de hac re, unum ait eſſe opus Hiſtoriæ, unumque finem, utilitatem: jucundum vero ſi & ipſum ſequatur, melius hoc eſſe: perinde atque in athleta vires requiruntur, forma ac venuſtas laudantur.* Famian. Strada, *Proluſ.* 2. lib. 2. p. m. 223.

(43) Cicero de Finibus, lib. 1. cap. 5.

Laudo

which cannot but pleaſe thoſe, who are deſirous of knowing the particular circumſtances relating to the lives of famous men. I am to obſerve, that Patru repreſents our Ablancourt as poſſeſſed of the moſt excellent moral qualities.

Laudo manentem. Si celeres quatit
Pennas, reſigno quæ dedit, & meâ
Virtute me involvo (44).

(44) Horat. Od. 29. lib. 3.

" Whene'er ſhe ſtays with what ſhe brings,
" I'm pleas'd, but when ſhe ſhakes her wings,
" I ſtrait reſign my juſt pretence.
" I give her back her fading gold ;
" Myſelf in my virtue fold :
" *And live content with want and innocence.*"
CREECH.

In this manner Chriſtians behave with regard to philoſophical knowledge. If after they have proved ſome tenet in religion, it oppoſes them, and ſerves the contrary tenet ; we let it go, ſay they, and wrap ourſelves up in our faith. This is a thick vail, which is quite proof againſt all the inclemencies of the air or weather, that is, againſt all the aſſaults of natural reaſon. Ablancourt acted in this manner. Nothing can be more judicious or ſolid than his reflections on the nature of faith, and the good uſe we ought to make of the uncertainty of reaſon. The certainty of divine faith is above that of ſcience or knowledge. That man would therefore be very unjuſt, who ſhould aſſert that a Chriſtian ſtood in need of philoſophical proofs, in order to be certainly ſure that his ſoul will not die. Is it not enough that he is certain of it by his ſubmiſſion to the authority of Heaven, and by a firm perſuaſion, that no foundation is ſo firm and immoveable as the word of God ? And muſt not a Chriſtian, if he is deſirous of acting as ſuch, believe the immortality of the Soul, becauſe God promiſes us eternal life ? If ſuch a one believe the immortality of the Soul merely from philoſophical reaſons, this would not be an act of faith ; and yet he muſt exert ſuch an act, if he is deſirous of complying with the duties of religion, and making himſelf agreeable to God. Chriſtians in an act of faith have no regard to the light of nature ; but rejecting it entirely, they rely on God's veracity. See what ſchoolmen ſay, when they enquire, whether opinion, knowledge and faith, can exiſt in our minds, at the ſame time, with regard to the ſame object.

I here have a very fine opportunity to quote a paſſage which I promiſed before (45). Mr. Locke was much in the ſame caſe with Mr. Ablancourt : he being cenſured for aſſerting, that the Soul's immortality was not clearly proved by the light of reaſon. Here follows his opinion (46). " This your accuſation of " my leſſening the credibility of theſe articles of " faith, [the immortality of the Soul, and the reſur- " rection of the body] is founded on this, that the " article of the immortality of the Soul abates of " its credibility, if it be allowed, that its immateria- " lity (which is the ſuppoſed proof from reaſon and " philoſophy of its immortality) cannot be demon- " ſtrated from natural reaſon : which argument of " your Lordſhip's bottoms, as I humbly conceive, on " this, that Divine Revelation abates of his credibi- " lity in all thoſe articles proportionably, as human " reaſon fails to ſupport the teſtimony of GOD. " And all that your Lordſhip in thoſe paſſages has " ſaid, when examined, will, I ſuppoſe, be found to " import thus much, viz. Does God promiſe any " thing to mankind to be believed ? It is very " fit and credible to be believed, if reaſon can de- " monſtrate it to be true. But if human reaſon comes " ſhort in the caſe, and cannot make it out, its " credibility is thereby leſſened ; which is, in effect, " to ſay, that the veracity of God is not a firm and " ſure foundation of faith to rely upon, without the " concurring teſtimony of reaſon, i. e. with reverence " be it ſpoken, GOD is not to be believed on his own " word, unleſs what he reveals be in itſelf credible, " and might be believed without him. I could not " have imagined to find this in a book, written in " defence of the myſtery of the Holy Trinity. Your " Lordſhip ſays, *You do not queſtion whether God can* " *give immortality to a material ſubſtance ; but you ſay* " *it* takes off very much *from the evidence of immorta-* " *lity, if it depends wholly upon* GOD's *giving that,* " *which of its own nature it is not capable of.* To which " I reply, any one's not being able to demonſtrate " the ſoul to be immaterial, *takes off* not *very much,* " nor at all from the *evidence of its immortality,* if " GOD has revealed that it ſhall be immortal, becauſe " the veracity of GOD is a demonſtration of the truth " of what he has revealed ; and the want of another " demonſtration of a propoſition, that is demonſtra- " tively true, takes not off from the evidence of it. " For where there is a clear demonſtration, there is " as much evidence as any truth can have, that is " not ſelf-evident (47) . . . Can any one who admits " of divine revelation . . . . think this propoſiiton " leſs credible, the bodies of men, after the reſur- " rection, ſhall live for ever ; than this, the ſouls of " men ſhall, after the reſurrection, live for ever ? " For that he muſt do, if he thinks either of them " is leſs credible than the other. If this be ſo, rea- " ſon is to be conſulted, how far GOD is to be be- " lieved ; and the credit of divine teſtimony muſt re- " ceive its force from the evidence of reaſon, which " is evidently to take away the credibility of divine " revelation, in all ſupernatural truths, wherein the " evidence of reaſon fails."

(47) Locke, ibid. p. 420, 421.

The Reader will find in the article POMPONATIUS ſeveral particulars relating to this ſubject ; but it muſt be obſerved, that many Schoolmen have aſſerted, that the reaſons, from the light of nature, for the ſoul's immortality, are not convincing and demonſtrative. *Naturæ rationes Henricus atque Scotus probabiliter ſuadere ajunt, non neceſſario demonſtrare* (48). Cajetanus, who had rejected that opinion in a haughty and publick manner (49), at laſt embraced it. I believe, ſays he, that our ſoul is immortal, but I do not know it to be ſo : *ſe credere quidem animam rationalem incorruptibilem eſſe, at neſcire tamen* (50). Himſelf and Scotus, and Joannes de Janduno, after having examined all the proofs alledged by Thomas Aquinas, declared that they were not demonſtrative : *Pronuntiarunt tandem rem non eſſe demonſtratam, ſed creditam* (51). Scotus anſwered all theſe proofs of Thomas Aquinas. The laſt mentioned writer propoſed twenty one probable reaſons for the ſoul's mortality, to which Joannes Janduno has added ſeveral others (52).

(48) Melchior. *Canus, Locor. Commun.* lib. 12. cap. ult. p. m. 724.

(49) Idem, ib.

(50) Idem, ib.

(51) Idem, ib. p. 725.

(52) Idem, ib. p. 727.

(45) Citation (63), of the art. DICEARCHUS.

(46) *Mr. Locke's Reply to the Biſhop of Wincheſt. Anſwer to his ſecond Letter*, p. 418, 419. See alſo *Nouv. de la Republ. des Lettres*, Nov. 1699. p. 510.

PERSIUS (CAIUS (*a*), was one of the moſt learned men of his time [*A*]. He was queſtor of Rome in 608, and Prætor two years after (*b*). Lucilius the Poet dreaded him ;

(*a*) Pliny calls him Manius, in Father Hardouin's edition. See the remark [*A*].

(*b*) According to Voſſius, *de Poet. Latin.* p. 41.

[*A*] *One of the moſt learned men of his time.*] Cicero mentions him two or three times. He introduces Craſſus the Orator declaring, that, like the Poet Lucilius, he does not require quite ignorant judges, nor ſuch as are very learned : and on this occaſion he informs us that Perſius, one of thoſe whom that Poet did not deſire to have for one of his readers, was one of the moſt learned men that had been ſeen in Rome (1). *Nam ut Cajus Lucilius homo doctus & perurbanus dicere ſolebat, ea quæ ſcriberet neque ab indoctiſſimis neque ab doctiſſimis legi velle, quod alteri nihil intelligerent, alteri plus fortaſſe quàm ipſe de ſe ; quo etiam ſcripſit ; Perſium non curo legere, hic enim fuit, ut noramus, omnium fere noſtrorum hominum doctiſſimus ; Lælium Decimum volo, quem cognovimus virum bonum & non illiteratum, ſed nihil ad Perſium ; ſic ego ſi jam mihi diſputandum ſit de his noſtris ſtudiis, nolim equidem apud ruſticos, ſed multo minus apud vos, malo enim non intelligi orationem meam, quàm reprehendi.* i. e. " For " as Caius Lucilius, a man of great learning and po- " liteneſs, uſed to ſay, that he would not willingly " have his compoſitions peruſed either by the moſt " learned or moſt ignorant men ; becauſe the latter " underſtood nothing, and the former perhaps knew " more

(1) Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. 2.

him; and ingenuously confeſſed, that he did not write for ſuch people; and deſired to have readers leſs learned than he. Some were of opinion, that Perſius wrote the ſpeech which was ſpoke by the Conſul Caius Fannius, againſt Caius Gracchus, the year of Rome 631 (c). The reaſon of this was, Fannius was but an indifferent Orator, and at the ſame time his ſpeech was ſo beautiful, that others imagined that many perſons of great learning and talents had ſhared in the writing of it (d). It was not very extraordinary in that age, for one man to draw up an Oration, and another to ſpeak it: nevertheleſs Tully refutes thoſe who did not aſcribe this Oration to Fannius. Some writers have been ſo ſtrangely miſtaken in chronology, as to confound our Perſius with the Poet of the following article [B].

(c) *Alii à C. Perſio literato homine ſcriptam eſſe ajebant, illo quem ſignificat valde doctum eſſe Lucilium; alii multos nobiles quod quiſque potuiſſet in illam orationem contuliſſe.* Cicero, *in Bruto.*

(d) *Eam ſuſpicionem propter hanc cauſam credo fuiſſe, quod Fannius in mediocribus Oratoribus habitus eſſet, oratio autem vel optima eſſet illo quidem tempore orationum omnium.* Cicero, *in Bruto.*

" more than himſelf: he alſo ſaid, that he was not " willing to have his writings read by Perſius, whom " he knew was very near the moſt learned man a- " mong the Romans: but he deſired to have ſuch " readers as Lælius Decimus, who was allowed to be " a man of probity and no ways illiterate, but infi- " nitely inferior to Perſius. Thus, with regard to " myſelf, were I to argue upon my ſtudies, I would " not like to do this in preſence of ignorant people, " much leſs before you; for I had rather my oration " ſhould not be underſtood than to have it meet with " cenſure." Cicero, in another place (z), declares, that he is not of Lucilius's temper; for that reaſon he ſhould be glad to be read by Perſius. *Nec enim ut noſter Lucilius recuſabo quo minus omnes mea legant. Utinam eſſet ille Perſius; Scipio vero & Rutilius multo etiam magis, quorum ille judicium reformidans Tarentinis ait ſe & Conſentinis & Siculis ſcribere.* i. e. " I will " not, like Lucilius, be againſt every perſon's read- " ing my compoſitions. I ſhould be glad were they " read by ſuch men as Perſius; and much more by " Scipio and Rutilius, whoſe judgment being dreaded " by him, he therefore ſays that he wrote to the " Tarentines, the Conſentini, and Sicilians." Pliny, being deſirous of employing Lucilius's thought, choſe to borrow it from Tully rather than from its Author; and he ſeems to have had an eye to a paſſage of Tully, where this particular was told with explanations different from thoſe which the latter has already ſeen. *Præterea*, ſays Pliny (3), *eſt quædam publica etiam eruditorum rejectio. Utitur illa & M. Tullius extra omnem ingenii aleam poſitus, & (quod miremur) per advocatum defenditur.* Nec doctiſſimis: Manium Perſium hæc legere nolo, Junium Congum volo (4). *Quod ſi hoc Lucilius qui primus condidit ſtylo naſum dicendum ſibi putavit: ſi Cicero mutuandum, præſertim cum de Republica ſcriberet, quanto nos cauſatius ab aliquo judice defendimus.* i. e. " Farther, one " may reject publickly, in ſome meaſure, the deci- " ſion of learned men. Tully does this, though he " had no occaſion to be under any apprehenſions; " and, what is a ſurprizing circumſtance, has an ad- " vocate to defend him. *I would not be read by men " of the greateſt erudition, ſuch as Manius Perſius, but by " thoſe like Junius Congus.* Now if Lucilius, who " was the firſt writer of ſatyr, thought proper to do " this if Tully was pleaſed to copy after him in " this reſpect, particularly when he wrote concern- " ing the Republick, how much more ought I " to be defended by ſome judge?" This paſſage of Cicero was doubtleſs in the Preface to his books *De Republica*, He thought at that time, no like what we meet with in book I. *De Finibus*, but as in book II. *De Oratore*. But we ought not to wonder at theſe variations, for the ſubjects are different. It is more ſurprizing, that every time he mentioned that reflection of Lucilius, he ſhould introduce various perſons different from Perſius; now *Lælius Decimus*; another time the *Sicilians* and *Tarentines*, a third *Junius Congus*. The reaſon of this may be, either becauſe Lucilius had mentioned, in the ſame place, ſeveral perſons whoſe ſagacity and penetration he did not fear in any manner; or becauſe he made uſe of the ſame reflection in ſeveral places, ſometimes againſt one man, at other times againſt another; for when a writer declares his fear of being criticiſed by a perſon on account of his great learning, this may immediately ſuggeſt a ſatyrical fling againſt other perſons whom he is deſirous of repreſenting as ignorant or half learned creatures. This was infinitely more Lucilius's view than to applaud Perſius's erudition. He might, in both of theſe caſes, have given Tully an occaſion of diverſifying the perſons he oppoſes to Perſius: and therefore Father Hardouin had reaſon to expunge from Pliny, *Lælius Decimus*, and to ſubſtitute there, on the authority of the beſt and moſt antient manuſcripts, *Junius Congus*. See the remark [F] of the article LUCILIUS.

(z) *De Finib.* lib. 1. cap. 3.

(3) *In Præfat.*

(4) So Father Hardouin reads. In the other editions it is thus: *Hæc doctiſſimum Perſium legere nolo, Lælium Decimum volo.*

[B] *Some writers . . . . confound our Perſius with the Poet of the following article.*] Fungerus (5), ſuppoſing very improperly the following words of Tully, *nihil ad Perſium*, to be ſpoken proverbially, imagined, with ſtill greater impropriety, that they meant Perſius the ſatyrical Poet, born about the end of Tiberius's reign. Theſe two errors were taken notice of by Voſſius: who expreſſes his ſorrow at his meeting with ſo many blunders of this kind in antient as well as modern Authors. I wiſh (ſays he) our youth would hence conſider, how uſeful chronology is, an ignorance of which is ſometimes fatal to perſons, who, in other reſpects, are learned enough. But this (continues he) would not be ſo great a grievance, if Fungerus was the only Author who had erred ſo flagrantly in that particular: but I could quote ſix hundred more of the ſame kind from other Authors, a great number of which are from the antients themſelves. *Vellem*, ſays he (6), *ut juventus hinc videat quàm neceſſaria ſit doctrina temporum, cujus neglectu ſpiſſe fœdeque peccatur à viris alioqui non ineruditis. Quamquam nec tanti id foret, ſi unus ille* (Fungerus) *ſic exorbitaret. Sexcenta id genus poteram ex aliis adferre, pluſcula etiam ex veteribus ipſis.*

(5) *In Nova Proverbior. Farragine, apud* Voſſium, *Inſtit. Orat.* lib. 4 cap. 11. and *de Poet. Lat.* p. 41.

(6) *De Poet. Lat.* ibid.

PERSIUS (AULUS PERSIUS FLACCUS) [A], a ſatyrical Poet in Nero's reign,

[A] *Aulus Perſius Flaccus.*] Thoſe who affirm that he was ſirnamed *Flaccus*, becauſe of his imitating Horace, did not conſider that this was his father's ſirname (1); and have not been more lucky in their gueſs, when they aſſerted that he was called Severus, becauſe he profeſſed the Philoſophy of the Stoicks. I am obliged to Caſaubon (2) for theſe two remarks. He believes that, with regard to the ſecond, that an inſcription found in Volaterra, occaſioned that error. The inſcription is as follows. *A. Perſius A. F. Severus V. an.* 8. *M.* 3. *D.* 19. This ſuppoſes that thoſe, whom this famous Critick cenſures, had affirmed that the title *Severus* had been given Perſius as the ſirname of a family, in which view they merited cenſure; but had they conſidered this title no otherwiſe than as an epithet, like that of *ardens*, which Juvenal beſtowed on Lucilius (3), no one, in my opinion, ought to cenſure thoſe perſons, for having an eye to our Poet's fondneſs for the Stoical Philoſophy; nor could it be ſaid, that they had any regard to the inſcription of Volaterra. No Writer ever deſerved more the elogium of *Severe*, than our Poet, if we conſider the impetuous ſtyle of his invectives and ſatyrs, for which reaſon Barthius beſtowed this elogium on him. It was therefore not juſt to apply to him that rigorous reprimand of Caſaubon. The perſon I now hint at is Magyrus (4); for after quoting the following words of Barthius (5), he ought not to have made ſuch an application as he did. *Severum veteres libri ab auctoritate caſtigandi & invectione in malos mores nominant*, he adds, *ſed videtur huic vaniſſimo commento occaſionem præbuiſſe inſcriptio illa memoria avorum Volaterris inventa, ubi* Aul. PERSII *cujuſdam octennis pueri fit mentio, cui cognomen*

(1) Sueton. *in Vita Perſii.*

(2) *Notis in Vitam Perſii.*

(3) Sat. 1. So Perſius beſtows the epithet *Vafer* on Horace; and Ovid that of *Doctus* on Catullus.

(4) *Eponymolog. Critic.* p. 648.

(5) 4 *Adverſar.* 1.

reign, was born at Volaterra in Tuſcany [*B*]. He was a Roman Knight, and related both by blood and marriage to perſons of the higheſt rank. He was educated, till twelve years of age, in Volaterra; and afterwards continued his ſtudies at Rome under Paleman the Grammarian, Virginius the Rhetorician, and a Stoick Philoſopher named Cornutus, who had ſo great an eſteem for him, that it grew to an intimate and moſt laſting friendſhip. Perſius has immortalized this friendſhip in his Poems, and his gratitude for the good offices of this friend (*a*). He expreſſed this ſtill more ſtrongly by a codicil, he bequeathing him his library and a conſiderable ſum of money (*b*): but Cornutus accepted only of the books, and left the money to the heirs (*c*). He adviſed his friend's mother to ſuppreſs certain Poems which her ſon had writ in his early youth. He without doubt judged, that they would not be worthy of the exalted reputation the reſt that were publiſhed had gained, and which was ſo great, that the copies were immediately bought. This may ſerve as a pattern for thoſe to imitate, who publiſh ſo many poſthumous bad books, in hopes that the fame and reputation of the deceaſed Author will be their paſſport. Among other compoſitions of Perſius ſuppreſſed on this occaſion, were the verſes which he wrote on Arria, that illuſtrious Roman Lady, who ſtabbed herſelf, as an example for her dear huſband to do the like. Moreri ſuppoſes falſely that this was a ſatyr againſt Arria [*C*]: but it was rather a panegyrick; and this cannot be reaſonably doubted, when we conſider the great friendſhip which our Author had for Thraſeas, ſon-in law to Arria, his relation (*d*). He and Lucan ſtudied under Cornutus; on which occaſion he gained his fellow-pupil's love to ſuch a degree, that whenever Perſius read his verſes, Lucan

(*a*) Perſius, Sat. 5. *paſſim.*

(*c*) *i. e.* To Perſius's ſiſters.

(*d*) *Ipſe etiam decem fere annis ſumme dilectus apud Thraſeam eſt, ita ut peregrinaretur quoque cum eo aliquando, cognatam ejus Arriam* (daughter of her who killed herſelf) *uxorem habente.* Suetonius, *in vita Perſii.* Inſtead of *dilectus apud Thraſeam*, Lipſius, *in Annal. Tacit.* lib. 16. corrects it thus, *dilectus à Pæto Thraſea.*

(*b*) Twenty-five thouſand crowns, according to the calculation of ſome perſons. See the preface to Father Tarteron's tranſlation.

nomen fuit Severo. Caſaub. i. e. "He is called Severus by antient Authors, from the freedom with "which he cenſured and inveighed againſt vice; "but this ſilly fiction ſeems to have aroſe from an "inſcription found at Volaterra, in the memory of "our fore-fathers, wherein one Aul. PERSIUS, a boy "of eight years old, and firnamed Severus, is mentioned."

[*B*] *Born at Volaterra in Tuſcany.*] All Authors are not agreed as to this particular, Hetruria and Liguria contending on this ſubject. Perſius might boaſt his having a conſiderable ſhare in Homer's fate; two very conſiderable Provinces diſputing for the honour of his birth. The Hetrurians ground their pretenſions on the teſtimony of ſome antient Authors, who declare that Perſius was born in Volaterra (8); whilſt the Ligurians ground theirs on the following lines:

(6) The Author of *Perſius's Life*; Euſebius *in Chron*; Caſſiodorus *in Faſt.*

Mihi nunc Ligus ora
Intepet, hibernatque meum mare, qua latus ingens
Dant ſcopuli, & multa littus ſe valle receptat
Lunai portum eſt operæ cognoſcere cives (7).

(7) Perſ. Sat. 4. ver. 6.

"For me my warmer conſtitution wants
"More cold, than our Ligurian winter grants;
"And, therefore, to my native ſhores retir'd,
"I view my coaſt old Ennius once admir'd;
"Where clifts on either ſide their points diſplay;
"And, after, opening in an ampler way,
"Afford the pleaſing proſpect of the Bay.
"'Tis worth your while, O Romans, to regard
"The Port of Luna, ſays our learned Bard."
DRYDEN.

They pretend that the Poet ſpeaks of his native country, and conſequently that he was born in *Portus Lunæ*, now called the Gulph *Della Spetie*. Don Gaſparo Maſſa has treated this controverſy with great learning, in a Diſſertation printed at Genoa in 1667. *Della vita, origine, è patria di Aulo Perſio Flacco.* As he believes that the city called *Luna* was ſituated in Tuſcany (8), he is far from granting that our Poet was born there; for Perſius not being born in Volterra would a ſignify little to him, if he could not deprive Tuſcany of the glory of his birth, and prove that he was born in the river of Genoa. He therefore declares him to have been born in Tigulia, near *Portus Lunæ, ſituated in Liguria, eighty ſtadia from Luna* (9). The reader may pleaſe to take notice, that the town of Luna and the Port of Luna are not the ſame. Lewis Aproſio is of the ſame opinion with Gaſparo Maſſa, as is manifeſt from his Diſſertation *Della patria d' A. Perſio*, printed at Genoa in 1664. See how little one can rely on Moreri. He ſays *Aproſio aſſerts, that Perſius was a native of Volaterra*; and that, *according to Caſpar Maſſa, he was born in Luna or della Spezzia.* This is a very falſe aſſertion with reſpect to Aproſio, and no ways accurate with regard to Maſſa. By the way, though the arguments of theſe writers are not of ſuch a nature as to admit of any good reply to them, they yet are probable enough; and, were I to chooſe, I had rather follow their opinion (10) than that of Euſebius. The reader is to know, that Soprina, not ſatisfied with having inſerted Perſius in the catalogue of the writers of Liguria (11), and given ſome reaſons for this, has annexed the two diſcourſes above-mentioned to his work.

(8) Page 40.

(9) Aproſio, *della Patria d' A. Perſio*, p. 14.

(10) It is that of Bartholomew Fontius, in his *Commentary on Perſius*, printed at Venice in 1491, and of Hippolyto Landinelli, *nell' origine di Luni*, cap. 11. *apud* Michael Juſtiniani, *Scritt. Liguri*, p. 108.

[*C*] *Moreri ſuppoſes falſely that this was a ſatyr againſt Arria.*] I believe we need not look elſewhere for the cauſe of this miſtake than in the following words: *Scripſerat in pueritia Flaccus . . . . paucos in ſororem Thraſeæ & in Arriæ matrem verſus quæ ſe ante virum occiderat* (12). The Criticks (13) have thus corrected it, *in ſocrum Thraſeæ Arriæ matrem*, or *Arrian* (14) *matrem.* The propoſition *in* is equivocal (15), it ſometimes ſignifying *againſt*, and ſometimes *upon.* Now any perſon who gives ever ſo little attention, will ſee that it ought to be underſtood here in the ſecond manner; for is it ever ſo little probable that Perſius ſhould have writ verſes againſt a Lady who was his relation, mother to the wife of his beſt friend, and famous for dying a moſt heroic death, according to the Doctrines of a Sect in which our Poet was educated? The friendſhip between Perſius and Thraſea, that Lady's ſon-in-law, ſubſiſted near ten years: which ſignifies, as Caſaubon obſerves, that Perſius did not live but about ten years, after the ſtrict friendſhip he had contracted with Thraſea. Now as he lived but till the age of eight and twenty it is manifeſt that their friendſhip commenced whilſt Perſius was ſtudying philoſophy under Cornutus; and it is probable that he made the lines in queſtion, after he had contracted the friendſhip here hinted at.

Cum primum pavido cuſtos mihi purpura ceſſit,
Bullaque ſuccinctis laribus donata pependit,
Me tibi ſuppoſui (16).

(11) Printed at Genoa, in 4to, anno 1667.

(12) Sueton. *in Vita Perſii.*

(13) Caſaub. *Not. in Vitam Perſii.*

(14) Gronovius, *in eamd. Vitam*, in edit. Sueton. *Græviana.*

(15) See Caſaub. *in Perſii*, Sat. 1. p. 110.

(16) Perſius, *ad Cornutum*, Sat. 5.

"When firſt my childiſh robe reſign'd the charge,
"And left me, unconfin'd, to live at large;
"When now my golden Bulla (hung on high,
"To houſhold Gods) declar'd me paſt a boy,
"And my white ſhield proclaim'd my liberty:
. . . . . .
"Juſt at that age when manhood ſet me free,
"I then depos'd myſelf, and left the reins to thee."
DRYDEN.

The word *pueritia* is applied, by the beſt Authors in the Latin tongue, to perſons of eighteen or even twenty years of age. I will here give a catalogue of the reſt of Moreri's errors. He ſays that Perſius *had writ a book againſt Arria, which his maſter Cornutius obliged him to throw into the flames.* But taking this for granted, it would not have been a book, but a ſmall number of verſes, *paucos verſus.* His maſter's name was *Cornutus*, not *Cornutius*; and it was not till after the Author's death, that he adviſed his mother

Lucan could ſcarce refrain from breaking into acclamations: an example rarely ſeen in Poets of equal rank; and ſometimes too common merely through artifice and vanity [D]. Perſius was not acquainted with Seneca till very late, and could never approve of his genius. He was a good friend, and a better ſon, brother and relation [E]. He was perfectly chaſte, though a very handſome man; he was ſober, gentle as a lamb, and modeſt as a young virgin: ſo true it is, that we muſt not always judge of a man's morals from his writings, for Perſius's ſatyrs are very licentious, and full of rancour and gall. It is thought that he even did not ſpare the cruel Nero; but had pointed him out ſo plainly, that Cornutus thought proper to alter ſome of his expreſſions (e) [F]. He died at twenty

(e) Extracted from his Life, written, as is conjectured, by Suetonius.

ther to ſuppreſs thoſe verſes, and all ſuch as her ſon had writ in his youth. *Omnia autem Cornutus auctor ſuit* MATRI *ejus ut aboleret* (17). By this paſſage, we prove the Author of the epiſtolary Preface to the new tranſlation of Perſius to have committed an error. His words are as follow (18): "He wrote "ſome verſes on that ſubject (19) which were no "ways in commendation of ſo generous and ſo faithful a wife (20); but he followed the advice that "was given him; ſuppreſſed the verſes, and acted "prudently." Moreri gives the name of Virginius Fulvius to the Rhetorician under whom Perſius ſtudied; whereas he ſhould have called him Verginius Flaccus. He ſays that this pretended *Virginius Fulvius*, and *Rhemnius Palemon, had ſuperintended Lucan's education*. To what purpoſe is this remark, ſince he was not to ſay any thing of Lucan's friendſhip for Perſius? But farther; none of the Authors cited by him ſpeak of this pretended education. It is with regard to Cornutus, that the Author of Perſius's life obſerves that he taught Lucan and Perſius at the ſame time. I ſhall take notice hereunder (21) of the chronological miſtake committed by Moreri.

(17) Sueton. *in Vita Perſii.*

(18) The Epiſtle prefixed to *Tarteron's Tranſlation of Perſius.*

(19) Upon the action of Arria.

(20) This is an error which I refute.

(21) In the rem. [G].

Mr. Marais has been ſo kind as to inform us, that Moreri might very probably have taken from Mr. Geffrier (22) the particulars he relates with regard to Arria; for Mr. Geffrier was ſo tender of that Lady's reputation, that, in order *to repair the injury*, which he pretends Perſius had done to her, he prefixed, to his tranſlation, a ſonnet written by Father le Moine in honour of Arria, inſerted in the *Galerie des Femmes fortes*.

(22) Whom I ſhall mention in the cloſe of rem. [F].

[D] *An example . . . . . ſometimes too common through artifice and vanity.*] This a modern Author has expreſſed very freely, and without ſaying that Lucan's conduct was exempt from this defect. "Perſius, "ſays he (23), was much better pleaſed with Lucan, "who perhaps had ingratiated himſelf into his favour, by applauding the beautiful paſſages of his "ſatyrs, and by ſaying frequently, and with an air of "admiration (24), *How excellent are theſe pieces!* For "how modeſt ſoever an Author may be, he is eaſily enſnared by the charms of ſuch flattering encomiums, given aloud, by a good judge, in an aſſembly of people. Had not Lucan (Sir), his "views in this? Did not he expect a return? You "know that Authors and Poets ſeldom beſtow ſuch "elogiums for nothing; and when they endeavour "to rival one another with compliments and applauſes, they are no ways ſparing, but make very ſtrong paſſes at one another. You and I are "acquainted with ſome who are conſidered, in the "article of wit, if I may uſe that expreſſion, for the "*Boutevilles* of this age; they challenge the moſt "expert; and, whether by way of rencounter, or "by a duel in form, which his Majeſty never prohibited, they endeavour to conquer one another; "and are in no manner ſparing of the moſt obliging expreſſions and polite compliments; and that "even in print, that poſterity may not be under the "leaſt doubt with regard to that matter. In this "kind of duels, the weakeſt is always the aggreſſor, and he always even ſends or carries the challenge. This (Sir) is Horace's metaphor, and you "cannot but look upon it to be equally whimſical "and bold: It is in the epiſtle to Florus. With "regard to myſelf; if the title of Writer made me "greedy of praiſe, I would infinitely rather be applauded by a good Author, with whom I had not "the leaſt acquaintance, one whoſe name was even "unknown to me, whom I had never ſeen, and who "would not gain any thing by applauding me: ſuch "encomiums could not be ſuſpected."

(23) Epiſtle prefixed to Tarteron, the Jeſuit's, tranſlation of Perſius.

(24) *Lucanus adeo mirabatur ſcripta Flacci, ut vix retineret ſe illo recitante à clamore quin illa eſſe vera poemata diceret.* Sueton. *in Vita Perſii.*

[E] *He was a good friend, and a better ſon, brother and relation.*] The Author from whom I borrowed theſe words, ſhall alſo furniſh a Commentary to them. *You are perhaps,* ſays he (25), *ſurprized at this, and you poſſibly may have your reaſons for it: however, it is certainly fact; and thoſe who were beſt acquainted with him, ſay that he might have been propoſed as a pattern in this reſpect* (26). *And indeed, he had a real and ſolid friendſhip for his ſiſters, and a reſpectful tenderneſs for Fulvia his mother, though ſhe was married to a ſecond huſband; and if he was but a child when his father died; if he was but ſeven or eight years old when ſhe committed . . . I had like to have ſaid folly (but we ought to be ſomewhat reſerved in favour of ſuch women;) he yet had ſenſe enough at that time to know that this was not right: for reaſon diſplays itſelf ſtrongly on thoſe occaſions; it animates itſelf; and does not always wait the uſually allotted time to make its reflections; eſpecially when it is a perſon who is of a ſatyrical diſpoſition. But I muſt tell the whole truth; the ſecond huſband died in a ſhort time, and left Perſius in a condition to reſpect and love his mother as ſincerely as he did when he was but a child* (27). *I cannot ſay whether Fulvia took great care of her ſon's education; and whether ſhe was not too fond of herſelf, to neglect an article of ſo much importance: this I will not pretend to anſwer for; for ſecond marriages divert parents very much from this ſort of cares, and even the condition of a young widow; but a circumſtance I can aſſure you is, that this Roman Knight, how young ſoever he might be, endeavoured as much as poſſible to be as perfect as I have repreſented him.* I will add to this agreeable Commentary the following words from Suetonius, *Reliquit circa H-SXX matri & ſorori . . . Cornutus ſublatis libris pecuniam ſororibus, quas frater hæredes fecerat, reliquit.* i. e. "He bequeathed about "five and twenty thouſand crowns to his mother "and ſiſter . . . Cornutus took the books, but paid "the money to the ſiſters, whom their brother had "made his heirs." What ſhall we think of an Hiſtorian, who, in the ſame leaf, where he declares twice that Perſius had but one ſiſter, obſerves that Perſius bequeathed his eſtate to his mother and ſiſter, and appointed his ſiſters his heirs?

(25) Epiſtle prefixed to the new tranſlation of the *Satyrs of Juvenal and Perſius*, by Father Tarteron.

(26) Sueton. *in vita Perſii.*

(27) *Pater ejus Flaccus pupillum reliquit moriens, annorum fere ſex. Fulvia Siſennia mater nupſit poſtea Fuſio, Equiti Romano: & eum quoque extulit intra paucos annos.* Sueton. *in vita Perſii.*

[F] *It is thought . . . . he had pointed out* Nero *ſo plainly, that Cornutus thought proper to alter ſome of his expreſſions.*] He had employed the following words in his firſt ſatyr.

Auriculas aſini Mida rex habet.

"King Midas has got aſſes ears.

Cornutus would have them changed as follows,

Auriculas aſini quis non habet (28)?

"Who has not aſſes ears?

(28) Ibid.

If Cornutus thought that Nero was too plainly hinted at here, he acted very prudently, though perhaps that Emperor had not then begun to plunge himſelf in wickedneſs, he being a good Monarch for five or ſix years. But how came it that Cornutus did not animadvert on four verſes inſerted in the ſatyr in queſtion, and which were borrowed from a tragedy of Nero? Was there any danger to be apprehended, in ſaying *King Midas has aſſes ears*; at the ſame time that his verſes might, without incurring any danger, be propoſed as a pattern of ridiculous poetry? I meet with ſome kind of difficulty here; and perhaps the four verſes following:

Torva

Torva Mimalloneis implerunt cornua bombis,
Et raptum vitulo caput allatura ſuperbo
Baſſaris, & Lyncem Mænas flexura corymbis
Evion ingeminat: reparabilis adſonat Echo (29).

(29) Perſius, Sat. ver. 99.

" Their crooked horns the Mimallonian crew
" With blaſts inſpir'd; and Baſſaris who ſlew
" The ſcornful calf, with ſword advanc'd on high,
" Made from his neck his haughty head to fly.
" And Mænas, when with ivy-bridles bound,
" She led the ſpotted Lynx, then Evion rung around;
" Evion from woods and floods repairing Echo's ſound. DRYDEN.

the abovementioned lines, I ſay, were, at moſt, but an indirect, hidden, and altogether oblique raillery; for if Nero had writ thoſe verſes, how could any one be ſo bold as to cite them verbatim, merely to laugh at them, ſince it was thought neceſſary to correct theſe words, *auriculas aſini Mida rex habet?* The contraſt is too ſtrong; on one ſide a great deal of cowardice is ſeen, and on the other, a great deal of raſhneſs. But I will inform my Readers of all my ſcruples. Cornutus ſeems to me to ſpoil his friend's thought, without any neceſſity for his ſo doing; and his fears appear to me ill-grounded. Perſius having been told, that it is dangerous to cenſure the faults of other people, and that he ought not to mention them, even ſo much as to a pit; replies, that he, at leaſt, will tell his book under ground, what he has ſeen, viz. that King Midas had aſſes ears.

Men' mutire nefas, nec clam nec cum ſcrobe? nuſquam.
Heic tamen infodiam. Vidi, vidi ipſe, libelle,
Auriculas Aſini Mida rex habet *.

* Perſius, Sat. 1.

. . . . . " and is my muſe controul'd
" By ſervile awe? Born free, and not be bold?
" At leaſt I'll dig a hole within the ground;
" And to the truſty earth commit the ſound;
" The reeds ſhall tell you what the Poet fears,
" *King Midas has a ſnout, and aſſes ears.* Dryden.

This is a very plain alluſion to the ſtory of Midas's barber, which was very well known to Nero.

. . . . . *Secedit humumque*
Effodit & domini quales aſpexerit aures
Voce refert parva, terræque immurmurat hauſtæ (30).

(30) Ovid. *Metamorph.* lib. 11. ver. 186.

" Reſtleſs, at laſt, a private place he found,
" Then dug a hole, and told it to the ground;
" In a low whiſper he reveal'd the caſe,
" And cover'd in the earth, and ſilent left the place. CROXALL.

It was not therefore very probable, that the Prince in queſtion ſhould be diſguſted at any perſon, for giving a faithful relation of the fineſt ſtroke in that hiſtory, *auriculas aſini Mida rex habet.* If we change theſe words into the following, *auriculas aſini quis non habet*, theſe are no longer the barber's own words, but a vague imitation of them. If it ſhould be objected to me, that a Writer had better leſſen the beauty of a thought, than exaſperate a tyrant, I will ſay as I did before; *Why don't you ſuppreſs the four verſes; you ought to force the Author to expunge them, not only if they are borrowed from one of Nero's poems, but alſo if they ſhould only include ſome of his phraſes.* We need not doubt but Malherbe would have been diſguſted at the following lines of Boileau, even tho' he had not named him:

Irai-je dans une ode en phraſes de Malherbe,
Troubler dans ſes roſeaux le Danube ſuperbe,
Delivrer de Sion le peuple gemiſſant,
Faire trembler Memphis & palir le Croiſſant,
Et paſſant du Jourdain les ondes allarmées
Cueillir *mal à propos* les palmes Idumées (31)?

(31) Des Preaux's Sat. 9. ver. 251.

" Shall I, like Malherbe, in a lofty ode,
" *Diſturb the haughty Danube in its reeds;*
" *Free from their bonds ſad Sion's groaning people,*
" *Make Memphis trouble; the bright creſcent pale;*
" *And croſſing ſwift the frighted waves of Jordan,*
" *Gather* untimely *Idumea's palms.*

Boileau names no perſon when he ſays:

Tout chantre ne peut pas ſur le ton d'un Orphée,
Entonner en grands vers la diſcorde étouffée:
Peindre Bellone en feu tonnant de toutes parts,
Et le Belge effrayé fuyant ſur ſes remparts (32):

(32) Idem, ibid. ver. 39.

" *'Tis not for ev'ry Bard, to ſing, like Orpheus,*
" *In ſounding verſe,* dread Diſcord's overthrow;
" *To paint* Bellona thundering round the globe,
" And frighted Belgium flying from its ramparts.

Nevertheleſs, would any one doubt but that it would raiſe the indignation of that man, who ſhould ſee that his verſes are here ridiculed? In my opinion therefore, the *torva Mimalloneis, &c.* cannot be a fragment either from Nero's poems, or parody for imitation of his verſes; for once again, if he was capable of being diſguſted at the *auriculas aſini Mida rex habet*, which was an old ſtory, how could it be expected that he ſhould bear with patience to have ridiculous centos made of his own expreſſions. For this reaſon, with ſubmiſſion to the old Scholiaſt, I will not ſubſcribe to the following words of Boileau, till my ſcruples be removed: *If we examine*, ſays he (33), *Perſius, who wrote under the empire of Nero; he does not merely cenſure the compoſitions of the Poets his contemporaries, but even attacks the very verſes of Nero. For every one knows, and all Nero's court was ſenſible, that the four Latin verſes* torva Mimalloneis, &c. *which Perſius ridicules ſo ſharply in his firſt ſatyr, were Nero's verſes. Nevertheleſs, we don't find Nero, though ſo cruel a Monarch, puniſhed Perſius; and this Tyrant, though ſo great an enemy to reaſon, and ſo very fond of his works, as is well known, was yet ſo reaſonable as to permit his own verſes to be ridiculed; and thought that, on ſuch an occaſion, it did not become the Emperor to concern himſelf about the affairs of the Poet.* I ſhall ſay no more of this ſcruple. Caſaubon is of opinion, that the four verſes in queſtion were taken from a tragedy (34). And to prove that Nero had writ ſuch a piece, he cites Dion, who ſays only, that Nero acted that part of the Muſician in the repreſentation of the *Bacchæ* (35). But is this a proof that he wrote them? not to mention that hexameter verſes were not (I believe) employed in tragedy; and yet the four verſes in queſtion are hexameters. Had this learned Commentator compared his reflection on *torva Mimalloneis* with his preface on the fourth ſatyr, I queſtion whether he would have perſiſted in that opinion. And indeed, it is affirmed in this preface, that Perſius's chief view in writing the 4th ſatyr, was to cenſure Nero's conduct; but to prevent his coming into trouble, he diſguiſed his deſign in ſuch a manner, that he did not employ a ſingle expreſſion to point out that Prince; and that he had contrived to make his eſcape, in caſe he ſhould be accuſed of levelling his ſatyr at the Government. Caſaubon obſerves alſo, that this ſatyr was writ before this Prince had quite ſhewn to the world what a wretch he was. *Cujus* (ſatiræ quartæ) *etſi præcipuus erat ſcopus in Neronem invehi, atque ipſum ſatirico ſale defricare . . . . ſic tamen poeta in hoc argumento indignationi ſuæ habenas laxavit, ut neque palam neque plenis velis in flagitioſiſſimum principem inveheretur, verum tectè & longè mollius quam vel natura ipſius ferebat, vel Neronis flagitia ac ſcelera merebantur. Nos autem putamus tum ſcriptam eſſe hanc ſatiram cum nondum totus innotuerat Nero, cujus principium laude digna habuit multa. . . . Probè verò norat Perſius cum ad hanc ſatiram ſcribendam ſe accingeret, quantam rem & quàm periculoſam moliretur. Quamobrem conſilio prudentiſſimo hoc argumentum Platonis imitatione ſibi tractandum cenſuit, non ſolum nominibus inde petitis, ſed etiam ſententia propemodum univerſa; ut ſi quis forte Corycæus aut Cercops nomen ipſius deferret, probabili excuſatione poſſet factum ſuum defendere quaſi exercendi tantum ſtili cauſa petitum è libris ſummi philoſophi argumentum latinis verſibus tentaſſet complecti. Quare etiam ab omnibus illum videmus abſtinuiſſe, quæ Neronis perſonam propriè erant denotatura. . . . .* " Though the chief aim of his " fourth ſatyr was to cenſure Nero, and ſatyrize him " in a ſtrong manner, . . nevertheleſs, the Poet ſo " checked his indignation, that he did not inveigh " againſt that moſt wicked Prince, either openly or " directly; but obliquely, and with much more gen- " tleneſs than his own temper or Nero's crimes de- " ſerved.

(33) Idem, *Diſcourſe on Satyr.*

(34) *Hinc intelligimus Bacchas Neronis ejuſdem argumenti fuiſſe eum Bacchis Euripidis.* Caſaub. in Sat. 1. Perſ. p. 142.

(35) *Sunt autem Neronis verſus ex ejus Bachis, cujus carminis etiam Dio nominatim facit mentionem.* Idem, ibid. p. 140. *Vide etiam*, p. 134.

twenty eight years of age [G]. Whatever his panegyriſts may ſay, it muſt be confeſſed that he wrote in a harſh, obſcure manner [H], inſomuch that he may almoſt be called

" ſerved. It is my opinion, that this ſatyr was writ at " a time when Nero was not perfectly known, he " having done many good things in the beginning " of his reign. . . . Perſius, when he firſt began to " write this ſatyr, was very ſenſible that he was en- " gaging in a moſt dangerous attempt: for this rea- " ſon he thought it would be proper for him to treat " this ſubject after Plato's manner; he not only " borrowing the names from thence, but even the " greateſt part of his thoughts; in order that, if a- " ny malicious perſon might take it into his head to " inform againſt him, he might make the plauſible " defence following, viz. that it was merely to exer- " ciſe his pen, he had attempted to work up, into " Latin verſe, the argument of that great Phi- " loſopher: for which reaſon we find that he for- " bore every kind of expreſſion that might denote " the perſon of Nero." May we not juſtly wonder, that a Writer who is of this opinion, ſhould have imagined that Perſius preſumed to ridicule Nero's verſes, and that he cited them word for word, without the leaſt diſguiſe? It will be anſwered, that this Prince was no ways ambitious of the title of Poet; but good proofs ought to be given of this, or ſuch an aſſertion ſhould not be advanced; for moſt perſons are commonly fond of their poetical compoſitions (36). A crown and ſceptre cannot root out this defect; and we know in particular, that Nero was more ſenſibly touched, when cenſured for his muſic, than when ſatyrized for his crimes (37). We may naturally ſuppoſe, from his being a Poet, that he could not bear to be ſatyrized. Did not he baniſh Cornutus, was he not going to put him to death, for having preſumed to ſay, that Nero would make too many verſes, ſhould he compoſe four hundred books of them; and that Chryſippus ought not to have been alledged as an example, ſince the books of that Philoſopher were of uſe for the conduct of life (38)? Was not he jealous of Lucan, becauſe he attempted poetry? and did he not forbid him to write any (39)? *Lucanum propriæ cauſſæ accendebant, quod famam carminum ejus premebat Nero, prohibueratque oſtentare, vanus adſimulatione* (40). i. e. " Lucan was " fired by motives of ſelf-intereſt, becauſe Nero en- " deavoured to ſuppreſs the reputation of his poems, " and commanded him not to publiſh any more, " &c." Lucan was ſo exaſperated at this prohibition, that he aſſociated with the Conſpirators, who endeavoured to kill that Emperor.

I ſhould never have done, if I undertook to quote all the Authors (41) who imagine that the four verſes, which are ſo ſtrongly ridiculed by Perſius, were writ by Nero. I ſhall only quote the notes that have been added to the new verſion of Petronius (42): *Liberty has been allowed in all ages, to criticize all bad works that are publiſhed. Defects in genius may be attacked every where, and this liberty is coeval with the world. The* Torva, &c. *which was read in Juvenal* (43), *ſhews that Nero himſelf, though ſo very cruel, was not offended at it, and that he never intended to impeach thoſe who criticized his works, as guilty of high treaſon on that account: he being out of humour with thoſe only, who wrote verſes better than he did.*

I am to obſerve that the Life of Perſius, written, as is ſuppoſed, by Suetonius (44), does not ſay that the *torva Mimalloneis* bore any relation to Nero. It gives no other example of the liberty which this Poet took to criticize him, than the verſe in which *Mida rex* was introduced, and which Cornutus obliged him to retouch. Thus we have but one teſtimony for the *torva Mimalloneis*, viz. the old Scholiaſt on Perſius. An Engliſh Author, who wrote good notes on Perſius's ſatyrs, does not affirm, as ſo many others have done, that Nero was Author of the four verſes in queſtion: *ſive à Nerone*, ſays he (45), *ſive ab alio quopiam nobili Romano compoſita i. e.* " Whether they were writ " by Nero, or by any other noble Roman." Mr. Marais pointed out to me this paſſage of the Engliſh Commentator. He alſo informed me in a letter, that the Sieur Geffrier, who publiſhed at Paris, in 1658, a French paraphraſtic tranſlation of Perſius, affirms that theſe four verſes were wrote by Nero.

[G] *He died at twenty-eight years of age.*] This appears from the Conſulſhips under which he was born and died. He was born the 4th of December, under the Conſulates of Fabius Perſicus and L. Vitellius; and died under the Conſulates of Rubrius Marius and Aſinius Gallus, November 24. Now as there was but an interval of 28 years between theſe Conſulſhips, it follows that Perſius died at 28 year of age, within a few days. Conſequently the Author of this Life made a very wrong calculation, when, after having given ſo very exactly the day and years of his birth and death, he afterwards ſays that he died in the thirteenth year of his age. St. Jerom is not ſo much miſtaken, and yet he is not accurate enough. He ſays that he was born the 2d year of the 203d Olympiad, and died in the 29th year of his age, the ſecond of the 210th Olympiad. Now this cannot be true, but by ſuppoſing that he was born in the firſt month of the year, and died ſome months later; but beſides that, St. Jerom does not make theſe diſtinctions, we have ſhewn that Perſius was born in December, and died in November. I am more ſurprized to ſee Scaliger approve St. Jerom's calculation, than at St. Jerom's miſtake. Scaliger ſays, that this Father juſtly computed twenty-nine years, from the number 2050, to the number 2078. He likewiſe finds twenty-nine years between the two Conſulſhips abovementioned; but he ſhould rather have found twenty-eight. The firſt of theſe Conſulſhips anſwers to the year of Chriſt 34, the 20th year of Tiberius, and the 786th of Rome: and the ſecond anſwers to the year of Chriſt 62, the 8th year of Nero's reign, and the 814th of Rome, according to Calviſius's chronology. Moreri is quite inaccurate in this whole affair. He fixes the birth of Perſius to the end of the 32d year of Chriſt; and his death, *at the age of 29 years, the 9th of Nero's reign, and the 62d of our Saviour.* Now to affirm this with any ſhew of reaſon, he ſhould have added, that he died in the beginning of the 62d year of the Chriſtian Æra; but this would have been falſe, ſince he died the 24th of November. It is therefore certain that, according to Moreri's calculation, Perſius muſt have died at near thirty years of age. Farther, the 32d year of Chriſt anſwers, according to him, to the 18th year of Tiberius (46): now it is certain that, from the 18th year of Tiberius's reign, to the 9th of that of Nero, there muſt have paſſed an interval of 31 years: and conſequently Perſius muſt have died at 31 years of age. The Dutch edition fixes his death under the year of our Lord 26; an error that aroſe from a tranſpoſition of figures, which the printers are but too apt to make. Augoſtino Oldoini has committed ſome childiſh errors in his calculation of Perſius's life. He declares that he was born the year of Rome 795, and died at thirty three years of age, in the 9th year of Nero's Empire. He is of opinion, that the time of his birth anſwers to the 203d Olympiad, and the 22d year of Tiberius's Empire (47). See Calviſius; and it will appear that the 1ſt year of the 203d Olympiad is the 785 of Rome; and that the 9th of Nero is the 815 of Rome; and that there is an interval of but twenty eight years between the 22d of Tiberius and the 9th of Nero.

Mr. Marais informs me in a letter, that the Sieur Geffrier fixes Perſius's death to the 203d Olympiad, the year of Rome 785, and the 22d year of Tiberius's reign.

[H] *Whatever his Panegyriſts may ſay . . . . it muſt be confeſſed that he wrote in a harſh obſcure manner.*] Among theſe rank Iſaac Caſaubon (48). I grant that the encomiums which he beſtows upon Perſius are leſs unallayed than thoſe which Quintilian and Martial beſtowed upon him: he blends ſome cenſures with them; but, after all, he acknowledges that Perſius was a man of great merit and parts, and he undertakes his defence againſt the great Julius Scaliger; but at the ſame time falls down, with the utmoſt humility, before the throne of that formidable antagoniſt. I ſhall take notice only of that part of their diſpute, which relates to the obſcurity of our Poet. Caſaubon is ſurprized that Scaliger ſhould ſpeak of it more than once; he to whom nothing was obſcure: but this, in my opinion, is falling into the ſophiſm called by the Logicians *ignorationem elenchi*,

(36) *Scripſit ſummo vir ingenio & ſcientia ſingulari Philoſophus artifices omnes opus ſuum adamare. Poetas tamen præcipue.* Menagius, *Epiſt. Dedic.* Carmin.

(37) *Nihil æque doluit, quam ut malum ſe citharœdum increpitum.* Sueton. *in Nerone*, cap. 41.

(38) Xiphilin. *in Nerone.*

(39) Xiphilin. *in Nerone & Tacit. Ann.* lib. 15. cap. 49.

(40) Tacit. ib.

(41) See the rem. [K].

(42) Page 24. Tom. 1. Dutch edit. 1694.

(43) It ſhould be Perſius.

(44) Annexed to Suetonius's treatiſe *de claris Rhetoribus.*

(45) Joannes Bond, *in Perſ.* Sat. 1. p. m. 24.

(46) He declares, in the article of Tiberius, that this Emperor died the 23d year of his reign, and the 37th of our Lord.

(47) Oldoini, *Athen. Liguſt.* p. 80, 81.

(48) In the Prolegomena to the Commentary which he publiſhed on that Author at Paris, in 8vo, anno 1605. He inſerted it in the Dutch edit. of *Juvenal and Perſius*, printed in 1696, 4to.

called the Lycophron of the Latins [*I*]. The elder Scaliger, and ſeveral other excellent Criticks, have written againſt him with great ſeverity (*f*). Perhaps they run into a more pardonable extreme, than the beſtowing high encomiums on this Poet would be. I muſt obſerve, that the ſeverity of the times in which he lived, cannot plead his apology with regard to the obſcurity of his manner of writing [*K*], as ſome writers pretend. Some Italian

(*f*) See Baillet, *on the Poets*, num. 1158.

chi, a miſtaking the ſtate of the queſtion; a ſophiſm as frequently found among the Criticks as the Philoſophers. Scaliger did not ſay that our Perſius was obſcure with regard to him; ſo far from it, he affirmed that he underſtood him throughout. He only ſays that this Poet's works were formerly ranked in the number of thoſe things which were unknown; and he accuſes him, as guilty of impertinence, for writing in order to be read, and not to be underſtood (49). He almoſt inſults him, for that the Commentators had defeated his deſign, by clearing up all the obſcurity which he had purpoſely thrown over his writings, in order to be eternally buried under it, and to the everlaſting admiration of fools.

(49) *Perſii ſtilus meroſus, & ille ineptus qui cum legi vellet quæ ſcripſiſſet, intelligi noluit quæ legerentur, quamquam nunc à nobis omnia intelliguntur. At fuit tempus cum inter ignota haberetur.* Jul. Cæſ. Scalig. *Poetic.* lib. 6. cap. 6 p. m. 773. See alſo chap. 97. book 3. p. 343.

Omnia enim ſtolidi magis admirantur amantque
Inverſis quæ ſub verbis latitantia cernunt (50).

" The more abſtruſe and difficult things ſeem,
" The more they raiſe a blockhead's admiration."

(50) Lucretius, lib. 1. ver. 642.

The encomiums, which Quintilian and Martial beſtow upon him, put me in mind of thoſe which are given to two of our French Poets. *It is not the quantity and number of a man's compoſitions, which crown him with immortality. Two ſheets of paper have tranſmitted Perſius to us. Abbé de Ceriſi will deſcend to later poſterity, with only his ſingle Metamorphoſes of Philis's eyes into ſtars, rather than a great number of Authors who fill a conſiderable ſpace in our libraries; and the temple of death* (51) *will force its way along the ſtream of time, better than Biſhop Du Bellay's ſix hundred volumes* (52). This remark is pretty conſonant to the Latin verſes following:

(51) By Mr. Habert of the French Academy.

(52) *Gurre des Auteurs*, p. 139.

Sæpius in libro memoratur Perſius uno,
Quam levis in tota Marſus Amazonide (53).

" Perſius has gain'd more glory by one book,
" Than by the whole Amazonis, mean Marſus."

(53) Martial. *Epigr.* 29. lib. 4.

as alſo to the following words: *Multum & veræ gloriæ quamvis uno libro Perſius meruit* (54). i. e. " Perſius " deſerved much ſolid glory by writing only one " book."

(54) Quintil. lib. 10. cap. 1.

[*I*] *He may alſo be called the Lycophron of the Latins.*] I have read ſomewhere (55), that the meaning of the flat, unweildy volumes of the *Talmudiſts is ſo obſcure with regard to us, (from the envy they bore to their ſucceſſors) that we have greater reaſon to cut and tear their books, than a Father of the Church did Perſius's ſatyrs: ſaying, that ſince this Poet would not, like other writers, be underſtood exteriorly, he was determined to ſee whether he was more intelligible within.* Here follows another paſſage, in which Lycophron and Perſius are put in parallel (56). *Trithemius's book, in my opinion, ought to be ſawed in two; as ſome perſon formerly did Lycophron's Poem called Caſſandra, to ſee what was in the inſide of it, ſince nothing could be percieved on the outſide. Or as St. Jerom is formerly ſaid to have done with the ſatyrs of Perſius, the riddles and obſcurities of which not being ſufficiently underſtood by him; intellecturis ignibus ille dedit* (57). i. e. " He threw them into " the flames, in order that they might be there un- " ravelled." I wiſh this laſt incident, and the reſt alſo, were well warranted: for I find that Caſaubon refutes the cenſures of Perſius, and the teſtimony of St. Jerom (58).

(55) Tom. 1. of *Conferences du Bureau d'Adreſſe.*

(56) Vigenaire, *Traite des Chifres*, p. 12.

(57) *Ex Ovidio, Triſt.* lib. 4. Eleg. 10.

(58) *Certe aliud Quintilianus judicabat cum veræ laude dignum pronunciaret, aliud Hieronymus cum diſertiſſimum ſatiricum vocaret.* Caſaubon *in Prolog. Comment. in Perſium.*

Mr. Marais furniſhed me likewiſe with the following obſervation. An elogium is given of the Commentary of John Bond, in a book where no reader would ever go to look upon it; I mean in the Preface to the *Alboſiæ Sigeæ Toletanæ Satyra Sotadica* (59). The words, which contain the elogium in queſtion, deſcribe ſtill better Perſius's obſcurity: *Gratuleris tibi Aule Perſi. Obvolviſti te ipſe cæca nocte, videri nolebas, altam verſibus & verſuum ſenſibus profudiſti caliginem. Nolebas intelligi: forte & tu te non intelligebas. Non fecerunt ad te nox & caligo ut exerraret* (Joannes Bond) *venit, vidit, diſcuſſit noctem & caliginem. Perſpectum id omne habet, ut tute loqueris,* quod latet arcanâ non enarrabile fibrâ. *Eripuit tibi te neganti conſpectum. Latebas intra te, ne te curioſa & erudita inveniret ſagacitas. Eras ipſe involucrum tibi. Quis vero fuit furor ille tuus?* i. e. " You yourſelf (Perſius) was de- " lighted with the thoughts of it. You ſhrouded " yourſelf in ſubſtantial darkneſs; you would not " be ſeen; and have thrown a thick miſt over your " verſes, and the meaning of them. Perhaps you " did not underſtand yourſelf. However, your gloom " was not able to miſlead John Bond. He came, he " ſaw, and diſpelled the dark night. He diſcovered " all that which, according to your manner of ex- " preſſion, lay concealed,

" And, thro' the vail of words, he view'd the naked mind.

" He got a ſight of you againſt your will. You lay " hid within yourſelf, to prevent the moſt learned " and ſagacious men from finding you out. You " were as a mantle or covering to yourſelf: but to " what could this mad conduct be owing?" By the way, this Commentary of Bond on Perſius was printed a year after the Author's death, under the direction of Roger Prowſe his ſon-in-law. I have the London edition of 1614 before me. If this was the firſt, as I ſuppoſe it to be, Bond muſt have died in 1613. No mention is made of this in the Sieur Witte's *Diarium*.

(59) The Preface to my edition of the *Alboſiæ &c. Satyra Sotadica*, has not the paſſage which Mr. Marais found in his edition.

(*a*) *Si non vis intelligi, nec ego volo te intelligere.* i. e. " If you do not care to be underſtood, I will not " underſtand you." A ſaying of Colucius with regard to Perſius the Poet, l. 5. n. 34. of the *Forêt Nuptiale*. REM. CRIT.

[*K*] *The ſeverity of the times in which he lived, cannot plead his apology with regard to the obſcurity of his manner of writing.*] I am ſorry that I cannot agree in opinion with the Author of the Preface, who furniſhed me with two ſuch entertaining Commentaries. *I am ſenſible,* ſays he (60), *that Perſius is not ſo intelligible at firſt ſight; and that he might, had he thought proper, have expreſſed himſelf with greater clearneſs: but how could he do this under Nero? He was a cruel and blood-thirſty Monarch, who could not bear a jeſt. And as he had more reaſon than any perſon, to aſcribe to himſelf the ſharpeſt and moſt ingenious part of a ſatyr, provided it hinted ever ſo obliquely at him: I do not wonder that Perſius ſhould affect to be enigmatical and myſterious. When therefore Julius Scaliger calls him a feveriſh learned man,* it is probable that he did not think on what he *ſaid; I am ſure that this haughty and formidable Critick would himſelf have been ſeized with a violent ſhivering, and have felt an univerſal tremor over his whole body at the bare ſight of that Emperor. I even am ſurprized at Perſius's boldneſs, in his once attempting to ridicule that Emperor: for that part of the verſe* Auriculas Aſini Mida Rex habet, *was levelled particularly at him. Perſius would have been completely ruined had not the prudent, the diſcreet Cornutus ſtruck out the proper name, and ſubſtituted in its place a name in which all mankind are concerned. I even cannot conceive how this Philoſopher, who afterwards was ſent into baniſhment by the tyrant, becauſe his conſcience would not permit him to approve of the deſign of his Poem, permitted his Diſciple to run the hazard of publiſhing, with a malicious intent, (as an example of admirable verſe) the* Torva Mimalloneis, *&c.* Here follow two obſervations on this paſſage.

(60) *Epiſtle* prefixed to Father Tarteron's tranſlation.

I. All who read Perſius attentively, plainly perceive that he wrote obſcurely, not out of policy, but becauſe it was his taſte, and that he had given his genius this turn; for had the fear of bringing himſelf into trouble, with regard to the Court, prompted him to conceal his thoughts under the thickeſt vail, he would have done this only in ſuch verſes as bore ſome relation to the life the tyrant led. But we find him twiſting and darkning his expreſſions, and employing

Italian Genealogiſts declare, that the Falconcini of Volterra, deſcended from his father [*L*].

ploying alluſions and enigmatical figures, even when his deſign is only to inſinuate a moral maxim, the cleareſt explication of which could not have given the leaſt cauſe of diſguſt to Nero. I ſhall not exhibit any example of this, but refer my readers to that Anthor's ſatyrs: as they are not many in number, any perſon may ſoon ſatisfy himſelf whether I am right or wrong in my conjectures. But if any one had rather not take that trouble, and chooſes rather to depend on the judgment of a learned Critick, he need go no farther. The judgment is as follows: *Obſcuritatis hujus diverſas afferre cauſſas poſſumus, eaſque certiſſimas, in auctore ſunt aliquæ, aliæ extra illum, quædam in interpretibus. Non negabo perobſcura quædam eſſe in quarta, prima quoque: ſed poëtæ facilè ignoſco, cùm cogito crudeliſſimi & φοινικωτάτου tyranni, in quem illa erant, metu, de induſtria atramenti ſepiarum aliquid eſſe affuſum: neque dubito ſapientiſſimum præceptorum Cornutum ſcribenti adfuiſſe, qui vetus verbum crebrò illi inſuſurraret, Σκότισον. . . . . Cùm ſcribit idem βιογράφος, verecundiæ virginalis Partheniam noſtrum fuiſſe, aliud agens cauſſam nos docet cur ille locus tenebricosè fuerit tractatus, cui vix alius toto libro obſcuritate par, obſcænitate ſimilis nullus, τριτικοπὴν illam dico è quarta.* At ſi unctus ceſſes. *Etiam illud ultrò concedimus, nonnulla Perſii loca tropis parum uſitatis & audacioribus eſſe offuſcata, hujus quoque non culpam, ſed cauſſam, ita enim dicere æquius, ingenio poëtæ aſſignamus: quod cùm eſſet magnum, magna ſectabatur* (61). . . . . *Fuit præterea Flaccus noſter ὁ φιλόμωθός πως, ſed amans brevitatis: quæ res obſcuriorem eſt ubi illum reddit* (62). i. e. "We may "give many reaſons, and thoſe very certain ones, "for his writing in ſo obſcure a manner: ſome relate "to the Author himſelf, ſome to exterior circum"ſtances, and others to his Commentators. I will "not deny but that we meet with ſome extremely ob"ſcure paſſages in the fourth ſatyr, as likewiſe in "the firſt: but I preſently forgive the Poet, when I "reflect, that the fear of that moſt cruel and blood"thirſty tyrant obliged him to cloud over his words "as much as poſſible. Nor do I doubt but that his "moſt wiſe maſter Cornutus aſſiſted him in his com"poſitions, and frequently inculcated this maxim to "him, *be obſcure* . . . . . Since that biographer "informs us, that our Poet was as modeſt as a maid; "he aſſigns another reaſon why he involved ſo much "in ſhades this paſſage, than which ſcarce any is ſo "obſcure in his whole book, and none ſo obſcene. "The place I mean, is that in the fourth Satyr.

(61) Caſaub. *in Prolegomenis, ad Perſium*, folio m. e ij.

(62) Idem, folio e iij.

"*At ſi unctus ceſſes.*

"But if with oil anointed thou repoſe.

"I likewiſe muſt allow, that ſome paſſages in Per"ſius are rendered dark by the unuſual figures which "are of a bold turn; but that cauſe (for it is not "juſt to call it a fault) I aſcribe to the Poet's geni"us, which being great, aimed at great things. . . . "Farther, our Poet was not very talkative, but a lo"ver of brevity, a circumſtance that makes him "more obſcure." Here we find that Caſauboh aſcribes the obſcurity we meet with in Perſius to four cauſes. 1. His fear of Nero. 2. His modeſty. 3. The ſublimity of his genius. 4. His love for conciſeneſs. Now ought theſe four cauſes to be reduced to the firſt, as the Author of the preface to the new tranſlation has done?

II. As the Author in queſtion has aſſerted, that Perſius wrote in an obſcure ſtyle from his fear of Nero, he ſhould not have ſuppoſed that the *torva Mimalloneis*, &c. were that Prince's verſes. It was not enough for him to ſay, that he could not comprehend how Cornutus could permit this; he ought to have aſſerted poſitively, that he would not have conſented to it, and that Perſius had no occaſion for a Corrector. Otherwiſe this will involve us in a very ſilly argument; ſuch a one as ſeems to exceed all the caprices and extravagant whims of the human mind.

[*L*] *Some Italian Genealogiſts declare, that the Falconcini of Volterra deſcend from his father.*] Here follows a reaſon which Francis Stelluti (63) employs, to prove that Perſius was of Volterra. We have, ſays he, a tradition, that the family of the Falconcini is deſcended from Flaccus, a Roman Knight, Perſius's father; which is the more probable, becauſe the name of Perſius was preſerved in that family; and has conſtantly appeared in it for upwards of three hundred years: It is anſwered, that Perſius had no brother, nor any children: that the ſirname Flaccus, was ſpread over ſeveral cities in Italy; and that the noble and illuſtrious family of Perſius has ſubſiſted above four hundred years in Genoa. See Gaſparo Maſſa's diſſertation aforementioned: Hippolite Landinelli (64) informs us, that there is ſhewn, at Volterra, a houſe which is ſaid to have belonged to Perſius.

(63) *The Life of Perſius*, prefixed to the Italian paraphraſe of that Poet.

(64) *Nell' de Origine di Lani*, cap. 11. *apud Mich. Juſtinian i Scritt. Ligari*, p. 108.

PERSONA (CHRISTOPHER), by birth a Roman, and Prior of the Convent (*a*) of Santa Balbina (*b*), of the order of the Guillelmites (*c*), on Mount Aventine, was noted in the 15th Century for his ſkill in the Greek tongue. It is ſaid that he went into Greece to learn it (*d*). He tranſlated into Latin Agathias and ſome other Authors [*A*]. It is affirmed

(a) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 116.

(b) Geſner, in his *Bibliotheca*, ſays *Sancta Albina.*

(c) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 116.

(d) Konig. *Bibl. vet. & nova.*

[*A*] *He tranſlated into Latin Agathias, and ſome other Authors.*] He tranſlated into Latin the Hiſtory of the Goths, written by Procopius: but thoſe who affirm, with Paulus Jovius (1), that he alſo tranſlated Procopius's Hiſtory of the War of the Perſians, and the War of the Vandals, are miſtaken. The piece he publiſhed of Procopius ſhewed the fraud of Leonardo Aretino (2), which I mention elſewhere (3). He gave us ſeveral other tranſlations; that of Origin's books againſt Celſus, that of twenty five of St. Chryſoſtom's Homilies, that of ſome treatiſes of St. Athanaſius, and of ſome treatiſes of Theophylact's (4). The verſions in queſtion are not very good ones; but both Paulus Jovius, and ſo many other writers who mention him, are inexcuſable for not taking any notice of him. Du Pin is ſo much a Gentleman, that I am ſure he will not be diſpleaſed with me for ſaying, that the following words in his Tome I. are a little obſcure. *Origen's treatiſe againſt Celſus is divided into eight books, which were long ſince publiſhed in Greek, with Gelenius's tranſlation, and with notes by Eſchelius and one Chriſtopher Perſona, printed at Rome in* 1471, *and afterwards very correctly in England in* 1658 (5). I obſerve I. That the changing Hoeſchelius into Eſchelius may miſlead a reader. It would incline him to believe, that there is a writer named Eſchelius; and that he is not the ſame perſon with the learned man of Auſburg, who has obliged the world by publiſhing ſeveral Greek Authors. II. Du Pin expreſsly hints, that Perſona did not give a tranſlation of Origen's book in queſtion, but only ſome notes to illuſtrate it. Nevertheleſs Geſner (6) informs us, that this Author dedicated, to Sixtus IV. his Latin verſion of the eight books of Origen againſt Celſus. III. Du Pin's words ſignify, that theſe eight books were printed at Rome in 1471, in Greek, with Gelenius's tranſlation, and the notes of Eſchelius and Perſona. But he ſhould not have ſaid this; for Gelenius lived in the 16th Century; and the Greek edition, with Gelenius's verſion, was not publiſhed till 1605. It was a preſent made by Hoeſchelius.

(1) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 9.

(2) Idem, ibid. and cap. 116.

(3) Rem. [*F*] of the article ARETINO LEONARDO.

(4) Geſner, *Biblioth.*

(5) Du Pin, *Bibliotb. des Auteurs Eccl.* Tom. 1. p. 133. Dutch edit.

(6) Geſner, *Biblioth.* folio 167 *verſo.*

Here follows a conſiderable Supplement from Mr. Simon. The printers have been guilty of two errors on that occaſion, they ſubſtituting the year 1581, inſtead of 1481 (7), and Suſchelius inſtead of Hoeſchelius. "We learn from Theodore Gaza *, that Pope Ni"cholas V. ſent a man purpoſely to Conſtantinople, "to fetch from thence the books which he wrote a"gainſt Celſus; and that the inſtant he received them, "he

(7) I ſuppoſe that Simon had writ 1411, and not as Du Pin, 1471.

* Theod. *Gaz. epiſt. ad Chriſtop. Perſon.*

affirmed that he died of the plague in 1486 (e). Voſſius ſpeaks of him with the higheſt contempt [B]. Nevertheleſs there are diſputes about who ſhall have him for their own: the Auſtin Friers declare him to be of their Order; but the Servites claim him, and rank him in the catalogue of their Authors (f).

(e) idem, ibid. Baillet, *Jugemens des Traduc. Latins.* 312.

(f) Proſper Mandoſius, *Bibliotb. Romana*, Centur. 1. num. 82. p. 59.

" promiſed a conſiderable recompence to any perſon " who ſhould tranſlate them into Latin. But this " Pope dying, they were not printed at Rome, in " Latin only, till the year 1581, under the Pontifi- " cate of Sixtus IV. Gaza, not expecting to be as " well rewarded by Sixtus as by his Predeceſſor, pre- " vailed with Chriſtopher Perſona, Prior of Santa " Balbina, to tranſlate them into Latin; and there " was not any other tranſlation till Suſchelius publiſhed " them in Greek and Latin at Auſburg, from other " Greek manuſcripts, found by him in the libraries " of Germany. Laſtly, Spencer, an Engliſh Pro- " teſtant, publiſhed a very fine edition of them at " Cambridge in 1658, which does not differ in any " manner from that of Auſburg, becauſe he had no " Greek MSS. He only corrected the tranſlation, " and added ſome new notes (8)."

(8) Simon, *Lettres Choiſies*, p. 94. edit. of 1700.

[B] *Voſſius ſpeaks of him with the higheſt contempt.*] The publication of Procopius's Greek work, ſays he, was ſo much the more conſiderable preſent, as there were only bad tranſlations of that work. He adds, that the very impertinent Chriſtopher Perſona omitted a great many particulars, and publiſhed his own Chimeras rather than the thoughts of the Hiſtorian. *Eſtque hoc egregii viri* (Davidis Hœſchelii) *beneficium eo majus, quòd Latini interpretes toties abeant à Græcis: imprimis ineptiſſimus ille Chriſtophorus Perſona quatuor rerum Gothicarum libros vertit; ſi vertiſſe, & non pervertiſſe dici is debet, qui multa adeò omittit, & in iis, quæ refert, toties nobis ſua narrat ſomnia* (9). i. e. " We " are ſo much the more obliged to that excellent man " David Hoeſchelius, for his preſent, as the Latin " tranſlators vary ſo frequently from the Greek; and, " in particular, that moſt ſilly writer, Chriſtopher " Perſona, who has given us a verſion of four books " of the Hiſtory of the Goths: if we may give it " the name of verſion, and not perverſion, ſince he " has omitted ſo many particulars, and inſerted ſo " many chimeras of his own." I have taken notice elſewhere (10), of a miſtake of Voſſius, which Sandius, who wrote animadverſions upon him, has taken no notice of. Voſſius affirms, that Leonardo Aretino's Plagiariſms with reſpect to a book of Procopius, prompted Perſona to tranſlate Agathias (11). He ſhould have ſaid, that theſe prompted him to tranſlate Procopius's work in queſtion into Latin. *Procopium Latine loquentem fecit, non dubia in Leonardum Aretinum confiata invidia, qui ſuppreſſo Græci authoris nomine Gothicam hiſtoriam tanquam è variis ſcriptoribus decerptam pro ſua Juliano Cæſarino Cardinali, qui ad Varnam ab Amurathe cæſus periit, nullo pudore nuncuparat* (12). i. e. " He gave a Latin verſion of Pro- " copius, merely out of reſentment, (as is very plain) " to Leonardo Aretino, who ſuppreſſing the Greek Au- " thor's name, had, in a moſt barefaced and ſhame- " leſs manner, dedicated to Julianus Cæſarinus the " Cardinal, ſlain at Varna by Amurath, the Hiſtory " of the Goths, as though it had been his own " work, and by him collected from various Au- " thors." Voſſius, by citing this paſſage, has expoſed himſelf to the animadverſions of the Criticks.

(9) Voſſius, *de Hiſtor. Græcis*, p. 269, 270. See alſo his *de Arte Hiſtorica*, p. 94.

(10) Rem. [F] of the article ARETINO (LEONARDO).

(11) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 558.

(12) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 116. p. 258.

PETAVIUS DIONYSIUS), in French *Petau*, born at Orleans in the year 1583, entered into the ſociety of the Jeſuits in the year 1605. He taught rhetorick in their College at Paris, and afterwards divinity with a wonderful capacity (a). I ſhall not give a character of his extenſive and deep learning: for you may meet with it in a book (b) which has not been long printed, and is to be had of all the booktellers. You may alſo conſult the funeral Oration of that Jeſuit, written in Latin by Henry Valeſius (c); you will alſo find in the *Gallia Orientalis* (d) a full account of ſeveral things which had been ſaid of him, with the titles of moſt of his works, and times when they were printed. You may alſo meet with the titles of them and their date in Moreri's Dictionary. Monſieur Baillet has collected a great many particulars which relate to this great Author. See his *Jugemens des Savans ſur les Critiques Grammariens* *, Chapter DXIII. *ſur les Traducteurs Latins* †, Chapter CMXX. and *ſur les Poetes*, Chapter MCDLXXIV. It is enough for me to refer you to theſe Authors, I ſhall only add, 1. That Dionyſius Petavius died at Paris (e) December the 11th (f), 1652, thirteen weeks after his antagoniſt Salmaſius [A]. 2. That

(a) Alegambe, *Bibliotb. Script. Societ.* p. 96.

(b) The *Eloges des Hommes illuſtres* by Mr. Perrault, Tom. 1. p. 63, &c. of the Dutch edit. 1698.

(c) It is inſerted in the *Lives of illuſtrious Men*, collected by Dr. William Bates, and printed at London, in the year 1681.

(d) Page 217 & *ſeq.*

* The Grammarians who are alſo Critics.

† The Latin Tranſlators.

(e) *Gazette de Paris*, for December the 14th, 1652, where it is obſerved, that ſeveral Princes, and particularly Pope Urban VIII. deſired to have him at their Court, but that he declined that honour, both out of modeſty, and to obey Lewis XIII. who thought it uſeful and glorious to his Kingdom, to keep ſo great a man there.

(f) And not in November, as F. Labbe aſſerts, *Chronol. Franc.* Tom. 5. p. 894.

[A] *His antagoniſt Salmaſius.*] The war they waged againſt each other laſted very long, and was very briſk: it had been impoſſible to match two champions more capable to reſiſt one another than theſe two were. It is a pity they did not write leſs paſſionately. Their direct controverſy began, if I am not miſtaken, ſoon after Salmaſius had publiſhed his Commentary on Tertullian's treatiſe *de Pallio*, in the year 1622. Petavius, concealing his name under that of *Antonius Kercoëtius Aremoricus*, cenſured (1) that Commentary. He was anſwered in a work printed (2) in the year 1623, and intitled, *Confutatio Animadverſorum Antonii Kercoëtii ad Claudii Salmaſii Notas in Tertullianum de Pallio. Auctore Franciſco Franco J. C.* Petavius replied in a work divided into 3 parts, the firſt of which was printed at Paris, in the year 1622, and the two others ſucceſſively the next year in the ſame city. The firſt is entitled, *Antonii Kercoëtii Aremorici Maſtigophorus primus, ſive Elenchus Confutationis quam Claudius Salmaſius ſub ementito nomine Animadverſis Kercoëtianis oppoſuit.* The ſecond is entitled, *Antonii Kercoëtii Aremorici Maſtigophorus ſecundus, ſive Elenchi Confutationis. . . . Pars ſecunda:* and the third, *Antonii Kercoëtii Aremorici Maſtigophorus tertius, ſive Elenchi Confutationis . . . . pars tertia.* I cannot tell whether his reply was refuted or not. But I know that after this firſt controverſy, he endeavoured to meet with his adverſary, and to attack him wherever he could. They who are acquainted with Salmaſius's character, will eaſily imagine that he defended himſelf, and attacked in his turn. He wrote ſome beautiful lines in Latin, which Monſieur Menage has inſerted in one of his books, as I have obſerved above (3), and which turn upon a particular which has been obſerved of Apes. Scaliger had made uſe of the ſame compariſon, not only againſt Lydiat (4), but alſo againſt Scioppius. *Scioppius*, ſays he (5), *ſcripſit adverſus Jeſuitas. Scioppius wrote againſt the Jeſuits: he will aſcend too high, and is ridiculous like the monkey, who the higher he climbs, the more he ſhews his backſide.* The Author of the Apology for Stephen Paſquier againſt Garaſſe made uſe of Salmaſius's Latin lines, without naming him; he gave a kind of Paraphraſe of them, and tranſcribed ſome. Here follows the paſſage (6). " There is a pleaſant apologue told of a " monkey, which I may very properly apply to Garaſ- " ſe's humour, and to his actions, which are mere " apiſh tricks. An old ape all bald behind, but full " of malice within, poſted once an advertiſement up " in all the publick ſtreets of the Republick of the " apes and baboons, giving notice, that whoever had a " mind to ſee a very fine ſhow, might reſort to ſuch a " place, and he promiſed to divert them well. The " day appointed being come, every one ſet out, apes " great and little, monkies and baboons, males and " females, with or without tails, all crowd to the " place, there never was ſuch a concourſe of them " ſeen before.

(1) This Cenſure, entitled, *Animadverſorum Liber*, was printed at Rennes, in the year 1622. 8vo.

(2) At Paris, and not at Middelburg, as is ſet down in the title.

(3) Quotation (111) of the art. HOSPITAL (Michael de l').

(4) See above, quotation (112), of the article HOSPITAL (Michael de l').

(5) *Scaligerana*, under the word *Scioppius*, p. m. 222.

(6) *Defenſe pour Eſtienne Paſquier*, Liv. 1. ſect. 7. p. 93, &c.

" *Conveniunt*

2. That he has done the Socinians great ſervice, though unawares, and againſt his intention [*B*]. 3. That it has been ſaid the Jeſuits were very much diſpleaſed with him for the

" *Conveniunt omnes, Cercopitheci, Simiæ,*
" *Clurinæ pecudes, omne genus Cercopium :*
" *Quæ ſunt caudatæ, quæ ſine caudis ambulant,*
" *Similes hominibus beſtiæ turpiſſimæ.*
" *Erat inter illos ingens expectatio :*
" *Quidnam editurus, & miri novi foret,*
" *Tam grandium Minator ille* SIMIUS.

" Every one takes his ſeat, they waited a great while " for the Merry-Andrew: after he had kept them " four or five hours in ſuſpence, he arrives at laſt, and " gets on a tree which was to be his ſtage. He " jumps from branch to branch, up and down, gets " on the top of the tree, comes down again, laſtly, " having made his fifteen turns, he begins to turn " his back to the ſpectators, and ſhews them his " backſide, thus making fools of thoſe who truſted to " a monkey's promiſes. Poggius obſerves, that a cer- " tain buffoon played the ſame trick in the city of " Bologna; but we have a quite new inſtance of it " in Garaſſe." What we are told here by Poggius was applied to Laurence Valla; Monſieur Menage would perhaps have quoted it, if he had called it to mind. Here follows the ſtory, with the application of it. *Perſimilis eſt* Valla *noſter homini ridiculo : qui cum aliquando ſe ex quadam turri volaturum certo die profiteretur : & populum ad id ſpectaculum conveniſſet : homines ſuſpenſos variis alarum oſtentationibus ad noctem uſque detinuit. Deinde omnibus volatum cupide exſpectantibus : populo culum oſtendit. Ita Laurentius noſter poſt multas atque ingentes verborum pollicitationes ; poſt tantam expectationem promiſſorum : tandem non culum, quidem ut ille, ſed volantis cerebri inſaniam, & pergrandem ignorantiæ ſupellectilem oſtendit* (7). " Valla is ve- " ry much like a certain buffoon, who promiſed once " that he would fly from a high ſteeple, and having " got a great number of people together, he kept " them at bay till night, raiſing their expectations, " by diſplaying his wings before them: at laſt, as " they expected he was going to fly, which they ve- " ry much longed to ſee, he ſhewed them only his " back-ſide. Thus our Laurence, after many and " mighty promiſes, having raiſed our expectation " very high, ſhews us, not indeed his back-ſide, like " that buffoon, but the ſillineſs of his empty brains, " and the produce of a moſt profound ignorance."

(7) Poggius, *Invectiv.* lib. 1.

It cannot be denied, but the Jeſuit Petavius ſhewed too much arrogance, and too much bitterneſs, not only againſt Salmaſius, but alſo againſt Scaliger, and againſt many other perſons. They were in the right to obſerve this by way of parentheſis, in this Jeſuit's article in the Dutch edition of Moreri. I wonder that Monſieur Perrault choſe rather to paraphraſe a paſſage in Henry Valeſius's oration, than to omit it intirely. *Tanta ejus viri* (Scaligeri) *auctoritas omnium prope præjudicio roborata Petavium noſtrum à ſcribendo minime deterruit. Immo vero ipſum eo magis impulit, ut quæ ab illo emendatore temporum peccata fuerant, ipſe in ſuis de doctrina temporum libris emendaret. Non quod illius viri gloriæ obtrectaret ; ſed ne plerique forte auctoritate* Scaligeri *inducti, minime diſcuſſa rei veritate, in errorem præcipites laberentur* (8). Thus ſpeaks Henry Valeſius: and here follow Monſieur Perrault's words. Scaliger's work *was looked upon as a rule, which all the world was to follow. But this did not prevent Father Petavius from attempting the ſame undertaking, and from correcting in his book of the doctrine of the times, many errors, which are to be met with in Scaliger's work of the Emendation of Chronology ; but he did it with all the decency and civility, which men of letters owe to one another, ſo that without drowning his predeceſſor's glory, he gained himſelf a very great reputation in the ſame ſcience* (9). If you read a paſſage from Monſieur Morus, and another from Guy Patin (10), you will not have a very good opinion of the civility of this adverſary of Scaliger.

(8) Henricus Valeſius, *in Orat. funebri Dionyſii Petavii*, p. 682. *Collect. Bateſianæ.*

(9) Perrault, *Hommes illuſtres*, Tom. 1. p. m. 65, 66.

(10) See the *Nouvelles Lettres contre Maimbourg*, p. 182.

[*B*] *He has done the Socinians great ſervice, though . . . againſt his inclination.*] Let us tranſcribe a long paſſage from Monſieur Simon. It relates to this particular, and contains ſome other things which belong to Father Petavius's article. " I have heard " from Monſieur Hardy, that Monſieur de l'Aubeſ- " pine had alſo ſome controverſy with F. Petavius, " and threatened him that he would get ſome of his " notes on St. Epiphanius condemned; but I am " ſure that this learned Jeſuit would have defended " himſelf very well. If there be any thing to cen- " ſure in Petavius's works, it is chiefly in the ſe- " cond volume of his Theological Doctrines *, " that he ſeems to favour the Arians: it is " true that he ſoftened thoſe paſſages in his pre- " face; but as the body of the work continues en- " tire, and the preface, which is an excellent piece, " came only afterwards, it has not entirely prevent- " ed the harm which that book is like to do at this " time, when the new Unitarians boaſt that F. Pe- " tavius declared for them. I have ſeen ſome per- " ſons here, who imagine that Grotius, who had a " great correſpondence with Crellius, and with ſome " other Socinians, impoſed upon that learned Jeſuit; " but it is by no means probable, that ſo learned a " man, as Petavius was, would have ſuffered him- " ſelf to be miſled by Grotius who was his friend. " It is much more probable, that he wrote his own " thoughts honeſtly and with ſincerity. It would be " to the ſociety's reputation to continue their Fellow- " Jeſuit's *doctrines* throughout the reſt of the Syſtem of " Divinity, by following his method, which is ex- " cellent. It is certain that he had that deſign " himſelf; for I have ſeen a ſcheme he had drawn " up for that purpoſe; whereby I have known his " manner of ſtudying, of which I may give you an " account in another letter. A friend of mine told " me for certain, that he was not looked upon as an " able Divine among the Jeſuits, and that he was " often obliged to apply to ſome other Fathers who " lodged in the ſame houſe, when he had ſome " Theological argument to treat of. Several of our " people (11) ſay the ſame of Father Morin, who is " indeed a pitiful reaſoner. But whatever may be " ſaid of F. Petavius in his ſociety, I find him e- " very where admirable. Can there be any thing " more delightful than his fine Latin ſtyle in ſuch " difficult ſubjects? I only wiſh he had not been ſo " prolix in his expreſſions. A man who treats of " Doctrines, cannot be too conciſe; he muſt avoid " all long-winded periods as much as poſſible: here- " in did F. Sirmond excel, who had the art of " expreſſing himſelf in a few words, and very clear- " ly; and yet he was much inferior to F. Petavius " in point of learning (12)." Monſieur Simon was in the right to obſerve, that Father Petavius's preface was not a good remedy: for notwithſtanding that preface, the Socinians and the new Arians take a great advantage of that Jeſuit's collections, concerning the tradition of the three firſt centuries. Theſe collections encouraged Sandius to write a book, which has vexed the orthodox, and put a great deal of work on their hands. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, in the account of a book written by Dr. Bull, an Engliſhman (13). See alſo Monſieur Jurieu, in his *Tableau du Socinianiſme*, p. 224, and 363. But obſerve, that this Miniſter pretending to make an advantage of Father Petavius's authority, falſified his words, and that the Biſhop of Meaux did not pardon him that fault. You will ſee the proof of this immediately.

* *Dogmata Theologica.*

(11) That is to ſay, the Fathers of the Oratory; for Monſieur Simon was among them, when he wrote this.

(12) Simon, *Lettres choiſies*, p. 12, 13.

(13) For Sept. 1685, in the catalogue of new books. num. 1. See alſo theſe *Nouvelles* for June 1685, art. 2. p. 611. and for June 1686, art. 8. p. 399. of the 2d edition.

Laſtly the Theology of the antient Fathers, theſe are Monſieur Jurieu's words (14), *was ſo imperfect*, with regard to the Doctrine of the Trinity, *that the Jeſuit Petavius was forced to acknowledge in theſe very words, that they gave us only* a rough draught *of it* *. Here follows the Biſhop of Meaux's anſwer (15). " Go " now and truſt your Miniſter, when he quotes paſſa- " ges to you. No, *brethren*, he does not read them, " or he reads them but careleſsly, he looks in them " only for difficulties, and not for ſolutions; he la- " bours to perplex people's minds, and not to inſtruct " them; he ſpares nothing to miſlead you. As for " inſtance, when having a mind to perſuade you † " that *the theology of the antient Fathers is imperfect* " with regard to the myſtery of the Trinity, he makes " Father Petavius ſay *in theſe very words, that they* " *have given us only a rough draught of it.* But that

(14) Jurieu, 6 *Lettre Paſtorale*, of the 3d year, p. 154. edit. in 12mo.

* *Theolog. Dogm.* Tom. 2. *Præfat.* cap. 3.

(15) Boſſuet, *premier Avertiſſement aux Proteſtans*, num. 27 and 28. p. 28 of the Dutch edition.

† *Lett.* 6. p. 43.

the manner after which he ſpoke of St. Auguſtin's Hypotheſis concerning Grace [C]. 4. That his *Dogmata Theologica*, which were very dear and very ſcarce, are no longer ſo, ſince

" learned Father ſays quite the contrary in the paſſage " to which the Miniſter refers us, which is in the " Preface to the ſecond volume of his *Dogmata Theo-* ** *Theol. Dogm.* " *logica*. For he ** undertakes there to prove, that Tom. 2. *Præf.* " the Catholick Doctrine was always the ſame upon cap. 1. num. 10. " that ſubject, and in the very firſt chapter of that 12. " Preface he demonſtrates, that the *chief and eſſenti-* " *al part* of that myſtery has always been well known " by tradition; that the Fathers of the firſt Centu- " ries *agree with us in the main, as to the ſubſtance and* " *the thing itſelf, though not always in the manner of ex-* " *preſſing it:* which he continues to prove in the ſecond †† Ibid. c. 2. " chapter ††, by the authority of St. Ignatius, of " St. Polycarp, and of all the antient Doctors. ** Ibid. c. 3. " Laſtly, in the third chapter **, which is that " which the Miniſter objects to us, the learned Je- " ſuit, ſpeaking of St. Juſtin, againſt whom they " would raiſe the greateſt ſuſpicions, declares, that " this holy Martyr *has admirably well and moſt clearly* " *propoſed all that is material in that myſtery:* which he †† Ibid. n. 3. " proves †† alſo by the authority of Athenagoras, of " Theophilus of Antioch, and of the others, *who all* " *held*, ſays he, *the chief and material part of that* " *Doctrine*; whence he infers, that if we meet with " ſome obſcure paſſages in the works of theſe holy " Doctors, it is becauſe as they had to deal *with* " *Heathens and with Philoſophers, they did not declare the* " *moſt ſecret and hidden part of the myſtery with the* " *greateſt ſubtilty and accuracy, in the books they pub-* " *liſhed: and in order to win theſe Philoſophers, they* " *give that myſtery ſuch a turn as agreed beſt with Plato-* " *niſm, which they had ſtudied: as was ſtill done a long* " *time after, in the catechiſms which were compoſed to* " *inſtruct thoſe whom they would win over to Chriſtia-* " *nity, to whom they gave only the firſt ſtrokes*, or as the " Miniſter tranſlates it, *the rough draught of the myſte-* " *ries:* not but that they were well acquainted with " them, but becauſe thoſe minds being ſtill weak " were not judged capable to bear the whole weight " of them: ſo that it was thought proper to lead " them into ſo deep a myſtery with ſuch a regard as " became their weakneſs. This is *in ſo many words*, " what that Father aſſerts. Your Miniſter makes " him ſay quite contrary *in ſo many words*. He makes " him ſay, that *their theology was imperfect*, becauſe, " he ſays, they uſed ſome modifications, and pro- " portioned their doctrines to the capacity of the ig- " norant, and he miſtakes for an ignorance in the " teachers, the prudent modifications they uſed with " regard to their pupils." Monſieur de Meaux had obſerved juſt before, that *Father Petavius's learned Preface was an explanation of all that he taught upon that ſubject* (16). I think it is as reaſonable an explanation as a very able man could give: but yet it is plain nevertheleſs, that this Jeſuit has contradicted himſelf, or that he was under ſuch a perplexity of variations, as never fails to puzzle thoſe, who change parties, whilſt they are writing. His deſign was at firſt to repreſent ingenuouſly the doctrine of the three firſt Centuries. He did not miſrepreſent the opinions of the Fathers, who entertained falſe notions of the myſtery of the three Perſons. He pretended only to give a true account of things, and to add to it the moſt natural explications which the words could bear. This was letting the publick know that the Fathers had uttered moſt abſurd falſities with regard to the generation of the word, and the myſteries connected with that. This was giving riſe to a very ſtrong objection againſt the authority of the Canons of the Council of Nice: one might infer from thence, that the Doctrine of the Trinity is not a fundamental article in religion, ſince they who erred upon that article were nevertheleſs ſaved. The new Antitrinitarians might draw many conſequences from thence. Father Petavius had notice of it; and was obliged to afford ſome remedy againſt that evil. With this view he wrote his Preface; his aim, his motives altered from black to white; the queſtion was now only to aſſert the orthodoxy of the Fathers; he was under a neceſſity to give them ſatisfaction: in a word, he was obliged to contradict himſelf. Monſieur Jurieu underwent the ſame trial. He wrote a paſtoral letter (17), in which he laboured only to undermine the Hiſtory of the Variations. It was neceſſary for his purpoſe, to aſſert that the Fathers had erred in the moſt fundamental articles of the Chriſtian Faith: he brought them as low as he could, and expatiated on the abſurd notions they had of the Trinity. He minded only his preſent intereſt, nor was it poſſible for him to keep within bounds. But ſometime after (18), he had thoſe to refute, who aſſert that the Doctrine of the Trinity is not neceſſary to ſalvation, and that the Socinians muſt conſequently be tolerated: it was then neceſſary for him to aſſert that the Fathers were orthodox; and he aſſerted it accordingly: he made them whiter than ſnow, he ſet up for their apologiſt, and their panegyriſt, and for the accuſer of thoſe who deſpiſed them, and who did it even after his own example (19). This is making ſport with the publick, and expoſing one's ſelf to be loaded with ſhame: notwithſtanding all his variations, it was proved to him, that he had ſaved the Socinians, though very much againſt his will (20). Compare this with the remark [C] of the article RODON.

[C] *The Jeſuits were very much diſpleaſed with him for the manner after which he ſpoke of . . . . . Grace.*] It has been reported that the vexations they gave him had almoſt obliged him to leave their College. But they maintain it is a mere fable. Let us quote a printed book. Dom. Dionyſius Sammarthanus a Benedictine Monk obſerves (21), that it is pretended Father Petau corrected in the 10th book of the 1ſt volume of his *Dogmata*, what he had aſſerted in the 9th in favour of St. Auguſtin's doctrine. But ſome body has anſwered (22) that this was falſe, and that *the ſociety never gave that learned old man the leaſt trouble on that account: and if they had deſigned him any mortification, they would have gone otherwiſe to work; for inſtead of obliging him to recant in the 10th book, they would have made him alter and correct the 11th, ſince theſe two books are parts of one and the ſame volume:* whence it is inferred (23), *that Father Petavius never thought* of removing, *and that this is only a little ſtory invented by the Janſeniſts, whoſe echo Sammarthanus is.* However it is certain, that in the writings of the Janſeniſts (24), they have quoted ſome paſſages from Petavius, which are favourable to the Auguſtinian Hypotheſis, and that it has been aſſerted, when this Jeſuit wrote againſt the friends of Janſenius, he forſook his former opinions. Read the following paſſage from the Hiſtory of Janſeniſm. " F. Petavius " would not refuſe coming to his brethren's aſſiſtance, " to defend the honour and doctrine of his ſociety a " gainſt his own ſentiments, and at the expence of his " own reputation. He wrote firſt a treatiſe of Law " and Grace againſt Janſenius, which was publiſhed " that year: he endeavoured afterwards to refute " what Monſieur Fromond had written againſt his " diſſertation upon liberty; this work came out to- " wards the end of the ſame year, with this title: " *Elenchus Theriacæ Vicentii Lenis, ſive Liberti Fro-* " *mondi, Doctoris Lovanienſis Pariſiis* 1648 (25)." This is related under the year 1648. The following paſſage belongs to the year 1649. *Father Dionyſius Petavius a Jeſuit, having taught in his* Dogmata Theologica, *the Doctrine of St. Auguſtin, as being that of the Church, which every one ought to follow, renounced it to defend the cauſe and opinions of his ſociety, and undertook to explain, according to Molina's ſyſtem, the diſtinction which St. Auguſtin makes between the grace by which one acts*, auxilium quo, *which is the efficacious grace, and the grace without which one can do nothing*, auxilium ſine quo non, *which is the ſufficient grace. He entitled that piece* Diſſertatio brevis de Adjutorio SINE QUO NON, & de Adjutorio QUO; ad mentem B. Auguſtini (26).

That the reader may have a diſtinct and full account of what the Anti-Moliniſts publiſhed upon this ſubject, I ſhall tranſcribe another paſſage here. Father Petavius's " learning was almoſt univerſal, and " his name famous among the learned. If his judg- " ment had been anſwerable to his application, they " who have more regard for that qualification in a " man,

(16) Boſſuet, *premier Averтiſſement aux Proteſtans*, num. 25. p. 25.

(17) The 6th of the 3d year; it is dated November the 15th, 1588.

(18) See his 6th and 7th Letter of his *Tableau de Socinianiſme*, printed in the year 1690.

(19) See Mr. Saurin, in his *Examen de la Theologie de Mr. Jurieu*, p. 670, &c.

(20) See the book entitled, *Janua cœlorum reſerata*, p. 126 & *ſeq.*

(21) See the book entitled, *La Conduite qu'ont tenue les Peres Benedictins depuis qu'on a attaque leur Edition de S. Auguſtin*, p. 56.

(22) See the ſame book, p. 57, &c.

(23) Ibid. p. 58, 59.

(24) See above, quotation (24) of the article St. AUGUSTIN, and the *Hiſtoire abregée de la Congregation de Auxiliis*, p. 73, &c. of the edit. printed in the year 1687.

(25) *Hiſt. du Janſeniſme*, Tom. 1. p. 247. under the year 1648. See alſo p. 377, 378, under the year 1650.

(26) Ibid. p. 505. ad ann. 1651.

(g) In the year 1700. See what Monſieur Bernard obſerved concerning that edition, in his *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for Aug. 1700, p. 180, &c.

ſince the new edition that was publiſhed of them at Amſterdam (g), with the addition of ſeveral treatiſes.

" man, than for an immenſe reading, and who think " that an able man, is a man, who with a reaſonable " ſtock of learning, knows how to judge well of " things, would like his works more than they do. " It is ſomething ſurpriſing and inconceivable, to " ſee how in his *Dogmata*, he gave up to the Arians " the Fathers of the three firſt centuries, and how he " ſuppoſed them all to have been favourers of Aria- " niſm. I am far from thinking that his faith was " any thing the leſs Catholick for it, and from infer- " ring from it the other exorbitant conſequences, " which the Calviniſts, the other Proteſtants, and the " Socinians inferred. It is true, he thought to make " ſome amends for his fault by a preface, which the " Doctors of the Sorbonne obliged him to write; " but this was only putting the remedy near the " wound, but not curing it. He ſhould have burnt " that wretched work, whereby he would have ſpared " a great deal of ſhame to himſelf. His judgment " does not appear much more in what he wrote con- " cerning Grace. For his ſuperiors having obliged him " to recant the very Auguſtinian Doctrine upon grace " and predeſtination, which he had admitted and " aſſerted as the doctrine of the church, in the 12th " book of his 1ſt volume; he declared in the 10th " againſt that doctrine, leſt he ſhould agree with his " ſociety's adverſaries; but without altering the " foundations he had laid down in the foregoing " book. —— I do not obſerve this with a deſign to " inſult that Author, who had certainly ſome merit, " nor to enjoy the wicked pleaſure of ſpeaking ill " of a Jeſuit; but to let the Reader know, that it is " proper to miſtruſt thoſe who write many and large " books, and who compile paſſages, and that we " muſt beware not to depend upon them, without " conſidering, 1, Whether they write with judgment, " and give themſelves time to reflect upon what they " write: 2, Whether they write with liberty, and " without any biaſs, that is to ſay, whether they be " not members of a body or corporation, which " make a publick profeſſion not to admit ſome opi- " nions, and to admit others, and which obliges " every member to ſubmit blindly to all the engage- " ments of the whole body, under the penalty of be- " ing forced to *remove*, as Father Petavius uſed to " ſpeak, when he mentioned to his friends the rea- " ſons why he altered his opinions; *I am too old to* " *remove to other lodgings*, ſaid he to the late Monſieur " de Marolles, Abbot of Villeloin (27)."

(27) *Note ſur la 3 Reponſe du Prince de Conti au Pere des Champs*, p. 74, &c.

(a) See the *Short Chronology* of his Life by Baron Huiſſen, in the 2d volume of *The preſent State and Regulations of the Church of Ruſſia*. By Tho. Conſett, M. A.

☞ PETER I. Czar [*A*] of Ruſſia, who raiſed that Nation and Empire from a very low condition [*B*] to a State of great power and grandeur, was born May 30th, 1672, old ſtyle (*a*), and was ſon of the Czar *Alexis Michaelowits* by Natalia Kirilouna Nariſkin his ſecond wife (*b*). This Czar dying in 1676, *Feodor* or *Theodore*, his eldeſt ſon by his firſt wife, ſucceeded to the throne, and died in 1682. Upon his deceaſe, Peter, though but

p. 405. edit. Lond. 1729, in 8vo.

(b) Monſieur de Fontenelle's *Elogium upon Peter I. Czar of Ruſſia.*

[*A*] *Czar.*] Mr. Thomas Conſett, Chaplain to the Britiſh Factory in Ruſſia, in his *Preſent State and Regulations of the Church of Ruſſia* (1), writes this word *Tſar*; and in his *Preface* (2) aſſures us, that the Sclavonians and Ruſſians both write and ſpeak it as he does; *for* Czar, ſays he, *is a meer corruption of foreigners, who were led to this way of writing it, either from the reſemblance of the ſound to the title of the Emperor of Germany, to which they were accuſtomed, or from their ignorance of the language itſelf, or of the true force of the letters in it.* He obſerves likewiſe, that *Tſar* ſignifies *King*, in the Sclavonian language, throughout the Bible. Mr. Philip John von Strahlenberg alſo tells us (3), that *Czar* in the Sclavonian tongue ſignifies *King*, and alſo ſometimes *Emperor*; becauſe in all Sclavonian books, as well ſacred as profane, all Kings are called *Czar*; as in the Sclavonian Bible, which was tranſlated from the Greek about 700 years ago, long before the Ruſſian grand Princes took the title of Czar, the Kings, Pharaoh, Saul, David, &c. are called *Czars*; and in this language there is no difference between the title of *Emperor* and *King*. He acquaints us likewiſe, that this title of *Czar* was firſt aſſumed by *Iwan Waſielewitz*, ſirnamed the *Great*, grandfather of *Iwan Baſilowitz* the Tyrant, after he had conquered the city of Cuſan, was crowned there with the crown of Cuſan, and had alſo ſeized upon all the Principalities which were appennages; for notwithſtanding the Ruſſian Princes often changed their reſidence, they formerly ſtyled themſelves only *Grand Princes* of *Ruſſia*. This *Iwan Waſielewitz* ſoon after dying, his ſon *Baſilius*, by means of civil diſſenſions, loſt the Kingdom of Cuſan, together with the title of *Czar*, and ſuffered beſides very much by the Tartars. But his ſon *Iwan Baſilowitz* the ſecond, ſirnamed *Groſnoy*, i. e. *Tyrant*, recovered all, conquered the two Kingdoms of Cuſan and Aſtracan, and reſumed the title of his grandfather, ſtiling himſelf *Czar* of Cuſan, Aſtracan, and Siberia, *Grand Prince* of Moſcow, Wolodimir, and Novogrod, Lord of Pleſcow, &c. Likewiſe *Powelitel* and *Samoderſchetz* of all the Ruſſians. The former of theſe two titles ſignifies *Imperator*, *Commander*; and the latter, *Self-Preſerver* or *Sovereign*. Theſe titles have been allowed him and his ſucceſſors by moſt Potentates, till in 1721, when Czar Peter made peace with Sweden, the Senate, Synod, and Generals deſired the Czar, in the name of the States of Ruſſia, to ſtyle himſelf the *Great*, and *Father of his Country*. But the Archbiſhop of Novogrod perſuaded the Czar, that he might change the title of *Powelitel* into Latin, and call himſelf *Imperator*; which, though other Potentates had formerly allowed him to uſe this title in the Ruſſian language, being turned into Latin, cauſed many diſputes in Europe.

(1) Printed at Lond. 1729, in 8vo.

(2) p. 68.

(3) *Hiſtorico-Geographical Deſcription of the North and Eaſtern Parts of Europe and Aſia, but more particularly of Ruſſia, Siberia, and Great Tartary*, chap. 7. p. 276. Engl. tranſlat. Lond. 1738, in 4to.

[*B*] *Who raiſed that Nation and Empire from a very low condition.*] Monſieur *de Fontenelle* (4) tells us, Ruſſia was yet in a ſtate of ignorance and ruſticity, almoſt equal to that, which is inſeparable from the infancy of nations. Not but the Ruſſians had ſparks of ſagacity and penetration; they were informed with a genius, and were capable of imitating what they ſaw; but then they were dead to all induſtry; the peaſant, born a ſlave, and oppreſſed by a rapacious and mercileſs Lord, contented himſelf with the produce of a rude and artleſs huſbandry, and did not care to labour for more, than what might furniſh them with a bare ſubſiſtence; for indeed he had no opportunity of improving his fortune, nor durſt he ſo much as attempt it. The Lord himſelf was afraid of appearing wealthy; and arts are the natural offspring of riches, and of a gentle and mild adminiſtration. The arts of war, no leſs neceſſary to a nation than huſbandry, languiſhed almoſt under the ſame neglect; for the Ruſſians had extended their power to the north and eaſt only, where they met with people more rude and barbarous than themſelves; but had not made the leaſt acquiſition either to the weſt or to the ſouth, where they border upon the Swedes, Poles, and Turks. The Czars, from political views, would not ſuffer any of their Nobility or Gentry to go into the field; who at laſt conſidered that inglorious ſtate and inactivity as an honourable exemption; and if any of them happened to ſerve, their birth made them Commanders, ſtanding them inſtead of experience, or any other accompliſhment. They had ſeveral German Officers in their troops, but moſt of whom had been no more than private Centinels in their own country, and would never have been raiſed to Officers any where but in Ruſſia, and as ignorant of their buſineſs, as before their advancement. The Ruſſian armies, levied by force and violence, and made up of the dregs of the people, ill diſciplined, and commanded by raw and unexperienced Officers, were not able to make head againſt a body of regular troops; and if ever they happened

(4) *Elogium on his Imperial Majeſty* Peter I. *Czar of Ruſſia.*

but ten years of age, was proclaimed Czar, in excluſion of John his elder brother, who being but of a ſickly conſtitution, was at the ſame time very weak in his underſtanding. The Streltſi, who were the eſtabliſhed guard of the Czars, being fomented and encouraged by the Princeſs Sophia, his half-ſiſter, who flattered herſelf with the hopes of enjoying a greater ſhare of authority under John, who was her brother by both father and mother, and wholly incapable of acting himſelf, made an inſurrection in favour of John [*C*] ; and to put an end to the Civil War, it was at laſt agreed, that the two brothers ſhould jointly ſhare the Imperial Dignity. Peter, who was now Czar in his tender years, had been exceedingly ill brought up, not only through the general defects of the Ruſſian education, but likewiſe through the arts of the Princeſs Sophia, who ſurrounded him with every thing, that might ſtifle his natural deſire of knowledge, deprave his mind, and debaſe and enervate it with pleaſures. Notwithſtanding this, his natural inclination for military exerciſes diſcovered itſelf in his tendereſt years. Czar Feodor delighted in magnificence of dreſs, and numerous ſets of horſes ; and Czar Peter, though he was even at that age offended with his pageantry and vain oſtentation, which in his eyes appeared not only uſeleſs but burthenſome, yet ſaw with pleaſure, that his ſubjects, who had hither diſcovered too great a neglect for every kind of pomp, began inſenſibly to have a taſte for it. He conſidered, that the force of his example might be employed to nobler purpoſes ; and accordingly formed a company of fifty men, commanded by foreign Officers, and clothed and exerciſed after the German manner [*D*]. This company he reinforced with ſeveral others, which were all commanded by foreign Officers, who made uſe of the German Diſcipline, till at laſt he had got together a conſiderable body of ſoldiers. As he had at that time no war upon his hands, he made his companies fight againſt one another, or form imaginary ſieges ; he made a trial of their valour, and laid the ſchemes of future victories. The Streltſi looked upon this no otherwiſe than as the amuſement of a young Prince : but the Czar, who ſaw they were too formidable, and intirely in the intereſt of the Princeſs *Sophia*, concealed the deſign, which he had formed of cruſhing them ; and for this, was ſecuring to himſelf a body of troops, better diſciplined,

happened to overcome, which to them was a matter indifferent, it was entirely owing to fortunate and uncommon circumſtances, which threw the victory into their hands. The main ſtrength of the Empire lay in the *Streltſi*, a body little different from that of the Turkiſh Janiſaries, and which, like them, was formidable to the Sovereign, as well as to the people, whom they ſerved to keep in awe and ſubjection. Their trade, which was low and languiſhing, was entirely engroſſed by foreign merchants ; and the ignorance and indolence of the inhabitants of the country, furniſhed ſtrangers but with too fair an opportunity of over-reaching them. The Ruſſians had not as yet put to ſea, either ſhips of war, or trading veſſels ; ſo that the port of Archangel was only of uſe to foreign nations. Though the Chriſtian religion obliges its profeſſors, the Clergy at leaſt, to acquire ſome ſhare of learning, theſe were involved in as thick clouds of ignorance, as the moſt common of the people. All that they knew in general was, that they were of the Greek church, and that they were obliged to hate the Latin. Not a Clergyman among them, had either learning or genius ſufficient to preach even to ſo illiterate an audience. Scarce was a book to be met with in the moſt antient and richeſt monaſteries. An aſtoniſhing depravation of manners, as well as of opinions, prevailed univerſally, and which they did not, as in other nations, conceal under the ſpecious appearances of decorum, or ſo much as ſet off with any ſallies of wit, or ſuperficial graces. Yet was this nation at the ſame time inſufferably haughty, deſpiſing every thing, which did not come within the reach of their underſtanding ; and to be proud, is to be profoundly ignorant. To this the Czars themſelves contributed, by not allowing their ſubjects to viſit foreign countries ; which probably aroſe from the apprehenſion they were under, that travelling would give their people an opportunity of diſcovering the miſery of their condition. The Ruſſians, who were ſcarce known but to their neareſt neighbours, were looked upon as having nothing to do in the common intereſts of Europe. They had very little correſpondence with the other Powers, who thought them ſcarce worth their notice, and had bare curioſity to inform themſelves from time to time of the moſt conſiderable revolutions, that happened amongſt them. Such was the ſtate of Ruſſia, ſays Monſieur *de Fontenelle*, when Czar Peter I. was born.

[*C*] *The* Streltſi . . . . *being fomented and encouraged by the Princeſs* Sophia . . . . *made an inſurrection in favour of John.*] Mr. Conſett (5) tells us, that the Princeſs's real intention was to be Regent herſelf, and to dethrone Peter ; " in which attempt, by the " aſſiſtance of the *Streltſi* *, who were the eſtabliſh- " ed guard of the Tſars, and whom ſhe had drawn " into her party, having engaged *Gudunoff* their " General, by a promiſe of giving her ſiſter, the " Princeſs *Catharina*, in marriage to his ſon, ſhe " ſucceeded ſo far as to get *Ivan* proclaimed Tſar, " in conjunction with his brother *Peer Alexiewich*. " But this point was carried with ſuch circumſtances " of barbarity and cruelty, as reflect heavily on the " memory of that Princeſs ; for the Streltſi animated " and incenſed by various pretences of the late " Tſar *Feodore*'s being poiſoned by his Phyſicians, at " the inſtigation of ſome of the chief men at the " helm, whoſe names were artfully whiſpered about, " and of a deſign formed at court, to mix poiſon in " the liquor given them at his funeral ; and the Ge- " neral, with many of the chief Officers, who were " generally the younger brothers of the firſt families " in Ruſſia, being before engaged in her deſigns ; " and the army thus enraged againſt the court, they " began firſt with the murther of the two Phyſicians, " who had adminiſtered phyſick to the deceaſed " Tſar ; cut in pieces ſeveral of the chief Officers of " the Crown, who were pointed out for deſtruction, " and threw others from the balcony of the Royal " Palace upon the ſoldiers pikes, who ſtood under- " neath for that purpoſe, with their pikes planted " upright to receive them ; committed many other " violences, and put the city every where in an up- " roar ; till after ſome days their fury ceaſed, and " the Coronation of the two Princes was celebrated. " But this violent proceeding ſo alarmed the adhe- " rents to Peter, that Prince *Burris Alexiewich Gallit- " ſin* carried him to Troitſa (or Trinity) monaſtery, " a ſtrong place, 60 Ruſs miles from Moſco, to ſe- " cure his perſon ; where he remained ſome time, " till this hurry was over and quieted."

(5) *Preface*, p. 26, & *ſeqq.*

* *Strelets* in the ſingular is an Archer or Bowman ; in the plural *Streltſi*.

[*D*] *Formed a company of fifty men, commanded by foreign Officers, and clothed and exerciſed after the German manner.*] He entered himſelf into the loweſt poſt, that of a Drum. Nor was this only an idle farce, to amuſe and divert himſelf and his court. He had ordered his commanding Officers, intirely to forget that he was Czar. He performed the duties of his poſt with the greateſt diligence, and paid the utmoſt deference and ſubmiſſion to the orders of his ſuperiors.

plined, and whoſe fidelity was more to be relied on. At the ſame time he had another project in view, of equal importance with the former, and yet more difficult to be put in execution. The ſight of a ſmall Dutch veſſel, which he had met with on a Lake belonging to one of his pleaſure-houſes, where it lay uſeleſs and neglected, had made an impreſſion on his mind; and he carried his reflections ſo far, as to a deſign, next to impracticable in itſelf,, and which perhaps appeared little leſs in his own eyes, that of forming a Navy [*E*]. His firſt care was to get ſome Hollanders to build ſome ſmall veſſels at Moſcow, and afterwards four frigates of four guns each, on the Lake of Pereſlave. He had already taught them to combat againſt one another; and he paſſed two ſummers ſucceſſively on board Engliſh or Dutch ſhips, which ſet out from Archangel, in order that he might perſonally inſtruct himſelf in every branch of naval affairs. In the beginning of the year 1696 Czar *John* died, and *Peter* was now ſole maſter of the Empire. He began his reign with the ſiege of Aſoph, then in the hands of the Turks; but did not take it till 1697, after having ſent for Venetians, who built ſeveral gallies on the river Don, to ſhut up the mouth of that river, and prevent the Turks from relieving the place. This gave him a ſtronger idea than ever of the neceſſity and importance of a naval force, but he was ſenſible at the ſame time of the great diſadvantage which he lay under, from having none but foreign ſhips, or at leaſt none but what he was obliged to employ foreigners in building. He was deſirous of ſurmounting theſe diſadvantages; and as the affairs, which he projected, was too new and of too ſingular a nature, to be ſo much as conſidered in his Council; and as the execution of his views, if he had entruſted them in any other hands but his own, would have been almoſt impoſſible, or at leaſt gone on but very ſlowly; he reſolved ſingly to attempt ſo bold an undertaking. In 1698 he ſent an Embaſſy to Holland, at the head of which were Monſieur le Fort, a Genevois, and Count Golowin, the Great Chancellor; and he himſelf went *incognito* in the retinue, and viſited England

ſuperiors. He fed upon his pay only, and lay only in a Drummer's tent in the rear of his company. He was ſometime after raiſed to a Serjeant, when, in the judgment of his Officers, whom he would have puniſhed, had they diſcovered the leaſt partiality in his favour, he was juſtly intitled to that advancement. And he never roſe otherwiſe, than as a ſoldier of fortune, whoſe advancement would even have been approved of by his comrades. Herein his deſign was to teach his Nobility, that birth alone was not a ſufficient title to military employments; and to let his ſubjects know that merit was the only one. The inferior employments, through which he had gradually paſſed, and the hardſhips he had ſuffered in them, gave him a juſter right to require their imitation in this particular, than he could have claimed from his abſolute authority (6).

(6) Fontenelle, *ubi ſupra.*

[*E*] *Carried his reflections ſo far as to a deſign, next to impracticable in itſelf, and which perhaps appeared little leſs in his own eyes, that of forming a navy.*] Mr. *Conſett*, in his ſecond volume, has publiſhed *An Account of the Riſe and Naval Power in Ruſſia: Or the Story of the little Boat, which gave riſe to the Ruſſian Fleet. Being the Preface to the* Sea-Regulations *in Ruſſia, and ſaid to be written by the Tſar* Peter Alexiewich *himſelf.* In this piece we are informed, that it happened, that the Czar was in the Flax-yard at Iſmaeloff (7), and walking by the magazines, where ſome remains of the houſhold furniture of *Niketa Ivanowich Romanoff*, his great uncle, were laid, ſpied, among other things, a ſmall foreign veſſel: and his native curioſity not ſuffering him to paſs it by without an enquiry, he preſently aſked *Francis Timerman* (who then lived with him, and taught him Geometry and Fortification) what that was? he told him it was an Engliſh boat. The Czar again aſking, Where was it made uſe of? *Timerman* anſwered, that it was uſed by ſhips to bring and carry goods. The Czar aſked, In what is it preferable to the Ruſſian veſſels? for he obſerved it to be built in a better and ſtronger manner than the Ruſſian: *Timerman* anſwered, that it goes with a ſail, with the wind, or againſt it. This greatly ſurprized him, and raiſed his curioſity to ſee a proof of it. Upon which, *Timerman* ſought out *Carſtens Brand*, the Carpenter, who had been ſent for by the Czar's father from Holland, to build ſhips in the Caſpian ſea. He repaired the boat, made the maſt and ſails, and ſailed up and down the river Yauſe (8) in the Czar's ſight, who was extremely pleaſed with it; and deſired to ſteer it himſelf. And becauſe he obſerved the boat not to anſwer her helm, but often to ſtrike againſt the bank, he aſked *Brand* the reaſon of it; who anſwered, it was becauſe the water was narrow, and the boat had not ſufficient way. Upon which the Czar ordered it to be carried into a water called the *Proſian Pond*; but this was nothing better, and his deſire was ſo inflamed, that he reſolved to carry it to the lake of Pereſlave; but his mother, who was extremely anxious for his ſafety, endeavoured to diſſuade him from this journey to the lake, which he at laſt found an opportunity of taking, under the pretext of performing a vow in Trinity monaſtery. After he had taken a full view of the extent of this lake, he entreated his mother to build there an houſe and veſſels; and *Brand* built two ſmall frigates and three yatchts, wherein the Czar diverted himſelf a few years. But afterwards, he thought this too ſmall a water, and deſigned to go to the lake Cubins, which is large and extenſive, but not deep enough. Then he reſolved to viſit the ſea itſelf; but here again he met with oppoſition from his mother's care; but notwithſtanding this, in the year 1694, he went to Archangel, and thence in his own yatcht, called the St. Peter, ſailed to Ponoia, in company with Engliſh and Dutch Merchant-ſhips, under the convoy of one Dutch Man of War, commanded by Captain *Jolle Jolſon*. He was ſo much delighted with his voyage, that he bent his thoughts wholly towards building a fleet; and when in the invaſion of the Tartars, he had taken Aſoph, he determined to execute his reſolution. A fit place for building ſhips was found in the river Verenez, which runs by a city of the ſame. Builders were ſent for from Holland; and in 1696, a new work was begun in Ruſſia, viz. the building of great ſhips, gallies, and other veſſels. And he took meaſures to bring the art itſelf into his own nation; for which end, he ſent great numbers of his Nobility and Gentry into Holland, and other countries, to learn ſhip-building and navigation. And what is ſtill moſt remarkable, he viſited Holland and England in Perſon, in order to make himſelf maſter of thoſe arts. Mr. *Conſett* (9) relates a curious ſtory, of which himſelf was an eye-witneſs, and which ſhews the affection that the Czar had for the little boat, which had given riſe to all his naval force; and tells us, that in 1723 (10), this boat was brought from Moſcow to Peterſburg, repaired and beautified, in order to make her laſt and moſt glorious appearance on the 12th of Auguſt. In June, the Czar ſailed to Revel with his fleet, and returned to Croonſtadt in the beginning of Auguſt; at which time a great number of yatchts and buyers, ſaid to be 200, and one galliot, were ordered to meet him there, and to attend on the little boat. After this fleet was arrived within half a league of that place with their charge, they had orders to caſt anchor, till the nine

(7) An old ſeat of his family near Moſcow.

(8) A ſmall river which runs by the ſuburbs of Moſcow.

(9) Vol. 2. p. 218, 219.

(10) Strahlenberg, c. 11. p. 311. ſays in 1721.

England as well as Holland, in order to inform himſelf fully in the art of ſhip-building [*F*]. The news of the revolt of forty thouſand Streltſi obliged him to ſet out ſuddenly for Vienna, and arriving at Moſcow about the end of the year 1699, immediately broke them all [*G*], thinking himſelf more ſecure in the reſpect they would pay to his intrepidity, than in that they owed to his orders. In 1700 he had got together a body of ſtanding forces, conſiſting of thirty thouſand foot, including the troops, which he had formerly raiſed and ſecured to his intereſts. And now the vaſt project, which he had formed, diſplayed itſelf in all its parts. He opened his Dominions, which had till then been ſhut up, having firſt ſent the chief Nobility of his Empire into foreign countries to improve

flags in ſo many pinnaces came up to pay their reſpects to the mother of their great fleet. At the return of the flags, the yatchts, *&c.* weighed anchor, and went into the haven, except the galliot, which bore the little boat, that lay off at ſea till the day of the grand ſolemnity, when ſhe was received with uncommon ceremony. For the Czar a ſecond time viſited her with the flags alone, launched her, and graced her with his Imperial Standard, ſteering her himſelf, and two other Admirals rowing, with the Surveyor of the Navy *Joan Michaelowich Golovin*. At her launching the great Admiral General fired ſeven guns, as a ſignal to the whole Fleet, conſiſting of twenty two men of war of the Line, to fire at once. Then away ſhe came, and as ſhe rowed by each ſhip, was ſaluted by all the canon. After ſhe had paſſed through the whole Fleet, and rowed into the Haven, the whole Fleet paid their laſt compliment to their mother with one general ſalute of their canon. After this there was a dinner, and in the evening the Court and Flag-officers were rendezvouſed on the ſides of the Haven, and cloſed the ſcene with much drinking. A few days after the boat was brought back to Peterſburgh, and laid up in the Caſtle, where ſhe is preſerved with the utmoſt care.

[*F*] *Viſited England as well as Holland, in order to inform himſelf fully in the art of ſhip-building.*] Monſieur de Fontenelle tells us that he entered himſelf in the India Admiralty-Office at Amſterdam, and cauſed himſelf to be inrolled in the liſt of ſhip-carpenters by the name of *Peter Michaelof*, and not of *Peter Michaelowitz*, a name he ſhould have aſſumed, as being that of his grandfather; for this termination in the Ruſſian language diſtinguiſhes the man of quality from the vulgar; and he was reſolved not in the leaſt to take upon himſelf on account of his ſovereign dignity. He worked in the yard with greater aſſiduity and application than his companions, who were not actuated with motives comparable to thoſe, with which he was inſpired. The Czar's quality was known to all; and they ſhewed him to one another with a regard and veneration, which did not ſo much ariſe from the conſideration of his being a ſoverign Prince, as from the buſineſs he was come about. King William III. of England, who was then in Holland, *and was himſelf*, ſays Monſieur *de Fontenelle, a perfect judge of perſonal merit*, paid him all the regard and reſpect, which a Prince endued with ſuch uncommon qualities juſtly deſerved; and his diſguiſe only diſpenſed him from that, which was barely ceremonius and troubleſome. In the *Preface* to the *Sea Regulations in Ruſſia*, above quoted, we are informed (11), that "at Amſterdam, in the "wood-yard, called the *Oſtend Wharf*, the Czar "wrought with other voluntiers in the ſhips, and in "a little time made that proficiency as to paſs for a "good carpenter. After this, he deſired *John Pool*, "maſter of the yard, to inſtruct him in the proportions of a ſhip, which he learned in four days. "But becauſe in Holland this art was not taught perfectly in the mathematical way, but only ſome "principles of it, and the reſt muſt be acquired by "long practice and experience; and the aboveſaid "maſter told him, that they could not demonſtrate "this in lines; it gave him great uneaſineſs, that "he had taken ſo long a journey for that purpoſe, "and had failed of his end ſo much deſired. A few "days after, it happened, that his Majeſty was at "the houſe of *John Theeſing* a Merchant, where he "ſat in company very penſive for the aboveſaid reaſon; but when in the courſe of converſation he "was aſked the cauſe of his melancholy, he then declared the above reaſon for it, An Engliſhman in "the company, who heard this, told him, that in "England, this kind of ſtructure was in the ſame "perfection as other arts and ſciences, and might be "learned in a ſhort time. His Majeſty was glad to "hear this, and hereupon went in all haſte to England, and there, in four months time, finiſhed his "learning; and at his return brought over with him "two maſter ſhip-builders, *John Deane* and *Joſeph* "*Noy*." Mr. Conſett obſerves (12), that Baron *Huyſſen*, Counſellor in the College of War, in his *Hiſtory of the Life of the Czar*, relates, that the Czar perceived the method of building ſhips in England to be more regular, and much better, than that of Holland; and he was often heard to ſay, that if he had never gone to England, he had ſtill remained ignorant of that art. In England he met with a ſecond reception from King *William*, who, to make him a preſent agreeable to his taſte, and that might ſerve as a model of the art, which he was ſo deſirous of learning, gave him a magnificent yatcht (13). Mr. Conſett tells us (14), that as ſoon as he returned from England, he went down to Veronez, whither he carried the two Engliſh builders, *Deane* and *Noy*, the firſt of whom ſoon after deſired a diſcharge, which was granted, without his having given any proof of his art. The Czar himſelf and *Joſeph Noy* received orders from the Lord High Admiral *Theodore Alexiewich Golovin*, to build each of them a man of war. The Czar having taken upon himſelf the title of a maſter-builder, was pleaſed to ſubmit to the condition of that character; and in compliance with that order, gave the firſt proof of his ſkill in the art, which he had learned abroad, and continued afterwards to bear this title; and had at all times, notwithſtanding his great engagements in other affairs, one ſhip upon the ſtocks; and at his death left a ſhip half built, one of the largeſt ſhips in Europe, 180 foot long upon the deck, 151 broad, and 21 deep, with 110 guns, and is ſaid to be one of the fineſt that ever was ſeen, as indeed were all the reſt built by him. He drew himſelf the draught of this great ſhip at Riga, where was no maſter-builder beſides himſelf; and when he returned to Peterſburg, he gave the ſurveyor an account, that he had drawn his draught of the great ſhip, which he had orders to build from the Surveyor's Office; and according to the regulations of the Navy, preſented the draught to be examined. This ſhip was launched June 29, 1727, and is called *Peter pervoie tworoi*, i. e. *The firſt and ſecond*.

(11) Conſett, vol. 2. p. 214.

(12) Ibid. p. 215.

(13) Fontenelle, *ubi ſupra*.

(14) Vol. 2. p. 215.

[*G*] *The revolt of forty thouſand Streltſi . . . . arriving at Moſcow about the end of the year* 1699, *he immediately broke them all.*] Mr. *Conſett* obſerves (15), that "during the Tſar's abſence abroad at this time, "the Princeſs *Sophia* being uneaſy under her confine-"ment, and reſolved to regain her liberty, found the "means to correſpond with the Streltſi, who were "now quartered at a diſtance from Moſco in Ukrania, "and to inſtigate them to a third rebellion in her "favour. About ſix regiments of them mutinied "under a pretence of want of pay, and were on "their march towards Moſco, to make their de-"mands on the Government, when General *Gordon* "at the head of four Regiments of foreign Diſci-"plines, *viz. Preobazenſki* and *Simonoffſki* Regiments, "one of his own name, and by the name of *le Fort*, "with the Militia of the city and county com-"manded by *Alexei Simonowich Shein*, met them in "the way to Voſcreſenſki (or Jeruſalem) Monaſtery, "offered to give them all reaſonable ſatisfaction, and "deſired them to retreat peaceably to the poſt they "had left, and to deſiſt from thoſe hoſtile proceed-"ings. But the more he endeavoured to pacify "them, they grew the more inſolent and preſſing to "proſecute their intended journey; inſomuch that he "was

(15) *Pref.* 4. 35.

improve themſelves in knowledge and learning [*H*]. He invited into Ruſſia all the foreigners he could meet with, who were capable of inſtructing his ſubjects in any manner; and gave the kindeſt reception to all land and ſea Officers, ſailors, mathematicians, architects, men ſkilful in the diſcovery of mines, and working in metals, phyſicians, ſurgeons, and indeed artificers of every kind, who would ſettle in his Dominions. In the mean time this new ſcene of things, the novelty of which was alone ſufficient to make it diſliked, raiſed many diſcontents; and his deſpotic authority exerted upon that occaſion, was ſcarce powerful enough to ſuppreſs them [*I*]. In 1700 being ſtrengthened by the alliance of Auguſtus King of Poland, he made war upon Charles XII. King of Sweden: in which he was not deterred by the ill ſucceſs, which he met with at firſt, for he uſed to ſay, *I know, that my armies muſt be overcome for a great while; but even this will at laſt teach them to conquer*. However, he afterwards gained conſiderable advantages; and the acquiſitions he had made in Livonia and Ingria, Provinces ſubject to the Swedes, were ſo important, that he projected the building of a fortreſs, whoſe Port, ſituated on the Baltick, might be large enough to receive a Fleet; and accordingly laid the foundation of the city of Peterſburg in 1703, which is one of the ſtrongeſt in Europe. In 1706 having driven the Swedes out of Courland, and defeated them at Kaliſche, Dubrovna, and Leſnoy, and reduced to order the Zaporovian Coſſacks, he took from them Okzakow, the laſt Sanctuary of theſe Rebels. In 1709 he gained a complete victory over the Swedes at Pultowa [*K*], having ſhewn himſelf to be no leſs a great Captain, than a brave and intrepid Soldier; and obliged the King of Sweden to fly for ſhelter to Bender in the Turkiſh Dominions. He did not fail of making an advantage of the misfortunes and abſence of that King; and made a complete conqueſt of Livonia and Ingria, to which he added Finland, and a part of Swediſh Pomerania. The Turks having broken the truce, which they had concluded with him, he was incloſed by their army in 1712 on the banks of the Pruth; and that in ſo advantageous a ſituation, that he ſeemed inevitably loſt. In the midſt of the conſternation his army was under, the Czarina Catharine [*L*], who was reſolved to follow him into the field, dared alone to project

" was conſtrained to repulſe and fight them, which " he did very ſucceſsfully, and carried them priſo- " ners to Moſco; and making a decimation, exe- " cuted every tenth man. But the Tſar receiving " the news of this inſurrection, haſtened his return " home, and provoked beyond all patience with " the inſolence and impiety of their repeated revolts " and treaſon, proceeded to a new ſcrutiny for the " ringleaders in this rebellion, and made terrible ex- " amples of them by a total extirpation of their kin- " dred and families; yet took no other ſatisfaction " of his ſiſter the Princeſs, than to continue her con- " finement in the nunnery, and to hang the Prieſt, " who had carried her letters, on a gallows before " her window, holding with his right hand a letter " into it, which had been intercepted from her cor- " reſpondents."

[*H*] *Sent the chief Nobility of his Empire into foreign countries, to improve themſelves in knowledge and learning.*] Monſieur de Fontenelle tells us (16), that he ſent them to viſit different parts of Europe; pointing out to each of them, according to their various talents and inclinations, what they were to make their ſtudy. Some of them obeyed in a very aukward manner; and one in particular, who had been ſent to Venice, ſhut himſelf up four years together in his apartment, that when he came out, he might pleaſe himſelf with the agreeable thoughts of having neither ſeen nor informed himſelf in a ſingle inſtance. But in general the Czar's project had its deſired effect; the Noblemen improved themſelves in foreign countries, and Europe opened to them a new ſcene, with which they had been altogether unacquainted, and from which they reaped no ſmall benefit and advantage.

(16) *Ubi ſupra.*

[*I*] *This new ſcene of things, the novelty of which was alone ſufficient to make it diſliked, raiſed many diſcontents; and his deſpotick authority, exerted upon that occaſion, was ſcarce powerful enough to ſuppreſs them.*] Monſieur *de Fontenelle* tells us, that *he had to do with a dull, heavy, untoward people, grown idle by the little fruit they reaped from their labours, inured to ſevere, cruel, and often juſt puniſhments. And the dreadful miſery, under which they groaned, made them out of love with life, perſuaded by long experience, that there was no poſſibility of attaining to any happineſs, and therefore intirely inſenſible to any appearance of it. The moſt trifling and indifferent changes, in dreſs for inſtance, or the obliging them to cut off their long beards, was very ſtiffly oppoſed, and was ſometimes alone a very ſufficient cauſe for an inſurrection. And indeed the Czar, to break his ſubjects to the moſt uſeful innovations, was obliged to exert himſelf with far greater vigour, than would have been neceſſary, if his people had been of a more gentle and tractable diſpoſition. Beſides, a circumſtance, which laid him under a yet ſtronger obligation to act with ſome ſeverity, was, that the Ruſſians conſidered grandeur and ſuperiority in no other light than as a power of doing evil; and an indulgent and gentle maſter would not have appeared to them a great Prince, nor would they have conſidered him as their ſovereign.*

[*K*] *In* 1709 *he gained a complete victory over the Swedes at Pultowa.*] A great part of the Swediſh army were made priſoners. The Swediſh Generals, who were taken, were conſtantly entertained at his own table; and one day, when he had drank an health to his maſters, who had inſtructed him in the art of war, Count *Rinſchild*, one of the chief officers among the priſoners, aſked him, *who they were whom he honoured with ſo glorious a title? Yourſelves, Gentlemen*, ſaid he. *Your Majeſty is then very ungrateful*, replied the Count, *to have ſo beaten your maſters.* The Czar, to make ſome reparation for this glorious ingratitude, immediately gave order to return them all their ſwords; and he treated them with as much honour, as their own Sovereign could have done, had they made him victorious. The defeat of the Swedes at Pultowa gave him an advantage with reſpect to the eſtabliſhment of arts beyond what himſelf could ever have expected. Near three thouſand Swediſh officers were diſperſed up and down his Dominions, and particularly in Siberia, a country of a vaſt extent, which runs as far as the Confines of China; and whither they always ſend ſuch Ruſſians as are condemned to baniſhment. Theſe priſoners, who had no ſubſiſtence, and ſaw their return into their own country was very doubtful, at leaſt at a great diſtance, began to apply themſelves to the various profeſſions, which they were capable of; and excited by neceſſity, ſoon made a conſiderable progreſs in them. There were even maſters of languages and mathematicians among them. They ſoon formed a kind of Colony, which poliſhed and civilized the antient inhabitants of the country; and many arts, which tho' eſtabliſhed at Moſcow and Peterſburg, would not probably have reached Siberia under a long courſe of time, were thus ſuddenly ſettled there (17).

(17) Fontenelle, *ubi ſupra.*

[*L*] *The Czarina* Catharine.] Monſieur *de la Motraye* (18) gives us a curious account of her hiſtory, and tells us, that ſhe was born in a village called Rung-

(18) *Voyages and Travels*, vol. 3. c. 3.

hen,

project an expedient. She ſent to negotiate with the Grand Viſier, and let him privately ſee, that a great ſum of money was at his ſervice: he was tempted, and the Czar's prudence completed the work. To perpetuate the memory of this event, he cauſed the Czarina to inſtitute the Order of St. Catharine, of which ſhe was declared Sovereign, and into which none but women were to be admitted. The King of Sweden having at laſt quitted the Turkiſh Dominions in 1713, the Czar found this formidable enemy advancing to oppoſe him; but he was now ſtrengthened by an alliance with the King of Denmark. He carried the war into the Dutchy of Holſtein, which was in alliance with the Swedes; and at the ſame time purſued his obſervations and political ſtudies [*M*]. In 1714 he obtained a victory at ſea over the Swedes at Hangout near the coaſts of Finland; upon

hen, on the banks of the lake Worthſy in Livonia, and not in the neighbourhood of Dorpt, as other Writers affirm, who, in order to make her extraction the more illuſtrious, have repreſented her father to have been Lieutenant-Colonel of the family of *Albendel*, and others to have been Colonel *Roſen*. But the common report is, that her father was a vaſſal of this Colonel, who dying when ſhe was but four or five years old, as her mother did ſoon after, there was nothing left for her ſubſiſtence; for it is rare, that the vaſſals of the Livonian and Ruſſian Nobility leave any thing to their children. The pariſh Clerk, who kept a ſchool, took her into his houſe, till Dr. *Gluck*, Miniſter of Marienbourg, happening to come to that village, liked the girl, and being willing to eaſe the Clerk, whoſe income was very ſmall, carried her home with him. Dr. *Gluck* treated her almoſt in the ſame manner, as if ſhe had been his own daughter; and his wife finding her endued with excellent diſpoſitions, ſhewed her equal affection. She was employed in buſineſs ſuitable to her age, as ſpinning, and ſewing, which ſhe performed extremely well. She had learned to read of the pariſh Clerk of Runghen. When ſhe left that place, ſhe ſpake only the language of the country, which a is dialect of the Sclavonian tongue; but at Dr. *Gluck*'s ſhe learned the German language to perfection, and ſpent all her leiſure hours in reading. A Livonian Serjeant in the Swediſh army fell paſſionately in love with her; and ſhe agreed to marry him, if he could obtain the conſent of Dr. *Gluck*, whoſe circumſtances being very narrow, gave his conſent more readily than he would otherwiſe have done. This Serjeant was of a good family, had a ſmall eſtate of his own, and was in a fair way to preferment, being diſtinguiſhed for his bravery and ſobriety. It is ſaid, that Dr. *Gluck* performed the marriage ceremony himſelf. The next day, the Ruſſians, under the command of Lieutenant-General *Baur*, made themſelves maſters of Marienbourg, which is of itſelf a weak place, and was then defended only by a few Swediſh troops. The General ſeeing *Catharine* among the priſoners, and obſerving, notwithſtanding her tears, ſomething in her face, which ſtruck him, he aſked her ſeveral queſtions concerning her condition, to which ſhe made anſwers with more good ſenſe than is uſual in perſons of her rank. He bid her therefore fear nothing, ſince he would take care to ſee her well uſed; and immediately ordered her to be conducted to the place where his baggage was, where were ſome women, who waſhed his linen, and did other buſineſs ſuitable to their ſex; and finding her afterwards very proper to manage his houſhold affairs, he gave her a ſort of authority and inſpection over theſe women, and the reſt of his domeſticks, by whom ſhe was extremely beloved for her behaviour towards them, when ſhe inſtructed them in their duty. It happened, that Prince *Menzikoff*, who was the General's Patron, having ſeen her one day, obſerved ſomething very extraordinary in her air and behaviour, and aſking who ſhe was, and in what condition ſhe ſerved him, the General told him the particulars abovementioned. The Prince declaring, that he wanted ſuch a perſon in his family, the General anſwered, that he was too much obliged to his Highneſs to refuſe him any thing, and immediately called for *Catharine*, and told her, that was Prince *Menzikoff*, who had occaſion for a ſervant like herſelf; and that he had too much kindneſs for her, to prevent her receiving ſuch a piece of honour and good fortune. She only anſwered with a profound curteſy, which ſhewed, if not her conſent, at leaſt that it was not in her power to refuſe the offer made to her. In ſhort, Prince *Menzikoff* took her with him, or ſhe went to him the ſame day. He kept her in his ſervice till the year 1703 or 1704, when the Czar ſaw her one day, as he was at dinner with him, and ſpoke to her; and ſhe made ſo great an impreſſion upon his heart, that he at laſt married her.

It will be aſked, perhaps, what became of her young huſband, after the taking of Marienbourg? But this is very uncertain, as the Reader may ſee in Monſieur de la Motraye.

The ſame Writer tells us (19), that the Czarina, by her complaiſance and engaging behaviour, made herſelf miſtreſs of the heart and affection of the Czar; ſhe accompanied him every where, and ſhared with him in all the dangers and fatigues of the war; and had in ſome ſort the government of all his paſſions, and even ſaved the lives of many more perſons, than Monſieur *le Fort* was able to do. She acquired the eſteem of every one, ſoldiers, ſailors, &c. and would often go herſelf, before or after an engagement, followed by ſome of her ſervants, with bottles of ſtrong liquors, and fill out ſeveral glaſſes to give them with her own hand. Some perſons who had been almoſt about the Czar ever ſince the year 1704, aſſured Monſieur *de la Motraye*, that he had a perfect indifference for all other women; and that he never ſhewed the leaſt jealouſy but once, and that was a few weeks before he died, when he looked upon her as the innocent cauſe of it. For having ſuſpected his Chamberlain, who was one of the handſomeſt men of the country, of having ſome preſumptuous deſign upon her honour, becauſe he ſaw him kiſs her hand one day, as he gave her his arm to help her out of her chaiſe; and ſuppoſing, that his ſiſter, who was one of the Maids of Honour, favoured this bold attempt, ſo contrary to the reſpect due to her Majeſty, he went out alone one morning to the monaſtery of St. Alexander Newſky, and left orders to ſeize the Chamberlain and his ſiſter; to hang the firſt, and give the Knout to the other under the gallows, and to baniſh her; and to cut off the Chamberlain's head, and expoſe it on a poſt; which was put in execution in leſs than half an hour after his departure. This was told Monſieur *de la Motraye*, at his arrival at Peterſburg, by perſons who ſaw the execution; and added, that the Czar the next day went with the Empreſs to take the air, and ordered the chaiſe to paſs, both in going and coming, cloſe by the poſt. However, as a proof of his having no ſuſpicion of her virtue and fidelity, he cauſed the Nobility and Clergy, a few days before his death, to renew or confirm the oath, which he had obliged them to take, to acknowledge her as Sovereign of all Ruſſia after his death, as well as whomever ſhe ſhould name to ſucceed her. As ſoon as the Czar died, ſhe recalled the ſiſter of the Chamberlain from her baniſhment, and replaced her about her perſon. She did not forget her benefactors in the midſt of her grandeur, but gave a penſion to Dr. *Gluck* and his family, as ſoon as ſhe had it in her power ſo to do.

(19) p. 137.

[*M*] *At the ſame time purſued his obſervations and political ſtudies.*] He cauſed his Engineers to draw the plan of every city, and make deſigns of all the different mills and machines, that he had not in his country. He inſtructed himſelf in every part of huſbandry, and in all ſorts of trade, wherever he came. He engaged experienced artificers in his ſervice, and ſent them into his dominions. Being at Gottorp, then in the hands of the King of Denmark, he was much delighted with a large globe, in the concave of which the heavens were repreſented, and the

upon which he entered with his Fleet triumphantly into the Haven of Peterſburgh [*N*]. In 1716, he, with his Conſort, paid a viſit to the King of Denmark at Copenhagen, where he ſpent three months [*O*] ; and from thence went to Hamburgh, Hanover, and Wolfenbuttel, and thence to Holland, where he left the Czarina, and went to France in 1617, and on the 19th of June that year viſited the Royal Academy of Sciences at Paris [*P*]. It would be endleſs to enumerate all the different eſtabliſhments, for which the Ruſſians are obliged to him ; but we ſhall mention ſome of the principal in the note [*Q*]. In his laſt ſickneſs, notwithſtanding the moſt exquiſite and continual pains of the ſtrangury,

earth on the outward convexity. It was made after a deſign of *Tycho Brahe*, and is ſo capacious, that twelve perſons may ſit round a table in the inſide, and by turning it about, obſerve the celeſtial motitions. The ſight of this ſo ſtruck the Czar, that he deſired the King of Denmark would make him a preſent of it, and ſent for a frigate from Peterſburg, on purpoſe to carry it thither, where it was placed by ſome Aſtronomers, who were there, in a large houſe, which he had built for that purpoſe (19).

(19) Fontenelle, *ubi ſupra.*

[*N*] *Entered with his fleet triumphantly into the haven of Peterſburg.*] The Author of *The preſent State of Ruſſia ; being the Journal of a foreign Miniſter, who reſided in Ruſſia. Tranſlated from the High Dutch* (20), gives us the following account of this triumph. On the 15th of September, the Czar arrived at Cronſlat, where he ſtayed two days, till the Czarina was brought to bed of a Princeſs ; and on the 20th he approached the fortreſs, with the Ruſſian and Swediſh ſhips, and was ſaluted with 150 guns. Firſt, came three Ruſſian gallies. Secondly, three Swediſh ſcherboats, of four guns each. Thirdly, ſix Swediſh gallies, of fourteen guns each. Fourthly, the Swediſh frigate, with the Rear-Admiral *Oehrenſchield*. Fifthly, a ſcampavie, with the Ruſſian Rear-Admiral, viz. the Czar himſelf, who would never ſuffer himſelf in the fleet to be called or diſtinguiſhed otherwiſe, than by his employment. Sixthly, three Ruſſian ſcampavies full of Ruſſian ſoldiers. Thoſe ſhips having caſt anchor, and the men being landed, they marched through the triumphal arch in the following order. 1. Major-General *Gollowin*, leading a company of the Preobrazinſky guards. 2. Ten pieces of canon, ſixty colours, and three ſtandards, taken by General *Knees Gallizin*, in the engagement near Waſa in Finland, againſt the Swediſh Major-General *Arenfeld*. 3. Two companies of the regiment of Aſtracan. 4. Two hundred Swediſh ſubaltern Sea-Officers, ſoldiers, and ſailors. 5. Two companies of the regiment Preobrazinſky. 6. Fourteen Swediſh Sea-Officers. 7. The flag of the Swediſh Rear-Admiral, carried by four Subalterns. 8. The Swediſh Rear-Admiral Oehrenſchield, in new clothes laced with ſilver, of which the Czar had made him a preſent. 9. The Czar, as Rear-Admiral, in a green ſuit, laced with gold. 10. The remaining companies of the regiment of Preobrazinſky cloſed the proceſſion. The triumphal arch was moſt magnificently adorned, and repreſented divers emblems. Among others was to be ſeen, the Roman eagle ſeizing an elephant, with this inſcription, *Aquila non capit muſcas*, i. e. " The Eagle does not catch Flies." The name of the Swediſh frigate, *the Elephant*, gave the explanation. In this order, the victorious and vanquiſhed proceeded to the fortreſs, where the Vice-Czar *Romadonaſsky* ſitting on a throne, ſurrounded by the whole Senate, cauſed the Czar, as Rear-Admiral, to be called before the Aſſembly, and received at his hands, a relation in writing, of the victory obtained. The ſame being read by Romadonoſsky and the Senators, they took it under deliberation, and propoſed ſeveral queſtions to the Ruſſian Rear-Admiral ; after which they unanimouſly declared him Vice-Admiral of Ruſſia, in conſideration of the moſt faithful ſervice which he had done to his native country ; of which proclamation being made, the whole room reſounded with *Sdraſtwi Vice-Admiral*, i. e. *Health to the Vice-Admiral*. The Czar having returned thanks, went on board his ſloop, on which he hoiſted the flag of Vice-Admiral, and having received the congratulations of the foreign Miniſters, he went to Prince *Menzikoff*'s palace ; where a noble entertainment was prepared. After he roſe from the table, he ſhewed particular marks of eſteem to the Swediſh Rear-Admiral *Oehrenſchield*, and ſaid to all the noble Ruſſians ſtanding about him ; *Here you ſee a brave and faithful ſervant of his Maſter, who has made himſelf worthy of the higheſt reward at his hands, and who ſhall always have my favour as long as he is with me, though he has killed me many a brave Ruſſian. I forgive it you*, (ſaid he, turning to him with a ſmile) *and you may depend upon my good will.* Mr. *Oehrenſchield* having thanked the Czar, anſwered, *However honourably I may have acted with regard to my Maſter, I did but my duty : I ſought death* (he had received ſeven wounds) *but did not meet it ; and it is no ſmall comfort to me, in my misfortune, to be a priſoner of your Majeſty, and to be uſed ſo favourably, and with ſo much diſtinction, by ſo great a Sea-Officer, and now deſervedly Vice-Admiral.*

(20) Printed at Lond. 1723, in two volumes in 8vo.

[*O*] *He, with his Conſort, paid a viſit to the King of Denmark at Copenhagen, where he ſpent three months.*] He viſited there every ſchool of the Univerſity, and all the men of letters in the place. He was ſo regardleſs of ceremony, that it was to him indifferent, whether they waited on him, or he went himſelf to ſee them at their houſes. He went every day in a ſloop, attended with two Engineers, to coaſt the two Kingdoms of Denmark and Sweden ; he ſurveyed all the windings, ſounded every part of the Straits, and afterwards had the whole ſo exactly deſcribed in charts, that not ſo much as the ſmalleſt ſhelf, or bank of ſand, eſcaped his obſervation. And it is a ſure mark of the great reſpect which his allies bore him, that they did not in any manner oppoſe him in his great and aſſiduous labours to make himſelf maſter in every part of uſeful knowledge. He received a yet more glorious teſtimony of their eſteem. England was at that time in alliance with him, as well as Denmark ; and theſe two Powers having joined their fleets to his, gave him the ſupreme command of the whole (21).

(21) Fontinelle, *ubi ſupra.*

[*P*] *Viſited the Royal Academy of Sciences at Paris.*] He was entertained there with the lateſt invented and moſt curious experiments and machines. He was no ſooner returned into his dominions, but he ordered Dr. *Areſkin*, a Scots Gentleman, his firſt Phyſician, to write to the Abbé *Bignon*, and acquaint him with his intentions of becoming a Member of that Academy. And after the Academy had returned him their thanks with all reſpect, and in the moſt grateful manner, for the honour which he did them, he wrote to them a letter with his own hand. Theſe particulars may be ſeen in the *Hiſtory* of that Academy, for the year 1720 (22). The Academy ſent him every year the volume of the Hiſtory, which, as an Academecian, he was intitled to ; and he always accepted of it with pleaſure, as from his brethren (23).

(22) p. 125.

(23) Fontenelle, *ubi ſupra.*

[*Q*] *We ſhall mention ſome of the principal.*] In order to carry the power of a nation to its utmoſt height, it was neceſſary, that the Sovereign ſhould ſtudy his country, both as a Geographer, and a Natural Philoſopher. He was to be perfectly acquainted with all its natural advantages, and to have the art of making uſe of them. He therefore applied himſelf vigorouſly to the theory of thoſe ſciences, that he might the better be able to put them in practice. He would not truſt theſe momentous affairs in the hands of Miniſters, who ſeldom labour ſo aſſiduouſly for the publick good. He would truſt no eyes but his own ; and looked upon voyages of three or four hundred leagues as nothing, when he was to inſtruct himſelf in any uſeful kind of knowledge. He made theſe voyages, attended only by three or four perſons, and with an intrepidity ſufficient alone to keep danger at a diſtance. And indeed, he was ſo thoroughly acquainted with the map of his vaſt Dominions, that he was able, without the leaſt miſtake, to form the greateſt deſigns, that could be founded on the general ſituation of his country, or the particular diſpoſition of any of its parts.

As

gury, he ſpoke of affairs with the utmoſt tranquillity and acuteneſs of judgment. Among other things, when the Senators and Biſhops mentioned the variety of obligations, which the Empire of Ruſſia lay under to him, for reforming abuſes and bad cuſtoms, and introducing uſeful arts and ſciences, he told them, that "he had forgot to reform one of the "moſt important points of all, the adminiſtration of juſtice: that among all the arts "and ſciences, which he had borrowed from the Chriſtian Powers, and in which they "infinitely excelled the Turks, he had conſidered, that the latter as far ſurpaſſed the "former in their adminiſtration of juſtice, ſince law-ſuits in Chriſtendom laſt for years "and even ages together, with an infinite expence, whereas in Turkey they are determined "in a few days, and with very little charge; and all this occaſioned by the tedious and "litigious pleadings of the Lawyers. To remedy this, he determined, that cauſes (as "among the Turks) ſhould be carried at laſt to the tribunal of the Magiſtrate or ordinary Judge; that proofs in writing and witneſſes ſhould be produced, and the characters and behaviour of the latter ſhould be particularly examined, and ſo an impartial "judgment be pronounced; all which would be finiſhed in a few hours. But if the party "condemned by thatCourt, ſhould think himſelf injured, he might appeal from this ſentence "to the Synod; and even after a ſecond judgment againſt him, to the Sovereign himſelf." Thoſe who were preſent approving this ſcheme, he commanded an order to be drawn up, which he ſigned and dated from his bed, and it was ſent immediately to all the Courts of his Empire. This order limits the determination of all cauſes to the term of eleven days; and in conſequence of it, all the ſuits then depending were decided before he cloſed his eyes in death (*c*). He died of the ſtrangury, cauſed by an impoſtume in the neck of his bladder, on the 28th of January 1725, aged fifty three years, and left the world with all the magnanimity of an hero, and the piety of a Chriſtian. As he had declared by proclamation publiſhed three years before his death, that he was at liberty to appoint whomſoever he pleaſed to ſucceed him, he nominated the Czarina, his widow, to be his ſucceſſor, who was thereupon immediately acknowledged Empreſs of Ruſſia by the ſeveral Eſtates thereof. We have a great many diſadvantageous things related of him

(*c*) Monſieur de la Motraye's *Voyages and Travels*, vol. 3. c. 3.

As all Meridians center under the Poles, the French and Chineſe, for inſtance, would be neighbours in the Northern Parts of the Earth, if their dominions extended very far that way. Thus the very Northern ſituation of the Empire of Ruſſia, and its great extent, make it join northwards to the Northern Parts of other Kingdoms, which lye at a vaſt diſtance from it towards the South. The Czar's Dominions border upon a great part of Europe and all Aſia; and he has beſides a conſiderable number of large rivers, which fall into different ſeas; as the Dwina into the White-ſea, which itſelf opens into the Ocean; the Don into the Black-ſea, an arm of the Mediterranean; and the Volga into the Caſpian. He obſerved, that theſe rivers, which hitherto had been of little or no advantage to his ſubjects, would join, as it were, his Dominions to the moſt diſtant countries, if he made a communication between them, either by means of ſeveral ſmall rivers that fall into them, or by digging new canals. He ſet himſelf about executing theſe vaſt deſigns, cauſed all the neceſſary levels to be taken, marked out of all the places, where the canals ſhould be dug, and appointed the number of the ſluices. The communication between the Volkowa, which runs by Peterſburg, and the Volga being finiſhed, it opens a paſſage by water, for eight hundred French leagues together, acroſs all Ruſſia, from Peterſburg to the Caſpian Sea or Perſia. The Czar ſent the Royal Academy of Sciences at Paris the draught of this vaſt communication, of which he was himſelf the chief Engineer. His Dominions towards the Eaſt extend to the Frontiers of China, and almoſt to the Seas of Japan, being a vaſt tract of land for upwards of fifteen hundred French leagues. The Ruſſian Caravans, which traded to China, uſed to take up a whole year in their journey. The Czar ſaw, that this great journey might be ſhortened and made more eaſy, either by the communication of rivers, by other laborious works, or by treaties with ſeveral Tartarian Princes, who might give a free paſſage through their reſpective Dominions; and by theſe means he found the journey would be performed in four months. According to the ſcheme, which he had formed, every thing was to center at Peterſburg, which by its advantageous ſituation ſeemed very well fitted for that purpoſe. This city, which he had founded, and called after his own name, was to him what *Alexandria* was to *Alexander* the Great, its founder; and as that was ſo happily placed, as in thoſe days to divert the current of trade from Tyre, which till then was the firſt city in the world for commerce; ſo in theſe, Peterſburg would draw all nations to its Port, and become the center of the moſt extenſive traffick in the Univerſe. The Czar extended his views ſtill farther. He was deſirous of knowing how his Dominions lay in reſpect of America, whether that bordered upon Tartary, or a paſſage might be found through the North-ſea thither, which would alſo have opened his trade to that new world. Two ſhips ſailed from Archangel upon this diſcovery, but one of them was ſtopped in its courſe by the ice, the other was never heard of more, ſo that in all probability it was loſt. In the beginning of the year 1725, in which he died, he gave orders to an experienced Sea-captain, to build two more ſhips for a ſecond attempt. The Revolution, which happened in Perſia by the revolt of Mahmoud, drew both the Ruſſian and Turkiſh arms to that ſide; and the Czar upon this occaſion not only made himſelf maſter of the city of Derbent, lying Weſtward on the Caſpian Sea, but likewiſe of every thing elſe, which might aſſiſt the views, which he had of enlarging the Ruſſian trade. He ordered a map to be made of that ſea, which is very different from thoſe before publiſhed. Ruſſia abounds in mines, which by the hereditary ſloth and indolence and general want of ſpirit in that nation, were either undiſcovered or neglected. The Czar ſent into Germany for perſons ſkilled in the knowledge of metals, and ſo made the beſt advantage of theſe hidden treaſures. Gold duſt was brought him from the ſhores of the Caſpian ſea, and the moſt remote parts of Siberia; and it is ſaid, that a pound of the latter yielded fourteen ounces of pure gold. Iron is indeed more common, but much more uſeful than gold; and that became common in Ruſſia, and with it all the arts, which do manufacture or make uſe of it.

Other eſtabliſhments, for which the Ruſſians are obliged to him, are thus enumerated by Monſieur Fontenelle.

A body of men conſiſting of one hundred thouſand foot, under as regular diſcipline as any in Europe, and a great number of the officers are already.

A Navy conſiſting of forty ſhips of the Line, and two hundred Gallies.

Fortifications in the beſt method at all towns, which deſerved them. An excellent civil Government in all the great cities, which were before as dangerous in the night, as the moſt unfrequented deſerts.

him in a book juſt publiſhed, ſome of which we ſhall mention in the note [*R*]; but ſhall add here ſome particulars of his character from Monſieur de Fontenelle, who tells us, that in the Czar's opinion, all the pomp and ſtate, which would only have ſurrounded his perſon, were derogatory to his character; and he left to Prince *Menzikoff* to expreſs the greatneſs

An Academy for naval affairs and navigation, where all the Nobility are obliged to ſend ſome of their children.

Colleges at Moſcow, Peterſburg, and Kiof, for languages, polite literature, and mathematicks; and ſchools in the villages, where the children of the peaſants are taught to read and write.

A College of Phyſicians, and a noble diſpenſatory at Moſcow, which furniſhes medicines to the great cities, and to the armies; whereas before there was no Phyſician but the Czar's, and no Apothecary in all his dominions.

Public lectures in Anatomy, a word never ſo much as heard of before in Ruſſia; and what may be looked upon as an excellent perpetual lecture, the cabinet of the celebrated Mr. *Ruyſch*, purchaſed by the Czar, and containing an immenſe collection of the moſt curious, inſtructive, and uncommon preparations.

An Obſervatory erected, not only for the uſe of Aſtronomers to obſerve the Heavens; but deſigned alſo as a repoſitory for all ſorts of curioſities in nature.

A Phyſic-garden, which the Botaniſts, whom he invited thither, were to ſtock, not only with all the plants, which are to be found in all the known parts of Europe, but likewiſe thoſe of the more northern parts, which lye ſtill undiſcovered, as well as thoſe of Aſia, Perſia, and the moſt diſtant coaſts of China.

Printing-houſes, where he has changed their old barbarous, and almoſt unintelligible characters, thro' the great number of abbreviations; and whereby books will become more common, which before, as they were hard to be read, were more rare to be met with, than almoſt any foreign commodity.

Interpreters for all the languages of Europe, and likewiſe for the Latin, the Greek, the Turkiſh, the Calmuck, the Mogul, and the Chineſe.

A Royal Library, compoſed of three very large ones, which he purchaſed in England, Holſtein, and Germany.

When the Czar had thus laid an uſeful and ſolid foundation, he applied himſelf to the fundamental part. He changed the architecture, which was exceſſive ugly and diſagreeable; or, to ſpeak more properly, he firſt introduced that ſcience into his dominions. There appeared in a little time, a number of regular and convenient houſes, with ſome palaces and publick edifices, particularly an Admiralty-office, on which he beſtowed ſo much grandeur and magnificence, becauſe it was not an edifice deſigned for ſhew and oſtentation only. He ſent for a great number of pictures from Italy and France, by which he inſtructed a people in the art of painting, who before knew no more of it, than was to be ſeen in the wretched daubings, which they had of their Saints.

He ſent ſhips laden with merchandiſe to Genoa and Leghorn, which returned freighted with marble and ſtatues. Upon which Pope *Clement* XI. pleaſed with his taſte, preſented him with a fine antique, and he had it brought to Peterſburg by land, not caring to venture ſuch a curioſity by ſea. He made likewiſe a cabinet of medals, a curioſity of but a modern date in thoſe countries.

His views were ſo general and extenſive, that he was once reſolved to ſend the young Ruſſian Ladies to ſome of the principal cities of Germany, to improve themſelves in politeneſs and behaviour; the want of which eclipſed the advantages received from nature. He had obſerved in other nations, how much acquired accompliſhments are capable of improving natural beauty, and how agreeable, even without that, many perſons have by an engaging behaviour made themſelves. But he ſoon became ſenſible of the inconvenience of theſe journies, ſo that he was forced to lay aſide all thoughts of them, and wait till ſuch time as the men, improved in politeneſs and civility, might be able to poliſh the ſofter ſex.

Their Religion, which, continues Monſieur *de Fontenelle*, ſcarce merited the name of Chriſtian, was not forgot in this general change. The Ruſſians, like the reſt of the Greek church, obſerved ſeveral Lents; and they believed, that provided they kept thoſe very ſtrictly, they had ſupply'd the place of every other duty. The worſhip of the Saints was degenerated into a ſhameful ſuperſtition: every man had his own in his houſe, for his immediate protection, and would lend him to a friend, whoſe Saint had not done ſo well by him. Miracles depended wholly on the invention and avarice of the prieſts. The Teachers, who were very illiterate themſelves, could teach their people nothing; a depravation of manners, which will in ſome degree maintain itſelf in ſpite of inſtruction, was here favoured and heightened by ignorance. The Czar ventured to undertake the reformation of ſo many abuſes, which affected his very political intereſts. Their frequent and ſevere faſts were very prejudicial to his troops, and often made them incapable of fighting. His predeceſſors had withdrawn themſelves from the Patriarch of Conſtantinople, and had ſet up one of their own. He aboliſhed this dignity, though pretty much independent on him; and by that means had a greater authority over his church. He made ſeveral judicious and uſeful eccleſiaſtical canons and inſtitutions; and, what is often neglected, he took care to have them put in execution. They began firſt with preaching in the Ruſſian language in Peterſburg. The Czar ventured ſtill greater lengths; he took away part of the revenues of theſe churches and monaſteries, which were too wealthy, leaving only what was neceſſary for their ſubſiſtence, and added the overplus to his own demeſnes. He eſtabliſhed alſo a general Liberty of Conſcience throughout all his dominions. Thus far Monſieur *de Fontenelle*; and Monſieur *de la Motraye* (24) tells us, that in order to effect this reformation of the church, the Czar ſent for the Biſhops and Divines from Novogrod, Kiow, and other places, who had ſtudied in foreign countries, and in ſhort all, whom he thought to be beſt able to adviſe him in that affair. He laid before them the ignorance of the Clergy in general, the ill conduct of the Monks, &c. He joined the Senate to this Aſſembly, in which he preſided himſelf: this ſynod was held for the firſt time in the palace of Peterſburg, in the year 1721; the ſecond time at Moſcow, in 1722; and the third time in the new Monaſtery of St. *Alexander Newſky*, near Peterſburg. He ordered the eſtabliſhment and convocation of it to be publiſhed in the following manner: *By the Grace, Mercy, and Love of God towards Mankind, and by the Command of the moſt wiſe, moſt ſerene, and moſt powerful* Peter the Great, *Emperor and Sovereign of all the Ruſſia's, &c. is ſettled, concluded and eſtabliſhed, in the holy orthodox church of Ruſſia, a ſpiritual Synod for the Regulation of ſpiritual Affairs, with the Advice and Conſent of the Ruſſian Clergy, and of the Senate, in the Metropolitan City of Peterſburg, &c.* All the Members of this Synod obliged themſelves, by ſeveral moſt ſolemn oaths, ſwearing by Almighty God on the moſt holy Evangeliſts, to declare their moſt ſincere ſentiments, as dictated by their own hearts, according to the beſt of their knowledge and underſtanding in the Scripture, and to conform to the regulations, which ſhould there be made.

(24) Vol. 3. c. 6.

[*R*] *We have a great many diſadvantageous things related of him in a book juſt publiſhed; ſome of which we ſhall mention in the note.*] The book is that of Mr. *Philip John Van Strahlenberg*, quoted above in the firſt remark. He was a Swediſh Officer, and had been thirteen years captive in the Czar's Dominions. In his *ſixth Chapter* he ſums up what has been ſaid by the admirers of the Czar in vindication or commendation of the ſeveral ſteps of his conduct; and then what has been alledged in oppoſition thereto by thoſe, who have diſapproved of it, and inſiſt upon its being tyrannical, unjuſt, and imprudent. Here is an abſtract of what he puts into the mouths of thoſe, who extol the Czar, and thoſe who condemn him. It

greatneſs of the Sovereign by the magnificence of the favourite. He had turned over to that Prince all external ſplendor, reſerving to himſelf only the moſt laborious functions; in which he was ſo aſſiduous as to go in perſon to all fires, which are very frequent in Ruſſia, and for the moſt part make dreadful havock, the greateſt part of the houſes being built of timber. He had eſtabliſhed ſeveral officers to aſſiſt upon theſe occaſions; and to ſet an example to the reſt he himſelf took one of thoſe poſts; and fearleſs of danger would climb to the tops of ſuch houſes as were on fire; expoſing his perſon, and performing

It is ſaid by the former, that he was a Prince extremely circumſpect in every thing he undertook. His great courage and intrepidity, whereby from his infancy he overcame all his enemies at home and abroad, was evident to the whole world. He formed an army according to the manner of the moſt polite and experienced nations; he fitted out fleets in all the four ſeas, which border upon Ruſſia; and left a force behind him, not only ſufficient for the defence of his country, but capable of ſuccouring his friends and allies. He cauſed many ſtrong fortreſſes to be raiſed after the beſt plans, and furniſhed them with good artillery and garriſons; and for the ſecurity of his fleets, made very convenient harbours. He introduced arts and ſciences into his Dominions; and freed religion from many ſuperſtitious abuſes. His inclination to juſtice was viſible by the laws and inſtitutions he made, in framing of which he was ſo diligent, that he ſeldom allowed himſelf above four hours ſleep. He made many extracts with his own hands from the beſt laws of Europe, read them often, or cauſed them to be read, and to be tranſlated into the Ruſſian tongue, the better to judge of the difference, and to proceed accordingly. He accuſtomed himſelf to walk every day through the ſtreets, in order that ſuch of his ſubjects as were oppreſſed might have an opportunity of preſenting their petitions, which he ever graciouſly received, and was no leſs ready in redreſſing their wrongs. For the encouragement of trade, which flouriſhed more in his reign than in former times, he built new and large cities. And for the more convenient tranſportation of merchandize he cauſed canals to be cut, and a direct road to be made between the cities of Moſcow and Peterſburg. By his great care in ſearching for mines, and encouraging ſeveral manufactures, of which Ruſſia had formerly little or no knowledge, he raiſed his revenues exceedingly, and was thereby enabled duly to pay his Miniſters, Houſhold, and Army. He was generous in rewarding all his faithful ſervants, many of whom he raiſed from mean extraction to grandeur and riches. On the other, he puniſhed his treacherous and diſloyal ſubjects without any reſpect of perſons. He had an averſion to ſuch as were negligent, and would not apply to and qualify themſelves for uſeful employments. Inſtances of which were his firſt Conſort, his own ſon, and ſiſters. His integrity and fidelity to his friends and allies appeared by his inviolable attachment to the King and Republick of Poland: he would never hearken to any projects detrimental to that Commonwealth. And when propoſals were laid before him in favour of the Duke of Holſtein, his ſon-in-law, with regard to the Crown of Sweden, he is reported to have anſwered, *I love my children, and am obliged to aſſiſt them. But in this caſe I muſt have more reſpect to my former engagements, than to my preſent intereſts.* As to his perſonal diſpoſition, he was beneficent, friendly, laborious, and without pride. He would accept of invitations to dine and ſup with his ſubjects, and be ſatisfied with their uſual table. He would ſpeak to high and low, and aſſiſt even the meaneſt to the utmoſt of his power. He had no regard for the pomp of a Court, and hated ſplendid apparel. He was ſo laborious, that he would frequently viſit his docks and yards, where ſhips were building; and with his own hands perform the work of a common ſhip-wright. He was an excellent turner; and ſo well ſkilled in naval, civil, and military architecture, and gunnery, that he ſurpaſſed many profeſſed maſters. His laſt regulation of the ſucceſſion was a noble inſtance of his concern for the welfare of his people; for he thereby aboliſhed the right of Primogeniture, to the end that the eldeſt Princes might not, by thinking themſelves inconteſtably ſecure of ſucceeding, nouriſh too early a pride, and neglecting to improve themſelves by ſtudy and application, endanger the ſafety of the whole Empire by their ill behaviour. Let us now turn the reverſe of this picture, and ſee what a figure is there repreſented. The enemies of the Czar's character alledge in general, "that whilſt his flatterers "are fondly pleaſing themſelves with the acquiſitions "and extenſion of the borders of Ruſſia, they turn "away their eyes from the far greater ruin of the "Empire within." And here they reckon as one cauſe of theſe evils, "the irregular courſe of life "and debaucheries, into which the Czar was "plunged into in his moſt early years, not only to the "great detriment of the Empire, but the ſhortening "of his own days." The ſteps, by which he was led into theſe wicked courſes, are here ſhewn, and the miſchievous conſequences of them are painted in ſtrong colours. "The eldeſt Senators, and the great "Officers of the Crown remonſtrated to him how "prejudicial they muſt needs be to his honour, and "his health, and the welfare of his Empire. But "this had no other effect than to irritate him againſt "his faithful adviſers, and drive him to greater exceſſes. That theſe might be the better concealed, "he reſided at Preabraſenſkie, at ſome diſtance from "his uſual Court; where he ſuffered none to approach him without an expreſs permiſſion, except "his favourites and ſoldiers. All this while he was "increaſing the number of his forces. He admitted "the loweſt of his people to his table and familiarity; which increaſed their inſolence to ſuch a degree, that they even inſulted the Nobility. He "promoted the moſt effectual methods of corrupting "the morals of his ſubjects, and particularly by encouraging a riotous celebration of what they call "the *Slavlenie*. This is a cuſtom in Ruſſia, where "the Prieſts at Chriſtmas time go from houſe to houſe "in their reſpective Pariſhes, ſinging hymns at the "birth of Chriſt, and congratulating the houſekeepers on the occaſion of the Feſtival, who are "wont to treat them in return, and make them preſents, according to their abilities. Some Noblemen and Citizens uſed to obſerve this ſacred ſeaſon "in ſomewhat a like manner, viſiting, feaſting, and "making preſents to one another. The Czar took "it into his head to do the ſame. At firſt he was "accompanied only by his own domeſticks, among "whom his tutor *Satow* repreſented the Prieſt as "Director; and they went into ſuch houſes only, "where they knew they ſhould be welcome. But "this matter was ſoon carried to a greater length; "for the Czar perſuaded ſome Senators and other "perſons of diſtinction to go with him; and thoſe "in their turn invited him to their houſes, and entertained him. How innocent ſoever theſe practices might be thought at firſt, they ſoon degenerated into great indecencies, and occaſioned ſome "reflections upon the Czar's behaviour. To ſtifle "theſe, he endeavoured to engage in his frolicks as "many as he could of the Grandees; he therefore "invited all his Courtiers, Miniſters of State, and "Officers of the army, to bear a part in them. This "company being too noble to be headed by a common Prieſt, (which was the character *Satow* repreſented) it was thought proper to give him a name "of more diſtinction, and to dignify the aſſembly "by ſome extraordinary title. *Satow* was thereupon "ſtyled the *Patriarch of Bacchus*; and under him "were appointed twelve Bacchanalian Archiepiſcopal "Aſſiſtants, who had their Prieſts and Deacons, "Clerks, *&c.* ſubject to them; and the whole fraternity bore the name of *Bacchus's Eccleſiaſtical "State*. The Czar's jeſters were made maſters of "the Ceremonies and Treaſurers; bottles were uſed "inſtead of cenſers; wine and brandy ſupplied the "place of holy water; and alms were diſtributed "with cudgels, *&c.* This train went from houſe to

"houſe,

ing ſuch actions, which we ſhould admire in the moſt ſubaltern Officers. He was not free from a certain roughneſs and harſhneſs of temper natural to his whole nation, and which the abſolute power of their Monarch was not likely to ſoften. He had indeed cured himſelf of the exceſs of drinking, a vice common in Ruſſia. The Czarina knew how to ſoften his anger, and mitigate his ſeverity. He had this uncommon happineſs, that the dangerous paſſion of love, that paſſion, which has ſullied the reputation of ſo many great men, was ſubſervient to the making him yet greater. He publiſhed the unfortunate

" houſe, in ſledges, twelve or twenty in each: the " Maſters of the Ceremonies ranked them in order, " with great clubs in their hands; and if any one " committed a fault, eſpecially if he was ſuſpected " of being a falſe brother, he received the ſacerdotal " bleſſing with the club's end. But if Prieſts or " Deacons were guilty of any errors, their puniſh- " ment was to drink off a quart of malt-ſpirits. " Thus theſe proceſſions cauſed many ſober people to " contract an habit of drunkenneſs, and ſome, who " were treated in the above-mentioned manner, died " the ſame night, almoſt before they could reach their " own habitations. The Czar likewiſe put the inha- " bitants of Moſcow under ſuch apprehenſions, that no " body durſt ſpeak any thing againſt him or his com- " panions. It was made capital to caſt any reflections " upon the Czar. . . . . Prince *Ramodamowſki*, who " was Preſident of an Inquiſition, appointed to en- " quire into ſuch offences, with the title of *Arch-* " *Emperor*, was a man of a cruel diſpoſition and " ſtrong conſtitution; of the latter he gave proofs by " drinking quarts of brandy, as he did of the former " by hanging, beheading, and torturing ſeveral in- " nocent perſons, without examination. And when " he was aſked why he tortured ſuch or ſuch an one, " his anſwer was, that he muſt needs be guilty, or " he would not have been impriſoned. The Czar " coming once when he had juſt tortured a man in " this manner, and aſking him what was his crime, " he gave the ſame anſwer; and upon examination of " the caſe the Czar found the unhappy wretch guilty " of nothing, which deſerved any ſuch treatment, and " only accuſed through the malice of ſome neigh- " bours, who pretended that he had ſlandered the " Czar. Yet the edict, upon which theſe vile pro- " ceedings were founded, was not reverſed, but ra- " ther ſtrengthened and confirmed. This *Slavlenie* " was continued to the Czar's death. However, for " a very weighty reaſon, which ſhould rather have " been a motive for its intire abolition, the titles of " the officers relating to it were changed; *Satow* " had that of *Arch-Pope*, his twelve Biſhops that of " Cardinals. This ſo offended all the Roman Catholic " Princes, and in particular the Emperor of Ger- " many, and the Electors, by the application of the " title of *Arch-Emperor*, that if they had not been " reſtrained by the ſituation of their affairs they " might have expreſſed their reſentments in a way " prejudical to Ruſſia."

(25) For Dec. 1737, Art. 41. p. 413.

The Author of the *Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned* (25), obſerves, that *if this indeed were a faithful repreſentation of* Peter *the* Great's *conduct, it would vaſtly degrade our idea of him. He appears here in the character of a buffoon, rather than a hero, and looks liker a tyrant than a father of his country. But it would be perhaps an injuſtice to the merit of that illuſtrious perſon, to regard it in any other light than that of calumny and detraction. It is the voice of envy and revenge, and proceeds, it may be, from thoſe only, who could not endure his glory, or who hated to be civilized; who were ſottiſh enough to imagine, that the diſgrace and ruin of a people muſt be the conſequence of deviating from the cuſtoms, or even the barbarity of their forefathers.*

Thoſe who are ſo liberal of their reproaches upon the Prince, are no leſs free in ſcandalizing his Miniſters and ſervants. They ſay, " that the Nobi- " lity, becoming diſaffected and alienated from the " Czar on account of his irregularities, abſented them- " ſelves from the Court. This gave the favourites " an opportunity of obtaining the high poſts, and " raiſing the fortunes of their families and relations. " Theſe minions were all wild and extravagant " youths. They begged the greateſt and moſt im- " portant Offices for their friends and dependents, " from whom, however, they expected a retaliation; " and finding this method very profitable, they pro- " ceeded to ſell the Governments and Waiwodſhips " to the higheſt bidders; the effect of which was a " general rapine and oppreſſion. The frequent com- " plaints of the injured either reached not the ears of " the Czar, or he, being prepoſſeſſed by the ſpecious " pretences of thoſe who cauſed them, was deaf, or re- " jected them as groundleſs. This encouraged ſtill " greater encroachments, and emboldened thoſe har- " pies to be more rapacious." Beſides the perſonal ill conduct of the Czar, and the villany of his confidents and upſtart Miniſters, ſeveral ſteps of his adminiſtration are charged as diſhonourable and injurious to the Empire. Such were " his obliging all the No- " blemen under thirty, to be foot-ſoldiers, dragoons, " or ſailors. His raiſing, on the other hand, the ve- " ry dregs of the people, to the moſt honourable " and important Offices. His adopting the Turkiſh " method, of ſuffering his Grandees to exhauſt the " populace, and then making them refund their rob- " beries into the royal treaſury. His ſelling the Go- " vernments of the Provinces at exceſſive rates, there- " by forcing the buyers to pillage the inhabitants. " And accordingly, as it is here ſet forth, they no " ſooner took poſſeſſion of their poſts, than they in- " vented many new ſtratagems to impoveriſh the " country, and fill their own coffers. Among ſeve- " ral, the following was one: they ſent the Commiſ- " ſioners, Clerks, &c. to receive the contributions, " at ſuch time as they knew the peaſants had moſt " buſineſs in the field. Theſe poor wretches were " then obliged to ſell their cattle and corn for half " the value, in order to ſatisfy theſe Cormorants, " or make preſents to the Commiſſioners for a little " reſpite of payment. This frequently forced them " to ſell the poor remains of their cattle, and to fly " from their houſe and home." It would be tedious to recite all the articles alledged in defamation of the Czar, but to thoſe already mentioned his enemies add: " The obliging the Nobility to abſent themſelves " from their eſtates, whereby they were reduced to " ruin, their Stewards enabled to defraud them of " great part of their revenues, and proviſions render- " ed ſo ſcarce and dear, as to neceſſitate an increaſe " of taxes. The Czar's endeavouring by all means " to render himſelf abſolute, and to degrade the Se- " nate. His miſtruſting and diſcarding from his " confidence, perſons of diſtinction and ſenſe, and " placing his truſt in mean and ignorant creatures. " His altering the cuſtom of his predeceſſors, who " were uſed to admit the young Lords and Gentry to " their levee, where by converſing with wiſe and " prudent men, they learnt wiſdom and virtue; and " introducing into his Court, all the arts of modern " luxury. His obliging the youth to be ſent to " Moſcow, and from thence to travel into foreign " countries; where no due care was taken to reſtrain " them from impiety and lewdneſs. His forcing " the ſons of the beſt families to do the duties of ſol- " diers and common ſailors, to the corruption of " their morals and behaviour. The tranſporting of " the trade of the Empire from Archangel to Peterſ- " burg. The promoting of monopolies, to the great " detriment of commerce. The aboliſhing of the " old, and enacting of new laws, which cauſed ſuch " a confuſion among the Judges, that they were at a " loſs in a multitude of inſtances how to decree; " and ſubjected many to confiſcation, and even capi- " tal puniſhments, for violating the ſtatutes, which " they underſtood not the meaning of. The chang- " ing of the royal reſidence, from the centre of his " dominions, to one of the extremities of it; from " whence many and great inconveniences enſued, and " a prodigious expence accrued to the publick. His " undertaking

unfortunate Hiſtory of Prince *Alexei* his ſon, together with the original papers relating to it [S] ; and his readineſs to expoſe to the whole world his conduct in this affair ought to be a proof, that he had nothing to reproach his conſcience with ; and ſome remarkable inſtances of his clemency towards perſons leſs dear to him, ſhould convince us, that his ſeverity towards his ſon was no more than neceſſary. He perfectly knew the honour due to merit, and that the reſpect he ſhewed it, was the only way to introduce it and make it flouriſh in his Dominions. He was not ſatisfied with giving teſtimonies of his beneficent temper, and ſettling penſions on perſons of merit, favours, which cannot be diſpenſed with, and are of abſolute neceſſity in the purſuit of the deſigns he had formed ; but he gave other marks of his eſteem, and thoſe of a ſtill more engaging nature, ſometimes after the very death of the perſons. He buried Dr. Areſkine, his chief Phyſician, with great pomp, and aſſiſted at the funeral with a lighted torch in his hand. He paid the ſame honour to two Engliſh Gentlemen, one of whom had been Rear-Admiral of his Fleet, and the other his Interpreter. He compoſed ſeveral pieces upon naval affairs ; and his name will increaſe the ſhort catalogue of thoſe Sovereigns, who have honoured the publick with their writings. He uſed to amuſe himſelf with turning, and preſented ſome pieces of his work to the Emperor of China. The diverſions, which he took with his Court, as ſome have deſcribed them, had a tincture of the antient Ruſſian ruſticity ; but he was contented with giving ſome relaxation to the mind, and could ſpare but few moments to the refinement of his pleaſures. There is related a very remarkable

" undertaking ſeveral pernicious enterprizes, which " are enumerated. And his adopting and inforcing " ſtrange cuſtoms and faſhions, which occaſioned di- " vers inſurrections and rebellions." Theſe, Mr. *Strahlenberg* ſays, are the different opinions and reaſonings, which he heard in Moſcow, from Ruſſian Vaſſals of credit and reputation, on both ſides, concerning the life and reign of the Czar ; and he declares, that he has exactly reported them, that impartial Hiſtorians may, for the future, ſeparate the good from the bad, and judge rightly of the atchievements of this great Monarch. After our Author's return from his captivity, he ſhewed theſe accounts to ſome Ruſſian Noblemen, and deſired their opinion of them ; upon which one of them communicated to him ſeveral remarks, eſpecially on thoſe paſſages, which are in derogation of the Czar's character ; ſome of which he confirms, others he mitigates and excuſes ; from ſome he vindicates the Czar, transferring the cenſure upon his Miniſters ; and with reſpect to others, he juſtifies his condnct.

[S] *He publiſhed the unfortunate Hiſtory of Prince* Alexei *his ſon, together with the original papers relating to it.*] The Reader may ſee them in the *ſecond volume* of the *Preſent State of Ruſſia: tranſlated from the High Dutch*, and printed at London 1722, in 8vo, in which they are publiſhed under the following title : *A manifeſto of the criminal Proceſs of the Czarewitz* Alexei Petrowitz, *judged and publiſhed at St. Peterſburg, the 25th day of June*, 1718, *O. S. tranſlated from the Ruſſian original, and printed by Order of his Czariſh Majeſty at the Hague, by John van Duren, Bookſeller.* MDCCXVIII. *Now done into Engliſh from the above French tranſlation.* In the firſt volume of the work cited above, we are told (27), that the Aſſembly of the Clergy having declared their opinion in writing, that the Czarewitz had deſerved death, and the Court of ſecular Judges eſtabliſhed by the Czar, for examining and judging this cauſe, having pronounced a ſentence, condemning the Czarewitz to death, a new ſeſſions was held on the 6th of July in the morning, and the Czarewitz brought out of the fortreſs into the court, under the guard of four under Officers, where he was obliged to repeat the confeſſion of his crimes, and to hear the ſentence of death, ſigned by the ſecular Judges, read to him ; after which he was ſent back into cuſtody. The next day, being Thurſday, the 7th of July, early in the morning, the news was brought to the Czar, that the violent paſſions of the mind, and the terrors of death, had thrown the Czarewitz into an apoplectick fit. About noon another meſſenger brought advice, that the Prince was in great danger of his life ; whereupon the Czar ſent for the principal men of his Court, and cauſed them to ſtay till he was informed by a third meſſenger, that the Prince being paſt hopes, could not out-live the evening, and that he was extremely deſirous to ſee his father. Then the Czar, attended by the company abovementioned, went to ſee his dying ſon, who, at the ſight of his father, burſt into tears, and, with his hands folded, ſpoke to him to this effect : " That he had grievouſly and " heinouſly offended the Majeſty of God Almighty, " and of the Czar ; that he hoped not to recover " of his indiſpoſition, and even if he ſhould, yet " he was unworthy of life : therefore he begged his " Majeſty, for God's ſake, only to take from him " the curſe he had laid upon him at Moſcow ; to " forgive him all his heavy crimes ; to impart to " him his paternal bleſſing, and cauſe prayers to be " put up for his ſoul." During theſe moving words, the Czar and the whole company almoſt melted away in tears. His Majeſty returned a pathetick anſwer, and repreſented to him in a few words, all the offences he had committed againſt him, and then gave him his forgiveneſs and bleſſings. After which they parted with abundance of tears and lamentations on both ſides. At five in the evening came a fourth meſſenger, being M. *Oczakoff*, Major of the guards, to acquaint the Czar, that the *Czarewitz* was extremely deſirous once more to ſee his father. The Czar at firſt was unwilling to comply with his ſon's requeſt ; but was at laſt perſuaded by the company, who repreſented to his Majeſty, how hard it would be to deny that comfort to a ſon, who, being on the point of death, might probably be tortured by the ſtings of a guilty conſcience. But when his Majeſty had juſt ſtept into his ſloop to go over to the fortreſs, a fifth meſſenger brought the news, that the Prince was already expired. Mr. *Strahlenburg* having told us (28), that the Czarewitz, together with his mother, and his father's half-ſiſter Mary, had conſpired againſt the Czar in 1717, obſerves, that " thoſe " perſons, who ſecretly favoured the Prince, judged " more moderately of this conſpiracy, and will not " allow the blame to be wholly on his ſide ; but " ſay, 1. That his father had been the cauſe of his " bad education ; Prince *Menzikoff* having been his " Tutor, whoſe extraction, education, and qualities, " being well known, it was eaſy to judge what me- " thods he could uſe for his education, who was " himſelf but of a mean genius. Beſides *Menzikoff*, " ſay they, did not viſit the Prince above twice or " thrice a year ; and whenever he reproved him for " any thing, it was in very harſh and unbecoming " language. As an inſtance of which they report, " that he once told the Prince to his face, *Thou* " *muſt not expect the Crown ; for I am as near to it as* " *thou* (29) ; and more of the like kinds of expreſ- " ſions ; which the Prince took ſo to heart, that " he loſt all taſte of applying himſelf to any thing, " which could be beneficial to him. The Prince " was obliged to reſide conſtantly at Preabrakenſkie, " where he had no converſation but that of common " people and Prieſts, who had been ſo indiſcreet as " to talk with him of the new cuſtoms introduced by " his Father, as the ruin of his country, and which " ſoon or late ought to be aboliſhed, His Father " likewiſe

(27) p. 228.

(28) *Hiſtorico-Geographical Deſcription, &c.* c. 3. p. 265. Eng. tranſlat.

(29) The Ruſſians in their language ſpeak familiarly in the ſecond perſon, as they do in the Latin.

markable particular concerning his dread of water, when he was young [*T*]. We ſhall cloſe this article with an Epigram on him [*U*], written by an ingenious Gentleman *.

* William Duncombe, Eſq; to whom we are obliged for the communication of it.

" likewiſe never ſpoke in a friendly manner to him ;
" but, when the Prince came to viſit him, uſed him
" more like a ſtranger than a ſon. All which contri-
" buted to his puſillanimity, inſomuch that he avoid-
" ed every opportunity of ſeeing his father. Beſides
" theſe circumſtances, he had not the beſt Counſellors
" about him ; but on the contrary, ſuch as *Kikin*,
" Archbiſhop of Roſcow, *Bojar Glelow*, *Zarewitſch*
" of Siberia, and others, who were of opinion, that
" he would, ſoon or late, come to the Crown, not-
" withſtanding theſe ill appearances."

[*T*] *A remarkable particular concerning his dread of water, when he was young.*] Mr. *Strahlenberg* tells us (30), that when the Czar was about five years of age, his mother went with him in a coach in the ſpring-ſeaſon, and paſſing over a damm, where there was a waterfall or cataract, which made a great noiſe, and he lying in his mother's lap aſleep, he was ſo frightened by the ruſhing of the water, that it brought a fever upon him. And though he ſoon recovered this, yet he retained ſuch a dread of water, that he could never bear to ſee any ſtanding water, much leſs to hear any running water, without the greateſt uneaſineſs. This continuing till he was fourteen years of age, was a great grief to his mother, as well as his brother *Iwan*, who feared it would be a great prejudice to him, when, ſoon or late, he ſhould come to the Crown. But Prince *Boris Gallizin*, who was his chief Governor, happily thought of a method of curing it. He perſuaded his pupil, it being fine weather, to go with him into the country, to a hunting-match, which he had appointed there; but the young Czar did not know, that there was a brook near the place. After a little diverſion in hunting, *Gallizin* ſaid, it is very hot weather ; I wiſh there was a brook in the neighbourhood, I would go in, and bathe. The young Prince replied, What ? will you kill yourſelf ? *Boris* anſwered, I have frequently bathed with your late father ; and yet I am alive ſtill ; adding, that it was very wholeſom to bathe in hot weather. The young Czar was ſurprized, and ſaid, that he had heard, that people were frequently drowned. *Boris* anſwered, How can a man be drowned, when the water is not deeper than his knees ? If it pleaſe your Majeſty, I will ſend ſomebody to find out a brook, and you ſhall ſee, that it is poſſible to bathe without drowning. Accordingly he ſent a Gentleman of the Bed-Chamber, who being returned, ſaid, that not far from thence there was a brook. The Czar went thither, but approached with fear and trembling, and ſtopped his horſe at a good diſtance from the place. *Boris* ſent ſome men thither, and ordered them to croſs the water forwards and backwards, and then to return, to ſhew themſelves, that they were alive. After this the Czar ventured to ride nearer. Then *Gallizin* with his horſe croſſed the water himſelf, and ordered ſome of his people to alight from their horſes, and go barefooted through the water, which the Czar admired at, and at laſt had the courage to go through it himſelf with his horſe, to the great admiration of thoſe, who were preſent. After this cure, he returned to his palace well pleaſed, and told it to his mother, and his brother *Iwan*, who hardly could believe it ſo great was their joy. Some days after, Czar *Iwan*, went with his brother *Peter*, to a ſummer palace called Izmælowa, where there are a great many fiſh-ponds ; and after they had diverted themſelves in the garden, he ordered ſome of his ſervants to bathe in a pond, and they would look on. But Czar *Peter* forbid it. However, Czar *Iwan* perſuaded him at length to conſent. The young men being very merry in the water, it pleaſed Czar *Peter* ſo well, that he had a mind to try it himſelf ; to which Czar *Iwan* encouraged him ; and by that means he got rid at once of all the fear of water, with which he had been before poſſeſſed.

(30) Chap. 6. p. 273. Engliſh tranſlation.

[*U*] *An Epigram on him.*] It is as follows.

" T' adorn with arts a rough barbarian race,
" And poliſh them with ev'ry manly grace ;
" To chace the ſhades of ignorance profound,
" And ſpread the beams of knowledge all around ;
" To brighten and exalt the human ſoul,
" And ſtill conſult the welfare of the whole ;
" If theſe be acts more worthy of applauſe,
" Than with wild havock, in ambition's cauſe,
" To conquer Kingdoms, to lay waſte and burn,
" And peaceful States with reſtleſs rage o'erturn,
" Then Ruſſian's Czar with greater glory reign'd,
" Than was by Philip's ſon, or Cæſar gain'd.
" March 1724."

This Epigram was thus tranſlated into Latin by Mr. Lewis Duncombe, the Author's Nephew, a youth of very promiſing parts, who died of the ſmall pox at Merton College, Oxford, in the year 1730, Ætat. 19.

Si ſit nobilius ſævam & ſine pectore gentem
Artibus inſtruere, ingenuo emollireque Cultu ;
Altaſq; Erroris longè de mentibus umbras
Pellere, doctrinæq; hilarem undiq; ſpargere lucem ;
Omnimodis ſtudiis animamq; polire ſagacem,
Inque ſalutem hominum totis contendere nervis ;
Quam Clade infandâ vacuum migrare per orbem,
Urbes vaſtare innocuas, & corde tumenti
Culmina celſa Deûm atque domos involvere flammis ;
Imperium Petrus majori laude tenebat,
Cæſare quam parta eſt, vel forti prole Philippi. T.

PETIT (JOHN), Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of Paris towards the beginning of the 15th century, gained a great reputation by his eloquence, and by his learning : but he miſapplied his talents ſometimes to defend bad cauſes. He pleaded for the Univerſity of Paris before the King's Council in the year 1406 (*a*). It was in order to prove, that Cardinal de Chalant, Pope Benedictus's Legate, complained, without reaſon, of thoſe who withdrew from the obedience of that Pope ; and *he moved that that* withdrawing *might be for the future kept and executed . . . . and that the Gallican Church might be no longer ſubject to the exactions unjuſtly introduced by the Court of Rome.* The King's Council referred that affair to the Parliament. The cauſe was pleaded there in the Great Chamber the 7th of June of that ſame year (*b*). John Petit harangued there as much as he liſted ; his diſcourſe was long, and as ſtrong as could be wiſhed. The Parliament gave no ſentence then, but was obliged ſome time after, to paſs a decree which favoured the Univerſity's pretenſions (*c*). John Petit was of the famous Embaſſy which France ſent into Italy for ſuppreſſing the Schiſm ; and he harangued at Rome July the 7th, 1407 (*d*). Thus far all is well ; we ſee him exert his eloquence in lawful cauſes ; but we ſhall ſoon ſee the ill uſe he made of it. The Duke of Burgundy having cauſed the Duke of Orleans, the King's only brother, to be aſſaſſinated, was bold enough to own that attempt, though a moſt horrid crime in all its circumſtances [*A*]. He entered Paris as it were in

(*a*) *Hiſtoire de Charles* VII. by a Monk of St. Denys, tranſlated into French by Monſieur le Laboureur, Liv. 26. chap. 2. p. 543.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 544.

(*c*) Ibid. chap. 3. p. 547.

(*d*) Ibid. Liv. 27. p. 606.

[*A*] *A moſt horrid crime in all its circumſtances.*] I have mentioned it in that Duke's article (1), but without hinting a particular, which prodigiouſly aggravates the heinouſneſs of that crime. The Monk of St Denys,

(1) The art. of BURGUNDY (John) rem. [*B*].

in triumph, and aſked audience, in order to prove that he had juſt reaſons to get the Duke of Orleans murthered (*e*). He choſe for his Council our John Petit, a baſe and mercenary ſoul, who would do any thing for money [*B*]; he maintained, March the 8th, 1408, in the great Hall of the Royal Palace of St. Paul, that the murther of that Duke was lawful (*f*). His plea was publiſhed (*g*). The Duke of Orleans's reputation was torn in pieces there with more fury, than his corps had been by the murtherers. The Duke's widow got that plea refuted by the Abbot of St. Denys, who pleaded for her, and for the deceaſed's reputation with a great deal of eloquence, before the King's Council, September the 11th, 1408 (*h*). The doctrine of the Duke of Burgundy's Orator was ſo abominable, and ſo proper to create all manner of diſorders in the State, that the Biſhop of

(*e*) *Hiſt. de Charles* VI. by a Monk of St. Denys, tranſlated by la Laboureur, Liv. 27. chap. 27. p. 631.

(*f*) Ibidem.

(*g*) You will meet with the ſubſtance of it in the Monk of St. Denys, Liv. 27. ch. 27. and you will find it at length in Monſtrelet, Liv. 1. ch 38, 39.

(*h*) *Hiſt. de Charles* VI. *traduite par le Laboureur*, Liv. 28. chap. 10. p. 660, 661.

Denys, who wrote the Hiſtory of Charles VI. which Monſieur Le Laboureur has tranſlated into French, aſſerts, that as ſoon as the Princes of the Blood heard that the Duke of Burgandy had cauſed the Duke of Orleans to be aſſaſſinated, they *abhorred ſo execrable a perfidiouſneſs*, and *wiſhed the Author of it already in the eternal torments of Hell, which ſo abominable a crime deſerved. They were*, adds he, *ſo much the more ſhocked at the Burgundian's baſeneſs and perfidiouſneſs, that it was not long ſince he was not only reconciled with the Duke of Orleans, but had alſo entered into a correſpondence of brotherly love with him. They had but lately confirmed it both by letters, and upon oath, and had even called God himſelf to witneſs, and taken the ſacrament together. There ſeemed to be a very good underſtanding between them in the conduct of the war, of which they had the management: they had vindicated each other's reputation in the bad ſucceſſes they met with, one would have thought their intereſt was the ſame: and as a greater token of union and friendſhip, the Duke of Burgundy knowing that his couſin the Duke of Orleans was out of order, had been to viſit him with all the marks, I do not ſay of civility, but of friendſhip; he even ſuffered himſelf to be prevailed to go and dine with him the next day, which was a Sunday. The other Princes of the Blood, knowing this, could not but conceive a very great indignation at ſuch an horrid proceeding, ſo that they would not hear his excuſes, and retired all in tears from the King's Council, and the next day, as the Duke of Burgundy was going to the Parliament houſe, they gave orders not to let him in* (2). The Council for the widow preſſed all thoſe circumſtances home (3). Obſerve here how well human nature knows to reconcile together in the ſame mind all the meanneſs and baſeneſs of hypocriſy, with the moſt inſolent and haughty audaciouſneſs. There never was a Prince more proud nor more couragious than John Duke of Burgundy; he was ſirnamed *the fearleſs (ſans peur)*, and yet what deceitfulneſs, and what diſſimulation do we not obſerve in his whole conduct? here follows an inſtance of it. *He affected to be afflicted as much as any other, he went into mourning afterwards, like all the Princes, and was not aſhamed to be preſent with them at the funeral ſolemnity which was celebrated in the Church of the Celeſtines, where this Duke in his life-time had ordered his corps to be buried* (4). He did not pull off the maſk, but when he ſaw the King's Council was going to reſolve to put Robert de Cani (5) in priſon, who was ſuſpected of that murther (6).

(2) *Hiſt. de Charles* VI. *traduite en Francoiſe par Mr. le Laboureur*, Liv. 27. chap. 28. p. 627.

(3) Ibid. Liv. 28. chap. 10. p. 666.

(4) Ibidem, Liv. 27. ch. 22. p. 625.

(5) Ibidem, ch. 23. p. 626.

(6) He hated the Duke of Orleans, becauſe this Duke has been a great while in love with his wife. Ibidem.

[*B*] *A mercenary ſoul, who would do any thing for money.*] There is no greater blemiſh in the reign of King Charles VI. than the triumphant impunity which the Duke of Orleans's aſſaſſin met with. It was much leſs the King's fault than his Kingdom's. For that unhappy Prince wanted moſt part of the time the uſe of his ſenſes, ſo that he could not be anſwerable for the diſorders of the State. It is the French nation that muſt be blamed; ſhe gave no aſſiſtance to the Prince, who required that ſuch an horrid attempt ſhould be revenged; ſhe divided after ſuch a manner, as rendered the murtherer's party more formidable than the other. The City of Paris, where the King's only brother was murthered, is chiefly to blame, for not endeavouring to puniſh that crime; it was in her power to ſee that the Burgundian might be uſed as he deſerved. It were wrong to cenſure the Univerſity of Paris, becauſe one of her Profeſſors of Divinity was wicked enough to ſet up for an Apologiſt of that murther; ſhe did not approve the bad principles of that furious declaimer; ſhe countenanced the Biſhop who condemned thoſe principles, as ſoon as ſhe could do it without danger, as will be ſeen in the following remark. Let us not cloſe this without obſerving, that John Petit was very ſure of the people's approbation, when he undertook to plead * (α) ſo abominable a cauſe, and he conſidered beſides, that he was to ſpeak for a Prince, whom the King himſelf dreaded. It is certain that Charles VI. ſent the Count of St. Paul to the Duke of Burgundy, *to offer him a publick audience, with a full pardon for himſelf, requiring nothing of him, but that he would deliver up the Aſſaſſins, that they might be proſecuted according to law: but he did very much diſappoint the King's expectations, ſince his Majeſty was obliged to treat with him after an honourable manner about the reparation of a moſt villainous attempt; for which purpoſe he ſent the Duke of* Berry *and the King of* Sicily *to meet him at Amiens. The noble Duke of* Bourbon *was appointed to be of that Embaſſy, but he deſired generouſly to be excuſed; he would not even continue at court, but aſked leave to retire upon his own eſtate, and choſe rather to give up the ſhare he had in the adminiſtration, than to come to terms with the ſtate for the murther of his nephew; I have been told for certain, that he ſent the Duke of Burgundy word ſeveral times, that he could never ſee with pleaſure the Author of ſo baſe and infamous a perfidiouſneſs* (7). Theſe two conſiderations, I mean the people's favour, and the Duke of Burgundy's credit, do not clear the Advocate. For the reſt, the reaſon why the people did not much care that the murtherer ſhould be puniſhed, was the hatred they had conceived againſt the Duke of Orleans, becauſe he was the Author of ſeveral taxes. It was becauſe of that hatred, that the people rejoiced at his death, and applauded the Duke of Burgundy: ſo true it is, that men have their private and domeſtick intereſt more at heart, than the fundamental laws of the State. *Tantum nimirum ex publicis malis ſentimus, quantum ad privatas res pertinet; nec in iis quicquam acrius quam pecuniæ damnum ſtimulat* (8). i. e. "We "feel the publick misfortunes only ſo far as they affect "our private intereſt; nor is there any thing that "vexes us more than the loſs of money." Montagne had well obſerved that defect. *It is not for the common cauſe they are concerned*, ſays he (9), *nor do they mind what is againſt the intereſt of all, and of the State, but what is againſt their own private intereſt. This makes them particularly paſſionate for their own party, beyond what juſtice and reaſon require.* Non tam omnia univerſi, quàm ea, quæ ad quemque pertinent, ſinguli carpebant. The impunity, which the Duke of Burgundy met with, was a mortal wound given to the juſtice, authority, and majeſty of the ſtate. But no matter for that; private perſons, as ſuch, did not feel it; they ſaw the pernicious conſequences of it only from a diſtance, every one was in hopes to avoid them; but the taxes laid by the Duke of Orleans fell heavy on every Citizen; hence it is, that none cared to revenge his death. We ſhall ſee by and by, that the mob at Paris was eaſily deluded again, when the Biſhop had condemned the Duke of Burgundy's apology.

(7) Ibidem, p. 627.

(8) *Annibal ad Carthaginienſes, apud* Livium, lib. 30. *ſub. fin.* p. m. 566.

(9) Montagne, *Eſſais*, Liv. 3. ch. 10. p. m. 410, 411.

* (α) John Petit was ſincere, and bold enough to urge, before the King's Council, two remarkable reaſons, by which he pretended to vindicate himſelf for daring to appear for the Duke of Burgundy in ſo odious a cauſe. The firſt is, that he was obliged to ſerve that Duke, to whom he had three years before taken an oath of allegiance: the ſecond, that this was the leaſt thing he could do out of gratitude for that Prince, who for a great while before gave him yearly a ſmall penſion, becauſe he had but an inconſiderable living. Monſtrelet has tranſmitted this particular to us; and honeſt Gentillet has inſerted it with John

of Paris condemned it [C], as ſoon as that Duke's faction had loſt ground. This Prince's Attornies appealed to the Pope, and he himſelf wrote to the Council of Conſtance, recommending John Petit's cauſe to the Fathers (i): his Embaſſadors and his friends aſſerted that the condemned propoſitions were not to be met with in that Doctor's book: the Commiſſaries appointed by the Council annulled the ſentence of the Biſhop of Paris [D]. Gerſon

(i) See the rem. [D].

Petit's plea, into his *Anti-Machiavel*, l. 3. max. 8. CRIT. REM.

[C] *John Petit's Doctrine was ſo abominable . . . . . that the Biſhop of Paris condemned it.*] Before it was condemned, ſeveral learned and virtuous perſons took great offence at the propoſitions of this Profeſſor of Divinity, and dreaded *the dangerous conſequences of them if they were not condemned. As for my part*, ſays the Monk of St. Denys (10), *I have ſeveral times declared that I wondered very much why the Biſhop of Paris, and the Inquiſitor of the Faith, neglected to cenſure a work which was ſo dangerous to men's morals, and ſo much againſt the ſervice of God: but I was always anſwered that the formidable authority of the Duke of Burgundy prevented them, and that they acted prudently to ſuffer that peſtiferous piece to lye in a manner buried in oblivion, rather than to run the danger of ſeeing it authorized by that Prince's credit. This appeared but too true in time; for no ſooner could they act with the ſecurity they ſo much deſired, but they commanded the Members of the Univerſity of Paris, upon pain of being puniſhed according to law, to bring forth without delay, all that they had wrote down in their Common-place books, and collections, concerning the ſaid John Petit's propoſition deſigned for the pretended juſtification of the Duke of Burgundy. They convened together, in the great hall of the Biſhops palace, the moſt celebrated Doctors and Bachelors of Divinity, and the Doctors of Civil and Canon Law, by whoſe advice and aſſiſtance they might examine what was erroneous in that piece: and having ſpent ſeveral days in that examination, with all the care and attention which the intereſt of religion required, laſtly on the ſixteenth of January they appointed out of that numerous aſſembly ſixteen Doctors choſen out of the Colleges of Paris, who made a collection of all the theſes and propoſitions alledged by that Doctor, which they judged fit to be condemned, in the following form.* The Hiſtorian gives us afterwards nine propoſitions of John Petit, with the cenſure that was paſſed upon them; and then he continues thus (11). " Such was the opinion of the " Doctors and Maſters there aſſembled; they declar- " ed alſo that this whole piece of maſter John Petit " was unworthy of a man of wit, and did not even " deſerve to be preſerved. Wherefore, on the twen- " ty third of February (12), the ſaid Biſhop and the " Inquiſitor of the Faith, being aſſembled in the " great hall of the Epiſcopal Palace, in the preſence " of ſeveral Prelates, and eminent Doctors, and of " a great crowd of people, judged it proper to cen- " ſure it as being erroneous both in point of doctrine " and of morals, and to ſentence it, as being ſcan- " dalous in ſeveral reſpects, to be burnt in the Court " before our Lady's Church. This was executed ac- " cordingly two days after in their preſence, on a " ſcaffold raiſed for that purpoſe, before a vaſt mul- " titude of people, after maſter *Benedictus Gencien*, a " famous and celebrated Doctor, had proved aloud and " moſt learnedly the odiouſneſs of theſe opinions." You will meet now with an inſtance of the people's inconſtant humour. *This was a moſt grievous affront to the Duke of Burgundy, who learnt by an experience which was neceſſary for example's ſake, how diſhonourable and ſhameful it is for great men to degenerate from the glory of their anceſtors: but his greateſt vexation was to hear, that that ſilly vindication had rendered him odious to the wiſeſt and moſt modeſt perſons, who ridiculed and deſpiſed him; that he was now a laughing ſtock to the common people, and to the very mob, that he had made himſelf a common talk, and was the ſubject of a thouſand ſatyrical ſongs, in which he was publickly ſtyled a traitor and murderer* (13).

(10) *Hiſtoire de Charles* VI. Liv. 33. ch. 28. p. 931, 932.

(11) Ibidem, p. 933.

(12) It was in 1414, beginning the year with the month of Jan.

(13) *Hiſtoire de Charles* VI. Liv. 33. chap. 28. p. 933.

Obſerve that Gerſon, Chancellor of the Univerſity, laboured very much to procure the cenſure (14). He did even preach often againſt John Petit's propoſitions, and *refuted, in the name of the Univerſity, and before the King, every part of* that Profeſſor's *diſcourſe and of his book* (15). Obſerve alſo that the ſubſtance of the nine propoſitions, which were cenſured, comes to this: " That it is lawful, and even commendable " and meritorious for any perſon by his own private " authority to kill a tyrant, and that for this purpoſe " he may make uſe of any means, even of treaſon " and flatteries, to make him fall into the ſnares " which are laid for him, notwithſtanding any " alliance he may have entered into with him, and " the oaths he has taken (16)."

(14) *Cancellarius contra Joannis Parvi aſſertiones concionatur ſæpius, has accurato & diligenti ſtudio expendit, & detectos in iis contra fidem errores configit. Tam curante potiſſimum Gerſone errorum cenſura à Theologiæ facultate & Pariſienſi Epiſcopo confecta eſt.* Jo. Launoius, *Hiſtoria Gymnaſii Navarræ*, p. 482.

(15) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. du grand Schiſme*, Liv. 5. p. m. 236.

(16) Ibidem.

[D] . . . . . *His friends aſſerted that the condemned propoſitions were not to be met with in that Doctor's books: the Commiſſaries appointed by the Council annulled the ſentence of the Biſhop of Paris.*] There was no other courſe to take; for unleſs they had been loſt to all ſenſe of ſhame, they could not deny the cenſure of the nine propoſitions to be well grounded. They were therefore under a neceſſity to do what the Janſeniſts have done a long time afterwards: they were, I ſay, obliged to have recourſe to the diſtinction of matter of fact and matter of law, *de facto, et de jure*, and to aſſert that the nine propoſitions were not to be met with in John Petit's book. And this was what they actually did. Read what follows: I trace the account ſomewhat high, that the reader may be the better acquainted with the whole affair.

" (17) As that ſentence (18) was extremely diſho- " nourable to the Duke of Burgundy, whoſe juſtifi- " cation was burnt with that book, to the eternal diſ- " grace of his name, his Attornies appealed to the " Holy See *. The Duke to court the Pope's fa- " vour undertook to protect him. . . . . † But know- " ing that the Pope had been arreſted at Freiburg " before he could enter into the Dutchy of Bur- " gundy, he wrote to the Council, in anſwer to the " notice he received from thence of the Pope's eva- " ſion, that as he had promiſed him his protection " only in caſe he would keep his word **, he was " now reſolved to forſake him ſince the Council was " not pleaſed with his conduct, and to adhere in " every thing to the holy Council. Having thus " artfully endeavoured to render the Fathers favour- " able to him, he added that he had notice that his " enemies laboured to defame him, with a pretence " to perſuade the Council to condemn certain here- " tical propoſitions, which were aſcribed to the late " Dr. John Petit, who had pleaded his cauſe like an " honeſt man: that as his reputation was concerned " therein, he earneſtly deſired the Fathers, that before " they determined any thing in ſo material a point, and " before they condemned that Dr.'s book, they would " be pleaſed to have it examined, in the preſence of " his Embaſſadors, that they might know whether " theſe propoſitions were really his, or whether they " were not maliciouſly forged by others, who endea- " voured to get them condemned under the name of " that celebrated Profeſſor, and even under his own †. " The Council appointed Commiſſaries for that pur- " poſe, who were the Cardinals of Albano, of Aquileia, " of Venice, and of Ailly. The Duke of Burgundy's " Embaſſadors, who by their intrigues had made a " powerful party, and who had at their head Martin " Porree, Biſhop of Arras, and Doctor of Divinity, " excepted at firſt againſt Cardinal Peter d'Ailly, be- " cauſe he had been Gerſon's maſter, whom they " took to be their chief antagoniſt, and they aſſerted " boldly that the propoſitions, which the Biſhop of " Paris condemned, as being ſet down by Doctor " John Petit in his book entitled *a Vindication of the* " *Duke of Burgnndy*, were not to be met with there " in the ſame terms in which they were produced; " that it was John Gerſon, who being jealous of the " reputation which Doctor Petit had gained in the " Univerſity, forged them after his own fancy, that " he might put an heretical conſtruction upon them, " which they themſelves condemned; but they were " ready to prove thoſe propoſitions were very ortho- " dox, as ſet down in that Doctor's book *. On the " other hand Cardinal d'Ailly, who had been objected " againſt, joined with the Doctors John Gerſon and " Jordan Morin, and they proteſted all three that " there was nothing more falſe † than what the Em- " baſ-

(17) Ibid. p. 23.

(18) That is to ſay, the Biſhop of Paris's ſentence.

* *J. Juvenal.*

† *Cod. Victor. apud Spond.*

** *Act. Victorin. apud Spond.*

†† *T. 5. Hiſt. Univ. p. 299. ex Monſtrel. J. Juvenal. Cod. Victor.*

* *J. Juvenal.*

† *Cod. Victor.*

Gerſon appealed from their ſentence to the Council, but he did not obtain all the ſatiſfaction he might reaſonably expect [*E*]. That aſſembly ſhewed that a Prince, who commands armies, is a very powerful protector of an Heretick. The Council's deciſion was expreſſed in general terms, and did not in the leaſt condemn either John Petit's book, or the Duke of Burgundy's attempt. The King of France did not act with the ſame caution: he cauſed that libel to be condemned with the utmoſt ſeverity, and baniſhed from Paris ſome Doctors who oppoſed the honeſt deſign, which the others had of making the Univerſity concern herſelf in the Biſhop's cauſe [*F*]. But two years after, that Prelate was obliged to ſee his ſentence reverſed, in order to pleaſe the Duke of Burgundy [*G*]. John

" baſſadors of Burgundy dared to aſſert: that if a " man had but eyes, could read and underſtand " French, he could not but know that the condemned propoſitions, and eſpecially that to which " all the reſt were reduced, were not only aſſerted by " John Petit, but contained alſo the whole ſubſtance " and a true abridgment of his libel, in which he " laboured nothing elſe but to prove them by his " pretended arguments, and by his falſe reaſonings. " Laſtly, after many debates upon that point, in " which the queſtion was only about a moſt plain " matter of fact, which the Burgundians continued " obſtinately to deny, the three Cardinals appointed " as Commiſſaries, who had declared for them, took " a very bad expedient: for as on the one hand they " could not approve ſuch wicked propoſitions, and " on the other hand were unwilling to condemn " the Duke of Burgundy's Advocate **, they reſolv- " ed to declare that the Biſhop of Paris was not a " proper judge in that cauſe, which belonged to the " Holy See, and thereupon they reverſed his ſen- " tence." Their decree was proclaimed by ſound of trumpet in the Court before the Porch of the Cathedral Church at Paris (19). You will find in a work of Gerſon by what intrigues the Burgundian Faction brought all this about. *Inſtituit inter Volucrem & Monimum, id eſt, inter ſe & fratrem ſuum dialogum, ubi καθ' ἕκαστα & ſingillatim exponit, quibus molitionibus Burgundiones uſi ſunt ut Pariſienſis cenſura caſſa & irrita declararetur* (20).

** *J. Juvenal.*

(19) *Dati ſunt à Concilio & ſelecti judices, qui repugnante Gerſone, & aliis qui ab ejus ſtabant partibus, Pariſienſem cenſuram abrogarunt, politicis potius quam Theologicis rationibus ducti. Cenſuræ abrogatis & lecta & publicata eſt buccis concrepantibus in propylæo Æ lis beatæ Mariæ Pariſ. Hæc Juvenalis Urſinus ut vidit, ita & retulit in Hiſtoria Caroli* VI. Joan. Launoius, *in Hiſtoria Gymnaſii Navarræ*, p. 489.

(20) Idem, ibid.

[*E*] *Gerſon appealed from this ſentence to the Council, but he did not obtain all the ſatisfaction he could reaſonably expect.*] He wiſhed no doubt that the Council would confirm the Biſhop of Paris's ſentence, by rendering expreſsly the book which contained the Duke of Burgundy's apology; but this was not done. " Either they had not at Conſtance John Petit's libel, " but only an extract containing his propoſitions; or " if they had it, they would not examine it, that " they might not oblige any man, as the Emperor * " adviſed, whoſe opinion was that they ought to " confine themſelves to the Doctrine in general, and " condemn only the fundamental propoſition, which " contained the ſubſtance of all the reſt, which they " did accordingly in theſe words. *It has been repreſented to this holy Council, that ſome erroneous and moſt " ſcandalous propoſitions have been taught, tending to the " ruin of every State and Kingdom, among which the " following has been preſented to the Fathers* †. *Every " tyrant may be, and ought lawfully and meritoriouſly to " be killed by whoever it be of his vaſſals or ſubjects, " making uſe for that purpoſe of ſnares, flatteries, and " feigned careſſes, notwithſtanding any oath, and what- " ever alliance one had entered into with him, and " without waiting for the ſentence or command of any " Judge whatſoever. The holy Council, to extirpate " that error, declares and determines, after mature deli- " berations, that that doctrine is againſt Faith and good " morals, it explodes and condemns it, as heretical, ſcan- " dalous, and giving room to frauds, deceits, falſities, " treaſons, and perjuries. Farther, it declares and de- " cides, that they who obſtinately maintain that moſt per- " nicious doctrine, are hereticks, and ought, as ſuch, to " be puniſhed according to the rules ſet down in the holy " Canons.* Such was the Council's decree: the Fathers, for certain reaſons, and chiefly that they " might not diſoblige the Duke of Burgundy, were " determined not to blend the matter of fact, with " the matter of law in this cauſe (21)."

* *Cod. Victor.*

† *Act. Concil. Conſt. Seſſ.* 15.

(21) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. du grand Schiſme*, Liv. 5. p. 240.

That conduct of the Council vexed John Gerſon ſo much the more, as he had been charged with acting herein not from the love of truth, but on account of the quarrels in which he had been engaged with John Petit (22). It was alſo objected to him, that he had at firſt reduced that man's doctrine to one ſingle propoſition, of which he made nine afterwards, when he came to know that the examiners were ſenſible that he had miſrepreſented his adverſary's opinion (23). He drew the indignation of the houſe of Burgundy upon himſelf to ſuch a degree, that he run great dangers after the Council was diſſolved. He was not ſuffered to return to Paris, to take again upon him his functions of Chancellor of the Univerſity. He was forced to retire through by-ways; he went and hid himſelf for ſome time in the Mountains of Bavaria, after which he croſſed Switzerland, and went to Lyons, where he continued till his death (24).

(22) Spondanus, ad ann. 1415. num. 51. p. 752.

(23) *Sentiens nihilominus Gerſonius Theologis illos agnoviſſe fraudem in truncatione propoſitionum Parvi illas alias novem concluſiones propoſuerit.* Idem, ibid.

(24) Launoius, *in Hiſtoria Gymnaſii Navarræ*, p. 490.

[*F*] *The King of France . . . . cauſed that libel to be condemned with the utmoſt ſeverity, and baniſhed from Paris ſome Doctors who oppoſed the honeſt deſign of . . . . the Biſhop.*] The account you will now read begins with the laſt of theſe two particulars. " Our Doc- " tors were at Conſtance, † fearing what happened, " namely, that the Cardinals, who were appointed " Commiſſaries, would favour the Burgundians, wrote " to their brethren at Paris, to do their endeavours, " that the Univerſity might concern herſelf in the " Biſhop's cauſe, to get his ſentence againſt John Petit's " doctrine confirmed; but it happened that ſeveral " members of that great body, having ſuffered them- " ſelves to be bribed by the party of that Doctor, " and of the Duke of Burgundy, caballed ſo effectu- " ally againſt him, that they prevented their obtain- " ing what they deſired. The honeſt Doctors, eſpe- " cially thoſe of the illuſtrious Sorbonne, and of Na- " varre, being always ſtrongly addicted to the good " cauſe, which Gerſon maintained with a great deal " of zeal and ſtrength, having laid their complaints " before the King, his Majeſty, with a deſign to rid " the Univerſity of thoſe turbulent ſpirits, who diſ- " turbed the Church and the State, ſent orders to " above forty of the moſt mutinous, to retire from " Paris that ſame day upon pain of death. . . . After " this, to prevent the revival of ſo abominable a " doctrine by preſerving the book in which it was " taught, his Majeſty ſent to the Parliament his de- " claration againſt the errors contained in that libel of " maſter John Petit *, entitled, *A Vindication of the " Duke of Burgundy*, with orders to cut in pieces in a " full Court all the copies that could be found of it; " forbidding alſo every one to keep any by him, " upon pain of forfeiting both his liberty and his " eſtate; commanding that this declaration be re- " giſtered with the Biſhop of Paris's ſentence, join- " ing together both the matter of fact and the mat- " ter of law in the condemnation of the moſt perni- " cious errors contained in Maſter John Petit's libel, " entitled, *A Vindication of the Duke of Burgundy*, " which begins with theſe words; *Par devers la treſ- " haute Majeſté Roiale*, and which has been publickly " † expoſed to ſale at Paris and in other places. All " this was regiſtered in the Parliament the fourth of " June 1416, and the 16th of September following " the King iſſued out a moſt ſevere decree, at the " Univerſity's requeſt, againſt thoſe who ſhould dare " again to aſſert the doctrine of that abominable li- " bel, declaring them ſubject to all the puniſhments " due to thoſe who are guilty of Treaſon (25)."

† J. Juvenal, p. 328, of the edit. printed at the Louvre.

* *Hiſt. Univ.* Liv. 5. p. 300. Quam M. Joannes Parvi nuncupatus juſtificationem Ducis Burgundiæ fecit appellari, ejus quaternos & particulas apud quemcumque inveniri poterunt, &c. Prædicta Propoſitio M. J. Parvi in ſeſe, & in ſuis aſſertionibus principaliter intentis & in ea contentis eſt abolenda atque damnanda tanquam in fide erronea, &c. & eam ſic abolemus & damnamus, &c. Quam juſtificationem D. Ducis Burgundiæ appellavit complures in ſe errores peſtiferos continentem, & quæ in tantum in dictis villa & Dioceſi Pariſienſi publicata extitit, quod venditioni publice expoſita & à pluribus empta fuerit. p. 301.

† Publicæ venditioni expoſita quæ ſic incipit. *Par devers, &c.* p. 302.

[*G*] . . . . . *That Prelate was obliged to ſee his ſentence reverſed, in order to pleaſe the Duke of Burgundy.*] One may obſerve in John Petit's affairs, what happens generally: a toleration, a condemnation, an abſolution, *&c.* according as the Prince who protected him was more or leſs powerful. His credit being very low at Paris in the year 1414, ſevere proceedings were carried on againſt his Apologiſt. His power being very great in the ſame city in the year 1418, the whole cenſure was declared void. Let us

(25) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. du grand Schiſme*, Liv. 5. p. 242, 243.

John Petit died in the year 1411, at Hedin, a city belonging to that Duke (*k*). He had taken ſanctuary thither, fearing the Duke of Orleans's ſons, who deſigned to have him convicted of hereſy. He was not a Cordelier, as ſome have aſſerted, but a ſecular Prieſt (*l*).

(*k*) Monſtrelet, lib. 1. cap. 39. *apud* Spondanum, ad ann. 1408. num. 1. p. 704.

(*l*) Spondanus, ad ann. 1408. num. 1. p. 703.

quote an Author who lived in that Century. *About this time,* ſays he (26), *there was a general proceſſion at Paris, at which were preſent all the Members of the Univerſity, and chiefly the Vicars of the Biſhop of Paris, who lay then very ſick at St. Omer. Theſe Vicars did there in a full Church, and in the preſence of the whole proceſſion repeal the ſentence of condemnation, which the ſaid Biſhop had formerly given againſt John Petit's propoſition, againſt the Duke of Burgundy's reputation, giving him thus ſatisfaction, with regard to his honour and loyalty, acknowledging him true Champion of the Crown of France, and ſhewing the power which the Biſhop had given them for that purpoſe, ſo that the Duke of Burgundy was ſatisfied.*

(26) John à Fevre, Seigneur de St. Remi, *Hiſtoire de Charles* VI. ch. 88. p. 124.

☞ PETRARCH (FRANCIS), a very learned Writer in the 14th Century, was born July 20, 1304, at Arezzo, and was ſon of Petrarco di Parenzo, a notary, and Eletta de' Canigiani, both of good families at Florence (*a*), from which city his father had been obliged to retire in 1300, by the faction of the *Neri* [*A*]. While young Petrarch lived at Piſa with his father, he received ſome tincture of learning from the famous Barlaam of Calabria, Monk of St. Baſil, and afterwards Biſhop of Geraci; and when his father was ſettled at Avignon, he was ſent by him to Carpentras, where he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of grammar, rhetoric, and philoſophy, for four years. He afterwards ſpent four years at Montpellier, where he ſtudied law under John Andreas, and Cino of Piſtoia. It is probable, that the latter, who excelled in Italian Poetry, inſpired him with an inclination for that art, and taught him the firſt principles of it. His father then ſent him to Bologna, in order that he might complete his ſtudies in the law under John Calderino and Bartholomew d'Oſſa. His application to the law was the effect of mere complaiſance to his father; but his genius led him entirely to poetry, eloquence, hiſtory, and moral philoſophy. And though his father, when he viſited him at Bologna, threw into the fire all the Latin Poets and Orators, except Virgil and Cicero, which were the only writers he granted to his ſon's importunate requeſts; yet it was not poſſible for Petrarch to alter his inclination, and reliſh the ſtudy of the law. His mother dying in 1324, and his father the year following, he returned to Avignon, in order to ſettle his domeſtick affairs; and then purchaſed about fifteen miles from that city, to the Eaſt, a country-houſe in a very ſolitary but agreeable ſituation, named *Vaucluſe*, where he ſpent a good part of the year. His falling in love in the year 1327 with the beautiful Laura, whom he has immortalized in his Poems [*B*], made this place ſtill more dear to him. His reſidence at Vaucluſe was interrupted by ſeveral journeys, which he took. For in 1327 Lewis of Bavaria's entrance into Italy having given him hopes, that the exiles of Florence would be recalled home, he went to Milan for that purpoſe; but was obliged to return to Avignon without ſucceſs. His inclination to travel induced him afterwards to go to Paris, and thence to Flanders and Germany. James Colonna, Biſhop of Lombez, with whom he had contracted a friendſhip at the Pope's Court at Avignon, going about that time to Rome, and inviting Petrarch thither, the latter took that opportunity of ſeeing that city. Upon his return to Avignon, at the perſuaſion of that Prelate and of Cardinal John Colonna his brother, he entered into the ſervice of Pope John XXII. who employed him in ſeveral affairs of importance both at Rome and in France. He was in hopes of obtaining by this means ſome conſiderable poſts; but being diſappointed, he retired to Vaucluſe, where he ſhewed his reſentment in three ſonnets extant among his works, and in ſome of his Latin Letters. It was there that he wrote moſt of his Latin works, and among the reſt his Poem upon Africa, which was eſteemed a prodigy in thoſe times of ignorance, and raiſed him ſo great a reputation in Italy and France, that he was invited the ſame day by the Senate of Rome and the Chancellors of the Univerſity of Paris to come and receive the poetical Crown. By the advice of his friends, and for many reaſons he preferred Rome to Paris; and embarked for the former city in 1341, and arrived at Naples, where King Robert, who was an eminent patron of learned men, would have diſſuaded him from going to Rome to receive the poetical Crown, and have given it himſelf. But Petrarch having thanked his Majeſty for his offer, purſued his journey

(*a*) See Lodovico Antonio Muratori's *Life of Petrarch*, prefixed to *Le Rime di Franceſco Petrarca, riſcontrate co' i Teſti a penna della Libreria Eſtenſe, e co' i fragmenti dell' originale d'eſſo Poeta, &c.* Edit. Modena 1711, in 4to, and the additions to this Life in the *Venice Journal*, Tome 8. p. 286.

[*A*] *From which city his Father had been obliged to retire in* 1300 *by the faction of the* Neri.] He went with his family to Arezzo, where they continued for ſome time; and it was during their reſidence at Arezzo, that Petrarch was born, who however has been always conſidered as a Florentine. He was but ſeven months old, when his mother obtained leave of the Republick of Florence to live at Anciſa, a village depending on that city, where her huſband had an eſtate; and ſhe removed thither with her ſon; which occaſioned ſome to imagine that he was born there. His father having in vain attempted to procure leave to return to his own country, ſent for his wife and ſon, who was then ſeven years old, and carried them with him to Piſa, in order that he might have the better opportunity to proſecute his own intereſts; but finding himſelf at laſt utterly diſappointed, he thought proper to retire two years after to Avignon, where the Pope reſided at that time.

[*B*] *Falling in love in the year* 1327 *with the beautiful* Laura, *whom he has immortalized in his Poems.*] *James Philip Tomaſini* in his *Petrarcha redivivus*, and other Writers aſſert, that ſhe was daughter of *Henry de Chiabau*, Lord of Cabrieres. But *Joſeph Maria Suares* and others affirm, that ſhe was of the family of *Sade*. What is certain is, that ſhe was born at Avignon June the 4th 1314, and ſpent the greateſt part of her life at Vaucluſe. Petrarch aſſures us, that his paſſion for her was entirely honourable. But ſome pretend to prove the contrary by his verſes themſelves,

journey to Rome, and received there from the Senate and People the poetical Crown on the 8th of April, being Eaſter-day, 1341 [*C*]. From Rome he went to Parma, where he received great honours from the Lords of Correggio. But his love of ſolitude and ſtudy, the fruits of which are a great many excellent works written by him [*D*], induced him to retire to a very agreeable place named *Selva Piana* in the territory of Reggio, where he ſpent part of the time, during which he reſided in that country, dividing himſelf between the city and his rural retirement. About that time his friends wrote to him

themſelves. However, his affection for her continued as long as ſhe lived, and even a great while after her death. She died April the 6th 1348, in the 34th year of her age, and was interred in the Church of the Cordeliers at Avignon. Petrarch has immortalized his grief for her loſs by a great number of verſes, which are full of her praiſes, and would make us imagine her to be a perfectly accompliſhed Lady, if we did not know, that it was a poet and a lover who ſpeaks.

[*C*] *Received there from the Senate and People the poetical Crown on the 8th of April, being Eaſter-Day, 1341.*] The circumſtances of this ſolemnity are ſo remarkable, that they deſerve to be related. Upon the day, on which it was to be performed, the Vice-Legate, who was of the family of Colonna and Biſhop of Terracina, cauſed a maſs to be celebrated with muſick at the altar of St. Peter; after which Petrarch was conducted to the palace of Colonna near Santa Maria *in via lata*, where they dined. After dinner, the under-maſter of the Ceremonies brought ſeveral works of *Petrarch*, and made a ſpeech to the aſſembly, in which he demanded, that he ſhould be crowned Poet, which was unanimouſly agreed to. Immediately after the Poet was dreſſed in the habits neceſſary for the ceremony. Firſt, he had the tragick *Cothurnus* of purple leather put upon his right leg, and on his left the comick buſkin of a violet colour, tied with blue ſtrings. Upon his doublet, which was of grey taffeta, he had a long robe of violet-coloured velvet, plaited at the collar, with ſleeves, doubled with green taffeta, and adorned with gold lace. And he was girt with a chain of diamonds. Upon this robe he had another of white ſattin open at the ſides. His head was then covered with a mitre of gold-cloth, and made in ſuch a manner as to receive the crowns upon it, and adorned with pendants behind, like thoſe of Biſhops. At his neck hung a violin with a chain conſiſting of figures and dragons. Upon his hands he had a pair of gloves, the right of Otter-ſkin, and the left of Ermin. When he was thus equipped, there came a girl with her hair looſe, bare-footed, with a bear's ſkin over her ſhoulders, and a lighted candle in her left hand, in order to hold up his robe, which was very long. In this manner he came down into the Court, where he found a chariot adorned with devices covered with laurel, ivy, and myrtle, and ſpread with cloth of gold, in which were repreſented Mount Parnaſſus, Apollo, and the Muſes. At the top was a ſeat, where our Poet ſat, having round him ſeveral books, and all the ſymbols of the liberal arts, and bearing on his knees a large violin of ivory. Of the four feet, which ſupported his ſeat, the firſt was a lion, the ſecond was an elephant, the third a griffin, and the fourth a panther. Divers perſons repreſenting the antient deities, walked round the chariot, which bore with Petrarch only the three Graces, and Bacchus, who had at his ſide Patience. The chariot was drawn by four horſes, and preceded by a woman dreſſed in a coarſe cloth, who drove before her with a wand a man well dreſſed, who ſat at his eaſe in a litter drawn by two horſes. A perſon repreſenting Envy, and carrying in her hand a croſs-bow bent, walked behind, and was followed by ſatyrs, fawns, and nymphs dancing. When the muſick ceaſed, young people leaped and danced about on all ſides, and ſung ſongs in honour of *Petrarch* and the city of Rome. In this order they arrived at the Capitol, where every body being aſcended, *Petrarch* made a ſpeech in Latin deſiring the poetical Crown; which was granted him; and three crowns placed upon his mitre, the firſt of laurel, the ſecond of ivy, and the third of myrtle. The Senator, who crowned him, preſented him with a robe valued at five hundred Ducats of gold, and the people of Rome gave him five hundred Ducats more, and every thing which had been made uſe of at his coronation. Mounting his chariot again he went in the ſame order, in which he came to the Church of St. Peter, throwing money among the people, which had been beſtowed on him by the Colonna's, who gave him for that purpoſe four hundred Florins. When he arrived at St. Peter's, he performed his devotions before the great altar, and offered his three Crowns there. He then returned to the palace of Colonna, where he was entertained at a magnificent ſupper, which was followed by a ball.

This relation is extracted from a letter written by *Senuccio del Bene*, a Florentine Poet, contemporary with *Petrarch*, or by an Author of a later date, who probably was *Jerom Marcatelli*, Canon of Padua, who publiſhed it firſt in 1549, as the Writers of the *Journal of Venice* affirm. The Author of that letter, a French tranſlation of which was printed at Paris 1565, in 4to. aſſures us that he was preſent at this ceremony; and the detail of it, which he gives, makes this probable enough. However, he is miſtaken with regard to the day of the ceremony, which he erroneouſly fixes on the Aſcenſion-Day, May 22; beſides, that this date is inconſiſtent with itſelf, ſince Aſcenſion-Day that year was the 17th of May, and not the 22d. Add to this, that the Writer of the letter endeavours to aſſign the reaſons of what paſſed in that ceremony, in which every thing alluded to the character and genius of a Poet.

[*D*] *A great many excellent works written by him.*] His works were printed at Baſil 1581, in four volumes in folio, under this title; *Franciſci Petrarchæ Opera quæ extant, omnia*. This edition contains his Latin and Italian works. The Latin had been printed together before at Baſil 1496, in folio, and Venice 1501, in folio. But this edition is more complete, and contains the following treatiſes. In the firſt Volume, 1. *De Remediis utriuſque Fortunæ Libri duo*. Lyons 1577, in 8vo. Geneva 1613, in 24°. Rotterdam 1649, in 8vo. Tranſlated into Italian, and publiſhed under the title of, *Opera di Franc. Petrarca de' Remedi dell' una el' altra Fortuna, tradotta per Remigio Florentino*. Venice 1549, in 8vo. A French tranſlation was printed at Paris 1534 in folio, under this title: *Meſſire François Petrarque des Rémedes de l'une & l'autre Fortune tranſlaté du Latin par Nicole Oreſme*. Grenaille and Sieur de Châteauniers made a new French Verſion, in which he altered the form of Dialogue, and by that means retrenched a great many tedious repetitions. It was publiſhed under this title; *Le ſage reſolu contre la Fortune & la mort; ou Petrarque mis en François*. Roan 1662, in 12mo. in two tomes. There is another French tranſlation ſtill later under this title: *Entretiens de Petrarque ſur la bonne & mauvaiſe Fortune, ou l'Art de vivre heureux*. Paris 1673, in two tomes in 12mo. 2. *De Vitâ ſolitariâ Libri duo*. 3. *De Otio Religioſorum Libri duo*. 4. *De verâ ſapientiâ Dialogi duo*. 5. *De Contemptu Mundi, ſive Secretorum Dialogi tres*. This work was printed ſeparately under this title: *De ſecreto Curarum conflictu. Regii Lepidi*, 1501, in 4to. 6. *Pſalmi Pœnitentiales ſeptem*. Theſe are ſeven Pſalms compoſed by Petrarch. 7. *De Republicâ optimè adminiſtrandâ Liber*. This and the following books were printed ſeparately at Berne in 1602, in 12mo. 8. *De Officio & virtutibus imperatoriis Liber*. 9. *Rerum memorabilium Libri quatuor*. Theſe are different parts of the Roman and Greek Hiſtory reunited under ſeveral titles. They were printed ſeparately at Berne in 1604, in 12mo. There is an old French tranſlation, entitled, *Les paroles joyeuſes & dits memorables des nobles & ſages hommes anciens, redigez par François Petrarque, & traduits en François*. Lyons 1531, in

him from Florence, that they were in hopes of procuring his return thither, and recovering his eſtate. Upon this he went to Arezzo, that he might be at hand to negotiate this affair; all the inhabitants of that city going out to meet him, and ſhewing him the moſt diſtinguiſhed honours. But he did not ſucceed in his deſigns; and finding the affair protracted to too great a length, returned to Parma, and ſoon after to Vaucluſe. He did not continue long in Provence; for Pope Clement VI. ſent him ſome time after to Naples to congratulate Queen Joan, upon her ſucceeding King Robert, who died in 1343. He went again into Italy in 1348 to viſit at Verona the Lords de la Scala, and at Padua James de Carrera, who was then Lord of that city, and with the Lords de la Scala had ſtrongly invited Petrarch by their letters. He was at Verona, when he heard of the death of his dear Laura, which filled him with great ſorrow. He returned to Avignon in 1349, and left it again in 1350, to go to Rome on occaſion of the Jubilee, and then retired to his ſolitude of Vaucluſe, where he continued till 1352, when being weary of this retirement, and excited by his love to Italy, he abſolutely abandoned Provence, and went to Milan, where he entered into the ſervice of the Viſconti, who ſhewed him all poſſible marks of eſteem, and employed him for ten years in affairs of conſequence and ſeveral embaſſies. The reſt of his life was continually taken up in travelling: he reſided ſometimes at Parma, ſometimes at Padua, other times at Ferrara or Venice. He was in the laſt city in 1364, when John Boccace came thither to inform him, in the name of the Republick of Florence, that his eſtate was reſtored to him, and liberty granted him of returning thither. This news was very agreeable to him; but he was not then in a condition to make uſe of the favour ſhewn him; for he was ſo broken in his health, that he could not think of going to ſettle in a place ſo far diſtant from that where he then was; and was ſo ſubject to fainting-fits, that once at Ferrara he was thought to be dead for thirty hours. He choſe therefore to retire to Padua, to finiſh his days there under the patronage of Francis de Carrera, Lord of that city, who gave him a very agreeable country-houſe at Arqua ten miles from that city. He took another journey to Venice in 1373 with a ſon of Francis de Carrera, to deſire in his name pardon of the Republick for ſome inſults, which he had offered it. They arrived there September 27, and were the next day introduced in the Council-hall, where Petrarch began his diſcourſe, but had ſcarce ſaid a few words, when he was ſo confounded, that he ſtopped ſhort. The audience was therefore deferred till the day following, when he ſpoke with ſo much eloquence

8vo. 10. *Vitarum illuſtrium Virorum Epitome.* Theſe are elogiums upon fourteen antient Romans in ſo many chapters. They were printed at the end of the four books *Rerum Memorabilium*, with a ſupplement of *Lorbardus de Siricho*, in which he treats of one and twenty other illuſtrious Romans and Greeks, at Baſil, in 1563, in folio. 11. *De pacificandâ Italiâ Exhortatio.* 12. *Ad veteres Romanæ Reipublicæ Defenſores Oratio.* 13. *De Libertate capeſſendâ hortatoria.* 14. *De Obedientiâ & Fide uxoriâ.* This is a Latin verſion of the laſt novel of Boccace, containing the ſtory of the patience of *Griſelidis.* 15. *De Avaritiâ vitandâ Oratio.* 16. *Itinerarium Syriacum.* Michael Poccianti has erroneouſly repreſented this work in his catalogue of the Florentine Writers, as different from another of the ſame kind, which he ſuppoſes to be only in manuſcript. Anthony Poſſevinus has made the ſame miſtake in his *Bibliotheca.* This treatiſe is a voyage to the Holy Land, or rather a deſcription, which Petrarch gives to one of his friends, of the places which he ſhould ſee in a journey, which he deſigned to take to Paleſtine. Reuſner has inſerted it in his collection of voyages, though it is in proſe, and all the reſt, which he has introduced into his collection, are in verſe. In the *ſecond* volume, are the following tracts, 17. *Epiſtolarum de Rebus Familiaribus Libri octo.* 18. *Epiſtolarum ad quoſdam ex veteribus illuſtriores Liber unus.* 19. *Epiſtolarum ſine titulo Liber unus.* 20. *Epiſtolarum de rebus ſenilibus, libri* 16. 21. *Epiſtolarum variarum Liber unus.* All theſe letters were printed together at Geneva in 1601, in 8vo. 22. *De ſui ipſius & aliorum ignorantiâ Liber.* Geneva 1609, in 12mo. 23. *Apologiæ contra Gallum.* 24. *Quatuor libri invectivarum contra quendam Medicum.* There are added at the end ſeveral works, which have been falſly aſcribed to Petrarch. In the *third* volume are theſe treatiſes: 25. *Epiſtolæ de ſumendâ atque receptâ Laureâ quinque.* Theſe letters are followed by the privilege which was granted him, on occaſion of his being crowned Poet. 26. *Bucolicorum Eclogæ* 10. 27. *Africa, hoc eſt, de Bello Punico Libri* ix. This poem is not very extraordinary, though highly admired by ſome Writers of his time; for there are enormous faults in it, not only againſt Quantity, but likewiſe againſt the eſſential Rules of Poetry. 28. *Epiſtolarum Libri tres.* Theſe Epiſtles are in verſe. 29. *Teſtamentum Petrarchæ.* The *fourth* volume contains his Latin works, of which there are many editions. We ſhall mention the principal. *Opere di Franceſco Petrarch, cioè le Rime.* Venice 1473, in folio. This is the firſt edition, and is extremely ſcarce. *Con li comenti di M. Franceſco Filelfo, Antonio da Tempo, Girolamo Aleſſandrino ſopra i ſonetti è le Canzoni, e di M. Bernardo Licinio ſopra i Trionfi.* Bologna 1475, in folio. *Con l'eſpoſizioni di Aleſſandro Vellutello.* Venice 1538, in 4to. *Con l'Eſpoſizione di Aldo Manuzio.* Venice 1533, in 8vo. *Con l'Eſpoſizione di Bernardino Daniello.* Venice 1541, in 4to. *Con nuove e brevi dicharazioni.* Venice 1548, in 8vo. Theſe explications are by Anthony Bruccioli. *Con l'Eſpoſizione di M. Gio. Andrea Geſualdo.* Venice 1553, in 4to. *Col Comento di Silvano de Venafro.* Rome 1626, in 4to. *Corrette da Girolamo Ruſcelli.* Venice 1554, in 8vo. *Corrette da Ludovico Dolce, con alcuni Avertimenti di Giulio Cammillo.* Venice 1557, in 12mo, and 1559, in 8vo. *Con nuove Eſpoſizioni.* Lyons 1574, in 16°. Theſe explications are by Bembo. The Academy *della Cruſca* quotes only this edition in their Dictionary. *Brevemente ſpoſte da Ludovico Caſtelvetro.* Baſil 1582, in 4to. *La Rime di Franceſco Petrarca, riſcontrate co' i Teſti a penna della Libreria Eſtenſe, è co' i Fragmenti dell' Originale d'eſſo Poeta. S'aggiungono le Conſiderazioni rivedute è ampliate d' Aleſſandro Saſſoni, le Annotazioni di Girolamo Muzio, è le Oſſervazioni di Lodovico Antonio Muratori.* Modena 1711, in 4to. Petrarch's Italian poem, conſiſts of the following pieces: 30 *Sonnetti & Canzoni.* Theſe are poems, which he wrote upon his beautiful *Laura.* They bear the general name of *Rime*, and are divided in two parts, the firſt of which contains thoſe, which he wrote during her life; and the ſecond thoſe, which he compoſed after her death. 31. *Fragmenti.* Theſe are to be met with only in a very ſcarce edition of part of Petrarch's poems, publiſhed by Frederic Ubaldini, at Rome 1642, in fol. 32. *Trionfi d' Amore, della Caſtita, della Morte, della Fama, del Tempo, della Divinita.*

Our

eloquence and force, that the Senate granted what he desired. He did not long survive this event; for upon his return to Arqua he died there July 18, 1374, aged seventy years, and was interred there [*E*]. He had embraced the Ecclesiastical State, and wore the habit, and gave himself the title of Clerk; he was Canon of Cavaillon and of Lombez, Archdeacon of the Church of Parma, and at last Canon of the Cathedral Church of Padua; but never received the Order of Priesthood. Besides these preferments, Robert King of Naples and Queen Joan gave him the title of Domestick Chaplain, as appears from the letters, which they granted him, the former in 1341, and the latter in 1343. He had a very good constitution; and his temperate manner of life contributed to preserve it a long time without sickness. He neither wished for nor despised riches, and loved glory, though without shewing too great a zeal for it. He had an excellent genius, and was a perfect master of the Italian Poetry; but his Latin Poems are much inferior. A great many Authors have written his life [*F*]. Jerom Squarciafico, in his account of him prefixed to Petrarch's Italian Poems, tells us, that he would never consent, that

Our Author's *Canzoni* are the best performances, in the judgment of Muratori, and are much superior to his *Sonetti*, among which, however, there are some incomparable. With regard to his *Trionfi*, the best Judges own, that they are inferior to his other poems, though there be in them invention, beautiful descriptions, admirable thoughts, and excellent verses. There have been several French translations of Petrarch's Italian poems, particularly the following. *Les Triomphes de Messire François Petrarque, traduit de Rime Toscane en Prose Françoise. Avec l'Expostion au long de toutes les Histoires y contenues.* Paris 1520, in folio, and since in 8vo and 16°. The Translator's name is unknown, except he was George de la Forge, of Bourbon, of whom we meet with a manuscript Translation in page 11, of the catalogue of manuscripts of Madam the Princess, printed in 1724. *Les six Triomphes de Petrarque traduits en Rime Françoise, par Jean Amayner, Baron d'Opede.* Lyons in 16°, without date. *Toutes les oeuvres vulgaires de François Petrarque, contenant quatre Livres de Madame Laure d'Avignon sa Maitresse, en Sonnets & Chants; les Triumphes d'Amour, de Châteté, de Mort, de Renommée, du Temps, & de la Divinité, traduites du Tuscan en vers Françoise par Vasquin Philieul, de Carpentras, Docteur is Droits, & Chanoine de Notre-Dame des Doms.* Avignon 1548, in 8vo. *Septante Sonnets traduits de Petrarque par Etienne du Tronchet, Foresion.* Paris 1575, and 1581, in 16°. With some other pieces by the Translator. *Le Petrarque traduit en Rime Françoise avec les Commentaires par Philippe de Maldeghem.* Brussels 1600, in 8vo. *Les Oeuvres amoureuses de Petrarque, traduites en François avec l'Italien à côté. Par le Sieur Placide Catamusi, Docteur & Professeur en Droit & Advocat en Parliament.* Paris 1669, in 12mo. We find here only the translation of the *Sonetti* and *Trionfi* of Petrarch; that of the *Canzoni* is not added. Du Verdier, in his *Biblotheque Françoise*, has committed a gross mistake, with relation to a Commentary upon Petrarch's *Trionfi*, by *Bernardo Illicinio* or *Licinio*. He writes thus, p. 117. "*Bernard Illicinius* has translated into French the Exposition and Commentary upon the Italian Text of Petrarch's triumphs, not printed, and seen by me in manuscript in the library of Count d'Urfé." Du Verdier's mistake manifestly arose from his having seen in the manuscript only the name of *Illicinius*; whence he imagined that this was the name of the French translation. Father Labbe, through another mistake, has asserted in his *Nova Bibliotheca Manuscriptorum*, that Illicinius had not translated, but written this Commentary in French; for his words are these: *The Triumphs of Petrarch in Italian, with the French Commentaries of Bernard Illicinius.* 33. *Chronica delle vite de Pontefici & Imperatori Romani, in fino à suoi tempi alla quale sono state aggiunte quelle da tempi del Petrarca fino a Pio* III. Florence 1478, in folio. Venice 1507, in 4to, and 1534, in 8vo. Geneva 1615, in 4to. Nicholas Franco published at Venice in 1543, in 8vo, a work under the title of *Petrarchista*, in which he relates, that being at Avignon, at the house of one Robert, he saw several original pieces of Petrarch, which had not been published, and among others some elegies, of which he gives a specimen in page 26. But whoever is the least conversant in the writings of Petrarch, will easily perceive, that Franco intended to impose on the ignorant, since the piece which he cites, is only a Cento from Petrarch's verses already printed. There has been a prodigious number of Commentaries on Petrarch's poems: most of his Sonnets have served as an exercise for the critical talent of the learned men of Italy; which shews the esteem, in which our Author is held. The Reader may see the titles of some of them in Haym's *Notizia de' Libri rari*, p. 212 *& seqq.*

[*E*] *Upon his return to Arqua he died there July* 18, 1374, *aged seventy years, and was interred there.*] He ordered by his will made at Padua in 1370, that he should be interred at Arqua. His funeral was honoured by the presence of the Lord of Padua, and the Bishop and Clergy of that city; and his funeral Oration was pronounced by his friend Bonaventure Badoaro of Peraga, of the Order of the Eremites, who was afterwards Cardinal. The following Epitaph, which was written by Petrarch himself, was placed over his grave.

Frigida Franciſci lapis hic tegit ossa Petrarcæ:
Suscipe, Virgo parens, animam; sate Virgine parce:
Fessaque jam terris cœli requiescat in arce.
Anno Domini 1374, 18 *Julii.*

Below were added these words: *Viro insigni* F. P. *Laureato* Franciscolus de Brosano *Mediolanensis, Gener, individuâ conversatione, amore, propinquitate, & successione, memoria.* This *Franciscolus de Brosano* had married a natural daughter, which Petrarch had by a Lady of a good family, who lived in the village of Linterno, afterwards called corruptly *l'Inferno*, near Milan; Petrarch left *Franciscolus* his universal Legatee.

[*F*] *A great many Authors have written his life.*] Above five and twenty have given an account of his life at large; but they are inconsistent with each other both in dates and facts. That which Muratori prefixed to Petrarch's Italian Poems in his edition printed in 1711, is the most exact, and has been followed in this article, to which we have joined the additions made to it in the *Journal of Venice*, Tome VIII. p. 186. However, we shall give a list of those, who laboured in this design, before that learned Author. *Paul Vergerio* published a life of Petrarch in Latin, and *James Philip Tomisini* has inserted it in page 175 of his *Petrarcha redivivus*, at Padua 1650, in 4to. *Xicco* or *Siccone Polentone* of Padua wrote another in Latin, which *Tomasini* likewise published under the name of an anonymous Writer from a manuscript of *James Gaffarel* in his *Petrarcha redivivus*, p. 185. *Giannezzo* (in Latin *Jannoctius*) *Manetti* left one in Latin, published by *Tomasini* in the same book, p. 195. *Leonardo Aretino* wrote his account in Italian, printed in *Tomasini's* book, p. 207. *Ludovico Beccatelli*, Archbishop of Ragusa, wrote one in Italian, subjoined to the preceding in *Tomasini's Petrarcha redivivus*, p. 213. *Rodolphus Agricola* wrote his account in Latin, according to *Trithemius*; but it seems never to have been printed. *Philip Villani* left one in Italian, which has continued in manuscript. *Girolamo Squarciafico* prefixed one in Italian to his Commentary upon the Italian Poems of Petrarch, first printed at Milan in 1494, in folio, and several times since. *Alexander Vellutello* prefixed one to his Commentary upon our Poet, printed at Venice in 1538, in 4to. and reprinted several

that his ſiſter ſhould become the Miſtreſs of Pope Benedict XII. who was deſperately in love with her, and promiſed him a Cardinal's hat as a reward; but that another brother ſold this ſiſter to that Pope upon very mean terms.

veral times. *Andrea Geſualdo* added a much larger account of Petrarch's life than any of the preceding, to his Commentaries on that Poet, printed at Venice 1553, in 4to. *Antonio da Tempo* of Padua prefixed one written in Italian, as well as the preceding, to his Commentary publiſhed at Bologna in 1475, in folio. *Bernardino Daniello* of *Lucca* wrote one in the ſame language, which he added to his Commentary printed at Venice in 1541, in 4to. *Papirius Maſſo* publiſhed in Latin the lives of *Dante*, *Petrarch*, and *Boccace*, at Paris 1587, in 8vo. and they are inſerted in the collection of his *Elogia*. *Paulus Jovius* has given our Author a place in his *Elogia*, among which his is the fifth. *Jacobi Philippi Tomaſini Petrarcha redivivus, integram Poetæ vitam Iconibus ære cælatis exhibens. Acceſſit nobiliſſimæ Fœminæ Lauræ brevis Hiſtoria. Editio altera correcta & aucta.* Padua 1650, in 4to. *Tomaſini* has added to this a letter of *Fortunio Liceti*, whom he had conſulted concerning the orthography of Petrarch's name; in which letter *Liceti* declares for *Petrarcha* written with an *h*. *Michael Poccianti* treats at large of our Author in his *Catalogus Scriptorum Florentinorum*. *Giulio Negri* has given him a long article, though a very confuſed and erroneous one, in his *Hiſtoria de Fiorentini Scrittori*. *Placide Catanuſi* has prefixed a pretty long account of *Petrarch* to his French tranſlation of our Author's Poems, and inſiſted principally upon the ceremony of his being crowned Poet; but there are many miſtakes in that account. T.

☞ PETTY (WILLIAM), ſon of Anthony Petty, a Clothier, was born at Romſey, a little haven-town in Hampſhire, May 26, 1623; and while a boy, took great delight in ſpending his time among Artificers there, as Smiths, Carpenters, Joiners, &c. whoſe trades, in ſome reſpects, he underſtood ſo well at twelve years of age, that he could work at them. At that time he went to the Grammar-ſchool there (*a*); at fifteen years of age was maſter of the Latin, Greek, and French tongues, the whole body of Arithmetic, and thoſe parts of practical Geometry and Aſtronomy uſeful to Navigation, and Dialing, with the knowledge of ſeveral mechanical trades (*b*). Soon after this, he went to Caen in Normandy, and with a little ſtock of Merchandize, which he then improved, maintained himſelf there, and afterwards removed to Paris, and ſtudied Anatomy, and read Veſalius with Mr. Hobbes, who had a great affection for him, and aſſiſted him in his ſtudies (*c*). Upon his return to England, he was preferred in the King's Navy; and at the age of twenty years, had gotten about ſixty pounds, with as much Mathematics as any one of his age was known to have had; and with this money, in 1643, when the war between the King and Parliament grew hot, he went into the Netherlands and France for three years, and having vigorouſly proſecuted his ſtudies, eſpecially in Phyſic, at Utrecht, Leyden, Amſterdam and Paris, he returned home to Romſey, bringing with him about ten pounds more than he had carried out of England (*d*). On the 16th of March, 1647, he obtained a patent from the Parliament, to teach the art of double writing [*A*]; which patent was to continue in force for ſeventeen years. In 1648, he publiſhed at London in 4to, *Advice to Mr.* Samuel Hartlib, *for the Advancement of ſome particular Parts of Learning* [*B*]. At this time he adhered to the predo-

(*a*) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 807. 2d edit.

(*b*) This he tells us himſelf, in laſt Will, dated May 2, 1685.

(*c*) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(*d*) See his *Will.*

[*A*] *His art of double writing.*] In his *Advice to Mr.* Samuel Hartlib, *for the advancement of ſome particular parts of learning*, printed at London 1648, in 4to, he writes thus: *There is invented an inſtrument of ſmall bulke and price, eaſily made, and very durable, whereby any man, even at the firſt ſight and handling, may write two reſembling copies of the ſame thing at once, as ſerviceably and as faſt (allowing two lines upon each page for ſetting the inſtruments) as by the ordinary way. Of what nature, or in what character, or what matter ſoever, as paper, parchment, a book, &c. the ſaid writing ought to be upon, made. The uſe hereof will be very great to Lawyers and Scriveners, for making of indentures, and all kinde of counter-parts; to Merchants, Intelligencers, Regiſters, Secretaries, Clarkes, &c. for copying of letters, accompts, invoices, entering of warrants, and other records; to Scholars for tranſcribing of rare manuſcripts, and preſerving originals from falſification, and other injuries of time. It leſſeneth the labour of examination, ſerveth to diſcover forgeries and ſurreptitious copies, and to the tranſacting of all buſineſſes of writing, as with eaſe and ſpeed, ſo with privacy alſo.*

[*B*] Advice to Mr. *Samuel Hartlib*, for the Advancement of ſome particular Parts of Learning.] In the dedication to Mr. Hartlib, dated at London the 8th of January 1647-8, he writes thus: "I have had "many flying thoughts concerning the advancement "of reall learning in general, but particularly of the "education of Youth, Mathematics, Phyſic, and con"cerning the Hiſtory of Art and Nature, with ſome "more ſerious ones concerning your owne moſt ex"cellent Advices for an Office of Publick Addreſſe. "And indeed they were but flying thoughts, for ſee"ing what vaſt ſummes were requiſite to carry on "thoſe deſigns, and how unwilling or unable men "generally are to contribute towards them, I thought "it but labour loſt to fix my mind much upon them. "But it having pleaſed God, unexpectedly, to make "me the Inventor of the art of double writing, daily "and hourly uſefull to all ſorts of perſons in all "places of the world, and that to perpetuity, I con"ceived, that if there were underſtanding enough in "men to be ſenſible of their own good, and thank"fulneſſe or honeſty to reward the Contrivers of it. "ſuch meanes might be raiſed out of this art, as "might at leaſt ſet the aforementioned deſigns on "float, and make them ready to ſet ſaile towards "the haven of perfection upon every opportunity of "ſtronger gales. And thereupon I reaſſumed my me"ditations, which I here give you, deſiring you and "your ingenious friends to remeditate upon them, "and correct them; but withall to think of the "beſt courſe how to improve my invention to ſuch ad"vantage, as may, if poſſible, make us capable of en"joying more then bare ideas of that happineſſe, "which the atchievements of our deſigns promiſeth. "I ſhall deſire you to ſhew them unto no more then "needs you muſt, ſince they can pleaſe only thoſe "few, that are reall friends to the deſigne of reali"ties; not thoſe, who are tickled only with rhetori"call prefaces, tranſitions, and epilogues, and charm"ed with fine alluſions and metaphors, (all which I "do not condemn) wherewith, as I had no abili"ties to adorn my diſcourſe, ſo I wanted all other "requiſites thereunto, having written it (as yourſelf "muſt beare me witneſſe) at your own importunity, "in the midſt of my cares and indeavours to perfect "mine invention, and which is worſe in the midſt "of my hard, and perhaps, unprofitable labour, to "prevent the ingratitude and backwardneſſe of men "to

predominant party of the Kingdom, and went to Oxford, when the Parliamentary Viſitors were exerciſing their juriſdiction in that Univerſity, and ſettled there for ſome time, proſecuting the ſtudy of Phyſic, and teaching Anatomy and Chemiſtry to the young Scholars there. He became likewiſe Deputy-Profeſſor of Anatomy to Dr. Thomas Clayton, who had an unſurmountable averſion to the ſight of a dead body. March 7, 1649-50, he was created Doctor of Phyſic, by virtue of a diſpenſation from the Delegates of the Univerſity; and was ſoon after made Fellow of Braſen-noſe College, in the room of *Nathaniel Hoyle*, B. D. In December 1650, he was one of the chief perſons

" to reward him, who ſhall earneſtly labour to ex-
" preſſe himſelfe,

" Yours and your deſignes moſt affectionate Servant,

" *W. P.*

(1) p. 1. In the tract itſelf, he obſerves (1), that his deſign is to *point at ſome pieces of knowledge, the improvement whereof would make much to the generall good and comfort of all mankind, and withall to deliver our own opinion, by what meanes they may be raiſed ſome one degree neerer to perfection. But before we can meddle,* ſays he, *with this great work, we muſt firſt think of getting Labourers, by appointing ſome generall randevouz, where all men either able or willing to take up armes againſt the many difficulties thereof, may find entertainment. That is to ſay, we muſt recommend the inſtitution of an* Office *of* common Addreſſe, *according to the projection of Maſter* Hartlib, *(that painfull and great inſtrument of this deſigne,) whereby the wants and deſires of all, may be made known to all; where men may know what is already done in the buſineſſe of learning; what is at preſent in doing, and what is intended to be done; to the end, that by ſuch a generall communication of deſignes and mutual aſſiſtance, the wits and endeavours of the world may no longer be as ſo many ſcattered coals or firebrands, which for want of union are ſoone quenched; whereas being but layed together, they would have yeelded a comfortable light and heat. For methinkes the preſent condition of men is like a field, where a battle hath beene lately fought, where we may ſee many leggs, and armes, and eyes lying here and there, which, for want of a union, and a ſoul to quicken and enliven them, are good for nothing but to feed ravens, and infect the air. So we ſee many wittes and ingenuities lying ſcattered up and downe the world, whereof ſome are now labouring to doe what is already done, and puſling themſelves to reinvent what is already invented. Others we ſee quite ſtuck faſt in difficulties for want of a few directions, which ſome other man (might he be met withall) both could and would moſt eaſily give him. Againe, one man wants a ſmall ſumme of mony to carry on ſome deſigne, that requires it; and there is perhaps another, who hath twice as much ready to beſtow on the ſame deſigne; but theſe two having no means ever to heare the one of the other, the good work, intended and deſired by both parties, doth utterly periſh, and come to nothing. But this we paſſe over ſleightly, though very fundamental to our buſineſſe, becauſe the Maſter-builder thereof himſelf hath done it ſo ſolidly.* " Having by this means procured " work-men, and what elſe is neceſſary to the worke, " that which we would have them to labour in, is; " How to finde out ſuch arts as are yet undiſcovered; " how to learne what is already known, by more " compendious and facile ways, and to apply it to " more, and thoſe more noble uſes; how to work in " men an higher eſteeme of learning, ſo as to give " occaſion, encouragement, and opportunity to more " men to apply themſelves to its advancement.

" The next thing then to be done will be,

I. " To ſee what is well and ſufficiently done al-
" ready, exploding whatſoever is nice, contentious,
" and merely phantaſtical; all which muſt in ſome
" meaſure be ſuppreſſed and brought into diſgrace
" and contempt with all men.

II. " This ſurvey may be made by peruſing
" all books, and taking notice of all mechanical in-
" ventions.

III. " In this peruſal all the real or experimental
" learning may be ſifted and collected out of the ſaid
" books.

IV. " There muſt be appointed able readers of
" all ſuch books, with certain and well limited di-
" rections what to collect out of them.

V. " Every book muſt be ſo read by two ſeverall
" perſons apart, to prevent miſtakes and failings
" from the ſaid directions.

VI. " The directions for reading muſt be ſuch, as
" the Readers obſerving them, may exactly agree
" in their collections.

VII. " Out of all theſe bookes, one booke or great
" worke may be made, though conſiſting of many
" volumes.

VIII. " The moſt artificiall indices, tables, or o-
" ther helps for the ready finding, remembring, and
" well underſtanding all things contained in theſe
" bookes, muſt be contrived and put in practice.

" Having thus taken the height or pitch, where-
" unto all arts and ſciences whatſoever are already
" come, and obſerved where they now ſtick; the
" ableſt men in every reſpective faculty muſt be ſet
" apart, to drive them on further with ſufficient
" maintenance and encouragement for the ſame.
" Whereunto it is requiſite, that two or three, one
" under another, be employed about each faculty,
" to the end that ſome of them dying, or any other-
" wiſe failing, there may never want men acquainted
" with the whole deſigne, and able to carry it on,
" with the help of others to be admitted under them.
" And that at leaſt, yearly accounts be taken of
" thoſe men's endeavours, and rewards be proportion-
" ed to them accordingly." Our Author then propoſes,

1. That there be inſtituted *Ergaſtula Literaria*, literary work-houſes, where children may be taught as well to do ſomething toward their living, as to read and write.

That the buſineſs of education be not, as now, committed to the worſt and unworthieſt of men; but that it be ſeriouſly ſtudied and practiſed by the beſt and ableſt perſons.

That all children above ſeven years old may be preſented to this kind of education, none being to be excluded, by reaſon of the poverty and unability of their parents; for hereby it hath come to paſs, that many are now holding the plow, which might have been fit to ſteer the State. Wherefore let ſuch poor children be imployed on works, whereby they may earn their living, equal to their ſtrength and underſtanding, and ſuch as they may perform, as well as elder and abler perſons, viz. attending engines, &c. And if they cannot get their whole living, and their parents can contribute nothing at all to make it up, let them ſtay ſomewhat the longer in the work-houſe.

That ſince few children have need of reading, before they know, or can be acquainted with the things they read of; or of writing, before their thoughts are worth the recording, or they are able to put them into any form, (which we call inditing;) much leſs of learning languages, when there are books enough for their preſent uſe in their own mother tongue; our opinion is, that thoſe things being withall ſomewhat above their capacity, as being to be attained by judgment, which is the weakeſt in children, and be deferred a while, and others more needful for them, ſuch as are in the order of nature before theſe aforementioned, and are attainable by the help of memory, which is either moſt ſtrong, or unpreoccupied in children, be ſtudied before them. We wiſh therefore, that the Educands be taught to obſerve and remember all ſenſible objects and actions, whether they be natural or artificial, which the Educators muſt, upon all occaſions, expound unto them.

That

That they uſe ſuch exerciſes, whether in work, or for recreation, as tend to the health, agility, and ſtrength of their bodies.

That they be taught to read by much more compendious means than are in common uſe; which is a thing certainly very eaſy and feaſible.

That they be not only taught to write according to our common way, but alſo to write ſwiftly, and in real characters; as likewiſe the dexterous uſe of the inſtruments for writing many copies of the ſame thing at once.

That the artificial memory be thought upon; and if the precepts thereof be not too far above children's capacities, we conceive it not improper for them to learn that alſo.

That in no caſe the art of drawing and deſigning be omitted, to what courſe of life ſoever theſe children are to be applied; ſince the uſe thereof for expreſſing the conceptions of the mind, ſeems to be little inferiour to that of writing, and in many caſes performs what by words is impoſſible.

That the elements of arithmetic and geometry be all ſtudied, being not only of great and frequent uſe in all human affairs; but alſo ſure guides and helps to reaſon, and eſpecial remedies for a volatile and unſteady mind.

That effectual courſes be taken to try the abilities of the bodies and minds of children, the ſtrength of their memory, inclination of their affections either to vice or virtue, and to which of them in particular; and withall to alter what is bad in them, and increaſe and improve what is good, applying all, whether good or bad, to the leaſt inconveniency, and moſt advantage.

That ſuch as ſhall have need to learn foreign languages, (the uſe whereof would be much leſſened, were the real and common characters brought into practice) may be taught them by incomparably more eaſy ways than are now uſual.

That no ignoble, unneceſſary, or condemned part of learning be taught in thoſe houſes of education; ſo that if any man ſhall vainly fall upon them, he himſelf only may be blamed.

That ſuch as have any natural ability and fitneſs to muſic, be encouraged and inſtructed therein.

That all children, though of the higheſt rank, be taught ſome gentile manufacture in their minority, ſuch as theſe, turning of curious figures, making mathematical inſtruments, dials, and how to uſe them in aſtronomical obſervations; making watches, and other trochilic motions; limning and painting on glaſs or in oyl-colours; graving, etching, carving, emboſſing, and molding in ſundry matters; the Lapidary's art in knowing, cutting, and ſetting jewels; grinding of glaſſes dioptrical and catoptrical; botanics and gardening; making muſical inſtruments; Navarchy, and making models for buildings and rigging of ſhips; architecture and making models for houſes; the Confectioner's, Perfumer's, or Dier's arts; Chemiſtry, refining metals, and counterfeiting jewels; Anatomy, making ſkeletons, and excarnating bowels; making Mariner's compaſſes, globes, and other magnetic devices.

And all for theſe reaſons:

1. They will be leſs liable to be cozened by Artificers.

2. They will become more induſtrious in general.

3. They will certainly bring to paſs moſt excellent works, being as Gentlemen ambitious to excell ordinary workmen.

4. They being able to make experiments themſelves, may do it with leſs charge, and more care, than others will do it for them.

5. The *Reſpublica Artium* will be much advanced, when ſuch as are rich and able, are alſo willing to make luciferous experiments.

6. It may engage them to be Mecenas's and Patrons of arts.

7. It will keep them from worſe occaſions of ſpending their time and eſtates.

8. As it will be a great ornament in proſperity, ſo it will be a great refuge and ſtay in adverſity, and common calamity.

" We have already, ſays our Author, recommend-
" ed the ſtudy of the elements of arithmetic and
" geometry to all men in general. But they being
" the beſt grounded parts of ſpeculative knowledge,
" and of ſo vaſt uſe in all practical arts, we cannot
" but commend deeper enquiries into them. And
" although the way of advancing them in particu-
" lar, may be drawn from what we have already
" delivered concerning the advancement of learning
" in generall; yet for the more explicite under-
" ſtanding of our meaning herein, we referre to Maſter
" *Pell*'s moſt excellent idea thereof, written to Maſ-
" ter *Hartlib* (2).

(2) See the art. of PELL (John), remark [*B*].

" In the next place, for the advancement of all
" mechanicall arts and manufactures, we wiſh that
" there were erected a *Gymnaſium Mechanicum*, or
" a college of Trades-men, (or for more expedition,
" untill ſuch place could be built, that the moſt con-
" venient houſes for ſuch a purpoſe, may be either
" bought or hired,) wherein we would, that one at
" leaſt of every trade (but the prime, moſt ingenious
" workman, the moſt deſirous to improve his art)
" might be allowed therein a handſome dwell-
" ing rent-free, which with the credit of being ad-
" mitted into this ſociety, and the quick ſale,
" which certainly they would have of their commo-
" dities, when all men would repair thither, as to a
" market of rare and exquiſite pieces of workman-
" ſhip, would be a ſufficient motive to attract the
" very ableſt Mechanicks, and ſuch as we have deſ-
" cribed to deſire a Fellowſhip in this College.

" From this inſtitution we may clearly hope, when
" the excellent in all arts are not only neighbours,
" but intimate friends and brethren, united in a
" common deſire and zeal to promote them, that
" all trades will miraculouſly proſper, and new in-
" ventions would be more frequent then new faſhions
" of clothes and houſhold ſtuffe. Here would be the
" beſt and moſt effectual opportunities and means for
" writing a hiſtory of trades in perfection and exact-
" neſſe, and what experiments and ſtuffe would all
" thoſe ſhops and operations afford to active and
" philoſophical heads, out of which to extract that
" interpretation of nature, whereof there is ſo little,
" and that ſo bad, as yet extant in the world?

" Within the walls of this *Gymnaſium* or College,
" ſhould be a *Noſocomium Academicum*, according to
" the moſt exact and perfect idea thereof; a com-
" pleat *Theatrum Botanicum*; ſtalls and cages for all
" ſtrange beaſts and birds, with ponds and conſer-
" vatories for all exotic fiſhes. Here all animals,
" capable thereof, ſhould be made fit for ſome kind
" of labour and employment, that they may as well
" be of uſe living as dead. Here ſhould be a repo-
" ſitary of all kind of rarities, natural and artificial,
" pieces of antiquity, modells of all great and noble
" engines, with deſignes and platforms of gardens
" and buildings; the moſt artificiall fountains and
" water-works; a library of ſelect books; an aſtro-
" nomicall obſervatory for celeſtiall bodies and me-
" teors; large pieces of ground for ſeverall experi-
" ments of agriculture; galleries of the rareſt paint-
" ings and ſtatues; with the faireſt globes and geo-
" graphicall maps of the beſt deſcriptions. And ſo
" far as is poſſible, we would have this place to be
" the epitome or abſtract of the whole world; ſo
" that a man converſant within theſe walls, would
" certainly prove a greater ſcholar, than the walking
" libraries ſo called, although he could neither write
" nor read. But if a child, before he learned to
" read or write, were made acquainted with all
" things and actions (as he might in this college,)
" how eaſily would he underſtand all good books afte-
" wards, and ſmell out the ſopperies of bad ones?"

Our Author next gives us a plan of the *Noſocomium Academicum*; and afterwards recommends the compiling of a work, whoſe title might juſtly be, *Vellus aureum, ſive Facultatum Lucriferarum Deſcriptio magna*; wherein all the practiſed ways of getting a ſubſiſtence, and whereby men raiſe their fortunes, may be at large declared. And among theſe we wiſh, that the Hiſtory of Arts or Manufactures might firſt be undertaken as the moſt pleaſant and profitable of all the reſt, wherein ſhould be deſcribed the whole proceſs of manual operations and applications of one natural thing (which we call the elements of artificials) to another, with the neceſſary inſtruments and machines, whereby every piece of work is elaborated and made to be what it is; unto which work bare words being not ſufficient, all inſtruments and tools muſt be pictured, and colours added, when the de-

ſons concerned in the [C] recovery of one *Anne Greene*, who had been hanged at Oxford Caſtle on the 14th of that month, for the ſuppoſed murther of her baſtard child. In the beginning of January, 1650-1, he was unanimouſly elected Profeſſor of Anatomy at Oxford, upon the reſignation of Dr. Clayton; and ſoon after was made one of the College of Phyſicians at London, and Profeſſor of Muſic at Greſham College, which laſt he obtained by the intereſt of his dear friend Captain *John Graunt* [D] (e). Being now maſter of 500 l. 100 l. of which were allowed him to go to Ireland, he landed at Waterford in that Kingdom, on the 10th of September, the ſame year, and became

(e) Wood, ubi ſupra.

ſcriptions cannot be made intelligible without them. *This Hiſtory*, ſays he, *muſt not be made out of a Farrago of imperfect relations made to the compiler, either by too rude or couſening workmen; but all things thereunto appertaining muſt be by himſelfe obſerved and atteſted by the moſt judicious and candid of each reſpective profeſſion, as well to make the work the more authentick (it being to be the baſis of many future inferences and philoſophations) as the more clearly and diſtinctly to enforme the Compiler himſelf, by whoſe judgment as the alembick, and induſtry of fire, it is hoped, that the quinteſſence and magiſteries of all preſent inventions may be extracted, and new ones produced in abundance. Although it be intended to teach the making of all artificials; yet it is not to be underſtood, that when there hath been taught how to make a ſtoole or a naile of one faſhion, that the art of making a chaire or a naile of another faſhion ſhould be long inſiſted on. But the compiler ſhould ſtrive to reduce the making of all artificials in each trade to a certaine number and claſſes of operations, tools, and materials; neither need he to ſet the figures, or mention the names of all artificials that ever were made, but only of ſuch as are moſt knowne and of common uſe amongſt men. He needeth not to deſcribe every punctilio in making all the aforementioned particulars, and yet leave no more defects than may be ſupplied by every common underſtanding. For we queſtion whether, if he ſhould engage himſelfe in ſuch an endleſſe labour, a man by the bare light and inſtruction of the book could attaine to a dextrous practice of trade, whereunto hath been required ſeven yeares Autopſia; but are confident, that the help of this book will leſſen the former tædium by more than half. He ſhould not ſo abridge the work as not to diſtinguiſh between inſtruments of the ſame name; as between a loome to weave kerſies, and another wherein to weave ſilk ribbands or ſtockings. He ſhould all along give the mechanicall reaſon of every inſtrument, material, and operation, when the ſame is ſenſible and cleere. He ſhould all along note his own defects in ſetting down theſe hiſtories, in caſe he had not at the time of the writing thereof ſufficient information, and withal the deficiencies of the trades themſelves. Now whereas there be divers wayes and methods of working moſt manufactures, he ſhould in each thing ſtick cloſe to the way of ſome one maſter; but note all the diverſities he knoweth, and give his opinion of the uſe and goodneſs of each.*

" Moreover the œconomy *ſive Ars augendæ rei familiaris* in all profeſſions ought to be enquired into, " *viz.* what ſeaſons of the yeare are moſt proper to " each work; which the beſt places and times to " buy materials, and to put off the Commodities " when finiſhed; how moſt thriftily to hire, enter- " taine, and overſee ſervants and workmen; how " to diſpoſe of every excrement and refuſe of mate- " rials, or of broken, worne, or otherwiſe unſer- " viceable tooles and utenſils; with all cauteles, im- " poſtures, and other ſleights good or bad, whereby " men uſe to over-reach one another.

" There ought to be added to this work many and " various indices, beſides the alphabetical ones; as " namely one of all the artificials mentioned in the " whole worke. Another of all the natural mate- " rials or elements of artificials uſed, from whence " they come, where to be had, and what are the or- " dinary and middle prices of them. Another of all " the qualities or ſchemes of matter, as of all li- " quifiable things, viſcid, friable, heavy, tranſpa- " rent, abſterſive, or otherwiſe qualified according to " all the claſſes of 1, 2, and 3 qualities, to the end " that materials for all inventions and experiments " may be at hand and in ſight. Another of all ope- " rations mentioned in the whole work, as ſawing, " hewing, filing, boring, melting, diſſolving, turn- " ing, beating, grinding, boyling, calcining, knit- " ting, ſpinning, ſewing, twiſting, &c. to the end " that they all may alſo be at hand for the purpoſes " aforeſaid. Another of all tooles and machines, " as files, ſawes, chiſſels, ſheeres, ſives, loomes, " ſhuttles, wheeles, wedges, knives, ſkrews, &c. for " the ſame purpoſe alſo.

" The Compiler ought to publiſh all his con- " jectures, how odd inventions may be perfected, " and new ones produced; giving directions how " to try the truth of them. So that by all thoſe, " unto whoſe hands theſe books ſhall come perchance, " all the ſaid ſuppoſitions may be tried, and the ſuc- " ceſſe reported to the Compiler himſelfe.

" The Compiler's firſt ſcope in inventions ſhall " bee, how to apply all materials that grow in abun- " dance in this kingdome, and whereof but inconſi- " derable uſe and profits are as yet made, to more " advantage to the Commonwealth; and alſo how " all impotents, whether onely blind, or onely lame, " and all children of above ſeven years old, might " earne their bread, and not be ſo long burthen- " ſome to their parents and others.

" There ſhould be made a Preface to the work to " teach men how to make the moſt of experiments, " and to record the ſucceſſes of them whatſoever, " whether according to hopes or no, all being e- " qually luciferous, although not equally lucriferous.

" There ought to be much artifice uſed, that all " the aforementioned indices may handſomely re- " ferre one to another; that all things contained in " the whole book may be moſt eaſily found, and " moſt readily attend the ſeekers of new inven- " tions.

" The way to accompliſh this worke muſt be to " enquire what to this purpoſe is already done, or in " hand, in all places, and alſo by whom; ſo that " communication of Counſels and proceedings may " (if poſſible) be had with thoſe undertakers.

" All bookes of this ſubject already extant in " print muſt be collected and bought, not to tranſ- " cribe them, but to examine them *per Autopſiam*, and " re-experiment the experiments contained in them; " and withall to give hints of new enquiries.

" The Compiler muſt be content to devote his " whole life to this employment; one, who (as we " ſaid before) hath the fire of induſtry, and the " alembick of a curious and rational head, to extract " the quinteſſence of whatſoever he ſeeth.

" He ſhould be as young as ſufficient abilities will " admit, to the end that he may with the concur- " rence of God's ordinary providence either finiſh or " very farre advance the worke, while he liveth; " and alſo that living long in that employment, he " may heap up the larger ſtock of experiments; " which how much the greater it is in one man, " affordeth ſo much the more hopes of new in- " ventions."

[C] *Concerned in the recovery of Anne Greene, who had been hanged*, &c.] The reader may ſee a particular account of this extraordinary accident in a pamphlet printed at Oxford 1651, with this title. *News from the dead: or a true and exact Narration of the miraculous deliverance of Anne Greene, who being executed at Oxford December* 14, 1650, *afterwards revived; and by the care of certain Phyſicians there ſhe is now perfectly recovered. Together with the manner of her ſuffering, and the particular means uſed for her recovery. Written by a ſcholar in Oxford for the ſatisfaction of a friend, who deſired to be informed concerning the truth of the buſineſs. Whereunto are annexed certain Poems caſually written on that ſubject.*

[D] *His dear friend Captain* John Graunt.] We ſhall take this opportunity to add here a remark to the article, which we have already given of that ingenious Writer. Biſhop Burnet (3) ſpeaking of the Fire of London, writes thus: *The moſt extraordinary*

(3) *Hiſtory of his own Time*, vol. I.

became Phyſician to the army, with the allowance of 20 ſhillings a day, in which place he continued till June 1659, gaining by his practice about 400 l. *per ann.* above the ſaid ſalary. About September 1654, perceiving, that the admeaſurements of the lands in Ireland forfeited on account of the Rebellion in 1641, and intended to regulate the ſatiſfaction of the ſoldiers, who had ſuppreſſed the ſame, was moſt inſufficiently and abſurdly managed, he obtained a contract dated December 11 the ſame year for making the ſaid admeaſurements; which he performed in ſuch a manner, that he gained about 9000 l. thereby, which with the 500 l. abovementioned, with his ſalary of 20 s. *per diem*, and the benefit of his practice, together with 600 l. more for directing an after-ſurvey of the adventurer's lands, and 800 l. more for two years ſalary as Clerk of the Council, raiſed him an eſtate of about 13000 l. in ready and real money. Part of this money he beſtowed in ſoldier's debentures, part in purchaſing the Earl of Arundel's houſe in Lothbury London, and part he kept in caſh to anſwer emergencies. He purchaſed lands in Ireland, great part of which were loſt by the Court of Innocents in 1663 (*f*). In January 1658 he was elected one of the Burgeſſes for Weſtlow in Cornwall, to ſerve in Richard Cromwell's Parliament, which began at Weſtminſter on the 27th of that month. But that Parliament being ſoon diſſolved, he went again into Ireland, where he had a great conteſt with Sir Hierom Sankey [*E*]. Returning after the Reſtoration, he was introduced to King Charles II. who was highly pleaſed with his ingenious diſcourſe, and on the 11th of April 1661 knighted him, and afterwards, as it was reported, deſigned to create him Earl of Kilmore in Ireland. Upon the eſtabliſhment of the Royal Society, he was appointed one of its firſt Members, and afterwards one of the Council belonging to it (*g*). In 1662 he publiſhed *a Treatiſe of Taxes and Contributions* [*F*]. In the beginning of 1663 he was greatly applauded in Ireland for the ſucceſs of his new invention of *a double-bottom'd ſhip* [*G*]. Beſides the tracts above-mentioned, he wrote ſeveral other works.

(*f*) See his *Will.*

(*g*) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

paſſage, though it is but a preſumption, was told me by Dr. Lloyd (4) *and the Counteſs of* Clarendon. *The latter had a great eſtate in the New River, that is brought from Ware to London, which is brought together at Iſlington, where there is a great room full of pipes, that convey it through all the ſtreets of London. The conſtant order of that water was, to ſet the pipes a running on Saturday-night, that ſo the ciſterns might be all full by Sunday-morning; there being a more than ordinary conſumption of water that day. There was one* Graunt, *a Papiſt, under whoſe name Sir* William Petty *publiſhed his* Obſervations *on the* Bills of Mortality. *He had ſome time before applied himſelf to* Lloyd, *who had great credit with the Counteſs of* Clarendon; *and ſaid, he could raiſe that eſtate conſiderably, if ſhe would make him a Truſtee for her. His ſchemes were probable; and he was made one of the Board, that governed that matter; and by that he had a right to come as oft as he pleaſed, to view their works at Iſlington. He went thither the Saturday before the fire broke out; and calling for the key of the place, where the heads of the pipes were, he turned all the cocks that were then open, and ſtopt the water, and then went away, and carried the keys with him. So when the fire broke out next morning, they opened the pipes in the ſtreets to find water, but there was none. And ſome hours were loſt in ſending to Iſlington, where the door was to be broke open, and the cocks turned. And it was long before the water got to London.* Graunt *indeed denied, that he had turned the cocks; but the officer of the works affirmed, that he had, according to order, ſet them all a running; and that no perſon had got the keys from him beſides* Graunt, *who confeſſed that he had carried away the keys, but pretended he did it without deſign.* Mr. William Maitland, F. R. S. in order to inform himſelf concerning the truth of this account, applied himſelf, as he tells us (5), to the Governor and Company of the New River, who ordered their minute-book to be communicated to him, from which it appears, that at a General Court of the ſaid Company held at Mr. Clifton's in Covent-Garden, on the 25th of September 1666, John Graunt, Eſq; was firſt admitted a Member of the ſaid New River Company (in the room of Alexander Broom deceaſed) in truſt for one of the ſhares belonging to Sir *William Backhouſe*, Knight, who dying in the year 1669, Dame Flower Backhouſe (probably his relict (6), became poſſeſſed of nine of his ſhares; and on the 12th of November the ſame year ſhe appointed Mr. *Graunt* one of her Truſtees in the ſaid Company. "Whereby it is manifeſt, *ſays Mr.* "Maitland, that the above recited relation, which "the Biſhop had of Dr. *Lloyd* and the Counteſs of "*Clarendon*, has not the leaſt foundation. For by "what has been ſaid it is evident, that Mr. *Graunt* "was not admitted into the government of the New "River Company till twenty three days after the "breaking out of the Fire of London; and then "put in truſt by the above named Sir *William Backhouſe*; whoſe relict, daughter, relation, or name-ſake, the abovementioned Dame *Flower Backhouſe*, "was ſome time after married to *Henry* Lord *Cornbury*, eldeſt ſon to the Earl of *Clarendon*; and who "by right of his ſaid Lady was firſt admitted a "Member of the ſaid Company on the 10th of No-"vember in the year 1670, and afterwards as Earl "of *Clarendon*, on the 9th of November 1676, be-"ing the firſt of that family, that ever was con-"cerned in the New River Company."

(4) Dr. William Lloyd, Biſhop of Worceſter.

(5) *Hiſtory of London*, b. 1. c. 3+. p. 291.

(6) She was his widow, as appears from Wood's *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 290. 2d edit.

[*E*] *Where he had a great conteſt with Sir Hierom Sankey.*] This Sir *Hierom Sankey* or *Zanchy* preferred ſix articles againſt our Author relating to his conduct in Ireland: 1. *That he the ſaid Dr.* Petty *had received great bribes.* 2. *That he had made a trade of buying debentures in vaſt numbers againſt the Statute.* 3. *That he had gotten vaſt ſums of money and ſcopes of land by fraud.* 4. *That he had uſed many foul practices as Surveyor and Commiſſioner for ſetting out lands.* 5. *That he and his Fellow-Commiſſioners had placed ſome debentures in better places than they could claim, denying right to others.* 6. *That he and his Fellow-Commiſſioners had totally diſpoſed of the army's ſecurity; the debt ſtill remaining chargeable on the State.* The Reader may ſee further concerning this affair in *A Brief of Proceedings between Sir* Hierome Sanky *and Dr.* Petty, *with the State of the Controverſy between them.* London 1659, in folio; and *Reflections upon ſome Perſons and Things in Ireland, by Letters to and from Dr.* Petty; *with Sir* Hierome Sankey's *Speech in Parliament.* London 1660, in 8vo.

[*F*] *In* 1662 *he publiſhed a* Treatiſe of Taxes and Contributions.] It was printed under this title, *A Treatiſe of Taxes and Contributions; ſhewing the Nature and Meaſures of Crown-Lands, Aſſeſſments, Cuſtoms, Poll-monies, Lotteries, Benevolence,* &c. London 1662 and 1667, in 4to.

[*G*] *His new invention of a* double-bottomed ſhip.] In July 1663, when firſt this ſhip adventured from Dublin to Holyhead, ſhe ſtaid there many days before her return; "and it was pleaſant, *ſays Mr.* Wood "(7), to conſider how her adverſaries inſulted, and "having firſt eſtabliſhed the concluſion, that ſhe was "caſt away, did afterwards diſcourſe the ſeveral ne-"ceſſities why it ſhould be ſo. Some ſaid, it was "impoſſible her maſt could be ſufficiently planted "againſt a ſtrong gale; others ſaid ſhe was gone "to land at O. Braſil. But her return in triumph "with

(7) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 808.

works [*H*]. He died at his houſe in Piccadilly-ſtreet, almoſt oppoſite to St. James's Church, within the liberty of Weſtminſter, of a gangrene in the foot, occaſioned by the ſwelling of the gout, on the 16th of December 1687; and his body was interred at Romſey, his native town, near thoſe of his father and mother. By his wife Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Hardreſs Waller, Knight, and Relict of Sir Maurice Fenton, he had iſſue two ſons, *viz. Charles*, created Baron of Shelborne in Ireland ſoon after his father's death, and *Henry*, and a daughter named *Anne*. He had alſo a natural daughter extremely like him in perſon, who was an actreſs in the Duke's Theatre in 1680 and afterwards. He wrote a life of himſelf, which, after his death, came into the hands of his brother-in-law Waller (*b*). In his laſt will he obſerves, that his real eſtate might be 6500 l. *per ann.* his perſonal eſtate about 45000 l. his bad and deſperate debts 3000 l. and the demonſtrable improvements of his Iriſh eſtate 4000 l. *per ann.* in all 15000 l. *per ann.* And with regard to his religion he expreſſes himſelf thus: "As for religion, I die "in the profeſſion of that faith and in the practice of ſuch worſhip as I find eſtabliſhed "by the law of my country, not being able to believe what I myſelf pleaſe, nor wor- "ſhip God better than by doing as I would be done unto, and obſerving the laws of "my country, and expreſſing my love and honour to Almighty God by ſuch ſigns and "tokens

(*b*) Wood, ibid. col. 807—811.

"with theſe viſible advantages above other veſſels "did check the deriſion of ſome, and becalmed the "violence of others; the firſt point being clearly "gained, that ſhe could bear the ſeas. She then "turned in againſt wind into that narrow Harbour "(Holyhead) amongſt the rocks and ſhips, with "ſuch dexterity, as many antient ſeamen did then "confeſs they had never ſeen the like. About "ſame time *Thomas* Earl of *Oſſory* and other perſons "of honour were embarked in her, and drove to "and again within the Bar near Dublin. It then "blew very hard, inſomuch that a ſmall Holland "veſſel, famous for a good ſailor, which ſet ſail "with her, was in appearance after looked upon to "be overſet, whilſt ſhe inclined not above half a "foot to one ſide more than another, ſo that "it was truly then called *the pad of the ſea*. It ap- "peared very much to excel all other forms of ſhips "in ſailing, in carriage, in ſecurity, and many o- "ther ſuch benefits; but at length in its return home "from a certain voyage, it was deſtroyed by a com- "mon fate, and by ſuch a dreadful tempeſt, as over- "whelmed a great fleet the ſame night. So that "the antient fabrick of ſhips had no reaſon to tri- "umph over that new model, when of ſeventy ſail "that were in the ſtorm, there was not one eſcaped "to bring the news. In a word, though this in- "vention ſucceeded not, while it was only ſupported "by private purſes, *it will* (as one (8) obſerves) *un- "doubtedly produce great effects, if ever it ſhall be re- "trived upon the publick ſtock of the nation.*" Sir William Petty gave a model of this ſhip made with his own hand to the Royal Society, and it is now in their *Muſæum*.

(8) Tho. Sprat, in *The Hiſtory of the Royal Society*, Lond. 1667, in 4to. part. 2. p. 240.

[*H*] *Several other works.*] They are as follow. I. *A Diſcourſe made before the Royal Society, 26 Nov. 1674. concerning the uſe of duplicate proportion in ſundry important particulars.* London 1674, in 12mo. See the *Philoſophical Tranſactions*, num. 109. p. 209. There is a ſevere cenſure of this diſcourſe, written by Dr. Tho. Barlow, Biſhop of Lincoln, printed in his *Genuine Remains*, p. 151. & ſeqq. Edit. London 1693, in 8vo. II. *A new Hypotheſis of ſpringing, or elaſtic motion:* printed at the end of the preceding diſcourſe. III. *An Apparatus to the Hiſtory of the common practices of Dying.* See Sprat's *Hiſtory of the Royal Society*, Part II. p. 284, &c. Edit. London 1667. IV. *A Treatiſe about the building of Ships.* It was preſented by the Author in manuſcript to the Royal Society about 1665, contained in about a quire of paper of his own writing. But William Lord Brouncker, Preſident of that Society, took it away, and kept it in his poſſeſſion till 1682, and afterwards, perhaps to the time of his death, ſaying that it was too great an Arcanum of State to be commonly peruſed. The Author had no copy of it by him, but there was one in the hands of Dr. Robert Wood, who lived in Ireland (9). V. *Colloquium Davidis cum Animâ ſuâ (accinente paraphraſin in 134 Pſalmum) de magnalibus Dei.* London 1679, in two ſheets in fol. This piece, which is in Hexameter Verſe, was compoſed by the Author March 25, 1678, under the name of *Caſſid. Aureus Minutius.* VI. *Political Arithmetic; or a Diſcourſe concerning the Extent of Land, People, Buildings, Huſbandry, Manufacture, Commerce, Fiſhery, Artizans, Seamen, Soldiers, Publick Revenues, Intereſt, Taxes, Superlucration, Regiſtries, Banks, valuation of Men, increaſing of Seamen, of Militias, Harbours, Situation, Shipping, Power at Sea, &c. as the ſame relates to every country in general, but more particularly to the territories of his Majeſty of Great Britain, and his neighbours of Holland, Zealand, and France.* This was preſented in manuſcript to King Charles II. but was not printed till the year 1690, in 8vo. The Lord Sherborne, our Author's ſon, in his Dedication of this book, obſerves, that it was "by him ſtyled "*Political Arithmetic*, inaſmuch as things of Govern- "ment, and of no leſs concern and extent than the "glory of the Prince and the happineſs and great- "neſs of the people, are by the ordinary rules of "arithmetic brought into a ſort of demonſtration. "He was allowed by all to be the inventor of this "method of inſtruction, where the perplexed and "intricate ways of the world are explained by a ve- "ry mean piece of ſcience; and had not the Doc- "trines of this Eſſay offended France, they had long "ſince ſeen the light, and had found followers, "as well as improvements before this time, to the "advantage, perhaps, of mankind." In the *firſt Chapter*, our Author endeavours to ſhew, that a ſmall country, and a few people, may by their ſituation, trade, and policy, be equivalent in wealth and ſtrength, to a far greater people and territory; and particularly, how conveniences for ſhipping and water-carriage do moſt eminently and fundamentally conduce thereto. In the *ſecond Chapter*, he ſhews, that ſome kind of taxes, and publick levies, may rather increaſe than diminiſh the Common-wealth. In the *third Chapter*, that France cannot, by reaſon of natural and perpetual impediments, be more powerful at ſea, than the Engliſh or Hollanders. In the *fourth*, that the people and territories of the King of England are naturally near as conſiderable for wealth and ſtrength, as thoſe of France. In the *fifth*, that the impediments of England's greatneſs, are but contingent and removeable. In the *ſixth*, that the power and wealth of England had increaſed for above forty years before. In the *ſeventh*, that one tenth part of the whole expence of the King of England's ſubject is ſufficient to maintain one hundred thouſand foot, thirty thouſand horſe, and forty thouſand men at ſea; and to defray all other charges of the Government, both ordinary and extraordinary, if the ſame were regularly taxed and raiſed. In the *eighth*, that there are ſpare hands enough among the King of England's ſubjects, to earn two millions *per ann.* more than they now do; and that there are employments ready, proper, and ſufficient for that purpoſe. In the *ninth*, that there is money ſufficient to drive the trade of the nation. In the *tenth*, that the King of England's ſubjects have ſtock ſufficient and convenient to drive the trade of the whole commercial world. VII. *Another Eſſay of Political Arithmetic, concerning the Growth of the City of London, with the Meaſures, Periods, Cauſes, and Conſequences thereof*, Ann. 1682. London 1683 and 1686, in 8vo. The principal points of this diſcourſe are, 1. That London doubles in forty years, and all England

(9) Wood, *ubi ſupra*, col. 809.

" tokens as are underſtood to be ſuch by the people, with whom I live, God knowing " my heart even without any. And thus begging his divine Majeſty to make me what " he would have me to be both as to faith and good works, I willingly reſign my ſoul " into his hands, relying only upon his infinite mercy and the mercies of our Saviour, " for my happineſs after this life, where I expect to know and ſee God more clearly than " by the ſtudy of the Scriptures and of his works I have hitherto been able to do. " Grant me, O Lord, an eaſy paſſage in thyſelf, that as I have lived in thy fear, I " may be known to die in thy favour. Amen."

land in three hundred and ſixty years. 2. That there were, *anno* 1682, about ſix hundred and ſeventy thouſand ſouls in London; and about ſeven millions four hundred thouſand in all England and Wales, about twenty eight millions of acres of profitable land. 3. That the periods of doubling the people, are found to be in all degrees, from between ten to twelve hundred years. 4. That the growth of London muſt ſtop of itſelf before the year 1800. 5. A table, helping to underſtand the ſcriptures, concerning the number of people mentioned in them. 6. That the world will be fully peopled within the next two thouſand years. 7. Twelve ways whereby to try any propoſal pretended for the public good. 8. How the City of London may be made, morally ſpeaking, invincible. 8. An help to uniformity in religion. 10. That it is poſſible to increaſe mankind by generation, four times more than preſent. 11. The plagues of London are the chief impediment and objection againſt the growth of the city. 12. That an exact account of the people is neceſſary in this matter. VIII. *Obſervations upon the Dublin Bills of Mortality*, 1681, *and the State of that City*. London 1683, in 8vo. IX. *Maps of Ireland*, being his actual ſurvey of that whole Kingdom, publiſhed in folio, in 1685. X. *Eſſay concerning the Multiplication of Mankind*. London 1686, in 8vo. With this was printed the ſecond edition of *Another Eſſay in Political Arithmetic*. XI. *Further Obſervations upon the Dublin Bills; or Accounts of the Houſes, Hearths, Baptiſms, and Burials in that City*. London 1686, in 8vo. XII. *Two Eſſays in Political Arithmetic, concerning the People, Houſing, Hoſpitals, &c. of London and Paris: with Obſervations upon the Cities of London and Rome*. London 1687, in 8vo. In the firſt Eſſay, he endeavours to prove, that London hath more people and houſing than the Cities of Paris and Rouen put together; and is alſo more conſiderable in ſeveral other reſpects. In the ſecond, he attempts to ſhew, that in the hoſpital called *L'Hoſtel Dieu*, at Paris, there die three thouſand *per annum*, by reaſon of ill accommodation. XIII. *Five Eſſays in Political Arithmetic*: viz. 1. *Objections from the City of* Rey *in Perſia, and from Monſieur* Auzout, *againſt two former Eſſays, anſwered, and that* London *hath as many people as* Paris, Rome, *and* Rouen *put together*. 2. *A Compariſon between* London *and* Paris, *in fourteen Particulars*. 3. *Proofs that* London, *within its* 134 *Pariſhes, named in the Bills of Mortality, there live about nine hundred ninety ſix thouſand people*. 4. *An Eſtimate of the People in* London, Paris, Amſterdam, Venice, Rome, Dublin, Briſtol *and* Rouen, *with ſeveral Obſervations upon the ſame*. 5. *Concerning Holland, and the reſt of the ſeven United Provinces*. XIV. *A Treatiſe of Taxes and Contributions, particularly fitted for the State of Ireland*. London 1691, in 4to, printed in a book, intitled, *A Collection of three State Tracts, &c.* XV. *A Treatiſe of Naval Philoſophy, &c.* London 1691, in 8vo. XVI. *The Political Anatomy of Ireland, &c.* London 1692, in 8vo. XVII. *Verbum Sapienti: or, An Account of the Wealth and Extence of England, &c.* London 1691, in 8vo. This is animadverted on in a pamphlet, intitled, *A Letter from a Gentleman in the Country, to his Friend in the City, &c.* London 1692, in 4to. XVIII. In the *Philoſophical Tranſactions*, he has the following pieces: viz. 1. *Experiments to be made relating to Land-Carriage*. N°. 161. p. 666. 2. *Some Queries whereby to examine Mineral Waters*. N°. 166. p. 802. 3. *A Miſcellaneous Catalogue of mean, vulgar, cheap, and ſimple Experiments*. N°. 167. p. 849. 4. *An Extract of two Eſſays in Political Arithmetic, concerning the comparative Magnitude of London and Paris*. No. 183. p. 152. 5. *A further Aſſertion of the Propoſitions concerning the Magnitude, &c. of London, contained in two Paſſages, &c. together with a Vindication of the ſaid Eſſays, from the Objections of ſome learned Perſons of the French Nation*. No. 185. p. 237. 6. *What a complete Treatiſe of Navigation ſhould contain, drawn up in the year* 1685. N°. 198. T.

PEYRAREDE (JOHN DE), a Gentleman of Gaſcony (*a*) and a Proteſtant [*A*], wrote good Latin verſes, and underſtood the art of criticiſm very well. He made himſelf known at Paris towards the beginning of Lewis the XIV.'s reign. He publiſhed obſervations on Terence, and *Hemiſtichs* to fill up the imperfect lines in Virgil's Æneis, to which he added ſome verſes. He dedicated this work to the Queen of Sweden (*b*). His emendations and critical conjectures on Florus deſerved the approbation of La Mothe le Vayer, who followed them pretty often, and has quoted him with commendations [*B*]. He is ſometimes mentioned in Balzac's letters. I ſhall tranſcribe a paſſage from them which is very much to his honour [*C*]. We find in a letter, which he wrote from Paris

(*a*) He called himſelf *Nobilis Aquitanus*, in his works, as the Abbé de Marolles obſerves in his *Denombrement des Auteurs qui l'ont obligé*, *i. e.* " A Cata- " logue of the " Authors who " obliged him."

(*b*) See l'Abbé de Marolles, ib.

[*A*] *A Proteſtant.*] He was one even ſo far as to be ſcrupulouſly zealous, if we may form conjectures from a letter of Monſieur Balzac to Monſieur Conrart. *But who told you*, ſays he to him (1), *that I have an antipathy againſt the Huguenots? It cannot be neither Monſieur Conrart, nor Salmaſius, nor Monſieur Daillé, whom I have ſo much commended, and ſo much celebrated; whom I love and eſteem moſt particularly, of which I have made ſo publick a profeſſion. It muſt be, no doubt, that the honeſt Monſieur de Peyrarede would make no difference between an inoffenſive raillery, and what is ſaid ſeriouſly, and that amidſt the freedom of converſation he put a criminal conſtruction on ſome words which came from an innocent intention. Without entering deeper upon this ſubject, I proteſt to you, dear Sir, that I have no greater averſion for the Huguenots, than you have for the Catholicks.*

(1) Balzac, *Lettre premiere à Conrart*, Liv. 1. p. m. 25, 26.

[*B*] *La Mothe le Vayer . . . . has quoted him with commendations.*] " I have followed the interpretation " of the learned Monſieur Peyrarede," ſays he in his notes on the 19th chapter of the 2d book of Florus (2). In another place he makes uſe of an epithet which is more honourable ſtill. *Theſe words*, ſays he (3), *are very dark, I have explained them according to the expoſition of the illuſtrious Monſieur Peyrarede.* The Abbé de Marolles quotes him often in his remarks on Statius.

(2) See Mothe le Vayer, *Remarques ſur Florus*, p. 910. See alſo p. 842.

(3) Ibid. p. 933.

[*C*] *I ſhall quote a paſſage which is very much to his honour.*] " Laſt Friday's Mail brought me ſome " news from our Monſieur de Peyrarede. Do you " know that his name is already very famous at " Paris, and that the Celtæ have the Aquitanians in " admiration? Or, if you would have me ſay it after " another manner, and ſpeak it poetically of a Poet, " the God of the River Seine wonders to hear the " Muſes of the Dordonne ſing ſo well. For my " part, I am contented with their laſt work, and if " the ſouls of the bleſſed could be raiſed by the " charms of beautiful lines, I do not queſtion but the " Duke of Brezé would come down from Heaven " the moment one ſhould rehearſe to him the fol- " lowing lines:

" *Tu*

ris April 20, 1641, to Iſaac Voſſius (c), that he began to percieve the infirmities of old age, and that during thirty years he had been overwhelmed with misfortunes, or buſy with improving his eſtate. It appears from that letter that he had a ſon.

(c) It is the 324th of thoſe which were written to John Gerard Voſſius.

" *Tu nube ſerena*
" *Stellato fulgens apice, et radiante corona,*
" *Ad tua Sacra veni, quæ multo Regia luctu*
" *Concelebrat, Sacrique Chori, Sanctuſque Senatus, &c.*
" *Aſpice ut ipſa gemens, ingenti affixa feretro,*
" *Horridaque et laceris luget Victoria pennis,*
" *Quæ quondam tua caſtra, tuas comitata triremes,*
" *Deſeruit tua ſigna ſemel: nunc cædis acerbæ*
" *Invidiam lenire velit ; fatiſque malignis*
" *Imputat, infandæ excuſat crimina cladis, &c.*

i. e. " Did you ever read any thing more noble and " more moving than this poor Goddeſs's victory, " afflicted for the death of that brave Duke? What " a moving ſcene is it to behold her with her gar- " ments torn, and her wings broke, doing penance " for the fault ſhe imagined ſhe had committed ; to " ſee her tied, and as it were nailed to that large " coffin, which ſhe waſhes with her tears! ſhe is " inconſolable for the misfortune which happened " at Orbitello, ſhe wiſhes ſhe could lay the blame of " it on ill fate ; ſhe *&c.* (4)." This is what Monſieur Balzac wrote December the 4th 1646.

(4) Balzac, *Lettres Choiſies*, part. 2. liv. 3. *Lett.* 37. p. m. 378.

PEYRE (JAMES D' AUZOLES (*a*) LA), a Gentleman of Auvergne (*b*), and one of the moſt ridiculous Writers of the 17th Century, tells us in the beginning of one of his books, that he was the ſon of Peter d'Auzoles and of Mary Fabri of Auvergne, He did not deſerve to be refuted by learned men, and yet he had that honour [*A*]. He is ſoundly ridiculed in a work of Monſieur Baillet (*c*), where he mentions a book, which la Peyre entitled *Anti-Babau* (*d*). He died of an apoplectick fit at Paris the 19th of May 1642 (*e*). I have mentioned ſomething of him in the article Balzac (*f*), and I ſhall give hereunder an inſtance of the ſhallowneſs of his wit [*B*].

(a) It is not true that his name was *d'Auzoles la Reine*, as is aſſerted in Moreri.

(b) *Nobilis Avernas.* Ludov. Jacob. *Biblioth. Pontific.* p. 343.

(c) In his *Anti's*, art. 155.

(d) It is an anſwer to a letter of Father Bolduc.

(e) Ludov. Jacob, *Biblioth. Pontific.* p. 343. But Peter de St. Romuald, *Journal Chronol.* tom. 1. p. 619, aſſerts, that he died of a malignant fever, June the 30th.

(f) Quotat. (43).

[*A*] *He did not deſerve to be refuted by learned men, and yet he has had that honour.*] His little book, *de la vie perdurable de Melchiſedech* (of Melchizedech's long Life,) printed in the year 1622, was refuted by the Jeſuit Salian : his *Jobe*, printed the next year, was refuted by the Capuchin Bolduc, and by the Jeſuit Petavius (1). He ought to have thanked that Jeſuit, and not to have been ſo imprudent as to attack him in a work of Chronology, which he intitled *Diſciple des tems*, (the Diſciple of the Times.) It is he who is meant, though his name be not mentioned, in the Preface to the 2d part of Petavius's *Rationarium temporis*, where it is obſerved, that of ſo many works of Chronology, which had been publiſhed till that time, there were none more wretched than that which is intitled *Sainte Chronologie* (the Holy Chronology). La Peyre was the Author of it, and alſo of a ſmall *folio*, printed in the year 1629, with this title. *La Sainte Geographie, c'eſt à dire, exacte Deſcription de la Terre, & veritable Demonſtration du Paradis terreſtre.* i. e. " The holy Geography, that is to ſay, an accurate " deſcription of the earth, and a true demonſtration " of the terreſtrial Paradiſe." I wonder Voſſius did not put this Author in his long liſt of Chronologers.

(1) See Monſieur Baillet's *Anti's.* artic. 155.

[*B*] *I ſhall give an inſtance of the ſhallowneſs of his wit.*] The Abbé de Marolles affords it me. *Monſieur le Febvre Chantereau*, ſays he (2), *aſſerts, that the common method of computing the years of our Lord is the beſt, and preferable to any other, againſt the opinion of Scaliger, Petavius, and others, who reckon a few years more, or ſuppoſe a few leſs: and as I obſerved, that he commended, in this reſpect, the late Monſieur de la Peyre, James D'Auzoles, with whom I have alſo been very much acquainted, I wondered a little at it, becauſe this good man, though he ſtudied with a great deal of application, yet had not a wonderful genius : which I could eaſily find out, by the opinion he entertained, that one might make the year to conſiſt of but three hundred and ſixty-four days, inſtead of three hundred and ſixty-five and ſomething more, that it might always begin with a Sunday, and end always with a Saturday. To ſpeak the truth, he muſt not have underſtood his ſcience wonderfully well ; for if his opinion herein were followed, the month of January would ſoon fall on the time when Auguſt ſhould be ; becauſe the year would always be a day and ſome hours too ſhort ; which being loſt of courſe in the months, they muſt unavoidably change their proper ſeaſon. But he could never underſtand this, and fell into a ſtrange paſſion ; whence I inferred, that Monſieur de la Peyre was not ſo wonderfully ſkilled, as he imagined, in the ſcience which he profeſſed.* He practiſed ſometimes in his controverſies, what is uſually done in ſummons, among thoſe who are at law together ; I mean, that he ſet down very accurately the place of his abode. He dated his *Anti-Babau from Paris, at Mr. Conturier's, an honeſt man, and a man of honour, at whoſe houſe he lodged*, the 5th of Auguſt, 1631 (3). Does not this ſhew moſt plainly, that he had but a very ſhallow wit?

(2) Marolles, *Mémoires*, p. 271, 272.

(1) Baillet, in his *Anti's*, art. 155.

PEYRERE (ISAAC LA), a native of Bourdeaux, has made himſelf famous by his treatiſe of the Præadamites, which was printed in Holland in the year 1655 [*A*], and which a crowd of Authors refuted immediately [*B*]. He was then a Proteſtant, and had a poſt in the Prince of Condé's family. Though he did not put his name to that work, yet

[*A*] *His Treatiſe of the Præadamites, which was printed in Holland in the year* 1655 (1).] Heidanus was charged with having been concerned in the printing of that book, but he cleared himſelf, and the accuſer never dared to reply : I learn this particular from Petrus ab Andlo. *Ignorantiam Mareſii ſequitur ejus effrons et immane mendacium, quavis pœna digniſſimum.* Eum *ſcilicet* qui familiam ducit inter hodiernos Carteſianos, obſtetricatum fuiſſe Editioni Libri de Præadamitis inſcripti. *Sed cum vir ille doctiſſimus deteſtandam hanc calumniam publicè à ſe ſit amolitus in parte ſecunda ſuarum Conſiderationum de Sabbatho et Die Dominica*, pag. 3. *Nec ille, qui, ut inquit Marcſius*, olim per indirectum id exprobraverat, *cujus Gonorrhœam et profluvia hic lambere ac reſorbere voluit noſter, quicquam reſpondere potuerit, hoc maledicentiſſimæ linguæ ſpiculum inter ſcuta rejiceremus, niſi dudum in auctoris caput recidiſſet cum immortali ejus ignominia* (2). You will meet with the ſcheme of the book concerning the Præadamites, in the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary.

(1) Obſerve that I have ſeen in the catalogue of a library, which was ſold at Leyden October the 1ſt, 1696, that book of the Præadamites, as tho' it had been printed, and theſe words are added, *editio optima*, beſt edition, 1653, 8vo.

(2) Petrus ab Andlo, *Anim. ad Vindicias Diſſertat.* p. 10.

[*B*] . . . . . *and which a crowd of Authors refuted immediately.*] The Author of the Supplement to Moreri names but four perſons (3), who wrote againſt the Syſtem of the Præadamites. Here follows a more complete catalogue of them. John Conrad Dannhawerus, Profeſſor of Divinity at Straſburg, publiſhed there, *Præadamita mutis, ſive fabula primorum hominum ante Adamum conditorum exploſa.* John Micrælius, Profeſſor of Philoſophy, and Principal of the College at Stetin, wrote a work againſt la Peyrere (4). John Henry Urſinus publiſhed at Francfort *Novus Prometheus Præadamitarum plaſtes ad Caucaſum relegatus et religatus.* Samuel des Marets, Profeſſor of Divinity at Groningen, publiſhed there, *Refutatio Fabulæ Præadamiticæ abſoluta ſeptem prioribus quæſtionibus cum Præfatione Apologetica pro αὐθεντία ſacræ Scripturæ.* John Helpert, Profeſſor at Helmſtat, cauſed to be printed

(3) Monſieur Morin (it is Morin the Aſtrologer) Anthony Hulſe, Author of the *Nonens Præadamiticum*, J. Pythius, and J. Helpert.

(4) It was printed at Stetin.

yet he was known to be the Author of it, which was the reaſon why he was impriſoned in the Spaniſh Low-countries [C]. He knew of no better method to get out of trouble, than by imputing his Doctrines to the Principles of the Proteſtants, and by promiſing to go to Maſs. He went to Rome, where he was kindly received by Alexander VII. (a). He publiſhed, according to cuſtom, the reaſons which determined him to change his religion. Some Roman Catholicks laughed at them [D]. He lived retired the latter part of his life (b). He had been in Denmark, among the attendants of Monſieur de la Thuillerie the French Embaſſador, and wrote there two relations which have been publiſhed [E]. He is mentioned in the *Menagiana* [F], as you will ſee hereunder. A fragment from a letter, which I ſhall tranſcribe, will acquaint the Reader with ſome particulars, which are very curious [G].

(a) See the rem. [C].

(b) See the rem. [F].

PEZELIUS

printed at Amſterdam, *Diſquiſitio de Præadamitis*. Anthony Hulſius's *Non ens Præadamiticum*, was printed by John Elzevier at Leyden. Philip le Prieur publiſhed at Paris, *Animadverſiones in Librum Præadamitarum*, and took the name of *Euſebius Romanus*. All the books I have been mentioning, were printed in the year 1656, as Thomas Bangius obſerves (5), who adds, that La Peyrere ſhewed him his manuſcript at Copenhagen, in the year 1645. *Neutiquam tamen*, continues he, *perſuadere nobis unquam potuimus, eò temeritatis dilapſurum virum alias humanum & ingenioſum, ut hoc commentum publicis typis excudendum daret, niſi res ipſa noſtris oculis expoſita fuiſſet*, i. e. "I could never "have thought, that this man, otherwiſe honeſt and "ingenious, would have come to that degree of raſh- "neſs, as to print that romance, had I not ſeen it "with my own eyes." Crenius obſerves (6), that Calovius and Schotanus have ſtrongly argued againſt the Præadamitical Hypotheſis, the former in the 3d volume of his Common places, the latter in his Bibliotheque of the Sacred Hiſtory. He obſerves alſo (7), that in John Urſinus's edition of the *Prometheus Præadamitarum*, we meet with *Doctiſſimorum quorundam Gallorum in Librum de Præadamitis Notæ cenſoriæ*, and (8) that Philip le Prieur gave another edition of his work at Paris, in the year 1658, in which he commends his antagoniſt for embracing the Roman Catholick Religion. Bangius does not mention a treatiſe printed at Leyden in 1658, with this title, *Reſponſio exetaſtica ad Tractatum incerto autore nuper editum cui titulus* Præadamitæ. *Autore J. Pythio Miniſtro Jeſu Chriſti in Swartewael.*

(5) Thomas Bangius, *in Cœlo Orientis, Exercit. 2. Quæſt. 8. p. 134. apud Thomam Crenium, Faſce 2. Exercit. Philologico-Hiſtoricarum*, p. 13.

(6) Thomas Crenius, ibid.

(7) Idem, ibid. p. 8.

(8) Idem, ibid. p. 10.

[C] *He was impriſoned in the Spaniſh Low-countries.*] "In the year 1655, the Biſhop of Namure publiſhed "a Cenſure of the book of the Præadamites, written "by the Sieur la Peyrere, but yet without naming "him, becauſe he had not declared himſelf the Au- "thor of it, though it was but too well known. But "he met with a much worſe uſage on the ſame ac- "count when he was at Bruſſels, in February 1656 "(9). Thirty men armed entered outrageouſly into "his chamber, and carried him off, and having "made him wander for ſome time up and down the "ſtreets of Bruſſels, they threw him at laſt into the "tower of Turemberg, and all this by the Arch- "Duke Leopold's conſent. He was told this was "done by the authority of the Arch-biſhop of Mech- "lin's Grand-Vicar. At laſt, having continued "ſome time in that tower, he was ſet at liberty by the "credit of his Maſter the Prince of Condé, by whoſe "advice he went immediately to Rome to proſtrate "himſelf at the Pope's feet, and ſubmit both his "book and himſelf intirely to his Holineſs's will, "becoming thus a true and ſound Catholick with all "the good ſucceſs he could wiſh. This is what he "has related himſelf in his petition to the moſt "holy Father Alexander VII. (10)." See the remark [G].

(9) Moreri is then miſtaken, when he aſſerts, that *la Peyrere* recanted in a book printed at Rome in 1655. His Printers have put 1555.

(10) Pieire de Saint Romuald, *Journal Chronologique & Hiſtorique, 25 Decembre*, p. m. 675.

[D] *Some Roman Catholicks laughed at them.*] Read the following paſſage, extracted from a letter which Guy Patin wrote April the 9th 1658. "The Author "of the book concerning the Præadamites, named "Iſaac de la Pereire (11), a Gaſcoon, is come back "hither from Rome. He has publiſhed a little "book in 4to, in which he explains the reaſons "why he changed his religion (this in the ſtyle of "the ſchools is called to abjure one's hereſy). He "has diſowned his book of the Præadamites. I "have ſeen that book, but it does not ſell well. It "is ſaid the Pope has given him a ſmall Abbey, "and that Mazarin has promiſed him ſome new fa- "vour from Heaven, or from purgatory. He is "here waiting for that bleſſing with all the impati- "ence and eagerneſs you may imagine in a Gaſcoon, "who is afraid to ſtarve, and who changed his reli- "gion with no other view but to make his fortune, "and to live well at the expence of all thoſe whom "it may concern. He ſets up here for a great "performer of miracles, or a diſtributer of indul- "gences .... (12). A Gaſcoon, who is learned, is "a courtier, and a converted Huguenot, is very pro- "per for that ſport, and capable to act ſuch a part."

(11) It ſhould be *La Peyrere.*

(12) Patin, *Lettre* 117. p. 454, 455, of the 1ſt volume.

[E] *He wrote two relations which have been publiſhed.*] He wrote them for his friend La Mothe le Vayer: the one is an account of Greenland, the other of Iceland: they are both pretty curious. I have quoted ſomething from the latter in the article *Jonas (Arngrimus)*. He dedicated it to the Prince of Condé, and hints in his dedication that he had a mind to write that Hero's life. I imagine that he is the Author of the Account of the Battle of Lens.

[F] *He is mentioned in the Menagiana.*] "Iſaac de "la Peyrere (13) of Bordeaux is the Author of a "book entitled the *Præadamites*, in which he pre- "tends to prove that Adam was not the firſt of man- "kind. This good man was a boarder at the Fa- "thers of the Oratory in their houſe of our Lady of "the Vertues. He continued to be ſtill infatuated "with his Præadamites, and it is probable he carried "that fancy to the grave. He would have been very "well pleaſed, had he known that there was a Rabbi "who mentioned Adam's tutor. But that Rabbi "was a Rabbi, and that is ſaying enough. When "the book of the Præadamites was publiſhed, it was "ſentenced to be burnt by the common hangman. "I deſired the Author, who was a friend of mine, "to ſend it me before it were brought to light: he "took the joke and ſent it me with this line from "Ovid, in which he only changed the word *urbem*, "(the city) into *ignem*, (the fire)."

(13) He ſhould have ſaid *Iſaac la Peyrere.* Moreri ought to have called him ſo, and not *la Pereré.*

"*Parve, nec invideo, ſine me, liber, ibis in ignem* (14).

i. e. "Little book, you ſhall go into the fire without "me, nor do I envy your fate."

(14) *Suite du Menagiana*, p. 38, of the Dutch edition.

See the *Melanges de Vigneul-Marville*, page 144. of the firſt Volume (15).

(15) He is called there *de la Peyrere.*

[G] *A fragment from a letter .... will acquaint the Reader with ſome particulars, which are very curious.*] As I do not give much credit to Peter de St. Romuald, I deſired to know from a Gentleman of great merit, and who was at that time in the Prince of Condé's family, whether or not that honeſt Monk had given a true account of the matter. Here follows the anſwer that was ſent to me. "I think I can give "you a very accurate account of what you aſk me, "becauſe Monſieur de la Peirere was a great friend of "mine. He was arreſted at Bruſſels at the time your "Author mentions: but the ſecret hiſtory of this "is, that the late Prince * was concerned in that affair "by the means of a Jeſuit who loved Monſieur de "la Peirere, bating his religion, which he would "have him change. For which purpoſe they took a "pretence from his book of the Præadamites to ar- "reſt him, and they made him dread the conſe- "quences of that book, if he would not forſake his "religion. The good man, who was by no means "obſtinate with regard to what is called religion, "ſoon changed his own, and his maſter gave "him

* Of Condé.

PEZELIUS (CHRISTOPHER), a Proteſtant Divine, was born the 5th of March 1539 at Plawen in the Veightland in Germany (*a*). He taught five years in the College of his native place, and was afterwards Profeſſor of Divinity and Miniſter at Wittenberg (*b*); but as he was one of thoſe Doctors who refuted Lutheraniſm ſecretly, and deſigned to introduce Calviniſm, he was deprived of his employments, and impriſoned in 1574, with ſeveral other of his Collegues: nor were they ſet at liberty but on condition that they ſhould retire from Saxony, and write nothing in the world againſt the Elector, nor againſt his Univerſities, nor againſt his Churches (*c*) [*A*]. He retired to Egra, and having ſtayed there a little while, he was invited to Sigen to be Principal of the ſchool there, by Count John of Naſſau, brother of William of Naſſau Prince of Orange. Some time after he was choſen Miniſter at Herborn (*d*), from which place he dates the Dedication of one of his books (*e*) in the Month of September 1580. He was Profeſſor of Divinity at Bremen in the year 1588, and was alſo ſuperintendent of the Churches there, in which poſt he continued till his death, which happened February the 25th 1604 (*f*). He publiſhed a great many books [*B*]. He was at Heidelberg in 1599, and was at the meeting of the faculty of Divinity, before whom Conrad Vorſtius gave an account of his faith (*g*). It is very ſtrange that neither Melchior Adam, nor Paul Freher, gave an account of his life.

(*a*) Chriſtop. Pezelius, *Epiſt. Dedicat.* part. 7. *Argumentor. Melanchth.*

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

(*c*) Idem, *Epiſt. Dedicat.* 2 part. *Argumentor. Melanchth.*

(*d*) Idem, Ibid.

(*e*) *Secundæ Partis Argumentor. Melanchth.*

(*f*) Witte, *in Diario Biograph.*

(*g*) See *the Life of* David Pareus, p. m. 56, 58. See alſo the rem. [*C*] of the art. VORSTIUS (Conrad).

" him wherewithal to go to Rome to fetch his abſo-
" lution, of which he did not make much account.
" He returned to his maſter, who had always a great
" friendſhip for him, and maintained him, ſince his
" return into France, at the houſe of the Fathers of
" the Oratory at Paris. I have often ſeen him there,
" and found him not much perſuaded of Popery, but
" extremely infatuated with his notion of the Præada-
" mites, of which he wrote and ſpoke to his friends
" till his death. The Attorney General of that Or-
" der, who is a friend of mine, entertained me once
" at dinner with him, and made him confeſs, that
" he was always a writing books, which, he whiſper-
" ed to me, would be burnt the moment the good
" man had given up the ghoſt. La Peirere was the
" beſt man in the world, of the mildeſt temper,
" and who with a very eaſy mind believed but lit-
" tle."

[*A*] *Pezelius . . . . and his Collegues . . . . . were not ſet at liberty, but on condition that they ſhould . . . . . write nothing in the world againſt the Elector, nor againſt his Univerſities, nor againſt his Churches.*] They kept nevertheleſs to themſelves the liberty of declaring their ſentiments. *Sic Deus Opt. Max. eventus poſtea rexit, ut à triſti ſervitute atque obligatione prius nobis impoſita una cum Collegis liberatus, duris quidem conditionibus (ut patria tota excederemus, nec adverſus illuſtris. Electorem Saxoniæ, ejuſque Scholas et Eccleſias ſtylum ſtringeremus, confeſſione tamen veritatis, et conſcientiæ noſtra ratione integra et liberanobis, ut verbi diminiſtris relicta) in exilium ire juberemur* (1). I do not know how Pezelius reconciled his promiſe with the writings he publiſhed againſt the Lutheran Doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper: I know only that he was engaged in a very hot paper war with the moſt zealous Doctors of the other party; as for inſtance, with Nicholas Selneccerus, Daniel Hoffman, Gyles Hunnius, and Philip Marbachius. The very title of a work he publiſhed at Bremen in 1591, ſhews that he wrote paſſionately. That title is as follows: *Defenſio contra vaniſſimas Calumnias, quas N. Selneccerus evomuit in Reſponſione Chriſtophori Pezelii Confutationis quatuordecim cauſarum Selnecciarum de condemnationibus Calviniſtarum* (2). i. e. " A vindication againſt the " moſt falſe ſlanders, which N. Selneccerus belched " out in his anſwer to Pezelius's refutation of Selnec- " cerus's fourteen reaſons for which he pretends the " Calviniſts ought to be condemned." The title of another book, which he publiſhed in 1593, contains among other things, theſe words. *Quam* (Pezelii Explicationem) *Hermannus Hamelmannus libello, cui titulum fecit*, de depravatione, fraudulentia, impoſtura, et falſitate D. Chriſtophori Pezelii, et omnium Sacramentorum, *temerario ac ſtolido conatu oppugnare auſus fuit* (3). i. e. " Which explication of Pezelius Her- " man Hamelmannus by a raſh and fooliſh attempt " dared to refute in a book, which he entitled, *of* " *the miſrepreſentation, fraud, impoſture, and falſity of* " *Chriſtopher Pezelius, and of all the Sacramentarians.*" Hoſpitian mentions ſome other works of Pezelius publiſhed during this Sacramentarian Controverſy, and he gives an extract of the following (4), which was publiſhed at Bremen in 1589, *Tractatus Chriſtophori Pezelii propoſitus in Gymnaſio Bremenſi, in explicatione Examinis Philippi Melanchthonis de Cœna Domini, &c.*

(1) Chriſtoph. Pezelius, *Epiſt. Dedicat.* 2 *part. Argument. Melanchth.* folio 65.

(2) See Hoſpinian's *Hiſtoria Sacram.* Tom. 2. p. 670.

(3) Ibid. p. 80.

(4) Ibid. p. 662.

[*B*] *He publiſhed a great many books.*] For beſides thoſe which I have juſt now mentioned, he publiſhed at Wittenburg in 1565 an Oration *de generatione hominis*, and in 1571 *Apologia veræ doctrinæ de definitione Evangelii oppoſita Thraſonicis præſtigiis Joan. Wigardi* (5). His Commentary on Geneſis was printed at Newſtad in the year 1599, in 8vo. and his expoſition of the firſt Chapters of St. John's Goſpel in the year 1586, in 8vo. It would be too long to mention all the others. I ſhall only obſerve that his *Melificium Hiſtoricum* is a large Commentary on John Sleidanus's Treatiſe *de quatuor Monarchiis*; that it extends to the reign of Heraclius; that it was printed at Marpurg in two parts in 4to, in the year 1610; and that the next year Lampadius added a third part to it, which carries the hiſtory down to his time. I ſhall alſo obſerve that Pezelius publiſhed extracts from Melanchthon's works, in which he put the objections and anſwers relating to theological ſubjects in a very good order, and intermixed the whole with *Scholia*. That work contains ſeven or eight volumes in 8vo, which have been publiſhed at different times. The firſt volume was printed in the year 1578.

(5) *Epit. Bibl. Geſneri*, p. 146.

PHÆDRUS, a Latin Author, who wrote five books in Iambic verſe, was a Thracian (*a*). He was made free by Auguſtus [*A*], and lived till after the death of Sejanus (*b*). He had been oppreſſed by that favourite of Tiberius (*c*). He repreſents himſelf as a man who never cared to hoard up riches [*B*]. All the Criticks are not of opinion that

(*a*) Phædr. *in Præfat.* lib. 3.

(*b*) See Scheffe-rus *in Vita Phædri.*

(*c*) See the ſame Author, ibid.

[*A*] *He was made free by Auguſtus.*] He is called *Auguſti Libertus*, Auguſtus's freed-man, in the title of his Fables. Lipſius, Andrew Scot, Dempſterus, Borrichius, and ſeveral other Criticks underſtand by that expreſſion, that Tiberius made him free (1). But Florent Chrétien, Voſſius, Scheffer, &c. chooſe to underſtand it of Auguſtus. I follow this laſt opinion, though I muſt confeſs that the proofs of it do not come up to a full demonſtration. This however is certain, namely, that Phædrus relates as an eye-witneſs, ſome things which happened under Auguſtus. See the 11th fable of the 3d book; but not the 8th of the 5th book, where Bathyllus is mentioned, for Voſſius (2) is in the wrong to aſſert, that Phædrus ſpeaks of that, as having ſeen it himſelf.

(1) See Scheffe-rus's notes in *Phædrum*, init.

(2) Voſſius, *de Poet. Latinis*, p. 38.

[*B*] *He repreſents himſelf as a man, who never cared to hoard up riches.*] See his preface to his 3d book, where he mentions this as one of the reaſons which ſhould facilitate his promotion to the rank of a Poet.

Quamvis

that he is the perſon mentioned in an Epigram of Martial [C]. It is to be obſerved, that Caſaubon, who had ſo much learning, did not know there was a Phædrus among the antients, till Peter Pithou publiſhed Phædrus's Fables [D]. Since that firſt edition, which was publiſhed in the year 1596, there have been ſeveral others with the notes of the moſt eminent Criticks. See a catalogue of thoſe editions in John Scheffer's Preface on that Author, and add to them the edition (d) of the year 1698, which Burman procured, and which contains, beſides the notes of Gudius which had never been publiſhed, the entire Commentaries of Conrad Ritterſhuſius, of Nicholas Rigault, of Nicholas Heinſius, of John Scheffer, and of John Lewis Praſch, with extracts from ſome other Commentators. The edition which was publiſhed ſince that (e), by the care and with the notes of Hoogſtraten is the moſt beautiful of all that have been yet printed, with regard to the letter, and the cuts. It was made for the uſe of the young Prince of Naſſau Governor of the

(d) Of Amſterdam, for Henry Wetſtein.

(e) At Amſterdam, for Francis Halmo, 1701, 4to.

Quamvis in ipſa natus ſim pene ſchola,
Curamque habendi penitus corde eraſerim,
Et laude invita in hanc vitam incubuerim,
Faſtidioſe tamen in cælum recipior.

(3) He ſays there, *Hujus reſpectu Fabulæ deterritus, periculoſum ſemper vitavi lucrum.*

See alſo the 5th fable of the 5th book (3).

[C] *All the Critics are not of opinion, that he is the perſon mentioned in an Epigram of Martial.*] Here follows that Poet's words.

Dic, Muſa, quid agat Canius meus Rufus?
Utrumne Chartis tradit ille victuris
Legenda temporum acta Claudianorum?
An quæ Neroni falſus adſtruit ſcriptor?
An æmulatur improbi jocos Phædri (4)?

(4) Mart. *Epigr.* 20. lib. 3.

i. e. " Tell me, Muſe, what does my friend Canius " Rufus apply himſelf to? Does he write for poſte- " rity the Hiſtory of what paſt under the Claudii? " Or does he give an account of what a lying Au- " thor imputes to Nero? Does he endeavour to imi- " tate the jokes of that wicked Phædrus?"

Scriverius's note on the laſt of theſe five lines, is the moſt outrageous in the world againſt thoſe who are of opinion, that Martial ſpeaks of our Phædrus: *Poſſunt ne magis decoquere de judicio, ac magis ludere de otio ſuo viri docti, qui exiſtimant Fabulatorem Phædrum à Clariſſimo Pithæo editum, & cujus Arienus quidam, ſive Arianus, in præfatione Fabularum ſuarum Æſopiarum ad Theodoſium meminit, hunc eundem eſſe, de quo loquitur Martialis? Volunt nos credere ſcilicet, Libertum illum Auguſti Cæſaris fuiſſe, ſtylo atque tempore parem Laberio vel Publio Mimo, & quidem, quantum conjiciunt, ſub Tiberio vixiſſe, atque adeo poſt Sejanum damnatum: Nugæ. Certe niſi vehementer fallor, ævo illo dignus cenſeri minime poteſt ſcriptor iſte, cuicui tandem ille alapas & libertatem debeat* (5). i. e. " Is it poſſible that learn- " ed men ſhould miſuſe their judgment, and miſ- " ſpend their leiſure ſo far, as to imagine that Phæ- " drus, the Author of the Fables, which have been " publiſhed by the celebrated Pithou, and whom A- " rienus or Arianus mentions in his preface to The- " odoſius, prefixed to his Æſopian Fables, is the " perſon whom Martial mentions here? They would, " forſooth, perſuade us, that he was Auguſtus's freed- " man, and contemporary with Laberius, and with " Publius the Mimographer, and equal to them with " regard to his ſtyle, and that he lived, as they ima- " gine, under Tiberius, and even after Sejanus " was ſentenced to death. Theſe are mere trifles: " and indeed, if I am not miſtaken, that Writer, to " whomſoever he owed his liberty, can by no means " be thought worthy of that age." Scriverius boaſts that he can prove his opinion by ſeveral arguments, and obſerves, among other things, that Perot, Archbiſhop of Siponto, is the Author of one of the Fables which have been publiſhed under the name of Phædrus (6). It is certain that one of the Fables, which Perot aſſerts he extracted from Arienus, and put into Iambick verſe, does hardly differ from the other. *Alluſit ad Fabulam*, ſays he in his Commentary on the 77th Epigram of the 1ſt book of Martial (7), *quam nos ex Arieno in Fabellas noſtras adoleſcentes Iambico carmine tranſtulimus:*

Olim quas vellent eſſe in tutela ſua
Divi legerunt Arbores, &c (8).

(5) Scriverius, *in Martial. Epigr.* 20. lib. 3. p. m. 88.

(6) It is the 18th of the 3d book in my edit. which is that of Hamburg 1673.

(7) And not the 20th of the 3d book, as Menage aſſerts in his *Meſcolanze*, p. 220.

(8) You will meet with the reſt in Menage, ibidem.

But the Criticks did not fail to judge, that he aſcribed it unjuſtly to himſelf. However it be, one may well wonder that a book, which abounds with ſo much wit and good ſenſe, as Phædrus's does, was ſo little known during ſeveral ages. Suppoſe Martial ſpeaks of him, we have in this caſe but two Authors who mentioned him (9). I have obſerved elſewhere (10), that Seneca had not the leaſt knowledge of him, and this was for a great while the caſe of Caſaubon, as I ſhall obſerve hereunder. This ought to leſſen a little our wonder, with regard to the obſcurity, in which Curtius's name and reputation lay buried for ſo many years. Let us add, that Velleius Paterculus met with the ſame fate. See above, the article of PATERCULUS, remark [D], quotation (23).

(9) Avienus mentions him, as Scriverius obſerves in the paſſage quoted above.

(10) In the art. ÆSOP, rem. [M]. See hereunder the words of the Jeſuit Vavaſſeur.

[D] *Caſaubon . . . did not know there was a Phædrus . . . . till Peter Pithou publiſhed Phædrus's fables.*] Here follows what he wrote to Peter Pithou: *Ex Epiſtola tua primum de Phædro Auguſti Liberto cognovi; nam plane mihi ante id nomen incognitum, prorſuſque de eo qua ſcriptore qua ſcripto vel legi nihil, vel ſi eſt aliter non memini.* i. e. " It is by your letter, that I firſt " came to be acquainted with Phædrus, Auguſtus's " freed-man; that name was quite unknown to me; " I never read any thing neither of the man, nor of " his works; or if I did, I do not remember it at " all." This letter of Caſaubon was wrote in the year 1596, at which time Peter Pithou publiſhed the Fables of Phædrus at Troies. He ſent a copy of them to Father Sirmond, who was then at Rome. This Jeſuit ſhewed it to the learned men in that city, who judged at firſt that it was a ſuppoſititious work; but having examined it more carefully, they altered their opinion, and thought they could obſerve in it the characteriſtical marks of the age of Auguſtus. You may read theſe particulars in Latin. *Memini equidem Jacobum Sirmandum narrare mihi ſolitum, cum Petrus Pithæus hos Phædri Æſopiarum quinque Libros Lutetiæ* (11) *edidiſſet primum, & ad ſe Romam pro veteri amicitia muneri miſiſſet, percuſſos illico Romanos novitate voluminis, atque ut gens eſt emunctæ naris, natura nunquam verba cui potuit dare, ſuſpicari cæpiſſe nam quidnam partus iſte recens ac ſuppoſititius eſſet, qui tanto intervallo appareret, tamque dilituiſſet diu: veruntamen libro perlecto toto, neminem dubitaſſe, quin ætatem redoleret Auguſti, ac ſummam illam facilitatem ſtyli & ſcripturæ, & beatam copiam repræſentaret; tuncque vixiſſet auctor, cum laus bene loquendi temporum potius, quam hominum fuit; ibique etiam apud Cæſarem ſerviſſet, ubi ſedem ac domicilium eruditio collocaſſe videretur; qua in domo filiæ & nepotes, intimi & familiares, ſervi & liberti literas egregie didiciſſent* (12). Theſe are the words of a Jeſuit, who immediately after makes ſome reflections on this paſſage from Seneca, *Æſopios logos intentatum Romanis ingeniis opus*, (the Romans have not attempted to imitate Æſop's Fables). He maintains that Seneca does not ground his aſſertion on Phædrus's being a Thracian, and not a Roman; he refutes effectually thoſe who pretend to account thus for the matter; and he thinks either that Seneca's memory failed him, or that Tiberius's ſucceſſors took care to have the copies of Phædrus's work deſtroyed immediately, becauſe they ſaw their tyranny expoſed therein; and that for this reaſon Seneca was unacquainted with that book. I cannot well approve this laſt obſervation; for if the work had been ſuppreſſed for that reaſon, Seneca would have more eaſily remembered it. But let us hear our Jeſuit (13). *Miror vehementer, cur affirmarit Seneca, Æſopios loges eſſe intentatum Romanis ingeniis opus: quum Phædrum hunc haberet, quem opponere poſſet toti Græciæ. Nam quod*

(11) He publiſhed them at Troies in Champagne, and not at Paris.

(12) Franciſcus Vavaſſor. *de ludicra dictione*, p. 206, 207.

(13) Idem, ibid. p. 207.

the Provinces of Friesland and Groningen. The French translation, which Moreri commends, was made by the Gentlemen of Port-Royal. How good soever it may be, yet Monsieur le Fevre of Saumur found many blunders in it [*E*].

quod clarissima Lumina superioris sæculi duo, Petrus Pithœus et Justus Lipsius prodiderunt, vere id à Seneca dictum, quia Phædrus non genere aut ortu Romanus, sed Thrax, sicut ipse testatum reliquit, esset, minus ea probabilis videtur expositio Senecæ. Quasi vero Romanis ingeniis opus intentatum, sit quicquam aliud, quam Latinis literis nondum illustratum nec elaboratum opus: aut Comœdia fuerit carmen intactum Romanis, quamvis id solus natione Afer Terentius tractasset: aut si percenseret Seneca, qui philosophiam Scriptores Latine explicassent, de eo se numero eximeret ipse; propterea quod natione foret Hispanus, patria Cordubensis. At non exemit Quintilianus, qui quo loco de Philosophis egit Latinis, his illum potissimum annumeravit; cum inter Oratores, Poetas, et alios diversi generis scriptores potuisset referre. Citius dixerim Senecam vel parum hic attendisse, quid scriberet; vel istud, ut alia, oblitum prorsus memoriæ vitio peccasse . . . . (14). *Illud verisimilius, iniquissimis Tiberii, Caligulæ, Claudii, Neronis temporibus, cum scripta edictis abolerentur et Senatus consultis, si cui Poetæ aut Historico verbum excidisset opportunum delationi et calumniæ, cum ne liberæ quidem relictæ cogitationes; et opinio tacita de Principe, sicunde vel ex vultu argui posset, Majestatis rea fieret, libellum fabularem, cujus in Apologis plerisque mera illius sæculi Tyrannis noteretur, suppressum fuisse continuo, ac evanisse tandem, et ignoratum à Seneca, et reliquæ posteritatis oculis subductum.* i. e. " I " wonder very much why Seneca asserted, that " Æsop's Fables was a work unattempted by the Romans, since he had Phædrus, whom he might " have opposed to all Greece. For what these two " most eminent men of the last Century, Peter Pithou, and Justus Lipsius have asserted, seems by no " means probable to me; namely, that Seneca spoke " the truth, because Phædrus was not a Roman by " birth nor by extraction, but a Thracian. As " though a work unattempted by the Romans were " any thing else but a work not illustrated nor explained in the Latin tongue: or as though comedy " would be a kind of poem never touched upon by " the Romans, in case Terence, who was an African, " were the only Author who wrote Comedies in " Latin: or as though Seneca, treating of the Authors who explained Philosophy in Latin, should " except himself from their number, because he was " originally from Spain, and born at Corduba. But " Quintilian did not leave him out of that number; " for in the place where he treats of the Latin Philo- " sophers, he reckons him chiefly among them; " though he might have placed him among the " Orators, or the Poets, or among Writers of some " other kinds. I would therefore rather say, that " Seneca did not consider accurately what he was " writing here, or that his memory failed, as it did " on some other occasions. . . . . But, what is more " probable still, it must be observed that in those " dangerous times of Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, " and Nero, when books were suppressed by edicts, " and by decrees from the Senate, if a Poet or an " Historian dropped but one word which might give " an handle for calumny, or information; when " men's very thoughts were not free, when any opinion entertained of the Prince, though concealed " in the breast became capital, if it could be but " guessed at by a man's looks, or by his countenance, " it must be observed, I say, that as Phædrus's Fables contained many hints against the tyranny of " those times, they must have been very soon suppressed, and vanished away at last, so that Seneca " was unacquainted with them, and the following " ages never saw them." Let us not forget to observe, that Gabriel Faerne did not act very honestly, if we may believe Thuanus (15), He had the manuscript of Phædrus by him, but was sure not to boast of it, nor to publish it. His reason was, that he would have discredited the Fables, which he had wrote in Latin verse, from Æsop's original, if he had acquainted the world, that there was such a work of Phædrus, Augustus's freedman, still extant. Let us not forget Monsieur Perrault's observation on that passage of Thuanus. We meet with it in a Preface which he prefixed to his French translation in verse of this Faerne's Fables, published at Paris in 1699. Here follow his own words. " The beau- " tiful style in which Faerne wrote his Fables, got " him the name of the second Phædrus, though he " had never seen his works, which did not come to " our knowledge but above thirty years after Faerne's " death. For it was Monsieur Pithou, who having " met with it among the dust of an antient library, " published it in the beginning of this Century. " Thuanus, who in his History mentions our Author " very honourably, pretends that Phædrus was not " unknown to him; he does even blame him for " suppressing that antient Writer, in order to conceal " his own plagiarism; but what he asserts there is " not grounded in the least, and could not come into " his head, but by the strong prepossession, in which " all the exorbitant admirers of antiquity indulge " themselves; namely, that a modern Author can " write nothing that is excellent, unless he has some " eminent Author for his pattern. Of the hundred " Fables which Faerne turned into Latin verse, there " are but five which Phædrus also handled: and if " these five there is but one or two, which are ex- " pressed nearly after the same manner; which hap- " pened only because it is impossible that two men " who write upon the same subject, should not hap- " pen sometimes to have the same thoughts, and to " use the same expressions." The latter part of this passage is as full a vindication of Faerne as could be wished.

(14) Franciscus Vavassor, *de Ludicra Dictione*, p. 208.

(15) Thuanus, lib. 28. *sub fin.* p. m. 578. *ad ann.* 1561. Du Ryer has erroneously translated these words of Thuanus. *Si Phædri, cujus sive imitatione sive æmulatione luserat, nomen non dissimulasset:* which Du Ryer renders thus, " If he had not " concealed the " name of Phæ- " drus, *with* " *whom he made* " *sport*," instead of, *whom he strove to imitate or to surpass in the composition of Fables.*

[*E*] *Monsieur le Fevre of Saumur found many blunders in it.*] He published very good notes on Phædrus in the year 1657, and he was already very famous for his learning; and yet the learned Schefferus had not heard any thing of him in the year 1660. He came then to know both the name of the Author, and how valuable a work his Phædrus was, by a letter he received from Gronovius (16). *Mihi sane,* says he (17), *adeo ad diem illum Faber fuit ignoratus, ut illius nihil ante, ac ne notas quidem in Scriptorem nostrum, nisi serò, ut prædixi, viderim vel legerim.* I observe this that the reader may see, the most learned men are sometimes unknown to each other, though they flourish in the same age, and be contemporaries.

(16) Scheffer. *Præfat. in* 2 *edit.*

(17) Idem, ibid.

PHÆDRUS (THOMAS), Professor of Eloquence at Rome towards the end of the 15th Century, and in the beginning of the 16th passed for the Cicero of his time [*A*]. He was Canon of Lateran, and keeper of the Library in the Vatican (*a*). He owed the beginning of his fortune to the acting of Seneca's Hippolytus, in which he performed the part of Phædra (*b*); whence he also kept the name of Phædrus. The cause of his death

(*a*) Parrhasius, *de Quæsitis per Epistolam*, p. 34.

(*b*) See the rem. [*A*].

[*A*] *He passed for the Cicero of his time*] Let us quote Erasmus, who will acquaint us with some pretty curious particulars concerning this Phædrus. *Romæ . . cognovi et amavi* Petrum (1) Phædrum, *lingua verius quam calamo celebrem: mira erat in dicendo tum copia tum auctoritas. Magna felicitatis pars est* Romæ *innotuisse; ille primum innotuit ex* Senecæ Tragœdia, *cui Titulus* Hippolytus, *in qua representarit personam* Phædræ, *in area, quæ est ante palatium Cardinalis* Raphaelis Georgiani. *Sic ex ipso Cardinale didici, unde et* Phædro *cognomen additum. Is obiit minor annis, ni fallor, quinquaginta, dictus sæculi sui* Cicero (2). i. e. " At Rome . . . . . I was acquainted and inti- " mate with Peter Phædrus, a man more famous in- " deed by his tongue, than by his pen. He spoke " with wonderful eloquence and gravity. It is a " great happiness for a man to make himself known " at Rome. Our Phædrus got some reputation there " by

(1) Parrhasius & Pierius Valerianus call him *Thomas*.

(2) Erasmus, *Epistola*, 5. lib. 23. p. 1210.

death was attended with remarkable circumſtances [*B*]. Riding once through the city on a mule, he met a cart drawn by wild oxen; his mule took a fright, and threw him down. He was ſo happy that the cart paſſed over him without doing him any hurt, becauſe he happened to fall within the ſpace between the two wheels: but his fright, and his fall ſpoiled the whole maſs of his blood to ſuch a degree, that he contracted a diſtemper of which he was never cured. If he had lived longer, he would probably have publiſhed ſome books [*C*], which would perhaps have confirmed what has been obſerved of him, that his tongue was better than his pen (*c*). Parrhaſius, his Collegue, who was infinitely obliged to him, was extremely ſorry for his death. I do not know whether it was Phædrus or another, who preached the ſermon, which Eraſmus has ſo juſtly cenſured [*D*]. Voſſius imagined that this Roman Profeſſor was the Author of the Antiquities of Hetruria [*E*], which have been publiſhed under the fictitious name of Proſper.

(*c*) See the rem. [*A*].

(*d*) See the rem. [*B*], of the art. PARRHASIUS.

PHAON

" by Seneca's tragedy, intitled, Hippolytus, in which " he acted the part of *Phædra*, whence he got the " ſirname of *Phædrus*: that Tragedy was acted in " the Court-yard before the Palace of Cardinal Ra- " phael Georgianus: this I have from the Cardinal " himſelf. Phædrus died being not yet fifty, if I " am not miſtaken, being ſtyled the Cicero of his " time." Here follows the character which Pierius Valerianus gives of our Phædrus's eloquence. *Neque diu felix fuit Thomas Phædrus, affluentiſſimum eloquentiæ flumen, quo non alius eo tempore orando clarior, neque vehementior fuit, Romanæ ipſe quoque Cathedræ decus, & ornamentum* (3). i. e. " Nor was Thomas Phædrus a " long time happy, that moſt fluent ſtream of elo- " quence, than whom no man at that time ſpoke " with more clearneſs and ſtrength. He was alſo the " glory and ornament of the Roman See." Add to this, what I quote from Parrhaſius in the remark [*C*], and Peter Bembus's teſtimony: he was a ſkillful judge in matters of eloquence, and very much commends our Thomas Phædrus in that reſpect: It is in the 3d letter of the 4th book, dated from Venice, January the 13th, 1505. Let us extract a particular from thence. A perſon had wrote to him, that Phædrus grew luſty. So much the better, ſaid he, we may then uſe him after the manner of the ancient heroes, and ſtyle him *good and great*, or *luſty*. *Illum certe poſſumus heroum more* ὠύτε μεγάτε *dicere.*

(3) Pierius Valerianus, *de Literat. Infelicit.* lib. 1. p. 25.

[*B*] *The cauſe of his death was attended with remarkable circumſtances.*] You will ſee them elegantly expreſſed in the following paſſage from Pierius Valerianus. *Quam vero miſerabiliter, quamque inopino mortis genere ſubreptus interiit, dum ſcilicet mula media urbe vehitur junctis factus obviam bubalis, qui viſendæ magnitudinis carrucam trahebant: Conſternata ſiquidem mula, bubaliſque identidem perterrefactis, ſimul ab ea calcitroſa excuſſus eſt tam magnæ corporaturæ vir, quantum hominem noſtis, ſimul à plauſtro ſuperatus, quamvis in rotarum medium intervallum incidens eliſionem evitarit, corrupto tamen præ timore & gravi caſu intra viſcera ſanguine, multa inde longæ & occultæ valetudinis incommoda perpeſſus, in ejuſmodi ærumna vita functus eſt* (4).

(4) Idem, ibid. *N. B.* The ſenſe of this paſſage is given in the text of this article.

[*C*] *He would probably have publiſhed ſome books.*] The Reader will not be diſpleaſed to know the titles of them, which Parrhaſius has tranſmitted down to us. I ſhall therefore tranſcribe the following paſſage, which contains a noble elogium of our Phædrus; but we muſt remember that the perſon who ſpeaks is an Orator, who had received many favours from him. *Quis eſt in hoc orbis terrarum domicilio (cujus antiquum ſcenæ decus inſtauravit) quis in hac excultiſſima Academia (quæ Phædro Rhetore cœlum vertice contingebat) quis adeo barbarus à Muſis abeſt, & Gratiis, qui ad extincti Phædri nomen ubertim non fleat. O deteſtandam fati importunitatem? Silet, heu, T. Phædre, vox illa tua jucunde ſonora; illa argutæ linguæ ſuadela, quæ mentes hominum in omnis affectus impellebat, quæ Romanam faucundiam à Gothis uſque temporibus amiſſam reſtituit. Ubi nunc eſt ille geſtus cum ſententiis congruens? Ubi illa incorrupti Latini ſermonis integritas? Quis ultimam manum tot inchoatis operibus imponet? Quæ (non ſecus ac Apellis illa decantatiſſima Venus) interrupta pendent: luculentiſſimæ ſcilicet Orationes, Apologia Ciceronis in obtrectatores, quam mihi paucis ante diebus, quam cœpiſſet æſtuare, domi ſuæ per ſummam voluptatem legit: Annalium breviarium, quo res omnes à Populo Romano geſtas complexus eſt: in Horatii Poeticam vigilantiſſima commentaria: in Plauti Comœdias ſcrupuloſiſſimæ quæſtiones* (5). i. e. " Who is there in this City (whoſe an- " cient glory Phædrus reſtored) who in this moſt po- " lite Univerſity (who when Phædrus was Profeſſor " of Eloquence, lifted her head up to the ſky) who " ſo barbarous, and ſo unacquainted with the Muſes " and with the Graces, but will ſhed a whole flood " of tears on the death of Phædrus? Oh! the abo- " minable cruelty of Fate! Thy ſweet voice, oh " Phædrus, is alas! no longer heard: that power- " ful and perſuading tongue, which could raiſe all " kinds of paſſions in men, and reſtored the antient " eloquence, loſt ever ſince the invaſion of the Goths, " that tongue ſpeaks no more. Where is now that " action of yours always anſwerable to the ſenſe of " your diſcourſes? What is become of that pure and " uncorrupted Latin ſtyle? Who ſhall complete ſo " many of your works juſt begun, which (like that " celebrated Venus of Apelles) lie unfiniſhed? His " eloquent Orations; his apology for Cicero againſt " his Revilers, which Phædrus read to me with the " utmoſt pleaſure a few days before he fell ſick; " that Compendium of Annals, in which he gives a " ſummary account of the whole Roman Hiſtory; " thoſe elaborate Commentaries on Horace's Art of " Poetry; thoſe moſt curious queſtions on Plautus's Co- " medies." If this Oration were dated, we ſhould know the time when Phædrus died. Obſerve that Volaterranus, having hinted the ſeries of the antient wars, expreſſes himſelf thus. BELLORUM IGITUR HUJUSMODI *excurſum T. Phædri noſtri ex magna parte diligentia collectum, non abs te fuerit ſimul ordine repetiiſſe* (6). i. e. " It will be of ſome uſe to give a me- " thodical account of thoſe wars, the ſeries and con- " nexion of which have been ſet down chiefly by " the care of our friend T. Phædrus."

(5) Janus Parrhaſius, *in Orat. ante Prælectionem Epiſt. Ciceron. ad Atticum*, p. 145, 146.

(6) Volaterranus, *Comment. Urban.* lib. 38. p. m. 1459.

[*D*] *The ſermon, which Eraſmus has ſo juſtly cenſured.*] That ſermon was delivered before Pope Julius II. on a Holy Friday. Eraſmus heard it, and received no edification from it. The Preacher laboured only to appear Ciceronian. Eraſmus does not name him (7), but we may think that he means one of the Profeſſors of Eloquence, of whom he had ſaid what follows. *Florebant id temporis præter cæteros dicendi laude Petrus Phædrus & Camillus hac ætate minor, ſed eloquentiæ viribus major, niſi quod ille jam hujus laudis arcem occupaverat* (9). i. e. " At that time were fa- " mous for their eloquence, among others, Peter " Phædrus, and Camillus, only the latter was ſome- " thing younger, but his eloquence was greater (and " his reputation would have been greater alſo, had it " not been that) the former had got the ſtart of " him."

(7) *Nomen Oratoris non edam, ne videar hominis probi & eruditi famam arrodere voluiſſe. Eraſm. in Ciceroniano*, p. 39. i. e. " I " ſhall not name " the Preacher, " leſt it ſhould " be thought " that I deſign- " ed to traduce " a pious and " learned man."

[*E*] *Voſſius imagined that* Phædrus *was the Author of the Antiquities of Hetruria.*] Here follow his words. *Fuere qui fœtum crederent Gulielmi Poſtelli. Sed verus auctor eſt Thomas Fædrus, qui vixit anno* 1490 (10). *i. e.* " Some thought it was a work of William Poſtel. " But the true Author of it is Thomas Fædrus, who " lived the year 1490." Voſſius has been very much wronged in Placcius's treatiſe *De Scriptis Anonymis*; for after the words which I have tranſcribed, and thoſe that are before them, we find immediately this; *Cujus Thomæ ulteriorem nullam nec apud ipſum, nec apud Geſnerum, alioſve illius generis auctores invenio mentionem. Verum enim vero non opus eſt ut de eo multum hic ſolliciti ſimus, cum non illum, ſed ipſum* CURTIUM INGHIRAMIUM, *qui fragmenta illa primus, ac ſi Scornelli prope Vulterram ea ſub terra inveniſſet, Florentiæ publicavit, parentem hujuſce ſuppoſititii figmenti fuiſſe prolixe docuerit*

(9) Idem, ibid. p. 38.

(10) Voſſius, *de Hiſtor. Latinis*, lib. 1. cap. 9. *in fin.* p. 41.

Leo

Leo Allatius, *in ſuis ad dictas Antiquitates annotationibus, Pariſiis* 1640, *& biennio poſt Romæ iterum excuſis* (11). i. e. "I do not find this Thomas mentioned any more, either by him, or by Geſner, or by any other Writer of the ſame kind. But we ought not to trouble ourſelves much about this, ſince it is not he, but Curtius Inghiramius, who publiſhed thoſe fragments firſt at Florence, as though he had found them under ground near Volterra, and who is the true Author of this ſuppoſititious work, as Leo Allatius fully ſhews, in his notes upon thoſe Antiquities, printed at Paris in 1640, and reprinted two years after at Rome." That whole Latin paſſage is printed in Italicks after the ſame manner as the words tranſcribed from Voſſius, nor is there the leaſt mark to ſhew there is a diſtinction to be made between the former part of the paſſage and the latter: ſo that there is no Reader but may juſtly imagine, that Voſſius ſaid all this; one may therefore think he knew nothing of all that Parrhaſius, Eraſmus, and Pierius Valerianus relate of Phædrus. The worſt is, that one might imagine, Voſſius was inconſiderate enough to aſſert in the ſame page, that Thomas Phædrus is the true Author of a book which Curtius Inghiramius compoſed. Let us obſerve by the by, that Voſſius's miſ-ſpelling has miſled Konig (12) who made two Authors out of one; he gives us Thomas Fœdrus for an Author, different from Thomas Phædrus, and refers us to Hallervord.

(11) Placcius, *de Scriptis Anonymis, in Appendice*, p. 30.

(12) See his *Bibliotheca vetus & nova*, p. 310, and 628.

PHAON of Mitylene, in the iſland of Leſbos, was a very handſom man, who was extremely beloved by the fair ſex. Poor Sappho was caught, as well as many others, and found him ſo little complaiſant, that ſhe was diſconſolate, as we ſhall obſerve in her article. The Poets, after their uſual manner of having recourſe to miracles at every turn, have feigned, that Phaon's great beauty, which made ſuch deep impreſſions on the Ladies hearts, was a preſent which the Goddeſs Venus made him, to reward him for the ſervices he had done her. He took her once in his boat, without inquiring who ſhe was, and carried her with all ſpeed to the place ſhe deſired (*a*) [*A*]. He aſked nothing for his trouble (*b*), but he was nevertheleſs well paid. Venus made him a preſent of a veſſel of alabaſter full of a certain ointment, with which he had no ſooner rubbed himſelf, but he became the moſt handſom of all men (*c*). He ſet the hearts of all the women at Mitylene on fire. Youth returned upon him, and ſo forth (*d*). He made an ill uſe of it, which coſt him his life, for he was killed in the very fact, I mean being ſurpriſed committing adultery (*e*). Some have aſſerted, that the property of a certain herb was the cauſe of Sappho's love for him [*B*].

(*a*) Ælian. *Hiſt. div.* lib. 12. cap. 17.

(*b*) Palæphatus, *de Fabul.*

(*c*) Ælian. *Hiſt. div.* lib. 20. cap. 17.

(*d*) Palæphatus, *de Fabul.* Lucanus, *Dialog. Mortuor.* Tom. 1. p. 234.

(*e*) Ælian. *Hiſt. div.* lib. 12. cap. 17.

[*A*] *He carried* Venus . . . . *to the place ſhe deſired.*] There is a paſſage in Lucian, by which we learn, not whither he carried her, but where ſhe imbarked. Μῶν καὶ σύ τινα ὥσπερ ὁ Φάων τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἐκ Χίου διαπορθμεύσας εἶτά σοι εὐξαμένῳ ἔδωκε νέον εἶναι καὶ καλὸν ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς καὶ ἀξιέραστον. *Have you alſo*, aſks Simylus of Polyſtratus, *carried Venus over from Chios, like Phaon of old, that at your requeſt ſhe made you grow young again, and become handſom and lovely* (1)? One might infer from theſe words, that Phaon aſked as a reward, the favour of being reſtored to youth and beauty. But Palæphatus gives us not the leaſt hint of this, he obſerves, that Phaon had been a Mariner all his life-time, and never uſed any one uncivilly, nor made the poor pay for their paſſage, for which reaſon he was admired in the iſle of Leſbos; that Venus, being diſguiſed like an old woman, entered into his boat, that he croſſed her over with ſpeed, and aſked her nothing for his trouble; but that from an old man as he was, ſhe made him become an handſom youth. Servius touches (2) upon this ſtory, and adds to it the following particular, extracted from two comic Poets (3), that Phaon built a temple to Venus on the mountain of Leucas, from which a woman, who was deeply in love with him, had thrown herſelf into the ſea. Let us obſerve, that Lucian imagined that Phaon was of the iſle of Chios (4), wherein he was probably miſtaken.

(1) Lucian. *Dialog. Mortuor.* Tom. 1. p. 234.

(2) Servius, *in Æn.* 3. ver. 273. Correct in the edition of Leyden 1680. *Venerem mutatam in navis formam*, thus, *in anus formam.*

(3) Menander and Turpilius.

(4) Lucian. *in Navigio*, Tom. 2. p. 696.

[*B*] *Some have aſſerted, that the property of a certain herb was the cauſe of Sappho's love for him.*] It is ſtrange men ſhould not be willing to grant, that Sappho could fall paſſionately in love by the bare ſtrength of her natural temper. You ſee that Pliny accounts for it by ſo fabulous a principle as Venus's ointment. He is very much in the right to obſerve, that that herb has ſomething monſtrous in it (5). *Portentoſum eſt quod de ea traditur, radicem ejus alterutrius ſexus ſimilitudinem referre, raram inventu: ſed ſi viris contigerit mas, amabiles fieri. Ob hoc & Phaonem Leſbium dilectum à Sappho. Multæ circa hoc non Magorum ſolum vanitates, ſed etiam Pythagoricorum* (6). i. e. "They relate a wonderful particular of that herb, namely, that its roots repreſents the diſtinguiſhing parts of either ſex; but it is a difficult matter to find it. If that which repreſents the male-ſex happens to be uſed by a man, he becomes lovely. This was the cauſe of Sappho's love for Phaon the Leſbian. Not only the Magi, but even the Pythagoreans have aſſerted many idle ſtories concerning that plant." The plant meant here is white Eryngium, called by the Latins *centum capita*, which Pinet tranſlates *Chardon à cent têtes*, the thiſtle with an hundred heads.

(5) Plin. lib. 22. cap. 8.

(6) Father Hardouin refers us here to a book falſely intitled, *Kiranium Kirani*, p. 37.

PHASELIS, a ſea-port town in Lycia, on the borders of Pamphylia (*a*). It was one of the cities which got the greateſt riches by the piracies of the Cilicians, for which reaſon it was deſtroyed by Publius Servilius (*b*), after the victories he gained over thoſe Pirates. It was in a wretched condition when Pompey landed there after the battle of Pharſalia [*A*]. It has been aſſerted, that it was built by Mopſus (*c*). This city has been

(*a*) Strabo, lib. 14. p. 458. See alſo T. Livius, lib. 37. cap. 23. (*b*) *Nec mari ſubmoviſſe contentus validiſſimas urbes eorum & diuturna præda abundantes, Phaſelin & Olympon evertit, Iſaurumque ipſam arcem Ciliciæ.* Florus, lib. 3. cap. 6. (*c*) Pomponius Mela, lib. 1. cap. 14.

[*A*] *It was in a pitiful condition when Pompey landed there, after the battle of Pharſalia.*] If we may believe Lucan, there were more people in Pompey's ſhip, than in that city.

Te primum parva Phaſeli
Magnus adit. Nam te metui vetat incola rarus,
Exhauſtæque domus populis, majorque carinæ
Quam tua turba fuit (1).

(1) Lucan. lib. 8.

——"Poor Phaſelis, firſt receives the wand'ring train
"There, free from fears, with eaſe he may command
"Her citizens, ſcarce equal to his band." *Rowe.*

And yet Strabo, who lived after Pompey, ſpeaks of Phaſelis, as of a conſiderable city with three harbours for ſhips. He meant, probably, the condition that

been very much talked of with regard to a certain miraculous favour, which Alexander was ſaid to have received there from the Gods [*B*]. I ſhall make a remark upon this as

(2) Obſerve that it is by no means probable that that city was reſtored to its antient ſplendor after the battle of Pharſalia, till Strabo's time.

(3) Strabo, lib. 14. p. 458.

that city had been in before his time (2); but he ought not to have expreſſed himſelf in the preſent tenſe. Εἶτα Φάσηλις, τρεῖς ἔχουσα λιμένας, πόλις ἀξιόλογος. *Ac deinde Phaſelis, tres habens portus, urbs memorabilis* (3).

[*B*] *A miraculous favour which Alexander was ſaid to have received there from the Gods.*] Let us begin with quoting Joſephus, who having given an account of the paſſage through the Red Sea, makes the following obſervation. *No man ought to wonder at this, as though it were incredible, that the ſea ſhould have opened a way to the firſt men, who were not cunning enough then to find out ſome crafty device, and who were in danger of their lives, this being done either by God's good will, or by a natural cauſe. For it is not long ſince the ſea of Pamphylia opened itſelf to make way for the Macedonians, who were led by Alexander the Great, and who had no other way to paſs by; becauſe God had determined to make uſe of Alexander and his army, to deſtroy the Kingdom of Perſia; which is witneſſed by all thoſe who wrote that King's atchievements. But let every one think of this what he pleaſes* (4). It is not true, that all Alexander's Hiſtorians took the manner, in which he paſſed the Streight of Pamphylia near Phaſelis, to be miraculous. We ſhall now quote a celebrated Author, who hints very clearly, that there was nothing of a miracle on that occaſion. *Alexander marched his army along the ſea-coaſt of Pamphylia with ſuch expedition, that many Hiſtorians have deſcribed and extolled it with that height of admiration, as if it were no leſs than a miracle, and an extraordinary effect of divine favour, that the waves which are wont to come rowling in from the main, and hardly ever leave ſo much as the beach under the ſteep broken cliffs at any time uncovered, ſhould on a ſudden retire, to afford him paſſage. Menander in one of his Comedies, ſeems to allude to this wonderful event, when he ſays,* " If I want " an inſtance of it, Alexander comes preſently to " my mind; I aſk him, Can you paſs over the ſea? " He replies, As eaſily as over the dry land." *Yet Alexander himſelf, in his epiſtles, does not ſpeak of this as any thing miraculous; he obſerves only, that he went from Phaſelis, and marched through the Streights which they call the Ladders* (5). We ought to be obliged to Plutarch for mentioning that Conqueror's letters, for they decide the whole matter; they convince of impoſture or of error thoſe who have deſcribed that paſſage as ſomething ſupernatural, and as a very great miracle. If there had been ſome prodigy in this, and ſome extraordinary favour from Heaven, Alexander would not have failed to mention it in the letters he wrote concerning that march of his army. No political reaſon could oblige him to conceal ſo wonderful an event; and there were ſeveral conſiderable motives, which would have induced him to mention it. Nothing could be of a more deciſive conſequence for him, than to convince the whole world that the Gods had viſibly declared in his favour, that they ſubmitted the moſt untractable elements to him, and that even nature renounced her antient cuſtoms, in order to haſten the King of Perſia's ruin. He himſelf therefore ſhould have wrote an account of that great miracle to his mother, to Antipater, to all the nations of Greece, and have ſent it to all the places where he deſired to be known. He ought to have taken care to ſee his letters duly attended with all that could make them authentick, and yet he gave an account of it in the moſt ſimple manner imaginable. Let it not be objected, that he would owe nothing but to his own courage; this is not true; for we have proved in his article (6), that his furious ambition of paſſing for a God was very much owing to his policy. It appears plainly from the whole tenor of his conduct, that he wiſhed for nothing more paſſionately, than to ſee all the nations fully perſuaded of the great influence of his good fortune, and of the unchangeable happineſs of his deſtiny. A man will go infinitely farther with ſuch a reputation, than with that of a moſt brave and able Captain: for upon the whole, all the world knows, that General's courage and prudence are limited, but men imagine that nothing can ſtop a Conqueror, in whoſe favour Fortune has openly declared, and who can command Heaven and Earth, the Sea and the Winds. *Queis militat æther, Et conjurati veniunt ad claſſica venti* (7). So that the chief intereſt and greateſt concern of Conquerors is, to be looked upon as perſons whom God deſigns to bring great revolutions about, and whom he favours with his miracles. If this makes us abate ſomething of their glory with regard to their courage, or to their genius and ability, they are recompenſed with uſury in other reſpects. The extent of their conqueſts, the number of their victories, the rapidity with which great deeds are performed, when Fortune directs them, and takes every thing almoſt wholly upon herſelf, without caring for the concourſe of prudence, all this, I ſay, is an object of admiration, infinitely more dazzling, than thoſe limited and moderate conqueſts, which are owing only to the moſt conſummate prudence, and to the moſt undaunted intrepidity. Are there any human virtues, that can inſpire us with the ſame reſpect, the ſame veneration, the ſame eſteem, which we naturally conceive for thoſe whom we look upon as choice veſſels, deſigned by God for the foundation of Empires, his favourites, and his minions? A man is much more admired upon that ſcore, than if he diſtinguiſhed himſelf only by his prudence and by his courage. Obſerve, laſtly, that there are ſome things entirely independent on a Conqueror's valour and wiſdom. Theſe qualities are not capable to open a paſſage for an army through the ſea or through a river; and therefore, when a General confeſſes that the ſea and the rivers opened miraculouſly a paſſage for his army, men do not rob him of the glory due to him, to beſtow it on fortune; for all the world is fully perſuaded, that the ability and courage of a great Warrior are not capable to produce ſuch effects; all the world would look upon him as a mad-man, or would laugh at him, if he ſhould dare to boaſt that he found means to make a great army croſs an arm of the ſea without ſhips, and without pontons. It is therefore impoſſible to find out good reaſons, which could determine Alexander to conceal the miracle in queſtion: whence we muſt infer, that if he did not mention it in the letters he wrote concerning his march, it was becauſe there happened nothing extraordinary then.

(4) Joſeph. *Antiquit.* lib. 2. towards the end. I make uſe of Genebrard's (French) Tranſlation, becauſe I ſhall be obliged to quote him by and by upon another account.

(5) Plutarch, in his *Life of Alexander*, cap. 6. p. m. 154, 155. I make uſe of Amyot's Tranſlation; you will meet with this paſſage in page 673 and 674, of the Greek and Latin edition of Plutarch.

(6) See the art. MACEDONIA rem. [*H*], and the art. OLYMPIAS, rem. [*F*].

(7) Theſe are Claudian's words, *in* 3 *Conſulat. Honorii Aug.* ver. 95. This relates to a prodigy, which made Theodoſius gain the victory over Eugenius in 394. See Monſieur Flechier, *Vie de Theodoſe*, Liv. 4. p. 479. edit. in 12mo. and Barthius in Claudianum, p. 509, &c. The whole paſſage in Claudianus is as follows. *O nimium dilecte Deo, cui fundit ab antris Æolus armatas hiemes, cui militat æther. Et conjurati veniunt ad claſſica venti.* i. e. " Oh " Prince too " much beloved " of God! in " whoſe favour " Æolus pours " down rain " from Heaven, " for whom the " ſkies fight, " and at whoſe " call the winds " come to his " aſſiſtance.

I can ſupport my argument by a very good obſervation. The moſt ambitious Princes, the warriors the moſt covetous of praiſe, are never ſo inventive as their flatterers, nor ſo cunning as their panegyriſts (8), with regard to thoſe things which are proper to add a luſtre to a Conqueror's glory. Since then Alexander's flatterers, ſince the Orators and the Poets, who have commended him, have aſſerted that the Sea of Pamphylia retired its waves to make a paſſage for his army, and that there happened a great miracle on that occaſion, we ought to believe that they were perſuaded, that by this means they would labour more effectually to render his glory immortal, and that they would make it thus more wonderful. He did not bethink himſelf of that device, and with regard to that kind of artifices, he was not equal to the wits, the flatterers, and the orators, in point of invention; ſo that he wrote plainly and ſincerely how he croſſed the ſea. If he had made uſe of craft, if he had concealed the prodigy, leſt he ſhould leſſen his glory by confeſſing that the Gods had aſſiſted him, his flatterers would have well known what his taſte was in this reſpect, they would have ſuited their commendations to it, and had never mentioned the miracle. If we had all the poems and pamphlets, which were publiſhed upon that ſubject during this Prince's life, we ſhould meet with many idle ſtories in them: but as it is the fate of thoſe pieces to periſh as ſoon and even ſooner than their Authors, poſterity has not been peſtered with them. So that nothing has been tranſmitted down to us, but the plain account to which the graveſt Hiſtorians reduced the whole matter; and it is not difficult to get a true notion of that affair by conſulting an able geographer. Strabo tells us that Mount Climax is ſo near the Sea of Pamphylia, that it is ſeparated from it only by a narrow

(8) Apply to this theſe words of Pliny the younger, *Paneg. Trajan.* cap. 55. *Ingenioſior eſt ad excogitandum ſimulatio veritate, ſervitus libertate, metus amore.* i. e. " Diſſimulation " is more cunning to find out " flatteries than " truth, ſlavery " more than liberty, fear " more than " love."

WHETHER ALEXANDER could have any reaſons to conceal a miracle performed in his favour.

as I have promiſed (*d*).

(*d*) Article MACEDONIA in the text, letter (*d*).

row paſſage, which may be croſſed on foot when that Sea is ſtill, but which is all covered with water when that Sea is high. Alexander truſting to his good fortune commanded his army to paſs through that place, without waiting till the return of the ſpring had carried off the waters. His ſoldiers paſſed accordingly being to their waiſt in the water: this is the whole miracle. Περὶ Φασηλίδα δ' ἐϛὶ τὰ κατὰ θάλατταν ϛεινὰ, δι' ὧν Ἀλέξανδρος παρήγαγε τὴν ϛρατείαν: ἔϛι δ' ὄρος Κλίμαξ καλούμενον ἐπίκειϛαι δὲ τῷ Παμφυλίῳ πελάγει, ϛενὴν ἀπολείπων πάροδον ἐπὶ τῷ αἰγιαλῷ, ταῖς μὲν νηνεμίαις γυμνουμένην, ὡς τε εἶναι βάϛιμον τοῖς ὀδεύουϛι πλημμυρονὶς δὲ τῷ πελάγει, ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων καλυπτομένην ἐπιπολύ· ἡ μὲν οὖν διὰ τοῦ ὄρους ὑπέρβαϛις, περίοδον ἔχει ϗ προσάντης ἐϛὶ, τῷ δ' αἰγιαλῷ χρῶνται κατὰ τὰς εὐδίας. Ὁ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος εἰς χειμέριον ἐμπεσὼν καιρὸν, ϗ τὸ πλέον ἐπιτρέπων τῇ τύχῃ, πρὶν ἀνεῖναι τὸ κύμα ὁρμῆϛαι, ϗ ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐν ὕδαϛι γενέϛθαι τὴν πορείαν συνίδὼν, μέχρι ὀμφαλοῦ βαπτιζομένων. *Apud Phaſelidem ſunt ad mare anguſtiæ, per quas exercitum traduxit Alexander. Eſt enim ibi mons Climax, Pamphylio incumbens mari, & propter littus arctum relinquens tranſitum: qui tranquillo mari nudatur, & à viatoribus perambulari poteſt: mari exundante, fluctibus admodum obtegitur. Alexander autem hybernam incidit in tempeſtatem, cumque fortunæ maximam eventus partem crederet, antequam defluerent undæ profectus eſt: itaque contigit, ut totum diem milites per aquam iter facerent uſque ad umbilicum in eam demerſi* (9). Others aſſert that the South wind, which blowed ſeveral days ſucceſſively, and which had made the Sea overflow the whole paſſage even to the foot of the Mountain, ceaſed to blow the moment Alexander arrived, and that there aroſe a North wind, which drove the waters from the ſhore. Freinſhemius (10) quotes the Author who mentioned this; I ſhall tranſcribe his text and his quotations. * *Parte exercitus ad Pergenſium urbem per montes præmiſſa; cæteros ipſe per littus ducebat, qua Climax mons Pamphylio mari imminens anguſtam euntibus ſemitam relinquit, quoties mare tranquillum eſt; at quum æſtus incubuit, fluctibus operitur. Idque hyeme frequens & prope perpetuum eſt. At Alexander nihil æque ac moram metuens, exercitum per æqua, per iniqua, eodem ardore atque impetu rapiebat. Continui per eos dies Auſtri flaverant, qui mare in littus propellentes, omnia itineris veſtigia altis paludibus opplent: adſiduæ etiam magnæque pluviæ, ut ventis iſtis ſpirantibus ſolet, ruebant. Sed adventante Alexandro ſubito exortus Aquilo cælum purgavit imbribus, undas rejecit in mare, & Macedonibus tranſitum aperuit, Sic quoque unius ** diei itinere per incerta vada emergendum fuit; aqua ad umbilicum ferme pertingente. Tantam in periculis Alexandri fiduciam, ut ab ipſius ingenio profectam non dubito; ita frequentibus prodigiis & ominibus auctam confirmatamque fuiſſe crediderim: poſtquam decreto numinis, clariſſimis maximiſque rebus ſe deſtinari conjecit.* i. e. "Having ſent part of his army to Perga, he "led the reſt along the coaſt, where Mount Climax "hanging over the Sea of Pamphylia leaves a narrow "path to walk over when the Sea is calm, but which "in a ſtorm is covered with water, which happens "often, and almoſt continually in the winter. But "Alexander fearing nothing more than a delay, "continued with the ſame eagerneſs to lead his army "along, whether the roads were good or bad. The "wind having been South for many days had driven "the ſea over that path, ſo that it was all drowned: "add to this the heavy rains which uſed to fall con"tinually when the wind is South. But on Alexan"der's arrival there aroſe on a ſudden a North wind, "which drove the waters into the ſea, cleared the "ſky, and opened a paſſage for the Macedonians. "But notwithſtanding this the army was to march "a whole day through an uncertain road, the ſol"diers being to their waiſt in the water. So great "was Alexander's courage in the midſt of dangers; "I do not queſtion but it was owing to his own tem"per, yet I am apt to think it was alſo encreaſed "and ſtrengthened by the many prodigies and preſa"ges he met with, which made him imagine he was "deſigned by Heaven for great and glorious actions." Joſephus ſhews but little judgment, when he compares the paſſage through the Red Sea with the paſſage over the Sea of Pamphylia. He imagined that Alexander's miracle would incline the Greeks to believe that of Moſes; but he had reaſons to fear leſt the paſſage through the Red Sea ſhould be accounted for by natural cauſes, as that through the Sea of Pamphylia is aſcribed to the North wind. If Genebrard had made uſe of a leſs reproachful terms, his obſervation on the following words of Joſephus could not be blamed. *The Egyptians were diſappointed in their expectation, not knowing that ſuch an opening and ſuch a road was not deſigned for all, but only for the Hebrews, who were making their eſcape to ſave their lives, and not for their enemies, who purſued them with a deſign to ruin and deſtroy them* (11). Here follows Genebrard's note. "Hence you may know how execrable Joachin Va"dian's impiety is, who dares to write in his Com"mentaries on Pomponius Mela, that Moſes waited "the opportunity when the Red Sea was to return "into the Ocean, and leave its bottom dry, as it "happens twice a day at Mount St. Michael in Nor"mandy. For beſides that God would ſhew his "power herein, the Red Sea does never leave its "bottom dry by ebbing and flowing, or by riſing "and falling, but is always full of water, as appears "plainly from Geography, and the Sea Chart's (12)." Joſephus ought to have avoided making his parallel with ſo much the more caution, that he had room to fear leſt the Greek Philoſophers ſhould make an advantage of what is obſerved in the ſacred hiſtory, namely, that *the Lord cauſed the Sea to go back by a ſtrong Eaſt wind all that night* (13). Here then, might they ſay, are two miracles, which are much alike, and both the effect of the wind. There aroſe in Alexander's favour a North wind, which drove the waters of the Sea back into its channel; another wind did the ſame in Moſes's favour. Several Writers, to make the conqueſts of the Macedonian army appear more wonderful, have taken for a miracle a North wind, which by chance proved very favourable to them. The Hiſtorian of the Hebrews has done the ſame (14): to prevent therefore theſe objections Joſephus ſhould have forbore the parallel he makes ſo unſeaſonably. The Author of a Commentary *in uſum Delphini* cenſures him ſeverely for it. *Ut imperite, ne dicam impie, feciſſe Joſephus videatur, qui narrato Iſraelitarum tranſitu per rubrum mare, qui credibile probaret eſſe miraculum, ſimile quiddam Alexandro contigiſſe agnoſcit, & ab omnibus affirmari tradit qui res ejus geſtas literis mandarunt* (15).

Obſerve that it is an eaſy matter to point out a very material difference between what paſſed near Phaſelis, and what happened in Ægypt. The wind which drove back the Red Sea was preceded by an human action, which ſhewed that God himſelf acted herein in a ſpecial manner. *Moſes ſtretched out his hand over the Sea* (16). But farther, there is a particular here, which cannot be aſcribed to the wind: *The waters were divided, and the children of Iſrael went into the midſt of the Sea upon the dry ground, and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left.* If it be ſuppoſed, that the wind made that opening or diviſion, it muſt be confeſſed that it was not natural, that is to ſay, that it blew only on a very little portion of the ſea, and that letting the waters on the right and on the left alone, it made a way in the middle, and drove back only the waters which happened to be in that middle, ſupporting thoſe that were on both ſides. If it be aſked why it was neceſſary the wind ſhould blow all night, ſince God has no occaſion for the ſecond cauſes to dry up in a moment an arm of the Sea, I anſwer that it is not the buſineſs of the creatures to preſcribe to their Creator how he ought to act. And beſides, they who aſſert that the miracles of the antient law were produced occaſionally as they were deſired by a creature, are perhaps not miſtaken. See what are Father Malebranche's and Monſieur Arnaud's opinions upon this (17). If the Angel, to whoſe care the people of Iſrael was committed, was the occaſional cauſe of all Moſes's miracles, we would have no reaſon to wonder, that the action of bodies, the violence of the winds, *&c.* were made uſe of on thoſe occaſions. Several difficulties may be ſolved by that principle. An Heathen would ſay perhaps, according to the ſtyle of thoſe who ſpoke ſo much of the Genii of the Emperors, that Alexander's genius cauſed the South

(9) Strabo, lib. 14. p. 458.

(10) *Supplem. in Q. Curtium*, lib. 2. cap. 11. num. 18. See alſo his *Index* to Q. Curtius, under the word *Pamphylia*.

* Strabo, lib. 14. Curt. 5. 3. 22. 6. 3. 16. Artemon *in* Senecæ ſuaſor. 1. Arrian. 1, 8. 8. Euſtath. *in* Dionyſ. ver. 855, & 865. Appian. lib. 2. *de Bell. Civil.* Joſeph. *Antiquit.* lib. 2. *extremo.* Plutarch. cap. 27 & 28.

** Strabo, lib. 14.

(11) Joſephus, book 2. towards the end, according to Genebrard's Tranſlation.

(12) Genebrard, in the margin of his Tranſlation of Joſephus, book 2. of the *Antiquities of the Jews*, folio 53, of the Paris edit. 1604, in 8vo.

(13) Exodus, chap. 14. ver. 21.

(14) You muſt ſuppoſe all this is ſaid by the Greek Philoſophers we have juſt now mentioned.

(15) Mich. le Tellier, *Notis in* Q. Curtium, lib. 5. *capite ipſi undeſimo*, 193.

(16) Exodus, chap. 14. ver. 21. See Monſieur le Clerc's *Diſſertation*, mentioned in the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans*, for Octob. 1695. p. 59, 60.

(17) Monſieur Arnaud publiſhed in the year 1685, *A Diſſertation on the manner after which God performed Miracles under the antient Law, by the means of the Angels.* He refutes Father Malebranche in that *Diſſertation.*

PHASIS, a River which runs through Colchis, and diſcharges itſelf in the Euxine Sea, had that name ſince a young man had thrown himſelf into it. It was called Arcturus before that time. That young man was the ſon of Apollo and Ocyroe (*a*): he killed his mother whom he ſurprized in the very fact [*A*], I mean in the arms of a lover. The furies appeared to him, and tormented him to ſuch a degree, that he threw himſelf into the Arcturus. There grew in that River a plant named *Leucophyllus*, which had a wonderful property; for it prevented women from committing adultery. But it was to be gathered with ſome precautions (*b*) [*B*]. Nothing has rendered the Phaſis more famous than the expedition of the Argonauts: for all the Poets who have celebrated it could not but remember this great River, ſince the Argonauts were obliged to ſail towards its head, in order to get the golden Fleece. With regard to this and ſeveral other particulars I refer you to Lloyd's Dictionary: but as to the preſent ſtate of the Phaſis you will meet

(*a*) Who was the daughter of Oceanus.

(*b*) Extracted from Plutarch, in his Treatiſe *de Fluviis*, p. m. 16, 17.

South wind to ceaſe, and a North wind to blow, the day when that Conqueror deſigned to paſs along the ſea-ſhore near Phaſelis. But in order to perſuade us of this, it were neceſſary to prove, that in caſe Alexander had continued in Macedonia, the North wind would not have ſucceeded to the South wind, the day he made his army march along that ſhore. But it is impoſſible to prove and to know this. One might indeed comprehend, that thoſe Genii of the Emperors could, by their knowledge in natural philoſophy, *applicando activa paſſivis*, have made a wind ceaſe, and have raiſed another; but one cannot know whether they do it actually in ſuch a place, or at ſuch a time.

[*A*] *He killed his mother, whom he ſurprized in the very fact.*] They who have read Pontus de Tyard may wonder that I ſhould ſpeak of young Phaſis, without beſtowing upon him the ſame elogies, which that Author beſtows upon him. *Phaſis*, ſays he (1), *being grown a man, and a chaſte obſerver of the rules of continency, ſurprized his* mother *committing adultery. Being vexed and exaſperated at his mother's ſin, and not capable to reſtrain his anger, he killed her.* If you have a mind to ſee how he expreſſes this poetically read what follows.

(1) Pontus de Tyard, in the *Twelve Tables of Rivers and Fountains*, folio m. 11.

Leur fils Phaſis ja grand, mais de chaſte nature,
D'un adultere bras voit ſa mere embraſſée,
Dont d'un glaive vangeur l'ayant morte laiſſée,
Il choiſit en Arcture & morte & ſepulture (2).

(2) Ibid. folio 12.

But to account for my conduct, it is ſufficient for me to obſerve, that the Author from whom Pontus de Tyard borrowed this ſtory, does not ſay that Phaſis was chaſte: I judged therefore that it was not fit to add any thing to the original. The method, which numberleſs tranſcribers follow, is very wrong: they blend together the facts they mention with their own conjectures, or with the conſequences they infer from them: for they inſert them into the body of their narration, as though the Authors from whom they borrow thoſe facts, had alſo related thoſe conjectures and conſequences. It were proper to diſtinguiſh what one adds from what one tranſcribes, eſpecially when thoſe additions do not neceſſarily follow from the reſt. Pontus de Tyard has not followed that rule, he imagined that Phaſis muſt have been a ſevere obſerver of continency, ſince Ocyroe's adultery induced him to kill her. He has aſſerted theſe two particulars as though Plutarch had related them both; he has blended his own inference with that antient Author's account. But it is a conſequence, which at moſt is but probable. For a man without being very chaſte himſelf, might conceive ſo much horror by ſeeing his mother in a lover's arms, as to kill her. All they who puniſh diſſoluteneſs in their own families, are not modeſt for all that. There may be men, who debauch as many women as they can, and yet would uſe very cruelly a ſiſter, a mother-in-law, or even a mother, if they ſuffered themſelves to be debauched, and eſpecially if they were ſurprized in the very act of adultery (3). I would not have expatiated ſo much on Pontus de Tyard's fault, if I did not ſee that even at this time very eminent Authors are guilty of it.

(3) Ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ, *in flagranti crimine.* Plut. *de Fluviis* p. m. 12. See Mauſſac's notes, p. 234, on that expreſſion of Plutarch.

I do not urge Valerius Flaccus's authority in order to prove that Phaſis was not continent. For when that Poet relates that Phaſis being paſſionately in love with a beautiful nymph, whom he purſued moſt deſperately, he means the God of the River Phaſis.

Barbarus in patriis ſectatur montibus Aean
Phaſis, amore furens: pavidas jacit illa pharetras
Virgineo turbata metu; diſcurſibus & jam
Deficit: ac volucri victam deus alligat unda (4).

(4) Valer. Flaccus, *Argonaut.* lib 5. ver. 425. p. m. 304.

[*B*] *There grew . . . . . a plant . . . . . which had a wonderful property. . . . . It was to be gathered with ſome precautions.*] It was to be found at break of day in the beginning of the ſpring, when the myſteries of Hecate were celebrating: the God Pan's preſence was very much required there (5). See the margin (6). Jealous huſbands having gathered it, ſpread it about their beds, in order to keep them pure and undefiled: ἣν οἱ ζηλότυποι τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἁπτόμενοι, ῥίπτουσι περὶ τὸν παρθένιον θάλαμον, καὶ ἀνοσίους τηροῦσι τοὺς γάμους. *Quam poſtquam hominum zelotypi collegerunt, circa thalamum virginalem jaciunt, ut puras conſervent nuptias* (7). We meet with the ſame words in a book of Ariſtotle (8), but they have been added to it; and Monſieur Mauſſac does not queſtion (9) but they were extracted from the ſame work, from which I have juſt now tranſcribed them. Let us obſerve, that if a drunken man (10) came near the place where that plant grew, he loſt his ſenſes immediately, and confeſſed all the crimes he had committed, or deſigned to commit: he was ſeized, wrapt up in a piece of leather, and caſt into a round hole, which was called the little mouth of the impious, and which was like a well. That man's corps was ſeen thirty days after in the lake Mœotis, full of worms, and was immediately devoured by vultures, which had not been obſerved there before (11).

(5) Πρὸς πάνισμον ἔνθεον, *ad Divinum Panis Dei afflatum.* Plutarchus, *de Fluviis*, p. 17.

(6) This calls to my mind a vulgar tradition, which prevails in ſome provinces of France; which is, that the ſeed of Fern cannot be gathered but on St. John's Eve, at midnight exactly; and that to gather it ſucceſsfully, one muſt be aſſiſted by ſome Sorcereſs; that it has admirable properties, &c.

(7) Plutarchus, *de Fluviis*, p. 16.

(8) Περὶ θαυμασίων ἀκουσμ. *De mirabili auſcultatione*, ſub fin.

(9) Mauſſac, *in Plutarchum de Fluviis*, p. 235.

(10) Ἐάν τις τῶν ἀσεβεστέρων διὰ μέθην, *ſi quis impurus ob ebrietatem.* Plutarchus de Fluviis, p. 16.

I cannot tell whether the ſtory of this plant was not altered by thoſe, who abridged the Authors who mentioned it firſt, and by thoſe who quoted ſome part of thoſe abridgments. Theſe are two conſiderable cauſes of falſifications, becauſe ſome writers draw up a quite new account by quoting ſomething from the abbreviators, and ſomething from thoſe who applied to their particular deſigns what ſuited their purpoſe, omitting all the other circumſtances, and even improving thoſe which could be of any uſe to them. However it be, there is ſome probability that the firſt foundation of this ſtory was, that when the myſteries of Hecate were celebrating, the men, being obliged to contain themſelves, uſed to put into their wives beds an herb, the property of which was to cool nature. We have ſeen (12), that ſomething like this was practiſed among the Athenians, during the ſolemnity of the *Theſmophoria*. But it muſt be confeſſed, that the herb of the Phaſis would have been much more conſiderable than the *Agnus caſtus* of the Athenians, ſince its property not being confined to the duration of a feſtival, would have removed for ever the uneaſineſs of all jealous huſbands. Here follow ſome other lines of Pontus de Tyard.

(11) Extracted from Plutarch. ib. *exCteſippo*, lib. 2. *Rerum Scythicarum.*

(12) In the rem. [*B*], of the art. THESMOPHORIA.

Depuis du nom Phaſis eſt appellé ce fleuve,
Où le chaſte arbriſſeau Leucophile ſe treuve,
Remede à jalouſie en un froid cœur tombée.
Car quiconque au Printemps en ſon lit cachera
Cette plante trempée en Phaſis: treuvera
Que jamais ſa Venus ne ſera dérobée (13).

(13) Pontus de Tyard, *Douze Fables de Fleuves, ou Fontaines*, folio 12.

i. e. "Phaſis was ſince that time the name of this "River, in which grows the chaſte ſhrub called "*Leucophyllus*, a remedy againſt jealouſy in a cold "heart:

as I have promiſed (d).

(d) Article MACEDONIA in the text, letter (d).

row paſſage, which may be croſſed on foot when that Sea is ſtill, but which is all covered with water when that Sea is high. Alexander truſting to his good fortune commanded his army to paſs through that place, without waiting till the return of the ſpring had carried off the waters. His ſoldiers paſſed accordingly being to their waiſt in the water: this is the whole miracle. Περὶ Φασηλίδα δ' ἐστὶ τὰ κατὰ θάλατταν στενὰ, δι' ὧν Ἀλέξανδρος παρήγαγε τὴν στρατείαν: ἔστι δ' ὄρος Κλίμαξ καλούμενον ἐπίκεισθαι δὲ τῷ Παμφυλίῳ πελάγει, στενὴν ἀπολιπὸν πάροδον ἐπὶ τῷ αἰγιαλῷ, ταῖς μὲν νηνεμίαις γυμνευομένην, ὡς τε εἶναι βάσιμον τοῖς ὀθνείοις πλημμυροῦσαν δὲ τῷ πελάγει, ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων καλύπτομένην ἐπιπολύ· ἡ μὲν οὖν διὰ τὸ ὄρους ὑπέρβασις, περίοδον ἔχει καὶ προσάντης ἐστὶ, τῷ δ' αἰγιαλῷ χρῶνται κατὰ τὰς εὐδίας. Ὁ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος εἰς χειμέριον ἐμπεσὼν καιρὸν, καὶ τὸ πλέον ἐπιτρέπων τῇ τύχῃ, πρὶν ἀνεῖναι τὸ πύμα ὄμβροις, καὶ ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐν ὕδασι γενέσθαι τὴν πορείαν συνέβη, μέχρι ὀμφαλῶ βαπτιζομένων. *Apud Phaſelidem ſunt ad mare anguſtiæ, per quas exercitum traduxit Alexander. Eſt enim ibi mons Climax, Pamphylio incumbens mari, & propter littus arctum relinquens tranſitum: qui tranquillo mari nudatur, & à viatoribus perambulari poteſt: mari exundante, fluctibus admodum obtegitur. Alexander autem hybernam incidit in tempeſtatem, cumque fortunæ maximam eventus partem crederet, antequam defluerent undæ profectus eſt: itaque contigit, ut totum diem milites per aquam iter facerent uſque ad umbilicum in eam demerſi* (9). Others aſſert that the South wind, which blowed ſeveral days ſucceſſively, and which had made the Sea overflow the whole paſſage even to the foot of the Mountain, ceaſed to blow the moment Alexander arrived, and that there aroſe a North wind, which drove the waters from the ſhore. Freinſhemius (10) quotes the Author who mentioned this; I ſhall tranſcribe his text and his quotations. * *Parte exercitus ad Pergenſium urbem per montes præmiſſa; cæteros ipſe per littus ducebat, qua Climax mons Pamphylio mari imminens anguſtam euntibus ſemitam relinquit, quoties mare tranquillum eſt; at quum æſtus incubuit, fluctibus operitur. Idque hyeme frequens & prope perpetuum eſt. At Alexander nihil æque ac moram metuens, exercitum per æqua, per iniqua, eodem ardore atque impetu rapiebat. Continui per eos dies Auſtri flaverant, qui mare in littus propellentes, omnia itineris veſtigia altis paludibus opplent: adſiduæ etiam magnæque pluviæ, ut ventis iſtis ſpirantibus ſolet, ruebant. Sed adventante Alexandro ſubito exortus Aquilo cælum purgavit imbribus, undas rejecit in mare, & Macedonibus tranſitum aperuit, Sic quoque unius ** diei itinere per incerta vada emergendum fuit; aqua ad umbilicum ferme pertingente. Tantam in periculis Alexandri fiduciam, ut ab ipſius ingenio profectam non dubito; ita frequentibus prodigiis & ominibus auctam confirmatamque fuiſſe crediderim: poſtquam decreto numinis, clariſſimis maximiſque rebus ſe deſtinari conjecit.* i. e. "Having ſent part of his army to Perga, he "led the reſt along the coaſt, where Mount Climax "hanging over the Sea of Pamphylia leaves a narrow "path to walk over when the Sea is calm, but which "in a ſtorm is covered with water, which happens "often, and almoſt continually in the winter. But "Alexander fearing nothing more than a delay, "continued with the ſame eagerneſs to lead his army "along, whether the roads were good or bad. The "wind having been South for many days had driven "the ſea over that path, ſo that it was all drowned: "add to this the heavy rains which uſed to fall con"tinually when the wind is South. But on Alexan"der's arrival there aroſe on a ſudden a North wind, "which drove the waters into the ſea, cleared the "ſky, and opened a paſſage for the Macedonians. "But notwithſtanding this the army was to march "a whole day through an uncertain road, the ſol"diers being to their waiſt in the water. So great "was Alexander's courage in the midſt of dangers; "I do not queſtion but it was owing to his own tem"per, yet I am apt to think it was alſo encreaſed "and ſtrengthened by the many prodigies and preſa"ges he met with, which made him imagine he was "deſigned by Heaven for great and glorious actions." Joſephus ſhews but little judgment, when he compares the paſſage through the Red Sea with the paſſage over the Sea of Pamphylia. He imagined that Alexander's miracle would incline the Greeks to believe that of Moſes; but he had reaſons to fear leſt the paſſage through the Red Sea ſhould be accounted for by natural cauſes, as that through the Sea of Pamphylia is aſcribed to the North wind. If Genebrard had made uſe of a leſs reproachful terms, his obſervation on the following words of Joſephus could not be blamed. *The Egyptians were diſappointed in their expectation, not knowing that ſuch an opening and ſuch a road was not deſigned for all, but only for the Hebrews, who were making their eſcape to ſave their lives, and not for their enemies, who purſued them with a deſign to ruin and deſtroy them* (11). Here follows Genebrard's note. "Hence you may know how execrable Joachin Va"dian's impiety is, who dares to write in his Com"mentaries on Pomponius Mela, that Moſes waited "the opportunity when the Red Sea was to return "into the Ocean, and leave its bottom dry, as it "happens twice a day at Mount St. Michael in Nor"mandy. For beſides that God would ſhew his "power herein, the Red Sea does never leave its "bottom dry by ebbing and flowing, or by riſing "and falling, but is always full of water, as appears "plainly from Geography, and the Sea Chart's (12)." Joſephus ought to have avoided making his parallel with ſo much the more caution, that he had room to fear leſt the Greek Philoſophers ſhould make an advantage of what is obſerved in the ſacred hiſtory, namely, that *the Lord cauſed the Sea to go back by a ſtrong Eaſt wind all that night* (13). Here then, might they ſay, are two miracles, which are much alike, and both the effect of the wind. There aroſe in Alexander's favour a North wind, which drove the waters of the Sea back into its channel; another wind did the ſame in Moſes's favour. Several Writers, to make the conqueſts of the Macedonian army appear more wonderful, have taken for a miracle a North wind, which by chance proved very favourable to them. The Hiſtorian of the Hebrews has done the ſame (14): to prevent therefore theſe objections Joſephus ſhould have forbore the parallel he makes ſo unſeaſonably. The Author of a Commentary *in uſum Delphini* cenſures him ſeverely for it. *Ut imperite, ne dicam impie, feciſſe Joſephus videatur, qui narrato Iſraelitarum tranſitu per rubrum mare, qui credibile probaret eſſe miraculum, ſimile quiddam Alexandro contigiſſe agnoſcit, & ab omnibus affirmari tradit qui res ejus geſtas literis mandarunt* (15).

Obſerve that it is an eaſy matter to point out a very material difference between what paſſed near Phaſelis, and what happened in Ægypt. The wind which drove back the Red Sea was preceded by an human action, which ſhewed that God himſelf acted herein in a ſpecial manner. *Moſes ſtretched out his hand over the Sea* (16). But farther, there is a particular here, which cannot be aſcribed to the wind: *The waters were divided, and the children of Iſrael went into the midſt of the Sea upon the dry ground, and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left.* If it be ſuppoſed, that the wind made that opening or diviſion, it muſt be confeſſed that it was not natural, that is to ſay, that it blew only on a very little portion of the ſea, and that letting the waters on the right and on the left alone, it made a way in the middle, and drove back only the waters which happened to be in that middle, ſupporting thoſe that were on both ſides. If it be aſked why it was neceſſary the wind ſhould blow all night, ſince God has no occaſion for the ſecond cauſes to dry up in a moment an arm of the Sea, I anſwer that it is not the buſineſs of the creatures to preſcribe to their Creator how he ought to act. And beſides, they who aſſert that the miracles of the antient law were produced occaſionally as they were deſired by a creature, are perhaps not miſtaken. See what are Father Malebranche's and Monſieur Arnaud's opinions upon this (17). If the Angel, to whoſe care the people of Iſrael was committed, was the occaſional cauſe of all Moſes's miracles, we would have no reaſon to wonder, that the action of bodies, the violence of the winds, &c. were made uſe of on thoſe occaſions. Several difficulties may be ſolved by that principle. An Heathen would ſay perhaps, according to the ſtyle of thoſe who ſpoke ſo much of the Genii of the Emperors, that Alexander's genius cauſed the South

(9) Strabo, lib. 14. p. 458.

(10) *Supplem. in Q. Curtium*, lib. 2. cap. 11. num. 18. See alſo his *Index* to Q. Curtius, under the word *Pampbylia*.

* Strabo, lib. 14. Curt. 5. 3. 22. 6. 3. 16. Artemon *in* Senecæ ſuaſor. 1. Arrian. 1, 8. 8. Euſtath. *in* Dionyſ. ver. 855, & 865. Appian. lib. 2. *de Bell. Civil.* Joſeph. *Antiquit.* lib. 2. *extremo.* Plutarch. cap. 27 & 28.

** Strabo, lib. 14.

(11) Joſephus, book 2. towards the end, according to Genebrard's Tranſlation.

(12) Genebrard, in the margin of his Tranſlation of Joſephus, book 2. of the *Antiquities of the Jews*, folio 53, of the Paris edit. 1604, in 8vo.

(13) Exodus, chap. 14. ver. 21.

(14) You muſt ſuppoſe all this is ſaid by the Greek Philoſophers we have juſt now mentioned.

(15) Mich. le Tellier, *Notis in* Q. Curtium, lib. 5. *Capite ipſi undeſimo*, 193.

(16) Exodus, chap. 14. ver. 21. See Monſieur le Clerc's *Diſſertation*, mentioned in the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans*, for Octob. 1695. p. 59, 60.

(17) Monſieur Arnaud publiſhed in the year 1685, *A Diſſertation on the manner after which God performed Miracles under the antient Law, by the means of the Angels.* He refutes Father Malebranche in that *Diſſertation.*

PHASIS, a River which runs through Colchis, and diſcharges itſelf in the Euxine Sea, had that name ſince a young man had thrown himſelf into it. It was called Arcturus before that time. That young man was the ſon of Apollo and Ocyroe (*a*): he killed his mother whom he ſurprized in the very fact [*A*], I mean in the arms of a lover. The furies appeared to him, and tormented him to ſuch a degree, that he threw himſelf into the Arcturus. There grew in that River a plant named *Leucophyllus*, which had a wonderful property; for it prevented women from committing adultery. But it was to be gathered with ſome precautions (*b*) [*B*]. Nothing has rendered the Phaſis more famous than the expedition of the Argonauts: for all the Poets who have celebrated it could not but remember this great River, ſince the Argonauts were obliged to ſail towards its head, in order to get the golden Fleece. With regard to this and ſeveral other particulars I refer you to Lloyd's Dictionary: but as to the preſent ſtate of the Phaſis you will meet

(*a*) Who was the daughter of Oceanus.

(*b*) Extracted from Plutarch, in his Treatiſe *de Fluviis*, p. m. 16, 17.

South wind to ceaſe, and a North wind to blow, the day when that Conqueror deſigned to paſs along the ſea-ſhore near Phaſelis. But in order to perſuade us of this, it were neceſſary to prove, that in caſe Alexander had continued in Macedonia, the North wind would not have ſucceeded to the South wind, the day he made his army march along that ſhore. But it is impoſſible to prove and to know this. One might indeed comprehend, that thoſe Genii of the Emperors could, by their knowledge in natural philoſophy, *applicando activa paſſivis*, have made a wind ceaſe, and have raiſed another; but one cannot know whether they do it actually in ſuch a place, or at ſuch a time.

[*A*] *He killed his mother, whom he ſurprized in the very fact.*] They who have read Pontus de Tyard may wonder that I ſhould ſpeak of young Phaſis, without beſtowing upon him the ſame elogies, which that Author beſtows upon him. *Phaſis*, ſays he (1), *being grown a man, and a chaſte obſerver of the rules of continency, ſurprized his* mother *committing adultery. Being vexed and exaſperated at his mother's ſin, and not capable to reſtrain his anger, he killed her.* If you have a mind to ſee how he expreſſes this poetically read what follows.

(1) Pontus de Tyard, in the *Twelve Tables of Rivers and Fountains*, folio m. 11.

Leur fils Phaſis ja grand, mais de chaſte nature,
D'un adultere bras voit ſa mere embraſſée,
Dont d'un glaive vangeur l'ayant morte laiſſée,
Il choiſit en Arcture & morte & ſepulture (2).

(2) Ibid. folio 12.

But to account for my conduct, it is ſufficient for me to obſerve, that the Author from whom Pontus de Tyard borrowed this ſtory, does not ſay that Phaſis was chaſte: I judged therefore that it was not fit to add any thing to the original. The method, which numberleſs tranſcribers follow, is very wrong: they blend together the facts they mention with their own conjectures, or with the conſequences they infer from them: for they inſert them into the body of their narration, as though the Authors from whom they borrow thoſe facts, had alſo related thoſe conjectures and conſequences. It were proper to diſtinguiſh what one adds from what one tranſcribes, eſpecially when thoſe additions do not neceſſarily follow from the reſt. Pontus de Tyard has not followed that rule, he imagined that Phaſis muſt have been a ſevere obſerver of continency, ſince Ocyroe's adultery induced him to kill her. He has aſſerted theſe two particulars as though Plutarch had related them both; he has blended his own inference with that antient Author's account. But it is a conſequence, which at moſt is but probable. For a man without being very chaſte himſelf, might conceive ſo much horror by ſeeing his mother in a lover's arms, as to kill her. All they who puniſh diſſoluteneſs in their own families, are not modeſt for all that. There may be men, who debauch as many women as they can, and yet would uſe very cruelly a ſiſter, a mother-in-law, or even a mother, if they ſuffered themſelves to be debauched, and eſpecially if they were ſurprized in the very act of adultery (3). I would not have expatiated ſo much on Pontus de Tyard's fault, if I did not ſee that even at this time very eminent Authors are guilty of it.

(3) Ἐπαγτοφώρῳ, *in flagranti crimine.* Plut. *de Fluviis* p. m. 12. See Mauſſac's notes, p. 234, on that expreſſion of Plutarch.

I do not urge Valerius Flaccus's authority in order to prove that Phaſis was not continent. For when that Poet relates that Phaſis being paſſionately in love with a beautiful nymph, whom he purſued moſt deſperately, he means the God of the River Phaſis.

Barbarus in patriis ſectatur montibus Aean
Phaſis, amore furens: pavidas jacit illa pharetras
Virgineo turbata metu; diſcurſibus & jam
Deficit: ac volucri victam deus alligat unda (4).

(4) Valer. Flaccus, *Argonaut.* lib 5. ver. 425. p. m. 304.

[*B*] *There grew . . . . . a plant . . . . . which had a wonderful property. . . . . It was to be gathered with ſome precautions.*] It was to be found at break of day in the beginning of the ſpring, when the myſteries of Hecate were celebrating: the God Pan's preſence was very much required there (5). See the margin (6). Jealous huſbands having gathered it, ſpread it about their beds, in order to keep them pure and undefiled: ἣν οἱ ζηλότυποι τῶν ἀνδρῶν διεπόμενοι, ῥίπτουσι περὶ τὸν παρθένιον θάλαμον, καὶ ἀνοδίνιον τηροῦσιν τὸν γάμον. *Quam poſtquam hominum zelotypi collegerunt, circa thalamum virginalem jaciunt, ut puras conſervent nuptias* (7). We meet with the ſame words in a book of Ariſtotle (8), but they have been added to it; and Monſieur Mauſſac does not queſtion (9) but they were extracted from the ſame work, from which I have juſt now tranſcribed them. Let us obſerve, that if a drunken man (10) came near the place where that plant grew, he loſt his ſenſes immediately, and confeſſed all the crimes he had committed, or deſigned to commit: he was ſeized, wrapt up in a piece of leather, and caſt into a round hole, which was called the little mouth of the impious, and which was like a well. That man's corps was ſeen thirty days after in the lake Mœotis, full of worms, and was immediately devoured by vultures, which had not been obſerved there before (11).

(5) Πρὸς παύισμαν ἔνθιον, *ad Divinum Panis Dei afflatum.* Plutarchus, *de Fluviis*, p. 17.

(6) This calls to my mind a vulgar tradition, which prevails in ſome provinces of France; which is, that the ſeed of Fern cannot be gathered but on St. John's Eve, at midnight exactly; and that to gather it ſucceſsfully, one muſt be aſſiſted by ſome Sorcereſs; that it has admirable properties, &c.

(7) Plutarchus, *de Fluviis*, p. 16.

I cannot tell whether the ſtory of this plant was not altered by thoſe, who abridged the Authors who mentioned it firſt, and by thoſe who quoted ſome part of thoſe abridgments. Theſe are two conſiderable cauſes of falſifications, becauſe ſome writers draw up a quite new account by quoting ſomething from the abbreviators, and ſomething from thoſe who applied to their particular deſigns what ſuited their purpoſe, omitting all the other circumſtances, and even improving thoſe which could be of any uſe to them. However it be, there is ſome probability that the firſt foundation of this ſtory was, that when the myſteries of Hecate were celebrating, the men, being obliged to contain themſelves, uſed to put into their wives beds an herb, the property of which was to cool nature. We have ſeen (12), that ſomething like this was practiſed among the Athenians, during the ſolemnity of the *Theſmophoria*. But it muſt be confeſſed, that the herb of the Phaſis would have been much more conſiderable than the *Agnus caſtus* of the Athenians, ſince its property not being confined to the duration of a feſtival, would have removed for ever the uneaſineſs of all jealous huſbands. Here follow ſome other lines of Pontus de Tyard.

(8) Περὶ θαυμασίων ἀκουσμ. *De mirabili auſcultatione*, ſub fin.

(9) Mauſſac, *in Plutarchum de Fluviis*, p. 235.

(10) Ἐάν τις τῶν ἀσεβεστέρων διὰ μέθην, *ſi quis impurus ob ebrietatem.* Plutarchus de Fluviis, p. 16.

(11) Extracted from Plutarch. ib. *ex Cteſippo*, lib. 2. *Rerum Scythicarum.*

(12) In the rem. [*B*], of the art. THESMOPHORIA.

Depuis du nom Phaſis eſt appellé ce fleuve,
Où le chaſte arbriſſeau Leucophile ſe treuve,
Remede à jalouſie en un froid cœur tombée.
Car quiconque au Printemps en ſon lit cachera
Cette plante trempée en Phaſis: treuvera
Que jamais ſa Venus ne ſera dérobée (13).

(13) Pontus de Tyard, *Douze Fables de Fleuves, ou Fontaines*, folio 12.

i. e. "Phaſis was ſince that time the name of this "River, in which grows the chaſte ſhrub called "*Leucophyllus*, a remedy againſt jealouſy in a cold "heart:

meet with a better account of it in Moreri.

" heart. For whoever takes that plant in the ſpring, " dips it in the Phaſis, and hides it in his bed, " will find that his Venus will never be ſtole away " from him."

PHERON, King of Egypt, the ſon and ſucceſſor of Seſoſtris, did not undertake any war, and was puniſhed with blindneſs, for being ſo audacious as to ſhoot a dart on the waters of the Nile. They were ſwelled ſo much that they were above eighteen cubits high over the fields, and the wind made the River riſe in great waves. The King ſeeing this, commitred the attempt I have been mentioning, and was ſtruck blind on the ſpot. He continued ten years in that condition, and then he was told by an Oracle that the time of his misfortune was going to expire, and that he would recover his ſight, in caſe his eyes were waſhed with the water of a woman, who never lay with any man but her own huſband. He tried firſt his own ſpouſe's water, but got no benefit by it; afterwards he uſed that of other women, and at laſt he was cured. He cauſed all the women, whoſe water he had uſed to no purpoſe, to be conducted into a certain city, and had them all burnt together with the city; afterwards he married the woman to whom he was indebted for the recovery of his eye-ſight; and he conſecrated in the Temples ſeveral monuments of his gratitude towards the Gods, and particularly two Obeliſks in the Temple of the Sun [A], which were an hundred cubits high, and eight cubits broad. A man of Memphis, whom the Greeks called Proteus reigned after him (a). This article being to be met with in Moreri's Dictionary, I deſigned at firſt to omit it. But I altered my reſolution, when I ſaw what libertles men take in falſifying that ſtory. As I was determined to cenſure that licentiouſneſs, it was neceſſary that I ſhould lay before the readers a faithful account of this old ſtory, that it might be compared with the falſe copy which modern Writers have preſumed to give of it [B].

(a) Extracted from Herodotus, lib. 2. cap. 111, 112. p. m. 129, 130. See alſo Diod. Sicilus, lib. 1. cap. 59.

PHILELPHUS

[A] *And particularly two Obeliſks in the Temple of the Sun.*] Sir John Marſham (1) thinks they are both at Rome. and that the one is that which Sixtus V. cauſed to be erected before St. Peter's Church. He thinks alſo Caligula had one of theſe two obeliſks carried to Rome, and grounds his opinion on ſome paſſages in Pliny, which do not ſignify this. Here follows what Pliny obſerves, according to Father Hardouin's edition; in which the erroneous reading, which Sir John followed, is corrected. *Tertius* (obeliſcus) *Romæ in Vaticano Caii & Neronis principum Circo, ex omnibus unus omnino factus eſt imitatione ejus; quem fecerat Seſoſtridis filius Nuncoreus. Ejuſdem remanet & alius centum cubitorum, quem poſt cæcitatem viſu reddito, ex oraculo ſoli ſacravit* (2). i. e. " The third " (Obeliſk) is at Rome in the Vatican *Circus* or Ring " of the Emperors Claudius and Nero; it was made " up of all the reſt in imitation of that, which Nuncoreus Seſoſtris's ſon erected. There is alſo another of the ſame Nuncoreus, an hundred cubits " high, which he conſecrated to the ſun according " to the Oracle, having recovered his eye-ſight, after he had been ſometime blind." You ſhall ſee now how Sir John Marſham quotes this paſſage. *Plinio appellatur* Nuncoreus Seſoſtridis filius *ille, qui Obeliſcum* centum cubitorum poſt cæcitatem (vidi reddito ex oraculo) Soli ſacravit. Ejuſdem remanet & alius Romæ (in Vaticano Caii & Neronis principum Circo) ex omnibus unus omnino fractus eſt in mobilitione (3). *i. e.* " *Pliny calls* Nuncoreus *that* ſon of " Seſoſtris, who after he had been blind conſecrated " to the Sun *an Obeliſk* an hundred feet high (when " he had recovered his ſight, according to the Oracle.) " There remains alſo another of his at Rome in the " Vatican *Circus* of the Emperors Claudius and Nero, which alone was entirely broken in pieces, " in the taking of it down." Obſerve that Pliny (4) does not aſſert, that the obeliſk which was carried to Rome under Caligula, was one of the two obeliſks which the ſon of Seſoſtris erected.

(1) Marſh. *Chron. Can. Seculo* 15. p. m. 413, 414.

(2) Plinius, lib. 36. cap. 11. p. m. 199.

(3) Marſh. *Chron. Can.* p. 414.

(4) Plinius, lib. 36. cap. 9. p. 296, 297.

[B] *I lay before the Reader a faithful account of that old ſtory, that it might be compared with the falſe copy which modern writers have preſumed to give of it.*] I do not pretend to level this at Monſieur Chevreau: for he has not falſified Herodotus's narration (5). It is true he adds a particular to it, which is that the woman who reſtored Pheron's eye-ſight was a gardiner's wife; this Hiſtorian whom he quotes does not aſſert this; but that addition is not material; and after all it is true that an antient Hiſtorian (6), whom he does not quote, calls that woman a gardiner's wife. The reflection, which is added to Chevreau's account, is not to be cenſured. An Author, who relates what he has read, may, if he pleaſes, add moral reflections to it; he muſt only take care that his Readers be not puzzled to know whether they be his, or belong to the Author he quotes. Monſieur Chevreau does not leave us in ſuſpenſe; we perceive without the leaſt trouble, that it was he and not Herodotus, who ſays, " If there were a Pheron at this time, and if the " remedy which cured him were in uſe, and the ſame " penalty revived, there are many women, who " would have occaſion to fear leſt they ſhould ſtarve " with cold (7)." This is a Commentary ſuitable to the text: for it is not to be queſtioned, but this Hiſtory of Pheron is a mere ſtory, or a ſatyrical invention againſt the women. My readers do not want to be be told, 1. That there never was an oracle, which told a King, who had been ten years blind, that he would ſoon recover his ſight. 2. That it is not true that a chaſte woman's water ever cured blindneſs. Men are therefore ſufficiently perſuaded among Chriſtians, that what Herodotus related in that paſſage is a mere fable, and one of the ſtories, which in thoſe dark and ignorant ages were invented almoſt with the ſame view as the apologues, and the fictions of Æſop were; I mean, with a deſign to inſpire people with a fear of the Gods, and to cenſure bad morals. Railleries were ſometimes made uſe of, and wicked jokes againſt the women. This point was not omitted in the ſtory of Pheron. But our modern Writers, finding it too ſimple, and dreſſed up too negligently, have taken pains to adorn it. It is related in the *Saint-Evremoniana* after this manner. " A King " named *Pheron* being grown blind, begged of the " Oracle a remedy to cure him; the urine of a woman true to her huſband was preſcribed to him. " But his own wife and all the women in the Kingdom wanting that virtue, he was obliged to ſend " Embaſſadors into the neighbouring Kingdoms, to " enquire for one; after numberleſs enquiries he met " with one by chance, who cured him: and having " firſt cauſed his wife to be burnt, he married the " woman who reſtored his ſight to him: but indeed " ſhe did not prove ſo chaſte afterwards; and the " King having aſked her the reaſon why ſhe had " been true to her firſt huſband, ſhe anſwered ingenuouſly, that *no man had ever aſked her the queſtion* " (8)." When a Boccaccio or a Douville inſert into their ſtory the moſt diverting particulars they can think of, one ought not to take offence at it; the ground-work is entirely their own, they may adorn it as they pleaſe. But when a man relates a ſtory contained in the beſt books which antiquity has tranſmitted down to us, he is no longer at liberty to ſet it off with new ornaments, by a ſupplement of particulars

(5) See the 2d part of the *Chevræana*, p. 395, of the Dutch edition.

(6) Diod. Siculus, lib. 1. cap. 59.

(7) *Chevræana*, 2 part. p. 396.

(8) S. Evremoniana, p. 132, 133, of the Dutch edition.

(9) See the *Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres*, Feb. 1701. p. 145.

ticulars lately invented. And yet this is what has been done in the *Saint-Evremoniana*. It is a book of which we are told for certain, that Monsieur de Saint Evremont is not the Author, and which he disowns from the beginning to the end (9). There are nevertheless many good things in that work, and which seem to be expressed after his own manner: but whoever be the Author of it, Monsieur de Vigneul Marville would not scruple to give him the following advice. *The more a writer abounds with such particulars, as are to be met with in Brantome, the more he raises himself above the common sort of Writers, and proves useful to the publick: they who relate them ought only to take care, that they be true and well grounded. For an Author should not be suffered to forge chimeras in order to adorn his History* (10).

(10) Vign. Marville, *Melanges d'Histoire & de Litterature*, Tom. 2. p. 159, of the Dutch edit.

Let us observe by the by, that this is not the first time, that authors and booksellers have falsly ascribed works to Monsieur de St. Evremont. That artifice begins to grow stale, and one cannot reflect upon this without comparing that illustrious Author to the man, to whom seven women were to go and say, *We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel, only let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach* (11).

(11) Isaiah, c. 4. ver. 1.

PHILELPHUS . . . . . .

. . . . . .

The work he entitled *Florentinarum de exilio Commentationum, pro exulibus Florentinis à Cosmo Medicæo atque ejus factione ejectis, conscriptarum Libri tres*, and dedicated by him to Vitalian Borrhomeo, is not in the catalogue of his works inserted in his life. In all probability it was never printed. The Author mentions it in a letter to Anthony Metallus, and in another letter to John Olzina (*a*). I read this in a work of Don Nicholas Antonio (*b*), to whom Martin Vasques Sirvela (*c*) had lent that manuscript.

(*a*) See the 16th book of Philelphus's *Epistles*.

(*b*) Nicol. Antonius, *de Exilio*, lib. 1. cap. 1. p. 4.

(*c*) He had a noble Library in Seville.

PHILETAS, a Grammarian, Critick, and Poet, was a native of the island of Cos, and lived in the time of Alexander the Great, and of Ptolemy I. King of Egypt, who appointed him Preceptor to his son Ptolemy Philadelphus (*a*). He published several Poems, of which there are extant only some fragments in Athenæus; and in certain other antient Authors who had quoted him [*A*]. He wrote elegies with so much beauty, that many allowed him the second place in that species of versification. It is not certain that Propertius, a good judge of these matters, gave him only the second place [*B*]. Now as this elegy was employed chiefly in mournful subjects, and the misfortunes of lovers; it cannot be denied but that Philetas had a peculiar talent, for exhibiting, by his air, and every part of his exterior, the character of the Poem in which he excelled; and to prevent the want of opportunities which make the Muses grow languid. He was so very short, and so thin, that he was obliged to put lead into his shoes, to prevent his being carried away by the wind [*C*]. This was the way to avoid the reproaches, which are so frequently made to Lent-preachers, when, with a hale and ruddy complexion, they groan on account of the corrupted state of mankind, and bewail the contempt in which the laws of mortification are held. This would become them better, were they as lean as our Philetas. Besides, we may easily suppose, that he very frequently was reduced to the necessity of deploring the cruelty of his Battis; for an air like that of our Philetas, a body so very much emaciated, that the least puff of wind could cast him to the ground, was

(*a*) Suidas. See also Strabo, book 14. p. 452.

(*b*) *Me tamen Coæ Battis amasse dies.* Ovid. Trist. lib. 1. El. 6. ver. 2.

[*A*] *Some antient Authors . . . . . had quoted him.*] Parthenius borrows his second amorous adventure from him (1). Stephanus Byzantinus cites him under the Greek words ἴχνη and φλιῶς. He is quoted three or four times in the *Etymologicum magnum*. Stobæus mentions something of his *Paignia*, in the discourses containing the subjects of consolation, παιγνιχά. I suppose that the Philetas cited by them is he of Cos: for I do not know that Philetas of Ephesus, whom we hear of only by Suidas, was ever an Author. I will not pretend to say, as many do, that Claudian hinted at Philetas in the following verse:

(1) Under the article Philetas in Moreri, Parthenius should not have been cited in *Erat.* but in *Erot.* i. e. *in Eroticis.*

Fors juvat audentes, Coi sententia vatis.

" Fortune assists the bold, said Coos' bard:

(2) See Barthius in Claud. *Epist. ad Probin.* p. 967.

it not being certain, whether we ought to read Coi rather than Cei, Chii, or Prisei (2).

[*B*] *Many allowed him the second place . . . . . It is not certain that Propertius . . . . . gave him only the second place.*] I leave those, who have considered a little the three following passages of Propertius, to determine this matter.

(3) Propert. lib. 2. *Eleg.* 34.

Tu satius memorem musis imitere Philetam,
Et non inflati somnia Callimachi (3).

(4) Idem. lib. 3. *Eleg.* 8.

Inter Callimachi sat erit placuisse libellos,
Et cecinisse modis Coe poeta tuis (4).

(5) Idem. lib. 3. *Eleg.* 1. There is another passage *Eleg.* 6. lib. 4. where he hints at those two Poets, and Philetas the first. *Stat. Silv.* 2. lib. 1. names Philetas before Callimachus.

Callimachi manes & Coi sacra Philetæ
In vestrum quæso me sinite ire nemus.

" The Muse belov'd, Philetas, imitate;
" And not Callimachus's turgid dreams.
" 'Twill be enough, if like Callimachus
" You please, and like the bard of Coos sing.

" Permit, the Manes of Callimachus,
" And fam'd Philetas, in your groves to go."

I do not desire, that those passages should be understood as they are explained by Joseph Scaliger; for I am of opinion that he is mistaken, in imagining that Propertius dissuades from the imitation of the turgid Callimachus: and when he reads, instead of *Coe Poeta tuis*, he reads *pare Poeta tuis*, to conclude from thence, that Propertius judged Philetas's verses to be sweeter than those of any other Poet. I do not desire all this; I am certain that, without having recourse to such helps, the reader will find that, all things duly considered, Propertius does not rank Philetas below Callimachus. I do not know why Ælian ranks Philetas among the heroic Poets (6), nor why Lorenzo Crasso (7) makes Callimachus say, that Philetas holds the second place in elegiac writing: Quintillian ought to be cited: *Elegiæ princeps habetur Callimachus*, says he, Chap. I. Lib. X. of his institutions, *secundas confessione plurimorum Philetas occupavit*. i. e. " Callimachus is looked upon as the " first elegiae writer; and Philetas, as most persons " confess, has obtained the second rank." See also Proclus in the extracts of his *Chrestomathia*, which Photius has preserved (8).

(6) Ælian. Var. *Hist.* lib. 10. cap. 6.

(7) *Istor. de Poet. Grec.* 231.

(8) Photius, cap. 239.

[*C*] *He was obliged to put lead into his shoes, to prevent his being carried away by the wind.*] He used to put leaden balls to his feet, according to Athenæus (9), or leaden soles to his shoes, according to the Authors copied by Ælian, though he does not give credit to their story (10). The reason of his unbelief is, that a man, who was not able to bear up against the wind, would not have been able to wear such heavy shoes.

(9) Athen. lib. 12. cap. 13. p. 552.

(10) Ælian. Var. *Hist.* lib. 9. cap. 14. See also lib. 10. cap. 6.

[*D*] *His*

was no very inviting charm in the article of love. This circumſtance, perhaps, had rendered him ſo very ſkilful in writing of elegies. In all probability he was ſeldom ſucceſsful in his amorous purſuits, but met with continual repulſes. Be this as it will, the hectic and emaciating diſorder, which at laſt brought him to his end, was not aſcribed to his good or ill fortune in his amours; but it was aſcribed, in his epitaph, to his over great application to ſtudy, and to his watchings [D]; a circumſtance that would be much more honourable to his memory, had he employed himſelf in important ſubjects: but the poor creature waſted his ſtrength, and deſtroyed his health, by ſearching after the captious and intricate ſophiſms of the Logicians (c); and particularly after that called the Liar, which was a mere puerile ſubtilty [E]. It is thought that he gave the title of *Telephus* to one of his Poems, from his father's name. It is mentioned under this title by the Scholiaſt on Apollonius (d); but according to Voſſius, page 401 of his Greek Hiſtorians, that Scholiaſt ſpoke of a Poem entitled *Templum*.

(c) Athen. lib. 9. Suidas.

(d) In lib. 4. *apud Andræam Schottum in Procli Chreſtomathiam.*

[D] *His death was aſcribed, in his epitaph, to his own great application to ſtudy, and to his watchings.*] We are obliged to Athenæus for preſerving this particular incident (11). *You run the hazard*, ſays he, directing himſelf to an inquiſitive man, who never eat any meat, without enquiring how long it had had the name by which it was called, *to wear out your life in thoſe kinds of reſearches, as Philetas did his, in examining a ſophiſm; for this ſtudy emaciated his body to ſuch a degree, that it brought him to his end. His inſcription engraved on his tomb, declares this, &c.* Muretus, in his notes on elegy 1. book 3. of Propertius, carries this teſtimony of Athenæus a little farther than he ſhould have done; he making that Author ſay, that Philetas loſt his life by too intenſe an application to his ſtudies, and by his vexation at his not having been able to diſcover the ſolution of a ſophiſm. Athenæus does not mention this vexation. Had Muretus only conjectured this, nothing could have been objected to him; but a Writer ought to lay it down as a law to himſelf, never to aſcribe to an Author, words which were never ſaid by him. How troubleſome muſt it be for our Readers, when we confound our paraphraſes, gloſſes and conjectures, with the text of the antient Authors cited by us (12)?

(11) Κινδυνεύεις ἴσως ποτὲ διὰ ταῦτας τὰς φροντίδας ὥσπερ ὁ Κῶος φιλητᾶς ζητῶν τὸν καλούμενον ψευδολόγον τῶν λόγων, ὁμοίως ἐκεῖνος διαλυθῆναι· ἰσχνὸς γὰρ πάνυ τὸ σῶμα διὰ τὰς ζητήσεις γενόμενος ἀπέθανεν. ὡς τὸ πρὸ τῆ μνημείῳ αὐτῆ ἐπίγραμμα δηλοῖ Φίλητ' ἐγὼ φιλητᾶς εἰμὶ λόγων ὁ ψευδόμενος μ' Ὦλεσε, καὶ νυκτῶν φροντίδες ἐσπέριοι. *Eſt itaque periculum ne ob has curas aliquando ut Philetas Cous perveſtigans rationum mentientem dictam exolutus pereas: nam corpore ob id ſtudium valde attenuato is obiit, quod inſculptum ejus monumento declarat hoc Epigramma Hoſpes, Philetas ſum mendax & captioſa ratio Me perdidit, veſpertinæque ac nocturnæ ſtudiorum curæ.* Athen. lib. 9. p. 401.

[E] *The Liar . . . . . was a mere puerile ſubtilty.*] The ſophiſm, to which the Greeks give the name of ψευδόμενον, is called *mentiens* by Tully, in his ſecond book *de Divinatione*. This is one of the moſt famous ſophiſms that Eubulides, Euclid's ſucceſſor, exhibited (13). It conſiſted of certain terms, which ſeem to deſtroy one another; or, according to Africanus the Civilian (14), it is a way of reaſoning, *qua quicquid verum eſſe conſtitueris, falſum eſſe reperietur*, i. e. "whereby, whatever a perſon lays down "for a truth, is found to be falſe.". Here follows an example of this (15): *If you ſay that you tell a lie, and, in ſaying this, you tell the truth, you tell a lie: now you ſay that you lie, and in this you ſay the truth; conſequently you lie, in telling the truth.* This is a ſyllogiſm, whereby one proves that a man did not ſpeak truth, for the very reaſon that he does ſpeak it. The ſame ſophiſm may be made, by ſuppoſing that a man who foreſwears himſelf, ſwears that he is foreſworn; for, at one and the ſame time, he ſwears the truth, and conſequently he is not foreſworn; and ſwears a falſhood, and conſequently he is foreſworn. The ſame contradictory conſequences were drawn from Epimenides, a Cretan by birth, who had ſaid that all the Cretans are liars. The Stoicks were very fond of theſe falſe ſubtilties of the ſect of Megara. The modern Logicians ſometimes employ the propoſitions they call *ſeipſas falſificantes*; ſuch as the following, *ſemper mentior, i. e.* I always lie. Any perſon, who is maſter of a little good ſenſe, may eaſily diſcover the fallacy of this kind of ſophiſms; and yet (16) Ariſtotle too declares very ſeriouſly, that the ſophiſm called the *Liar* is a very puzzling one. I am far leſs pleaſed to hear him ſay this, than to ſee Seneca laughing at the multitude of books, which had been compoſed on that ſophiſm (17); *quid me detines in eo quem tu ipſe pſeudomenon appellas, de quo tantum librorum compoſitum eſt* (18), *ecce tota mihi vita mentitur, hanc coargue, hanc ad verum, ſi acutus es, dirige*, i. e. "Why do you entertain me ſo long "with what you call the Liar, upon which ſo many "books have been writ? Lo, all my life is made "up of lies; diſprove this, and, if you have any "ſubtilty, direct this to truth." Read the remark [D], of the article EUCLID.

(15) See Cicero, *Academ.* 4.

(16) *Ethic. Nicom.* lib. 7. cap. 3. rem. [D] art. EUCLID

(17) Seneca, *Epiſt.* 45.

(18) Chryſippus had writ eleven books upon it. Diog. Laert. *in ejus Vita.*

(12) Compare this with remark [B] of the art. PHERON. (13) Diog. Laert. lib. 2. (14) *L. qui quadring.* 88 *ad leg. Falc.*

☞ PHILIPS (KATHERINE), a very ingenious Lady in the 17th Century, was daughter of Mr. John Fowler, of Bucklerſbury, in London, Merchant, by Katherine his wife, daughter of Daniel Oxenbridge, Dr. of Phyſic. She was born in the Pariſh of St. Mary Wool-Church, in London, and baptized there on the 11th of January, 1631, and educated under Mrs. Salmon, at a ſchool in Hackney, where ſhe very early diſtinguiſhed herſelf for her ſkill in Poetry. She married James Philips, of the Priory of Cardigan, Eſq; and went with the Viſcounteſs of Dungannon into Ireland, and tranſlated from the French into Engliſh Corneille's Tragedy of *Pompey* [A], which

[A] *Tranſlated from the French into Engliſh Corneille's Tragedy of* Pompey.] She tranſlated it at the requeſt of the Earl of Orrery, and dedicated it to the Counteſs of Cork. It was acted with great applauſe at the Duke's Theatre. How great an opinion Lord Orrery had of her performance, appears from the following verſes, being part of a copy addreſſed to her:

"You Engliſh *Corneille's Pompey* with ſuch flame,
"That you both raiſe our wonder and our fame.
"If he could read it, he like us would call
"The *Copy* greater than th' *Original*.
"You cannot mend what is already done,
"Unleſs you'll finiſh what you have begun.
"Who your tranſlation ſees, cannot but ſay,
"That 'tis *Orinda's Work*, and but his *Play*.
"The French to learn our language now will ſeek,
"To hear their greateſt wit more nobly ſpeak.
"Rome too will grant, were our tongue to her known,
"Cæſar ſpeaks better in't, than in his own.
"And all thoſe wreaths once circled *Pompey*'s brow,
"Exalt his fame leſs than your verſes now."

The Prologue to it, when it was acted at the Theatre in Dublin, was written by the Earl of Roſcommon, and the Epilogue by Sir Edward Deering, Bart. This Tragedy of Corneille was tranſlated by Mr. Waller, the Earl of Dorſet, &c. Mrs. Philips ſpeaks of this tranſlation in a letter to Sir Charles Cotterel, dated September the 17th 1663, in the following terms (1): *I have ſeen the ſecond and fourth acts of* Pompey, *that was tranſlated by the wits, and have read and conſidered them very impartially. The expreſſions are ſome of them great and noble, and the verſes ſmooth; yet there is room in ſeveral places for an ordinary Critic to ſhew his ſkill. But I cannot but be ſurprized at*

(1) *Letters from Orinda to Poliarchus*, p. 178, 179. edit. Lond. 1705.

which was ſeveral times acted at the new Theatre there with great applauſe, in 1663 and 1664, in which laſt year it was publiſhed. Her poems were firſt printed the ſame year, though without her conſent [*B*]. She died of the Small-pox in Fleetſtreet, in June 1664, and was interred on the 22d of that month, in the Church of St. Bennet Sherehog in London

at the great liberty they have taken in adding, omitting, and altering the original, as they pleaſe themſelves. This I take to be a liberty not pardonable in Tranſlators, and unbecoming the modeſty of that attempt. For ſince the different ways of writing ought to be obſerved with their ſeveral properties, this way of garbling Authors is fitter for a paraphraſe than a tranſlation. But having aſſumed ſo great a licence, I wonder their Verſes are any where either flat or rough, which you will obſerve them not ſeldom to be. Beſides, their Rhymes are frequently very bad; but what chiefly diſguſts me, is, that the ſenſe moſt commonly languiſhes through three or four lines, and then ends in the middle of the fifth. For I am of opinion, that the ſenſe ought always to be confined to the couplet; otherwiſe the lines muſt needs be ſpiritleſs and dull. I wiſh you could procure me the third and fifth Acts, for I long to ſee them, eſpecially the third, which I take to be the moſt noble and beſt written in the French.

[*B*] *Her Poems were firſt printed the ſame year* [1664], *though without her conſent.*] They were printed in 8vo. Upon the publication of this edition, her friend Sir *Charles Cotterel*, knowing how averſe ſhe was to appear in print, and being ſure that it was without her conſent, went immediately, both to the Gentleman who had licenſed it upon the Bookſeller's averment that he had her leave, and to the Bookſeller himſelf, for whom it was printed; and took the beſt courſe he could with both to get it ſuppreſſed, as it preſently was (though afterwards many of the books were privately ſold) and gave her an account by the next poſt, of what he had done. Upon this ſhe wrote a letter to Sir *Charles*, dated January the 29th, 1663-4, in which ſhe writes thus (2): *I am ſo obliged to you for the friendly concern you take in the unfortunate attempt of the unworthy publiſhing of my fooliſh rhymes, that I know not which way to expreſs, much leſs to deſerve the leaſt part of ſo noble an obligation.* Philaſter *gave me a hint of this misfortune laſt poſt, and I immediately took an opportunity of expreſſing to him the great, but juſt affliction it was to me; and begged him to join with you in doing what I ſee your friendſhip had urged you both to do without that requeſt; for which I now thank you, it being all that could be done to give me eaſe; but the ſmart of that wound ſtill remains and hurts my mind. You may be aſſured, I had obeyed you by writing after my old ill rate, on the occaſion you mention, had you not in your next letter ſeemed to have changed your opinion, adviſing me rather to haſten to London, and vindicate myſelf, by publiſhing a true copy. Beſides, I conſidered it would have been too airy a way of reſenting ſuch an injury; and I could not be ſo ſoon reconciled to verſe, which has been ſo inſtrumental to afflict me, as to fall to it again already. However, if you ſtill think it proper, I will reſign my judgment and humour to yours, and try what I can do that way. Mean while, I have ſent you incloſed my true thoughts on that occaſion in proſe, and have mixed nothing elſe with it, to the end that you may, if you pleaſe, ſhew it to any body, that ſuſpects my ignorance and innocence of that falſe edition of my verſes; and I believe it will make a greater impreſſion on them, than if it were written in rhyme.* Incloſed in this letter ſhe ſent the following. " 'Tis well " you chid me ſo much for endeavouring to expreſs " a part of the ſenſe I have of your obligations; " for while you go on in conferring them paſt all " poſſibility of acknowledgment, it is very convenient for me to be forbidden to attempt it. Your " laſt generoſity in vindicating me for the unworthy " uſage I have received from the preſs at London, " as much tranſcends all your former favours, as the " injury done me by that Printer and Publiſher, " ſurpaſſes all the troubles, that to my remembrance " I ever had. All I can ſay to you for it is only " this, that you aſſert the cauſe of an innocent, tho' " a very unhappy perſon; and that it is impoſſible " for malice itſelf to have printed thoſe rhymes, " which you tell me are got abroad ſo impudently, " with ſo much wrong and abuſe to them, as the " very publication of them at all, though never ſo " correct, had been to me, who never writ a line " in my life, with intention to have it printed; " and am truly of my Lord *Falkland*'s mind, when " he ſays,

" ——*He danger fear'd than cenſure leſs,*
" *Nor could he dread a breach like to the preſs.*

" You know me, Sir, to have been all along ſufficiently diſtruſtful of whatever my own want of company and a better employment, or the commands " of others have ſeduced me to write, and that I " have rather endeavoured never to have thoſe trifles ſeen at all, than that they ſhould be expoſed " to all the world in this impudent manner, in which " they now moſt unhappily are. But is there no " retreat can ſhield me from the malice of this " world? I thought that rocks and mountains might " have hidden me; that it was free for all to beguile " their ſolitude with what harmleſs thoughts they " pleaſed; and that our rivers, though they are babling, would not have betrayed the follies of impertinent thoughts, that were produced on their " banks. But I am the only unfortunate perſon, " who cannot ſo much as think in private; who " muſt have all my imaginations and idle notions " rifled and expoſed to play the Mountebanks, and " dance upon the ropes to entertain the Rabble; to " undergo all the raillery of the Wits; and all the " ſeverity of the Wiſe; to be the ſport of ſome that " can, and deriſion of others, that cannot read a " verſe. This is the moſt cruel accident, that could " ever have befallen me, and has already made a " proportionate impreſſion on me; for it has coſt me " a ſharp fit of ſickneſs ſince I heard it, and I believe would have been more fatal, but that I conſidered what a champion I have in you, whoſe " credit in the world will gain me a belief with all " the better ſort of perſons, that I am ſo innocent " of that wretched artifice of a ſecret conſent, of " which I fear I am ſuſpected, that whoever would " have brought me thoſe copies corrected and amended, and a thouſand pounds to have bought my " permiſſion to print them, ſhould not have obtained it. You know too, beſides, that though " there are many things in this villainous impreſſion, " which the ignorance of what occaſioned them, and " the falſeneſs of the copies may repreſent very ridiculous and extravagant; yet I could give ſome " account of them, even to the ſevereſt *Cato*; and " ſure they muſt be more abuſed, than I can believe " it poſſible for them to be, (for I have not yet " ſeen the book, nor can imagine what it is,) before they can be diſguiſed in ſuch a manner, as " not to deſerve the character of thoſe lines of Sir " *Edward Dering*, in his *Epilogue* to *Pompey*,

" ——*No nobler thought can tax*
" *Thoſe rhymes of blemiſh to the bluſhing ſex:*
" *As chaſte the lines, as harmleſs is the ſenſe,*
" *As the firſt ſmiles of infant innocence.*

" So that I hope there will be no need of juſtifying " them to virtue and honour. And I am ſo little " concerned for the reputation of writing ſenſe, that " provided the world will believe me wholly innocent of the leaſt knowledge, much more of any " connivance at this publication, I will willingly " compound, never to trouble them with the true copies; which nevertheleſs, you adviſe me to do; " though if you ſtill judge it abſolutely neceſſary to " the reparation of the misfortune, and to the general ſatisfaction, and if, as you tell me, all the reſt " of my friends will preſs me to it, I ſhall reſolve " upon it with the ſame reluctancy, that I would " cut off a limb to ſave my life. However, I hope " you will ſatisfy all your acquaintance of my averſion to it; and did they know me as well as you do, " that

(2) Ibid. p. 219, 220.

London [C], under a grave-ſtone, where her father, grandfather, and grandmother lye interred (a). Mr. Cowley wrote an Ode on her death. Dr. Jeremiah Taylor addreſſed to her his *Meaſures and Offices of Friendſhip*; the ſecond edition of which was printed at London 1657, in 12mo. She aſſumed the name of *Orinda*. The Author of the *Preface* to her *Poems* printed at London 1678 in folio, tells us, that ſhe "wrote her familiar "letters with great facility, in a very fair hand, and perfect orthography; and if they "were collected with thoſe excellent diſcourſes ſhe writ on ſeveral ſubjects, they would "make a volume much larger than this of her Poems (b)." In 1705 a ſmall volume of her letters to Sir Charles Cotterel were printed at London under the title of *Letters from Orinda to Poliarchus*; the Editor of which tells us, that *they were the effect of an happy intimacy between herſelf and the late famous* Poliarchus, *and are an admirable pattern for the pleaſing correſpondence of a virtuous friendſhip. They will ſufficiently inſtruct us how an entercourſe of writing between perſons of different ſexes ought to be managed with delight and innocence; and to teach the world not to load ſuch a commerce with cenſure and detraction, when it is removed at ſuch a diſtance from even the appearance of guilt.*

(a) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 402, 403. 2d edition.

(b) Which contains about 320 pages in folio.

"that apology were very unneceſſary; for I am ſo "far from expecting applauſe on account of any "thing I write, that I can ſcarce expect a pardon. "And ſometimes I think, that to make verſes, is ſo "much above my reach, and a diverſion ſo unfit for "the ſex to which I belong, that I am about to re-"ſolve againſt it for ever; and could I have reco-"vered thoſe fugitive papers, that have eſcaped my "hand, I had long ſince, I believe, made a ſacrifice "of them all to the flames. The truth is, I have "always had an incorrigible inclination to the vani-"ty of rhyming, but intended the effects of that hu-"mour only for my own amuſement in a retired "life; and therefore did not ſo much reſiſt it, as a "wiſer woman would have done. But ſome of my "deareſt and beſt friends having found my Ballads "(for they deſerve no better a name) they made me "ſo much believe they did not diſlike them, that I "was betrayed to permit ſome copies to be taken "for their diverſion, but this with ſo little concern "for them, that I have loſt moſt of their originals; "which I ſuppoſe to be the cauſe of my preſent miſ-"fortune. For ſome infernal ſpirits or other have "catched thoſe rags of paper; and what the care-"leſs blotted writing kept them from underſtanding, "they have ſupplied by conjecture, till they have at "length put them in the ſhape wherein you ſaw "them; or elſe I know not which way it is poſſible "for them to have been collected, and ſo abomina-"bly printed, as I hear they are. I believe too, there "are ſome among them, that are not mine; and "thus I am not only injured in my own particular, "but on the account likewiſe of thoſe worthy per-"ſons, who had then the ill luck to be of my con-"verſation, whoſe names are, without their leave, "expoſed in this impreſſion, ſo that there are but few "things in the power of fortune, that could have "afflicted me more than this treacherous accident. "To conclude, I know you ſo much my friend, that "I need not aſk your pardon for making this tedious "complaint; but I own it is a great injuſtice to re-"venge myſelf thus on you, for the wrongs which have "been done me by others; and therefore, will only "tell you, that the ſole advantage I gain by this "cruel news is, that it has convinced me by dear "experience, that no adverſary can ſhake the con-"ſtancy of your friendſhip, and that in the worſt hu-"mour that ever I was in, I ſtill am, &c.

Januar. 29.
1663-4. "*Orinda.*"

In 1667, there was printed at London, in folio, *Poems by the moſt deſervedly admired, Mrs.* Katherine Philips, *the matcheleſs* Orinda. *To which is added, Monſieur* Corneille's, Pompey *and* Horace, *Tragedies. With ſeveral other tranſlations from the French,* with her picture before it, engraven by Faithorne. There was likewiſe another edition at London 1678, in folio.

She tranſlated but the four firſt Acts of *Corneille's Horace*, the fifth being done by Sir John Denham.

[C] *Interred . . . in the Church of St. Bennet Sherehog, in London.*] Her ſon Hector, who died an infant, was interred there; and ſhe wrote the following epitaph on him, printed among her works.

What on earth deſerves our truſt?
Youth and beauty both are duſt.
Long we gathering are with pain,
What one moment calls again.
Seven years childleſs marriage paſt,
A ſon, a ſon is born at laſt;
So exactly limb'd and fair,
Full of good ſpirits, mien, and air,
As a long life promiſed;
Yet in leſs than ſix weeks dead.
Too promiſing, too great a mind
In ſo ſmall room to be confin'd.
Therefore as fit in Heav'n to dwell,
He quickly broke the priſon-ſhell.
So the ſubtle Alchemiſt
Can't with Hermes' ſeal reſiſt
The pow'rful ſpirit's ſubtler flight,
But 'twill bid him long good night.
And ſo the ſun, if it ariſe
Half ſo glorious as his eyes,
Like this infant, takes a ſhrowd,
Buried in a morning cloud.

T.

☞ PHILIPS JOHN, an eminent Engliſh Poet, was ſon of Dr. Stephen Philips, Arch-deacon of Salop, and born at Bampton in Oxfordſhire, December 30, 1676. After he was well grounded in Grammar learning, he was ſent to Wincheſter ſchool, where he made himſelf maſter of the Latin and Greek languages, and was ſoon diſtinguiſhed for an happy imitation of the excellencies, which he diſcovered in the beſt claſſical Authors (a). With this foundation of good learning he was removed to Chriſt-Church in Oxford, where he performed all his Univerſity-exerciſes with applauſe, and in a ſhort time grew to be ſuperior to moſt of his Contemporaries, and following the natural bent of his genius, beſides other valuable Authors, became acquainted with Milton [A], whom

(a) Mr. *George Sewell's Life and Character of Mr. John Philips*, p. 4. 3d edit. Lond. 1720.

[A] *Beſides other valuable Authors became acquainted with* Milton.] Mr. Sewell tells us (1), that there was not an alluſion in *Paradiſe Loſt*, drawn from the thoughts and expreſſions of *Homer* or *Virgil*, which our Author could not immediately refer to; and by that he perceived what a peculiar life and grace their ſentiments added to Engliſh poetry; how much their images raiſed its ſpirit, and what weight and beauty their words, when tranſlated, gave to its language. Nor was he leſs curious in obſerving the force and elegance of his mother-tongue; but, by the example of his darling *Milton*, ſearched backwards into the works of our old Engliſh Poets, to furniſh him with proper, ſounding, and ſignificant expreſſions, and prove the due extent and compaſs of the language. For this purpoſe he carefully read over *Chaucer* and *Spencer*;

(1) *Life and Character of Mr. John Philips*, p. 5.

whom he ſtudied with application, and traced him in all his ſucceſsful tranſlations from the antients. Nor was he ſo in love with poetry, as to neglect any other parts of good literature, but was very well verſed in the whole compaſs of Natural Philoſophy [*B*]. While he continued at the Univerſity, he was honoured with the acquaintance of the beſt and politeſt men in it; and had a particular intimacy with Edmund Smith, Author of the Tragedy of *Phædra* and *Hippolytus* (*b*). The firſt Poem, which diſtinguiſhed him, was his *Splendid Shilling* [*C*]. The reaſon of his coming to London was the perſuaſion of ſome great perſons, who engaged him to write upon the battle of Blenheim (*c*); his Poem upon which [*D*] introduced him to the Earl of Oxford and Henry St. John, Eſq; afterwards Lord Viſcount Bolingbroke, and other noble patrons. He laid the foundation, and wrote the firſt book of his *Cyder* [*E*] at Oxford, and the ſecond for the moſt part at London (*d*). All that we have left more of this Poet is a Latin Ode to Henry St. John, Eſq; which is eſteemed a maſter-piece; the ſtyle being pure and elegant, the ſubject of a mixt nature, reſembling the ſublime ſpirit and gay facetious humour

(*b*) *Sewell's Life and Character of Mr. John Philips*, p. 4——9. 3d edit. Lond. 1720.

(*c*) Ibid. p. 11.

(*d*) Ibid. p. 18.

Spencer; and afterwards in his writings did not ſcruple to revive any words or phraſes, which he thought deſerved it, with that modeſty and liberty, which Horace allows of, either in the coining of new, or reſtoring of antient expreſſions.

[*B*] *Nor was he ſo in love with poetry, as to neglect any other parts of good literature, but was very well verſed in the whole compaſs of Natural Philoſophy.*] He ſeemed, in his ſtudies, as well as his writings, to have made *Virgil* his pattern, and often to have broken out with him into the following rapturous wiſh:

Me vero primum dulces ante omnia Muſæ,
Quarum ſacra fero ingenti perculſus amore,
Accipiant; cœlique vias & ſidera monſtrent;
Defectus ſolis varios, Lunæque labores;
Unde tremor terris, quæ vi maria alta tumeſcant
Objicibus ruptis, rurſuſque in ſe ipſa reſidant:
Quid tantum oceano properent ſe tingere ſoles
Hyberni; vel quæ tardis mora noctibus obſtet (2).

(2) Virgil, *Georgic*, lib. 2.

" Give me the ways of wandring ſtars to know,
" The depths of Heav'n above, and Earth below;
" Teach me the various labours of the Moon,
" And whence proceed th' eclipſes of the Sun.
" Why flowing tides prevail upon the main,
" And in what dark receſs they ſhrink again.
" What ſhakes the ſolid earth, what cauſe delays
" The ſummer-nights, and ſhortens winter-days."
DRYDEN.

Mr. *Philips* was no leſs paſſionate an admirer of nature; and it is probable, that he drew his own character in that deſcription, which he gives of a philoſophical and retired life, at the latter end of the firſt book of his *Cyder*:

——— *He to his labour hies,*
Gladſome, intent on ſomewhat that may eaſe
Unhealthy mortals, and with curious ſearch
Examines all the properties of herbs,
Foſſils, and minerals, that th' embowell'd earth
Diſplays, if by his induſtry he can
Benefit human race.

And we have good reaſon to believe, that much might have been attained to, and many new diſcoveries made by ſo diligent an enquirer, and ſo faithful a recorder of phyſical operations. However, though death prevented the hopes of the world in that reſpect, yet the admirable paſſages of that kind, which we find in his Poem on *Cyder*, may convince us of the niceneſs of his obſervations in natural cauſes. Beſide this, he was particularly ſkilled in all manner of antiquities, eſpecially thoſe of his own country; and part of this too he has, with much art and beauty, intermixed with his poetry (3).

(3) Sewell, p. 6, 7, 8.

[*C*] *His* ſplendid Shilling.] In the *Tatler* (4) it is ſtyled *the fineſt burleſque Poem in the Britiſh language*. " Nor was it only, ſays Mr. *Sewell* (5), the fineſt of " that kind in our tongue, but handled in a manner " quite different from what had been made uſe of " by an Author of our own or other nations; the " ſentiments and ſtyle being in this both new; " whereas in thoſe, the jeſt lies more in alluſions to " the thoughts and fables of the Antients, than in the " pomp of the expreſſion. The ſame humour is continued through the whole, and not unnaturally " diverſified, as moſt poems of that nature have been " before. Out of that variety of circumſtances, which " his fruitful invention muſt ſuggeſt to him on ſuch " a ſubject, he has not choſen any but what are " diverting to every Reader, and ſome, that none " but his inimitable dreſs could have made diverting " to any. When we read it, we are betrayed into a " pleaſure, that we could not expect; though at the " ſame time, the ſublimity of the ſtyle, and the gra- " vity of the phraſe, ſeem to chaſtiſe that laughter, " which they provoke." Mr. *Edmund Smith*, in his poem upon our Author's death, ſpeaks thus concerning this poem.

(4) No. 250.

(5) p. 14, 15.

In her beſt light the comic Muſe appears,
When ſhe with borrow'd pride the buſkin wears.

[*D*] *His poem upon* Blenheim.] In this he ſhews, as Mr. Sewell remarks (6), that he could uſe the ſame ſublime and nervous ſtyle as properly on a ſerious and heroic ſubject, as he had before done on one of a more light and ludicrous nature. The *Exordium* of this piece is a juſt alluſion to the beginning of the *Æneid*, (if that be *Virgil's*,) and that of *Spencer's Fairy Queen*.

(6) p. 16.

From low and abject themes the grov'ling muſe
Now mounts aërial, to ſing of arms
Triumphant, and emblaze the martial acts
Of Britain's hero.

The ſpirit is kept on the ſame to the end; the whole being full of noble ſentiments and majeſtic numbers, and not admitting any rival on the ſame occaſion, except Mr. *Addiſon's Campaign*.

[*E*] *His* Cyder.] He was determined to the choice of this ſubject, by the violent paſſion he had to do ſome honour to his native country. The poem is founded upon the model of *Virgil's Georgics*, " and " comes neareſt, ſays Mr. *Sewell* (7), of any other, " to that admirable poem, which the Critics prefer " to the divine *Æneid*. Yet though it is eaſy to " diſcern who was his guide in that difficult way, " we may obſerve, that he comes after rather like " a purſuer than a follower, not tracing him ſtep af- " ter ſtep, but chooſing thoſe paths, in which he " might eaſieſt overtake him. All his imitations are " far from being ſervile, though ſometimes very " cloſe; at other times he brings in a new variety, " and entertains us with ſcenes more unexpected and " pleaſing perhaps, than his maſter's themſelves were " to thoſe, who firſt ſaw that work. The conduct " and management are ſuperior to all other Copy- " ers of that original; and even the admired *Rapin* " is much below him, both in deſign and ſucceſs; " for the Frenchman either fills his *Gardens* with the " idle fables of antiquity, or new tranſformations " of his own; and has, in contradiction to his own " rules of Criticiſm, injudiciouſly blended the ſe- " rious and ſublime ſtyle of *Virgil*, with the elegant " turns of *Ovid* in his *Metamorphoſis*. Nor has the " great genius of Mr. *Cowley* ſucceeded better in his " books of *Plants*, who, beſides the ſame faults with " the former, is continually varying his numbers " from one ſort of verſe to another, and alluding to " remote hints of Medicinal Writers, which, though " allowed

(7) p. 18.

(e) Ibid. p. 25.

humour of Horace (*e*). He intended to have written a Poem upon the *Reſurrection* and the *Day of Judgment* [*F*]. He was beloved by all who knew him; ſomewhat reſerved and ſilent among ſtrangers, but free, familiar, and eaſy with his friends. He was averſe to diſputes, and thought no time ſo ill ſpent, and no wit ſo ill uſed, as that which was employed in ſuch debates (*f*). His whole life was diſtinguiſhed by a natural goodneſs, and well grounded and unaffected piety, an univerſal charity, and a ſteady adherence to his principles. No one obſerved the natural and civil duties of life with a ſtricter regard, whether thoſe of a ſon, a friend, or a member of Society; and he had the happineſs to fill every one of thoſe parts without even the ſuſpicion either of undutifulneſs, inſincerity, or diſreſpect. Thus he continued to the laſt, not owing his virtues to the happineſs of his conſtitution, but the frame of his mind; inſomuch that during a long ſickneſs, which is apt to ruffle the ſmootheſt temper, he never betrayed any diſcontent or uneaſineſs, the integrity of his life ſtill preſerving the chearfulneſs of his ſpirits. And if his friends had meaſured their hopes of his life only by his unconcernedneſs in his ſickneſs, they could not but conclude, that either his date would be much longer, or that he was at all times prepared for death. He had long been troubled with a lingering conſumption attended with an aſthma; and the ſummer before he died, by the advice of his phyſicians, removed to the Bath; where, although he had the aſſiſtance of the ableſt of the faculty, by whom he was generally beloved, he only got ſome preſent eaſe, and went from thence, but with ſmall hopes of a recovery; and upon the return of his diſtimpers, died at Hereford the 15th of February following, in the year 1708. He was interred in the Cathedral of Hereford, with an inſcription upon his grave-ſtone [*G*]; and had a monument erected to his memory in Weſtminſter-Abbey by Sir Simon Harcourt, afterwards Lord Chancellor; the epitaph on which was written by Dr. Freind [*H*].

(f) Ibid. p. 8.

PHILISTUS,

" allowed to be uſeful, are yet ſo numerous, that " they flatten the dignity of the verſe, and ſink it " from a Poem to a Treatiſe of Phyſic. It is not " out of envy to the merit of theſe great men, (and " who will ever be ſuch in ſpite of envy) that we " take notice of theſe miſtakes; but only to ſhew " the judgment of him, who followed them, in a- " voiding to commit the ſame. Whatever ſcenes he " preſents us with, appear delicate and charming; " the philoſophical touches ſurprize, the moral in- " ſtruct, and the gay deſcriptions tranſport the Rea- " der. Sometimes he opens the bowels of the " earth; at others, he paints its ſurface; ſometimes " he dwells upon its lower products and fruits; at " others, mounts to its higher and more ſtately plan- " tations, and then beautifies it with the innocent " pleaſures of its inhabitants. Here we are taught " the nature and variety of ſoils, there the difference " of vegetables; the ſports of a rural, the retire- " ment of a contemplative life, the working genius " of the huſbandman, the induſtry of the mechanic, " contribute as much to diverſify, as the due praiſes " of exalted patriots, heroes, and ſtateſmen, to raiſe " and ennoble the poetry. The change of ſeaſons " and their diſtinctions, introduced by the riſing " and ſetting of the ſtars, the effects of heat, cold, " ſhowers and tempeſts, are in their ſeveral places " very ornamental, and their deſcriptions inferior " only to thoſe of *Virgil*."

[*F*] *He intended to have written a Poem upon the* Reſurrection *and the* Day of Judgment.] Mr. Sewell remarks (8), that in this Poem, *it is probable he would not only have exceeded all other, but even his own performances. That ſubject indeed was only proper to be treated of in that ſolemn ſtyle, which he makes uſe of, and by one, whoſe juſt notions of religion, and true ſpirit of poetry, could have carried his Reader without a wild enthuſiaſm,*

(8) Sewell, p. 26.

——extra flammantia Mœnia Mundi.
LUCRET.

Milton *has given a few fine touches upon the ſame; but ſtill there remains an inexhauſtible ſtore of materials to be drawn from the Prophets, the Pſalmiſt, and the other inſpired Writers, which in his poetical dreſs might, without the falſe boaſting of old Poets, have endured to the day that it deſcribed. The meaneſt ſoul and the loweſt imagination cannot think of that time and the deſcription we meet with of it in holy writ, without the greateſt emotion, and the deepeſt impreſſion. What then might we not expect from the believing heart of a good man, and the regulated flights and raptures of an excellent Chriſtian Poet?* Our Author's friend Mr. *Smith*, who had probably ſeen the firſt rudiments of his deſign, ſpeaks thus of it in his Poem upon his death:

O! had relenting Heav'n prolong'd his days,
The towring bard had ſung in nobler lays,
How the laſt trumpet wakes the lazy dead;
How Saints aloft the croſs triumphant ſpread;
How op'ning Heav'ns their happy regions ſhow,
And yawning gulphs with flaming vengeance glow,
And Saints rejoice above, and Sinners howl below.
Well might he ſing the day he could not fear,
And paint the glories he was ſure to wear.

[*G*] *An inſcription upon the grave-ſtone.*] The inſcription is as follows:

JOHANNES PHILIPS.
Obiit 15 *die Febr. Anno* { *Dom.* 1708. / *Ætat. ſuæ* 32.
Cujus
Oſſa ſi requiras, hanc Urnam inſpice;
Si ingenium neſcias, ipſius Opera conſule;
Si Tumulum deſideras, Templum adi Weſtmonaſterienſe.
Qualis quantuſque Vir fuerit,
Dicat elegans illa & præclara,
Quæ Cenotaphium ibi decorat,
Inſcriptio.
Quam interim erga Cognatos pius & officioſus,
Teſtetur hoc Saxum,
A Mariâ Philips *Matre ipſius pientiſſimâ*
Dilecti Filii Memoriæ non ſine lacrymis dicatum.

[*H*] *The Epitaph on which was written by Dr.* Freind.] It is as follows.

Herefordiæ conduntur Oſſa,
Hoc in Delubro ſtatuitur Imago,
Britanniam omnem pervagatur Fama
JOHANNIS PHILIPS:
Qui viris bonis doctiſque juxta charus,
Immortale ſuum Ingenium,
Eruditione multuplici excultum,
Miro animi Candore,
Eximiâ morum ſimplicitate,
Honeſtavit.
Litterarum amœniorum ſitim,
Quam Wintoniæ Puer ſentire cœperat,
Inter Ædis Chriſti Alumnos jugiter explevit,
In illo Muſarum domicilio
Præclaris æmulorum ſtudiis excitatus,
Optimis ſcribendi Magiſtris ſemper intentus,
Carmina ſermone patrio compoſuit
A Græcis Latiniſque Fontibus feliciter deducta,
Atticis Romaniſque auribus omnino digna;
Verſuum quippe harmoniam
Rhythmo didicerat
Antiquo illo, libero, multiformi,

PHILISTUS, a Greek Hiſtorian, born in Syracuſe, had a conſiderable ſhare in the friendſhip of Dionyſius the tyrant, and aſſiſted him conſiderably in eſtabliſhing his power (*a*). Dionyſius appointed him Governor of the Citadel of Syracuſe; and it is even thought that he enjoyed the tyrant's mother, her ſon knowing it. He loſt Dionyſius's favour, after marrying, without the conſent of that Prince, the daughter of Leptines his brother (*b*); and being ſent into exile, choſe to reſide in the city of Adria: but was recalled after the tyrant's death. Thoſe, who perſuaded the younger Dionyſius to recall him, were enemies to Dion (*c*), and were afraid leſt Plato ſhould change the tyrant's mind; and were of opinion that no perſon was better qualified than Philiſtus, to traverſe the deſigns of that Philoſopher. They were not miſtaken: for the inſtant that Philiſtus was recalled, he oppoſed Plato, and prompted the tyrant to drive out Dion (*d*). The latter was ſoon able to make war upon Dionyſius whom he at laſt beſieged in the fortreſs of Syracuſe, and triumphed over the fleet which Philiſtus had brought to ſuccour the beſieged (*e*), the firſt year of the 107th Olympiad (*f*). According to ſome Authors Philiſtus having loſt the battle laid violent hands on himſelf: but others relate, that he was taken by his enemies and put to a cruel death [*A*]. He was a man of merit, if we conſider him only with regard to the qualities of his mind, his knowledge, and his abilities as a writer and even a ſoldier (*g*): but his moral qualities cannot be juſtly applauded, ſince he employed his talents in concealing, under ſpecious gloſſes, the injuſtice of tyranny (*h*). There would have been ſome generoſity in his conduct, had it not been blended with ſelf-love [*B*]. He wrote ſeveral books [*C*], but his Hiſtory of Sicily was looked

(*a*) Plutarch. *in* Dione, p. 962.

(*b*) i. e. Dionyſius's brother.

(*c*) He was brother to the ſecond wife of the elder Dionyſius.

(*d*) Extracted from Plutarch *in* Dione, p. 962, 963.

(*e*) Idem, ibid. p. 970, 973.

(*f*) Diod. Sic. lib. 16. cap. 16.

(*g*) See the cloſe of the rem. [*A*].

(*h*) Plutarch. *in* Dione, p. 974. See the rem. [*B*].

Ad res ipſas apto prorſus & attemperato,
Non numeris in eundem ferè orbem redeuntibus,
Non clauſularum ſimiliter cadentium ſono,
Metiri:
Uni in hoc laudis genere Miltono *ſecundus,*
Primoque pæne par.
Res ſeu tenues, ſeu grandes, ſeu mediocres
Ornandas ſuſceperat,
Nuſquam non quod decuit,
Et videt, & aſſecutus eſt,
Egregius, quoqcunque ſtylum verteret,
Fandi author, & Modorum artifex.
Fas ſit huic,
Auſo licet à tuâ Metrorum lege diſcedere,
O Poeſis Anglicanæ Pater atque conditor, Chaucere,
Alterum tibi latus claudere,
Vatum certè Cineres tuos undique ſtipantium
Non dedecebit Chorum.

Simon Harcourt *Miles*
Viri bene de ſe deque Literis meriti,
Quoad viveret, Fautor,
Poſt-obitum piè memor,
Hoc illi ſaxum poni voluit.

J. Philips, Stephani *S. T. P. Archdiaconi*
Salop. Filius, natus eſt Bamptoniæ
In Agro Oxon. Dec. 30. 1676.
Obiit Herefordiæ Febr. 15. 1708. T.

[*A*] *According to ſome Authors, Philiſtus . . . . . laid violent hands on himſelf: but others relate, that . . . his enemies . . . . put him to a cruel death.*] It will be beſt to tranſcribe Plutarch's account of this affair (1). *Having conquered Philiſtus, they treated him in a very barbarous and cruel manner. It is true indeed Ephorus ſays, that he diſpatched himſelf, upon ſeeing that his galley was taken: but Timonides, who always accompanied Dion, from the beginning of the war, writing to Speuſippus the Philoſopher, ſays, that he was taken priſoner alive, by his galley's running a ground; and that the Syracuſans firſt took off his coat of mail, ſtript him ſtark naked; and after treating him in the moſt contumelious manner, cut off his head, then gave the body to ſome boys, bidding them drag it through the diſtrict of the city called Acradina, and afterwards throw it into the quarries. And Timæus, inſulting him ſtill more, ſays, that the little boys hung up the dead body by the lame leg, and dragged him through the whole city, where he was inſulted by all the inhabitants of Syracuſe, who were greatly pleaſed to ſee him dragged by the leg, who had ſaid, that it would not become Dionyſius to be beholden to the ſwiftneſs of his horſe for his flight from the throne* (2), *but be dragged out by the leg rather than quit it voluntarily. And yet Philiſtus relates this, not as ſpoken by him to Dionyſius, but by another perſon* (3). Diodorus Siculus is one of thoſe who relate that Philiſtus killed himſelf, to prevent his falling alive into the hands of his enemies; and to ſave himſelf from the tortures and ignominy which they would have made him ſuffer (4). This was a bloody engagement, and Philiſtus, by his valour, made victory incline at firſt to his ſide: but at laſt he was hemmed in by a great number of the enemy's ſhips, who exerted their utmoſt endeavours in order to take him priſoner (5). We are told by the ſame Hiſtorian, that his body met with the moſt contumelious uſage, and was left unburied (6). He obſerves, I. That Philiſtus did ſingular ſervice to both the Dionyſius's; and behaved with greater fidelity towards them than any of their adherents. II. That the tyrant, not finding any perſon worthy of filling the employment which was become vacant by the death of Philiſtus, the moſt valiant of his friends, was diſheartened; and offered Dion half his Kingdom, and afterwards his Crown. III. That Philiſtus had greatly ſignalized his bravery in an expedition by land; and that the younger Dionyſius had beſtowed upon him the command of all his naval forces, as ſoon as he heard that the Syracuſans had raiſed Heraclides, Dion's great friend, to the like employment (7).

(1) Plutarch. *in* Dione, p. 973, according to Amyot's tranſlation.

(2) Compare this with citat. (31), of the art. PERIANDER.

(3) Diod. Siculus, lib. 14. cap. 8. p. 571, ſuppoſes that Philiſtus ſaid that.

(4) Diod. Siculus, lib. 14. cap. 16. p. m. 743.

(5) Idem, ibid.

(6) Idem, ibid.

(7) Idem, lib. 16. cap. 16. p. 747.

[*B*] *There would have been ſome generoſity in his conduct, had it not been blended with ſelf-love.*] Dionyſius the tyrant had honoured him with his affection, and munificence, and afterwards ſent him into baniſhment. We generally find that an Hiſtorian is biaſſed by the preſent reſentment of an injury, rather than by the remembrance of paſt favours; I mean, that if he compoſes his work during the exile, to which his patron and benefactor has ſentenced him, he ſpeaks more to his prejudice than advantage. But Philiſtus acted very differently from this. He wrote a Hiſtory during his diſgrace, and did not, by any paſſage in it, diſcover that his affection for him was leſſened in any manner; but paid the higheſt regard to him, excuſed, and applauded him. One would have concluded that he had writ his work in Syracuſe, cheriſhed by the auſpices of that Prince, and poſſeſſed of the noble employments he had enjoyed under him. If the good offices, which Monarchs receive from an Hiſtorian, in prejudice of truth, can be at any time praiſe-worthy; this doubtleſs would be, when he beſtows them on thoſe very perſons who had ſent him into exile. It is an indication of a great ſoul, to treaſure up more carefully the remembrance of a benefit, than the memory of an injury; but ſince Philiſtus flattered Dionyſius, in hopes of being recalled to Syracuſe, this perſonal intereſt, this mixture of ſelf-love, tarniſhes the beauty of his action; and therefore we ought not to ſay, with Pauſanias, that this circumſtance excuſes him (8).

(8) Εἰ δὲ καὶ Φίλιστος αἰτίαν δικαίαν ἔλαβεν, ἐλπιζων την ἐν Συρακοσσαις καθοδον ἀπεκρύψατο τῶν Διονυσίου τὰ ἀνοσιώτατα. *Nam ſi Philiſtus venia dignus habetur qui cum Syracuſas ſe reſtitutum iri ſperaret, multa Dionyſii flagitia diſſimulavit.* Pauſanias, lib. 1. p. 13.

[*C*] *He wrote ſeveral books.*] Suidas (9) aſcribes to him a treatiſe on Oratory: *Ægyptica*, in twelve books; *Res Siculæ*, in eleven books; ſome ſpeeches, one of which relates to the city of Naucratis; the hiſtory of Dionyſius the Tyrant; three books on the Theology of the Egyptians; a Treatiſe on Libya and

(9) Suidas, *in* Φιλιστος.

looked upon as his maſter-piece [*D*]. He imitated Thucydides's laconic ſtyle, and avoided

and Syria. He firſt obſerves, that Philiſtus was of Naucratis or Syracuſe, which makes me ſuſpect that he makes two Authors one. There are, in his catalogue, many works which don't well ſuit our Philiſtus; and which I would attribute to a Philiſtus born in Naucratis. Raguſa the Jeſuit (10), citing Conſtantine Laſcaris, ſuppoſes two Philiſtus's; the one of Syracuſe or Naucratis, and the other of Syracuſe. The former, ſays he, was related to Dionyſius the Tyrant, and died in a war againſt the Carthaginians: he wrote ſeveral things relating to Sicily. The latter was ſent into baniſhment by the elder Dionyſius, and wrote a conſiderable part of his Hiſtory during his exile. *Plura ſcripſit de rebus Ægyptiacis lib.* 12. *de Sicanicis lib.* 11. *item de Baccho: de Theologia Ægyptiorum lib.* 6. *de Syria & Libya.* This only confounds things the more; for this Author, after ſuppoſing that there were two Philiſtus's, divides what he ought to have aſcribed ſingly to one or other of them: he changes the circumſtances (11); and aſcribes thoſe books to the Syracuſan, which ſhould rather have been aſcribed to him whoſe native country is doubtful.

(10) Hieronymus Raguſa, *in Elogiis Siculorum*, p. 232, 233.

(11) Philiſtus, who died in war, did not fight againſt the Carthaginians, but againſt the troops of Dion of Syracuſe.

[*D*] . . . *his Hiſtory of Sicily was looked upon as his maſter-piece.*] It was divided into two parts; the firſt comprehended, in 7 books, the tranſactions during above 800 years, and concluded with the taking of Agrigentum, that is, the third year of the 93d Olympiad; for at that time the Carthaginians poſſeſſed themſelves of this city (12). The ſecond part, conſiſting of four books, began with the reign of the elder Dionyſius, that is, where the firſt ended; for this Dionyſius poſſeſſed himſelf of Syracuſe, the year after the taking of Agrigentum (13). Theſe are the eleven books *Rerum Sicularum*, which Suidas ſuppoſes were writ by Philiſtus; but he alſo aſcribes to him the particular Hiſtory of Dionyſius the Tyrant, in ſix books. Voſſius is of opinion, that Cicero, in the paſſage cited hereunder, has regard only to the diviſion mentioned above, viz. that of the Hiſtory of Sicily, in two parts; one in ſeven books, the other in four. *Siculus ille* (Philiſtus) *capitalis, creber, acutus, brevis: pene puſillus Thucydides: ſed utros ejus habueris libros (duo enim ſunt corpora) an utroſque, neſcio. Me magis de Dionyſio delectat: ipſe eſt enim veterator magnus & perfamiliaris Philiſto Dionyſius* (14). i. e. "Philiſtus the "Sicilian is ſubtle, copious, acute, laconic, and al- "moſt a little Thucydides; but I don't know which "of his two books you would have (there being two) "or both of them. That which treats of Dionyſius "pleaſes me moſt; for Dionyſius was a ſubtle old "fox, and extremely intimate with Philiſtus." This opinion of Voſſius is perhaps very rational; but perhaps alſo Tully placed, on the one hand, the two parts of the general Hiſtory of Sicily; and, on the other, the particular Hiſtory of Dionyſius the Tyrant, mentioned by Suidas. Dionyſius Harlicanaſſeus ſeems to favour ſomething more thoſe who aſſert, that the Hiſtory of the Tyrant, is the ſame book with the ſecond part of the Hiſtory of Sicily, than thoſe who ſhould affirm the contrary (15). However this be, Cicero was not diſpleaſed with our Philiſtus, as an Hiſtorian; and conſequently thoſe who deſpiſed him, may be looked upon as perſons of an over delicate, or of a depraved taſte. *Dionyſii mater ejus qui Syracuſanorum tyrannus fuit ut ſcriptum apud Philiſtum eſt, & doctum hominem & diligentem & æqualem temporum illorum, quum prægnans hunc ipſum Dionyſium alvo contineret, ſomniavit ſe peperiſſe Satyriſcum* (16). i. e. "The "mother of Dionyſius, who was the tyrant of Sy- "racuſe, (as is related by Philiſtus, a very learned "and careful Author, and who lived in thoſe times) "being with child of Dionyſius, dreamed that ſhe "was delivered of a ſatyr or hairy monſter." Thoſe who ſhall duly conſider the applauſes which Tully has beſtowed on Thucydides, will lay great ſtreſs on his declaring immediately, that Philiſtus imitated Thucydides very happily. *Hunc conſecutus eſt Syracuſius Philiſtus, qui quum Dionyſii tyranni familiariſſimus eſſet ocium ſuum conſumpſit in hiſtoria ſcribenda* MAXIMEQUE *Thucydidem eſt, ſicut mihi videtur,* IMITATUS (17). i. e. "He was followed by Philiſtus the Syracuſan, who "being extremely intimate with Dionyſius the ty- "rant, employed his leiſure hours in writing hiſtory; "and, in my opinion, imitated Thucydides very ex- "actly." Quintilian affirms, that Philiſtus is much clearer than Thucydides (18). This is a great elogium: for obſcurity is a great defect, and may outweigh the great advantages which Thucydides is thought to have over Philiſtus. If it were poſſible for us to compare the writings of this latter with Thucydides, we perhaps ſhould find, that Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus has ranked the Philiſtus a little too low under the other (19). However, Philiſtus being called the *little Thucydides* by Cicero, will always be a great honour to the firſt mentioned. Thoſe, who called a certain actor in Paris, *little* Moliere, imagined they paid him no ſmall compliment.

(12) Diod. Sicul. lib. 13. cap. 103. p. m. 554.

(13) Idem, ibid.

(14) *Cicero ad Quintum fratrem*, Epiſt. 12. lib. 2.

(15) See Dionyſ. Halicarn. *Epiſt. Pompeium*, p. m. 261.

(16) Cicero, lib. 1. *de Divinat.* cap. 20.

(17) Idem, lib. 2. *de Oratore*, folio 73 [*D*].

(18) *Philiſtus quoque meretur qui turbæ quamvis bonorum poſt bos authorum eximatur, imitator Thucydidis, & ut multo infirmior ita aliquatenus lucidior.* Quint. lib. 10. cap. 1. p. m. 469.

(19) Dion. Hal. *Epiſt. ad Pompeium*, p. 261, and 262. See alſo p. 190.

I muſt take notice of two errors which have been committed with regard to the *pene puſillus Thucydides* of Cicero: one of them was animadverted upon by Voſſius, and the other by a Jeſuit. A learned Commentator imagined, that the reaſon why Cicero gives Philiſtus the abovementioned title, was, becauſe he wrote very little in compariſon of Thucydides: but this is a miſtake. *Id referri eo minime debet quod præ Thucydide pauca admodum ſcripſerit, quæ* * *Paulli Manutii ſententia eſt, (nam longe aliud apparet ex iis quæ ex Suida & Diodoro adduximus) ſed quia non paullo quidem infirmior ſit Thucydide, ut Fabius* † *quoque cenſet, attamen imitetur eum non infeliciter* (20). i. e. "We "muſt not conclude this, becauſe he wrote very little "in compariſon of Thucydides, as Paulus Manutius "thinks, (for the reverſe appears from what I quoted "from Suidas and Diodorus Siculus:) but becauſe "he has not ſo much ſtrength as Thucydides, as Fa- "bius likewiſe thinks, and yet is a happy imitator "of him." An Author who has collected the errors of great men, imagined that Cicero had ſpoke very contemptuouſly of Thucydides, and called him the little Thucydides. This blunder is refuted as follows: *Iſto fere pacto hallucinatum fuiſſe virum doctum, qui de erroribus magnorum virorum ſcripſit, illico ſenſi, ut hic iſtius liber in manus meas incidit. Is pagina nonageſima extrema ait, Thucydidem hiſtoricum videri ne enarratorem quidem interdum, ideo* pene puſillum Ciceroni dictum. *Non animadvertit ſcriptor, tum profecto aliud agens, neque quemquam ab ullo vocari ſolere pene parvum, aut pene magnum, ſed omnino parvum, aut magnum; neque ibi apud Tullium, ubi pene puſillus Thucydides dicitur, uſurpari hoc de Thucydide* (21). i. e. "By this I in- "ſtantly perceived, that a miſtake had been com- "mitted by the learned Author, who wrote concern- "ing the errors of great men, as ſoon as his work fell "into my hands. The Author in queſtion declares, "in his ninetieth page, that Thucydides the Hiſto- "rian ſeems ſometimes not to deſerve to be called "even a writer of narratives, and for that reaſon is "called *pene puſillus* by Cicero. This Author, whoſe "mind was abſent at that time, did not conſider, "that no perſon is ever called *pene parvus*, or *pene* "*magnus*, but abſolutely *parvus* or *magnus*; and "that the expreſſion (in Cicero) *pene puſillus Thu-* "*cydides*, is not meant of Thucydides." Father Vavaſſor ſhews afterwards, that Cicero ſpoke of our Philiſtus.

* *Notis ad eum Ciceronis locum.*

† Lib. 10. cap. 1.

(20) Voſſius, *de Hiſtor. Græc.* lib. 1. cap. 6. p. 27.

(21) Franciſcus Vavaſſor, *de ludicra Dictione*, p. 166, 167.

I have one more obſervation to make. Cicero declares that the hiſtory of Dionyſius's hiſtory pleaſed him much more than Philiſtus's other work, becauſe Dionyſius was of a knaviſh diſpoſition, and was very familiar with that Hiſtorian's. Voſſius, fearing that it would give occaſion to ſpeak ill of Cicero, takes great care to illuſtrate that matter. Cicero, ſays he, does not praiſe Philiſtus's moral character: the only circumſtance he ſearches for, in that Hiſtory, is the benefit which may be reaped from the knowledge of the knaviſh artifices of that tyrant. *Non animum Philiſti laudavit Tullius, ſed utilitatem libri prædicavit: atque id imprimis quidem propter prudentiam quam ex vafri adeo tyranni vita capere eſſet: ſed & propter dictionem quam Thucydideæ æmulam fuiſſe etiam ex ſecundo de oratore cognoſcimus, ac propterea idem in Bruto, &c.* (22). Theſe latter words are quite uſeleſs, not to ſay worſe: for the queſtion was not to apologize for Cicero, becauſe he took a pleaſure in reading Philiſtus; but becauſe he took more delight in reading

(22) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græcis*, lib. 1. cap. 6. p. 27.

avoided digreſſions to an exceſs [*E*]. He was handled with great ſeverity by Timæus the Hiſtorian. Plutarch cenſures him for it, though, on the other hand, he blames Ephorus for applauding Philiſtus [*F*].

PHILYRA,

ing the Hiſtory of Dionyſius the tyrant. It will be to no purpoſe, to juſtify this taſte, to ſay that Philiſtus was a fine writer. We do not know that he diſtinguiſhed himſelf more by his ſtyle in the hiſtory of Dionyſius, than in the other. We ſhould therefore ſay, that Voſſius choſe rather to make a tranſition, than to reaſon in a juſt manner. Thoſe who know how vaſtly difficult it is to write with connexion, I mean ſo as to introduce tranſitions in a proper manner, and at the ſame time to obſerve exactly all the rules of logic, will not wonder ſo much that there were ſuch numerous faults, like thoſe I have been ſpeaking of in Authors.

By the way, Voſſius's apology for Cicero is extremely juſt. Every man of a curious and inquiſitive turn of mind, eſpecially if he looks into the affairs of the commonwealth, will join in opinion with that illuſtrious Roman, and not be the leſs honeſt man upon that account. He will rather chooſe to read the particular hiſtory of an artful politician, a mighty villian, a bold and ſubtle uſurper, than general hiſtories, and eſpecially when the authors of them have lived familiarly with the tyrant. There you will object to me, that ſuch writers will diſguiſe matters, and ſet the crimes of their heroes in a favourable light: and this Philiſtus did. I anſwer, that a judicious reader will ſee through thoſe artifices, and make a proper advantage of them. I do not doubt but that many perſons, for the ſake of recovering this ſingle book of Philiſtus, would give up four or five of the antient authors, who have been tranſmitted to us. Philiſtus would inform us of a great many tranſactions, to which we are utter ſtrangers. We ſcarce know any thing of Dionyſius the tyrant, beſides his cruel actions and his diffidence: now theſe form but a very ſmall part of his picture. A man, who makes himſelf maſter of a powerful Republick, and maintains his uſurpation during many years, in ſpite of numberleſs obſtacles, is generally poſſeſſed of many valuable qualities. How theſe were blended in Dionyſius we know not, nor are we acquainted with the particulars of his conduct, or of many defects, which the Syracuſans might have. It would be of advantage to ſee the light in which Philiſtus ſet thoſe things. The maxim, *intereſt reipublicæ cognoſci malos*; i. e. It is for the advantage of the commonwealth that wicked men ſhould be known, ought to be extended ſo far. He who hears but one ſide, hears nothing, or cannot form a right judgment; or, ſhould he judge rightly, this would be only by mere chance.

[*E*] .... *he avoided digreſſions to an exceſs.*] It is a fault in a Writer to take a pleaſure in rambling from his ſubject, and Theopompus the Hiſtorian has been juſtly cenſured for it (23). But it does not follow, that it is an excellency in an Author, to take a pleaſure in never leaving his chief ſubject; on the contrary, it is over-doing, it is ſpoiling a good thing.

(23) See remarks [*E*] and [*F*] of the art. THEOPOMPUS.

(24) Horat. *Epiſt.* 6. lib. 1. ver. 15.

Inſani ſapiens nomen ferat, æquus iniqui,
Ultra quam ſatis eſt virtutem ſi petat ipſam (24).
" The juſt will be unjuſt, wiſe void of wit,
" That ſeek e'en virtue more than what is fit."
CREECH.

There is a medium between theſe two extremes, as Theon has judiciouſly obſerved. Οὐ γὰρ ἁπλῶς χρὴ (παρήκασιν) πᾶσαν παραιτεῖσθαι, καθάπερ ὁ Φίλιστος, ἀναπαύσει γὰρ τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ἀκροατῶν. ἀλλὰ τὴν τηλικαύτην τὸ μήκος, ἥτις ἀπαλλοτριοῖ τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ἀκροωμένων, ὥστε δεῖσθαι πάλιν ὑπομνήσεως τῶν προειρημένων, ὡς Θεόπομπος ἐν ταῖς Φιλιππικαῖς (25). i. e. " Nor ought we, " like Philiſtus, to entirely avoid digreſſions; be- " cauſe this may be a relief to the minds of the au- " ditors: but ſuch only as are ſo very prolix, that " they call off their minds, ſo as to make it neceſ- " ſary to repeat what was ſaid before: digreſſions " like thoſe which Theopompus employs in his Phi- " lippicks." It is plain that Theon blames Philiſtus for not uſing digreſſions; but he ſays they are neceſſary ſometimes, and ſerve as ſo many reſting places. His obſervation is juſt: a little variety is neceſſary in all works of wit; and it is obſerved, that the moſt regular Writers do not afford the greateſt pleaſure. I could point out certain Hiſtories which often make readers yawn, and even fall aſleep, though the Authors had exactly obſerved, in their compoſitions, all the rules of art; though their ſtyle was grave, cloſe, correct, and ſententious: their naration unencumbered with incidents and trifling particulars; and without deſcending to particulars or employing digreſſions; ever directed by the right line becauſe it is the ſhorteſt (26). Other Writers, ſometimes quitting a grave character, with regard to the ſtyle or ſubject: and making no ſcruple to go out of their way, for the ſake of an epiſode, write ſuch a hiſtory as engages the reader's attention perpetually; ſo that he gets to the end of the work before he has had time to be tired. I ſhall not examine, whether this be a proof of one of thoſe things, *viz.* either that the rules are falſe, or elſe the reader's mind. I only inſiſt upon the fact, and am guided by the remark of a man of very good taſte. *What a prodigious difference*, ſays he (27), *there is between a beautiful work, and a perfect or regular work; I do not know whether we have yet had any of the latter kind. It is perhaps leſs difficult for a great genius to hit upon the great and ſublime, than to avoid faults of every kind. The Cid had but one voice, at its firſt appearance, that of admiration; it triumphed over authority and politics, which attempted, but in vain, to ruin its reputation; it reunited in its favour thoſe who are always divided in opinion and ſentiment, the great and the common people; they all learnt it by heart, and repeated it, before the actors, when exhibited on the ſtage. In a word, the Cid is one of the fineſt poems that can be made; and one of the beſt criticiſms ever made on any ſubject, is that of the Cid.* This is one of the fineſt examples that can be given of the inſufficiency of rules. The Author of the Cid ſcarce followed one of them: the French Academy accuſed him for infringing them, and nevertheleſs it charmed, and ſtill continues to charm the publick. It loſt its cauſe before the ſupreme judges, and won it in all other places; it appealed to the people, like that Horatius who killed his ſiſter, and prevailed with them to annul the ſentence of the eſtabliſhed Judges. Montagne's Eſſays are another example of a happy irregularity. Were that book to be thrown into a very methodical form, it would take away its greateſt beauties.

(25) Theop. *in Progymnaſm.* cap. 4. p. m. 44.

(26) *A puncto ad punctum linea recta eſt omnium breviſſima.*

(27) La Bruyere, *Characteres dece Siecle*, in the Chapter on Works on Wit, p. m. 76, 77.

By the way, I am not ſo much concerned, as may be imagined, to vindicate digreſſions: for the hiſtorical part of this work is infinitely more conformable to Philiſtus's manner than to that of Theopompus; and, with reſpect to my Commentary, I am not obliged to apologize for its containing ſeveral digreſſions. It is a ſpecies of writing, which requires, or admits them naturally: it is a compilation, and what we call miſcellanies. Variety is eſſential to this ſpecies of writing; and ought principally to be indulged in thoſe writers, who are perſuaded that by this method only they can keep the reader from being tired (28). I am to obſerve, that a digreſſion cannot be ſaid to be too long, only becauſe it takes up ſeveral pages, but when each individual part of it takes up too much room; for how conciſe ſoever a writer may be on every one in particular, the joining of many together will render him prolix. *Solet enim eſſe quædam partium brevitas quæ longam tamen efficit ſummam* (29). I employ this reflection of Quintilian in a ſenſe different from that in which he uſes it.

(28) *Liber fuit & opuſculis varius & metris: ita ſolemus qui ingenio parum fidimus ſatietatis periculum fugere.* Plin. Epiſt. 21. lib. 8.

(29) Quintilian. lib. 4. cap. 2. p. m. 183.

[*F*] *Plutarch cenſures* Timæus, *tho', on the other hand, he blames Ephorus for applauding Philiſtus.*] " But " Timæus makes this a handle, and a juſt one, to " reprove the affection, diligence and fidelity, which " Philiſtus had always ſhewn for the ſupport and de- " fence of the tyranny; and inveighs againſt him in " the moſt abuſive manner on that account. As to " thoſe whom he had really injured, if they were " ſo inhuman as to ſhew their reſentment againſt his " dead body, they perhaps were in ſome meaſure ex- " cuſable; but thoſe who wrote his actions after his " death;

PHILYRA, the daughter of Oceanus, was ſo much charmed with the paſſion which Saturn declared he had for her, that ſhe indulged him the laſt favour. Rhea, Saturn's wife, knew nothing of it for ſome time; but at laſt, entertaining ſome ſuſpicions on that head, ſhe watched the two lovers ſo narrowly, that ſhe caught them in the amorous congreſs. Saturn, to conceal himſelf, aſſumed the form of a horſe [*A*]; but Philyra was in ſuch confuſion that ſhe left the country [*B*], and went and wandered on the Mountains of the Pelaſgi, where ſhe was delivered of Chiron the Centaur (*a*). Her grief for bringing forth a child, part man and part horſe, obliged her to beſeech the Gods to change her into ſome other being [*C*]; and her prayers being heard, ſhe was metamorphoſed into a tree (*b*).

(*a*) Extracted from Apollon. *Argon.* lib. 2. ver. 1235 & *ſeq.*

(*b*) *A* lime-tree. See the rem. [*C*].

" death; who were never once injured by him in his " life-time, ought to ſoften their rage when they are " ſpeaking of him: methinks, they ſhould not, for " their own reputation ſake, reproach him in in- " ſulting, opprobrious language, for thoſe calamities " which may as eaſily befall the beſt man in the " world. On the other hand, Ephorus does not " ſhew much prudence in praiſing Philiſtus; for tho' " he is very ingenious in finding out excuſes to diſ- " guiſe baſe and wicked actions, and very artful in " inventing ſpecious reaſons, dreſſed in beautiful " words; he yet, though he ſhould exert his utmoſt " endeavours, would not be able to acquit him from " the imputation, of being the moſt zealous aſſertor " of arbitrary Government that ever lived; and of " ever loving, coveted and deſired the pleaſures, the " power, the riches, and alliances of tyrants: but " he, in my opinion, who does not applaud Philiſ- " tus's defects, nor reproaches him for his calamities, " obſerves the juſt medium which becomes an Hiſ- " torian (30)." What Plutarch ſays with reſpect to theſe *alliances of tyrants*, is confirmed by the following words of Cornelius Nepos: *Philiſtum hiſtoricum Syracuſas reduxit, hominem amicum non magis tyranno quam tyrannidi* (31). i. e. " He recalled to Syracuſe, " Philiſtus the hiſtorian, no leſs a friend to the ty- " rant, than to tyranny." And by the following paſſage from Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus: *Philiſtus Thucydidem ſequitur moribus exceptis: hic enim liber eſt, & animi magnitudinis ac gravitatis plenus: ille tyrannorum & aliorum cupiditati plus nimio ſubſervit* (32). i. e. " Philiſtus made Thucydides his pattern, except in " his moral conduct: for the latter was a great per- " ſonage, and animated by a noble ſoul, but the " former behaved towards tyrants and others in too " obſequious a manner."

(30) Plut. *in* Dione, p. 974.

(31) Corn. Nepos, *in Vita Dionyſii*, cap. 3.

(32) Dion. Hal. *Epiſt. ad Pompeium*, p. 190.

[*A*] *Saturn . . . . . aſſumed the form of a horſe.*] Virgil adds, that he ran away with the utmoſt ſpeed, and that all Pelion (1) ecchoed with his neighing.

(1) A Mountain of Theſſaly.

Talis & ipſe jubam cervice effundit equina
Conjugis adventu pernix Saturnus, & altum
Peliona hinnitu fugiens implevit acuto (2).

(2) Virgil. *Georgic.* lib. 3. ver. 92.

" In ſuch a ſhape grim Saturn did reſtrain
" His heavenly limbs, and flow'd with ſuch a mane,
" When, half ſurpriz'd, and fearing to be ſeen,
" The Leacher gallop'd from his jealous queen,
" Ran up the ridges of the rock amain,
" And with ſhrill neighings fill'd the neighbouring plain DRYDEN.

This is probable enough. A huſband, caught, in the amorous congreſs by his wife, is expoſed to ſuch a flood of injurious expreſſions, ſuch a ſtorm of reproaches, that the moſt prudent thing he can do is to fly from her. Some affirm (3), that Saturn aſſumed a horſe's form to enjoy Philyra; and conſequently his wife's preſence did not compel him to the neceſſity of doing this. Perhaps he employed this artifice by way of precaution, as he was afraid of Rhea's vigilance, and endeavoured to deceive her before hand.

(3) Pherecydes, *apud Scholiaſt. Apollonii* in lib. 2. ver. 1237.

(4) Hyginus, cap. 138.

(5) Philargyrius, *in Virgil. Georgic.* lib. 3. ver. 93.

(6) Apollon. lib. 2. ver. 1236.

[*B*] *Philyra was in ſuch confuſion that ſhe left the country.*] Authors are not agreed with reſpect to the ſcene of this action. Some fix it in Thrace (4), others in Theſſaly (5), and others again in an iſland of the Euxine Sea. Apollonius (6) is of the laſt opinion; and ſince he makes Philyra fly as far as Theſſaly, he conſequently muſt ſuppoſe her ſhame and confuſion to be extreme.

Ἡ δ' αἰδοῖ χαλκόν τε καὶ ἤθεα κεῖνα λιποῦσα
Ὠκιαλὶς Φιλύρη, εἰς ὄρεα μακρὰ πελασγῶν
Ἦλθ'.

(7) Idem, ibid. ver. 1242.

" Philyra, Ocean's daughter, quite aſham'd
" Of her looſe conduct, left that fatal place,
" And to the high, Pelaſgian mountains fled.

Some affirm that Saturn metamorphoſed her into a mare, to ſave her from the confuſion with which the crime ſhe had filled muſt neceſſarily fill her (8). It is to be obſerved that Saturn was at that time in proſperity. He poſſeſſed his Kingdom (9): his ſon Jupiter was but an infant; but it is affirmed, that after his being dethroned, and was fled into Italy, he again immerſed himſelf into his former debauchery.

(8) *Adventante uxore ſe in equum, illa in equam convertit, atque ita uterque effugerunt.* Philargyrius, *in Virgil. Georgic.* lib. 3. ver. 93.

Advena quos profugus gignens, & equina libido
Intulit Italiæ: Tuſcis namque ille puellis
Primus adhinnivit ſimulato numine mœchus.
Mox patre deterior ſilveſtri habitator Olympi
Juppiter, inceſta ſpurcavit labe Lacænas (10).

(9) Apollon. lib. 2. ver. 1237.

(10) Prudent. *in Symmach.* lib. 1. ver. 56.

" Whom baniſh'd Saturn, in a horſe's ſhape,
" Brought to fair Italy. He firſt debauch'd
" The lovely Tuſcan Maids, in that diſguiſe.
" Great Jove, his ſon, acted ſtill worſe than he,
" And with the Spartan Dames committed inceſt."

This is likely enough: for, as has been obſerved elſewhere (11), when Kings of a lewd diſpoſition are ſent into baniſhment, this does not prove a remedy to their paſſion. By the way, this paſſage of Prudentius does not agree with the following verſes:

(11) In the text of the article BASINA, in the text, after the citation (*a*).

Credo pudicitiam Saturno Rege moratam
In terris viſamque diu, cum frigida parvas
Præberet ſpelunca domos, ignemque laremque
Et pecus & dominos communi clauderet umbra (12).

(12) Juvenal, Sat. 6. *init.*

" In Saturn's reign, at nature's early birth,
" There was that thing call'd chaſtity on earth,
" When in a narrow cave, their common ſhade,
" The Sheep, the Shepherds, and their Gods were laid:
" When reeds and leaves and hides of beaſts were ſpread
" By mountain-houſewives, for their homely bed,
" And moſſy pillows rais'd for the rude huſband's head." DRYDEN.

[*C*] *Her grief . . . . . obliged her to beſeech the Gods to change her into ſome other being.*] Hyginus ſays, that ſhe addreſſed Jupiter: but as Apollonius obſerves that Chiron was born during the infancy of Jupiter, it is more natural to ſuppoſe, that Philyra had not recourſe to him expreſsly, it not being probable, that ſhe ſtaid till he had expelled Saturn, and ſeized on the Empire of the Skies. *Philyra poſtquam inuſitatam ſpeciem ſe peperiſſe vidit, petit ab Jove at ſe in aliam ſpeciem commutaret, quæ in arborem Philyram, hoc eſt tilliam commutata eſt* (3). i. e. " Philyra perceiving that ſhe " had been delivered of a monſter, implored Jupiter " to transform her into ſome other being, and ac- " cordingly ſhe was metamorphoſed into a Lime-tree."

(13) Hyginus, cap. 138.

PHILLA, one of the moſt illuſtrious Ladies of antiquity, was the daughter of Antipater, Governor of Macedon in Alexander's abſence. She was a woman of fine ſenſe, and abilities, which enabled her to ſhare in affairs of Government (*a*). She behaved with ſo

(*a*) Diod. Sicul. lib. 19. cap. 59. p. m. 1013.

ſo much dexterity, in managing the various tempers of thoſe whom it was neceſſary to reduce, or keep to, their allegiance, that ſhe prevented an army, compoſed entirely of factious and turbulent men, from making an inſurrection. She married ſuch maidens as were poor at her own expence; and oppoſed, with ſo much vigour, thoſe who oppreſſed the innocent, that ſhe entirely freed and ſecured many perſons who were going to be ruined by ſlanderers. Her abilities were not the effect of experience; for, when but a young maiden, Antipater her father, one of the wiſeſt politicians of his time (*b*), uſed to conſult her on affairs of the higheſt importance. We ſhould know the particulars of this Princeſs's capacity (*c*), had all the books of Diodorus Siculus been tranſmitted to us; but thoſe parts of his hiſtory which treated of this are loſt. Philla's firſt huſband (*d*) was Craterus (*e*), who was better beloved by the Macedonians than any of Alexander's Captains. After Craterus's death ſhe married Demetrius (*f*), and was indeed her ſecond huſband's chief wife [*A*], but had no great ſhare in his affection. Demetrius was a voluptuous Prince (*g*), who kept, at one and the ſame time, many miſtreſſes, ſome of whom had been common ſtrumpets. He was diſguſted at Philla, upon pretence that he was younger than ſhe (*h*): and at the ſame time was diſtractedly fond of the Courtezan Lamia, whoſe charms were upon the decline (*i*). Philla came to a tragical end: for hearing that Demetrius had loſt his dominions, ſhe had not courage enough to ſee him in his miſerable, fugitive condition; but poiſoned herſelf, at the ſame time curſing her huſband's (*k*) fortune, whoſe injuries to him exceeded her favours (*l*). She had brought him one ſon (*m*); and a daughter, the famous Stratonice (*n*), wife of Seleucus, whom Seleucus reſigned to his ſon Antiochus (*o*). A niece of hers ſoon ſupplied her room [*B*].

(*b*) Diod. Sic. lib. 19. cap. 59. p. 1014.

(*c*) See Diod. Sicul. ibid.

(*d*) Idem, ibid. p. 1013.

(*e*) Plut. *in* Demetrio, p. 895, *A*.

(*f*) Diod. Sicul. and Plut. ibid.

(*g*) Plut. *in* Demetrio, p. 895. *A*.

(*h*) Idem, ibid. p. 902, *C*.

(*i*) *Vide* rem. [*C*] of the art. LAMIA, the Courtezan.

(*k*) Plut. *in* Demetrio, p. 911.

(*l*) Μισήσασα τὴν τύχην αὐτῆ βεβαιοτέραν ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς ὖσαν ἢ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, πιοῦσα φάρμακον ἀπέθανε. *Fortunam ejus execrata quæ in adverſitatibus eſſet quam ſecundis rebus ſtabilior, atque hauſto veneno extincta eſt.* Plut. *in* Demetrio, p. 911.

(*m*) Idem, p. 906, *E*. His name was Antigonus, Idem, ibid. p. 915.

(*n*) Idem, ibid. p. 903, *D*.

(*o*) Idem, ibid. p. 907.

[*A*] *She was her ſecond huſband's chief wife.*] He had ſeveral at the ſame time: our Philla; Eurydice deſcended from Miltiades, and widow of Orpheltes, King of Cyrene (1): Deidamia, daughter of Æacides King of Epirus, and Pyrrhus's ſiſter (2). Of all theſe wives, Philla was moſt eſteemed, and enjoyed the greateſt authority. I wiſh the Author, who informs me of this, had aſcribed this diſtinction to the ſuperior merit of this Lady, and not merely to the glory of Antipater and Craterus. Πολλαῖς ἅμα συνῆν γυναιξὶν ὧν ἀξίωμα μέγιστον εἶχε καὶ τιμὴν Φίλλα, διὰ Ἀντίπατρον τὸν πατέρα, καὶ διὰ τὸ προσυνῳκηκέναι Κρατερῷ. *Multas uno tempore conjuges habebat* (Demetrius) *quarum erat maxima in dignatione & honore Phila, tum propter patrem Antipatrum, tum quòd etiam matrimonio juncta fuiſſet Cratero* (3). I don't doubt but that Antigonus made choice of her for his daughter-in-law, from the conſideration that ſhe was a conſiderable match, for the two reaſons juſt mentioned. Demetrius was vaſtly averſe to this match, becauſe of the diſparity of his age and that of his intended bride; but his father whiſpered in his ear a paſſage, with a little alteration, from Euripides, the ſenſe of which is, that a man ought to marry a rich wife, be his reluctance ever ſo great. Ἀπροθύμως δ' ἔχοντι, λέγεται πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν Εὐριπίδειον εἰπεῖν, Ὅπου τὸ κέρδος, παρὰ φύσιν γαμητέον. ὁμοιόπτωτόν τι τῷ δηλευτέον εὐθυρρήμονήσας. *Abhorrenti vero dicitur in aurem hoc Euripideum inſuſurraſſe,*

Ubi lucrum ſuadet, reluctetur licet
Natura, ducas conjugem.

Ubi Ducas conjugem, pro Servias, ſcitè ſubjecit (4). It is very probable that Demetrius had an eſteem for Philla, and gave her outward marks of his eſteem, but never made uſe of her for his pleaſures. I am to obſerve, that he deputed her to Caſſander, to juſtify his conduct with regard to Pliſtarchus, who made heavy complaints about him (5). This ſhews that he judged his wife well qualified for negotiations. I likewiſe muſt obſerve, that he was greatly exaſperated at the Rhodians, for giving the King of Egypt a veſſel they had taken, on board of which was the letter which Philla wrote to him, and the rich things ſhe ſent to him (6).

[*B*] *A niece of hers ſoon ſupplied her room.*] She was daughter of Ptolemy and Eurydice, Philla's ſiſter, and was named Ptolemais (7). She had been betrothed to Demetrius in Philla's life-time (8). He had a ſon by her named Demetrius, who was King of Cyrene (9). This doubtleſs is the ſame whom I mentioned in the article ARSINOE.

(1) Plut. *in* Demetrio, p. 894, *E*.

(2) Idem, ibid. p. 900, *B*.

(3) Idem, ibid. 894, 895.

(4) Idem, ibid. p. 895.

(5) Idem, ibid. p. 904, *A*.

(6) Idem, ibid. p. 898. Diod. Sicul. lib. 20. cap. 94.

(7) Idem, ibid. p. 911, *F*.

(8) Idem, ibid. p. 904.

(9) Idem, ibid. p. 915.

PHILOMELUS, General of the Phoceans, in the beginning of the ſacred war, as it is called, could not find a better expedient to oppoſe the enemies of his country [*A*], than by ſeizing on the Temple of Delphi. He went to Lacedæmonia to communicate his deſign to Archidamus (*a*), who anſwered, that he could not aſſiſt him openly in that enterprize, but promiſed to furniſh him with men and money ſecretly. Philomelus, with this ſuccour, made himſelf maſter of the Temple, and put to the ſword all thoſe who made the leaſt reſiſtance. He was invaded ſoon after by the Locrians, and defeated them: he was flushed to ſuch a degree with this victory, that he took the decrees made by the Amphictyones out of the Temple of Delphi, and forced the Prieſteſs to pronounce the oracle to him. The anſwer he received from it could not fail of pleaſing him; it declaring, that it permitted him to ſucceed in all things he might have a mind to. He procured an authentick inſtrument of this Oracle, and had it read publickly, that the world might know, that he could act, from that time, under the authority and with the approbation of a God, in whatſoever he might undertake. He ſent Embaſſadors to all the nations of Greece. The Athenians and Lacedæmonians made an alliance with him [*B*]: but the Thebans and others entered into a league againſt him, which gave riſe to the

(*a*) He was King of Lacedæmonia.

[*A*] *The enemies of his country.*] Theſe were the Thebans, who had cauſed the Senate of the Amphictyones, to ſentence the Phoceans to pay an exorbitant fine; and were going to paſs a decree, that in caſe the Phoceans did not pay it, their lands ſhould be confiſcated for the benefit of Apollo (1).

[*B*] *The Athenians and Lacedæmonians made an alliance with him.*] We learn from this hiſtory, one of the political cuſtoms of governments. The Reader has already ſeen (2), that the King of Lacedæmonia, ſo far from diſſuading Philomelus from invading the Temple of Delphi, encouraged him, and furniſhed him with ſuccours for that purpoſe. However, he managed things in ſuch a manner, that no proof could be

(1) Diod. Sicul. lib. 16. cap. 23.

(2) In the text of this article.

the ſacred war. Philomelus did not offer to touch the treaſures of the Temple; but contented himſelf with laying heavy taxes on the inhabitants of Delphi, who had enriched themſelves with the ſums which the Devotees of other nations had left there. He took the field with a powerful army, and defeated the Locrians. As this victory ſwelled his courage, and depreſſed that of the vanquiſhed, ſo it raiſed him a greater number of enemies. Finding himſelf reduced to the neceſſity of oppoſing them with a greater force, he no longer had the regard he till then had ſhewn for the Temple [C], but took away many treaſures from it. Having promiſed very great pay to all ſuch mercenaries or foreigners as ſhould enliſt themſelves under him, he raiſed a conſiderable body of forces without much difficulty, notwithſtanding that conſcientious people refuſed to fight under

be brought, of his having openly eſpouſed Philomelus's quarrel; but took care, not to let it appear, that the Government was any way concerned in the ſuccours of men and money which he furniſhed the Phocean General. As the ſucceſs of this enterprize was not certain, prudence ſuggeſted to the Lacedæmonian Monarch, that it would not be adviſeable in him to hazard the glory of his country, by engaging publickly in meaſures which claſhed with the intereſt of religion; but as the invaſion of this Temple might be of prejudice to the people (3), who were at that time the moſt dreaded by all their neighbours, policy ſuggeſted, that it would be for their intereſt to favour the impious deſign of thoſe who intended to ſubdue the Oracle of Delphos. Such were the grounds of the Lacedæmonian Monarch's conduct. But after that the deſign was executed, they pulled off the maſk, and concluded an alliance publickly with Philomelus, though they knew they ſhould be attacked by a people, who would declare, that the ſole motive of their taking up arms was, to ſet the Oracle of Delphos at liberty, and puniſh the impiety and ſacrilegious actions of the Phoceans. The Citizens of Athens and Lacedæmonia were the readieſt, and diſcovered the greateſt warmth, in aſſiſting the uſurpers of the temple, as well during the life of Philomelus, who firſt plundered it, as during the adminiſtration of his ſucceſſors, who profaned all its treaſures, thoſe antient and rich monuments of the piety of ſo many Nations and Princes. Nevertheleſs, both the Athenians and Lacedæmonians pretended a mighty zeal for religion; and were greatly obſervant of feſtivals, vows and offerings. Wo be to the man, who ſhould preſume to argue againſt, or inculcate any thing in oppoſition to the worſhip of the Gods: the greateſt Philoſopher that ever lived in the world, would have run the hazard of his life, had he been ſo bold as to do this. How comes it therefore to paſs, that the Phoceans found ſo ſtrong a ſupport, and ſuch faithful allies, in theſe two cities, after the commiſſion of an impious action; after having profaned and deſtroyed the greateſt object of the devotion of all the Grecians, and even of the Barbarians? The reaſon is this: it would have been impoſſible to have puniſhed the Phoceans for their impiety, without raiſing the power and glory of the Thebans to a more exalted pitch than ever it had attained. Now the political intereſt of the Athenians and Lacedæmonians required, that the Theban power ſhould be weakned, though the intereſt of religion required, that the Phoceans ſhould be chaſtized, yet the Nations abovementioned thought it more prudent to ſupport them; and therefore they joined with them, againſt the Theban chiefs, in a kind of cruſade, raiſed for the ſetting free of Apollo. The temporal good of States has, in all ages, been preferred to that of religion.

(3) The Thebans.

Diodorus Siculus obſerves, that the Phoceans furniſhed the Athenians and Lacedæmonians, with more ſubſidies than was neceſſary for the payment of the troops (4). This therefore was not a chargeable alliance, but then it was a very ſcandalous one; it being plain to the whole world, that the Athenians and Lacedæmonians ſhared in the profit ariſing from the ſacrilege. Theſe furniſhed the Phoceans with troops, and received from them ſuch ſubſidies as were more than ſufficient for the payment of the troops. There was another affair, which made the world inveigh againſt the Athenians. Dionyſius the Sicilian Tyrant was ſending into Greece ſome ſtatues of gold and ivory, which he intended to conſecrate to the temples of Delphi and Jupiter Olympius. Iphicrates commanded at that time a fleet of the Athenians near Corcyra. He took, among other ſhips, thoſe which carried thoſe ſtatues, and aſked his Superiors, in what manner he ſhould diſpoſe of them. The people being aſſembled on this propoſal, made a decree, by which Iphicrates was commanded not to examine ſo ſtrictly thoſe matters which related to the Gods; but to take the utmoſt care of the ſubſiſtence of the forces. Περιτυχὼν ταῖς κομιζόσαις αὐτὰ ναυσὶν ὁ Ἰφικράτης ϗ κραλήσας αὐτῶν, διεπέμψατο πρὸς τὸν δῆμον, ἐπερωτῶν τί χρὴ πράτ͂ειν, οἱ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι προσέταξαν αὐτῷ μὴ τὰ τῶν Θεῶν ἐξελάζειν, ἀλλὰ σκοπεῖν ὅπως ϛρατιώτας διατρέψῃ (5). *Iphicrates in naves, quæ dona votiva portabant, fortè fortuna incidens, in poteſtatem redactas Athenas mitteret, cum hac ſciſcitatione, quid facto nunc opus eſſet? populuſque contra, non ſcrupulosè Deorum res examinare, ſed quomodo militem alat, providere ipſum juberet.* He underſtood the meaning of theſe words ſo well, that he ſold the ſtatues; as likewiſe all the reſt of the effects which the Privateers had ſeized upon. The Athenians were very ſtrongly inveighed againſt on that account (6); and Diodorus obſerves, that they plundered in this manner Apollo both by ſea and land, though they recognized him for their founder. He alſo takes notice of the odd humour of the Lacedæmonians. The inhabitants of this city declared, that they owed their glory and proſperity to the Oracles of Apollo; and nevertheleſs, they made a confederacy with thoſe impious people who plundered the temple of Delphi. Such is the way of the world, and ſuch it will ever be. Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν οὖν περὶ τὸ θεῖον τοιαῦτα ἔπραξαν, ϗ ταῦτ' εὐχόμενοι τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα πατρῷον αὐτῶν εἶναι ϗ πρόγονον. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ τῷ περὶ Δελφοὺς μαντείῳ χρησάμενοι, ϗ τὴν θαυμαζομένην παρὰ πᾶσι πολιτείαν διὰ τοῦτο κτησάμενοι, ϗ περὶ τῶν μεγίσων ἔτι ϗ νῦν τὸν θεὸν ἐπερωτῶντες, ἐτόλμησαν τοῖς τὸ ἱερὸν συλήσασι κοινωνῆσαι τῆς παρανομίας. *Hæc tum Athenienſes in Numen committere non verebantur, qui tamen Apollinem Deum patrium & progenitorem ſuum eſſe gloriari ſolebant. Lacedæmonii etiam, quamvis Rempublicam ſuam cunctis gentibus admirabilem Delphici oraculi conſilio inſtituiſſent, deque rebus maximis (ut ad hanc uſque tempeſtatem factitant) Dei voluntatem exquirerent, cum profligatiſſimis tamen fani expilatoribus ſacrilegæ impietatis ſocietatem inire non dubitant* (7).

(4) Diod. Sicul. lib. 16. cap. 58.

(5) Idem, ibid. p. 453. The Latin Tranſlation of theſe words is, in the 8vo edition, in p. 781.

(6) See in Diod. Sicul. ibid. the letter which the Tyrant Dionyſius wrote to him.

(7) Idem, ibid.

[C] *He no longer had the regard he till then had ſhewn for the temple.*] Here follows a citation from Diodorus Siculus. Ὁ Φιλόμηλος ἤκμασε μισθοφόρων ἀθροίζειν πλῆθος, προσδεομένῳ δὲ τοῦ πολέμου χρημάτων, πλειόνων ἠνεγκάζετο τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀναθήμασιν ἐπιβαλεῖν τὰς χεῖρας ϗ συλᾶν τὸ μαντεῖον (8). *Philomelus majore conductitii militis robore ſe confirmare ſtatuit. At quia majores bellum ſumptus flagitabat, donariis ſacris manus injicere coactus, templum deprædatur* (9). This is declaring very expreſsly, that Philomelus did not ſhare the treaſures and gifts of the temple of Delphi: and yet Diodorus Siculus affirms the direct contrary in the ſame book. I don't know whether this contradiction had been obſerved before. Τῶν δὲ προγεγενημένων ϛρατηγῶν ὁ μὲν πρῶτος ἄρξας Φιλόμηλος ἀπίσχετο τῶν ἀναθημάτων, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος προσαγορευόμενος μὲν Ὀνόμαρχος ἀδελφὸς δὲ ὢν Φιλομήλα πλεῖϛα τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ χρημάτων καθιεδαπάνησε, τρίτος δὲ Φάυλλος ὁ ἀδελφὸς Ὀνομάρχα ϛρατηγήσας οὐκ ὀλίγα τῶν ἀναθημάτων κατένοψεν εἰς τὰς τῶν ξένων μισθοφοράς (10). *Priorum ſanè ducum, qui primus imperium geſſerat, Philomelus à ſacris templi donariis ſe continuerat, ſucceſſor verò ejus & frater Onomarchus plurimum de conſecratis Deo ad belli ſumptus convertit. Tertius inde Phayllus Onomarchi frater, dum Prætoris munere fungitur, non pauca de repoſitis in templo, ad perſolvendum conductitiis ſtipendia, concidit* (11).

(8) Diod. Sicul. lib. 16. p. 430, 431. edition Hanov. 1604.

(9) Thoſe who have only the Latin edition, in 8vo, in 1611, will find this in cap. 30. lib. 16. p. 759.

(10) Idem, Diodorus, ibid. p. 452.

(11) Page 780, of the 8vo edit.

[D] *Con-*

under his banners [*D*]. He now marched into the enemy's country, and was ſucceſsful in the firſt engagements; but, not long after, he was obliged to maintain a running fight, in craggy places; when ſeeing it would be impoſſible for him to fly, and being reſolved not to be taken priſoner, he threw himſelf headlong from a rock. He was ſucceeded by Onomarchus his brother, who was afterwards ſucceeded by Phayllus, his other brother, who both carried off the remaining treaſures of the Temple. They behaved with ſome caution at firſt; but at laſt they completed the plunder of it; the Athenians and Lacedæmonians ſtill continuing their allies (*b*). Theſe tranſactions happened in the time of Philip of Macedon, Father to Alexander the Great. The Hiſtorian, who relates theſe particulars, does not omit the tragical end of thoſe who committed thoſe ſacrilegious actions [*E*].

He even obſerves, that divine juſtice purſued, with great ſeverity, thoſe women who preſumed to adorn themſelves with the ornaments which their huſbands had forced out of the Temple of Delphi (*c*); but he does not mention a female-dancer, to whom a preſent of this kind was very fatal [*F*]. Juſtin obſerves, that though the whole world had this action of the Phoceans in the utmoſt deteſtation, they yet were not ſo much hated as thoſe who (*d*) reduced them to that neceſſity (*e*). People's envy or hatred with regard to an infamous action, is generally divided after this manner, which diſtribution is not very unjuſt: for, thoſe who force a man to attempt a deſperate action, act with greater liberty than he. Pauſanias makes a remark which it may not be improper to mention here. Philomelus, ſays he, having adviſed the Phoceans to plunder the Temple of Delphi, and having employed ſeveral plauſible reaſons to prompt them to it, perſuaded them very ſtrongly to attempt it; whether God had blinded them, or that they, from their own natures, preferred gain to religion (*f*). He informs us (*g*), that Philomelus was a native of Ledon a city of Phocis, and that the Temple was plundered the 4th year of the 105th Olympiad.

(*b*) Extracted from Diod. Sicul. lib. 16. cap. 23. *& ſeq. ad Olympiadem* 106.

(*c*) See the cloſe of the rem. [*A*], of the art. CALLIRRHOE, and the rem. [*S*] of the art. HELENA.

(*d*) The Thebans.

(*e*) Juſtin. lib. 8. cap. 1.

(*f*) Εἴτε τὴν γνώμην σφίσι τῷ Θεῷ βλάπτοντος, εἴτε καὶ αὐτοῖς πεφυκόσιν ἐπίπροσθεν εὐσεβείας τὰ κέρδη ποιεῖσθαι. *Sive quod mentem Deus à rectis conſiliis avertiſſet, ſeu quod is populus ſuapte natura religioni ſolitus eſſet quæſtum anteponere.* Pauſanias, Lib. 10. p. 318.

(*g*) Idem, ibid. p. 317.

[*D*] *Conſcientious people refuſed to fight under his banners.*] Τῶν μὲν δὴ ἐπιεικῶν ἀνδρῶν οὐδεὶς ἀπεγράψατο πρὸς τὴν στρατείαν διὰ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν· οἱ δὲ πονηρότατοι καὶ θεῶν διὰ τὴν πλεονεξίαν καταφρονοῦντες, προθύμως συνέτρεχον πρὸς τὸν Φιλόμηλον. *i. e.* "No man of virtue "would enliſt under him, becauſe the principles of "religion forbids this, whilſt every wicked wretch, "deſpiſing the Gods for the ſake of gain, was extremely deſirous of ſerving under Philomelus."

(12) Diod. Sicul. lib. 16. cap. 30. p. 759. edit. 8vo.

[*E*] *Diodorus Siculus does not omit the tragical end of thoſe who committed thoſe ſacrilegious actions.*] This obſervation of the Hiſtorian (13) ought not to be looked upon as ſuperſtitious; for though the temple of Delphi was conſecrated to a falſe God, it was nevertheleſs an impiety and a ſacrilegious action in thoſe who plundered it, and ſuppoſed Apollo to be a true God. I confeſs that the true God only can change the nature of profane things, and thoſe cannot become ſacred, but by his inſtitution. Thus all the gifts, which had been conſecrated in the temple of Delphi, remained in their firſt ſtate. The golden tiles, which King Crœſus conſecrated there (14), were nothing but gold; it was equally lawful to coin them into money, as an ingot that came from the mine; this, I ſay, was equally allowable, with regard to thoſe who were not of the heathen religion; but any man who ſuppoſed that the gifts of the temple were conſecrated to God, could not ſeize upon it, without being guilty of a ſacrilegious action; properly ſo called, which the true God, the ſole infallible judge of the quality of actions, and the only diſpenſer of rewards and puniſhments, thought fit to puniſh. I ſpeak of the puniſhments which the Jews would have deſerved, had they plundered the temple of Solomon (15).

(13) *Ubi ſupra*, cap. 57. p. 779, 780.

(14) Diod. Sicul. lib. 16. cap. 57. p. 780.

That the Reader may know what conſiderable votaries the antient Heathens were, with regard to their falſe Gods, I will obſerve by the way, that the gold and ſilver of which the temple was deſpoiled on this occaſion, and which was turned into current money, amounted to ten (16) thouſand talents (17). Some Authors relate, that the ſums which the Phoceans took out of it, equalled thoſe which Alexander found afterwards in the Exchequer of King Darius (18).

[*F*] *He does not mention a female-dancer, to whom a preſent of this kind was very fatal.*] That is a preſent taken from the ſpoils of the temple of Delphi. Our Philomelus gave the golden crown of the Cnidans to Pharſalia the female-dancer. A fine allotment this, and very agreeable to the end which the Cnidans had propoſed to themſelves! *Non hos quæſitum munus in uſus.* What a leap was this, from the arch of a temple, to the head of ſuch a woman! However this be, the female-dancer had an ill bargain of it. She went from Greece into Italy; and as ſhe was one day dancing at Metapontum, in the temple of Apollo, a company of young men flew to her crown; and fought ſo eagerly to get it, that they tore Pharſalia to pieces. This incident is related by Plutarch (19).

(15) See *Penſees ſur les Cometes*, num. 118. See alſo the following words of Seneca, cap. 7. lib. 7. *of Benefits. Injuriam ſacrilegus Deo quidem non poteſt facere, quem extra ictum ſua divinitas poſuit: ſed punitur, quia tanquam Deo fecit. Opinio illum noſtra, ac ſua, obligat pœnæ.* i. e. "A ſacrilegious "man cannot do "any injury to "God, he, by "his divinity, "being placed a"bove the reach "of men; ne"verthleſs he "is puniſhed, be"cauſe he at"tempted to in"jure God. Our "own opinion, "and his alſo, "renders us ob"noxious to pu"niſhment."

(16) About twenty millions, French money. (17) Diod. Sicul. lib. 16. cap. 57. (18) Ibid. (19) Plut. *de Pythiæ Oraculis*, p. 397, 398.

PHILO. Peter Bellier, Doctor of Laws, wrote a French verſion of part of Philo's works, and dedicated it to Mr. de Chiverni, Chancellor of France. This work was reviſed, corrected, and enlarged, with three books tranſlated from the original Greek, by Frederic Morel, Dean of the King's Readers and Interpreters, and then was reprinted at Paris in 1612, 8vo, and dedicated by Mr. Morel, to Philip Huraut, Biſhop of Chartres, ſon of the Chancellor of Chiverni.

PHLEGON, ſirnamed *Trallianus* (*a*), wrote ſeveral works, very little of which are now extant [*A*]. He was the Emperor Hadrian's freed-man. Thoſe who think he was manu-

(*a*) This ſignifies a native of Trallis, a city of Lydia.

(1) Suidas, *in* Φλέγων.

(2) Idem, ibid.

(3) Photius, *Bibliotb.* num. 975. p. 265.

(4) Suidas, *in* Φλέγων. *Anonymus in deſcript. Olym.*

[*A*] *He wrote ſeveral works, very little of which is now extant.*] He wrote a hiſtory of the Olympiads divided into 16 books (1). It was an univerſal hiſtory (2) beginning at the firſt Olympiad (3), and ending at the 229th (4). It is ſometimes cited under the name of Olympiads, and ſometimes under that of Chronicles. Photius joins theſe two titles together, ἀναγινώσθη, ſays he (5), Φλέγοντος Τραλλιανοῦ . . . ὀλυμπιονικῶν καὶ χρονικῶν συναγωγή. *i. e.* "I have read the "collection of Olympiads and Chronicles by Phle"gon Trallianus." Origen (6) and Maximus (7) have cited it under the title of Chronicles; as alſo Ste-

(5) Phot. *Bibl.* n. 971, p. 265.

(6) Origines, lib. 2. *contra Celſum.*

(7) Maximus, *in Schol. ad Dionyſii Areopagitæ Epiſt.* 7. *apud Meurſium Not. ad Phlegontem*, p. 170.

phanus

manumized by Auguſtus (*b*), had never peruſed his works. He lived, at leaſt, as long as the 18th year of the Empire of Antoninus Pius (*c*), he mentioning the Conſuls of that year (*d*), which is 142 years after Auguſtus's death. He had a freed-man, who was an Author [*B*]. It is thought that the Hiſtory of Hadrian, publiſhed under Phlegon's name, was writ by Hadrian himſelf [*C*]. Phlegon ſpeaks as being an eye-witneſs to the reſurrection of a young woman (*e*). Conſult Tillemont (*f*). It is ſaid that he ſpoke of the darkneſs which prevailed during our Lord's paſſion [*D*]. Photius blames him

(*b*) Suidas in Φλέγων, mentions this.

(*c*) The year of our Lord 156.

(*d*) Phleg. *de Rebus mirabilib.* cap. 10.

(*e*) Phleg. *de Rebus mirab.* cap. 1.

(*f*) Tellemont. *Hiſt. de Empereurs*, Tom. 1. p. 467. Bruſſels edit.

phanus Byzantinus (8), but he has cited much oftner under the title of Olympiads. Salmaſius was of opinion, that Phlegon's Chronicles were, perhaps, a ſeparate work, and divided into eight books (9); but would he have ſaid this, had he conſidered the title quoted by Photius, and the citations found in Origen and Maximus? The former cites the 13th and 14th book of the Chronicles, and the latter the 14th; to prove, by the teſtimony of a Heathen, the ſame incidents which Euſebius relates (10), as contained in the 13th book of Phlegon's Olympiads. I do not think that the following words of Suidas, τὰ πραχθέντα παντα χοῦ, *i. e.* "an Univerſal Hiſtory," ſhould be ſeparated from what goes before, and referred only to what follows; they agreeing perfectly well with the Hiſtory of the Olympiads, which he had ſpoke of juſt before. But if I deviate from Salmaſius's (11) opinion in that, I do not differ from it in this, *viz.* that we muſt ſuppoſe that Suidas meant, that Phlegon compoſed another book, divided into eight books, which alſo contained τὰ πραχθέντα παντα χοῦ, *i. e.* "an Univerſal Hiſtory," It happens pretty often, that a general hiſtory is written after different methods, by the ſame Author. Photius, who had read the firſt five books of Phlegon's Olympiads (12), gives a ſummary of the 177th Olympiad, where they ended. We may form a judgment of the whole piece from this ſpecimen, and we muſt own with Voſſius, that were this Chronicle extant, it might be of very great advantage in explaining a great number of particulars; but this does not prove that Photius did wrong in condemning the trifling particulars on which Phlegon expatiated, and ſuch a detail as tired the Readers, and clouded the moſt memorable incidents (13); and therefore we may juſtly cenſure ſome part of the following paſſage in Voſſius. *Non penitus probare poſſum quod idem* (Photius) *reprehendit anxiam illam curam in Olympiadibus recenſendis, atque iis annotandis quæ ſingularum tempore contigerunt. Imo vero utinam totum Chronicon extaret. Multum enim lucis abſque dubio priſcæ inde Eccleſiæ temporibus accederet*, i. e. "I cannot entirely approve Photius, for cenſuring the great diligence employed in giving an account of the Olympiads, and in taking notice of the ſeveral tranſactions which came to paſs under each of them. Wou'd that the entire Chronicle were extant; for this doubtleſs would throw great lights over the hiſtory of the primitive church." Photius's words, which I ſhall quote in the remark [*E*], will ſhew, that what he cenſured, was not juſtly repreſented by Voſſius. All that exiſts of this work of Phlegon, is a fragment which does not take up quite ſix pages in the Leyden edition of 1622, 4to. This treatiſe περὶ μακροβίων, *i. e.* "of perſons who have lived to a very advanced age," is ſhort enough; and there is great room to ſuppoſe that we have it not entire (15); it not making any mention of certain illuſtrious perſons who lived to a very great age. As to his treatiſe περὶ θαυμασίων, *i. e.* "of wonderful things," it contains 135 chapters, moſt of them very ſhort, and the beginning is imperfect. Theſe are the broken remains of Phlegon's works. Xylander tranſlated them into Latin, and publiſhed them at Baſil, with the Greek, and with notes, in 1568. Meurſius, in 1622, gave a new edition of them, with his notes, at Leyden. Suidas gives the titles of parts of the reſt of Phlegon's writings.

(8) *Vide Meurſium*, ibid. p. 169.

(9) Salmaſius, *in Spartian. Hiſt. Adrian.* cap. 16. p. m. 151. Tom. 1.

(10) See the rem. [*D*].

(11) Salmaſius, *in Spartian. Hiſt. Adrian.* cap. 16. p. m. 151. Tom. 1.

(12) Phot. *Bibl.* num. 97. p. 268.

(13) I cite Photius's words in the rem. [*E*].

(14) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græcis*, lib. 2. cap. 11. p. m. 219.

(15) Voſſius, *ubi ſupra*.

[*B*] *He had a freed-man who was an Author.*] This is manifeſt from the following words of Spartianus: *Legiſſe me apud Ælium Maurum Phlegontis Tralliani libertum memini, Septimium Severum immoderatiſſime cum moveretur lætatum quod duos Antoninos pari imperio reipublicæ relinqueret* (16), i. e. "I have read in Ælius "Maurus, Phlegon Trallianus's freed-man, that "Septimius Severus, in his expiring moments, diſcovered prodigious joy, becauſe he left two Anto"nius's equal ſharers in the Empire." Andreas Schottus affirms, without any good reaſon for it, that there is an error in this paſſage, and that we ſhould read them thus, *apud Ælii Hadriani libertum Phlegontem Trallianum* (17), i. e. "in Phlegon Trallianus, "the freed-man of Ælius Hadrianus." He is ſurprized that the Criticks had not yet made this correction: *quod mendum magnos ævi noſtri Criticos fugiſſe, quos nihil pæne fugit, equidem miror: ſed & poſteris ſpicas relinquunt non inviti* (18). His ſurprize is ill grounded; for it is no ways probable that Spartianus cited Phlegon in that place. How could any perſon ſuppoſe, that this freed-man of Hadrian ſurvived Severus, who died ſeventy-four years after Hadrian? See Voſſius, who employed this chronological reaſon againſt Andreas Schottus (19). The printers have committed a great many errors in that place (20).

(16) Ælius Spartianus, *in vita Severi*, cap. 20. p. m. 632. Tom. 1.

(17) Andr. Schottus, *Obſ. humanar.* lib. 2. cap. 19. p. 57.

(18) Idem, ibid.

(19) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* lib. 2. cap. 2. p. 176.

(20) They have twice printed *Trullanus*, inſtead of *Trallianus*. They have put *anno*, inſtead of *uno*; and omitted ſeveral words.

[*C*] *It is thought that the hiſtory of Hadrian, publiſhed under Phlegon's name, was writ by Hadrian himſelf.*] I have already made this remark in another place (21); but will repeat it here, and add Spartianus's own words: *Famæ celebris Adrianus tam cupidus fuit, ut libros vitæ ſuæ ſcriptos à ſe libertis ſuis literatis dederit, jubens ut eos ſuis nominibus publicarent: nam Phlegontis libri Adriani eſſe dicuntur* (22), "Adrian thirſted ſo "much after fame, that he gave the books of his "own life, drawn up by himſelf, to his freed-men, "commanding them to publiſh thoſe books under "their own names; for we are told, that Adrian "wrote Phlegon's books." Theſe words have been miſtaken by a German Author, who writes as follows: *Eos* (libros de mirabilibus, Olympiadibus, & longævis) *tanti æſtimavit Hadrianus, famæ percelebris cupidus, ut pro ſuis venditarit, ut colligere licet ex Ælio Spartiano* in Vita Hadriani (23), *i. e.* "Hadrian, "who had a ſtrong thirſt of fame, ſo highly eſteem"ed the books concerning wonderful things, the O"lympiads, and perſons who had lived to a very ad"vanced age, that he pretended them to be of his own "writing, as may be inferred from Hadrian's life, in "Ælius Spartianus." How ſtrangely are Spartianus's words perverted! The Author ſuppoſes that the Emperor Hadrian put his name to Phlegon's books; and cites, to prove his aſſertion, an Author who ſays that Hadrian put Phlegon's name to his own works. I muſt not leave this ſubject, without animadverting on an error of Moreri; few committed by him ſtand in greater need of correction. *Phlegon*, ſays he, *the Emperor Adrian's freed-man, had a great ſhare in the friendſhip of this Prince, who publiſhed a Hiſtory of his Life under his name. It is he who relates, in his 14th book, that the 4th year of the 202d Olympiad, &c.* The conſtruction of theſe words is ſo bad, that a man muſt be a Conjurer to underſtand them. They imply, according to the laws of Grammar, that Hadrian ſet his name to the Hiſtory which he publiſhed of his Life; but this is falſe, and does not ſquare with Moreri's intentions. Now as theſe words are not written according to the grammatical laws of conſtruction, they may be underſtood, either as if the Emperor in queſtion had publiſhed the Hiſtory of Phlegon under Phlegon's name, or as if he had publiſhed it under his (Hadrian's) name. Here is another error. The conſtruction of the words above cited will make all Readers take them in the following ſenſe, that the event of the fourth year of the 202d Olympiad, is found in book 14, of the Hiſtory publiſhed by Adrian. But this is miſleading the Reader; for if he miſtakes this ſnare, he will fall into another, as he will ſuppoſe that Phlegon wrote but one work.

(21) Citat. (49) of the art. HADRIAN.

(22) Spartian. *in Adriano*, cap. 16. p. m. 1504

(23) Tobias Magirus, *Eponymol. Critic.* p. 659. edit. 1687.

[*D*] *It is ſaid, that he ſpoke of the darkneſs which prevailed during our Lord's paſſion.*] As the book in which theſe words are contained, is loſt, the beſt I can do is, to cite Euſebius's teſtimony: this Writer not

him for expatiating too much on trifles, and for collecting too great a number of anſwers pronounced

not ſaying, in a vague and random manner, that Phlegon advanced this or t'other, but quotes his own words: Γράφει δὲ καὶ λίγει ὁ τὰς Ολυμπιάδας . . . . . περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ ιγ, ῥήμασιν αὐτοῖς τάδε. τῷ δ" ἔτει τῆς σβ Ολυμπιάδ◎ ἐγένετο ἔκλειψις ἡλίᵾ μεγίστη τῶν γνωρισμένων πρότερον. καὶ νὺξ ὥρα ϛ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐγένετο, ὥστε καὶ ἀστέρας ἐν οὐρανῷ φανῆναι. σεισμός τε μέγας κατὰ Βιθυνίαν γενόμεν◎ τὰ πολλὰ Νικαίας κατεσκέψατο, καὶ ταῦτα ὁ δηλωθεὶς ἀνὴρ (24). It is according to St. *Jerom*'s verſion; *Scribit vero ſuper his & Phlegon qui Olympiadarum egregius ſupputator eſt, in tertio decimo libro ita dicens:* quarto autem anno 202 Olympiadis magna & excellens inter omnes quæ ante eam acciderant, defectio ſolis facta: dies hora ſexta in tenebroſam noctem verſus, ut ſtellæ in cœlo viſæ ſint, terræque motus in Bithynia Nicææ urbis multas ædes ſubverterit. *Hæc ſupradictus vir* (25). Thus the abovementioned Author writes. We find that Euſebius is of opinion, that theſe words of Phlegon are relative to the prodigies, which accompanied Chriſt's crucifixion. Many more antient fathers of the Church have thought the ſame; but this belief is liable to ſome difficulties, the chief of which I take to be the following. No man had ever a ſtronger deſire than Phlegon to compile marvellous events, and to obſerve the præternatural circumſtances in them (26). How was it poſſible, that a man of this turn of mind had not taken notice of the moſt ſurprizing circumſtance in the eclipſe which he is ſuppoſed to hint at, I mean, its happening on the day when the moon was at full? This objection was no doubt propoſed; and, in all probability, ſcarce thought that the beſt way of ſolving this would be, to affirm, that he had taken notice of this circumſtance. Φλέγων ἱστορεῖ ἐπὶ Τιβερίᵾ Καίσαρ◎ ἐν παντελήᵾ ἔκλειψιν ἡλίᵾ γεγονέναι. *Narrat Phlegon imperante Tiberio Cæſare ſolis eclipſin plenilunio contigiſſe* (27). Theſe words of Africanus are related by Syncellus, who poſitively aſſerts therein, that Phlegon relates there happened, under the Empire of Tiberius, a ſolar eclipſe at the time when the moon was at full. But Phlegon did not ſay ſo; had he done this, Euſebius would not have omitted it; and Origen would not have ſaid, that Phlegon had omitted this particular. *Et Phlegon quidam in Chronicis ſuis ſcripſit in principatu Tiberii Cæſaris factum: ſed non ſignificavit in luna plena factum* (28). If it be objected, that he did not ſay that the eclipſe in queſtion did not happen during the new moon (29), I anſwer, that he had no occaſion to ſay ſo, this being a thing to be ſuppoſed. Philoponus's obſervation is of no uſe, it being a falſe gloſs. He pretends that Phlegon, taking notice of an eclipſe, the like of which had never been obſerved before, intimated the darkneſs which prevailed at the time of Chriſt's paſſion. Ἐγένετο ἡλίᵾ ἔκλειψις ὰκ ἐγνωσμένων πρότερον . . . . μὴ ἐγνῶσθαι τὴν τοιαύτην ἔκλειψιν τοῖς πρότερον χρόνοις. *Contigit eclipſis ſolis cujuſmodi nulla ante cognita eſt . . . . . ſuperioribus non eſſe cognitam eclipſim hujuſmodi* (30). This Author diſcovers too ſtrong an inclination, to make people ſpeak in ſuch a manner, as ſuits the intereſt of his party, and that at the expence of truth. Phlegon did not ſay, in general, that this eclipſe was of a different nature from all thoſe which preceded it: ſuch a random way of expreſſion would bear ſeveral interpretations, and might be turned to the advantage of Philoponus's cauſe. He made uſe of a limited phraſe; he obſerved that this eclipſe, with regard to the dimenſions of it, exceeded thoſe which had been obſerved before it. We ſhall take in the whole force of that expreſſion, if we ſuppoſe that the eclipſe ſpoken of in that place, happened during the perigæum of the moon, and that it was central. Such an eclipſe is ſo ſeldom ſeen, that an Hiſtorian, who relates ſuch particulars according to the impreſſion they make on people's minds, and not according to the exact obſervations of an Aſtronomer, who has conſulted the ephemerides of all ages; ſuch an Hiſtorian, I ſay, might naturally have made the ſame remark as Phlegon. See what the French Hiſtorians obſerve with regard to the eclipſe of the 2d of October 1605.

It muſt be obſerved, that it is not certain, that Phlegon ſays, that the earthquake which threw down ſeveral houſes in the city of Nicææ, happened at the ſame time with the eclipſe. He perhaps only took notice, that theſe two events were obſerved the ſame year. A perſon who ſhould abſolutely inſiſt that he intimated the ſame day, will plunge himſelf into another difficulty; for he muſt ſuppoſe the light of the ſun diſappeared at noon-day in Bithynia; and conſequently, that the darkneſs which was at the time of our Lord's paſſion, over-ſpread the whole earth. This opinion has always been oppoſed by perſons who no ways intended to prejudice in any manner the orthodox faith (31), and is ſubject to a difficulty, the ſtrength of which is not eaſily combatted; for, how can we think it poſſible, in caſe this darkneſs happened all over the world (32), Phlegon would have been the only Writer, or almoſt the only one (33), who had ſpoke of it? We muſt call to mind, that Huetius (34) blames Kepler for aſſerting, that Phlegon's eclipſe ought to be fixed to the 24th of November of the 2d year of the 202d Olympiad §α.

[§α The queſtion whether *Phlegon* ſpoke of the darkneſs at the time of the paſſion of our Lord, was canvaſſed here about eight years ago in ſeveral diſſertations *pro* and *con*, occaſioned by the paſſage from Phlegon being left out in an edition of Dr. Clarke's Boyle's Lectures, publiſhed ſoon after his death. Mr. Whiſton, in his Hiſtorical Memoirs of Dr. *Clarke*, p. 148, had ſaid, "Sometime before Dr. Clarke died, "Dr. Sykes perſuaded him to leave out of his fu-"ture editions of Boyle's Lectures that famous paſ-"ſage in Phlegon, of an eclipſe of the ſun and an "earthquake, which was cited by him, and has "been generally cited by others of the Learned, as "an atteſtation to the ſupernatural eclipſe of the "ſun, and the earthquake, at our Saviour's paſſion, "mentioned by the Evangeliſts." Mr. Whiſton then proceeds to expreſs *great diſpleaſure* againſt Dr. Sykes, and calls the *ſuggeſtion groundleſs*. Upon this Dr. Sykes publiſhed, *A Diſſertation on the Eclipſe mentioned by* Phlegon: *Or, an Enquiry whether that Eclipſe had any relation to the Darkneſs which happened at our Saviour's Paſſion*. London 1732. And he concludes it to be moſt probable, that Phlegon had in view a natural eclipſe, which happened on November the 24th, in the *firſt* year of the 202d Olympiad, and not in the 4th year of the Olympiad, in which year Chriſt was crucified. In this Dr. *Sykes* has given us Mr. *Whiſton*'s calculation, which he computed for the city of *Nice* in *Bithynia*, which he, Mr. W. ſays, "began there a-"bout a quarter after eight, and ended a quarter af-"ter ten, and was about 9 or 10 digits only there." The Dr. has likewiſe here conſidered what is uſually ſaid from the *Chineſe* Hiſtories concerning a darkneſs, which is repreſented as the darkneſs at the Paſſion.

To this Mr. *Whiſton* publiſhed an anſwer, called, *The Teſtimony of* Phlegon *vindicated; or an Account of the great Darkneſs and Earthquake at our Saviour's Paſſion, deſcribed by* Phlegon; *including all the Teſtimonies, both Heathen and Chriſtian, in the very words of the original Authors, during the firſt ſix Centuries of Chriſtianity, with proper Obſervations on thoſe Teſtimonies*. By William Whiſton. 1732.

Soon after appeared, *A Defence of the Diſſertation on the Eclipſe mentioned by* Phlegon: *Wherein it is farther ſhewn, That that Eclipſe had no relation to the Darkneſs which happened at our Saviour's Paſſion, and Mr.* Whiſton's Obſervations *are particularly conſidered. By* Arthur Aſhley Sykes, D. D. 1733. To which the Author has prefixed a *Preface* in juſtification of himſelf, for entering into this debate. In this defenſe of himſelf, the Dr. examines all Mr. *Whiſton's original evidences*; and particularly examines his notion, that this darkneſs was cauſed by a *Comet*. Then he gives us Mr. *Gale Morris*'s computation of the eclipſe Novemb. 24. which was total between *Cairo* in *Egypt* and *Jeruſalem:* that in the center of the ſhadow, the ſun was *totally darkened* about two minutes: that at Jeruſalem, the middle of the eclipſe was about a quarter of an hour after noon. Dr. *Halley*'s account, and Mr. *Hodgſon*'s, of the ſame eclipſe, are mentioned.

This *Defence* of Dr. *Sykes*'s Diſſertation drew on him ſeveral new adverſaries. Firſt, there appeared *A Letter to Dr. Sykes from* Oxford, entitled, Phlegon's *Teſtimony*

(24) Euſeb. *in Chron. ad Olymp.* σβ, p. 202. edit. Scaligeri, Amſtelod. 1658.

(25) See the abovementioned edition of Scaliger, p. 158.

(26) *Ex quo loco apparet quale fuerit argumentum librorum Olympiadum Phlegontis. Nam ſub quaque Olympiade, quid toto orbe geſtum eſſet recenſebat, prodigia præcipue & monſtra, reſque alias mirabiles memorabileſque.* Salmaſ. *in* Spart. p. 152. Tom. 1.

(27) Africanus, *apud* Georgium Syncellum, *in* Chronographia, *citante* Huetio *Demonſtrat. Evangel.* Propoſ. 3. p. m. 49.

(28) Origenes *in* Matth. Tract. 35.

(29) *Atque neque interlunio factum id adnotavit. Quare rem in medio reliquit.* Huet. *Demonſ. Evang.* Propoſ. 3. p. 49.

(30) Philoponus, *de Mundi Creatione*, lib. 2. *apud* Huet. ibid.

(31) See Antonius Bynæus, *de Morte Chriſti*, lib. 5. p. 405 & *ſeq.*

(32) See Voſſius, *Harmon. Evang.* lib. 2. cap. 10. p. 322.

(33) I add this reſtriction, becauſe Huetius, *Demonſtrat. Evangel.* Propoſ. 3. p. 51. ſays that Tacitus the Hiſtorian ſpoke alſo of it, to which he adds the teſtimony of the Chineſe, mentioned in Adrian Greſſon's Hiſtory of China.

(34) Huet. *ubi ſupra*, p. 49.

Teſtimony ſhewn to relate to the Darkneſs which happened at our Saviour's Paſſion. London 1733.

Phlegon *examined Critically and Impartially, in Anſwer to the late Diſſertation and Defence of* Dr. Sykes. *To which is added, a Poſtſcript, explaining a Paſſage in* Tertullian. By John Chapman, M. A. Cambridge 1734.

An Appeal to the genuine Records and Teſtimonies of Heathen and Jewiſh Writers in Defence of Chriſtianity. By Thomas Dawſon, D. D. London 1733.

Mr. *Whiſton* likewiſe publiſhed *ſix Diſſertations*, the third of which is, *A Reply to Dr.* Sykes's Defence *of his* Diſſertation *on the Eclipſe mentioned by* Phlegon. London 1734.

In this Mr. *Whiſton* has given us ſeveral *calculations* or *approximations* made for *Rome*, *Nice*, or *Jeruſalem*. And has made ſeveral obſervations upon the calculations publiſhed by Dr. Sykes.

Upon this Dr. Sykes publiſhed *A ſecond Defence of the Diſſertation upon the Eclipſe mentioned by* Phlegon: *Wherein Mr.* Chapman's *Objections, and thoſe of the Author of the Letter to Dr.* Sykes, *are particularly conſidered.* London 1734. In this Dr. *Sykes* examined all that he thought material in Mr. Whiſton's *Obſervations.*

Mr. *Chapman* in his Treatiſe has cited *Euſebius*, the *Chronicon Paſchale*, and *Joannes Philoponus* among the *Greeks:* among the *Latins*, *Jerom* and *Anaſtaſius*, the Author of the *Hiſtoria Miſcella* and *Freculphus Lexovienſis*, "all concurring in *one uniform* repreſenta-"tion of a fragment of *Phlegon*, and in one reading "of a controverted numeral." This appeared ſo juſt an argument, that it might eaſily ſatisfy an ordinary Reader. This therefore made Dr. *Sykes*'s ſecond Defence abſolutely neceſſary: and in that he ſhewed that five of the *ſeven* Writers here mentioned as *uniform*, either *tranſlated* or *tranſcribed* the paſſage not from *Phlegon* himſelf, but from *Euſebius*, who firſt quoted it. That there is no dependance upon this *firſt* Quoter: and that as to *Philoponus*, who did ſee *Phlegon*, he is ſo far from concurring with *Euſebius*, that he differs from him two years. Dr. *Sykes* then adds, that *Maximus* and *Malela* might likewiſe have been added, as living whilſt *Phlegon*'s books were, according to Mr. *Chapman*, extant. And then the evidence would ſtand thus: "*Five* are *Tranſcribers* or *Tranſlators* of *Euſebius*. *Philoponus*, where he profeſſes to give the very words of *Phlegon*, reads it a 2d way: *Maximus* a 3d way: *Malela* a 4th. So far are they from being *uniform* in the reading of this paſſage.

In anſwer to Dr. *Sykes*, Mr. *Chapman* publiſhed, PHLEGON *re-examined: In Anſwer to Dr.* Sykes's *Second* Defence *of his* Diſſertation *concerning* Phlegon. *To which is added, a Poſtſcript, concerning the* Chronicon Paſchale. *Camb.* 1735. And thus this controverſy ended.

Dr. Sykes, in his *Second Defence*, p. 76, 77, obſerves, that he had drawn up an Enquiry, whether Phlegon made uſe of the Julian or the Aſiatic form of year, in order to ſhew, whether the Δ of Euſebius were more probably to be changed into an A, as the Doctor ſuppoſed at firſt, or into a B, as Petavius and others think more probable. But as the Doctor did not publiſh that Enquiry, we ſhall inſert it here from his original manuſcript, which he favoured us with.

Auguſtus died when *Pompeius* and *Apuleius* were Conſuls, Aug. 19. A. Per. Jul. 4727, and conſequently *Tiberius*'s firſt year began then. His 15th therefore began A. P. J. 4741. His 18th began in A. P. J. 4744. If Chriſt therefore died in the 18th of Tiberius, it muſt be ſome time in the ſpring 4745.

Olympiad 202.	1. began in July A. P. J. 4742.	Tiberius's 15th began A. P. J. 4741.	ended Aug. 4742.
	2. Tiberius's 16th began Aug. 4742,	ended 4743.	
	3. Tiberius's 17th began 4743,	ended 4744.	
	4. Tiberius's 18th began 4744,	ended 4745.	
203.	1. Tiberius's 19th began 4745,	ended 4746.	

The Olympiadic year, and the years of Tiberius, all along vary but a little above a month from each other; and conſequently, there is but little chance of miſtaking, when one reduces any fact to thoſe reſpective years. But then, when one computes by the *Julian* years, it is eaſy to miſtake, becauſe there is a conſtant coincidence of the Olympiad with ſix months of one year, and ſix months of the following year. Or if a Writer makes uſe of the *Syromacedonian* year, or the *Egyptian* year, a difficulty may very eaſily ariſe how to adjuſt the Olympiad to the form of year he uſes. *E. g.* The *Aſiatics* uſed a year, which began October 1. or thereabouts. The *Egyptians*, notwithſtanding they uſed the *Nabonaſſarean* year among the Aſtronomers and Mathematicians, quite down to *Ptolemy*'s time, yet in all other inſtances, in a little time after the battle at *Actium*, they began their year Auguſt 29.

When therefore we meet with any fact ſaid to be done in ſuch a year of an Olympiad, unleſs there be other given circumſtances, it may be difficult to determine in what year of the *Julian* period it happened. And ſo again, if an Author reckons by, or makes uſe of the *Egyptian* or the *Syromacedonian* year, and names likewiſe the Olympiad in which a fact happened, it may be hard to ſay, whether he means the current *Syromacedonian* year in which the Olympiad happened, or the Olympiad as the European Grecians reckoned them.

To explain what I mean, when we ſay, that A. D. 29. Nov. 24. there happened an eclipſe of the ſun: it is true, that this happened A. Per. Jul. 4742. If you reckon the Olympiadic year from July to July, it was in the *firſt* year of the 202d Olympiad. But ſuppoſe a man were to uſe a year that began in Auguſt or in October, ſuch a Writer *might* ſay that this eclipſe happened in the ſecond year of that Olympiad; and he would mean, that it happened in the year current, in which the ſecond Olympiadic year was. For with ſuch a Writer, the year ending, *e. g.* in September, he would conclude all the facts of the year with that; and reckon the firſt year of the Olympiad to end there, and the ſecond year to contain all that fell within his compaſs from October to October again. So that this eclipſe happening in November, he muſt ſay that it fell in the ſecond year of the 202d Olympiad; meaning, that it fell in the compaſs of the year in courſe in which the ſecond year of that Olympiad was.

And thus in the caſe before us; unleſs one could ſay with certainty what year Phlegon made uſe of beſides the Olympiad, *i. e.* whether he uſed the Julian or Aſiatic year, it may be impoſſible to ſay, whether the true reading of him be in the *firſt*, or *ſecond* year, notwithſtanding he meant the very ſame eclipſe, A. D. 29. Nov. 24. For as he was born at *Tralles*, and was an *Aſiatic*, and thence it may be conceived probable enough, that he uſed the *Aſiatic* year; ſo likewiſe being a Roman Emperor's freedman, and being always about him, it is as probable that he might uſe the *Roman* year. Which form of year he did uſe, muſt be our next enquiry.

The principal, if not the ſole light we can have in this diſquiſition, is to be derived from *Photius*. For though *Philoponus* had *Phlegon* before him, and ſays from him, that *Tiberius* began his reign in the 2d year of the 198th Olympiad; yet as he began his reign in Auguſt, you cannot determine any thing: for let *Philoponus* uſe the *Alexandrian* or the *Julian* year, Auguſt will be in the ſecond year of that Olympiad, in either account. We muſt ſee therefore what can be diſcovered from *Photius*, whoſe words are as follow: λεύκολ☉ ἀμωσὶν ἐπολιόρκει καὶ μυρίναν ἐπὶ τῆς πολιορκίας καταλιπὼν μετὰ δυοῖν ταγμάτοιν, αὐτὸς μετὰ τριῶν ἄλλων προῆγεν ἐπὶ καῖσαρῶν, ὅπου διεχείμαζε καὶ Ἀθριανὸν ἐπέταξε πολεμῆσαι Μιθριδάτῃ· καὶ πολεμήσας ἐνίκησε καὶ σεισμῷ ἐν ῥώμῃ γενομένῳ πολλὰ τούτῳ συνέπεσε· καὶ ἄλλα δὲ πλεῖσα ἐν ταύτῃ ξυνηνέχθη τῇ Ολυμπιαδὶ CLXXVII. Καὶ Ρωμαίων τῷ τρίτῳ αὐτῆς ἔτει ἀπεστιμήθησαν μυριάδες ἐνενήκοντα καὶ μία. καὶ Σινατρούκην τὸν Πάρθων βασιλέα τελευτήσαντα διεδέξατο. Φράτης ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς θεός· καὶ φᾶισθαι τὸν ἐπικήριον διεδέξατο Πάτραν. καὶ Οὐϊργίλι☉ μάρων ὁ ποιητὴς ἐγενήθη τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει, εἰδοῖς ὀκτωβρίαις. Τῷ δὲ τετάρτῳ ἔτει Τιγράνης καὶ Μιθριδάτης ἀθροίσαντες, πεζοὺς μὲν τεσσαράς μυριάδας, ἱππέων δὲ τρεῖς, καὶ τὸν ἰταλικὸν αὐτοὺς ταξάντες τρόπον, ἐπολέμησαν λευκύλλῳ· καὶ νικᾷ Λεύκυλλ☉· καὶ πεντακισχίλιον μὲν τῶν μετὰ Τιγράνους ἔπεσον, πλείους δὲ τούτων, ἡχμαλωτίσθησαν, χωρὶς τῶ ἄλλω συγκλυδοῦς ὄχλω. καὶ

τὸ καπιτώλιον ἐν Ῥώμῃ Κάτλος καθιέρωσε. Καὶ Μέτελλος ἐπὶ τὸν κρητικὸν πόλεμον ὁρμήσας τρία τάγματα ἔχων, ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν νῆσον, καὶ μάχῃ νικήσας τὸν Λασσθένη, αὐτοκράτωρ ἀνηγορεύθη, καὶ τειχήρεις κατέστησε τοὺς Κρητας. καὶ Ἀθηνόδωρος πειρατὴς ἑξανδραποδισάμενος Δηλίους τὰ τῶν λιγομένων θεῶν ξόανα ἀπελυμήνατο. Γαίος δὲ τριάριος τὰ λελεκημένα τῆς πόλεως ἐπισκευάσας ἐτείχισε τὴν Δῆλον. *Pho. Biblio.* cap. 97. For if *Phlegon*, in his accounts of the Olympiads, mentions facts as done in any Olympiadic year, which were done between October and the July following, it is plain then, that he reckoned the Olympiads from July to July, and did not mean that the Olympiad fell in the year current.

Phlegon then tells us, that in the 177th Olympiad, "*Lucullus* beſieged *Amiſus*, and leaving Muræna with "two legions there, he marched to *Cabira*, and win-"tered there." The ſiege of Amyſus was began by Lucullus the autumn before, A. P. J. 4641, or Olympiad 176. 4. In the ſpring time, A. P. J. 4642, Olympiad 176. 4. Muræna was left before Amyſus **, whilſt Lucullus marched to Cabira, and ſpent the following winter there. The city of Amyſus held out two years, viz. all the year 4642, and was taken in 4643, at the end of the year. Hence therefore this may be concluded, that becauſe Lucullus *wintered* Olympiad 177.1. at Cabira, therefore Phlegon reckoning this winter into that year, he muſt reckon the 177. Olympiad 1. to extend from July A. P. J. 4642 to 4643, and conſequently that he uſed the Julian year, and not the Aſiatic year.

** μετὰ χειμῶνα Μυρίναν ἀπολιπὼν ἐπὶ τῆς πολιορκίας. Plut. Lucullus.

In the 3d year of this Olympiad, upon the *Ides of October*, the Poet Virgil was born, *i. e.* on the 15th of October; and ſo the Writer of his Life ſays, which is uſually attributed to Donatus. But this will not determine the point, becauſe the Roman year had been ſo managed, that the autumnal months then fell in the ſummer, and the ſummer months in the ſpring. By this means their October then fell much about 63 days ſooner in the year, than it now ſtands in the preſent Julian year, and conſequently Virgil was born about the 12th or 13th of Auguſt, which makes it that nothing can be determined from that circumſtance.

So again; in the 4th year of the 177th Olympiad, he tells us, that Tigranes and Mithridates were overcome by Lucullus. Now the battle happened on the day before the Nones of October ††, 1.2. the 6th; and for the ſame reaſon that you cannot infer any thing from its being ſaid that Virgil was born on the Ides of October, you cannot infer any thing as to the point in hand, from this battle's happening on the Nones. Both theſe incidents would really happen in the year which Phlegon mentions, whether he uſed the Julian or the Aſiatic year.

†† ἦν δὲ καὶ πρὸ μιᾶς νόνων Ὀκτωβρίων. Id. ibid.

In the ſame year *Metellus* went to the *Cretic* war, and overcoming *Laoſthenes*, was ſaluted *Imperator*. *Hortenſius* and *Metellus* were choſen Conſuls towards the end of October *Ante Chriſtum* 68. A. P. J. 4644, and ſerved the enſuing year, A. P. J. 4645. In which year was 177.4. Olympiad. So that here were eight months from their election to the Olympiad, in July 4645. Now the Cretan war laſted near three years, ſays *Eutropius* *, and very great battles were fought, and hard ſieges endured, before it was finiſhed. Oroſius ſays †, that Metellus was two years in conquering it. Now if we allow the time antecedent to the Olympiad, and that whole year, from July 4645, to A. P. J. 4646, it will be eaſy to account for the ſieges, and the conqueſt of *Cnoſſus*, *Erythræa*, *Cydonia*, and *Laoſthenes*'s holding out ſo long, and cauſing the war to be ſo long. Whereas if you reckon that the Aſiatic year is intended by Phlegon, this could not be done in the 177.4. Olympiad, but it ought to be 178.1. Olympiad.

* *Ingentibus prælits intra triennium omnem provinciam cepit, appellatuſque eſt Creticus.* Eutrop. lib. 6. cap. 11.

† *Cretam inſulam per biennium Metellus evertit.* Oroſ. lib. 6. cap. 4.

If this then be the caſe, then it follows, that as the eclipſe A. D. 29, was in Olympiad 202.1. the alteration of the numeral muſt be as I corrected it for a Δ into an A. But if by the year of an Olympiad, an Alexandrian ſhould mean the year current, in which ſuch an Olympiad happened, then no doubt November 24, A. D. 29, may be *reckoned to be* in the 2d year of that Olympiad, and then the alteration muſt be from a Δ into a B. And thus may *Philoponus* be ſtrictly underſtood, when he ſays that it was in the 2d year of the 202d Olympiad, and yet mean the ſame individual eclipſe that I do. To confirm this way of reckoning, I add, that Euſebius uſes the Aſiatic year, and begins it always with them in October. The firſt year therefore of the Olympiads began, according to him, in A. P. J. 3937. of his own numbers 1245. 202d Olympiad correſponds to his number 2045, A. P. J. 4741, and conſequently, the 2d year of that Olympiad began with him in October 4742; and therefore by this manner of reckoning, the Δ ſhould be changed into a B. Which of theſe is the certain ſure emendation, is of no great moment, ſince we both agree in the ſame eclipſe, and both agree that Euſebius is not to be depended on. The controverſy amounts to little more, than if a debate were to be about a fact or event which happened laſt February, ſince a number was to be altered, whether it were moſt proper to place it in 1733, or in 1734. ADD. REM.]

I will now proceed to a criticiſm of another kind. Euſebius ſays, that Phlegon wrote this in the 13th book of his hiſtory. Origen declares it to be the 13th or 14th (35). Maximus has cited only the 14th (36). Meurſius is of opinion, that Maximus's citation is the juſt one, and for this reaſon. Phlegon, ſays he (37), would include 15 Olympiads in each book; but not living long enough to finiſh the laſt, it contained only four Olympiads. It appears, upon a calculation, that he muſt have treated of the 202d in the 14 book; and conſequently he muſt have ſpoke of the eclipſe in that book. Meurſius's calculation is juſt; but he makes a falſe ſuppoſition; for this ſuppoſition that each book contained 15 Olympiads, is a mere chimera, ſince Photius affirms (38), that Phlegon's firſt five books extended to the 177th Olympiad. Salmaſius ought to have remembered this paſſage of Photius, as well as Meurſius; for, for want of knowing it, he imagined that Phlegon divided his work in ſuch a manner, that each of the eleven firſt books contained 14 Olympiads, and each of the laſt five contained fifteen books (39). All this is falſe; but here follows a conjecture which is rational enough. Phlegon divided that hiſtory into 16 almoſt equal parts. He found a greater number of materials in proportion, as he drew nearer to his own times; for which reaſon, each of his laſt books contained but a very ſmall number of Olympiads, whereas the five firſt contained 177. It is thus Mezerai's chronological epitome contains, in Tom. 1. the reign of 31 Kings, and the ſpace of 518 years; and the laſt Tom. is wholly taken up in Henry the IVth's reign (40). The like remark may be made on all the Hiſtories of a Nation divided into books (41). The firſt contains many more years than the laſt. Had Salmaſius conſidered this, he would not have meddled with the paſſage of Stephanus Byzantinus, which he pretended to correct. *In voce* Ὀλύμπιον (42), ſays he (43), *citat* (Stephanus) *Phlegontem* ἐν πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ Ὀλυμπιάδων: *in quo niſi fallor mendoſæ ſunt editiones, legendum enim* ἐν ἕκτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ Ὀλυμπιάδων. *Cujus emendationis hæc ratio eſt. Meminerat eo libro Phlegon Olympii ab Hadriano vel potius ſumptibus Hadriani ab Athenienſibus ædificati. Atqui ejus rei mentionem non niſi ultimo libro, id eſt decimo ſexto facere poterat Phlegon. Nec enim ultra tempora Hadriani Olympiadas ſuas contexuit.* i. e. "Stephanus, under the word *Olympion*, quotes Phlegon's fifteenth book of the Olympiads; in which, "if I miſtake not, the editions are erroneous; for, "it ought to be read, the ſixteenth book of the O-"lympiads. The reaſon of this emendation is this. "Phlegon had related in this book, that Olympeium "was built by Hadrian, or rather by the Athenians, "at Hadrian's expence. But it was impoſſible for "Phlegon to mention it, except under the laſt book, "that is, the ſixteenth: his Olympiads extending no "farther than the age in which Hadrian lived." This criticiſm is grounded on two very bad reaſons; the firſt is, that Phlegon could not ſpeak of an edifice built at the expence of the Emperor Hadrian, except in the book where he treated of the Olympiads which belonged to that Emperor's reign. The ſecond is, that he wrote the Hiſtory of thoſe Olympiads only in his laſt book. If the Reader is deſirous of knowing the falſity of the firſt reaſon, he need but conſider, that the beſt Annaliſts are apt to make ſome incidental obſervations, wherein they relate the preceding, as well as following tranſactions. If they ſpeak of the burning of a city, they don't ſcruple to obſerve, that it had been founded by ſuch a one, who flouriſhed at ſuch a time; nor to ſay, by way of anticipation, that it

(35) Origenes, *contra Celſum*, lib. 2.

(36) Maximus Schol. *ad Epiſtolam 7. Dionyſii Areopag.*

(37) Meurſius, *Not. ad Phlegont.* p. 170.

(38) Photius, *Biblioth.* num. 97. p. 268.

(39) Salmaſius, *in* Spartian. p. 151.

(40) Of the Dutch edit. divided into 6 volumes, 12mo.

(41) See the Hiſtory of France, written by Gaguin, Paulus Æmilius, &c.

(42) It ſhould be Ὀλυμπίων.

(43) Salmaſ. *in* Spartian. p. 151.

pronounced by the oracles. This cenſure is ſo judicious, that I could not forbear mentioning it [*E*].

it was rebuilt thirty years after. They take a particular pleaſure in theſe anticipations, when they are of ſervice to applaud the reigning Monarch. Phlegon may therefore very poſſibly have ſpoke of an *Olympieium*, under an Olympiad prior to the Empire of Hadrian his Sovereign and Benefactor; for, in ſpeaking of an incident which happened in the iſland of Delos, before that Prince's reign, he might ſay, that the place where it happened, had afterwards great honour done to it, by the Athenians building there an edifice, which they named Hadrian's new Athens (44), becauſe that Emperor furniſhed them with the money they ſtood in need of. We may ſuppoſe, with great probability, that he did not omit one opportunity of applauding the Monarch in queſtion, and that he ſpoke of him, *in ſeaſon and out of ſeaſon*; for which reaſon Salmaſius did not reaſon juſtly. I nevertheleſs will ſuppoſe, that Phlegon ſpoke of the building of that edifice, under the very year in which it was raiſed; but this does not prove that he ſpoke of it in his laſt book. It is probable, on all accounts, that he expatiated more on Hadrian's reign, than on the preceding reigns; and this is the conſtant practice of all Hiſtorians. Let us therefore ſay, that probably his 15th and 16th books, included only thoſe Olympiads during which Hadrian ſwayed the ſceptre; and thus Salmaſius's ſecond reaſon will not be more juſt than his firſt. He alſo might be criticiſed for affirming that Phlegon's work did not extend beyond the reign of that Emperor: nevertheleſs father Pagi (45) and ſome other learned men affirm, that the whole 229th Olympiad was included in it; whence it follows, that it contained likewiſe the three or four firſt years of Antoninus's reign.

(44) Steph. Byzant. *Voce* Ὀλυμπίειον.

(45) Pagi, in his Critique on Baronius, *ad ann.* 136. num. 4.

[*E*] *This cenſure of* Photius *is ſo judicious, that I could not forbear mentioning it.*] Here follows the whole paſſage. Ἔστι δὲ τὴν φράσιν οὔτε λίαν καμαιπετὴς, οὔτε τὸν ἀττικὸν ἐς τὸ ἀκριβὲς διασάζων χαρακτῆρα, ἄλλως τε δὲ καὶ ἡ περὶ τὰς ὀλυμπιάδας, καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐλαῖς τῶν ἀγωνισμάτων ὀνόματα, καὶ τὰς πράξεις, καὶ ἡ περὶ τοὺς χρησμοὺς ἄκαιρος φιλοπονία τε καὶ φιλολιμία, εἰς κόρον ἀπάγουσα τὸν ἀκροατὴν, καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο τῶν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ προκύπτειν συγχωροῦσα, ἀηδῆ τε σφόδρα τὸν λόγον δεικνύει, καὶ χαρίεσσιν οὐδὲν ἔχειν παρατίθησι. χρησμοῖς δὲ παντοίοις ἐς ὑπερβολὴν ἐστὶ κεχρημένος, i. e. "This Author's ſtyle is not altogether flat and mean, nor does it every where imitate the Attic manner of writing. But otherwiſe, the over nice accuracy and care with which he computes the Olympiads, and relates the names of the ſeveral conteſts, the tranſactions and even oracles, is not only very tireſome to the Reader, whereby a cloud is thrown over all other particulars in that book, and conſequently thoſe particulars are not permitted to appear; but the diction is thereby rendered unpleaſant and ungrateful; and indeed he is every moment inculcating the anſwers pronounced by all kinds of Deities (46)."

(46) Photius, *Bibliath.* num. 97. p. 268.

PHLEGYAS, ſon of the God Mars and Chryſe [*A*], reigned over a diſtrict of Bœotia after Eteocles's death. This diſtrict which before was called *Audreis*, was, from him, called *Phlegyantis*. He there built a city which he called from his own name; and invited to it the braveſt and moſt intrepid warriors of all Greece (*a*). As he was the braveſt warrior of his age, to what place ſoever he marched, in order to make inroads, he never returned from them without carrying off the corn, cattle, and every thing elſe (*b*). He uſed to act with great prudence and caution on thoſe occaſions: for inſtance, having a deſign to lay waſte Peloponneſus, he went firſt, upon pretence of travelling, and viewed the ſituation of the country, and enquired how many ſoldiers would be raiſed on it. It is related, that his daughter Coronis, who accompanied him, was then delivered of Eſculapius in Epidaurus (*c*). The inhabitants of the country where he reigned, led the ſame life as he had done [*B*]. Having no children, he was ſucceeded by one of his couſins

(*a*) *Ex* Pauſanio, lib. 9. cap. 36.

(*b*) Idem, lib. 2. cap. 26. p. m. 170.

(*c*) *Ex eodem* Pauſania, lib. 2. cap. 26. p. m. 176.

(1) Pauſan. lib. 9. cap. 34.

(2) Idem, ibid. cap. 36.

(3) Homer. *Iliad.* lib. 13. ver. 302.

(4) Idem, *Hymno in Apoll.* p. m. 786.

(5) Pauſan. lib. 9. cap. 36.

(6) Idem, ibid.

(7) Servius, *in Æneid.* lib. 6. ver. 618.

(8) Strabo, lib. 9. p. 304. obſerves, that the Gyrtoneans lived round Peneus and Peleus, and that they had antiently been called Phlegygei. Stephan. Byzant. *Voce* Γόρτων, ſays that Gyrton, a city of Theſſaly, was ſo called, from Gyrton, Phlegyas's brother.

(9) *Schol. Homeri in Iliad.* lib. 13. ver. 302.

[*A*] *Son of the God Mars and Chryſe.*] Andreus, ſon of the river Peneus, was the firſt who ſettled in a diſtrict of Bœotia, called *Andreis*, from his name. He married a daughter of Leucon, ſon of Athamas, and had a ſon named Eteocles who ſucceeded him, and granted part of the country to Halmus, ſon of Siſyphus (1). This Eteocles having no children, Phlegyas the ſon of Chryſe, Halmus's daughter, ſucceeded him (2).

[*B*] *The Phlegyei led the ſame kind of life as he had done.*] Homer mentions them as a people extremely brave (3), inſolent, outragious and impious (4). They uſed to make incurſions into the territories of their neighbours, to carry off whatever came in their way; and they even attempted to plunder the temple of Delphi (5). Philammon marched againſt them, at the head of a choſen body of Argivi; but himſelf, and the braveſt of his ſoldiers, were killed in battle. The impiety and cruelty of the Phlegyei did not go unpuniſhed; great numbers were killed by thunderbolts and earthquakes; others were carried off by the plague, ſome excepted, who retired into Phocis (6). Servius, on Euphorion's credit, affirms, that the Phlegyei inhabited an iſland, which Neptune, exaſperated at their ſacrilegious actions, deſtroyed by ſtriking it with his trident (7). The Scholiaſt in Homer relates, on the teſtimony of Pherecydes, that the Phlegyei or Gortynii (8), an atheiſtical people of Phocis, exerciſed a thouſand barbarities againſt their neighbours; that they burnt the temple of Delphi; that after the death of Amphion and Zethus, who had prevented their falling upon the city of Thebes, they took it; and that, as they were preparing to commit freſh acts of injuſtice, they were extirpated by Apollo (9). I muſt not forget what Ovid ſays, viz. that Ceyx, being deſirous to conſult the Oracle, was forced to go to Claros; becauſe the profane Phorbas, with the Phlegyei, prevented people from conſulting that of Delphi.

Ad Clarium parat ire Deum: nam templa profanus
Invia cum Phlegyis faciebat Delphica Phorbas (10).

" To viſit Claro's God he now prepares;
" For impious Phorbas, and the Phlegyan thieves,
" Infeſted all who ſhap'd their courſe to Delphi.

(10) Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 11. ver. 413.

The Phlegyei, according to Philoſtratus (11), had elected Phorbas for their King, both on account of his mighty ſtature, and becauſe he exceeded them all in barbarity. He uſed to ſtop all who went to Delphi; on which occaſion he ſent to the Phlegyei the old men and children; and fought with the young people, and overcame them, after which he cut their heads off; but he himſelf was vanquiſhed and ſlain by Apollo.

(11) Philoſtratus, in pict. of the Phlegyei.

(12) Farnab. *in Ovid. Metam.* lib. 11. ver. 413.

(13) Pauſan. lib. 5. cap. 1. p. m. 377.

(14) *Vigenere ſur Philoſtrate au Tableau des Phlegyens*, p. m. 815.

It is difficult to diſtinguiſh this Phorbas, from the ſeveral perſons who bore the ſame name. Farnaby (12) is of opinion, that Pauſanias ſpeaks of Phorbas, ſon of Lapitha (13); but he does not bring any proof for this. Vigenere was greatly puzzled on this occaſion (14), which I don't wonder at, the ſubject being too intricate. Pauſanias informs us of a Phorbas who commanded in Athens before the Olympiads (15): a Phorbas, ſon of Argus, and father of Triopas (16); a Phorbas, ſon of Triopas, and father of Pellene (17); and the Phorbas, who, according to Farnaby, was King of the Phlegyei. There was one Phorbas, the ſon

(15) Pauſan. lib. 6. cap. 19.

(16) Idem, lib. 2. cap. 16.

(17) Idem, lib. 7. cap. 26. p. 593.

cousins (*d*) [*C*]. It was feigned, that having burnt the temple of Delphi, out of revenge, becauſe his daughter Coronis had been got with child by Apollo, he was thrown into hell, and tortured in a grievous manner [*D*], after Apollo had ſhot him dead with arrows (*e*). Some ſay, that Ixion was his ſon (*f*); and others, that he was his brother (*g*). I have not yet found in any antient Author, what Charles Stephens, Lloyd, Hoffman and Moreri affirm, viz. that Phlegyas was King of the Lapithæ in Theſſaly.

(*d*) *Ex eodem* Pauſania, lib. 9. cap. 36.

(*e*) Servius, *in Æneid.* lib. 6. ver. 618.

(*f*) Idem, ibid.

(*g*) Strabo, lib. 9. p. 304.

ſon of Triopas, who killed all the ſerpents with which the iſland of Rhodes was filled (18). Homer mentions a Phorbas, ſon of Triopas (19)

[*C*] *He was ſucceeded by one of his couſins.*] This was Chryſes the ſon of Neptune, and of Chryſogenea, the daughter of Halmus, and ſiſter of Phlegyas's mother. The ſon and ſucceſſor of this Chryſes was Minyas, whence his ſubjects were called Minyans; by which name they were ſtill called in Pauſanias's time. They indeed were called Orchomenians in the reign of Orchomenus ſon of Chryſes; but they ſtill retained the name of Minyans, and were thereby diſtinguiſhed from the Orchomenians, ſituated in Arcadia (20). It is to be obſerved, that the Argonauts were commonly ſirnamed Mynians, becauſe ſeveral of them deſcended, by the mother's ſide, from Minyas (21). Other reaſons are given for this. See Lloyd under the word *Minyæ*, and Munckerus's notes on Hyginus (22).

(18) Hygin. *in Aſtronom.* lib. 1. cap. 14. See Meurſius, *in Rhodo*, lib. 1. cap. 5. p. 12 and 13.

(19) *Homer. Hymno in Apollin.* p. m. 782.

(20) *Ex* Pauſan. lib. 9. cap. 36.

(21) See Apollonius, and his Scholiaſt, *Argonaut.* lib. 1. ver. 229.

(22) Cap. 14. p. 44.

[*D*] *He was thrown into hell, and tortured in a grievous manner.*] The following words of Virgil are ambiguous:

Sedet, æternumque ſedebit
Infelix Theſeus, Phlegyaſque miſerrimus omnes
Admonet & magna teſtatur voce per umbras
Diſcite juſtitiam moniti & non temnere divos (23).

" Unhappy Theſeus, doom'd for ever there,
" Is fix'd by fate on his eternal chair;
" And wretched Phlegyas warns the world with cries;
" (Cou'd warning make the world more juſt or wiſe,)
" Learn righteouſneſs, and dread th' avenging Deities. *Dryden.*

(23) Virg. *Æn.* lib. 6. ver. 617.

It does not appear in the Latin verſes above, whether Phlegyas is the nominative ſingular, or the accuſative plural (24). In this latter caſe, the paſſage of Virgil is of no uſe to prove my text; but here follow other paſſages no ways ambiguous.

(24) See Servius, *in Æneid.* lib. 6. ver. 618.

Diſcumbitur altis
Porticibus: ſua cuique furens feſtinaque conjunx
Adjacet. Inferni qualis ſub nocte barathri
Adcubat attonitum Phlegyan & Theſea juxta
Tiſiphone, ſaevaſque dapes & pocula libat,
(Tormenti genus) & nigris amplectitur hydris (25).

We ſee here, that the fury Tiſiphone uſed to ſtand by the food which was offered to Theſeus and Phlegyas; and that ſhe taſted it firſt, to inſpire them with a horror for it, though they ſhould be almoſt famiſhed. Statius expreſſes this ſtill more clearly.

(25) Val. Flaccus, *Argonaut.* lib. 2. ver. 190.

Ultrix tibi torva Megæræ
Jejunum Phlegyam ſubter cava ſaxa jacentem
Æterno premit accubitu, dapibuſque profanis
Inſtimulat: ſed miſta famem faſtidia vincunt
Adſis ô memor hoſpitii, Junoniaque arva (26).

" The ſtern Megæra is thy dire avenger,
" And tortures Phlegyas, who for ever dreads
" The falling ſtone; excites him to devour
" The food, which he, tho' famiſh'd, cannot taſte.
" But O, propitious Deity, be preſent
" To Juno's land, the place which, glad, receiv'd thee.

(26) *Stat. Theb.* lib. 1. *ſub. fin.* ver. 712. p. m. 141. See Barthius, on this paſſage.

Virgil has finely deſcribed this kind of puniſhment; but he does not expreſsly ſay it was that of Phlegyas; and names only Ixion and Pirithous.

Quid memorem Lapithas Ixiona Pirithoumque (27).

" Ixion and Pirithous I cou'd name;
" And more Theſſalian Chiefs of mighty fame. *Dryden.*

(27) Virgil. *Æneid.* lib. 6. ver. 601.

PHOEBADIUS, Biſhop of Agen in the 4th century, ſhewed a very great zeal for the Orthodox Syſtem, and againſt Arianiſm. He wrote a book againſt the ſecond Formula of Faith [*A*], which Oſius and Potamius had drawn up at Sirmium, in the year 357 (*a*). He was preſent at the Synod of Rimini in the year 359, and defended, to the end of that Council, the Profeſſion of Faith drawn up at Nice, and refuſed to ſubſcribe that which was preſented to him. " Neither fear nor threatnings could make him alter his reſolution: but the Governor Taurus, finding he could not conquer his conſtancy by thoſe means, had recourſe to prayers, and entreated him with tears in his eyes, to uſe more gentle means, to deliver a vaſt number of Biſhops, who for ſeven months were locked up in a city, where they ſuffered great inconveniencies by the ſeverity of the winter, and for want of neceſſaries. . . . Phœbadius anſwered, he was ready to go into baniſhment, and to ſuffer all kinds of puniſhments, rather than do what was required of him, and that he would never admit a Formula of Faith drawn up by the Arians. That conteſt continued ſome days: but Phœbadius, finding it was impoſſible to agree peaceably, yielded at laſt, when Urſatius and Valens had declared, that the Creed they propoſed was Catholick, and that thoſe, who did not think it ſufficient, might add to it what they pleaſed (*b*)." Some Orthodox propoſitions were added to it, and among others, this; the Son of God is not a Creature; but Urſatius and Valens took care to have the following words ſlily incerted into it, namely, that he was not a Creature like the others, and by that artifice they got the ſubſcriptions they deſired (*c*). *Phœbadius being returned into his own country, was one of the Biſhops who*

(*a*) Du Pin, *Biblioth.* Tom. 2. p. 107. Dutch edition.

(*b*) Ibidem.

(*c*) Ibidem.

[*A*] *He wrote a book againſt the ſecond Formula of Faith.*] That work has been tranſmitted down to us. You will meet with the ſubſtance of it in Monſieur Du Pin (1). Father Labbe tells us, that Peter Pithou is the firſt who publiſhed it. *Primum prodiit ſtudio Petri Pithœi cum aliquot aliorum Veterum Galliæ Theologorum ſcriptis, Pariſiis apud Nivellium* 1586 *in* 4 *hoc titulo: Liber contra Epiſtolam ſive Edictum ſub nomine Conſtantii Imp. emiſſum in Synodo Mediolanenſi* (2). *i. e.* " It was firſt publiſhed by the care of Peter Pithou, with the works of ſome other antient Divines of Gaul (France), at Paris, for Nivelle, 1586, in 4to, with this title: A Book againſt the Epiſtle or Edict publiſhed in the Synod of Milan, under the name of the Emperor Conſtantius." Father Labbe adds, that it has been inſerted ſince into the Bibliotheque of the Fathers, and that Barthius has adorned it with notes. Monſieur Du Pin ſuppoſes alſo,

(1) In page 107 and 108, of the 2d vol. of his *Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſ.* Dutch edit.

(2) Labbe, *de Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis*, Tom. 2. p. 221.

who repented moſt of their fault, and who made amends for it by the declarations, and by the proteſtations they made againſt what they had done unawares, having been impoſed upon. He was preſent at the Council of Valence, in the year 374. *We have a letter of St. Ambroſe to him, and to Delphinus Biſhop of Bourdeaux. St. Jerom aſſerts in his book of Illuſtrious Men, that Phœbadius was ſtill living in his time* (d), *and that he was very old. He adds, that he wrote ſome works, beſides that which we have mentioned. The memory of this Saint is chiefly revered at Agen, where he is commonly called* Saint Fiari [*B*].

(d) That is to ſay, in the year 392, when St. Jerom wrote that book. See Father Labbe, *Diſſertat. de Script. Eccleſiaſt.* Tom. 2. p. 221.

ſo, that the edition publiſhed by Peter Pithou was the firſt, but he places it under the year 1589. John Darnalt, in the 5th chapter of his Antiquities of Agen, mentions an edition, publiſhed before that. *This Epiſtle of* Phœbadius, ſays he (3), *was found in our time, and publiſhed immediately by Robert Stephens, and afterwards by Nivelle, in* 1586. Let thoſe who have libraries, examine whether he be in the right or not.

(3) Darnalt, *Procureur du Roi au Preſidial d'Agen, Antiquitez d'Agen*, folio 32 *verſo*, of the Paris edition, 1606, in 8vo.

[*B*] *His memory is chiefly revered at Agen, where he is commonly called* Saint Fiari.] That illuſtrious Prelate's name has been ſtrongly altered and corrupted. *Sulpitius Severus calls him Fegadius. In the Greek tranſlation of St. Jerom's book, he is called Soebadius. . . . . In St. Ambroſe we read Fygadius* (4). Arnalt laments theſe alterations, and the deſtruction of the church conſecrated to that Biſhop. *We ſhall obſerve by the by, from another Author, that the name of that holy Biſhop, has been ſo unfortunate, among his friends, that at this time it is ſo much altered and changed, not only among the vulgar, but even in the books belonging to his own church, that ſome call him* Fœdarium, *others* Phœbadium *and* Feudarium ; *Ephionius calls him* Sebaudium, *and he is commonly named* Saint Fiari. *To this account of the alteration and mangling of his name, I ſhall add, that the injuries of the weather and of time have been ſo great and lamentable, that his church in this city was firſt pulled down, and then razed to the very foundations ; and the place where it ſtood, is now deſigned for an unworthy and profane uſe* (5). Beza relates a pretty curious particular, which belongs to the year 1561. " About that time John Barrelles, Miniſter of Tou-
" louſe, being ſick at Agen, where he took Phyſick,
" preached at noon-day in the houſe of Counſellor
" Rouſſanes ; and his meeting encreaſed daily ſo
" much, that at laſt, on the 16th of March, he
" preached in a little church, named St. Fiari, for-
" merly Biſhop of Agen, who wrote againſt the Ari-
" ans in St. Jerom's time, as he himſelf teſtifies in a
" treatiſe he wrote of the Doctors of the church,
" where his name is erroneouſly wrote *Sebadius*, in-
" ſtead of *Fedarius*. There was in that church a mar-
" ble tomb, which was ſaid to be that Biſhop's, and
" from which the nurſes uſed to ſcrape what they
" could, which they ſwallowed with their broth,
" that they might have a great deal of milk. And
" yet there is a ſmall city near Toulouſe, on the ri-
" ver Rege (6), where on the 25th of April, which
" is St. Fiari's feſtival, the neighbours uſed, time out
" of mind, to meet armed, leſt, ſay they, the people
" of Agen, from whom they pretend they ſtole the
" body of that Saint, ſhould come and take it back
" again. Let them decide the matter between them :
" however it be, the tomb having at laſt been open-
" ed at Agen, nothing was found in it but the ſkull
" with the teeth in it, pretty whole, conſidering the
" long time ſince which the Biſhop muſt have been
" buried there, which was above twelve hundred
" years (7)."

(4) Du Pin, *Bibliotb. des Auteurs Eccleſiaſt.* Tom. 2. p. 109.

(5) Arnault, *Antiquitez d'Agen*, folio 33.

(6) He ſhould have ſaid *Arige*.

(7) Beze, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* liv. 5. p. 790, 791.

PHRÆA (*a*) * (JOHN), a learned Engliſhman, taught Polite Literature in Italy with great applauſe [*A*]. He tranſlated, out of Greek into Latin, ſome treatiſes of Xenophon, and ſome books of Diodorus Siculus (*b*). Before this, he had tranſlated a diſcourſe of Syneſius (*c*). This was his firſt eſſay [*B*]. Pope Paul II. was ſo well pleaſed with the tranſlation which this learned Engliſhman had dedicated to him, that he intended to raiſe him to the Epiſcopal See of Bath, but John Phræa was ſnatched from the world, before he had an opportunity of being raiſed to that honour. He died in 1465

(a) See the rem. [*A*].

* Pitſeus, in his work *de illuſtribus Angliæ Scriptoribus*, calls him *Freus*.

(b) Voſſius, *de Hiſtor. Latinis*, p. 634.

(c) The praiſe of baldneſs.

[*A*] *He taught Polite Literature in Italy with great applauſe.*] I find this in a dedication of Beatus Rhenanus (1). *Is Joannes Phræa*, ſays he, *quod non ſine publico Britanniæ, quam nunc Angliam vocant, honore dixerim : utramque linguam egregie percalluit, bonas literas ſumma cum laude non paucos annos, idque in Italia profeſſus*, i. e. " This John Phræa, was perfectly well " ſkilled in both languages ; a circumſtance I take " notice of in honour to Britain, now called England ; " and he alſo taught, during many years, with the " higheſt applauſe, Polite Literature in Italy." I am to obſerve, that his name is *Phræa*, and not *Phreas* or *Phreus*, as Voſſius calls him (2). He calls himſelf *Joannes Phræa*, in the title of the work I am going to mention.

(1) That to the tranſlation of *Encomium calvitiei*. See the rem. [*B*].

(2) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 634.

[*B*] *A tranſlation of a diſcourſe of Syneſius was his firſt eſſay.*] He informs us, in his dedication, that he was determined not to follow the method of other Tranſlators. Theſe begin with an eaſy Author ; and when years and experience have improved them, they attempt more difficult verſions. He does not cenſure this way of proceeding, but declares that he thought it would be proper for him to proceed after a quite oppoſite method, and begin with Syneſius, one of the moſt obſcure Authors that ever wrote. Every man, adds he, ought to conſider what is adapted for him ; and Syneſius muſt neceſſarily be difficult, ſince not one learned man, among the great numbers who have tranſlated out of the Greek tongue into Latin, have attempted to give a verſion of Syneſius. Here follow Phræa's words. *Nos vero etſi nonnullis perſuaſi rationibus, quas nunc conſulto præterire libet, converſum ordinem magis ad doctrinam conducere arbitramur : ea tamen modeſtia hanc noſtram defenſamus opinionem, ut neque mihi ipſi arrogare, neque quod ſecus alii ſenſerint, id vitio illis dare velim. Suis enim quiſque in rebus, quid magis, quidve minus ſibi conducat, explorator eſt, & judex optimus. Itaque mihi in hoc à reliquis diſſentienti, à Syneſio ſummo philoſopho, autoreque graviſſimo, interpretationis initium auſpicari placuit. Quos autem hic ſcripſit libros, tot ac tantis obſtructi ſunt difficultatibus, ut haud ſciam ſi qua alia apud Græcos extent volumina, quæ cum his aut ſententiarum perplexitate, aut obſcuritate verborum auſim conferre. Cujus profecto rei argumentum eſt non mediocre, quod in tanto numero interpretum, quos noſtra, quoſve prior ætas vidit, nemo unquam inventus ſit, quod ſciam, qui hujus autoris opus aliquod attigerit* (3), i. e. " I, though perſuaded from ſome reaſons, which I " now omit purpoſely, am of opinion, that it will be " more for the advancement of learning, to invert " the common method : I yet would willingly de-
" fend my opinion with ſo much modeſty, as neither
" to arrogate too much to myſelf, nor cenſure others
" for being of a different opinion from me. Every
" man is beſt able to judge what is proper for him to
" do, or not do. I therefore thought fit, (in which,
" however, I differ from other people) to begin with
" tranſlating Syneſius, a great Philoſopher, and a
" grave Author. His compoſitions abound with ſo
" many and ſuch great difficulties, that I know not
" whether anyGreek Author is ſo intricate with regard
" to the thought, or ſo obſcure in his expreſſion. A
" proof of this is, that, among the great number of
" Tranſlators, in this or the former age, I know not
" of one who hath attempted to give us a verſion
" of this Author's works." The compoſition of Syneſius, tranſlated by Phræa, is, the praiſe or elogium of baldneſs. Beatus Phenanus printed this tranſlation at Baſil in 1515, and added a commentary to it. It is not mentioned either by Father Labbe, nor du Pin.

(3) Jo. Phræa, *in Epiſt. dedicat. Encomii calvitiei.*

[*C*] *He*

1465 [C], before his inſtalment (*d*), and it is thought that he was poiſoned by his competitor (*e*).

(*d*) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 634.

(*e*) *Veneno à competitore extinctum fuiſſe ſuſpicio erat.* Idem, ibid.

Phræa was Fellow of Baliol College in Oxford (*f*). It is related, that Poggius pretended to be the Author of the tranſlation of Diodorus Siculus, done by our Phræa [D].

(*f*) See the rem. [D].

[C] *He died in* 1465.] It is ſurprizing that Moreri, as he gives us that date (4), ſhould yet ſay that *Phræas lived in the 14th century.*

(4) The numbers are tranſpoſed in the Dutch edition; 1456 being printed inſtead of 1465.

[D] *It is related that Poggius pretended to be the Author of the tranſlation of Diodorus Siculus, done by our Phræa.*] Peruſe what follows: Burton, Hiſt. Linguæ Græc. p. 55. *ait Johannem Phræam Anglum Colleg. Baliolenſis Socium Diodori* 6. *libros vertiſſe, illamque verſionem Poggium nactum fuiſſe, & pro ſuo in publicum extruſiſſe, idque teſtari quoque* Brian Twyn. Antiq. Oxon. l. 3. (5). *i. e.* "Burton, in his Hiſtory of the "Greek tongue, p. 55, informs us, that John Phræa, "an Engliſhman, Fellow of Baliol College, tranſlated "ſix books of Diodorus Siculus; that this verſion "falling into Poggius's hands, he publiſhed it as his "own; and that is alſo atteſted by Brian Twyn, in "his third book of the Antiquities of Oxford."

(5) Henricus à Sypeſtein, *in Epiſtola de Plagiariis*, p. 70. annexed to *Amœnitates Theologico-Philologicæ* of *Almeloveen.*

PIASECKI (PAUL), in Latin *Piaſecius*, Biſhop of Premiſlia in Poland, lived in the 17th century. In 1646, he publiſhed *a beautiful Hiſtory of all the tranſactions in the Kingdom of Poland, from Stephen Battori till that year* (*a*). He herein introduced, occaſionally, the principal *tranſactions which happened in the Chriſtian world.* The judgment of Le Laboureur, from whom I borrow theſe particulars, with regard to this work, may be ſeen hereunder [A].

(*a*) Le Laboureur, *Relat. du Voiage de la Reine de Pologne*, part 2. p. 117.

[A] *The judgment of Le Laboureur . . . . may be ſeen hereunder.*] He is of opinion, that this Prelate had not ſufficient informations with regard to ſome affairs of France. *This circumſtance excepted,* ſays he (1), *it is a piece worthy the pains of a perſon of his rank; for he is a very faithful Hiſtorian; and ſo generouſly averſe to flattery, that he neither conceals the faults of the deceaſed King* (2), *nor thoſe of his ſon, the reigning Monarch, whom he never applauds without a juſt reaſon. He cenſures the ambition of the houſe of Auſtria; blames the injuſtice of its proceedings; and applauds very ingenuouſly the reaſon of our taking up arms, and the deſign of the alliances concluded by us, to oppoſe the attempts it meditated on all the Powers of Europe.* Here follows the judgment of a German Author of that work: *Quæ noſtram ætatem ſpectant, ea* Paulus Piaſecius in Chronicis geſtorum in Europa ſingularium *luculentius ſubminiſtrat; negant PIASECIO in omnibus ſecurè fidem adhiberi aliqui, & certum eſt, non eſſe ipſum ab omni in hiſtoria errore immunem* (3), i. e. "Paul Piaſecius, in the Chronicle of the Tranſactions of Europe, has treated excellently well thoſe matters "which relate to the preſent age. Yet ſome ſay "that Piaſecius is not to be relied upon in all things; "and it is certain that there are a few faults in his "Hiſtory." This Hiſtory of Piaſecius was reprinted at Amſterdam, from the Poliſh edition: the manner in which Amelot de la Houſſaie cites it, in his notes on Cardinal de Oſſat's Letters, and elſewhere, proves that he eſteemed it.

(1) Idem, ibid. This Journey was writ in 1646.

(2) Of the King of Poland.

(3) Maurit. *de Princip. Jur. Publ.* cap. 2. n. 25. *apud* Magirum, *Eponymolog.* p. m. 661.

PICARDS, by this name is called the followers of a certain man, who, about the beginning of the 15th century, improved upon the errors of the Adamites with regard to nakedneſs. His name was Picard; and he went from Flanders to Germany, and proceeded as far as Bohemia. It is related, that he impoſed upon people by juggling tricks. However this be, he had, in a little time, a great number of followers of both ſexes. He commanded them to go always naked, which was more than was required by the Adamites mentioned by St. Epiphanius, who only ſtrip themſelves naked in their aſſemblies. He called himſelf the ſon of God; and pretended that, like a new Adam, his father had ſent him into the world, there to reſtore the law of nature, which, according to him, conſiſted chiefly in two things, community with reſpect to women, and the going ſtark naked (*a*). He fortified himſelf in an iſland of Luſmik river, ſeven leagues from Thabor, the famous Zeſca's military reſidence. Unhappily for him, forty of his followers having committed great diſorders, drew upon them the forces of that formidable General. Theſe forty Adamites being gone out upon a party, plundered ſome country houſes, and killed upwards of two hundred perſons. Upon this, Ziſca (*b*) attacked the iſland, took it, and put to the ſword all the Picards, two excepted [A], whoſe lives he ſpared, in order to learn, from their own mouths, what ſort of religion they profeſſed. It is farther ſaid, that though marriage was not inſtituted among them, yet no man was allowed to lye with a woman, without firſt obtaining leave of the Chief of the Sect for that purpoſe. Any man who had an inclination for a woman, was obliged to take her by the hand, and lead her to Picard, to whom he ſaid, *My ſpirit is heated for this woman* (*c*); upon which the Founder ſaid, *Go, increaſe and multiply.* One of the great principles of the people of this Sect was, that no perſons in the world but themſelves were free, the reſt of mankind being ſlaves, eſpecially when they hid their privities: this is what was meant by ſome female followers of Picard, whom a Bohemian Nobleman kept in priſon for ſome time; they ſaying, that thoſe perſons who wore clothes, eſpecially ſuch as wore breeches, ought not to be conſidered as free. They were delivered

(*a*) Varillas, *Hiſt. du Wicleſian*, part. 2. p. 43. and *Hiſt. de l'Hereſ.* liv. 2. ad ann. 1420.

(*b*) JohnShechta, in a letter written by him to Eraſmus, in 1519. The 20th epiſtle of book 14, of Eraſmus's epiſtle, affirms that Picard infected Ziſca and his whole army with his errors.

(*c*) *In hanc ſpiritus meus concaluit.*

[A] *Two excepted.*] Varillas declares that all the men were executed; but that all ſuch *women as were with child had their lives ſpared* (1). He adds that, *after their delivery, they would not leave their diſſolute way of life; but that they were ſentenced to the flames, into which they threw themſelves laughing.* I know not why he departs from Æneas Silvius's relation, where it is ſaid that Ziſca gave quarter only to two men. *Adamitas omnes gladio delevit, duobus tantum reſervatis, ex quibus gentis ſuperſtitionem cognoſceret.* He, perhaps, was deſirous of rectifying this paſſage, by another of that Hiſtorian, where mention is made of ſome female Adamites, who were brought to bed in priſon, and ſuffered the torment of the flames with joy; but this paſſage cannot juſtify Varillas, ſince it appears, that thoſe women were in priſon with their huſbands, and were ſentenced to be burnt with them. To adjuſt the ſeveral parts of this account, we muſt ſuppoſe,

(1) Varillas, *Hiſt du Wicleſianiſme*, part 2. p. 43. and *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie*, liv. 2. ad ann. 1420.

vered of children in prison; and having been sentenced to the flames, together with their husbands, they suffered death laughing and singing (*d*). Some Enthusiasts among the Anabaptists have endeavoured to revive the madness of the Picards, with regard to nakedness [*B*]. This sort of people have been as much abhorred by the Protestants as by the Romanists, as Cardinal Hosius owns (*e*). Nevertheless, the Bohemian brethren have been called Picards [*C*], though their principles bore no similitude with those who were extirpated by Zisca, almost *after the same manner with the Interdict*. Those who pretend that Tandemus had revived in the 12th century, the heresy of the Adamites, in the same manner as Picard renewed it in the 15th (*f*), do not write with accuracy; Tandemus (*g*) not having commanded his followers to go naked. This may be more justly affirmed of the *Turlupins* *, as will be shewn in its proper place.

(*d*) *Ex* Æneas Silveo, *de Origine Bohemor.* cap. 41.

(*e*) Lib. *de utriusque speciei commun. apud* Prateol. *Voce* Pikardi.

(*f*) Moreri, under the word *Adamites*.

(*g*) See his art.

* Heretics, who used to go naked, &c.

suppose, either that all the Adamites were not in the island taken by Zisca, or that he had thrown some of them into prison, before the slaughter in question. If these two suppositions are denied, it cannot justly be asserted, that he saved only two Adamites. By the way, the Protestants have applauded him highly for this action (2).

(2) See du Plessis Mornay, *Mystere d'Iniquite*, p. 512; and Rivet, *Remarques sur la reponse de au Mystere d'Iniquite*, part. 2. p. 594.

[*B*] *Some Enthusiasts among the Anabaptists, have endeavoured to revive the madness of the Picards with regard to nakedness.*] I have spoke of this in the article of the ADAMITES, and have even alledged Lindanus, who is not to be very much depended on. But here follows an Author of much greater authority; I mean Lambert Hortensius (3), in his relation of the tumults of the Anabaptists, dedicated to the Magistrates of Amsterdam, whilst this affair was fresh in the memory of every one. He tells us, that on the 13th of February, 1535, an assembly, consisting of seven men and five women, met in Amsterdam, at the house of John Sibert, in Salt-house Street. One of these men, Theodoret Sartor, by name, called himself a Prophet. He fell prostrate on the ground to offer up his prayers to God; and having ended them, he said to one of his brethren, that he had seen God in his Majesty; that he had spoke to him; that he had gone from Paradise to Hell; and that, after duly considering all things, he knew that the day of judgment was at hand. They met again the same day; and after spending four hours in prayer and expounding, the Prophet took off his helmet and coat of mail; threw them, and the rest of his weapons, into the fire, and appeared naked before the whole assembly. He then commanded all the rest of the company to do the same; and his orders were so punctually obeyed, that they did not leave so much as the least bit of ribbon upon their heads, to tie up their hair; but threw every part of their dress into the flames, as a burnt-offering to the Lord. Immediately the Prophet commanded them to follow him, and do as he did. They then rush out, and run up and down the streets, crying, as loud as they could bawl, *Væ, væ, væ, divina vindicta, divina vindicta, divina vindicta!* i. e. "Woe, woe, woe, divine "vengeance, divine vengeance, divine vengeance!" The inhabitants, terrified at these howlings, imagined that the city was taken by the enemy, and take up arms. Presently the naked riotors are seized, and carried before the Magistrates, where they cast back with disdain the clothes which were offered them. In the mean time, a fire broke out in the house whence this infamous procession came, and was extinguished with great difficulty. March the 28th, the seven men were put to death; and some days after, nine of their accomplices were executed also. Gui de Bres, a Protestant Clergyman, relates this History in a book written against the Anabaptists, printed in 1565 (4). He did not understand the Roman manner of dating, *tertio Id. Februarii, quinto Kal. Mart.* which Hortensius makes use of; he translating, the *3d of February*, and the *5th of March*. He relates the rest exactly, except where he says that these Sectarists were put to the torture, and afterwards beat. In the Latin, (the original) no mention is made of the rack, and he ought to have translated *percutiuntur*, put to death.

(3) He was principal of the College of Naerden. This work was printed at Basil in 1548.

(4) It is entitled, *La Racine, source, & fondement des Anabaptistes ou Rebaptisez de nostre temps.* See also *l'Hist. des Anabaptistes*, printed at Amsterdam in 1695. p. 96 *& seq.* In p. 95, the figures are transposed, viz. the year 1553 for 1535.

[*C*] *The Bohemian brethren have been called Picards.*] By this name all those were called, who most vigorously opposed the progress of Popery in Bohemia; Sleidan dividing the Bohemians in manner following. *Ad Bohemos quod attinet, sic habet. A morte Joannis Hussi in tres potissimum sectas divisus est populus. Una est eorum qui Pontificem Romanum ut Ecclesiæ Principem, & Christi Vicarium agnoscunt: altera eorum, qui cœnam Domini percipiunt integram, & in Missis nonnulla recitant lingua populari; cæteris autem in rebus à Pontificiis nihil differunt: tertia est eorum qui dicuntur Picardi; Pontificem hi Romanum & clientelam ejus omnem appellant Antichristium, & meretricem illam in Apocalypsi depictam; præter biblica scripta nihil recipiunt; Sacerdotes & Episcopos sibi deligunt ipsi; matrimonio nemini interdicunt; mortuis nullas faciunt exequias; dies festos & ceremonias habent perpaucas* (5). i. e. "Here follows "what relates to the Bohemians. They, after John "Huss's death, were divided chiefly into three Sects. "The one acknowledge the Roman Pontiff to be "head of the Church, and Christ's Vicar. A second take the Lord's Supper in both kinds, and "some part of that service is in the vulgar tongue. "The third are called Picards; these give the name "of Antichrist, and the harlot described in the Revelations, to the Pope of Rome, and all who adhere "to him; they allow of nothing but the Scriptures; "they elect their own Priests and Bishops, forbid no "persons to marry; perform no rites at burials; and "have very few festivals and ceremonies." However, Rudigerus, in his History of the Bohemian brethren, will not allow (6) the name of Picards which was given them; and conjectures, that it was imposed on them by their enemies, *in order to reflect an odium on them by that infamous name, as though we* (says he) *had been no more than the wretched remains of the leud Picard, who, reviving the antient heresy of the Adamites, introduced nakedness and infamous actions.* This conjecture is probable enough.

(5) Sleidan, lib. 3. See also Thuan. book 6. and John Slechta's letter, among those of Erasmus, lib. 14. p. 675.

(6) Page 148.

PICCOLOMINI (ALEXANDER) Archbishop of Patras, and Coadjutor of Sienna, deserves a place among the illustrious men of the 16th Century. He was born in Sienna, and of the same family of Paul Pius (*a*). He was master of a great deal of learning, as appears by the books he wrote on various kinds of subjects [*A*]. However, I would

(*a*) Thuan. *Hist.* lib. 65. p. 233.

[*A*] *The books he wrote on various kinds of subjects.*] Ghilini mentions the following: *La Filosofia morale: la Theorica de' pianetti: l'Institutione dell' huomo: l'Institutione del Prencipe Christiano: della Grandezza dell' acqua e della terra: Parafrasi sù la Rettorica d'Aristotile: della creanza delle Donne: delle Stelle fisse: due Comedie cioè l'Alessandra e l'Amor Costante: la Sfera: i Sonetti: Traduzione della Poetica d'Aristotile: Annotazione sopra la medesima Poetica d'Aristotile: Tesoro dell' huomo in tre parti diviso tratta dell' buon nome & nella terza fa menzione dell' amor sopranaturale* (1). Vossius observes, that our Piccolomini printed at Venice in 1565, a Latin Commentary on Aristotle's mechanical questions (2). He bestows great encomiums on this Author: *Philosophus planè eximius fuit; tum ob ingenium, & industriam; tum quia feliciter adeò Mathesin, & philosophiam, conjunxit. Utrâque sanè excelluit; ut præclara tot ejus opera ostendunt* (3). i. e. "He doubtless was a great Philosopher, both "on account of his genius, and his application to "study, and because he so happily united mathe- "maticks and philosophy. His noble works prove "that he excelled in both."

(1) Ghilini, *Teatro d'Huomini letterati*, Tom. 1. p. 8.

(2) Vossius, *de Scient. Mathemat.* p. 302.

(3) Idem, ibid.

would not have people believe ſtrictly the ſeveral particulars which his panegyriſts relate concerning him [*B*]. He wrote on philoſophical ſubjects in his mother-tongue, and is thought to be the firſt who did ſo [*C*]. The treatiſe he publiſhed by order of Francis of Medicis, grand Duke of Tuſcany, with regard to the reformation of the Calendar, merited the approbation of perſons of the greateſt learning (*b*). He was very praiſe-worthy for having joined to the theory of the mathematics and phyſics, a regularity of manners and a very exemplary life (*c*). He adhered ſtrongly to the opinions of Ariſtotle (*d*). He was member of the Academy of the *Infiammati* of Padua (*e*). Notwithſtanding the gravity of his morals, and his cloſe application to philoſophical ſtudies, he nevertheleſs wrote ſome plays, which met with great applauſe [*D*]. He died in Sienna the 12th of March 1578 (*f*) aged threeſcore and ten years, and was buried in the cathedral (*g*). What Thuanus ſays of him [*E*] is curious enough, and worthy the imitation of ſtudious perſons: he ſpeaks of this as an eye-witneſs. It will be incumbent on me to criticize his tranſlator [*F*].

(*b*) Joh. Imperialis, *in Muſæo Hiſtor.* p. 82, 83.

(*c*) Idem, ibid. p. 82.

(*d*) Idem, ibid.

(*e*) Ghilini, *Teatr.* part. 1. p. 8.

(*f*) He did not live in 1600, as is affirmed by Moreri.

(*g*) Imperialis, *in Muſæo Hiſt.* p. 82.

PICCOLOMINI

[*B*] *His panegyriſts relate concerning him.*] I am of opinion that there is an hyperbole in the following paſſage of Thevet (4): "He really was a man, who "diſplayed a divine eloquence in his writings; and "had ſo wonderful a grace in ſpeaking, that he ſeemed "rather to charm the ears of his auditors, than perſuade them by the artifice of his rhetorick. With "regard to his ſkill in languages, he was not infe"rior to any perſon, whether with reſpect to the an"tiquity and propriety of the Hebrew tongue, the "elegance and ſweetneſs of the Latin ſtyle, in which "he was ſo great a maſter, that, it would have been "impoſſible for Tully, and the reſt of the excellent "Orators, to have expreſſed their thoughts better and "more naturally than our learned Alexander did. "He made ſo great a progreſs in divinity, law, phy"ſics, the mathematics, and philoſophy, that he "did not leave the moſt ſecret of their receſſes un"ſearched, as is well known to thoſe who had the "happineſs to ſee and converſe with him, and to "peruſe his learned and excellent works: he is ap"plauded for the eaſe with which he explained any "Authors he undertook, whoſe greateſt difficulties "he cleared up. Any one, who caſts an eye on his "Commentaries on the Meteors and other works of "Ariſtotle (5), will perceive that he diſcovered ſo "exactly his Author's ſenſe, that it would have "been ſcarce poſſible for Ariſtotle himſelf to have "illuſtrated his own opinions better than our Picco"lomini did."

(4) Thevet, *Eloge des Hommes illuſtres*, Tom. 8. cap. 3. p. 32, 33. edit. in 12. 1671.

(5) The Epitomizers of Geſner ſay only, that he tranſlated the Commentaries of Alexander Aphrodiſienſis, on the 4 books of *Ariſtotle's Meteors*.

[*C*] *He is thought to be the firſt who did ſo.*] Imperialis blames him for this, as depreciating learning, and not becoming the reſpect and veneration which was due to the language of antient Rome. *Efferbuit mire*, ſays he (6), *ingenium Alexandri Piccolominei Senenſis in cogendo ſub Etruſcis vexillis agmine ſcientiarum omnium, quo intentato alias facinore immortalem ſibi pararet in Italica celebritate triumphum. Memorabilis profecto induſtria, niſi trito proteri ſermone rerum apices præclariſſimarum eſſet, contemptum ipſarum quendam apud viliores inducere, & quod magis intereſt, eſſet Latinæ locutionis majeſtatem ac ſtudium abdicare qua ultro utiliſſima quæque comprehenſa & conſignata eſſe palam eſt.* i. e. "Alexander Piccolomini of Sienna had an ardent "deſire to bring the whole circle of the ſciences un"der the Tuſcan banners; by which attempt (where"in he was not preceded by any perſon) he hoped to "obtain an immortal triumph among the Italians. "His efforts would indeed have been praiſe-worthy, "did not his exhibiting the moſt exalted things in "the vulgar tongue bring them into ſome kind of "contempt with the meaner ſort of people; and "likewiſe baniſh the majeſty and ſtudy of the Latin "tongue, in which the moſt valuable particulars are "written." See the repreſentation, which Boccalini (7) ſuppoſes our Alexander to make on mount Parnaſſus. Some people are not willing that the key of the ſciences ſhould be permitted to come into the hands of the vulgar. They would have all books of philoſophy and erudition written in Latin; and require men of learning to deal with antient books as the Church of Rome has frequently treated the Scriptures. That Church will not permit the Scriptures to be read in the vulgar tongue without the utmoſt precautions. It is the *Sanctum Sanctorum*, from which the profane ought to be excluded. See the complaint which (8) Du Pin has refuted in the Preface to his new Bibliotheque of eccleſiaſtical Authors.

(6) Imperialis, *in Muſæo Hiſt.* p. 82.

(7) Boccalini, *Ragguagli di Parnaſo*, Centur. 1. cap. 73. p. m. 221, 222.

(8) It is mentioned in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for June 1686, art. 4. p. 653. See a paſſage in Tully, *in Oratione pro Muræna*, mentioned by Eraſmus, under the adage *cornicum oculos configere*. It is the 75th of century 3. Chil. 1. p. m. 123.

[*D*] *He wrote ſome plays, which met with great applauſe.*] I will here cite John Imperialis: *Neque tamen his dicatus gravioribus muniis abſtinuit interdum à luſibus poetarum comicas concinnando fabulas, quarum inſigniores duæ amoris conſtantis, & Alexandri titulo feruntur impreſſæ, in quibus ſic excelluit, ut ideo comicorum Italicorum princeps Trajani Boccalini judicio cenſeatur* (9). i. e. "Though he devoted himſelf to theſe graver "ſtudies, he yet ſometimes diverted himſelf with "writing Comedies; the two beſt of which are ſaid "to be printed under the title of *Conſtant Love* and "*Alexander*, which were ſo excellently well written, "that Trajano Boccalini looks upon him as the "Prince of comick Poets among the Italians." I am of opinion that Menage, from theſe words, had a right to rank our Piccolomini in the catalogue of ſuch Eccleſiaſticks as have writ amorous verſes (10).

(9) Imperialis, *in Muſæo Hiſt.* p. 83.

(10) Chap. 145. in the *Anti-Baillet*, Tom. 2.

[*E*] *What Thuanus ſays of him.*] He followed Paul de Foix, whom Charles IX. had ſent upon an embaſſy into Italy in 1573. This Embaſſador going to Sienna, went and viſited our Piccolomini, and found him reviſing his Commentaries on Ariſtotle. All the ſervants of our old Gentlemen were abroad; ſo that, by not being appriſed of the Embaſſador's coming, he found Piccolomini on a couch. I will tranſcribe, in Latin, the account he gives of the conſolation which reading adminiſtered to him, in the midſt of all the infirmities of old age. *Dum in urbe eſſet Foxius, Alexandrum Picolomineum veneranda canicie ſenem in ædibus ſuis inviſit, quem culcitræ incumbentem, & Ariſtoteli ſuo, hoc eſt à ſe diverſis explicationibus illuſtrato, recognoſcendo vacantem improviſus invenit. Nam ſolus erat, & famuli huc illuc per feſtum diem diverſi abierant. Quod ille anxietate ſumma excuſavit, & gratias Foxio pro tam honorifica ſalutatione egit, tum ſedere juſſis qui cum Foxio aderant, in iiſque Thuano. Multa de ſtudiis ſuis diſſeruit, eorumque ſe demum in ea ætate dulciſſimum fructum capere dixit, aliis oblectamentis deficientibus, quibus aliæ ætates innocenter & citra offenſam gaudere poſſunt. Quod cum dicebat, non tam ſenectuti ſolatium quærere dicebatur, quam adoleſcentes qui aderant, qua humanitate erat, ad deſidiam vitandam & Philoſophiæ ſtudia capeſſenda exemplo ſuo cohortari* (11). i. e. "Whilſt Mr. de Foix was in the city, he paid "a viſit to Alexander Piccolomini, a man venerable "for his ſilver hairs, and found him reclined on a "couch, and reviſing his Commentary on Ariſtotle. "The old man was alone; all his ſervants, (as it "was a holiday) being gone abroad. Piccolomini "begged a thouſand pardons of the Embaſſador; "returned him great thanks for the honour he did "him, and deſired thoſe who accompanied him, "among whom was Thuanus, to ſeat themſelves. "He then ſpoke a great deal concerning his ſtudies, "and ſaid they afforded him a vaſt deal of pleaſure "in his old age; he not being able to taſte of other "delights, which younger perſons might enjoy with "innocence and void of offence. He ſpoke this, "not ſo much to ſhew that he wanted comforts in "his old age; as kindly to excite the young perſons "preſent, by his example, to ſhun a life of ſloth, "and devote themſelves to the ſtudy of philoſophy."

(11) Thuan. de *Vita ſua*, lib. 1. p. m. 1170. col. 1.

[*F*] *It will be incumbent on me to criticiſe the tranſlator of Thuanus.*] I will compare his tranſlation with the Latin words of Thuanus. *Alexander Picolomini*, ſays he (12), *endeavoured to make people believe, that*

(12) *In* Teiſſier, *Eloges tires de Thou*, Tom. 1. p. 484, 485.

PICCOLOMINI (FRANCIS), was born in Sienna, and of the ſame family with him of the foregoing article. He was a very famous Philoſopher in the 16th Century. Though he was very young when he taught logic in the Univerſity of Sienna, his lectures were ſo excellent, that he raiſed the admiration of the whole city. He afterwards taught philoſophy in the Univerſity of Macerata, and afterwards ten years in that of Perugia [*A*]. He roſe to ſo great a height of reputation, that the Paduans invited him to accept of the ſame employment among them. Accordingly he was made Profeſſor extraordinary of philoſophy in that city in 1560; and about four years after, Profeſſor in ordinary in the ſame faculty. He publiſhed a great many Commentaries on Ariſtotle, which were highly eſteemed, on account of the clearneſs and ſubtilty with which they abounded. He endeavoured to revive the Platonic philoſophy [*B*], and to ſhew that it agreed, in the main, with that of Ariſtotle (*a*). The famous James Zabarella was his antagoniſt, and he publiſhed a piece againſt him. I ſhall take notice elſewhere of the things in which he excelled him [*C*]. Having obſerved that the diſputes, which the Profeſſor had appointed in the afternoon, occaſioned many quarrels and diviſions, he wiſely put an end to them (*b*). He took that ſtep with ſo much the leſs reluctance, as he enjoyed an annual penſion of fourteen hundred Florins (*c*). Thrice happy could he have appeaſed the quarrels which prevailed in his family, as happily as he did thoſe

(*a*) Extracted from James Philip Thomaſin, *Elog.* part. 1. p. 208 *& ſeq.*

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

(*c*) This intimates, that the Profeſſor gained ſome profit by theſe diſputes.

that he was of the family of Æneas Silvius, who, being raiſed to the Pontificate, aſſumed the name of Pius II. Here follows Thuanus's Latin. *Alexand. Picolominæus Æneæ Silvii qui pontifex Pius* II. *dici voluit, Gentilis, &c.* (13). It is plain Thuanus affirms, that our Alexander was related to Pope Pius II. but the tranſlator charges him with advancing a ſlander which reflects the higheſt odium on the memory of that learned Sienneze; he charging him with laying a falſe claim to that family. If it be an enormous blunder becauſe of the prejudice it does to an illuſtrious perſon; it is no leſs enormous, if we conſider how eaſily the original might have been underſtood. The Tranſlator adds, that *John Baptiſt the Sacriſtan or veſtry keeper, Deiphobus the Arch-Prieſt, and his other brothers beſtowed an honourable elogium on him* (14). I am of opinion that the following words of Thuanus are not faithfully tranſlated. *In majore patriæ urbis templo ſepultus, & honorifico à Jo. Baptiſta ædituo, Deiphobo Archipreſbytero aliiſque fratribus elogio ornatus.* I am perſuaded that, by *aliis fratribus*, we are to underſtand the reſt of the canons of the cathedral of Sienna, and not the brother of Alexander Piccolomini.

(13) Thuan. *Hiſt.* lib. 65. p. 233. ad ann. 1578.

(14) *i.e.* on Alexander Piccolomini.

[*A*] *He taught philoſophy in the Univerſity of Macerata, and afterwards . . . . . in that of Perugia.*] He quitted Sienna, in order to go to Macerata, at five and twenty; and intended to ſeat himſelf, as a ſcholar, rather than take the chair as a profeſſor: but ſoon after he came to Macerata, he was preſented to the chief profeſſorſhip in philoſophy. This we are told by Imperialis (1). He ſays nothing which intimates what is affirmed by Tomaſini, *viz.* that Piccolomini was logical profeſſor in Sienna before he went to Macerata. Imperialis adds, that he continued only a year in the laſt mentioned city; when being invited by the Perugians, he took that opportunity of diſplaying his capacity in a more noble theatre. During the ten years which he taught philoſophy there, he publiſhed a volume of Moral Philoſophy *(De Morali Philoſophia)* which was admired: *Tantis omnium cætuum laudibus exceptum, cum nihil eo, vel ad efformandos mores utilius, vel ad Rempublicam rectè gerendam accommodatius, vel ad omnem bonorum, malorumque notitiam ſuavius excogitari poſſit* (2). i. e. "It met with ſo univerſal an applauſe, be-" cauſe nothing could have been more happily adapt-" ed to form the manners; or more ſuited to the " well regulating of a ſtate, or better calculated for " the general knowledge of good and evil." Father le Moine (3) has mentioned this work with applauſe, and criticiſed ſome paſſages in it. Obſerve the following title, *Franciſci Piccolominei Senenſis univerſa Philoſophia de moribus nunc primum in decem gradus redacta & explicata. Venetiis in folio* 1583. This ſeems to intimate, that the firſt edition of this work is of 1583. If this be true, Imperialis is miſtaken, in ſaying, that our Author publiſhed his work during his profeſſorſhip in Perugia; and that this work was the occaſion of his being invited to Padua (4): for, according to Imperialis's calculation, he began to teach philoſophy in Padua, at about thirty ſeven years of age, that is anno 1557. This Hiſtorian cannot be excuſed, but by ſuppoſing that the Philoſopher in queſtion had publiſhed his moral work before the year 1557, and afterwards put it into a new order, till then unknown. Publiſhing it in that form at Venice in 1553, he might have given the title as above, though it was but a ſecond edition. I am to obſerve that he inſerted in his moral work, printed in 1583, a treatiſe *De Methodo*, wherein he oppoſed Zabarella his collegue and rival. The latter wrote a defenſe; but Piccolomini renewed the attack, by a piece entitled, *Comes politicus adverſus Jacobum Zabarellam.*

(1) Jo. Imperialis, *in Muſæo Hiſt.* p. 114.

(2) Idem, ibid.

(3) In his *Peinturas moralez.*

(4) *Hoc unum effecit poſtea ut graviſſimo Venetorum judicio ad Patavinum Gymnaſium fueris convocatus.* Imperialis, *in Muſæo Hiſt.* p. 114.

[*B*] *He endeavoured to revive the Platonic philoſophy.*] Imperialis declares, that he did not apply himſelf to this ſtudy till after he had left off teaching: but, according to Tomaſini, he read lectures, and wrote on that ſubject even in Padua. Imperialis's words are as follows. *Hac igitur egregie navata Venetis opera per annos duos & viginti patriam ſibi tandem viſendam cenſuit, in qua extremos etiam ſpiritus hauſit. Ac interim pluribus ad magnum Etruriæ Ducem legationibus* (5) *perfunctus, plurimiſque honoribus auctus amæniſſima Platonis philoſophia vacare cæpit, quam etiam commentariis exornandam ſuſceperat, ipſum namque dicere ſolitum accepimus, Platonis & Ariſtotelis philoſophiam duos quaſi oculos humani aciem intellectus dirigere, quorum alterutro ſi quis careat Cyclopis inſtar in hac rerum univerſitate labatur neceſſe eſt: ſed communia fata præclaros hoſce illius conatus interciderunt* (6). i. e. "After having happily " laboured for the Venetians twenty two years, he at " laſt reſolved to viſit his native country, in which " he died. In the mean time, after going upon ſe-" veral deputations to the grand Duke of Tuſcany, " and receiving a great many honours, he began to " devote himſelf to the delightful charms of the " Platonick philoſophy, on which he had undertaken " to write Commentaries; for I have been told he " uſed to ſay, that the philoſophy of Plato and Ariſ-" totle, like two eyes, directed the ſight of the un-" derſtanding of man; and that any perſon who had " but one of them, was like a Cyclops, and muſt ne-" ceſſarily ſtumble and fall in the world: but the " common deſtiny of mankind interrupted all the " noble deſigns of this Author." Read alſo Tomaſini's words (7), and make the neceſſary compariſons.

(5) Idem, ibid. p. 115.

(6) He mentions one of thoſe deputations, in the dedication of his book *de rerum definitionibus*, dated at Sienna, in 1600.

(7) Thomaſin. *Elog.* part. 1. p. 209.

[*C*] *I ſhall take notice elſewhere* (8) *of the things in which he excelled* Zabarella.] But I muſt obſerve here, that he was inferior to him in certain reſpects. He did not go to the bottom of a ſubject as Zabarella did: he uſed to ramble from one to another; and did not offer them ſo much as wine to be drank, as to be merely taſted. I take this to be Imperialis's thought. *Piccolomineus*, ſays he (9), *oratione quidem utitur expedita, gravi, & illaborata, cæterum ſententiarum nexu frequentior quam forte conveniat, excurrit enimvero, nec in concluſionibus hæret, novis at ſubinde doctrinæ cumulis urget, ut libanda potius quàm guſtanda propoſitorum veritas offerri videatur, propterea bene ſententium calculis ſancitum, hujus ſcripta magis provectiorum auribus inſervire, illius autem juniorum.* i. e. "Piccolomini's diction is ſhort, grave and unlaboured, " but perhaps too much perplexed. He employs too

(8) In the rem. [*A*] of the art. ZABARELLA.

(9) Imperialis, *in Muſæo Hiſt.* p. 115.

thoſe of his pupils; but his ſons hated one another to ſuch a degree, and were ſuch wretches, that they involved his old age in numberleſs troubles. He quitted his profeſſorſhips, after having exerciſed them with glory during fifty three years [*D*], and retired to Sienna, where he died in a very advanced age [*E*]. He left his heirs conſiderable wealth (*d*). His funeral obſequies ſhew, in a particular manner, the eſteem which the inhabitants of Sienna had for him; the whole city putting on mourning, and all the courts of juſtice being ſhut up (*e*). He had been Diſciple of the famous Zimara, and fellow-pupil of Felix Peretto, who, when Pope, aſſumed the name of Sixtus V. and who thought it a glory, ſo long as he lived, that he had been able to anſwer his objections in a publick diſputation (*f*) [*F*].

(*d*) *Ex* Tomaſini, *Elog.* part. 2. p. 208.

(*e*) Imperialis, *in Muſæo Hiſt.* p. 115.

(*f*) Idem, ibid. p. 114.

" many excurſions, and does not dwell long enough " upon a theme; but introduces, every now and then " new ſubjects; in ſuch a manner that the truth of " his propoſitions ſeems to be offered us, merely that " we may taſte, rather than drink of them; for this " reaſon the judges are of opinion, that his compoſitions are better adapted for thoſe who are of a " mature age; and thoſe of the other Author for " younger people."

[*D*] *He quitted his Profeſſorſhips, after having exerciſed them with glory during fifty three years.*] Tomaſini affirms this, but he cannot be reconciled with Imperialis, who ſays that our Profeſſor lived a year in Macerata, ten in Perugia, and twenty two in Padua *, which make but thirty three in all. Let it not be ſaid that he omitted the Profeſſorſhip in logic exerciſed by him in Sienna; for it could not continue twenty years, ſince Piccolomini was but five and twenty when he was Profeſſor of Philoſophy in Macerata, Ghilini ſuppoſes the fifty-three years mentioned by Tomaſini to be juſt (10): and he is more excuſable than Paul Freherus (11), who admits them, after affirming that Francis Piccolomini was appointed Profeſſor of Macerata at twenty-five years of age; that he was but one year Profeſſor there; that he exerciſed his Profeſſorſhip of Perugia but ten years, and that of Padua but twenty-two years. Such are the miſtakes which Writers commit, when they blend together oppoſite relations.

* He was 41 years in Padua, as appears by Tomaſini.

(10) Ghilini, *Teatro*, Tom. 1. p. 62. De Witte, *in Diario Biogr.* ad ann. 1604, ſpeaks only of 52 years.

(11) Freher, *in Theatro*, p. 1498.

[*E*] *He died in a very advanced age.*] Tomaſini and Imperialis agree in ſuppoſing him to be fourſcore and four years of age. They forgot to ſet down the day of his death; but we find, by the date of his epitaph in Ghilini (12), that it was in 1604. Imperialis obſerves, that our venerable old man was ſo happy as never to want Spectacles (13).

(12) *Theatro*, part. I. p. 62.

(13) *Ex eo fœlix in tanto ſenio quod oculorum vim nullo unquam chryſtalli ſubſidio juvit.* Imp. *Muſæo Hiſt.* p. 115.

[*F*] *Sixtus* V. . . . . *thought it a glory ſo long as he lived, that he had been able to anſwer his objections in a publick diſputation.*] Here follows an account of this incident, as related by Imperialis. *Et quidem Fœlix adhuc Minorita quod ſemel propoſitarum in templo Theſium ex utraque philoſophia publicum impugnatorem ſortitus erat Franciſcum, ſæpius porro pontifex ejus diei memoriam recolebat, ſibi digniſſimum reputans cum acerrimo, ut ipſe ajebat, ingenio in celebri confeſſu haud ſegniter doctrinæ atque ingenii gloriam ſuſtinuiſſe* (14).

(14) Ibid. p. 114.

PIENNE (JANE DE HALLUIN, LADY DE), maid of honour to Catharine de Medicis, was paſſionately beloved by Francis de Montmorency (*a*), eldeſt ſon of the Conſtable Anne de Montmorency. He promiſed her marriage without acquainting his father or his mother with it [*A*], fearing leſt they ſhould thwart his deſign. It is by no means probable that they would ever have conſented to it, though the Lady was of an illuſtrious family, and diſtinguiſhed by her virtue and merit: but there was a particular reaſon which moved them to oppoſe that marriage in the moſt publick manner, and which was, that Henry II. conſented that the Lady de Pienne's lover ſhould marry his natural daughter, the relict of the Duke of Caſtro. This alliance flattered the Conſtable's ambition ſo much, that he would not ſuffer his ſon's promiſe to be valid: and being in the higheſt favour with Henry II. in which a ſubject ever was with his Prince, he perſuaded that King to uſe all imaginable methods to have the promiſe, which the Lady de Pienne could urge, declared void. *This affair became the moſt conſiderable in Chriſtendom, by the oppoſition*

(*a*) Who was made Marſhal of France in the year 1559.

[*A*] *He promiſed her marriage, without acquainting his father or his mother with it.*] Monſieur le Laboureur, who had *the originals of all the proceedings* by him, relates (1), that they begin with *the examination of the two lovers in the Louvre*, October the 5th, 1556. " *That Jane de Halluin being firſt called in, ſaid ſhe* " *was about* 19 *or* 20 *years old*, and that it was 5 or " 6 years ſince Meſſire Francis de Montmorency propoſed marriage to her, at the Palace of Paris, or at " St. Germain's, and that *their diſcourſe was, that he* " *took her for his wife, and ſhe took him for her huſband.* " *She ſaid indeed, that before that time, he had often* " *offered to marry her, but ſhe would not accept it, be-* " *cauſe ſhe ſaw he was ſtill very young, and alſo be-* " *cauſe ſhe feared leſt the Conſtable would be diſpleaſed* " *at it: to which he anſwered, that he would wait ſo* " *long, and be ſo dutiful to his father, that he would* " *make him approve it: that ſhe would not have de-* " *clared it, had not the Sieur de Montmorency ſpoke of* " *it, on account of his marriage with Madam de Ca-* " *ſtro.*" She declared alſo, " that ſhe received no " gifts nor preſents from him as pledges of their " marriage, that every thing was tranſacted only by " word of mouth, without witneſſes, and that ſhe ne" ver mentioned it to any of her relations. That he " wrote to her during her confinement, but that ſhe " burnt his letters: *that he continued to hold the ſame* " *diſcourſes to her, ſince his return, particularly in the* " *Abbey of Vauluiſant, when he was there lately, and* " *even yeſterday at the Conſtable's houſe, he ſpoke to her* " *again to the ſame purpoſe, deſiring her not to be angry* " *at it. She added that ſhe did not know her marriage* " *was clandeſtine and unlawful, and that ſhe thought* " *he might marry, though his father and mother were* " *ſtill living, becauſe marriage is eſtabliſhed by God, and* " *the ceremonies only by the church.* Upon the whole, ſhe " referred herſelf to Monſieur de Montmorency, and " ſigned her anſwer. That Lord's anſwer was much " the ſame; and after he had declared that he was " twenty-ſix years old, he confeſſed all, and even " acknowledged that the night before, he had again " promiſed her that he would marry her, when he " mentioned to her the great perplexity he was in: " only, when he was aſked whether, as his father " and mother were ſtill living, he did not know, " that he could not marry without their conſent, he " anſwered, *that when he committed that folly, he did* " *not conſider all thoſe things, being but young ſtill, but* " *that if it were to be done again, he would reflect* " *more ſeriouſly upon it* . . . . (2). Theſe depoſitions " were ſent to Rome, with all the authorities that " could be gathered from the Holy Scripture, and " from the Fathers, againſt marriages contracted " without the parents conſent: the Pope received " all at firſt pretty civilly; he gave a very kind re" ception to the Sieur de Montmorency, and promiſed " him all the ſatisfaction he could wiſh. But he " only diſſembled, or elſe he had not yet thought of " improving that opportunity to make an alliance " between his own family and the houſe of France, " which

(1) Le Laboureur, *Addit. aux Memoires de Caſtelnau*, Tom. 2. p. 419.

(2) La Laboureur, *Addit. aux Memoires de Caſtelnau*, Tom. 2. p. 420. Take notice of Brantome's words, in his Elogy of the Conſtable de Montmorency, Tom. 2. of his *Memoirs*, p. 137. Thus when the Conſtable had negotiated . . . a marriage between him and .. King Henry's natural daughter . . . as his father acquainted him with it, telling him when the marriage was to be ſolemnized, Monſieur de Montmorency anſwered him, that he could not conſent to it, becauſe he had promiſed marriage to Mademoiſelle de Pienne. The good old man was very much ſurprized at this, and had recourſe to tears, &c.

tion of Pope Paul the Fourth's *intention, who had a mind to get that* daughter of Henry II. *who had already been married with an Italian who was a Pope's grandſon, for another Italian who was his own nephew. . . . . This Pope's own intereſt was the only reaſon why the diſpenſation, that was aſked of him, could not be eaſily obtained ; wherefore* Francis de Montmorency went in perſon to petition for it (*b*). The King did not think *the Pope could refuſe him any thing, in ſo favourable a juncture of time as that was, in which they were negotiating an alliance together againſt Spain.* And yet Paul IV. made ſo many difficulties, that the King was obliged to go another way to work [*B*]. He publiſhed an Edict, by which all clandeſtine marriages were declared void, and cauſed the Lady de Pienne to be ſhut up in a Convent, where they extorted from her a declaration by which ſhe gave up her claim : in a word the Pope was uſed very ſcornfully ; for the marriage of Francis de

(*b*) Le Laboureur, *Additions à Caſtelnau*, Tom. 2. p. 419.

" which made him protract that buſineſs, in order to " gain his point." In a proteſt, which Monſieur de Montmorency cauſed to be drawn up at Cardinal du Bellai's houſe at Rome, March the 23d, 1557, he declares, *That ſince five years and above he fell in love, through the folly of youth, with Lady Jane de Halluin, ſirnamed de Pienne, and had contracted marriage with her by word of mouth, without the conſent of the King, and his own father and mother ; that ſince that time, the King and his father having agreed upon his marriage with Diana of France, he was come to Rome, by their order, to get abſolution from the Pope, and a diſpenſation, for which he had continually petitioned his Holineſs ſince four months, having even juſtified his petition by a diſpenſation granted by the Pope in a caſe of the ſame nature : whereupon he was kept at bay with fair words and promiſes, and referred to a congregation of Divines and Canoniſts, ſummoned to meet the 23d of this month with the Cardinals, Archbiſhop and Biſhops, under colour of making the affair more legal, but in reality, as he knew from very good hands, to thwart his deſign, contrary to the Pope's promiſe, who backed the votes which were favourable to his adverſe party, though ſhe did not pretend to be a defendant in this cauſe ; the Pope alſo frowned upon and abuſed thoſe who voted for his abſolution, and ſhewed by all manner of proofs that he was againſt him. Wherefore, having notice of the Lady de Pienne's renunciation, he proteſts againſt all that the Pope might determine for the future againſt the liberty he claims to marry, and requires that the petitions preſented by him to his Holineſs for that purpoſe be regiſtred, together with the diſpenſation granted by the Pope in a caſe of the ſame nature* (3). His complaints of the Pope's conduct are grounded on the particulars, which will be mentioned hereunder (4).

(3) Le Laboureur, *Addit. à Caſtelnau*, Tom. 2. p. 432.

(4) In the rem. [*B*].

[*B*] *Paul* IV. *made ſo many difficulties, that the King was obliged to go another way to work.*] Let us ſee how Monſieur le Laboureur continues (5) : *The Pope kept* Monſieur de Montmorency *a great while at Rome, referring him from one Congregation to another, till at laſt his artifice was diſcovered ; the King and the Conſtable being diſappointed in their expectations they had conceived of him, and unwilling to be fruſtrated in an affair, which would thus have made a great noiſe only to their own diſadvantage, cauſed an Edict to be drawn up on purpoſe, which was publiſhed and recorded, by which all clandeſtine marriages were declared void : on the other hand, the King's authority was made uſe of, to oblige the poor Lady to give up her claim : ſhe was ſhut up in the Convent of the* Maidens of God *, *where for fear of being uſed worſe ſtill, and deſpairing to ſucceed in her wiſhes, ſhe was alſo made to believe that Monſieur de Montmorency had obtained a diſpenſation from the Pope.*

(5) *Addit. à Caſtelnau*, Tom. 2. p. 420.

* *Au Couvent des Filles de Dieu.*

In order to know how much this Pope was influenced by the private intereſt of his family, we muſt always have this capital point in view, namely, that Paul IV. had a mind to marry his nephew with the natural daughter of Henry II. which deſign could not ſucceed, if the promiſe made to the Lady de Pienne were declared void. We ſhall ſee that he wiſhed on this occaſion that the Papal authority had been leſs, and that he had been deprived of a right, of which he would have been very jealous in any other caſe. He was more concerned for the advantage of his family, than for the privileges of the Holy See, either becauſe he imagined that his ſucceſſors would eaſily find means to retrieve the damage he did them, or becauſe he conſidered only the preſent time, and preferred abſolutely his own private advantage, before that of the Papal authority. The buſineſs was very briſkly proſecuted by the Court of France ; nothing was omitted to make it ſucceed. They produced the deed by which the Lady de Pienne gave up all her claim, and the Edict againſt clandeſtine marriages (6). They found means to get (7) *a copy of a diſpenſation which* the Pope *had granted in a like caſe.* Here follows a paſſage from the account which Doctor de la Haye ſent to the Conſtable (8) : it contains a curious particular. Paul IV. (9) *ſent from the Datary, to know from him how that diſpenſation had been delivered ; for he wondered at it, and more ſtill, how it came to fall into our hands : to which the ſaid Datary anſwered, that it had been delivered in a full Court of the Chancery, and ſigned by his Holineſs himſelf, which the Pope could well remember, ſince his character was ſuch, that he would hear and ſee every thing that was done in his Chancery more carefully, than any of his Predeceſſors were wont to do. His Holineſs was quite amazed at it, and aſked his Datary by what means the ſaid diſpenſation could be reverſed and called in, which the Datary anſwered was abſolutely impoſſible, conſidering the diſpenſation was in the hands of the parties concerned, who by virtue of it were already married.*

(6) Le Laboureur, *Addit. à Caſtelnau*, Tom. 2. p. 424.

(7) Ibidem, p. 425.

(8) Ibidem, p. 424.

(9) Ibid. p. 426. See alſo the rem. [*D*].

Let us alſo give ſome account of the firſt congregation, which was held for the diſpenſation of that marriage. The Pope preſided in that congregation (10), to which he alſo called *ſeveral Divines and Canoniſts. . . . . The Pope ſpoke firſt,* and having propoſed the caſe, he ſaid (11) ; " We aſk whether a marri- " age contracted by word of mouth, which is a true " marriage, and a true ſacrament, according to the " opinion of the moſt holy Divines, can be broke " and declared void by us, I mean when it has not " been conſummated. Then he added this ; pray, " do not pretend to urge the proceedings and in- " ſtances of our Predeceſſors, which I proteſt I will " not follow, but ſo far as authority of the Scrip- " ture, and the arguments of the Divines will move " you to approve them. He ſaid alſo what follows : " I do not queſtion but my Predeceſſors and myſelf " may have done wrong ſometimes, not only in this " point, but in many others : and yet we are by no " means to blame for it : for God rules and governs " his Church ſo, as to conceal from her ſeveral " things for ſome time, which he reveals to her after- " wards ; which Chriſt himſelf hints plainly enough " to us, when he ſays to St. Peter, *what I do thou* " *knoweſt not now, but thou ſhalt know hereafter* * : " In another place he ſaid, *I have yet many things to* " *ſay unto you, but you cannot bear them now* †, *but the* " *Holy Ghoſt, whom the Father will ſend in my name,* " *ſhall teach you all things* **. Who knows then, " but what God kept formerly concealed concerning " the indiſſolubility of the holy matrimony, he is " now determined to declare by us ? Wherefore, " dear brethren, and children, you muſt endeavour " to aſſiſt me in this affair, and without minding " what ſuch or ſuch of my predeceſſors have done, " ſee whether it be not true that they have not ſuffi- " ciently underſtood, what we deſign now to examine " concerning the indiſſolubility of marriage. Hav- " ing ſaid this, he directed his diſcourſe to the Arch- " biſhop of Couſance, formerly Nuncio to the Em- " peror's Court, and commanded him to declare his " opinion. This Prelate did his beſt endeavours to " prove that ſuch a marriage cannot be declared void, " and as the Pope ſignified by ſeveral hints, that he " was extremely pleaſed with his opinion, as by his " ſmiles, by his looks, by his nods, and by his clap- " pings ; this determined the Archbiſhop to add a " great many things, which he had not thonght of " before, as appears both from his minutes, and by

(10) Ibidem, p. 427.

(11) Ibidem.

* John xvii. 7.

† Ibid. xvi. 12.

** Ibid. xiv. 26.

de Montmorenci with Henry the Second's daughter was celebrated with great pomp, though the diſpenſation was not granted [C]. The Pope owned a thing, which deſerves to be taken notice of [D]. The proceedings were carried on in a very unfair manner [E], and the Conſtable's ſon felt ſome remorſes of conſcience, which obliged him to apply

" the conferences which he had held : the Pope ſaid " aloud that the Archbiſhop had ſet the whole matter in a very clear light. After him ſpoke Biſhop " Antoniellus, a very antient and venerable man, " who was of a quite contrary opinion, and proved " in a few words, that the Pope could grant what " was required of him ; his Holineſs anſwered him " that he did not thank him for the great power he " gave him in that affair : and as that Prelate had " ſupported his opinion by ſome paſſages from St. " Thomas, the Pope obſerved, that St. Thomas " might have aſſerted many things in his youth, " which he recanted when he came to riper years " and to have more learning ; his Holineſs added " this paſſage from St. Paul, *when I was a child, I* " *ſpoke as a child, ... but when I became a man, I* " *put away childiſh things* * ; then he ſaid, it is not " with any deſign that I give you this warning, " but that they, who are ſtill to deliver their opinion, " may not lay any ſtreſs on what St. Thomas thought " in his youth. After him voted the Sacriſtan †, " who was of the ſame opinion with Biſhop Anto- " niellus, namely, that the Pope might and ought " to declare ſuch marriages void, when there is a rea- " ſonable cauſe for it ; and as among his arguments, " which where pretty long and not leſs learned, he " happened to quote ſomething from Doctor Da- " rand concerning the ſubject of matrimony, Da- " rand's writings not being allowed as good autho- " rities, and he quoting them without pretending to " defend them, the Pope who had already taken offence " at his opinion, fell into a paſſion againſt him, as " tho' he had been theauthor or aſſertor of Darand's " ſentiments ; and as the Sacriſtan endeavoured to " vindicate himſelf, the Pope ſilenced him with oppro- " brious language, and by dreadful threatnings, ſay- " ing ſeveral times, that he deſerved to be puniſhed, " and that he would tell him more of his mind in " private. This terrified the others ſo, that ſeveral " of them reſolved to alter their opinion entirely."

* 1 Cor. xiii. 11.

† I ſuppoſe the Keeper of the Sacred Palace is meant here.

There were but ſeven perſons who voted in that congregation : *the reſt* were kept *to be heard another time* (12). The Cardinals retired being very ill pleaſed, and one might eaſily underſtand, *without any other intelligence of what paſſed there . . . . . that there aroſe no leſs diſorder and confuſion among them, than what happens generally among the flock, when the ſhepherd is ſmitten and wounded. For they all went away quite aſtoniſhed, and almoſt with tears in their eyes, one one way, another another, without being able to relate to any of their friends or ſervants, how things paſſed, and to what reſolution they were come* (13). Cardinal du Bellay and Monſieur de Montmorenci having ſent word to the Conſervator of Naples, that conſidering the King's Edict, they might very well proceed without the Pope's diſpenſation, and that he ſhould remember, that *a leſs material affair than this determined Germany and England to break off with the Holy See, to which they uſed to pay obedience* (14) ; that Conſervator ſent the Datary to the Cardinals of Caraffa and Piſa to tell them, " that he was very much aſtoniſhed at " his Holineſs's proceedings, and that he could never " have thought the Pope would have ſet up both for " a judge and a party concerned in that affair, and " that he ſhould imagine the Holy Ghoſt directed " him only, and not alſo the reſt of his Counſellors : " deſpiſing every one's opinion, with ſo little regard " for his own dignity, and for thoſe, whom he com- " manded to ſpeak, and to whom he gave the com- " miſſion to deliver their opinions freely, without " any favour or biaſs whatſoever ; and that on a " leſs conſiderable occaſion than the preſent was. " Cardinal Cajetan's obſtinacy had reduced Germany " to the condition it was in, there being no great " hopes of ſeeing it brought to better terms, unleſs " by God's grace alone. They ſhould duly conſider " the contents of the King of France's Edict, by " which together with the cenſure of the Sorbonne, " and the Ordinary's authority, without any diſpen- " ſation from his Holineſs, Monſieur de Montmo- " renci might ſet himſelf at liberty, and marry " whom he pleaſed (15)." All this was preſented to the Pope, but did not make him alter his proceedings. Whence we may infer, that the Court of France looked upon that negotiation as a moſt important affair ; but that the Pope did not think it leſs important with regard to his own intereſt, not to determine any thing. If we had two or three volumes in folio, containing ſuch accounts as thoſe of Doctor de la Haye, and of Cardinal du Bellay (16), it would be one of the moſt curious works that could be placed in a library.

(12) Le Laboureur, *Addit. aux Memoirs de Caſtelnau*, Tom. 2. p. 429.

(13) Ibidem.

(14) Ibidem. P. 430, 431.

(15) Ibidem.

(16) Monſieur Le Laboureur gives us the latter at length, in his *Addit. à Caſtelnau*, Tom. 2. p. 432, &c.

[C] *The Pope was uſed very ſcornfully : for the marriage was celebrated, . . . though the diſpenſation was not granted.*] " The King and the Conſtable did not " think they could revenge themſelves better of the " Pope, for the little account he made of their re- " commendations, than by concluding the marriage " by virtue of the Edict againſt clandeſtine mar- " riages ; the ceremony was accordingly celebrated " with but greater pomp and ſolemnity on Monſieur " de Montmorenci's arrival in the month of May " 1557, the Court being then at Villier-Cotrez (17).

(17) Ibid. p. 437.

[D] *The Pope owned a thing, which deſerves to be taken notice of.*] It was in the congregation I have mentioned above. *I knew*, ſaid he (18), *that the Popes my predeceſſors have given ſeveral diſpenſations in ſuch caſes ; they are before God to anſwer for them. If they happen to have done wrong, I will not follow their example ; they may have done it out of ignorance, and thoſe ages did not know perhaps, what the following ages continually diſcover to us, according to* JESUS CHRIST'S *words*, ſcietis autem poſtea, &c. non poteſtis omnia portare modo, &c. Veniet Paracletus, &c *. *And as for what is objected, that I have given a diſpenſation in a like caſe, I would not have this to be any ways prejudicial to the ſubject before us, for God knows that I never underſtood it. There are in the Chancery a multitude of people, prelates, referendaries, and others, who are perpetually bawling one one way, another another, ſo that a poor decrepid Pope cannot hear or underſtand things accurately : for my part, I declare ſolemnly, that I never underſtood the matter ; and what is more, if, as a man, I have erred in one thing or another, I would not perſiſt in my error.* This is an abſtract from an account drawn up by Cardinal de Bellay, which Monſieur le Laboureur has inſerted among his additions to Caſtelnau's Memoirs : and here we have a man who truſted to a very weak diſpenſation ; for the ſame Pope, who had granted it to him, declared to the ſacred College, that he never underſtood that queſtion, and that old as he was, he could not be attentive to particulars among the clamours which reſounded throughout the place, where diſpenſations and other deeds are ſigned. And yet the man, who had obtained that diſpenſation, thought himſelf lawfully married : but if that diſpenſation were void, he committed ſo many acts of adultery every time he enjoyed his wife. Nothing ſeemed ſhameful to Paul IV. if he could but find pretences not to declare Monſieur de Montmorenci's marriage void.

(18) Ibid. p. 433.

* The paſſages from the Bible are tranſlated above in the rem. [B], a little below the quotation (11).

[E] *The proceedings were carried on in a very unfair manner.*] Nothing ſuited the Pope's purpoſe better than to urge that the Lady de Pienne required the confirmation of her marriage : in order therefore to anſwer that argument, a deed was procured in due form, by which it appeared that ſhe laid no manner of claim to Monſieur de Montmorenci. But ſuch a declaration could not be forced from her but by making her believe that the Pope had already granted the diſpenſation. Wherefore her lover did not ſcruple to write that falſity to her. Here follows his letter, which is as unkind as his former letters were ſweet and loving. " MADAM DE PIENNE, being ſenſible " of the fault which I have committed unawares, " and very ſorry that I offended againſt God, againſt " the King, and againſt my Father and Mother, I " have given our holy Father the Pope to underſtand " how

" how things paſſed between us both, and aſked his " Holineſs's pardon for it, which in his great good- " neſs and mercy he has granted me, giving me " alſo, as far as it may be neceſſary, a diſpenſation " to reſtore me to my former liberty; of which I " judged it proper to give notice. And to extricate " us both out of the misfortunes and perplexities we " are in, I deſiſt from all words and promiſes of " marriage which paſſed between us both, of which " by that diſpenſation we are diſcharged, and I " hereby diſengage you from them, deſiring you " moſt earneſtly to do the ſame with regard to me, " and to provide for yourſelf as you ſhall think fit: " for I am determined never more to have an intimate " communication or correſpondence with you; not but " that I eſteem you a very modeſt and virtuous Lady, " and of a very good family: but I muſt do my " duty, in order to avoid the unhappineſs and miſ- " fortunes, which might otherwiſe befal us, and " eſpecially to give his Majeſty and my parents an " opportunity to forget the offence I have committed " againſt them, and to endeavour to deſerve their fa- " vour again; and alſo to perform what I owe to " them by God's commandments, to whoſe grace " and providence I recommend you, MADAM DE " PIENNE; from Rome February the 5th. He, " whom you will always find ready to ſerve you, " MONTMORENCI (19)." Francis de la Porte, Gentleman to Monſieur de Montmorenci, a Maſter of the Requeſts, and one of the King's Secretaries, attended by two Notaries of the Chaſtelet, went to the Convent in which the Lady was ſhut up; the gates were opened to them (20) *by virtue of a letter ſigned by the King's own hand. They ſent for the Lady*, and after ſhe had read Monſieur de Montmomrenci's letter aloud, the Sieur de la Porte told her, *Madam, all that I have to ſay to you is by Monſieur de Montmorenci's order, and I ſhall tell it you, if you pleaſe, becauſe he has charged and commanded me to do it. You have ſeen by his letter, which you have juſt now been reading, how grievouſly he thinks he has offended againſt God. . . . .* (21) *He has moſt humbly entreated his Holineſs to pardon him the ſin he had committed by the promiſe of marriage which paſſed between you both, and to grant him a diſpenſation, that he and you may be at liberty to marry whom you pleaſe; which our holy Father has done, and by that means he has reſtored both Monſieur de Montmorenci and you to your former liberty, as he writes to you in the letter, which I have here delivered to you: wherefore, as he is, by the diſpenſation granted to him, free and at liberty to marry any other but you, whenever he ſhall think fit, I declare to you by his order, that he acquits and diſengages you from all words and promiſes of marriage, that may heretofore have paſſed between you both, and I deſire and require of you in his name, to declare to me whether you do not alſo acquit him of his promiſes to you?* To which the Lady de Pienne, *with tears in her eyes and ſobbing, replied after this manner. Monſieur de la Porte, I am much better pleaſed that the breaking off the promiſes between Monſieur de Montmorenci and me, ſhould come from him, than from me. He ſhews but too plainly by what you have told me from him, that his heart is leſs generous than a woman's, and this is nothing like what he told me ſo often, that he would loſe his life rather than alter his mind. He has deceived me very much; I ſee very well that he chooſes rather to be a rich, than an honeſt man.* There being nothing poſitive in this anſwer, the Sieur de la Porte repeated his arguments, inſiſting chiefly on the Pope's diſpenſation, and required that the Lady ſhould ſpeak plain. " Where- " upon the Lady crying as before ſpoke theſe words. " Why, Monſieur de la Porte, what anſwer would " you have me make? Could Monſieur de Mont- " morenci be ſo hard-hearted as to write me ſuch a " Letter?" This anſwer was not more to the purpoſe than the firſt. But the third queſtion was ſo home, that the Lady was under a neceſſity to come to the point. *Monſieur de la Porte*, ſaid ſhe (22), *ſince Monſieur de Montmorenci is determined to diſengage me from the promiſes of marriage paſt between us, and does actually diſengage me from them, I neither will nor can hinder him from doing what he pleaſes, and can have no will contrary to his own.* Monſieur de la Porte was not fully ſatisfied with this third anſwer, he inſiſted again, and obtained at laſt the following reply. " Monſieur de la Porte, ſince Monſieur de Montmo- " renci acquits me now of the promiſes of marriage " which have been interchanged between him and " me, if he were a King's ſon, or a Prince, after he " wrote me ſuch a letter as that which you have de- " livered to me from him, I would not marry him, " and I diſengage him from his promiſes. However, " I am aſtoniſhed at the manner after which he " writes to me in that letter you have given me; I " cannot well believe that he wrote it; ſince he was " uſed to write to me in a quite different ſtyle (23)" She was anſwered that they had ſeen Monſieur de Montmorenci write that letter with his own hand. The Lady, as ſhe was going away, endeavoured to recover her ſpirit, in order to excuſe her tears, which ſhe was ſeen to ſhed; but it was impoſſible for her to appear proud: all that ſhe ſaid betrayed the mortification, the ſorrow, and the grief ſhe had, not to marry that inconſtant lover. Men are uſed to ſay either out of joke or out of gallantry, that it is with the utmoſt reluctancy a miſtreſs is prevailed upon to pronounce that terrible *yes*, which ſhe muſt anſwer to the queſtion, *do you conſent to be the wife of ſuch an one?* But it is very probable that a *yes* of this kind was never more difficult to ſpeak, than that, which the Lady de Pienne anſwered to the queſtion, *do you conſent, that Monſieur de Montmorenci ſhould not marry you?*

There happened a particular, in which that Lord did in all probability forſwear himſelf. The fact is as follows. Being returned from Rome *he gave a declaration in writing before the chief perſons of* the King's *Council*, aſſerting, *that there was not between him and the Lady de Pienne a marriage contracted by word of mouth, and by reciprocal promiſes paſt between them, but only an agreement to make it be thought ſo, in order to endeavour by that means to obtain the conſent of his Father the Conſtable* (24). He affirmed upon oath, that that declaration written by his own hand *contained the truth* (25), and that if he petitioned for a diſpenſation from the Pope, by confeſſing to him more than he ſhould have done, it was only becauſe he hoped to obtain it eaſily, whereby it would not have appeared, that he made him at firſt believe a falſity: but that meeting with great difficulties at Rome, he was at laſt determined to declare the whole truth to the King and to the Conſtable. As though he had ſaid, I did not promiſe marriage to the Lady de Pienne, who had only agreed together to ſay that there was ſuch a reciprocal promiſe between us: we had no other deſign, than to engage my father and mother by that lie to conſent to our marriage. Having aſſerted that falſity very often, I could not reſolve to unſay it again, and that I might not be obliged to be inconſiſtent with myſelf, I choſe rather to aſk a diſpenſation of the Pope, and continued all along to tell lies to his Holineſs: but as I was not able to avoid inconſiſtencies by that means, I acknowledge at laſt, that my aſſertions were falſe, and I ſwear before the chief members of the King's Council, and certify it in writing, that I have been telling lies a long while, in order to impoſe upon my Father, my Mother, the Pope, *&c.* Muſt not ambition have a moſt tyrannical power over a man, when it forces ſuch a confeſſion from him? Is it probable that this lover ſhould have entered only in ſo ſlight an engagement with his miſtreſs, who was ſo young and ſo beautiful? The remorſes of conſcience, which ſtung him, as you ſhall ſee hereunder, confirm my opinion (26).

I muſt examine in this place an anſwer, which to me ſeems very ſophiſtical. Cardinal de Lorrain, after the outrage I have mentioned above (27), cauſed a letter to be publiſhed, in which we meet with theſe words. *I have heard others fetch the cauſe of the Marſhal de Montmorenci's ill-will ſomewhat higher, and even from the time when he was in great perplexity and trouble about his marriage with the Lady de Pienne, which he acknowledged and confeſſed before the ſaid Lord Cardinal, and other Lords, appointed by the late King Henry to examine that matter, and afterwards he denied it, and ſwore to the Pope, that he made no promiſe whatſoever to the ſaid Lady: ſo that the ſaid Sieur de Montmorenci was aſhamed that the Lord Cardinal ſhould know him to be a forſworn perſon, unworthy to bear witneſs, and who deſerved to be degraded of all his honours* (28). Here follows the anſwer of the Proteſtant who refuted that Letter. " The ſecond cauſe of the Marſhal de " Mont-

(19) Le Laboureur, *Addit. aux Memoires de Caſtelnau*, Tom. 2. p. 421.

(20) Ibidem.

(21) Ibidem, p. 422.

(22) Idem, ibid.

(23) Ibidem, p. 423.

(24) Ibidem, p. 437.

(25) Ibidem, p. 439.

(26) Add to this the Diſcourſes which the Lady de Pienne held to the Sieur de la Porte, as we have related above.

(27) Rem. [L], of the article LORRAINE (Charles de).

(28) *Lettre d'un Seigneur du pais de Haynault envoyée à un ſien voiſin & amy ſuyvant la Cour d'Eſpaigne*, p. m. 5 and 6. *i. e.* " A letter from " a Lord of the " Country of " Haynault, ſent " to one of his " neighbours " and friends, " who attended " the Court of " Spain."

apply to Pope Pius IV. for abſolution[F]. The Lady married afterwards a man of a much lower rank than the lover ſhe had loſt [G]. We have here a remarkable inſtance from which it appears that the paſſions of a Prince, which occaſion very often many abuſes, prove ſometimes a remedy to the diſorders of the State. The Edict, by which clandeſtine

" Montmorenci's enmity proceeds, you ſay, from " your holding him for a perjured man, on account " of the Lady de Pienne's marriage. Before I " clear him from that calumny by unqueſtionable " witneſſes and authorities, I muſt humbly deſire the " King's Majeſty to conſider your audaciouſneſs, by " which being carried beyond the bounds of reaſon, " you dare to publiſh that the marriage of his ſiſter " the Marſhal's wife is unlawful. For is it poſſible " not to draw that inſtance from your aſſertion? I " could eaſily pardon your ignorance, if it were not " attended with malice. For (though your imputa- " tion were as true, as it is falſe) can the promiſes of " children of diſtinguiſhed families be any ways " valid for the contracting of marriage, when they " are not approved by the conſent of their parents, " under whoſe authority they live? The examples " of Abraham and Iſaac ſhew us ſufficiently that it " is a father's buſineſs to marry his children accord- " ing to his own will and pleaſure. And if a vow " (which is a promiſe we make to God) made by a " maiden without her father's conſent, be void ac- " cording to the laws of Moſes, how much more " muſt a promiſe of marriage, which is made by " one perſon to another, be void, if the father does " not conſent to it? And though the antient Greeks " were too uncertain and wavering with regard to " ſuch marriages, yet they were not ſo far deprived " of the light of Nature, as to approve them; for " we ſee in Euripides, that a maiden anſwers to a " lover who courted her, *I cannot marry without my " father's conſent, to whom I am ſubject.* If you " ſhould urge, that a father has not ſo great an au- " thority over his ſons as over his daughters, all the " laws would be againſt you, by which a father may " even ſell his children in caſe of neceſſity (29)." After this the Author quotes the Scripture, the Fathers, the Councils, the Civilians, in order to prove that the marriage of children muſt depend on the will of their parents. But all that long diſcourſe is nothing but an evaſion; it is miſleading the reader, and paſſing *de genere in genus*, from one genus or kind to another. The queſtion was not, whether the Marſhal de Montmorenci's marriage with Henry the Second's natural daughter were lawful or not. The Author of the letter had not meddled with that queſtion, he had only aſſerted that the Marſhal was perjured by confeſſing and denying ſolemnly, that he promiſed marriage to the Lady de Pienne. Theſe two facts are an evident proof of perjury, whether the promiſes were obligatory or not: for if a man promiſed to commit a crime, he might indeed obtain from any tribunal to be diſengaged from his promiſe: but if he ſhould ſwear before ſome perſons that he had promiſed, and before others that he had not promiſed, he would be guilty of perjury. This is the caſe in which the Marſhal de Montmorenci was ſuppoſed to be; this was the chief point of the accuſation. The accuſer did not examine whether he ought to have performed his promiſe of marriage, or whether the promiſe were lawful or not: and yet the Proteſtant, who anſwered Cardinal de Lorraine's letter, ſuppoſed that the whole charge was grounded on the lawfulneſs of that promiſe which was not kept. Having made theſe falſe ſuppoſitions, he expatiates at random on ſeveral ſubjects; he quotes the divine laws, the law of nature, he treats of the right of fathers and parents, and ſays a thouſand uſeleſs things, and not one word to the purpoſe. This is the common practice of thoſe who have nothing material to anſwer, and yet fear leſt they ſhould hurt their cauſe if they made no reply. They alter the ſtate of the queſtion, that they may have an opportunity to talk a great deal. I do not doubt but a great many readers imagined that the Marſhal de Montmorenci's Apologiſt triumphed, and were very much edified to ſee that he made Henry the Second's daughter a party concerned in that affair. But this is an artifice too frequently uſed in polemical writings, and which after all is nothing but a trick and an evaſion to miſlead the readers.

(29) *Reſponſe à l'Epiſtre de Charles de Vaudemont Cardinal de Lorraine*, fol. E 3 *verſo*.

[F] *Some remorſes of conſcience . . . . . obliged him to apply to Pope Pius* IV. *for abſolution.*] " Things re- " mained in that condition as long as the Pope and " the King lived. But whether it was that the Mar- " ſhal de Montmorenci had afterwards ſome ſcruples " of conſcience, and aſcribed the ill ſucceſs of his " wife's pregnancy, who though ſhe had been ſeve- " ral times with child, had yet had but one alive, " and died even in a little time, or for ſome other " reaſon, he applied again to the Holy See, and af- " ter Paul the Fourth's death he ſent a petition to " Pius IV. of which I have the original draught by " me: and in which he ſet forth, how being ſur- " priſed by love he had heretofore promiſed marriage " to the Lady de Pienne, yet with condition to get " his father's conſent to it, and not otherwiſe; but " as he could not obtain it, the ſaid Lady had freely " acquitted him of his promiſe both by word of " mouth, and by a juridical declaration ſigned by her " before witneſſes, and in which ſhe ſtill perſiſted: " and he himſelf thought he was lawfully married " to another; yet becauſe of the promiſes made by " him, he deſired an abſolution *à Cautela* or for his " greater ſecurity, and that the commiſſion of it " might be directed to the Biſhop of Paris. Pope " Pius IV. whoſe private intereſt was not concerned " in this affair, as his predeceſſor's was, did not " make many difficulties, and ſent him a large and " full diſpenſation (30). . . . . This diſpenſation ſet " his conſcience at reſt, and did not much alter the " condition of his marriage, which continued to be " fruitleſs (31)" Monſieur le Laboureur was, for ſome reaſons relating to his own family, very much inclined to juſtify thoſe of the houſe of Montmorenci, as much as lay in his power: and yet he ſeems to think it was not true, that the promiſe meant here was only conditional. *If Diana of France's marriage with the Marſhal Duke de Montmorenci was both advantageous and honourable in the ſight of men, it has been juſtly queſtioned whether it were acceptable to God, ſince it was contracted with more violence than juſtice, againſt a pre-engagement of the Marſhal with Jane Halluin, founded on that Lord's love, and on his promiſe* (32).

(30) La Laboureur, *Addit. à Caſtlenau*, Tom. 2. p. 439.

(31) Ibidem.

(32) Ibidem.

[G] *The Lady married afterwards a man of a much lower rank than the lover ſhe had loſt.*] Brantome acquaints us with this: it is a parentheſis he has inſerted in the account he gives us of the reſtitution of the Duke of Savoy's towns: what he obſerves is a proof, that love intrudes itſelf into every buſineſs, and often becomes a ſpring which influences the moſt important affairs of the ſtate. There were ſome wiſe and prudent perſons in the King's Council, whoſe opinion was, that it was not proper to reſtore to the Duke of Savoy the cities he demanded. The King of Navarre (33) *maintained that the reſtitution muſt be made reſolutely, otherwiſe he ſhould not get the Kingdom of Sardinia ſo often promiſed to him, and that the Duke of Savoy had ſent him word and aſſured him, that he would aſſiſt him effectually at the Court of the King of Spain. . . . . At laſt after many debates, the weaker party prevailed over the ſtrongeſt, and for that purpoſe the King diſpatched to Piedmont, from the Bois de Vincennes, after the taking of Bourges, I being a witneſs to it, the Lord d'Alluye (Florimond Robertet) one of the four principal Secretaries of State, who was then deeply in love with the Lady de Pienne* (34). . . . . .

deſtine marriages were declared void, was a very good law, which proved very uſeful to the whole Kingdom [*H*]; but it was not with a view to promote the publick good that Henry II. made that law; it was only for the private intereſt of his favourite, and that he might not have the diſgrace of being over-reached by the Pope's artful intrigues (*c*). The

(*c*) See the rem. [*B*].

I have been told by many perſons of our Court; nor was it the King of Navarre's favour that induced her to it, for he had been dead then above a year; but yet it was he who firſt ſupported and encouraged that gentleman in his love, and aſſiſted him as much as lay in his power: for in ſuch affairs great men at Court can do much, and prove often very uſeful to their friends and fellow-courtiers. The King of Navarre knew very well how to chooſe his Miniſters, ſince on this occaſion he made uſe of a man deeply in love, whom he flattered with the hope of enjoying the object of his paſſion.

[*H*] *The Edict, by which clandeſtine marriages were declared void, was a very good law, which proved very uſeful to the whole Kingdom.*] One of the moſt able Advocates in the Parliament of Paris argues very well upon that ſubject in his letter to Robert and Fournier Profeſſors of Law at Orleans, and is angry becauſe the law was not ſevere enough. He wiſhed men had not ſtopt half way, and that all marriages in general, contracted againſt the conſent, or without the knowledge of the parents, had been void. His letter begins thus. "THE EDICT concerning marriages has been publiſhed in our Court of Parliament; it is indeed a noble and admirable Edict: but you would think it more noble ſtill, if you knew the reaſon of it. For ſome of thoſe who hold the higheſt poſts in France have been the occaſion of it. It is obſerved that moſt of the bad examples ariſe generally from ſuch things as were formerly eſtabliſhed with good and holy deſigns, but which in time come to be abuſed. On the other hand there never was a good law but was occaſioned by ſome ſcandalous practices. The diſtemper muſt come before one thinks of a remedy againſt it. As for this Edict, every one rejoices at it as a noble action, worthy of a King. I alone, like another Timon, and a Man-hater, ſigh and lament, not but that I am glad of the power and authority it gives to fathers over their children, but I am ſorry that they have not a greater power ſtill; and that, as Alexander the Great coming into Aſia did not unty the *Gordian* knot, like the other Princes, who had been there before him, but to have ſooner done cut it with his ſword, ſo they had finiſhed the buſineſs quite, by an order or decree made by the common conſent of the Gallican Church, declared all the marriages whatſoever void, when contracted only by promiſes, and without the authority and conſent of fathers and mothers. Here I cannot but pity our country (France) which being never tired with bringing all eccleſiaſtical affairs under a lawful and wholeſom diſcipline, did not put the finiſhing hand to this material buſineſs (35)." What he adds contains very judicious obſervations, but his concluſion is too ſevere, for he would have all thoſe puniſhed capitally, who by fair words inticed either a young man or a maid into the ſnares of matrimony. *Our Anceſtors*, ſays he (36), *knowing of what dangerous conſequence it would be, if a child under twenty five were judged to be lawfully married by a mere verbal promiſe, to the prejudice of the paternal authority, eſtabliſhed an action of* rape (*which was commonly called* raptum in parentes) *and which is unknown to all other nations. By which they gave leave to fathers and mothers, and even to guardians, to proſecute before the Royal Judge, him or her, who by ſuch fair words had inticed and ſuborned one of their children to marry: the conſequence and effect of that proſecution was ſuch, that it ſuſpended and ſtopt all other proceedings, that might be begun before the official and eccleſiaſtical Judge about the validity of the marriage. But what advantage did you ever reap from ſuch a proſecution? No other, but that, like true Frenchmen, we are at firſt ſtronger than men, and at laſt weaker than women. At the firſt beginning of the proſecution every one ſeems zealous to have it carried on rigorouſly, even the Judges ſeem to be infinitely favourable to the proſecutors: but in the end you never ſee any one puniſhed in an exemplary manner; and after all the raviſher gets the better of juſtice, and of the afflicted family, and continues in a peaceful poſſeſſion of her whom he had carried off. For my part I am of opinion, either that we ſhould have never eſtabliſh'd ſuch an action among us, or that it was neceſſary to make it end in the death of the perſon who committed the crime; that by his death the marriage might alſo be diſſolved.* He did not write perhaps all that he had in his thoughts; he meant perhaps thoſe, who do not only ſeduce a young maiden, but perſuade her alſo to ſuffer herſelf to be run away with. If he omitted inadvertently that part of the definition of a *rape*, his concluſion cannot be looked upon in France as too ſevere, for the French puniſh with death all thoſe who ſteal a maiden away, whether it be with or without her conſent. But perhaps this law was not yet eſtabliſhed in France, when Paſquier wrote his letter to the two Profeſſors of Orleans. I am apt to think it was enacted ſince that time, becauſe it was obſerved that the law, which puniſhed thoſe only, who carried a maiden away againſt her will, was not effectual enough. It was eaſily evaded; for it was no difficult taſk to make a woman confeſs, after ſhe had been run away with, that it was done with her conſent. Such a confeſſion ſaved a man's life, and a woman would not have it upon her conſcience that ſhe ſuffered a man to be put to death, who proteſted that nothing but his violent love for her determined him to ſteal her away: beſides this, a woman was diſgraced, expoſed to a thouſand ſuſpicions, in danger of not meeting afterwards with a good match, and of being conſidered only as another's leavings, after ſhe had been for ſome time in the power of a raviſher (37): all this being duly conſidered both by the girl and her relations, determined them to get the raviſher off ſo that he might not be puniſhed; ſhe had only to declare that ſhe was conſenting: ſo that the affair ended like all thoſe mentioned by Paſquier (38): it was therefore become a common practice to ſteal maidens away; the antient law proved ineffectual, ſo that it was neceſſary to make one more ſevere, by which no account was to be made of the declarations which maidens might make that they conſented to be ſtoln away. It was thought proper to puniſh even their conſent; impunity being proper only to multiply thoſe bad examples: the firſt who ſucceed are an encouragement to others, and men are not aſhamed to follow a road which many others have followed to their ſatisfaction, and without danger. Compare this with what you will meet in the remark of the article ARIOSTA.

The Author examines the Edict with regard to the leave it gives to *fathers and mothers to diſinherit their children, who had been ſo ill adviſed as to marry without their conſent* (39); he ſhews that it is neither a remedy nor a comfort, but a new misfortune (40): and he aſſerts that there is no other remedy, but an order of a Council, by which *all ſuch marriages be abſolutely declared void* (41). He quotes the Scripture, the Fathers, the Roman Laws, and the French Laws under Charles the Bald, and he obſerves that *we do not find there was ever a Council ſince that time, which deprived the Fathers of that noble authority over their children.*" "I know very well, continues he, that ſome centuries ago, there have been Monks, who patching up ſome obſolete gloſſes, have hinted this barbarous and bruciſh opinion, namely, that according to the Canon Law, the father and mother's conſent is not requiſite in the marriage of their children, but only for decency's ſake, and not by any neceſſity. Theſe profeſſed a perpetual celibacy. And would to God, that as that wiſe King of Sparta, Ageſilaus, being found once by a friend playing the fool with his children, deſired him to ſuſpend his judgment about what he had ſeen, till he was a father himſelf; ſo all theſe Monks would forbear giving their opinion in matters relating to matrimony, ſince by their vows, and their rules, they have not the liberty to become fathers. This is the reaſon why they judge of a father's love by their own, which is but common and cold (42)." I wonder he did not obſerve, that the permiſſion to diſinherit does not ſufficiently deter young lovers: for there

(35) Paſquier, *Lettres*, liv. 3. p. 111. of the 1ſt vol.

(36) Ibidem, p. 112, 113.

(37) Compare this with rem. [*E*] of the art. HELENA.

(38) When a maiden is ſtoln away, men make at firſt a great noiſe, they apply to the Courts of Juſtice, they cry aloud for puniſhment; but they cool by degrees, the prize continues in the Raviſher's poſſeſſion, and is declared a lawful prize. The worſt is, that he makes himſelf often dreadful. The relations fear, leſt, after he had diverted himſelf with his miſtreſs, he ſhould leave her in the lurch; he muſt be entreated, and is maſter of all the marriage articles which are to be drawn up according to his own wiſhes.

(39) Paſquier, *Lettres*, Tom. 1. p. 113.

(40) Is it not making me moſt unfortunate in my old age, not only to ſee that fool half miſerable, becauſe he engaged himſelf fillily, but alſo that I ſhould have no other comfort, but to make him quite miſerable, by diſinheriting him, as the Law gives me a power to do? Ibidem, p. 114.

(41) Ibidem.

(42) Paſquier, *Lettres*, Tom. 1. p. 117.

The houſe of Guiſe contributed moſt effectually to raiſe the difficulties, which Francis de Montmorenci met with at the Court of Rome [*I*].

there are ſo many fathers, who have eaſily pardoned a marriage contracted againſt their will, and there are ſo few inſtances of fathers who perſiſted in their reſentment, and ſhewed it by their laſt will, that young people flatter themſelves eaſily to ſee their parent ſoon reconciled with them. They depend very much on the ſtrength and force which nature gave to paternal affections (43), and they knew that a ſhort mortification is a ſufficient atonement for great faults with a father, *pro peccato magno paululum ſupplici ſatis eſt patri* (44).

Paſquier's cenſure is after all a great commendation of Henry the Second's Edict: for ſince that learned Civilian wiſhed, that the rebellion of children under age had been more ſeverely puniſhed, he commends and approves the new degree of puniſhment to which it was made liable. And beſides it muſt be obſerved, that he declares that what was wanting in that Edict, muſt be ſupplied by the eccleſiaſtical, and not by the Royal Authority.

Let it not be objected that that Edict is prejudicial to thoſe whoſe fathers are ſo covetous, or ſo fantaſtical and ill humoured, that they will never conſent to the marriage of their children. That objection is not reaſonable; there is no law which is uſeful to all perſons without exception (45): it is therefore enough that the Edicts prevent the greateſt evils. Now there are infinitely more young perſons, who out of love or out of a frolick will untimely marry, than there are fathers who would refuſe their conſent to reaſonable marriage. It is better therefore that the laws ſhould reſtrain the liberty of the children, than leſſen the authority of the parents: beſides, after a certain age the children are no longer under conſtraint by Henry the Second's Edict. Nor ſhould it be objected, that the liberty of marrying without the parent's conſent affords to many honeſt men who have no eſtate an opportunity of mending their fortune. This is what I have heard ſome Engliſhmen urge, who pretended to vindicate the privilege which ſome Churches at London enjoy, in which the Prieſts may marry, without the preliminary formalities, and thereby render the moſt clandeſtine marriages good in law; by that means, ſaid they to me, the eſtate of a very rich heireſs is come more than once to a poor family, which has flouriſhed ſince that time, and done a great deal of honour to her country. By ſuch an argument one might vindicate the ſtealing away of a maiden, and maintain that it ought to go unpuniſhed. But this is a wretched apology; for there is no abuſe, let it be ever ſo great, but is uſeful to ſome perſons. Muſt one therefore take care not to remove it? Can a man be really honeſt, and have true merit, when he endeavours to deprive fathers of the authority, which all the laws, human and divine, give them over their children? If you reckon right, you will find that for one man of worth who got an eſtate that way, there are twenty who had no other merit but the art of making themſelves beloved by a fair outſide, and by their courting and flattering, which won the heart of a young girl, either ſilly and ſimple, or angry at the ſevere uſage of a mother, a guardian, *&c.* The falſity of theſe apologies for privileged Churches muſt have been well underſtood, ſince it is not long ſince the news-papers have told us, that the parliament of England was about taking away the privilege of theſe Churches.

(43) *O nimium potens Quanto parentes ſanguinis vinclo tenes Natura! quam te colimus inviti quoque!* Seneca, *in* Hyppolyto, Act. 4. ver. 1114. *i. e.* "Oh too powerful nature, how ſtrong is the tye of blood in fathers! How much do we worſhip thee, even againſt our will!

(44) Terent. *in* Andria, Act. 5. Sc. 3. *in fine.*

A REFUTATION of thoſe who endeavour to juſtify clandeſtine marriages, and the ſtealing away of maidens.

(45) See above, the rem. [*E*], of the art. PATIN, quotation (**).

[*I*] *The houſe of Guiſe contributed moſt effectually to raiſe the difficulties . . . . . at the Court of Rome.*] "The "Duke of Guiſe's preſence at Rome, and the jea- "louſy of authority which was between him and the "Conſtable, gave ſo much the more room to ſuſpect, "that he would oppoſe the granting of the diſpenſation, "as it was deſigned for a marriage more advantageous "to the houſe of Montmorenci than the private in- "tereſt of the Guiſes could bear. He and his bro- "ther the Cardinal had made a ſtrict alliance with "Pope Paul IV. and with the whole family of the "Caraffes: they had been the chief authors of the "breaking of the truce with Spain, and the Conſta- "ble oppoſed it. It is therefore very probable that "they urged the Pope on; and if they did not of "their own accord propoſe to him to aſk Diana of "France for one of his nephews, yet it is very like- "ly, that they made him believe he might get her "by means of the difficulties he ſhould raiſe againſt "granting the diſpenſation, and that they gave him "to underſtand, ſuch a match would be a moſt pow- "erful ſupport for his family. So that they would "not only have broke a marriage of the utmoſt im- "portance to the houſe of Montmorenci, but have "alſo rendered another valid, contracted in a very "noble family indeed, but yet inferior to the other "in dignity and riches (46)." The Marſhal de Montmorenci's marriage with the Lady de Pienne was in many reſpects ſo diſadvantageous to the Guiſes, as Monſieur le Laboureur ſhews, that we may be very certain they acted the part he mentions. If they had not urged on the buſineſs, and prepoſſeſſed Paul the Fourth's mind, it is by no means probable that that crafty and ſubtle Pope would have had ſo little power over his own paſſions. You have ſeen (47) in what manner he ſhewed his partiality, by his anger, and by his rough way of proceeding againſt thoſe, who did not vote according to his own wiſhes. It was becauſe if he had left every one at liberty to vote freely, he did not know how to compaſs his deſigns, I mean, to execute the project which the Guiſes had put into his head. Had it not been for that reaſon, he would have acted with temper, and concealed his deſigns: he would have thus perſuaded a great many perſons, that a zeal for the diſcipline obliged him not to infringe the holy Canons in the leaſt, even tho' he could thereby oblige the moſt Chriſtian King, and extend the Papal Authority as far as his Predeceſſors had done more than once. If that had been the caſe, Monſieur Eſprit might have urged that Pope's conduct as a new inſtance of *the falſity of human virtues* *.

(46) Le Laboureur, *Addit. à Caſtelnau*, Tom. 2. p. 437.

(47) In the rem. [*B*].

* Monſieur Eſprit has publiſhed a book with that title.

PIGHIUS (ALBERTUS), born at Campen in Overyſſel, is reckoned among the learned men of the 16th Century: Moreri has given a large account of him, but he has not taken notice of a groſs blunder of Lewis Guicciardini [*A*], which we ſhall cenſure hereunder,

[*A*] *A groſs blunder of Lewis Guicciardini.*] Having obſerved that Albertus Pighius, an eminent Divine, and a great Mathematician, being loaded with honour and riches by the Popes Hadrian VI. Clement VII. and Paul III. left Italy, and returned into his own country, where he died glorioufly a few years after; Guicciardini adds that ſeveral Authors have nevertheleſs aſſerted, that Pighius was killed at Bologna by the fall of a bridge in the year 1530. He obſerves that Paulus Jovius is the firſt who related that falſity, and that Surius and others tranſcribed him blindly, whereupon he cenſures the raſhneſs of all wretched tranſcribers. *Paullus tamen Jovius, quem ſecuti ſunt poſtmodùm Frater Laurentius Surius, & alii quidam Scriptores, qui non inſtituta priùs collatione, neque adhibitâ ullâ conſimili diligentiâ, (digni ſanè hoc nomine qui repræhendantur) alienâ fide ſubnixi ad alios ſeſe perpetuò referunt: Paullus (inquam) Jovius, libro hiſtoriarum ſuarum vigeſimo ſexto, Albertum hunc, multò anteà tempore, anno ſcilicet Chriſti* 1530 *& in ipſa Caroli Quinti Cæſaris inauguratione, fortuita pontis ruinâ Bononiæ mortuum perhibet* (1). i. e. "And yet Paulus "Jovius, whom Frier Laurence Surius and others "followed afterwards, depending on the credit of "others, whom they perpetually imitate, without "examining things themſelves, and without uſing "any care or diligence, (for which they are cer- "tainly very much to blame:) Paulus Jovius (I ſay) "aſſerts in the 16th book of his Hiſtory, that this "Albertus Pighius was killed long before, at Bo- "logna,

(1) Ludovicus Guicciardinus, *in Deſcriptione Belgii Provinciarum*, p. m. 237.

hereunder, nor of Albertus Pighius's frightful uglineſs and bad pronunciation [*B*]. Moreri's errors of commiſſion are conſiderable enough [*C*]. Beza has aſſerted that Pighius wrote a book againſt Calvin, with a deſign to get a Cardinal's hat [*D*]. Others pretend that

" logna, by the fall of a bridge, in the year 1530, " at the time of the Emperor Charles the Fifth's " Coronation." Here is a cenſure very much to the purpoſe indeed! Guicciardini cenſures very ſeverely thoſe, who admit an Author's account without examining whether it be true or not; he uſes them, I ſay, with the utmoſt contempt; and he himſelf commits moſt fooliſhly the very ſame fact for which he blames them. For if he would have been at the trouble of conſulting Paulus Jovius and Frier Laurence Surius, he would have found that they do not aſſert, that Albertus Pighius loſt his life in the year 1530. He muſt therefore have copied blindfold ſome Writers, who aſcribe that falſity to thoſe two Authors. I have conſulted the Paſſage of Paul Jovius, which Guicciardini quotes, but I have found nothing there, relating to Pighius's death: I have conſulted the paſſage where he gives an account of Charles the Fifth's Coronation, and I have found there only, that Pighius was one of thoſe who fell down when the bridge ſunk in. *Ibi plerique militibus immixti, fœdo caſu procidentes, ſeſe pilis atque ſecuribus induerunt; inter quos fuit Albertus Pighius Belga theologus Lutheromaſtix, minima tamen pro tumultu clades incidit* (2). i. e. " Moſt of them being there mixed " with the ſoldiers, falling down moſt dangerouſly, " were mingled among the javelins and axes. One " of them was Albertus Pighius, a Dutch Divine, " and a great antagoniſt of Luther: but yet there " was little harm done, conſidering the great noiſe " the fall of the bridge made." A man who obſerves expreſsly that the bridge falling down made more noiſe than did harm, and who does not aſſert that Pighius, the only perſon he names of all thoſe who fell down, was killed by the fall, hints plainly enough that that Doctor eſcaped with his life. Obſerve that he calls him *Lutheromaſtix*, Luther's antagoniſt, which convicts Guicciardini of a new blunder; for he charges Paulus Jovius with accuſing Pighius of Lutheraniſm (3). His cenſure of Surius is very ill grounded; ſince that Carthuſian Monk has faithfully tranſcribed Paulus Jovius (4), and ſince he aſſerts alſo in another place that Pighius died only in the year 1545 (5). I add that Paulus Jovius obſerves, that Pighius's piety preſerved him from the fatal conſequences of that fall. *Quum id volumen* (de Hierarchia) *commentaretur . . . . . eum è ſummo vitæ periculo certiſſimum Dei maximi numen eripuit. Bononiæ enim in celeberrima pompa, quum tranſeunte coronato Cæſare Carolo Quinto, pars lignei pontis juxta Cæſarem turbæ pondere corruiſſet, Albertus lignorum atque hominum ruina ita oppreſſus eſt, ut probitatis ac inſtituti operis merito ſervaretur. Obiit nondum ſenex in patrio ſolo, ſacerdotiis à Clemente, & Paulo liberaliter honeſtatus* (6). i. e. " Whilſt he was " compoſing that work (of the Hierarchy) . . . God's " providence delivered him from a moſt imminent " danger of his life. For during the great ſolemnity which was celebrated at Bologna, when " Charles V. returned from the place where he had " been crowned, part of the bridge, near the Emperor, ſunk in by the weight of the people, and " Albertus Pighius, being almoſt ſqueezed to death by " the boards and the people that fell upon him, " would probably have periſhed, had not the merit " of his piety, and of his intended work ſaved him. " He died in his native country, before he was an " old man, being honoured with Church-preferments " by the Popes Clement and Paul." Hoſpinianus, anſwering thoſe, who pretended to ground an argument againſt Zwingle's Doctrine on that Author's dying a violent death, urges, among other reaſons, a recrimination. He names ſome perſons zealous for Popery, who met with a tragical end. He places Pighius among them. *De* Pighio *aliqui ſcribunt*, ſays he (7), *fuiſſe illum in tumultu oppreſſum in magna hominum frequentia una cum pecunia illa, quam à Papa & Cardinalibus propter operam ſuam in cauſa pontificia defendenda collocatam, acceperat.* i. e. " Some write that " Pighius periſhed in a tumult which aroſe among a " great crowd of people, together with the Money " he had received from the Pope and the Cardinals, " for the pains he had taken in defending the cauſe " of Popery." We meet in all communions with Hiſtorians who make an advantage of falſe reports. Orthodoxy does not cure that defect. See in the remark [*F*] the words of a Divine of the Augſburg Confeſſion, who was guilty of the ſame falſity with Hoſpinianus.

(2) Paulus Jovius, *Hiſtoriar.* lib. 27. folio m. 3 *verſo.*

(3) *Lutheraniſmi inſuper, etſi injuſtiſſime quidem, eum inſimulans: cum (ut diximus) a doctrinâ Lutheri fuerit alieniſſimus, adeoque ſummus illius hoſtis & antagoniſta.* Lud. Guicciardin. *in Deſcript. Belgii*, p. 237.

(4) Surius, *Commentar.* p. m. 239. ad ann. 1530.

(5) Idem, ibid. p. 491. ad ann. 1534.

(6) Jovius, *in Elogiis*, cap. 105. p. 246.

(7) Hoſpinian, *Hiſt. Sacrament.* Tom. 2. p. 210.

[*B*] *Pighius's frightful uglineſs and bad pronunciation.*] Paulus Jovius pretends that nature abuſed Pighius with ſome impudence, and concealed the eminent learning and Chriſtian eloquence, which ſhe beſtowed upon him, under a frightful face. *Magna hercle naturæ illudentis inverecundia, excellentem doctrinam cum illuſtri eloquentia conjunctam, ſi Chriſtiani ſcriptoris decus ſpectetur, multa infaceti oris truculentia opertam, in Alberto Pighio conſpeximus. . . . . In differendo vultus Scythico more contuſus & enormis, & aſpero gutture vox educta, & graviter reſonantis naſi tumultus, totam ferè ſapientiæ gloriam deformabant* (8). i. e. " Nature ſeems indeed " to have abuſed Pighius very indecently: for we " have ſeen his excellent doctrine joined with an " eminent eloquence, if you conſider the glory of a " Chriſtian Writer, hid as it were under the deformity of his diſagreeable face. . . . . His enormous " features diſtorted when he ſpoke, his words fetched " from his rough throat, and the diſagreeable noiſe " of his noſe did almoſt entirely ſpoil the glory of " his wiſdom."

(8) Jovius, *in Elogiis*, cap. 105. p. 245.

[*C*] *Moreri's errors of commiſſion are conſiderable enough.*] I. I do not pretend to determine the queſtion whether Pighius's father was a nobleman or not: but I dare to aſſert that Moreri takes the affirmative ſide of the queſtion a little too raſhly: the word *Patricius*, on which he grounds his aſſertion, is equivocal; and when it is uſed with regard to modern families, it ſignifies generally a man, whoſe anceſtors have been raiſed to the poſt of Senators or Burgomaſters, &c. The Patrician families in the imperial cities and in other places are ſometimes noble, but whether they be ſo or not, they are called Patrician, provided the offices of the Magiſtracy were ſucceſſively held by fathers and ſons, for ſome time. Herein conſiſted perhaps the whole Nobility of our Pighius's father (9). I am not ignorant, that Pighius had ſeveral conſiderable Lordſhips (10), and that this is generally a proof of a man's noble extraction; but as it is not a demonſtrative proof of it, I will not determine any thing poſitively. I am content with having taken notice of the ambiguous ſenſe of the word, on which Moreri grounded his aſſertion. II. To ſay, *Marc. Benevento ſpoiled Alphonſus's opinions concerning the ſituation of the eighth Circle*, is a condemnable expreſſion: there are but two blunders here: Moreri ought to have ſaid, that that man ſpoiled Alphonſus's Hypotheſis concerning the motion of the eighth Heaven (11). III. This expreſſion, *he wrote in* 1538 *an apology for the Council, which* Pope Paul III. *had publiſhed*, is abſurd; for that Pope did not publiſh an apology for the Council, but a Bull for the meeting of the Council. IV. That apology of Pighius was not rewarded *by a preſent of two thouſand Ducats, and by the proveſtſhip of St. John at Utrecht*; for Pighius received theſe two gratifications in the year 1535 (12), three years before the publication of that apology. V. To ſay that he died at Utrecht December the 24, 1543, is not an accurate tranſlation of Valerius Andreas, who ſaid, *obiit*, VII. *Kalend. Januarii, anni ineuntis* CIↃ IↃ XLII. That Latin paſſage ſignifies that Pighius died December the 26th 1542. Valerius Andreas is not miſtaken here: ſo that Spondamus committed a blunder, when he aſſerted, that Pighius and Eckius died both in the year 1543 within the ſpace of a month. He places Eckius's death on the 10th of February (13): Swertius places Pighius's death on the 29th of December 1543 (14), and Bullart follows him herein (15): but they are miſtaken; for there is a letter of Cardinal Sadolet, dated June the 17th 1543, in which Pighius's death is mentioned (16). See the remark [*F*].

(9) *Albertus Pighius Campenſis Tranſiſalanus patricio ſanguine natus.* Valer. Andreas, *Bibl. Belg.* p. 38.

(10) See the rem. [*F*].

(11) Valerius Andreas's words (*Bibl. Belgic.* p. 39.) which Moreri pretended to tranſlate are as follow. *Poſitionem Alphonſinam de motu octavi orbis depravantem.*

(12) Val. And. ibidem.

(13) Spondanus, *Ann. Eccleſ.* ad ann. 1543. num. 12. p. m. 479. He has tranſcribed this from Surius, except the day on which Eckius died, which Surius does not mention.

(14) *Swert. Ath. Belg.* p. 115.

(15) Bullart, *Academ. des Sciences*, Tom. 2. p. 14.

(16) See page 686, of Sadolet's letters, of the edition printed at Lyons, 1554.

[*D*] *Beza has aſſerted, that Pighius wrote a book againſt Calvin with a deſign to get a Cardinal's cap.*] All

that the reading of Calvin's works ſhook Pighius's orthodoxy a little [E] with regard to the merit of good works, and the juſtification of a ſinner. Others maintain that Pighius examined Calvin's works with ſuch a paſſionate deſire to refute them, that he receded ſo far from their adverſary's opinions as to run to the contrary extreme. They ſay he followed the ſteps of the Pelagians, for which reaſon Cardinal Bona adviſes us to read Pighius's works with caution (a). His treatiſe of free-will againſt Calvin, and his work concerning original ſin have been put by the Inquiſition of Spain into the catalogue of prohibited works. Poſſevin has given his readers notice, that this man's opinions concerning original ſin and grace are diſliked by the Divines, becauſe he ſeems to recede from St. Auguſtin's doctrine, which is approved by the Church (b). The Janſeniſt, who publiſhed ſome letters of the Prince de Conti, expreſſes himſelf in much ſtronger terms. He aſſerts that Pighius cannot be looked upon (c) *but as a wretched Divine*, ſince he was *a man to whom St. Auguſtin's Theology ſeemed ſuſpicious, a man who adviſed thoſe, who would learn the true doctrine concerning free will, to read the other works of St. Auguſtin rather than thoſe which he wrote againſt the Pelagians*, &c. (d). I ſhall tranſcribe ſome remarks, which have been made againſt John Gerhard, and which contain ſome particulars very proper for this article [F]; nor ſhall I forget to obſerve that Pighius was

(a) *Albertus Pighius ita preſſe Pelagianorum ſectabatur veſtigia ut opera ejus caute legenda meritò cenſuerit Cardinalis Bona.* Narratio Chron. Cauſæ Michaelis Baji, p. 192. Tom. 2. *Oper. Baji.* See the remark [G], quotation (32) and (33).

(b) Poſſevin. *in Apparatu.*

(c) See at the end of the *Prince de Conti's Letters to Father de Champs*, printed in the year 1689, the Treatiſe, intitled, *S. Auguſtin juſtifié de Calviniſme*, p. 181, 182.

(d) You will meet with the following part of this paſſage in the rem. [G], towards the end.

All honeſt men, adds Beza, deſpiſed that work of Pighius, and Satan diſappointed the Author's expectations. Such was his reward. *Adverſus Albertum Pighium Campenſem, ſophiſtam illius ætatis facilè principem, à quo etiam fuerat pro Antagoniſta delectus, ex quo videlicet reportata inſigni victoria, galerum mox à Pontifice conſequeretur. At ille hoc ſuo labore fruſtratus, id unum aſſequutus eſt quod merentur veritatis hoſtes, nempe ut & doctis ſaniſque hominibus fœteret, & ab ipſo Satana deciperetur* (17). i. e. "Againſt Albertus "Pighius of Campon, the chief Sophiſt of that age, "which choſe him for its champion, that having "gained a moſt illuſtrious victory, he might get a "Cardinal's Cap from the Pope: but he was fruſtrated "of the fruits of his labours, and the only reward "he got, was that, which the enemies of truth de"ſerve, namely, to be deceived by all good and "learned men, and to be deſpiſed by Satan himſelf."

(17) Beza, *in Vita Calvini*, ad ann. 1543.

[E] *The reading of Calvin's works ſhook Pighius's orthodoxy a little.*] Theophilus Raynaud having ſuppoſed that there are ſome Hereticks, whom a man cannot read without ſome danger, if he be not deeply learned; but that there are others who deliver their errors in ſo groſs a manner, that there is nothing to fear from them, even though a man be not very learned; that Author, I ſay, having ſet down that maxim as a principle, ſpeaks of Luther and Calvin: the latter he places in the former claſs of theſe Hereticks, and the former in the latter claſs: and he gives Pighius as a glaring inſtance of what he aſſerts. *Qua ratione Lutherus, qui ubique ſtercora, & cœnum crepat, ſuamque animi impotentiam ubique prodit, minoris legentis peritiam expoſcit, quam Calvinus, cujus in ſcribendo vafrities, etiam mediocriter doctis fraudi eſſe queat, ut in Alberto Pighio eſt deprehenſum, quem conſtat ex lectione librorum Calvini impactum non rarò eſſe in ſcopulos: tametſi homo erat non ineruditus, quod edita ab eo volumina teſtatum faciunt* (18). i. e. "Wherefore "Luther, who is continually flinging dirt about him, "and cannot reſtrain his paſſion, requires leſs ſkill in "his Readers, than Calvin, whoſe crafty way of "writing is apt to miſlead even thoſe who have ſome "learning, as it was obſerved in Pighius, whom it is "certain that the reading of Calvin's works led often "aſtray, though he did not want learning, as ap"pears by the works he has publiſhed." An Engliſh Proteſtant aſſerts that Pighius is abſolutely orthodox with regard to the article of Juſtification (19): another Proteſtant of the ſame country obſerves, that the Papiſts charge Pighius with being ſpoiled by the reading of Calvin's works; but that Pighius aſſerted, he had borrowed his doctrine only from the holy Scripture. *Dicunt* Pontificii Pighium. *alioqui* Catholicum Doctorem, *ſeductum ex Lectione librorum* Calvini. *At* Pighius *ipſe teſtatur, ſententiam ſuam ſe è lectione* Scripturarum *hauſiſſe: O* Calvinum *vel Adverſariorum teſtimonio beatum, cujus* Scripta *tantum cum* Sacris Scripturis *conſenſum retinent, ut ſi quod* Pontificius Doctor *celeberrimus fatetur ſe ex* Sacræ Scripturæ *lectione habuiſſe, id alii* Pontificii *lectioni librorum* Calvini *tribuant. Profectò niſi* Scholaſticorum *ſententia cum manifeſtis Scripturis pugnaſſet, nunquam illam deſeruiſſet* Pighius (20). *i. e.* "The Papiſts maintain, that Pighius, o"therwiſe a Catholick Doctor, was ſeduced by read"ing Calvin's works: but Pighius himſelf declares, "that he took his opinions from the Holy Scripture. "Happy Calvin, whoſe writings, even by his very "adverſary's Teſtimony, agree ſo well with the Scrip"ture, that if a moſt celebrated Popiſh Doctor con"feſſes he borrowed ſomething from the Bible, other "Papiſts aſcribe it to the reading of Calvin's works. "And really, if the opinion of the Schoolmen were "not inconſiſtent with the Scriptures, Pighius would "never have renounced it." Let us add a French Miniſter to theſe two Engliſhmen. "Cardinal Roſ"fenſis and Pighius, who wrote alſo againſt Luther, "aſſerted the Doctrine of Grace, and the latter even "maintained that we are not juſtified *by any inherent* "*juſtice, reſiding within us.* But he was paſſionately "refuted by the * Dean of the Univerſity of Louvain, "who charged him with having baſely forſaken the "Doctrine, which they had learnt together in Ha"drian the Sixth's ſchool, and with ſuffering him"ſelf to be corrupted by reading Calvin's Inſtituti"on (21)." I have juſt now ran over the Treatiſe *de Fide & Juſtificatione* (of Faith and Juſtification), which is the ſecond of the nine Controverſies which Pighius publiſhed at Cologne in the year 1542, with this title; *De Controverſiarum præcipuarum in Comitiis Ratiſbonenſibus tractatarum, & quibus nunc potiſſimum exagitatur Chriſti fides & religio, diligens & luculenta explicatio*, i. e. "An accurate and full Expoſiti"on of the chief Controverſies, which have been car"ried on at the Diet of Ratiſbone, and which "chiefly at this time diſturb Chriſt's Faith and Re"ligion." I have met with ſuch things there, that I cannot comprehend how it could be aſſerted, that his opinion about Juſtification, is entirely the ſame with that of the Proteſtants. He exerts all his ſtrength to refute them, and he aſſerts in ſo many Words, that God regards chiefly men's good works to juſtify and ſave them. *Ad amorem noſtrum atque opera præcipuum a Deo & majorem quam fidei reſpectum haberi in donando nobis juſtificationis & ſalutis gratiam*, i. e. "That "God regards chiefly our love and good works, and "even more than he does Faith, in the Grace of "Juſtification and Salvation he beſtows upon us." Such is the ſummary he has put in the margin, *folio* 63 *verſo*; in the following leaf he has put this, *opera noſtra coram Deo eſſe meritoria*, i. e. "That our "works are meritorious before God." I have examined the text, and found that the Doctrine delivered in it agrees exactly with the ſummary in the margin. We ſhall ſee hereunder (22), that Calvin and the Janſeniſt charge him with being a downright Plagiary.

* *Tapperus.*

(18) Theophil. Raynaudus, *de malis ac bonis Libris*, num. 453. p. m. 263.

(19) Mortonus, *Antidot. contra merita*, cap. 6. ſect. 1. *apud* Pope Blount, *Cenſ. Author.* p. 418.

(20) *Epiſc. Conſ. Carleton. Eccleſ. Catbol. contra Tridentin.* cap. 3. *apud* Pope Blount, ibid.

(21) Baſnage, *Hiſt. de la Religion des Egliſes Reformees*, Tom. 2. p. 39. of the edition publiſhed in 1690, in 12m.

(22) In the remark [G] towards the end.

[F] *I ſhall tranſcribe ſome remarks which have been made againſt John Gerhard, and which contain ſome particulars very proper for this article.*] The Author of theſe remarks was of Utrecht, and a Lawyer by profeſſion: his name was *Giſbertus Lappius à Waveren.* He ſent his remarks to Nihuſius, who inſerted them into his *Hypodigma*, printed in the year 1648. They are a ſharp cenſure of a paſſage of John Gerhard, Profeſſor of Divinity at Jena. The paſſage is in the 5th volume of that Profeſſor's Common-places, in the 14th

(e) Calvin, Bucer, &c.

was charged with Plagiariſm [G], and that they who wrote againſt him (e), confeſs that he had eloquence and wit, and all the qualities of a good Sophiſt, or of a very good Advocate of bad cauſes; that he knew how to give an odious turn to his adverſary's opinions, and to declaim effectually in thoſe paſſages, in which he could raiſe the Reader's indignation by means of ſome principles, which are acceptable to the generality of the people; that he knew how to cover the weak ſide of his cauſe, to ſpeak with aſſurance, and

14th ſection, where the Author refutes the 14th mark, which according to Bellarmine, is peculiar to the true church, namely, that they who oppoſe it die miſerably. John Gerhard retorts the argument upon him; he urges the unfortunate end which the perſecutors of the Reformed Religion met with, and places Pighius among them. *Eodem anno* CHRISTI CIↃ IↃXLIII, ſays he, *mortuus eſt Albertus Pighius, Papatûs defenſor non poſtremus; de quo ſcribunt, fuiſſe illum in tumultu oppreſſum, in magna hominum frequentia, unà cum pecunia, quam à Papa, & Cardinalibus propter operam ſuam, in cauſa Pontificia defendenda collatam, acceperat* *. The Cenſurer proves by the words of Paulus Jovius, which I have quoted (23), that the bridge broke down in the year 1530, and that Albertus Pighius was not killed by the fall. He adds, that the Pope's generoſity to him is poſterior to the year 1530; ſo that after all, he could not have been buried under the ruins of that bridge with his money, as the Divine of Jena ſuppoſes he was. He proves afterwards, that Albertus Pighius *Præpoſitus & Archidiaconus Eccleſiæ Divi Johannis, liber Dominus in Midrecht, Wilnes, Cudelſteert, Zevenhoven, Tamen, Dominus in Achtienhoven, Blocklant, Nuythoorn* (24), i. e. "Dean and Arch-deacon "of St. John's church, free Lord of Midrecht, Wil- "neſs, Cudelſteert, Zevenhoven, Tamen, and Lord "of Achtienhoven, Blocklant, Nuithoorn;" died, being duly attended with the ſacraments of the church, and with a great preſence of mind, December the 26th, 1542, in a ſtately houſe of his own at Utrecht. *Ultrajecti in ædibus clauſtralibus, quas in immunitate collegiatæ Eccleſiæ Divi Johannis magnificas poſſidebat* (25). That date of the day and year is contained in a letter, which John Vorſtius of Lombeca, Dean of the Cathedral of Utrecht, and one of the Executors of Albertus Pighius's teſtament, wrote December the 29th, 1542, to Gerart Hamont, Prior of the Carthuſians at Cologne. There is an abſtract of that letter, in which we meet with a remarkable particular, which is, that Pighius being nettled to the quick by a work of Bucer, was ſo animated by it, that notwithſtanding his diſtemper, he applied himſelf daily to draw up his vindication, nor could he be prevailed upon by any argument, to have any regard for the ill ſtate of his health. He would never interrupt the writing of his reply to Bucer, and this haſtened his death. The work was left imperfect, and was printed nevertheleſs (26). Here follow the Dean's expreſſions in his letter (27). *Hoc adjiciam, præfatum Præpoſitum, D. Pighium, libello quodam, nomine Buceri emiſſo, quo eum acrius punxit, ita, durante ſua ægritudine, fuiſſe commotum, ut nullâ perſuaſione induci potuerit, ut aliqua ſuæ valetudinis habita ratione, Apologiam quandam reſponſivam edere, & indies ſcribere, voluerit omittere. Quam quidem, inchoatam tantum, morte præventus, reliquit: quæ certe indubitata fuit cauſa celerioris ejus deceſſus. Eandem Apologiam, ſic inchoatam, curabo viſitari, ac deinde typis excudi.* As to what Gerhard aſſerts, that the Cardinals gave Pighius a large ſum of money, it is anſwered, that it is very probable, they ſhewed him their eſteem and good will by fair words only. Two letters are quoted to prove this, the one of Cardinal Sadolet, written in the year 1539, and the other of Cardinal Marcellus Cervinus, dated from Rome October 27. 1542. Sadolet aſſures Albertus Pighius, that he will recommend him to the Pope and the Cardinals; and Cervinus promiſes to repreſent Pighius's ſervices and want to the Pope, and proteſts, that if he could give him wherewithal to ſatisfy his creditors, he would do it with all his heart. *Quantum verò attinet ad æs alienum tuum, ſi ejus diſſolvendi facultas in mea poteſtate eſſet poſita, non laborares. Et tamen, quamvis S. S. D. N. multis magniſque hoc tempore impenſis ſimul gravetur, non deero, tua merita atque neceſſitates commemorare, & juvare rem tuam familiarem, quantum potero* (28). Laſtly, it is obſerved, that Pighius was grown poor by being engaged in ſeveral law-ſuits, the chief of which was, that which he proſecuted moſt vigorouſly againſt the Emperor, and againſt the Court of the Province *, who diſputed him the juriſdiction of his Provoſtſhip of St. John.

* Of Utrecht.

When all his proceedings are narrowly looked into, one cannot forbear obſerving, that he was a very intriguing man, and a pretty great *Faciendaire* §α or *Buſy-body*. I make uſe of that old word, becauſe it ſeems very expreſſive to me; and I met with it in good Authors, who lived in the beginning of the 17th century (29). I wiſh it were ſtill in uſe, and I wonder it is not to be met with in Nicot, nor in Monet, nor in Furetiere: but they have been unacquainted with ſeveral other words as remarkable as that is.

(29) Monſieur Du Pleſſis Mornai uſes it ſometimes.

§α [That word comes from the Italian *Facenda, buſineſs*, whence *Facendaro*, a Negotiator, a man of buſineſs, or a buſy-body, which anſwers to the French *Faciendaire*. Hence it is, that though that word be wanting in Nicot, in Monet, and in Furetiere, yet we meet with the word *Facende* in Oudin, who is more modern than Nicot and Monet. We meet alſo with *Facienda* in the Spaniſh, French and Italian dictionary, printed in 4to at Geneva, 1671. Let us obſerve that the word *Faciendaire* is to be met with in Paſquier, *l.* 6. *c.* 12. of his *Recherches*. CRIT. REM.]

[G] *Pighius was charged with Plagiariſm.*] Calvin charges him with it. His name is not to be met with in the Catalogues of Plagiaries, which have been yet publiſhed. Pighius began his book concerning free-will, with the connexion there is between the knowledge of God, and the knowledge of man. He had obſerved that method in Calvin's inſtitution; he followed it without declaring from whom he had borrowed it. Calvin blames him for that proceeding, and does not know how to account for ſo great a familiarity. He could give no other reaſon for it but a right of preſcription, conſidering it was a long time ſince Pighius practiſed Plagiariſm. *Miror quæ fronte auſus fuerit, nulla mei mentione facta, tam familiariter ſumere de meo libro, quod in ſuum tranſcriberet. Neque enim quo jure id faciat, video: niſi fortè præſcriptionem obtendat, quia ſic facere pridem ſolitus ſit. Nam in magno illo libro, quem adverſus noſtram confeſſionem edidit, integra ſæpe ex Inſtitutione mea paginas, ubi viſum eſt, infercit, ac ſuo commodo ſic adaptat, quaſi aliunde non ſumpſiſſet. Vellem nunc ſcire quo jure aut titulo mea ſic pro ſuis uſurpet. Si qua magna eſſet inter nos neceſſitudo, ego hanc confidentiam amicitiæ non difficulter concederem. Sed nunc huic veniæ non eſt locus. An quia hoſtis ſum, ſe jus direptionis in omnia mea habere putat? At hoc prædæ genus nullo, nec jure, nec more, defendi poteſt. Unus ergo prætextus reſtat, homini docto potuiſſe non minus venire in mentem quæ dixeram, quàm mihi prius venerant. Sed lectores obſecro, ſi tantum habeant otii, ut caput primum libri Pighiani cum primo Inſtitutionis meæ capite conferat. Nihil dico, niſi quod non ſine riſu ac ſtomacho perſpicient nimis perditam hominis impudentiam. Quòd ſi ulterius pergere libeat, percurrant quæ de Juſtificatione tractat in altero illo opere, & ad ſextum Inſtitutionis meæ caput exigant: mirum ſi bilem continere queant. Neque enim clanculum furatur aut carptim: neque artificio tegere ita ſtudet ſuas rapinas, ut apud ſe natum videatur, quod apud me legit, ſed ita palam mea ad verbum recitat, ut videatur paginas ipſas totas pigritiæ aſſuiſſe, quò deſcribendi laborem fugeret. Si fateretur authorem, eum dicerem mutuari: nunc quid cauſari poteſt, quo minus plagiarius palam vocetur*, i. e. "I wonder "how he had the aſſurance to tranſcribe ſo familiar- "ly ſeveral things from my book into his own, "without ſo much as naming me. I do not ſee by "what right he could do it, unleſs it be by right of "preſcription, becauſe he has been long uſed to it. "For in that great book, which he has publiſhed a- "gainſt our Articles of Faith, he has often tranſ- "cribed whole pages from my Inſtitutions, and "adapted them to his purpoſe, as though he had not "taken them from another. Now I would fain "know

(30) Calvin, *Reſponſ. contra Pighium de libero arbitrio* p. 140. *Opuſcul. Theolog.*

(23) See the remark [A].

(24) Gisbertus Lappius à Waveren, *apud* Nihuſium, *in* Hypodigmate, p. 339, 340.

(25) Idem, ibid.

(26) See Cochlæus, *in* Actis Lutheri, *ad ann.* 1542, folio m. 322.

(27) *Apud* Nihuſium, *in* Hypodigmate, p. 340.

(28) Ibidem, p. 342, 343.

* See the tranſlation of this paſſage, above, quotat. (7).

(f) See Cochlæus, *in Actis & Scriptis Lutheri*, ad ann. 1542. *ſubfin.* folio m. 322.

and to uſe a certain diſorder which made the Readers loſe ſight of the chief difficulty; that in general, he could handle his ſubjects very methodically when he pleaſed. He was ſure to inſert in a Perface what his antagoniſts confeſſed with regard to his noble talents (*f*).

" knew, what right or title he has to uſe what is " mine as his own. If there were a great correſpon- " dence between us, I would not ſcruple to pardon " his freedom on the ſcore of friendſhip. But this " is not the caſe. Does he think he has a right to " plunder me becauſe I am an enemy? But ſuch a " kind of depredation cannot be juſtified neither by " law, nor by cuſtom. He has therefore but one " pretence left, which is to ſay, that being a learned " man, he may have had the ſame thoughts which I " had. But if the Readers have any time to ſpare, " let them compare the firſt chapter of Pighius's book, " with the firſt chapter of my Inſtitutions. I ſay no- " thing, but that they will not be able to behold the " man's bare-faced impudence without laughter and " indignation. If they have a mind to go a little far- " ther, let them look over what he wrote concern- " ing Juſtification in his other work, and compare it " with the ſixth chapter of my Inſtitutions; it will " be a wonder if they can reſtrain their paſſion. For " he does not ſteal ſecretly, and here and there a " paſſage; nor does he endeavour to conceal his " theft by ſome artifice, to make that appear his " own, what he read in my work; but he gave my " own expreſſions word for word, ſo that he ſeems " to have tacked whole pages of my book to his " own, out of lazineſs, to ſave himſelf the trouble " of tranſcribing them. If he had named his Au- " thor, I would ſay, that he only borrowed from " me; but what can he ſay for himſelf to hinder " me from ſtyling him publickly a Plagiary?" You ſee that he is charged here with ſtealing word for word whole pages from Calvin's Inſtitutions, and tacking them to his own work, without concealing or diſguiſing his plagiariſm. This is a ſurpriſing aſſurance; but in order to excuſe him, it is added, that he minded only to pleaſe thoſe, who never conſulted the writings of the other party, and who admitted all that was publiſhed againſt the Proteſtant ſect. *Mirabitur quicunque leget, unde tantus homini ſtupor: qui nihil veritus ſit, in ipſo ſtatim veſtigio deprehendi. Ego verò dum omnia bene reputo, habeo quod pro hominis excuſatione dicam: eum ſecuritate magis quàm ſocordia id feciſſe. Satis enim habuit, ſi modo iis placeret, qui non minori religione à noſtris abſtinent, quàm facilitate omnia laudant ac mirantur, quæ nos quovis modo impugnant* (31), i. e. " Whoever reads this, will " wonder at that man's ſtupidity, who did not fear to " be taken in the very fact. But for my part, having " duly conſidered the whole, I have ſomething to " ſay in his defenſe; namely, that he acted out of " ſecurity, rather than out of ſilline ſs: for it was " enough for him, if he could but pleaſe thoſe, " who do not more ſcrupulouſly abſtain from read- " ing what we publiſh, than they eaſily commend " and admire all that is written againſt us." Obſerve that Calvin does not acknowledge that his works communicated ſome ſhare of orthodoxy to Pighius, and that he ſtyles him a Pelagian. *Hoc totum non modo Pelagii ſcholam tedolet, ſed mera eſt Pelagianæ impietatis magna ex parte profeſſio* (32). . . . *Quòd autem toties cum Pelagianis nihil ſe habere commune jactat, neſcio quos hic Pelagianos comminiſcatur. Neque enim tantùm cum iis, quos deſcribit Auguſtinus, multa habet ſimilia, ſed eorum quibuſdam multò eſt deterior. . .* (33) *Ergo, ut aliquando claudatur hic liber, fruſtra, aut ſe à Pelagio diſjungere conatur Pighius, cujus ſocietate eum teneri implicitum tam apertè demonſtravimus: aut nos Manichæo, aliiſque hæreticis adjungere, à quibus non minus diſſidemus, quàm ipſe ab orthodoxo Eccleſiæ ſenſu* (34), *i. e.* " All this does not only ſavour of Pelagi- " us's ſchool, but is even for the greateſt part a plain " confeſſion of the Pelagian impiety. . . . As for his " boaſting ſo often that he admits nothing of the " Pelagian ſyſtem, I do not know what kind of Pe- " lagianiſm he pretends to forge. For he does not " only admit many things like thoſe whom St. Au- " guſtin deſcribes, but he is alſo worſe than them in " ſome reſpects. . . . . Therefore, to put at laſt an " end to this book, it is to no purpoſe, for Pighius, " both to endeavour to ſeparate himſelf from Pelagi- " us, with whom we have ſo plainly demonſtrated " that he is intimately united, and to labour, to join " us with the Manicheans, and other Hereticks, " from whom we differ no leſs, than he does from " the orthodox ſenſe of the church."

(30) Calvin, *Reſponſ. contra Pighium de Libero Arbitrio*, p. 140. *Opuſcul. Theolog.*

(32) Idem, ibid. p. 163, 164.

(33) Idem, ibid. p. 188. col. 1.

(34) Idem, ibid. p. 191. col. 1.

The Janſeniſt, from whom I have tranſcribed ſome words (35), ſtyles him alſo a Pelagian. He is a man, ſays he (36), *who could not well underſtand the Doctrine of St.* Auguſtin, *nor that of the church concerning Grace and Free-will, ſince he was not thoroughly acquainted with the corruption of our nature, nor with original ſin, which is the key of that doctrine. A man who is really prepoſſeſſed with errors entirely Pelagian upon that ſubject, who ſpeaks againſt divine Predeſtination and againſt efficacious and gratuitous Grace, in a very indiſcreet and ignorant manner, not to ſay any thing worſe, though he knows it was St. Auguſtin's opinion; a man who takes the writings of a Semi-Pelagian, ſuch as Gennadius of Marſeilles was, for a rule of faith, and Pelagius's confeſſion of faith for a work of St. Auguſtin. Laſtly, having ſo much abuſed his doctrine, he does not ſpare his perſon, and would make him paſs for a Caviller:* declinat, fugit, diſſimulat; aliquid quærit quod cavilletur; *i. e.* " He (St. Auguſtin) uſes ſhifts and evaſions; " he diſſembles; he would find ſomething to cavil at;" *for a Writer who is dangerous with regard to the ſubject of free-will, and who refutes it wilfully:* ſtudio iniquiſſimus libero arbitrio; *aſcribing as little to it as he can, depriving it of all its ſtrength, and uſing diſſimulation and artifices, in order to weaken and depreciate it.* The Janſeniſt Author concludes (37), " that we ought not " to wonder the whole Faculty of Louvain, in her fa- " mous cenſure paſt in the year 1587, ſhould . . . . . " ſtyle *Pighius* a favourer and fellow of the Semi-Pe- " lagians; that the Faculty of Douay, in her cen " ſure, ſhould place him among the Diſciples of " Fauſtus de Riez; that the learned Eſtius . . . ſhould " ſpeak of him almoſt after the ſame manner; that " the learned John Molanus ſhould ſay, that *he was* " *blamed by the moſt eminent Divines, for renouncing St.* " *Auguſtin's doctrine,* WHICH IS THAT OF THE " CHURCH, *concerning Original Sin, Predeſtination,* " *and Grace of the Mediator,* to which Aubertus Miræus " gives his conſent."

(35) In the text of this article.

(36) *St. Auguſtin Juſtifié de Calviniſme*, p. 182.

(37) Idem, ibid. p. 183.

PIN (JOHN DU) in Latin *Pinus*, Biſhop of Rieux in the 16th century, was of Thouloufe. He went into Italy to improve his mind, and ſtudied Eloquence and the Law at Bologna, and publiſhed ſome books there, which gained him a reputation. Thoſe he publiſhed ſince, confirmed and encreaſed his glory [*A*]. He applied himſelf to write

[*A*] *He . . . publiſhed ſome books, which gained him a reputation. Thoſe, he publiſhed ſince, confirmed and encreaſed his glory.*] He wrote the life of Father Philip (1) Beroaldus, and that of Catharine of Sienna. Theſe two works were printed at Bologna, in the year 1505. A Letter, and ſome Epigrams, which he wrote to the honour of Codrus Urſeus, were printed with this Codrus's works. He wrote alſo a treatiſe *De vita aulica, of a Court-life*; his book *De claris fœminis*, of illuſtrious women, was printed at Paris in the year 1521, *in folio* (2). His Life of *Saint Roch* was printed at Paris *in 4to apud Joannem Parvum*, for John Petit: He was then *Senator Toloſanus & Orator Regius* (3), Counſellor in the Parliament of Thouloufe, and the King's Attorney. The *Allobrogicæ Narrationis Liber* was printed at Venice in 4to, in the year 1516, and then at Paris, by Badius, the ſame year (4).

(1) And not Peter, as it is in Moreri.

(2) Ex *Epitome Bibl. Geſneri*, p. 485, vel ex *Veſſio de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 662.

(3) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, *in Supplemento Epitomes Bibl. Geſneri*, p. 53.

(4) Idem, ibid.

[*B*] *He*

write a polite ſtyle in Latin [*B*]. He was Counſellor in the Parliament of Thouloufe, and Embaſſador of France, I do not know where, but I believe it was in Italy. I would not expreſs my ſelf thus, and I would give a more particular account of him, if I had his books, or if the Authors who ſpeak of him, and whom I could conſult, had related ſome facts concerning the hiſtory of his life; but they know nothing of him: Catel, his contemporary was ſo little acquainted with him, that he has committed a notorious Anachroniſm, when he mentioned him [*C*]. I cannot tell at what time Du Pin was made Biſhop of Rieux, nor when he died: I know only that he was ſtill in poſſeſſion of that Biſhoprick in 1530, and that he did not live beyond the year 1538 [*D*].

[*B*] *He applied himſelf to write a polite ſtyle in Latin.*] Let us prove this by a paſſage from Eraſmus. *Poſſet inter hujus laudis* (Tullianæ dictionis) *competitores numerari*, (Joannes Pinus) *niſi & hunc negotiorum tumultus & eccleſiaſtica dignitas à ſtudiis avulſiſſent. Olim certè præclarum ſui ſpecimen dedit, quùm Bononiæ Muſarum ſacra coleret. Nunc epiſcopum audio factum, quid acceſſerit eloquentiæ neſcio. Fieri poteſt ut plus acceſſerit eruditionis quàm dignitatis* (5), i. e. "John Du Pin "might be reckoned among thoſe who endeavour- "ed to imitate Tully's ſtyle, had not the hurry of "buſineſs, and eccleſiaſtical preferments hindered him "from proſecuting his ſtudies: he had indeed given "formerly a noble inſtance of his ſkill that way, "when he ſtudied at Bologna. I hear that he is "now made a Biſhop; how far he is improved in "eloquence I cannot tell; he has perhaps acquired "more learning than honour."

(5) Eraſmus, *in* Ciceroniano, p. m. 74.

[*C*] *Catel . . . . . has committed a notorious Anachroniſm when he mentioned him.*] See in his Memoirs of the Hiſtory of Languedoc (6) the catalogue of the Biſhops of Rieux; you will find John Du Pin two degrees higher than *Peter Lewis de Voltan, Biſhop of* Rieux *in* 1515.

(6) In page 1035.

[*D*] *He was ſtill in poſſeſſion of that Biſhoprick in* 1530, *and . . . . did not live beyond the year* 1538.] The firſt of theſe particulars may be proved by a letter, which Sadolet wrote *Pino Rivenſi Epiſcopo* (to Du Pin, Biſhop of Rieux) the 1ſt of March 1530 (7); it contains a noble elogium of our Du Pin, to whom the Author ſent a copy of his firſt work, which was a Commentary on the 90th Pſalm. The ſecond particular is proved by Hubert Suſſanneau's verſes, *in obitum Pini Rivorum Epiſc. cum interfuiſſet ejus funeri*, "On the death of Du Pin, Biſhop of Rieux, after "having been at his funeral." They are in *folio* 41 *verſo* of the four books of that Author's *Ludi*, of the Paris edition, *apud Simonem Colinæum* 1538, in 8vo. We find there that this Prelate was buried at Toulouſe with great pomp.

(7) It is in the 4th book of Sadolet's *Letters*, p. 150. edit. Lugd. 1554, in 8vo.

☞ PIN (LOUIS ELLIES DU), a very learned French Writer in the 18th century, was ſon of Louis Ellies du Pin, deſcended of a noble family in Normandy, by Mary Vitart, of a family in Champagne (*a*). He was born at Paris June 17th, 1657, and being inſtructed in the firſt rudiments of grammar by his father and maſters, was entered at ten years of age in the College of Harcourt under Mr. Lair, Profeſſor there. Under this excellent Maſter he conceived ſuch a reliſh for learning, that he afterwards applied himſelf to it with indefatigable induſtry. In 1672, he was admitted Maſter of Arts. Being determined then to enter into the church, he ſtudied at the Sorbonne; and having paſſed through the uſual courſe of ſtudies, applied himſelf intirely to the reading of the Fathers and Eccleſiaſtical Writers. He had then no other view, than to employ himſelf in an advantageous manner, and to prepare himſelf for the Licentiateſhip in Divinity, which he was then too young to be admitted into. In 1680, he took the degree of Bachelor of Divinity, and on the 1ſt of July 1684, that of Doctor. He ſoon after undertook to publiſh an Univerſal *Bibliotheque* of all the Eccleſiaſtical Writers [*A*], containing the Hiſtory of their Lives, the Catalogue, Critique, and Chronology

(*a*) Du Pin, *Nouvelle Bibl. des Auteurs Eccleſiaſt.* Tom. 19. p. 176. edit. Amſt. 1715, in 4to. *Europe Sçavante*, Tom. 4 and 9. *Nouv. Litter.* Tom. 10.

[*A*] *Soon after undertook to publiſh an Univerſal Bibliotheque of all the Eccleſiaſtical Writers.*] The *firſt Tome* containing the Writers of the three firſt centuries, was printed at Paris 1686, in 8vo. The ſecond edition, which was but little different from the former, was printed at Paris 1688, in 8vo. The third edition was printed there in two Tomes, 8vo, 1698. In this edition the preliminary diſſertation upon the Bible, which was inſerted in the preceding editions, is retrenched, and there are added the ſucceſſion of the Biſhops of the great Sees, and the hiſtory of Perſecutions, Councils, and Hereſies, which contains the whole of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. The *ſecond Tome*, containing the Writers of the fourth century, was printed at Paris 1687, in 8vo, and the 2d edition 1689, in 8vo, in two volumes. The third edition, which is the moſt exact and complete, was printed at Paris 1702, in 8vo, in three Tomes. The *firſt part* of the *third Tome*, containing the Writers who flouriſhed in the beginning of the fifth century, was printed at Paris 1688, in 8vo, and the ſecond edition there in 1690, in two volumes in 8vo. The *ſecond part* of the *third Tome*, containing the Writers of the fifth century, from the year 430 to 500, was printed at Paris 1690, in 8vo, and the ſecond edition there in 1702, in two volumes in 8vo. The *fourth Tome*, containing the Writers of the ſixth century, was printed at Paris 1690, in 8vo, and afterwards re-printed with great alterations. *The fifth Tome containing the Writers of the ſeventh and eighth centuries, with an Anſwer to the* Remarks *of Father* Petitdidier, *upon the firſt volume*, was printed at Paris 1691, in 8vo, and afterwards re-printed with many additions. The *Supplement, containing the principal points of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the fourth, fifth, ſixth, ſeventh, and eighth centuries, with a Chronological Table*, was printed at Paris 1711, in 8vo. As our Author had treated in the preceding volumes only of the Lives and Writings of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, and the Acts and Canons of Councils, he thought proper to publiſh a Supplement, in which, as likewiſe in the third edition of the 3 firſt centuries, we have the ſucceſſion of the Biſhops of the great Sees, the Hiſtory of Perſecutions, that of Hereſies, and Controverſies with regard to Doctrine, with a Chronological Table of the Hiſtory of thoſe ſeveral Centuries. The freedom which our Author uſed in this work in his judgments on the ſtyle, character, and doctrine of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, having diſpleaſed ſome perſons, it was complained of to the Archbiſhop of Paris, who in 1693, publiſhed the following Decree or Ordonnance againſt it. "*Fran-* "*cis*, by the Grace of God, and of the Holy Apo- "ſtolic See, Archbiſhop of Paris, Duke and Peer of "France, Commander of the King's Orders, Provi- "ſor of the College of *Sorbonne*, and ſuperior of "that of *Navarre*; to all thoſe to whom theſe pre- "ſent letters ſhall come, health and benediction: "The firſt duty of the Prieſts and Doctors of the "church is to preſerve its doctrine, wherewith they "are intruſted, as they have received it from the "Apoſtles, whoſe ſucceſſors they are; and not to "ſuffer any perſon, who makes any alteration there- "in, to go unpuniſhed. And ſince tradition is the "chanel, which ought to convey to us, by an unin-

logy of their works, a ſummary of what they contain, and judgment of their ſtyle and doctrine, and a Liſt of the ſeveral editions of their works. This was a vaſt deſign; but our Author's reſolution was not deterred; and he did not even confine himſelf to this work, though the execution of it ſeemed ſufficient to employ the lives of ſeveral perſons.

" terrupted courſe, the articles of the Catholic Faith " in their utmoſt purity; and ſince thoſe books, the " Authors whereof profeſs to repreſent it intire to us, " by carrying it up to the fountain-head, ſo that it " may be traced from age to age down to our own " times, ought to be ſtudied with the greateſt atten- " tion: we have thought ourſelves obliged to a more " particular examination of a book printed ſome " years ago in this city, intitled, *A new Bibliotheque* " *of Eccleſiaſtical Authors, &c.* whereof five Tomes, " divided into ſeven volumes, have been ſucceſſively " publiſhed. The deſign of this work is to treat of " all the Eccleſiaſtical Authors, who have lived ſince " the firſt beginning of the church, to give an ac- " count of their writings, and to acquaint the world " with their characters and worth; which the Au- " thor pretends to have executed for the firſt eight " centuries, in the volumes which he has already " publiſhed, intending to carry it on to our times in " thoſe which are to follow. And we have believed " ourſelves the more engaged to enter upon the exa- " mination of this book, becauſe we have heard, " that ſeveral perſons have found conſiderable faults " in theſe firſt Tomes. Therefore, that we might do " nothing in this matter without mature delibera- " tion and perfect knowledge, we have ordered this " work to be read by four Doctors of Divinity of the " Faculty of Paris, who having each of them in par- " ticular read all the Tomes, and having conferred " long together, have given us an exact report in ſe- " veral meetings. We have alſo examined this book " ourſelves with all poſſible attention, and we find; " that it is ſo far from being a work uſeful to the " church, that on the contrary, it would be very pre- " judicial to it, if it were ſuffered to be diſperſed. " We were alſo very willing to hear what defenſe " the Author could make, that we might know his " opinions and preſent diſpoſition. For which rea- " ſon we gave him the moſt favourable hearing that " we could in ſeveral meetings, in the preſence of " the aforeſaid Doctors; and ſince we have found in " him an intire ſubmiſſion to whatſoever we ſhould " enjoin, he having put into our hands a writing " ſigned by himſelf, and annexed to theſe preſents, " wherein upon twelve heads, which we thought " were the moſt liable to exception in his book, he " does in particular retract a great many propoſitions, " which he had advanced; and in general declares, " that he ſubmits himſelf without reſtriction or re- " ſerve to our judgment; and that this abſolute ac- " quieſcence (without which we ſhould not have be- " lieved his paper ſufficient, there being very many " propoſitions in his book, which deſerve condem- " nation, not touched upon in this writing) puts his " religion out of queſtion, we having nothing to " do but to give ſentence againſt the Doctrine of his " book. We could have wiſhed, indeed, to have " found this work capable of a limited correction; " and ſo have contented ourſelves with taking notice " to the Author of ſome alterations, which we ſhould " have obliged him to have made, and have ſaved " the reſt, without coming to a greater condemnati- " on, and an intire ſuppreſſion. But the evil being " diffuſed almoſt every where throughout the work, " we could not diſpenſe with condemning this book, " and forbidding all thoſe, whom God has been " pleaſed to put under our care, to read it, that the " miſchief, which it otherwiſe might poſſibly cauſe " amongſt the people, if its courſe were not ſtopped, " may be prevented, that the church may receive no " farther ſcandal, and that the Hereticks may take " no advantage from it againſt the Catholicks. For " theſe reaſons, having implored the aſſiſtance of the " Holy Ghoſt to guard and to direct us, we have " condemned, and do condemn the book intitled, " *A New Bibliotheque, &c. By Monſieur* Ellies du " Pin, *Doctor of the Faculty of Paris. Printed by* An- " drew Pralard, *at the Occaſion in St. James's Street,* " *in Paris*, as containing ſeveral propoſitions, that " are falſe, raſh, ſcandalous, capable of offending " pious ears, tending to weaken the arguments, " which are brought from tradition, to prove the " authority of the canonical books of holy ſcripture, " and of ſeveral other articles of faith, injurious to " General Councils, to the holy Apoſtolic See, and " to the Fathers of the Church, erroneous, and lead- " ing to Hereſy; forbidding, under the ſevereſt pe- " nalties, all perſons in our Dioceſe, of both ſexes, " to read this book, or cauſe it to be read, or to ad- " viſe the reading of it to any perſon whatever, or " to keep it in their houſes, or any where elſe; " commanding them, under the ſame penalties, to " return it into our hands as ſoon as poſſibly they " can. And we alſo command the Officers of our Ec- " cleſiaſtical Court to aſſiſt in the execution of this " preſent decree, to fix it up on the doors of the " churches of this city and of the ſuburbs thereof, " and wherever elſe there ſhall be occaſion; and al- " ſo to deſire, if need be, the aſſiſtance of the Magi- " ſtrates, whoſe zeal and piety we have upon ſo ma- " ny other occaſions had experience of, thereby to " hinder, by all due and reaſonable ways, the print- " ing, ſale, and diſperſing of the aforeſaid book. " Given at Paris in our Archiepiſcopal Palace, the " 16th day of April, MDCXCIII. Signed,

" *Francis*, Archbiſhop of Paris.

" Underneath,

" Monſeigneur *Wilbault*."

To this decree was annexed Monſieur du Pin's *Retractation*. Theſe pieces were tranſlated into Engliſh, and printed at London 1703, in folio, under this title: *The Decree or Ordonnance of the Archbiſhop of Paris; wherein he condemns Monſieur* du Pin's Bibliotheca of Eccleſiaſtical Authors. *To which is annexed, M.* du Pin's *Retractation of the ſaid* Bibliotheca. *Printed in French at Paris, by order of the Archbiſhop. Done into Engliſh by* William Wotton, *B. D. with his Preface and References.* In the preface Mr. Wotton obſerves, that in Monſieur du Pin's *Retractation, dread of farther miſchief ſeems to be far more viſible in almoſt every article, than real conviction ariſing from an inward ſenſe of the Author's having been in an error; at leaſt; that it is written in ſuch manner, as may very juſtly make one think ſo.* Notwithſtanding this ſubmiſſion of our Author to the Archbiſhop's judgment, his work was ſuppreſſed by an Arret of the Parliament. However he reſolved to continue his *Bibliotheque*, and ſoon after obtained a permiſſion for it, being obliged only to change the title, and ſomething of the method of it, by inſerting alſo the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. The *Hiſtory of the Controverſies and Affairs Eccleſiaſtical in the ninth century*, was printed at Paris 1694, in 8vo, and re-printed there 1698, in 8vo. *The Hiſtory of the Controverſies, &c. of the tenth century*, was printed at Paris 1696, in 8vo: that of the *eleventh century* at Paris 1696, in 8vo. in two volumes: that of the *twelfth century* at Paris 1696, in 8vo. in two volumes: that of the *thirteenth century* at Paris 1698, in 8vo. that of the *fourteenth century* at Paris 1698, in 8vo. and that of the *fifteenth century* at Paris 1698, two volumes in 8vo. There is ſubjoined to the ſecond volume a curious Diſſertation upon the Author of the book *De Imitatione Chriſti*. *The Hiſtory of the Church and Writers of the ſixteenth century* was printed at Paris 1701, 1703, in five volumes in 8vo. The 3 firſt volumes treat of the Church Hiſtory, and the two laſt of others of the Writers. *The Bibliotheque of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers of the ſeventeenth century* was printed at Paris 1708, in ſeven volumes in 8vo. Our Author in theſe volumes reſumed his former title, but omitted his name. *The Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the eighteenth century* was printed at Paris 1714, in four volumes in 8vo. *The Bibliotheque of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers of the eighteenth century from the year* 1700 *to* 1710

perſons. The different books, which he wrote [*B*], ſhew his prodigious readineſs in compoſing, and his uncommon application to ſtudy. But this will appear ſtill more extraordinary, when we conſider, that he was engaged in a great variety of incidental affairs;

1710 was printed at Paris 1711 in two volumes in 8vo. *The preliminary diſcourſe upon the Old and New Teſtament* was printed at Paris 1699 in three volumes in 8vo. Our Author had only given a ſhort eſſay of this work in the firſt edition of the *firſt tome* of his *Bibliotheque*, from which he afterwards ſeparated it, and enlarged it ſo as to make three volumes. Monſieur Baſnage de Bauval in his *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages Sçavans* * tells us, that in this work "we ſhall find all "the queſtions, which can be formed upon the ſubject, "treated with great order and method, and with that "good ſenſe and candour conſpicuous in all the writ-"ings of Monſieur du Pin." *The univerſal Table of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers* was printed at Paris 1704 in five volumes in 8vo. This is the moſt defective of all our Author's works. There are groſs errors to be met with in every page, and omiſſions without number. However, it is a rough draught of a work, which would be of great uſe, if it were perfected. All theſe volumes, which compoſe the *Bibliotheque of Eccleſiaſtical Writers*, are in number 47 in 8vo. They were reprinted at Amſterdam in 19 volumes in 4to. But as moſt of thoſe volumes were printed from the firſt editions, that edition is imperfect. This work was begun to be tranſlated into Latin, and the three firſt volumes printed at Amſterdam; but no farther progreſs was made. Monſieur du Pin was engaged at his death in a Latin tranſlation, to which he intended to make conſiderable additions. This Bibliotheque was likewiſe tranſlated into Engliſh, and printed at London in ſeveral volumes in folio. This work of our Author was attacked by Monſieur Simon in a book printed at Paris 1730 in four volumes in 8vo. under the following title; *Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques & de Prolegomenes de la Bible publiez per M.* Elies du Pin. *Avec des Eclairciſſemens & des Supplemens aux Endroits, où on les à juge neceſſaires, par feu* M. Richard Simon, *avec des Remarques.* Monſieur Simon undertook this criticiſm at the deſire of a friend, who having applied himſelf to the reading of Monſieur du Pin's *Bibliotheque*, requeſted Monſieur Simon to make ſome obſervations upon the laſt edition of it, which was reckoned to be the moſt correct. Monſieur Simon was eager to peruſe it; but at the opening only of the firſt volume, ſo many miſtakes occurred, that he thought it neceſſary for the publick good to undertake the correcting it. For however great Monſieur du Pin's capacity was, the vaſt compaſs of the work made it impracticable for him to read the originals; ſo that he was obliged to have recourſe to other Bibliothecarians, and to copy what they had written. This made him often fall into groſs errors, and likewiſe occaſioned his omitting the moſt material and uſeful things in thoſe Authors, whom he analyſes. To this we may alſo aſcribe his abſolute ſilence as to ſome Authors, his aſcribing works to others, which they never wrote, his omitting a great part of the works of many, &c. Monſieur Simon ſupplies theſe defects; and where he is not ſo exact as could be wiſhed, the *Remarks* of an anonymous Author at the end of each volume make up the defect. To give ſome inſtances of the want of accuracy in Monſieur du Pin; he frequently miſtakes widely in geography, taking the *Euxine* See for a country; confounding *Mortaigne* in *Picardy* with *Mauritania*; *Fleſſinghen* in *Zeland* with *Friſinghen*'s in *Bavaria*, &c. But ſuch errors had been pardonable in him, if he had been exact in more material points; but on the contrary, in his analyſis of Authors, he ſhews that he did not underſtand them. For inſtance, in his analyſis of St. *Jerom*'s 52d *Letter*, he makes him ſay, that he had written Commentaries upon the Book of Kings, which he never did, nor does he here ſay he had done. St. *Jerome*'s words are theſe: *Miſeram quædum* τῶν ὑπομνημάτων *in Prophetas duodecim ſancto Patri Domnioni*, Samuelem *quoque* & Malachim, *id eſt, quatuor Libros Regum.* Whoever underſtands Latin, may ſee plainly, that he does not here ſpeak of Commentaries upon the books of the Kings, but only upon the twelve Prophets. Nor are the miſtakes leſs conſiderable, which Monſieur du Pin is guilty of in his account of the different editions and beſt impreſſions of the eccleſiaſtical Writers. For inſtance, ſpeaking of *Origen* againſt *Celſus*, he ſays, that treatiſe was printed at Rome in 1471 in Greek, with the tranſlation of *Gelenius*, and the notes of *Hoeſchelius* and *Chriſtopher Perſona*; whereas *Gelenius* lived in the 16th Century, and the tranſlation did not appear before 1605. Pope Nicholas V. the Mecænas of his time, having got a copy of that treatiſe of Origen in Greek from Conſtantinople in 1447, promiſed a great reward to any perſon, who ſhould tranſlate it into Latin. Upon this offer, a certain Grecian named *Gaza* undertook it; but the Pope dying before it was finiſhed, and with him the hopes of the reward, *Gaza* gave over the work. After this, *Chriſtopher Perſona*, a Roman, applied himſelf to tranſlate this treatiſe, and publiſhed it, in Latin only, at Rome in 1471. There was no other tranſlation of it till *Hoeſchelius* publiſhed it in 1605, from other Greek copies found in Germany, together with the Latin tranſlation of *Gelenius*. This account is very different from Monſieur du Pin's. But theſe miſtakes are nothing, when compared with his error in relating *Epiphanius*'s opinion about the origin of the word *Apocrypha*. To underſtand this, it muſt be obſerved, that the Jews had, in the Eaſt end of every Synagogue, a kind of preſs, which in Hebrew is called *Aron*, in memory of the ark of the Teſtament, which was in the Temple. In this *Aron* they put thoſe books only, which they owned for divine and canonical; ſo that in the Hebrew phraſe, *a canonical book*, and *a book kept in the Aron*, are the ſame thing. *Epiphanius* therefore ſpeaking of the books of *Wiſdom* and *Eccleſiaſticus*, ſays, they were not in the claſs of canonical books among the *Jews*, not having been put into the *Aron* or *Ark*. *Tertullian* uſes the ſame way of ſpeaking, when he ſays, that ſome did not receive the book of *Enoch, quia nec in Judaicum Armarium admittitur.* Now to diſcover Monſieur du Pin's miſtake, we need only repeat his words: "St. *Epiphanius*, ſays he, ſeems to have an "opinion a little ſingular concerning the origin of the "term *Apocrypha*, when he ſays, that the books of "*Wiſdom* and *Eccleſiaſticus* are not among the number "of the ſacred books, becauſe they were put in the "*Aron*, that is to ſay, in the *Ark of the Teſtament*." If *Epiphanius* had ſaid what Monſieur du Pin puts into his mouth, his opinion had indeed been more than *a little ſingular*. In the ſame place Monſieur du Pin acquaints his readers, that ſome have been of opinion, that the *Apocryphal* books were called ſo, ἀπὸ τῆς κρυπτῆς, becauſe, ſays he, they were *extra Cryptam*. He ought at leaſt to have named the Author of ſo peculiar an opinion. Any one, who had the leaſt knowledge of Greek, would have tranſlated ἀπὸ τῆς κρυπτῆς, *à cryptâ*. And indeed the books, which were not canonical, were kept hidden, and for that reaſon were called by the Greeks ἀπόκρυφοι, and by the Hebrews *Guenouzim*; and the canonical books, as being in every one's hands, were called φανεροὶ. The two laſt volumes of Monſieur Simon's work contain a criticiſm upon the *Prolegomena* or *Preliminary diſcourſes* upon the ſacred Writers, publiſhed by Monſieur du Pin.

* For the year 1701.

[*B*] *The . . . . . books which he wrote.*] Beſides his *Bibliotheque* mentioned in the preceding remark, he wrote the following works. I. *De antiquâ Eccleſiæ Diſciplinâ Diſſertationes hiſtoricæ.* Paris 1686 in 4to. *Coloniæ Agrippinæ* (i. e. Amſterdam) 1691 in 4to. If the reader wants to be informed of the real ſentiments of the Author with regard to Church-power, he muſt procure thoſe paſſages, which were retrenched, and are to be found at the beginning of ſome copies of this work. II. *Liber Pſalmorum cum Notis, quibus eorum ſenſus literalis exponitur.* Paris 1691 in 8vo. Theſe notes are ſhort and clear, and remove almoſt all the difficulties, which the reader can meet with in underſtanding the text. This is the judgment given of this work in the *Journal des Sçavans.* III. *Le Livre des Pſeaumes traduit ſelon l'Hébreu, avec des courts notes.* Paris 1691 in 12mo. reprinted there in 1710 in 12mo. This is a tranſlation of his Latin Notes on the Pſalms. V. *La juſte Défenſe du Sieur du*

affairs; that he was Commiſſary in moſt of the affairs of the faculty; he then being appointed Profeſſor of Divinity in the Royal College, he was employed in his Lectures, as well as in the *Journal des Sçavans*, in which he had a ſhare for many years, that he furniſhed

Pin, *pour ſervir de Réponſe à un Libelle anonyme publié depuis peu contre les Pſeaumes qu'il à donnes au public.* Cologne 1693 in 12mo. V. *S. Optati Afri Milevitani Epiſcopi de Schiſmate Donatiſtarum Libri ſeptem ad MSS. Codices & veteres Editiones collati. Quibus acceſſere Hiſtoria Donatiſtarum, unà cum Monumentis veteribus ad eam rem ſpectantibus, necnon Geographiâ Epiſcopalis Africæ.* Paris 1700 in folio. VI. *Notæ in Pentateuchum.* Paris 1710 in two volumes 8vo. Theſe are notes on the Pentateuch, like thoſe, which he wrote on the Pſalms. VII. *Défenſe de la Cenſure de la Faculté de Theologie de Paris contre les Mémoires de la Chine.* Paris 1701 in 8vo. This is a defenſe of the cenſure of the Sorbonne againſt Father le Comte's *Mémoires de la Chine.* VIII. *De la Neceſſité de la Foy en Jeſus Chriſt, pour être ſauvé, ou l'on examine ſi les Payens ou les Philoſophes, qui ont eu la connoiſſance d'un Dieu, & qui ont moralement bien vecu, ont pû être ſauvés ſans avoir la Foy en Jeſus Chriſt.* Paris 1701 in two volumes in 8vo. This treatiſe was written by Monſieur Arnaud, and our Author only wrote the Preface, and made conſiderable additions to it. IX. *Dialogues poſthumes du Sieur de la Bruyere ſur le Quietiſme.* Paris 1699 in 12mo. Monſieur de la Bruyere wrote only ſeven of theſe dialogues, to which Monſieur du Pin added two others in order to complete the Author's deſign. The Author of the *Journal des Sçavans* obſerves, that theſe dialogues are full of wit and pleaſantry, and at the ſame time contains the principles and maxims of Chriſtian Morality treated with great force and eloquence. The characters of the perſons in the dialogues are well drawn and ſuſtained. The two laſt dialogues, which are written by Monſieur du Pin, are not inferior to the former in agreeableneſs and politeneſs of ſtyle. X. *Traité de la Doctrine Chretienne & Orthodoxe.* Paris 1703 in 8vo. This volume, which is the firſt of a Body of Divinity in French that he deſigned to publiſh, tho' he did not execute it, contains the Prolegomena of Divinity. The method propoſed by him, was to divide his work into five parts. The firſt was to treat of the Doctrines; the ſecond of the Sacraments; the third of Diſcipline; the fourth of Ceremonies; and the fifth of Morals. This diſpoſition, though a new one, is not immethodical. He was engaged in this work at his death; and hoped to finiſh his courſe with it. XI. *Joannis Gerſonii Doctoris & Cancellarii Pariſienſis Opera, quibus præfixa ſunt Gerſoniana & adjuncta aliorum hujus temporis ſcriptorum Opera ac Monumenta omnia ad negotium Joannis Parvi ſpectantia.* Amſterdam 1703 in five volumes in folio. Monſieur du Pin omitted nothing to render this edition complete; but he owns, that he could have wiſhed for the ſake of the correctneſs of it, that it had been printed under his inſpection. XII. *L'Hiſtoire d'Apollone de Tyane convaincue de fauſſeté & d'impoſture.* Paris 1705 in 12mo. Our Author publiſhed this under the name of Monſieur de Claireval. XIII. *Traité de la puiſſance Eccleſiaſtique & temporelle.* Paris 1707 in 8vo. This is a large Commentary upon the four propoſitions of the declaration of the aſſembly of the Clergy in 1682. XIV. *Bibliotheque Univerſelle des Hiſtoriens.* Paris 1707 in two volumes in 8vo. Amſterdam 1708 in 4to. Our Author in this work follows the ſame method with that of his *Bibliotheque of Eccleſiaſtical Works*; but he did not proceed far in it. It was tranſlated into Engliſh, and printed at London 1709 in two volumes in 8vo. under the following title; *The univerſal Library of Hiſtorians,* viz. *The Oriental, Greek, Latin, French, German, Spaniſh, Italian, Engliſh, and others. Containing an account of their Lives; the Abridgment, Chronology, and Geography of their Hiſtories; with critical Obſervations on their Style and Character; and a Catalogue of the ſeveral Editions of their Works. Alſo Chronological and Geographical Tables. Written in French by* Lewis Ellies du Pin, *Author of the* Eccleſiaſtical Bibliotheque, *now Abbot of Claraval. Done into Engliſh from the Paris Edition.* The Author in his *Advertiſement to the Reader* obſerves, that this work not only repreſents the lives of the Hiſtorians, and the catalogue of their works, but enters alſo into the detail of the hiſtories themſelves, and is indeed an abridgment of them; ſo that the reader may ſee here in little, not only the general Hiſtory, but likewiſe the particular and different relations of Hiſtorians, which has not hitherto been done. "*Suidas,* ſays he, ſpeaks of the Hiſtorians "and their works in his *Dictionary. Voſſius* after- "wards collected, with his uſual exactneſs, the names, "lives, and titles, of the writings of the Greek and "Latin Hiſtorians. But no *Bibliotheque Writer* has "yet attempted to make an abridgment of hiſtories; "though it is the moſt important, moſt uſeful, and "moſt agreeable part of a *Bibliotheque,* and the moſt "eſſential duty of a *Bibliotheque Writer.* It is not "enough for him to place the books in good order, "to exhibit the titles, to inform us who the Authors "were, and when and how they lived; but he ought "alſo to open them, to acquaint us what is contained "in them, to point out the fineſt paſſages, and the "advantages, which may be drawn from them, ei- "ther for the arts and ſciences, or for civil and po- "litical life. This is what has been chiefly endea- "voured in this *Bibliotheque* to be added to what *Voſſius* "and other *Bibliotheque Writers* have ſaid concerning "the Greek and Latin Hiſtorians. And we ſhall, "after the ſame manner, continue to treat of the "antient and modern Hiſtorians of other nations. "By this means, the Reader, in this work, will learn "the hiſtory of the world, as well as that of the "Authors. We cannot know the former but from "the report of the Hiſtorians; and all the conſide- "rable Hiſtorians extant will be abridged in this "work. This method of learning hiſtory will be "ſo much the more uſeful and certain, as the reader "will go to the ſources, and ſee the different manner, "in which the ſame events are related by different "Authors. He may in ſhort place them all in their "true epocha's and countries, where and when they "happened, by help of the chronological and geo- "graphical tables at the end of each volume." XV. *Lettre ſur l'ancienne Diſcipline de l'Egliſe touchant la Célébration de la Meſſe.* Paris 1708 in 12mo. XVI. *Hiſtoire des Juifs depuis Jeſus Chriſt juſqu' à preſent, contenant les Dogmes des Juifs, leurs Confeſſions de Foy, leurs Variations, & l'Hiſtoire de leur Religion, depuis la ruine du Temple; pour ſervir de ſupplement & de continuation à l'Hiſtoire de Joſeph.* Paris 1710 in 7 vols in 12mo. This hiſtory is that of Monſieur Baſnage, in which Monſieur du Pin made ſeveral alterations. As he ſuppreſſed the Author's name, Monſieur Baſnage complained of the injury done to him in a book, entitled, *Hiſtoire des Juifs reclaimée & rétablie par ſon veritable Auteur M.* Baſnage, *contre l'Edition anonyme & tronquée, qui s'en eſt faite à Paris.* Rotterdam 1711 in 8vo. He aſſures us likewiſe, that a great many errors were continued in the Paris edition, which had been corrected in the *Errata* of the Holland edition; that there were contradictions in the Paris edition by making alterations in one place, and by ſuffering in another place things repeated in both; and that every thing was retrenched, which was of any advantage to the Proteſtants, or which ſhewed the faults and defects of any of the Kings of France and Spain. XVII. *Diſſertationes hiſtoriques, chronologiques, & critiques ſur la Bible,* Tome I. Paris 1711 in 8vo. Theſe diſſertations relate only to the book of Geneſis, and were not continued. XVIII. *L'Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe en abregé par demandes & par réponſes, depuis le commencement du Monde juſqu' à preſent.* Paris 1712 in four tomes in 4to. It was reprinted at Paris 1714 in four tomes in 12mo. The Writers of the *Journal de Trevoux* ſpeak of this work in ſtrong terms of commendation. The Author, ſay they, who is an indefatigable writer, and of ſurprizing facility in compoſing, is maſter of his ſubject. His deſign is to be conciſe, and he is ſo without being obſcure, and without omitting any conſiderable fact. Another commendation due to him is, that he is not at all biaſſed by prejudice or paſſion. He

furniſhed ſome with memoirs, others with advices, and wrote Prefaces to many books; and that notwithſtanding all this, he found opportunity to relax himſelf with his friends one part of the day, and never refuſed the viſits of any perſon, being as courteous and affable in converſation, as unwearied in his ſtudies. However, his frankneſs of temper, as well as the nature of ſome of his writings, raiſed him a great number of enemies, who did not fail to take advantage of the opportunity, which the caſe of conſcience ſupplied them with, to bring him into trouble. Monſieur du Pin [C], who had ſigned it, was baniſhed to Chatelleraut, and deprived of his profeſſorſhip. A perſon uſed, as he was, to live at Paris in the midſt of men of letters, and only employed in his ſtudies, could not without great regret continue in the country at a diſtance from all converſation, and cut off even from the pleaſure of ſtudy. In order to procure leave to return, he began with retracting his ſubſcription, and then engaged ſeveral perſons of conſideration to intereſt themſelves in his affair; and at laſt diſowned a great many propoſitions, which he had advanced in ſome of his writings. By this means he obtained leave to return;

He acts the part of an Hiſtorian; he relates, and that is all. There is great judgment neceſſary to ſupport that character. We ſee him ſometimes at the brink of a precipice, but he knows how to ſtop: we perceive very well on what ſide his heart is; but in this work at leaſt his heart is not maſter of his pen. The ſtyle is not intirely correct, nor very much laboured; but it is clear and flowing, and that is ſufficient. A Carmelite, who aſſumed the name of *Salvaggio Canturani*, tranſlated this Hiſtory into Italian, and his tranſlation was printed at Venice 1716 in four volumes in 12mo. The Author of the *Journal of Venice* ſpeaking of this tranſlation in his 27th Tome, ſays that there are different opinions concerning the Author of the French original; but that it is of no conſequence to ſtay and examine that point. This is a piece of Fineſſe in that Journaliſt, who knew that the name of Monſieur du Pin was not well reliſhed in Italy. XIX. *L'Hiſtoire profane depuis ſon Commencement juſqu' à preſent.* Paris ſix volumes in 12mo. the two firſt in 1714, and the four others in 1716. Reprinted at Antwerp 1717 in ſix volumes in 12mo. This laſt edition is full of errors; and the proper names are almoſt every where diſguiſed. XX. *Analyſe de l'Apocalypſe, contenant une nouvelle explication ſimple & litterale de ce Livre, avec des Diſſertations ſur les Millenaires*, &c. Paris 1714, two tomes in 12mo. XXI. *Traité hiſtorique des Excommunications, dans lequel on expoſe l'ancienne & nouvelle diſcipline de l'Egliſe au ſujet des Excommunications & des autres cenſures.* Paris 1715 in 12mo. XXII. *Méthode pour etudier la Theologie, avec une Table des principales Queſtions, à examiner & à diſcuter dans les Etudes Theologiques, & les principaux Ouvrages ſur chaque Matiere.* Paris 1716 in 12mo. XXIII. *Dénonciation à M. le Procureur Général d'un Libelle injurieux aux Eveques, à S. A. R. Monſeigneur le Duc d'Orleans, intitulé Mémoire pour le Corps des Evêques, qui ont reçû la Conſtitution* Unigenitus, in 12mo. XXIV. *Défenſe de la Monarchie de Sicile contre les entrepriſes de la Cour de Rome, avec une relation veritable des precedez des deux Cours de Rome & de Sicile ſur les Conteſtations au ſujet du Tribunal de la Monarchie.* Amſterdam [Lyons] 1716 in 8vo. Amſterdam 1716 in 12mo. XXV. *Traité Philoſophique & Théologique ſur l'Amour de Dieu, dans lequel on établit & on explique les Veritez Catholiques, contre les Erreurs de quelques nouveaux Théologiens.* Paris 1717 in 12mo. XXVI. *Continuation du Traité de l'Amour de Dieu, contenant une Réponſe à un libelle injurieux, calomnieux, & ſeditieux, intitulé,* Dénonciation du Traité Philoſophique, &c. Paris 1717 in 8vo. XXVII. *Bibliotheque des Auteurs ſeparez de la Communion Romaine du* XVI. & XVII. *Siecle.* Paris 1718 in 8vo. two Tomes in four volumes. In the *Europe Sçavante*, Tome VII. p. 35. we have the following character of this book. "This work has no occaſion for any other commendation or cenſure than the name of Monſieur du Pin. There is ſtill the ſame rapidity in compoſing, the ſame haſtineſs in the ſtyle, the ſame moderation in the ſentiments, the ſame ſagacity in the judgments, the ſame precipitation in the enquiries, the ſame inaccuracy in the facts; in ſhort it is the ſame M. du Pin ſtill. He has omitted Authors more conſiderable than thoſe mentioned by him. The lives, which he gives, are too ſhort; two dates complete the whole affair; and amongſt thoſe, which are more ample, the facts are not ſufficiently ſtated, or they are related without any order. The Author has not even beſtowed the time or attention neceſſary to diſcuſs the facts: the chronological table is frequently inconſiſtent with the work itſelf. The catalogues of the books are not at all more perfect. To conclude, the extracts of the books are made with judgment, and contain only what is conſiderable or remarkable in them." Monſieur du Pin being ſhocked at the liberty, which had been taken in this *Journal* in paſſing the above-mentioned judgment upon his work, added to his firſt volume a very ſmart anſwer, to which the Authors of the *Journal* replied with great vivacity, though with ſomewhat more moderation in, Tome VII.

Beſides theſe works, Monſieur du Pin was employed in the later editions of *Moreri's Dictionary*, in which he made conſiderable additions and corrections. And he reviſed the tranſlation of *Petavius's Rationarium Temporum*, printed at Paris in 1715. and Monſieur *le Cointe's Hiſtory of Lewis* XIII.

[C] *Monſieur* du Pin . . . . . *had ſigned* the Caſe of Conſcience.] The affair of this Caſe of Conſcience was as follows (1). A Confeſſor in the country propoſed to the Doctors of Sorbonne a Caſe of Conſcience with relation to an Eccleſiaſtic, who was under his care. This Confeſſor had for ſeveral years heard the confeſſions of this Eccleſiaſtic, and given him abſolution without ſcruple concerning his doctrine and ſentiments, believing him to be *a Man of God.* At laſt ſome ſcruples aroſe in his mind, becauſe other Eccleſiaſtics told him, that his penitent entertained new and ſingular opinions. The Confeſſor not being willing, however, to condemn the perſon accuſed without hearing him, deſired to have ſome converſation with him out of the confeſſional. This was agreed to, and the Eccleſiaſtic opened his ſentiments to him; but the Confeſſor not thinking, that he had lights ſufficient to determine upon the novelty and ſingularity of theſe opinions, or to judge certainly whether they were thoſe condemned by the Church, addreſſed himſelf to theſe Doctors, in order to have their judgment upon the ſuſpicions, which were formed againſt this Eccleſiaſtic, and the anſwers, which he made in his juſtification. I. Concerning the five propoſitions of *Janſenius* condemned by the Popes *Innocent* X. and *Alexander* VII. he declared, that he condemned them, and always had condemned them ſimply and without reſtriction in all the ſenſes, in which the Church had condemned them, and even in the ſenſe of *Janſenius*, in the manner in which *Innocent* XII. had explained them in his brief to the Biſhops of the Low Countries. He had ſigned the *Formulary*, when it was required of him, and had a certificate of it. With reſpect to the caſe of *Janſenius*, as according to an Ordonnance of Monſieur *de Perefixe*, one muſt be either ignorant or malicious to pretend, that the Church requires the ſame belief of the fact as of the Right; the Eccleſiaſtic anſwered, that he did not pay the ſame regard to that deciſion as he did to the deciſion of the right, in the condemnation of the propoſitions; but that he believed, that it was ſufficient to ſhew a ſubmiſſion of reſpect and ſilence to what the Church had determined about the fact; and that as long as he could not be judicially convicted of having maintained any of the propoſitions condemned, he ought not to be diſturbed, nor have his faith ſuſpected; ſince Innocent XII. had forbid this by

(1) See Bernard's *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, Mois de Mars* 1703. p. 335 *& ſeqq.* April, p. 477. *& Mai* 1703. p. 594, 595.

return; but his profeſſorſhip was not reſtored to him. After he came back to Paris, his pen became more copious in its productions than before; he purſued all the ſeveral kinds of Literature; he was at the ſame time a Divine, Canoniſt, Hiſtorian, with regard to both ſacred and profane hiſtory, a Critic, and even a Philoſopher; and all this with the ſame eaſe, though ſometimes at the expence of his reputation; however his works had always a quick and large ſale: but the facility, with which he wrote, being ſuſpected by many perſons, it was frequently diſcovered, that either his accuracy was by no means equal to his diligence, or his diſquiſitions too ſuperficial to render ſome of his latter works of any uſe but to beginners. However, it muſt be acknowledged, that he was a man of excellent taſte, great freedom from ordinary prejudices, of a clear, exact, and methodical head, of infinite reading, a lively but regular imagination, an eaſy and noble ſtyle, and equitable and moderate temper, exempt from the violence of a party-ſpirit, and proper to form a plan for a reunion in religion. He correſponded with learned men of different communions; and Dr. Wake, the late Archbiſhop of Canterbury, wrote to him ſeveral letters, in which he expreſſed his regard for our Author's moderation, learning, and judgment. The Czar of Muſcovy, while he reſided at Paris, conſulted him upon ſome projects of a reunion. He had a great ſhare in oppoſing of the conſtitution *Unigenitus:* he was the ſoul and inſtrument of all that was done in the Sorbonne againſt

by a brief, which the Clergy of France had juſt authorized in their laſt aſſembly. II. Concerning Predeſtination and Grace, he anſwered, that he was perſuaded, that the one is gratuitous and antecedent to all foreſight of merit, and that the other is efficacious of itſelf and neceſſary to every good work; becauſe having ſtudied divinity, he was convinced, that theſe are the ſentiments of St. *Auguſtin*, whoſe Doctrine the Popes and Church of Rome direct to be followed, and whoſe ſentiments they ſtyle *tutiſſima & inconcuſſa Dogmata*. He owned however, that there are inward Graces, which give a real poſſibility of fulfilling the Commandments of God, but have not their full effect through the reſiſtance of the will. III. He declared, that he believed, that we are obliged to love God above all things and in all things, as our ultimate end; and that, as St. *Thomas Aquinas* expreſſes it, we are obliged to refer all things virtually to him. Whence he infers, that all actions, which are not referred to him, at leaſt in this manner, and which are not done by an impreſſion ariſing from ſome motion of the love of God, are ſins, for want of a good and right end; though theſe actions may be good with reſpect to the particular object or end. IV. He agreed, that the Church had not determined any thing concerning the ſufficiency or inſufficiency of attrition. He owned alſo, that attrition conceived through the motive of the fear of puniſhment is good, becauſe this fear is the gift of God, and is of great uſe. But he believ'd, that in order that this attrition may be a diſpenſation ſufficient to receive abſolution and remiſſion of ſins in the ſacrament of penance, it is neceſſary, that beſides this motive of fear it ſhould contain a beginning of actual charity and love towards God above all things, or as the ſource of all righteouſneſs, in order that the grief for ſin in this attrition may be predominant, and exclude the will of ſinning. This he pretended to ſhew from a great number of Theſes maintained in the Sorbonne. In ſhort he declared, that he thought he could not be juſtly reproached upon this ſubject, ſince the laſt aſſembly of the Clergy had revived in their cenſure the condemnation of the 85th, 86th, and 87th propoſitions, which they rejected as heretical, tending to hereſy, and contrary to the Council of Trent; and ſince the Archbiſhop of Roan had cenſured in his paſtoral letter of 1697, as an error oppoſite to Scripture and ſound doctrine, the opinion of thoſe, who aſſert, that *a Man fallen into Sin may be juſtified by the Sacrament of Penance, without returning to what is right through the love of God.* V. With regard to the manner of being preſent at Maſs, his opinion was, that it ought to be done with devotion and a ſpirit of penitence, if a perſon finds himſelf guilty of any mortal ſin; and that he, who is preſent at that ſacrifice, and brings thither the will and affection for any mortal ſin, without any ſentiment of penitence, commits a new ſin by this criminal diſpoſition, which is directly contrary to piety and the reverence due to God in the exerciſe of that ſovereign worſhip, which he profeſſes to pay to him. VI. He profeſſed to believe, that it is very uſeful to every Chriſtian to have a great deal of devotion for the Saints, and eſpecially the Holy Virgin, who is the Mother of God, and the Queen of Saints. But that he did not believe, that this devotion conſiſts in all the vain requeſts and abſurd practices, which are to be met with in certain Authors. He believed, that true devotion conſiſts in a warm love towards the Holy Virgin, full of reſpect and veneration; in a love, which occaſions us to rejoice in the favours, which God has conferred on her, which leads us to the imitation of her humility and other virtues, which is attended with confidence in her on account of her intereſt with her ſon, and which leads us to apply ourſelves to her as a powerful advocate, who can obtain for us all that ſhe aſks of God for us. But he cannot approve of preaching, that we ought to confide as much, or even more in her, than in God himſelf; or of aſſerting, that ſhe has delivered from eternal pains ſouls, which the juſtice of her ſon had condemned to them. He does not ſcruple to ſay, that ſuch diſcourſes as theſe are injurious to religion, and amuſe ſouls, and lull them a-ſleep in vice, thro' this falſe confidence in ſome outward practices, to which ſuch Preachers frequently reduce the devotion due to the holy Virgin. VII. Being aſked what he thought of the conception of the Virgin Mary, he anſwered, that he was inclined to believe what the church ſhould think proper to determine. That indeed he did not believe it to be immaculate, and that he was at liberty not to believe it by the conſtitution of *Alexander* VII. He declares, that he does not decide the queſtion, but that he takes care not to ſay any thing againſt the opinion of thoſe, who believe the immaculate conception, ſince the conſtitution forbids this. VIII. Being told, that the books which he had, occaſioned it to be thought, that he entertained ſingular and erroneous opinions; and that it gave ſcandal, that he read the treatiſe of *Frequent Communion*, the *Letters* of Monſieur *de S. Ciran*, the *Hours* of Monſieur *du Mont*, the *Morale de Grenoble*, the *Rituel d'Alet*, which were conſidered as bad books; he anſwered, that all theſe books having been printed with permiſſion, approved by ſeveral Biſhops and Doctors, and being in publick uſe, and univerſally received, he did not think, that he ought to be accuſed of entertaining a ſuſpected doctrine: that the treatiſe of *Frequent Communion* was approved by above thirty Biſhops and twenty Doctors; that it was never condemned at Rome, though it had been ſent thither under two Popes; that the rules propoſed in it are true and very ſafe, ſince they are taken from Councils, Fathers, and the beſt Eccleſiaſtical Authors, and are approved and practiſed by the moſt zealous Biſhops. That the *Letters* of Monſieur *de S. Ciran* had not been condemned by any Univerſity or Biſhop, but on the contrary, were printed with the approbation of ſeveral Doctors, and the recommendations of ſeveral Biſhops, whoſe buſineſs it is to judge of Doctrine, and upon whoſe judgment the faithful ought to reſt. That with reſpect to the *Hours* of Monſieur *du Mont*, he had made a preſent of them to a perſon, who did not underſtand Latin, for his edification, not having

againſt that conſtitution. The deputations, commiſſions, and memorials, all paſſed through his hands. At laſt being exhauſted by his labours, and by a regimen, which contributed to ſhorten his days, he died June the 6th 1719, aged ſixty two years. While he was in his laſt ſickneſs, Father *le Courayer* of St. Genevieve came to ſee him with another of his Brethren. Monſieur du Pin began the converſation at firſt with mentioning the criticiſm, which had been publiſhed in the *Europe Sçavante*, upon the firſt Tome of his *Bibliotheque des Auteurs ſeparez de la Communion Romaine*, and ſpoke of it with great ſeverity, not knowing that Father Courayer was the Author of it. Theſe Fathers then went up to the chamber of Monſieur *le Cointe*, who had written in conjunction with Monſieur du Pin, and was Author of the Anſwer to that Criticiſm, which had been erroneouſly aſcribed to Monſieur du Pin himſelf. Monſieur le Cointe, who likewiſe knew not, that Father Courayer was their antagoniſt, began upon the ſame ſubject, and told them, that if he lived, he would deſiſt from writing againſt thoſe, who had attacked

having any reaſon to ſuſpect that they were erroneous or prohibited, ſince they were ſo publickly uſed in the ſight and with the knowledge of the Eccleſiaſtical Superiors, with the approbation of the Doctors, and privilege of the King; that the decree of the Inquiſition, which had condemned them, came from a tribunal, which did not at all oblige, and was not acknowledged in France. With reſpect to the *Morale de Grenoble*, and the *Conferences de Luçon*, they are indeed new books; but that the doctrine of them was antient; and that he believed, that it was more advantageous to him to make uſe of them, than of a great many of the Caſuiſts. That the *Rituel* of Monſieur *d'Alet* had not been condemned by a conſtitution but through a ſurprize, from which even the moſt pious Popes do not think themſelves exempt; for beſides the proofs, which are to be had, we find that the ſame Pope, who had given it in 1668, without having required any retractation of Monſieur *d'Alet*, ſent him a Brief of Communion on the 19th of January the year following, with favourable teſtimonies of his virtue, piety, learning, and ſanctity. The laſt objection made to this Eccleſiaſtic by his Confeſſor was, that thoſe, by whom he was ſuſpected, were extremely diſpleaſed, that he had a French tranſlation of the New Teſtament. He anſwered, that he had one indeed; but that certainly he was not prohibited reading the New Teſtament tranſlated into the vulgar tongue, and adviſing the reading of it to the Faithful, ſince it was a practice which all the Fathers have taught us, and which the Cardinal de Noailles following their ſteps had authorized by the permiſſion, which he granted for the tranſlation of the whole Bible, ſold by *William Deſprez, Rüe S. Jacques*. That though there ſhould be a doubt about the tranſlation printed at Mons, he thought it would be allowed to adhere to the ſentiments of the Biſhop of Meaux, who being conſulted about the reading of tranſlations of the New Teſtament, anſwered, that any perſon might read them with the advice of his Rector or Confeſſor, if they judged, that he had the diſpoſitions neceſſary to profit by that reading. The only prohibition, to which the Biſhop of Meaux ſhews any regard, was the *Ordonnance* of Monſieur de Perefixe, Archbiſhop of Paris; but he ſays, that this prohibition does not oblige in other Dioceſes, where Prelates have determined nothing upon that ſubject, and conſequently left intire liberty to every perſon to chooſe what he ſhould think moſt uſeful to him. Theſe were the principal grounds of the ſcruple, which was raiſed in the Confeſſor, with relation to the conduct of this Eccleſiaſtic. He declared to the Doctors, whom he conſulted, that as the perſons, who had raiſed thoſe ſcruples, were perſons of a regular and pious behaviour, and great zeal for the ſervice of the church; and as the Eccleſiaſtic, whom they accuſed, ſeemed to be a man of piety, he durſt not condemn him upon this ſingle motive, meaning his excuſes, and being apprehenſive of paſſing a raſh judgment, if he did not ſee the reaſons, which might oblige him to it. If thoſe, ſays he, which theſe Eccleſiaſtics alledge againſt him, ſhould appear to the Doctors ſufficient to condemn his ſentiments, it would be eaſy to ſee what method he ought to take, that their judgment ſhould regulate his; and that the Eccleſiaſtic, concerning whom he conſulted them, having a deſire to be ſaved, and being a man of a ſincere mind, and not at all attached to his notions, he thought he would make no difficulty of renouncing whatever of his opinions ſhould be found prejudicial to his ſalvation. He requeſted therefore the aſſiſtance and directions of the Doctors, and deſired them very earneſtly not to refuſe him them for his inſtruction, by declaring plainly what regard he ought to ſhew to theſe accuſations and theſe juſtifications of this Eccleſiaſtic. The Doctors having conſidered the caſe above-mentioned, were of opinion, that the ſentiments of the Eccleſiaſtic in queſtion were neither new, nor ſingular, nor condemned by the Church, nor ſuch in ſhort that his Confeſſor ought to require him to abandon them before he gave him abſolution. This is what was deliberated in the Sorbonne on the 20th of July 1702, and ſigned by forty Doctors, whoſe names are as follow: *N. Petit-pied*, Profeſſor of Sorbonne; *G. Bourret*, Profeſſor of Sorbonne; *Sarraſin*, Royal Lecturer and Profeſſor; *Pinſſonat*, Royal Lecturer and Profeſſor; *Ellies du Pin*, Royal Profeſſor; *F. N. Alexandre*; *Le Pêcheur*; *Soullet*; *Deſhayettes*; *Verdier*; *De Cougniou*; *Herlau*; *Camet*, *Contet*, *Ruffin Le Beau*, all three Canons regular of S. Croix; *De Bourges*, Prior of St. Victor; *De Longueil*, and *Gueſton*, Canons regular of St. Victor; *De Combes*, Abbot of St. Geneviève; *Le Franc*; *Jollin*, Rector of St. Hilary; *Tullou*, Rector of St. Bennet; *Hideux*, Rector of the Innocents; *Blampignon*, Rector of St. Merry; *Feu*, Rector of St. Gervais; *De Voulges*, Rector of St. Martin; *Deſprez*, Rector of Rouelle; *Le Febvre des Chevaliers*, Archdeacon of the Church of Troyes; *Veron*, Treaſurer of the Church of Zangres; *Hyacinthe Delan*, Theologal of Roan; *Molin*; *De la Rogue*, formerly Theologal of Meaux; *De la Geneſte*; *Girard*; *Picard*, Rector of St. Cloud; *Borrey*; *L. de la Mare*; *G. de la Mare*; *Joly*.

There were ſeveral pieces publiſhed on occaſion of this Caſe of Conſcience. The firſt, which appeared, was a pamphlet in 4to. entitled, *Dialogues entre un jeune & un vieux Docteur ſur le Cas de Conſcience ſigné par quarante Docteurs*. This piece is very ſevere upon the Doctors for approving the Caſe of Conſcience.

There was publiſhed ſoon after another pamphlet upon the ſame ſubject, under this title, *Entrepriſe de quelques Docteurs contre la Cenſure de la derniere Aſſemblée du Clergé*, &c. The ſubſtance of this Author's reaſoning is in ſhort this. The aſſembly of the Clergy has cenſured the propoſition, which aſſerts, that *Janſeniſm is a phantom*. Now every body allows, that it is abſolutely the ſame thing to ſay, that Janſeniſm is a phantom, as to ſay that Janſenius did not teach the Hereſy of the five propoſitions condemned by the Popes. It is alſo the ſame thing, to ſay, a perſon obſtinately perſiſts in maintaining that the five propoſitions condemned are not in Janſenius; as to ſay, he continues in a reſpectful ſilence upon that ſubject: therefore that man ought not to be abſolved, who maintains, that one may continue in a *reſpectful ſilence*, any more than he who ſhould maintain, that *Janſeniſm is a phantom*.

The Doctors, who ſigned the Caſe of Conſcience, were attacked by ſeveral pamphlets; for, beſides the two abovementioned, there appeared three others. The firſt was intitled, *Attentat de* 40 *Docteurs contre l'Egliſe, dénoncé à tous les Evêques du Royaume*, in 4to, pagg. 41. The ſecond was called, *Entretien d'un Prélat & du R. P. Alexandre Dominicain*; and the third, *Entretien d'un Docteur de la Maiſon de Sorbonne avec un Docteur Ubiquiſte, qui à ſigné la Deciſion du Cas de*

tacked Monſieur du Pin, whom he ſtyled his *dear Maſter*; and though he had but a very ſmall eſtate, would at his death leave money for a foundation to ſupport thoſe, who ſhould defend his memory. Monſieur le Cointe died about fifteen days after Monſieur du Pin, but without performing his promiſe.

Conſcience couchant le Fait de Janſenius, in 4to. pag. 7. Monſieur d'Argenſon, Lieutenant of the Police, being informed, that there was printing at the Widow Mazuel's an Apology for the Caſe of Conſcience, ordered all that was printed off to be ſeized, the preſs to be broken, and the Widow to pay a conſiderable fine. The forty Doctors preſented a petition to the Cardinal de Noailles Archbiſhop of Paris, acquainting him with the reaſons which induced them to ſign the Caſe of Conſcience, and complaining of the defamatory pieces publiſhed on that ſubject. Monſieur *Bourlet*, Vicar of St. Mareel, who had ſolicited ſubſcriptions to the Caſe of Conſcience, was baniſhed to Quinpercorentin by a Letter *de Cachet* ſent to him on the 5th of February 1702-3. Several of the forty Doctors, who had ſigned the Caſe of Conſcience, wrote a Letter to the Cardinal Archbiſhop of Paris, to aſſure his Eminence, that they were perſuaded, that it was their duty to ſubmit their private judgment to that of the Church, even when the queſtion was about facts. However, the Caſe of Conſcience was condemned by an *Ordonnance* of the Archbiſhop, a brief of the Pope, and an *Arret* of the Council. And Monſieur du Pin was baniſhed to Chatelleraud in Poitou by order of his Majeſty; and before his departure was obliged to reſign abſolutely before a Notary his place of Profeſſor in the Royal College; and all the privileges granted by the King for printing of his books were revoked. Monſieur Petit-pied, Doctor and Profeſſor of Sorbonne, was likewiſe baniſhed to Baulne in Burgundy; and another Profeſſor choſen by the King's Order in his room. T.

PINCIER (JOHN), was born at Wettera in the country of Heſſen in the year 1521. He ſtudied firſt at Marpourg, and then at Louvain, and afterwards at Paris, at Zurich, and at Straſburg, and was Miniſter of the Proteſtant Church in his native place above thirty years; after which he performed the ſame functions in another place (*a*), till the infirmities of old age obliged him to petition to be diſcharged from his functions. Having obtained that favour, he retired to Franeberg, where his wife had a houſe. He died there January the 26th 1591 (*b*). He publiſhed ſome works, and deſerves a place among the Pſeudonymous Authors [*A*]. He declared againſt the Lutherans with regard to the Doctrines of Ubiquity and the Real Preſence. I have obſerved in another place (*c*), that he was Hyperius's brother-in-law.

(*a*) *In Cœnobio Henetienſi.*

(*b*) Extracted from the Epitaph, which his daughter, and his ſon-in-law, who was a Miniſter of the Goſpel, ſet up for him. It is to be met with in the *Deliciæ Itinerum* of Nathan. Chytræus, p. m. 651.

(*c*) In the art. KUCHLIN, in the marginal quotation (*a*).

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome works, and deſerves a place among the Pſeudonymous Writers.*] He publiſhed two books under the name of Helias Palingenius, the one entitled *Dipnoſophiſticæ Tragœdiæ procataſtrophe tractans & explicans controverſiam de Cœna Domini*, at Geneva 1569, in 8vo. The title of the other is *Elenchus ſanæ de Euchariſtia doctrinæ atque fidei ab incommutabili tam ſententiarum quam connexionum veritate inſtructus ad Auguſtini præſcriptum*, at Heidelberg 1575, in 8vo. (1). This is what I meet with in the epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque, in which it is conjectured that *Helias Palingenius* is a fictitious name, but we are not told there which is the true name. It is obſerved in another place (2) that John Pincier wrote a very learned and pious work *De Cœna Domini*, which was printed at Baſil in 8vo. it was in the year 1561, if we may believe Hoſpinianus (3). We are told in the Author's epitaph, that the two books, which he publiſhed under the name of Helias Palingenius were printed at Heidelberg, and that his *Antidotus* was printed at Geneva firſt under the name of *Johannes Pincierus*, and afterwards without any name (4). Monſieur Placius has not mentioned this Pſeudonymous Writer, and Monſieur Baillet has not put him into his catalogue. I imagine that the *Antidotus* is the ſame book, the ſubſtance of which we meet with in Hoſpinianus (5), who obſerves that it was reprinted at Heidelberg in the year 1575. He obſerves (6) alſo, that the *Elenchus* was printed firſt at Newſtad in the year 1575, and then at Heidelberg in the year 1583.

(1) Ex *Epitome Bibliotb. Geſneri*, p. 212.

(2) Ibidem, p. 485.

(3) Hoſpin. *Hiſt. Sacram.* Tom. 2. p. 480.

(4) See Pincier's Epitaph in Nathan. Chytræus, *Delic. Itinerum*, p. 651, 652.

(5) Hoſpin. *Hiſt. Sacram.* Tom. 2. p. 602.

(6) Idem, ibid. p. 604.

PINEAU (SEVERIN), in Latin *Pinæus*, born in Chartres (*a*), publiſhed at Paris, where he exerciſed the profeſſion of a ſurgeon, a Latin book in 1598, which has borne ſeveral impreſſions (*b*). He therein treats of the marks by which a maid's virginity may be known, a circumſtance that probably was the chief occaſion of its being ſo much ſought after by the publick. It is affirmed that the German tranſlation of it, publiſhed at Francfort about the beginning of the 17th Century, was prohibited by the Magiſtrates [*A*], who did not think it proper that thoſe ſubjects ſhould be treated in the language of the country. The Author wrote his book originally in French, and intended to publiſh it in that tongue; but finding, by the ſpecimens of it which he ſhewed to ſome perſons, that it gave occaſion to looſe diſcourſes or impertinent jeſts, he reſolved to write only for the learned [*B*]; and accordingly concluded his Preface with the following verſes of the antient Author (*c*):

Odi

(*a*) *Cornutenſis*, and not *Cornutenſis*, as in *Draudius*; or *Camutenſis*, as in *Lindenius renovatus.*

(*b*) Lindenius renovatus, mentions eight editions of it.

(*c*) Horace, Od. 1. lib. 3.

[*A*] *It is affirmed that the German tranſlation of* this work . . . . *was prohibited by the Magiſtrates.*] I find this particular in a letter written to Goldaſtus, which is the CLXXII. of the collection printed at Francfort in 1688. One Segeth, a friend of his, in a letter written to him from Hanaw, the 5th of Auguſt 1607, deſires him to buy that verſion for him, tho' it ſhould coſt ever ſo much; and he ſays that he was the more deſirous of having it, becauſe he had heard that the ſale of it was forbid. *Si in libellum quendam Severini Pevini* (1) *de dignoſcendis virginibus è Gallica in Germanicam linguam verſo incidas, eum mihi quocunque pretio compares, quod cum gratiarum actione reddetur. Audio iſthic apud Spieſſium excuſum, & interdictum ejus venditione, quod fateor mihi calcar addidit ad poſcendam.*

(1) Read *Pinæi.*

[*B*] *The Author wrote his book originally in French, and intended to publiſh it in that tongue; but finding . . . that it gave occaſion to looſe diſcourſes . . . . . he reſolved to write only for the learned.*] His intention was good; he deſigning to do ſervice to judges, who were very frequently puzled in certain cauſes wherein the women were plaintiffs; ſometimes becauſe they ſtill kept their virgin-flower, at other times becauſe they had loſt it. In the firſt caſe, a woman complained of her being married to an impotent huſband; and in the ſecond, of being raviſhed. There might be abuſes in both theſe complaints: there might alſo be ſome abuſe or error in the information of the fact; for either the matrons or other perſons appointed to inſpect the parts, were either not well enough acquainted

Odi profanum vulgus, & arceo :
Favete linguis : carmina non prius
Audita, Muſarum ſacerdos
Virginibus puerisque canto.

Hence, ye profane, I hate you all,
Both the great, vulgar, and the ſmall.
To virgin minds, which yet their native witneſs hold,
Nor yet diſcolour'd with the love of Gold,
That jaundice of the ſoul,
Which makes it look ſo gilded and ſo foul
To you, ye very few, theſe truths I tell :
The Muſe inſpires my ſong, hark, and obſerve it well.
COWLEY.

PINEAU (GABRIEL) DU), in Latin *Pinellus*, Counſellor in the preſidial Court at Angers, was a famous man. He died at Angers in 1644, in the ſeventy third year of his age (*a*).

(*a*) See Menage, *Remarks on the Life of William Menage*, p. 333, where he gives a catalogue of ſuch works of our Pineau as had been publiſhed, as likewiſe of thoſe which had not.

quainted with nature, or were unfair in their proceedings. Such are the reaſons why Pineau thought it incumbent on him to publiſh his diſcoveries, and render them intelligible to perſons who were ignorant of the Latin tongue : however, other reaſons prompted him to change his deſign. Here follow his own words (2) : *Te autem monitum volumus (amice lector) hoc opuſculum primum nos Gallicum feciſſe, ſicque in publicum proditurum decreviſſe ad eorum ſublevationem, qui judicibus & parentibus referre debent de conformatione naturali, aut vitiata pudendorum virginum nuptarum aut innuptarum, quarum hæ maximam vim à procis integritati ſuæ : illæ verum nullam à maritis aut ſaltem ſponſis imbecillioribus & fatuis illatam fuiſſe conqueruntur. Sed cum primas delineationes quibuſdam expoſuiſſemus, cognoviſſemuſque horum alios ad laſciviam, alios ad vaniloquium & procacitatem potius quam ad fructum aliquem ex eo ſibi & reipublicæ utilem colligendum expetere, inſtituti noſtri rationem mutavimus, atque in ſermonem Latinum convertimus, philiatriſque ſolis & literatis hominibus devovimus Horatii exemplo impulſi* (3). It is to be obſerved that his book conſiſts of two parts. In the firſt he inquires into the ſigns of virginity ; and aſſerts, in the ſecond, that two bones (4), at the time that women are delivered, part aſunder. He exhorts phyſicians and ſurgeons to remember his Hypotheſis ; either to facilitate the diſjunction of theſe two bones, or to join them together again after the child is born. *Propterea mulieres in utero habentes, & pueros adhuc in eo degentes ac ſtabulantes non ſic negligendos eſſe hortamur, ſed omni auxilio & arte juvandos, ut non minus ſaltem diligentes ſe præbuiſſe videantur Medici & Chirurgi in partibus dilatandis, per quas exit fœtus de utero matris, quam quum editus eſt, in iiſdem conſtringendis ſolliciti ſunt. Quod ſit apte & convenienter, ſi medicamenta emollientia qua voles forma parata ſymphyſibus prædictorum oſſium pubis & ilium adhibita fuerint, ut natura docet, atque ipſamet quantum poteſt, præſtat. Quæ oſſa his in ſymphyſibus adeo vehementer conſtricta ſunt reliquo vitæ tempore, ut citius alibi, puta, in medio ſui frangerentur, quam à cauſa quadam procatarctica ab invicem diducerentur, quæ tamen tempore partus diſtrahuntur* (5).

(1) Severinus Pinæus, *in Præfat. ad Lectorem*, p. 22.

(3) He here annexes the verſes of Horace, quoted at the end of the text of this article. The application of thoſe verſes is agreeable to the title which has been given to a book *De organis generationis* ; it was entitled, *Sacra Eleuſinia patefacta*. See *Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres*, for July 1684 p. 535 ; but obſerve that *Reinerus Rolfinctus*, the Author of that book, did not give it that title. It was by a trick of the Bookſeller that his work was publiſhed, as a new one, under the above-mentioned title in 1684, and without the Author's name.

(4) The *os pubis*, & *Os ilium*.

(5) S. Pinæus, *in Præf.* p. 21, 22.

PINET (ANTHONY DU), Lord of Noroy, was born in the 14th Century in the Franche Comté at Bezançon, according to La Croix du Maine (*a*), or at Baume les Nonnes, if Lewis Gollut may be credited (*b*). He publiſhed ſeveral books [*A*], ſome of which ſhew that he was zealous for the Proteſtant Religion. This is evident chiefly from the notes he added to the French tranſlation of the *Tax on the Chancery of Rome* [*B*]. He

(*a*) La Croix du Maine, *Biblioth. Franc.* p. 19.

(*b*) Gollut, *Memoires de la Franche Comté*, p. 6.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] The moſt conſiderable are only French tranſlations. I ſhall take notice of the beſt in the laſt remark of this article. The reſt are, a verſion of the third part of the Letters of Don Antonio de Guevara, and that of Guevara's *treatiſe concerning the working and privileges of gallies* (1). That of *the Commentaries of Father Andrew Mathiolus of Sienna, on the Hiſtory of Plants of Pedacion Dioſcorides Anazarbeus*, Lyons, folio (2) anno 1566 (3). That of the *Secret Miracles of Nature, by Levinus Lemnius, a Phyſician of Ziriſea*, Lyons 1567 (4). That of *Common Places of the Scriptures, collected by Wolfgang Muſculus, in 66 titles*, Geneva, by Euſtace Vignon, folio, 1577 (5). That of the *Tax of the caſual Forfeitures, &c.* I ſhall ſpeak of it in the following remark. As to the books written by him, here follow ſome of the controverſial kind : *The Conformity between the Proteſtant Churches of France, and the primitive Church, in Polity and Ceremonies*, Lyons 1564, 8vo (6). *Sermons on the Revelations* (7). Here follows a work of another kind. *Plans, Pictures and Deſcriptions of ſeveral Cities and Fortreſſes in Europe, Aſia, Africa, as in the India and America ; their Foundations, Antiquities, and Manner of Living ; with ſeveral general and particular maps, in a Coſmographical Way, with their Explications*, Lyons, by John Ogerolles, in 1564, folio (8). The Reader will find, in the remark [*C*], a critical remark againſt this compilation.

(1) Du Verdier, Vau Privas, *Biblioth. Franc.* p. 76, who ſays that theſe two verſions were printed together at Lyons, in 4to, anno 1560.

(2) Idem, p. 78.

(3) *La Croix du Maine*, p. 19.

(4) Ibid. p. 20.

(5) Du Verdier Vau Privas, *Biblioth. Franc.* p. 78.

(6) Ibid. p. 75.

(7) Ibid. p. 76.

(8) Ibid. p. 75.

[*B*] *The notes he added to the French tranſlation of the* Tax on the Chancery of Rome.] The title of this work is as follows. *The Tax on the caſual Forfeitures of the Pope's Shop, in Latin and French, with Annotations taken from the Decrees, Councils, and Canons, antient and modern, to verify the Diſcipline antiently obſerved in the Church ; the whole enlarged and reviſed. By A. D. P.* The Dedication *to all faithful Chriſtians*, is dated *from Lyons, the* 26th of March 1564. I'll tranſcribe ſome words from it, to give my Readers a ſpecimen of the freedom this Author wrote with, which indeed was the cuſtom of thoſe times. *For this reaſon I have ſet before them the aſſeſſment of their ſouls, according to the rates ſet upon them by their terreſtrial God : to the end that, ſeeing the trade they make of them and their conſciences, and the tyranny to which they are ſubject, and the danger to which they are obnoxious, they may lift up their eyes towards heaven, and at laſt know, how ſignal the grace of God is with regard to thoſe whom he delivers from ſuch a ſlavery. And leſt any Dataries, Auditors, Romancers, Bulliſts, Copiſts, Notary-Bankers, and all perſons of that ſtamp, ſhould imagine that I have miſtaken matters, I have faithfully annexed the Latin text of the Tax of the Papal Chamber, with a French tranſlation, and have added ſome annotations for the uſe and benefit of the Church. For the contents of the text are ſo ſhameful and abominable, that I muſt intreat you, my brethren, to pardon me, for offering it to ſo holy a ſociety as yours, where nothing is heard but ſpiritual ſongs, pſalms and praiſes to the Lord our God. But it is incumbent on us to ſhew a wicked man his wickedneſs, and the fool his folly, leſt we ſhould be judged to reſemble him* (9). We may naturally ſuppoſe, that a man who ſpeaks in this manner in his dedication, has expreſſed himſelf very bluntly in his Commentary on a text which lies ſo open to ſatyr

(9) Pinet, *Dedication to the Tax on the caſual forfeitures, &c.*

He puliſhed ſome very wild chimeras with reſpect to the genealogy of certain families

ſatyr and invective, as that of the Tax of the Roman Chancery. I wiſh that all du Pinet's notes were not in the controverſial caſt, and that ſome of them explained certain forms of expreſſion which occur very often: but I am of opinion, that he was not ſufficiently ſkilled in the Canon Law, nor the ſtyle of the Court of Rome, to clear up thoſe obſcure particulars. He intended, at the very opening of his Commentary, to exhibit the price of every tax, but was forced to confeſs that it was not in his power to do it. No Reader could be ſatisfied with what he ſays, as I will now make appear. The three ſorts of money mentioned in this apoſtolical Tarif of Rome, are *Turonenſes*, *Ducatus* and *Carlinus*, on which he has the following note. "As to the gold *Tournois*, ſome take "it for a Paris livre or pound. Others ſay that it is "an old crown, and others again that it is worth a "*Philippus*. In a word, I have not yet met with a- "ny thing certain with regard to that money; tho' "the *Tournois de Chambre* is generally worth a *Real*; "a Ducat is worth a Piſtolet, and four *Sous* or Pence "Tournois; and a *Carlin* is worth four *Sous* (10)." Thoſe who deſire to underſtand perfectly all they read, require a much better explication than that above; and it is certain, that this is one of the paſſages which the Author of the notes ought to have illuſtrated to the beſt of his power. His work was re-printed at Leyden in 1607 (11); and was re-printed at Amſterdam, with a new preface, in 1700. The Author of this preface obſerves, that he had done all that lay in his power to reduce to our money, the Tournois, Ducats and Carlins, employed in the Tax of the Pope's Chancery, but was not able to get any inſight into that matter; but that in caſe he did, he would inſert it in the next edition. He takes notice of what du Pinet obſerves with regard to the value of the three coins; and adds, that the Author of the notes, on the confeſſion of Sancy, affirms, that at the end of the book *of the Taxes of the Roman Chancery, there is a Tarif, which ſettles the Gros at four Sous Tournois, the Ducat at forty Sous, and the Carolus at eight Blancs* (12). The Author of theſe notes obſerves this, where he illuſtrates part of the following paſſage of D'Aubigne. "There is another book, "which thoſe I lately mentioned have endeavoured "to the utmoſt of their power to ſuppreſs; but the "Roman Pontiffs would never permit it. . . It is the "book on the Taxes, where a good Catholick ſees "a low price ſet upon ſines; and knows, at one "glance, how much he is to pay for them. He who "has deflowered a virgin, muſt pay ſix *gros*. Any "man who ſhall have known, carnally, (but with "mutual conſent) his own mother, ſiſter, couſin- "german, or god-mother, pays five *gros*. However, "if that be known in the church, he ſhall give ſix. "A ducat or five carlins muſt be paid by any perſon "who kills a father or a mother (13)." The Commentator on the words *five gros*, declares that this is found in folio 36 *verſo*. He doubtleſs means that edition mentioned by d'Aubigné, viz. that of Paris 1570 (14), by *Touſſaint Denis, in St. James's-Street, at the Sign of the wooden Croſs, and entitled*, Cancellaria Apoſtolica, the following note being made by him on theſe words, *It is the book of Taxes*. "*Taxæ* "*Cancellariæ Apoſtolicæ, & Taxæ Pœnitentiariæ iti-* "*dem Apoſtolicæ*. Printed at Paris, with his Majeſty's "licence, for three years, in 1520, for Touſſains "Denis, in St. James's-Street, at the wooden Croſs; "having, in the title-page, the arms of France, and "thoſe of the houſe of Medicis, to which Leo X. "was related (15)." He affirms, that *this book, tranſlated into French in* 1564, *by Anthony du Pinet, printed the ſame year in* 8vo, *at Lyons, for John Saugrain, and re-printed with the Latin* (16) *at Leyden in* 1607, *with this title*, Taxe des parties caſuelles de la Boutique du Pape, *is condemned among the anonymous Authors of the letter* A, *in the catalogue of books prohibited in* 1685, *by order of the Archbiſhop of Paris; and the Authors of that catalogue did not think it neceſſary to mention the Latin and Gothic original; becauſe that du Pinet's book is in French, and full of annotations, wherein the Author has endeavoured to point out a great deal of turpitude in the old book of taxes; whereas thoſe Gentlemen perhaps imagined, that the original was loſt; and farther, they doubtleſs did not dare to command it to be ſuppreſſed, by reaſon of the two great authorities which gave a ſanction to it. By the way*, the Tax of the Chancery, &c. was re-printed in 1613, *with the Pragmatic Sanction*. I am ſure that he will permit me to obſerve to him, that the book which du Pinet tranſlated is not the ſame cited by d'Aubigné. There is not any coin called *gros*, in the Tax which du Pinet tranſlated and illuſtrated with notes. We don't there ſee the chapter of *perpetual diſpenſations* mentioned by d'Aubigné, nor any particular concerning the tax laid on thoſe who commit inceſt with their mother, ſiſter, &c. Now ſince the Author of the notes affirms, that the perſons hinted at are taxed only five *gros*, folio 36 *verſo*, we muſt ſuppoſe that d'Aubigné does not aſſert a falſity. How comes it therefore to paſs, that neither du Pinet, nor thoſe who re-printed his tranſlation and commentary, knew any thing of that other tax, which was much more infamous than that they got printed? I am greatly ſurprized at it, and think he ought to be cenſured for not mentioning the edition he made uſe of. D'Aubigné's Commentator affirms, that the Paris edition of 1520 is the firſt: but I know, that in 1664, Stephen du Mont, a Bookſeller of Boiſleduc, puliſhed in Latin and Flemiſh, from an edition printed at Rome in 1514, a book entitled, *Taxæ Cancellariæ Apoſtolicæ, & Taxæ Sacræ Pœnitentiariæ Apoſtolicæ*, and that he collated, word for word, his edition with that of Rome, of which a certificate was given, printed in page 131, by a Secretary of the city of Boiſleduc. It is ſaid in the preface in queſtion, that this ſame work was printed at Colen *apud Goſvinum Colinium* in 1515 (17). I likewiſe know, that a Law-Profeſſor (18) in the Univerſity of Franeker, puliſhed, in 1651, with notes, a *Taxa Cameræ Apoſtolicæ*, which is different from the book printed at Boiſleduc.

As the particulars mentioned by d'Aubigné are found in the book of taxes cited by him, it is ſurpriſing ſuch a book ſhould have been puliſhed; and that even ſince it has afforded the Proteſtants a ſubject for ſo many triumphs, it yet ſhould have been reprinted with authority. Here follows the complaint made by a proteſtant Miniſter of Paris to the Biſhop of Belley on that account. "I dare not ſay all that "Dr. Diſpenſe * has hinted againſt this book, ſo "far as to apply to it the following words,

"*Proſtat & in quæſtu pro meretrice ſedet.*

"She, like a Proſtitute's let out for hire.

"Thoſe of your communion, ſo far from being a- "ſhamed of this book, which invites traders with "the ſound of the trumpet, that they are perpetu- "ally puliſhing and expoſing it to ſale. I myſelf "have ſeen three Paris editions of it. The firſt is of "anno 1520, which has been often cited by our "Authors. The ſecond was printed in 1545 †, and "the third in 1625, by the very man who prints "your books **. Among my books, I have the "edition of 1520, and that which was puliſhed in "our time, in 1625. I collated them, and find "them to agree; particularly in the following words "which cry aloud to God for vengeance. *Et nota* "*diligenter quod hujuſmodi gratiæ & diſpenſationes non* "*conceduntur pauperibus, quia non ſunt, ideo non poſſunt* "*conſolari*, i. e. "Take notice *particularly*, (and in- "deed the thing deſerves it) that ſuch graces and "diſpenſations are not granted to the poor; for, "not having wherewith to pay, they therefore can- "not be comforted." Theſe words, I ſay, which "are in folio 23 of the old edition of 1520, are alſo "in page 208 of the new edition of 1625: and thoſe "who are poſſeſſed of the edition of 1545, will "find them in folio 130 (19)."

Had D'Aubigné been aſked, whence it came that the Court of Rome, which is ſo highly inveighed againſt for its avarice, had taxed only at twenty pence tournois for the moſt flagrant ſpecies of inceſt; he doubtleſs would have anſwered, that traders who get their goods for nothing, find their account better in ſelling

(10) Du Pinet, *Taxe des Partes caſuelles*, p. 7.

(11) Note, that the Leyden edition is not exactly the ſame in every part, as that of Lyons 1564.

(12) *Notes in the Confeſſion of Sancy*, p. 101. edit. of 1699.

(13) *Confeſſion de Sancy*, lib. 1. chap. 2. p. 66.

(14) A typographical error, probably for 1520.

(15) *Notes on the Confeſſion of Sancy*, p. 100, 101.

(16) This implies that the edition of 1564, had not the Latin, but the Latin is certainly in it.

(17) See the art. BANCK.

(18) Laurence Bankius.

* *In Epiſt. ad Titum*, cap. 1. Digreſſ. 2. It is in p. 479. Paris edit. 1619, for Claude Morel.

† *Apud Galeatium à Prato.*

** *Apud Gervaſium Alliot.*

(19) Drelincourt's *Reply to the Anſwer of Biſhop de Belley*, p. m. 370, 371.

families [C]. The moſt valuable of all his pieces is his tranſlation of Pliny [D].

PINON

ſelling them at a very low rate, than in keeping them up at an extravagant price; for the cheap rate at which they ſell them, gets a much greater quantity off their hands by which means they indemnify themſelves largely, and with intereſt, by the great number of purchaſers they procure, the greateſt part of whom would not buy any thing, were it fixed at a very high price. But let no one miſtake the latter. The tax mentioned in this work is not all that is to be paid. The ſinner muſt alſo treat with the Datary, who proportions the ſum according to his circumſtances (20).

(20) *Vide* the remark [C] of the art. PARRHASIUS.

[C] *He publiſhed ſome very wild chimeras with reſpect to the genealogy of certain families.*] One of our ableſt Hiſtoriographers, ſpeaking of Francis d'Agoult Count de Sault (21), *the chief Nobleman in Province, and one of the greateſt Captains of his age*, and formerly devoted to the Huguenot's Party, *by which means he loſt his life, with John d'Agoult his brother, in the battle of St.* Denys, *anno* 1567. This Hiſtoriographer, I ſay, making the elogium of this Nobleman, ſays as follows (22): "He was valiant, generous, ſplendid, poſſeſſed very fine talents, and a lover of learning, and it was out of regard to him (23), that Anthony du Pinet, Lord of Noroy, collected, in his treatiſe on cities and fortreſſes, ſome whimſical traditions with regard to the origin of the houſe of Sault, to form from thence a romance more incredible than the apologues and converſations between men and beaſts; and which would have ruined this Author's reputation, had he not ſupported it by his tranſlation of Pliny's works. It is my opinion that poetry does not admit of ſuch fictions, ſo marvellous and incredible as this ſeems to be, as well as the Fable of Berold of Saxony, the pretended anceſtor of the Dukes of Savoy, and Ferry Borſtelſtickel, whom Thevet the Romancer makes the head of the illuſtrious houſe of Chabot: and it is a ſtrange circumſtance, that it muſt always coſt ſome King's or Emperor's daughter her honour, to lay the baſis of a falſe migration. All that can be alledged in excuſe for du Pinet is, that he wrote in an age when phantoms were given for anceſtors, to ſuch perſons, who having no traces of thoſe from whom they ſprung, gave, in order to dreſs them up, ſome traditions and old wives tales, of which flatterers made myſteries, with the alluſions which they ſought in the names and coats of arms of families; not knowing that coats of arms and ſirnames have their limits: and not ſuſpecting that an age of ignorance would be ſucceeded by ſo enlightened a one as ours, ſo as to go into the foreign countries, where they ſought for the firſt heroes of every race. That which du Pin made choice of for that of Agoult, is one Hugh, Prince of Tric, an imaginary State in Pomerania, whoſe valour and beauty rendered him worthy the love of the Infanta Valdugue, daughter of King Valdugue of Pomerania. He had a ſon by her, whom that Princeſs, when in priſon, letting down a window, to put the child into the hands of a peaſant, who was to carry it to the nurſe, a ſhe wolf came, who, notwithſtanding the ſtout reſiſtance made by the peaſant, ſeized it, and carried it to her den, among her cubs. She ſuckled it till the next day, when the King meeting with her as he was a hunting, purſued, and killed her, as alſo the cubs, and found the infant ſwathed in a rich cloth. The King cauſed the child to be baptiſed; and having diſcovered the hiſtory of its birth, he took off his illegitimacy by marrying his daughter to Prince Hugo, whom ſhe left a widower a little after, and who, being gone to make war upon the Greeks, took to his ſecond wife the daughter of the Emperor of Conſtantinople, where he lived and had many children by her. Wolf of Tric, his ſon by the firſt venter, ſo called in remembrance of ſo marvellous an accident, married Sidrac, daughter to the King of Ruſſia; and his eldeſt ſon of the ſame name having married a Princeſs of Saxony, came, with Berold of Saxony, to fight under the King of Arles (of Burgundy) and won the territory and valley of Sault in Provence, where he built the caſtle of Agoult, that gave a ſirname to his poſterity which left that of Tric. He adds, that the territory of Sault was ſettled in fee to him in 1200. Here we have a fine hotch-potch of hiſtory, chronology, and coſmography, all blended together; and the whole grounded on this, that the arms of Agoult are, not a ſhe wolf, as it ſhould have been, but a wolf with the marks of its gender, and becauſe ſome of that houſe aſſumed to themſelves, in the Latin titles, the ſeveral ſirnames of *Agouto, & de Tritis*, on account of the territory of Trez, an antient portion of the Viſcounts of Marſeilles, which fell to them by marriage."

(21) Le Laboureur, *Addit. de Caſtelnau*, Tom. 2. p. 511.

(22) Ibid.

(23) I ſuppoſe that this Count de Sault was one of thoſe whom du Pinet hints at in the preface to his tranſlation of Pliny, when he ſays, "during the fifteen months that I toil'd in making this tranſlation, I was often ſick, and employed in the affairs of ſome perſons of great diſtinction, to whoſe ſervice I am devoted."

This is not the only place where Le Laboureur exclaims very juſtly againſt the abſurd impertinence of Genealogiſts. See p. 801. Tome 1. of his additions to Caſtelnau's Memoirs, and it will appear that du Cheſne has undeceived the houſe of Rochefoucaut, *to its honour as well as to his own, with regard to the ignorant and whimſical impoſtures of brother Stephen of Luſignan, who makes more tribes ſpring from his Melluſina* (24), *than God promiſed to Abraham.* See alſo p. 559. Tom. 2. where he ſays, that in 1560, Renatus of Sanzay, *built, with John le Feron, King at Arms of France, this genealogy of the houſe of Sanzay, made up of near fifty deſcents, moſt of them enumerated year by year, with the names, ſirnames, and coats of arms of the women; whilſt all thoſe names, families and arms, are mere phantoms. This noble work having been imparted to brother Stephen of Luſignan, a Franciſcan Friar *, made it ſerve as the foundation of his grand romance of the 67 illuſtrious houſes ſprung from that of Luſignan, ſtill more incredible than that of Melluſina, out of whoſe mighty tub, as from a publick fountain, he let flow the nobility and blood of Luſignan to all perſons who deſired any of it.* Peruſe what follows. "In that age, people had not the method of drawing up genealogies from deeds and records, but contented themſelves with traditions and old wives fables to ſupply the defect of memory: they ſcarce knew their grandfathers by rule; and with regard to whatever were higher, they admitted as true all that was vented by certain falſe antiquaries, and downright enthuſiaſts, ſuch as John le Maire de Belges, the Author of the Romance, entitled, *Le Chevalier du Cygne*, (the Knight of the Swan,) written in honour of the houſe of Cleves; Forcatel, a Civilian, Author of *Montmorency Gallois*, brother Stephen of Luſignan, an egregious impoſtor; and John le Feron, whom I will charge with nothing but a too great credulity; and who, as King of arms, permitted his name to be put to ſeveral falſe genealogies, as did, in imitation of him, Bernard de Girart, S. du Haillan, genealogiſt of the Order of the Holy Ghoſt (25)"

(24) See what he ſays of Melluſina, p. 702, 703. Tom. 1. of his *Additions to Caſtelnau.*

* [He was a Dominican.] From the additions to the Paris edition of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 973. col. 2.

(25) Le Laboureur, p. 320. Tome 2.

[D] *His tranſlation of Pliny.*] I believe the firſt edition is of anno 1562, at Lyons in two volumes fol. Du Verdier Vau-Privas mentions only that of 1566, *printed at Lyons by Claude Senneton.* I make uſe of the fourth, that printed at Paris, *by John Houzé* 1608. We may juſtly affirm, without flattering du Pinet, that he deſerves a great applauſe for this tranſlation. He employed great pains in that work: he conſulted the antient MSS. and the old editions of Pliny; corrected and compared his work with them; made a great many original notes; drew up two large indexes; wrote *a treatiſe on antient weights and meaſures reduced to thoſe of the French*, and prefixed it to his verſion. This muſt neceſſarily have taken up a great deal of time. I am ſenſible that he committed a great number of errors, many of which are very abſurd. "He makes two Roman Gentlemen of two kinds of marble, the one called *Lapis Numidicus*, and the other *Sinandicus*. This is in Chap. I. Book XXXV. (26)." The perſon from whom I borrow this remark adds, *that our Author had committed a great many more errors, notwithſtanding which his work was very uſeful.* A reader who has ever ſo little equity, and has any idea of the difficulty of this undertaking, will be infinitely more inclined to eſteem that Author, for ſo happily tranſlating the greateſt part of it, than to deſpiſe him for his blunders. The peruſal of his Preface will ſhew, that he knew extremely well where the difficulties lay, and the helps that ſuch an undertaking required.

(26) La Mothe le Vayer, *Hexamer. Ruſtique*, p. m. 30.

PINON (JAMES), Abbot of Condé, Canon of the Church of Paris, ſon of James Pinon Dean of the Parliament of the ſame city (*a*), lived in the 17th Century. He gained applauſe by his Latin Poetry (*b*), *though he applied himſelf very late to it* [*A*]. In 1661 Mr. de Marolles, Abbot of Ville-loin, dedicated to him his French Verſion of Ovid's Poem in *Ibin*; and annexed to the book a letter he addreſſed to him. He beſtows great applauſes on him in both thoſe places, and declares him poſſeſſed of excellent qualities. He inſerted, at the end of the book in queſtion, ſeveral pieces of poetry by *James Pinon*, to whom the publick is obliged for an edition of Amiot's Plutarch in four volumes folio (*c*). His father alſo publiſhed ſome Latin Poems. Abbot de Ville-loin calls his Poem *De Anno Romano, a famous one:* that which he wrote, *De Crucifixo*, has been greatly applauded by a good Poet, I mean Nicholas Bourbon (*d*).

(*a*) Abbot de Marolles, *Denombrement des Auteurs*, p. 431.

(*b*) Ibid. Dedication to the French tranſlation of Ovid. *in Ibin.*

(*c*) L'Abbé de Marolles, *Denombrem. des Auteurs*, p. 431.

(*d*) See *Nicolai Borbonii Poemata*, p. 144. edit. 1630.

[*A*] *He gained applauſe by his Latin poetry, though he applied himſelf very late to it.*] I am informed, ſays Abbé de Ville-loin (1), "that you was not leſs "than thirty five years of age, when you firſt tried "that noble talent, which you exerted in a devout "ſeaſon, on the ſubject of David's penitential Pſalms. "And I know that your father, who alſo was a good "Latin poet, upon ſeeing that noble production of "your genius, (he being a great judge of all things) "was aſtoniſhed at them, as alſo was Mr. Bourbon "of the oratory, your dear friend, who is as able a "judge: ſo that you would have excited a reciprocal "jealouſy to one another, whatever powerful relation "and ſtrong friendſhip there was between you, had "they not been, at leaſt, as ſolicitous for your fame "and reputation as yourſelf. The latter adviſed you "to publiſh that excellent work: accompanying it, "at the ſame time, with a particular mark of his "eſteem, by the Hendecaſyllables, worthy of his ge-"nius, which he prefixed to it." *He ſpeaks this of you, alluding to your name, in his beautiful epiſtles.*

(1) Marolles, Abbé de Ville-loin, *Epitre à Mr. l'Abbé de Condé*, annexed to the tranſlation of *Ovid in Ibin.*

Uni condere carmen
Condæo latius atque exercere camœnas.

And elſewhere, after ſpeaking of your rare ſkill in ſacred as well as profane learning, he adds, with his uſual eloquence; that being poſſeſſed of all thoſe riches, neither the graces of poeſy, nor the Latin Muſes, have any ſecrets or myſteries but what they reveal to you.

Inſtructo tantis opibus, veteriſque Latinæ,
Arcana, & Muſarum adyta haud adeunda prophanis,
Tota patent.

..... *You immediately gained a very extraordinary reputation* by your poetry; *and ſome learned men of Germany, who ſaw a panegyrick of yours on the late King, ſpoke of it to Mr. d'Avaux Embaſſador for the peace at Munſter, and ſaid that it was one of the fineſt pieces they had ever ſeen. Such an elogium did not any way ſurprize that excellent man, who knew your merit, and who knew how greatly you was eſteemed by Believre and Depeſſes, as well as Father Gondran General of the Oratory, who, ſpeaking of your verſes, ſaid they were not dictated by man. ..... Collect all your noble compoſitions, which are in looſe ſheets, ſome of them printed, and others in MS. Theſe will form a very conſiderable collection: and I am certain that an honourable place will be aſſigned to it in the beſt choſen libraries. The variety will be admirable; becauſe, beſides that the ſubjects which are very different from one another, you have employed very aptly all kinds of ſtyles and characters of the beſt Authors of antiquity, but without taking whole verſes or periods from them, though the words are the ſame; nor their thoughts, your own genius, which is very prolific, ſuggeſting enough to you. As to your elegiac poetry, the verſification of Tibullus and Propertius is not more poliſhed than yours: there is as much wit in them as in Ovid's writings: your Hendecaſyllables are after the manner of thoſe of Catullus: your epiſtles and ſatyrs bear a great reſemblance to thoſe of Horace: and your epigrams are as ſprightly and witty as thoſe of Martial. I do not mention your heroic poetry, your genius for which you have ſufficiently ſhewn in your panegyrick on the late King, and in ſeveral ſacred pieces dedicated by you to Cardinal de Richelieu, the year his Majeſty was born* (2). Abbé de Marolles informs us in another place (3), that he kept, among the pieces of his own writing, an epiſtle to "Abbot Pinon, who delights ſo "much in Latin poetry, that no poet in this age "writes more pieces in every kind of poeſy, and in "which all judges allow him to have ſucceeded to "perfection. And though he had writ nothing but "his Foreſt of Pine-trees, entitled by him *Pinea "Sylva*; yet this is ſo perfect a piece, that one "might juſtly doubt whether any of the antients had "more genius, wit, and invention, than he, to ex-"preſs clearly and agreeably all his ideas, wherein "is conſidered the great number of perſons of all "ranks who have employed themſelves that way, "to whom alſo due praiſe could not be refuſed, in "caſe particulars were to be examined, which ſub-"ject has been expatiated elſewhere; but they cer-"tainly could not be finer than thoſe of Abbot "Pinon."

(2) Abbot de Marolles, *Dedication to the tranſlation of Ovid*, in Ibin.

(3) Ibid. in the catalogue of his works, p. 22.

The reader will doubtleſs wonder that Poems, on which ſo many elogiums were beſtowed publickly, ſhould be quite unknown in foreign countries; and that even ſo little notice ſhould have been taken of them in France, that Baillet has not given them a place in his vaſt collection of Poets: but two things muſt be conſidered; firſt, that a great deal ought always to be ſubtracted from the encomiums which are beſtowed publickly by friends; ſecondly, that Abbot de Condé, in all probability, did not follow his friend's advice, in collecting his ſcattered poems, and printing them in a volume. This was almoſt the only way of preſerving them: for pamphlets which contain only a few pages, though ever ſo finely written, are ſoon ſcattered (4): and, if not bound, are quite loſt in thirty years time; for which reaſon a ſecond edition ought to be made of them in one volume. Bookſellers undertake with pleaſure this trouble, with regard to ſuch French Poems as have had the good luck to pleaſe ſeverally: but they muſt be ſolicited and encouraged, when a Collection of Latin Poems is to be printed.

(4) We might apply to Poets, in a ſenſe of accommodation, the following verſes of Virgil. *Foliis tantum ne carmina manda; Ne turbata volent rapidis ludibria ventis.* *i. e.* "But oh! "commit not "thy prophetic "mind "To flitting "leaves, the "ſport of every "wind; "Leſt they diſ-"perſe in air or "empty fate, "&c." *Dryden.* See *Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres*, for Feb. 1687, at the cloſe of the firſt article. *Æneid.* lib. 6. ver. 74.

PINSSON (FRANCIS), Profeſſor of the Civil Law in Bourges, was admitted to that employment the 8th of February 1611. He had before taught, for ſome time, the inſtitutes in that city. He applied himſelf ſo diligently to the duties of his profeſſion, that he never failed in his Lectures; and, rather than miſs any of them, he uſed frequently to travel five leagues from his country-houſe, in order to be at his auditory at the time appointed. He taught the Canon Law a great many years, and had always five or ſix hundred ſcholars. He died at Bourges in 1643, aged ſixty three years. His firſt wife was Mary Bengy *, daughter of Anthony Bengy, whom I ſhall mention hereunder [*A*], and his ſecond wife N. d'Amours. He had no children but by his firſt wife. We are promiſed

* It ſhould be *Bargy*. From the addit. to vol. 4. p. 973. col. 1. of the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict.

[*A*] *Anthony Bengy, whom I ſhall mention hereunder.*] This Anthony Bengy, Eſq; Sieur de Puy-Valleé, was taken from the bar at twenty ſix years of age, to ſucceed Cujas in his profeſſorſhip of the civil law at Bourges in 1595. He exerciſed this employment with great aſſiduity till his death, which happened in 1616,

promiſed the publication of the things (*a*) he dictated in the ſchools of Bourges in 1625, *Ad Philippi Imperatoris reſcripta*; his Commentary on the Epiſtles of Pope Honorius III. and his funeral Oration ſpoke at the opening of the ſchool of Bourges in 1643, by Mr. de Roye, who was afterwards Law-Profeſſor in Angers (*b*).

(*a*) Mr. Pinſſon des Riolles his grandſon, intends to print thoſe pieces.

(*b*) Extracted from a manuſcript memoir.

1616, and had had two thouſand ſcholars. He dictated, among other things, the treatiſe on benefices, as far as Chap. IV. entitled *De oneribus & immunitatibus Eccleſiarum*. I ſhall ſpeak of it hereunder (1). He was Echevin (a kind of Sheriff) of Bourges in 1603 and 1604. The ſpeech he made at the opening of his Lectures in 1600, was printed the ſame year at Bourges, and entitled, *Concio funebris in memoriam defuncti Joannis Mercerii Juris utriuſque Doctoris in Schola Biturigum* (2). He wrote an epitaph on Cujas, which is printed no where but in the collection of *Privileges and Antiquities of Bourges* of John Chenu, but not in the laſt collection of the works of Cujas in ten volumes by Mr. Fabrot. In 1614 he wrote the epitaph of Marſhal de la Châtre which was never printed. I am to obſerve, that he had been a Counſellor in the profeſſorſhip of Bourges, He left, among other children, a ſon, who was his Majeſty's Counſellor and Advocate in the Preſidial Court of Bourges; afterwards the King's Advocate in the Finances or Exchequer; and who married, in 1618, Francis Chenu, daughter of John Chenu, a famous Advocate, and Author of ſeveral works (3).

(1) In the rem. [*A*] of the following article, in the title of the firſt book publiſhed by Francis Pinſſon the Advocate.

(2) To this funeral oration was added, *honeſtorum virorum lamenta Latinis Græcis & Gallicis verſibus ſcripta*. All theſe take up 38 pages in 4to.

(3) Extracted from a manuſcript memoir.

PINSSON (FRANCIS), ſon of the foregoing, was born in Bourges the 5th of April 1612; and after he had compleated all his ſtudies in that city, and even taken his degree, he came to Paris, where he was admitted an advocate the 5th of November 1533. He firſt applied himſelf to the Chatelet, and afterwards to the King's Bench, where he had a great deal of buſineſs, eſpecially in affairs relating to benefices. He printed ſeveral books on that ſubject. Hereunder is a catalogue of all the works he publiſhed [*A*], whence it may be juſtly inferred, that he was a man of great capacity and reputation. He was *Batonnier* of the Company of Advocates and Attornies of Parliament in 1682 [*B*]; and was admitted one of the twenty four honorary Doctors of the Faculty of the Impoſts at Paris, in the room of Mr. Boſcager, the 25th of February 1688. At his death he was Sub-Dean of the Company of Advocates the 10th of October 1691, aged upwards of threeſcore and nineteen, and was buried at St. Stephen du Mont. He left ſeveral children (*a*), and among the reſt, Mr. Pinſſon des Riolles, Advocate in the Parliament

(*a*) Extracted from a manuſcript memoir.

[*A*] *A catalogue of all the works he publiſhed.*] It appears to me ſo well drawn up, that I ſhall tranſcribe it verbatim as I received it. "The firſt work publiſhed by Francis Pinſſon was his Latin treatiſe on eccleſiaſtical benefices, which he finiſhed after the deceaſe of Mr. Bengy, his grandfather by the mother's ſide, for which reaſon this work is entitled as follows: *Antonii Bengei in Alma Biturigum Academia Anteceſſoris primicerii, & Franciſci Pinſſonii Pariſienſis Advocati ejuſdem ex filia Nepotis Tractatus de Beneficiis Eccleſiaſticis ex definitione deſumptus ad uſum fori Gallici & libertatum Eccleſiæ Gallicanæ accommodatus, Pariſiis ſumptibus Antonii de Sommaville* 1654, in folio, dedicated to Mr. du Bellievre, the firſt Preſident. He has reviſed, corrected, and enlarged that work conſiderably, which is now ready for the preſs, he having even obtained the Chancellor's privilege for that purpoſe. In 1663 he cauſed to be printed by Francis Muguet in 4to. *Sancti Ludovici Francorum Regis Pragmatica Sanctio, & in eam hiſtorica præfatio & Commentarius*, dedicated to his Majeſty. In 1666 he printed that of Charles VII. with the following title: *Caroli Septimi Francorum Regis Pragmatica Sanctio cum gloſſis Domini Coſmæ Guymier Pariſini ſupremæ Gallicarum curiæ Senatoris, & Inquiſitionum præſidis, & additionibus Philippi Probi Biturici ad Pragmaticæ Sanctionis & Concordatorum diſſidia componenda; accedunt hiſtoria Pragmaticæ Sanctionis & Concordatorum, annotationes marginales, & veterum inſtrumentorum ſupplementa, opera & ſtudio Franciſci Pinſſonii Biturici Advocati Pariſienſis, Pariſiis apud Franciſcum Clouzier* 1666, in folio, dedicated to the King. In 1674, he wrote an anſwer to the treatiſes publiſhed at that time under the title of *l'Abbé Commendataire*, a work in two little volumes 12mo. printed at Colen for Nicholas Schouten in 1673. the one under the name of the Sieur des Bois, Doctor of Laws, who is ſaid to be Gabriel Gerberon, a Benedictin; and the ſecond part in 1674, under the name of the Sieur Fromont, who is ſaid to be Delfau, a Benedictin alſo. This anſwer is only in manuſcript, and will be inſerted in the new edition of his treatiſe on benefices. The 18th of December 1668, he wrote a conſultation or caſe, ſince printed in the ſecond volume of his *Traité des Regales*, to ſhew that the King, by virtue of the treaty of peace of Aix la Chapelle, containing the ceſſion of the city of Ath, has a juſt right to the fortreſs of Condé, as being dependent on the Châtellenie of Aith. Since the 17th of June 1669, he wrote another printed in the ſame place, and which is a ſequel of the foregoing, wherein he ſhews, that the additional buildings in the city of Condé ought to belong to the King, as well as the city itſelf. In 1673 he publiſhed ſome ſummary notes on the indulto's granted to the King, printed in two volumes 12mo. by Charles de Sercy, and dedicated to his Majeſty. In 1681 he publiſhed his notes on the *Corpus Juris Canonici* inſerted in the works of Charles du Moulin, in the fourth volume of this laſt edition, with the following title: *Franciſci Pinſſonii Biturici Pariſienſis Advocati Manuale juris Pontificii Cæſarei & Gallici, compactum ex annotationibus Caroli Molinæi ad jus Pontificium ſive Canonicum; adverſariis Gabrielis du Pineau* (1) *Senatoris Andegavenſis ad Molinæanas annotationes, animadverſionibuſque ejuſdem Pinſonii ad utrumque; in quibus jus quotidianum & forenſe exhibetur ex libertatum Eccleſiæ Gallicanæ uberiori penu: Conſtitutionum Regiarum tùm antiquiorum, tùm recentiorum inexhauſto fonte, & ſuperiorum Galliæ tribunalium decretorio ſtylo.* Theſe notes are dedicated to Mr. Colbert, in folio, at Paris by Guignard, &c. Laſtly, in 1688. his treatiſe on the *Regale* or the King's rights over eccleſiaſtical benefices (2), dedicated to his Majeſty, was printed by John Guignard and Anthony Dezallier in two volumes 4to. He added to this work the conference on the edict of the *Controlle*, and the declaration of the regiſtering of benefices (3), with ſeveral other inſtructions on matters beneficiary, dedicated to Mr. de Lamoignon, the Advocate General, and Mr. de Lamoignon de Baſville, Intendant of Languedoc. He alſo had a hand in the publication of Anthony Mornac's works, printed in four volumes folio, for Anthony de Sommaville in 1654; and the two laſt editions of Charles du Moulin's works. He alſo wrote ſome remarks on a work of Mr. du Bois, Advocate of Parliament, entitled, *Maxims of the Canon Law*, which have been publiſhed ſeveral times with the book, by John Guignard, in two volumes 12mo, 1678 and 1684, &c. by Denis Simon, Counſellor in the Preſidial Court, and Aſſiſtant Judge in the Marſhalſea of Beauvais (4)."

(1) He whom I mentioned before, in the article PINEAU (GABRIEL DU).

(2) See the extract of it in the *Acta Eruditor.* Tom. 1. *of the Supplement*, p. 570 & *ſeq.*

(3) Extracted from a manuſcript memoir.

(4) Furetiere's Dict. under the word *Baſtonnier.*

[*B*] *He was* Bâtonnier *of the Company of Advocates*

lament of Paris, a Gentleman of merit; very well known to the Literati, and a very kind friend. He is writing, among other works, the lives of the poſſeſſors of Bourges.

and Attornies of Parliament.] As many of my readers may not have Furetiere's Dictionary, I will here explain the meaning of the word *Bâtonnier*. "It is "a Law-term, and ſignifies an antient Advocate, "who is choſen annually, according to ſeniority, to "be Principal of the Company of Advocates and "Attornies; to be Maſter of their Chapel and Fra- "ternity; and to preſide, when they aſſemble, for "maintaining the good order of the Court of Juſ- "tice, and the ſeveral regulations. To him alſo be- "longs the commiſſion of the employments of ſub- "altern Judges, whilſt they are ſilenced." The Authors of the *Acta Eruditorum*, make a very juſt excuſe, for their not giving an extract of this part of the work; *Quia*, ſay they, *ibid. p.* 574. *nec res nec verba facile intelligi poſſunt ab iis qui extra Galliam vivunt, & tabem illam fori Eccleſiaſtici, liteſque innumeras, ut & diſſenſiones ignorant, quæ non ſolum inter partes fervent, ſed & ſæpe inter Parliamentum & Tribunal regium.* i. e. "Becauſe neither the things nor "the words can eaſily be underſtood by ſuch perſons "as live out of France; and that they know no- "thing of this reproach of the Eccleſiaſtical Courts, "the numberleſs law-ſuits, and the conteſts which "ariſe, not only between the parties, but often be- "tween the Parliament and his Majeſty's Council."

PISTORIUS (JOHN), ſirnamed *Niddanus*, becauſe he was of Nidda in the country of Heſſen, gained a great reputation by his learning and his works. His Father JOHN PISTORIUS was a Knight of Malta, but he profeſſed Luther's Reformation very ſoon, and was one of the Miniſters who were preſent at the reading of the Augſburg Confeſſion in the Imperial Chamber, July the 25th 1530. He was the firſt who was appointed Superintendent of the Churches in the county of Nidda, and died January the 25th 1583, at the age of fourſcore and one (*a*). His ſon, who is the ſubject of this Article, was born February the 4th 1546. He choſe at firſt to follow the profeſſion of a Phyſician, and took his degree of Doctor in that Faculty; but he applied himſelf afterwards to the Law.

(*a*) *Ex* Frehero, *in* Theatro, p. 348.

☞ PITCAIRNE (ARCHIBALD (*a*), and eminent Phyſician an great promoter of mechanical principles of Phyſic, was born at Edinburgh Dec. 25. 1652. His Father was a Merchant and a Magiſtrate of that city, deſcended of an antient family in Fife, in which county the lands of Pitcairne had belonged to them for ſeveral ages [*A*]. He begun his ſtudies at the ſchool of Dalkeith, a village near Edinburgh; and having gone through a courſe of Philoſophy in the Univerſity of Edinburgh, he applied himſelf at firſt to the ſtudy of Divinity, which he ſoon grew weary of, and changed for that of the Civil Law. He had not continued his ſtudies long, when by too aſſiduous an application his health was conſiderably impaired; ſo that he grew hectic, and had all the appearances of a conſumption; for which being adviſed by his Phyſicians to travel to Montpellier in the South of France, he found himſelf entirely recovered by the time he reached Paris. He reſolved to proſecute the ſtudy of the Law in that Univerſity, but meeting with ſome of his countrymen there, who were ſtudents of Phyſic, and who informed him that there was no able Profeſſor of Law at Paris, he was perſuaded to join with them in their ſtudies during his abode there, which was only for a few months. Being called home ſo ſoon by his parents, it could not be expected that he ſhould have made any great progreſs in ſo ſhort a time; ſo that upon his return to his own country, he was abſolutely undetermined which profeſſion to follow. It was then he applied himſelf to the Mathematics, in which he made a prodigious progreſs without the aſſiſtance of a maſter. At laſt reſolving in earneſt to purſue that ſtudy of Phyſic, after applying himſelf for ſome time at Edinburgh to Botany, Pharmacy, and the *Materia Medica*, he went to Paris a ſecond time, where he finiſhed his ſtudies; and upon his return to Scotland came very ſoon into great reputation, ſo that within a few years, before he had publiſhed any thing conſiderable to recommend himſelf to the learned world [*B*], he had an invitation from the Curators of the Univerſity of Leyden to be Profeſſor of Phyſic there, which he accepted of. He pronounced his inaugural Oration April the 26th 1692. N. S. with great applauſe; and immediately got the ordinary ſtipend augmented by half. He continued there little more than a year, during which ſhort ſpace he publiſhed ſeveral Diſſertations, wherein by explaining ſome of the moſt important as well as moſt difficult parts of the animal Oeconomy, he has ſhewn the uſefulneſs of the Mathematics in improving the Theory of Phyſick. He returned to Scotland in the year 1693 to diſcharge an engagement, which he was under to a young Lady, daughter to Sir Archibald Stevenſon, an eminent Phyſician in Edinburgh; and being ſoon after married to her, was fully reſolved to ſet out again for Holland at the time the Colleges uſe to open at Leyden; but finding Sir Archibald and his Lady very unwilling to part with their daughter, in compliance with their earneſt entreaties, though againſt his own inclination, he ſettled at Edinburg, and wrote

(*a*) The particulars of this article were communicated by a very intimate and learned friend of our Author.

[*A*] *Deſcended of an antient family in Fife, in which county the lands of Pitcairne had belonged to them for ſeveral ages.*] In the reign of James IV. of Scotland, Andrew Pitcairne, of Pitcairne, went with his ſeven ſons to the battle of Flouden, where they were all killed. The widow was delivered of a poſthumous ſon; but by the hardſhips of thoſe times, both were turned out of poſſeſſion. The Doctor had amongſt the charters of his family, one from James V. reſtoring the widow to her jointure, and the heir to his eſtate, with this honourable narrative, that his father with ſeven ſons had died on Flouden-field, fighting valiantly for his royal father. The Doctor's mother's name was Sydſerf, of a good family in Eaſt Lothian, deſigned of Rochlaw.

[*B*] *Before he had publiſhed any thing conſiderable to recommend himſelf to the learned world.*] He had publiſhed nothing but the *Solutio Problematis de Inventoribus*, in 1688.

[*C*] *He*

wrote a valedictory letter to the Univerſity of Leyden. His extenſive practice made ſufficient amends for the loſs of his Profeſſorſhip; but the abrupt manner of taking leave, as it was diſobliging to his Collegues and the Curators of the Univerſity, ſo it was exceedingly diſagreeable to himſelf. He publiſhed his Diſſertations in one volume with ſome new ones in 1701 [C]; and dedicated them to the famous Bellini, Profeſſor at Piſa, in return to the ſame compliment, which the latter had made him, when he publiſhed his *Opuſcula*. This edition being printed in Holland, was by reaſon of the Author's diſtance from the preſs extremely incorrect; and as ſeveral pamphlets were publiſhed againſt his works, ſome advantage was taken even from the errors of the preſs. It was an eaſy taſk for his friends to repel theſe attacks; for he never gave himſelf any trouble about them. The laſt edition publiſhed in his life-time came out at Edinburgh a few months before his death, which happened October the 20th 1713. He was then in no capacity to reviſe it, or finiſh ſome rude draughts of papers, which were taken from his *Adverſaria*,

[C] *He publiſhed his Diſſertations in one volume, with ſome new ones, in* 1701.] They were printed at Rotterdam in 4to, under this title, *Archibaldi Pitcairnii Diſputationes Medicæ*. This volume contains 8 diſſertations. The 1ſt is concerning the Principles of Geometry, which are the only ones that can be applied to Phyſic. The 2d is concerning the circulation of the blood by the ſmalleſt veſſels. The 3d, concerning the cauſes of the different quantity of blood, which is carried to the lungs of animals not yet born, and of ſuch as are already born. The 4th, concerning the motion, whereby food becomes fit to ſupply the blood. The 5th, concerning the inventors. The 6th, concerning the circulation of the blood in animals that are born, and thoſe that are not. The 7th, concerning the cure of fevers by evacuating medicines. The 8th, concerning the effects of acids and alcali's in the cure of diſeaſes. In the firſt diſſertation our Author obſerves, that nothing hinders Phyſic more from being improved, than the curioſity of ſearching into the natural cauſes of the effects of medicines. The buſineſs of men is to know the virtues of medicines; but to inquire whence they have that power, is a ſuperfluous amuſement, ſince nature lies concealed. Beſides, this knowledge, if it were poſſible, would be uſeleſs. A Phyſician ought therefore to apply himſelf to diſcover by experience the effects of medicines and diſeaſes; and reduce his obſervations into maxims, and not needleſsly fatigue himſelf by enquiring into their cauſes, which are neither poſſible nor neceſſary to be known. If all Phyſicians would act thus, we ſhould not ſee Phyſick divided into ſo many ſects. There would be but one ſentiment, ſince men would then found their opinion on obſervation and experience. Remark the Aſtronomers; they do not trouble themſelves with ſubſtantial forms, or ſubtile matter, or concourſe of atoms; and yet they know exactly the motions of the heavens. Phyſicians ought to act in the ſame manner; they ought to examine well the effects, which medicines produce, and obſerve the motions in human bodies, and paſs by all the reſt as a curioſity, which ſerves only to introduce errors, that are unjuſtly charged on Phyſic, inſtead of being imputed to Phyſicians. An art, the deſign of which is to preſerve men's lives, ought not to be built on ſuch weak and frivolous foundations as ſyſtems, which any perſons may form. They ought to look back to the antient times, in order to obſerve what was then diſcovered; and to add to this all modern diſcoveries, and to make ſome themſelves, and to lay a foundation independent of the caprices of opinion. The antients being miſled by a love to particular ſects of philoſophy, introduced into Phyſic the fear of a vacuum, occult qualities, &c. and the better to deceive themſelves and others, they laid down this axiom, that the Phyſicians begin where the Naturaliſts end. How deformed ſoever the face of Phyſic was then, our Author obſerves, that it is no leſs ſo now, notwithſtanding the many happy diſcoveries which have been made in Botany and Anatomy of late years. It is true, we hear no more mention of the qualities, the fear of a *Vacuum*, attractive virtues, and ſubſtantial forms; but we ſpeak of pores differently ſhaped, ſecret fermentations, ſubtile matter, &c. terms which are no more inſtructive than thoſe of the antients. And I dare add, ſays our Author, that it will be eaſy to prove, that there is no ferment in the glands of the body; that all the orifices of the veſſels, and all the pores, are of the ſame ſhape, and conſequently that the different configuration of the pores, and the ferments, which Phyſicians have introduced, are mere chimera's. In the ſecond diſſertation he obſerves, that the circulation of the blood is an undoubted fact; but that the manner, by which the blood paſſes from the arteries to circulate in the veins, is a myſtery, which hath never yet been well explained. Some ſay, that this paſſage is made by the glands ſituated at the mouth of the arteries, and the entrance of the veins, and ſo ſerves as a *medium* for the communication of the blood. Others ſay, that the arteries and veins enter into one another immediately. There are others likewiſe, who maintain, that a vein and an artery is but one and the ſame veſſel bended like a *Syphon*. Our Author is of the laſt of theſe opinions; only in the place of the bending he ſuppoſes a gland, by the help of which the blood is filtrated before it paſſes into the other branch of the veſſel. He aſſerts, that the various filtrations in the body do not in any manner depend on the different ſhape, which the pores are ſuppoſed to be of, but only on the greatneſs or ſmallneſs of the paſſages, ſince in effect if bodies, which would come out, have leſs diameters than the pores they meet with, the difference of ſhape will not hinder their paſſing. The ſmallneſs or greatneſs of the paſſages is ſufficient to cauſe ſome bodies to paſs, and others to ſtay. This explication is ſimple and natural; and this ſimplicity, ſays he, ought to induce us to think it true, ſince God, that admirable Geometrician, acts always by the moſt ſimple methods. He takes occaſion here to recommend the uſe of Geometry, as it relates to Phyſic. In the third Diſſertation, he endeavours to ſhew, that in order to explain a certain effect we muſt not have recourſe to uncertain cauſes. I cannot bear with thoſe, ſays he, who to give us a reaſon of the effect of mercury in diſeaſes, make no difficulty to aſcribe to this mineral a virtue like that of Lixivial Salts extracted from plants, ſo that, ſay they, it is not ſtrange, that Mercury having the quality of thoſe ſalts draws along with it the acid ſalts, which cure the diſeaſes, where it is uſed. This explication ſuppoſes two doubtful, not to ſay falſe things to be true, *viz.* that the diſeaſes, which are cured by mercury, proceed from too great an acid; and that mercury is of the nature of ſalts, which are extracted from vegetables by calcination. They argue no better, ſays our Author, who, in order to ſhew why *Guiacum* is the moſt proper of all woods for theſe diſeaſes, ſay, that *Guiacum* is of the ſame nature with volatile ſalts; for this is ſuppoſing, that the action of the ſtomach and inteſtines occaſion in things, which enter into the body, the ſame changes as the action of fire by chemical operations, which is very doubtful. As for me, ſays our Author, I obſerve, that among the minerals uſed by Phyſicians againſt the ſame diſeaſes, mercury is the moſt weighty, and conſequently preſſes with moſt force againſt the obſtacles, which it meets with it, and moves them moſt violently. But to know whether Mercury be of an analogous nature with Salt of Tartar, is impoſſible, unleſs we can ſhew that gold is of the nature of acids, and at the ſame time be able to prove ſeveral other doubtful points. But to return to *Guaiacum*, the acid liquor, which is drawn thence by diſtillation, cannot be a ſign of the heavineſs of that wood; but at the ſame time it is not one of a ſmall force, that ought to be uſed

Adverſaria, and never deſigned to be publiſhed in the ſame form wherein they appear. His dictates to his ſcholars, which he always was at great pains to ſuppreſs [*D*], were printed ſome years after his death both in England and Holland, under the title of *Elementa Medicinæ Phyſico-Mathematica*, from an imperfect and incorrect copy. As he had not continued above a year in the Profeſſor's chair, he could not have taken much time or pains in theſe dictates, and as he had never reviſed them after he had left Holland, it could not be expected, that they ſhould be a very finiſhed work. It contains however many uncommon things not unworthy of its Author. The *Diſſertatio de Legibus Hiſtoriæ Naturalis* written by him for his diverſion, while he was confined by a fit of ſickneſs; but upon his recovery being reconciled to Sir Robert Sibbald, againſt whoſe *Prodromus Hiſtoriæ Naturalis Scotiæ* it was written, he ſuppreſſed it for fourteen years; and ſome copies of it coming abroad by accident, he diſowned it; ſo that Sir Robert believing it not to be his, wrote an anſwer to it, and dedicated it to him. He never finiſhed the Commentary on *Caſſii Problemata*, which he promiſed to publiſh, though it was pretty near complete; and the papers are now loſt. He diverted himſelf at his leiſure hours with Latin poetry, for which he had no ſmall talent, as appears from ſome of his compoſitions equal to the beſt performances of the moderns. He publiſhed himſelf a few of them under the title of *Poemata Selecta*, moſtly epigrams of the Lyric kind. A larger edition of them has been publiſhed ſince his death with the addition of ſome trifles by other hands to encreaſe the volume. The tranſlation of the 104th Pſalm was the production of a *Certamen Poeticum*, with Walter Danniſton, a country ſchoolmaſter and no bad Poet; which, upon acknowledging it to be better than his tranſlation, he allowed him to publiſh as his own. He borrowed Danniſton's name to many of his poems afterwards; one of which is publiſhed and tranſlated by Mr. Prior in his collection of Poems. His poetry has been accuſed of obſcurity, which indeed he affected in many of his pieces on a political account, he being no friend to the Revolution, which happened in his time. Beſides, many poems both antient and modern founded on private hiſtory fall under the imputation of obſcurity. Dr. Pitcairne's Poem *ad Robertum Lindeſium* is an inſtance of this, which is quite unintelligible without knowing a circumſtance of the Doctor's life, which he often told, and never without ſome commotion of ſpirit.

againſt acids. Thence it follows, that mercury hath ſo much more virtue, the more it is purified from every light body; and that gold reduced into a form proper to mingle itſelf with the blood cannot ſurpaſs in virtue other medicines but as it exceeds them in weight. Theſe reflections are uſeful to thoſe, who would explain the reſpiration of animals; for in this more than in any other ſubject Phyſicians are apt to ſuppoſe many falſe things to be true. In order to explain reſpiration, our Author gives us a particular detail of the moſt ſimple Phænomena, which are obſerved in it; and then aſks with Dr. Harvey, whence it comes to paſs, that the infant doth not die in its mother's belly, though it receives no air through the windpipe; and yet as ſoon as it is born and breathes, it cannot live without reſpiration. He inquires alſo why an infant born in its teguments and waters, or taken out ſo by operation, continues ſeveral hours without being ſuffocated; and that as ſoon as theſe teguments are broke, and air gets into the lungs, it cannot live without air. Before he reſolves theſe queſtions, he relates what learned Phyſicians have moſt plauſibly aſſerted on theſe ſubjects; and proves, that they have often forgot the rules which he laid down at firſt, *viz.* that we muſt not, in order to explain any Phænomena, ſuppoſe for truth that which is doubtful. Borelli is the firſt, whoſe opinion he examines: that learned writer ſays in his treatiſe of the motion of animals, that particles of air are mixed with the blood by help of reſpiration. George Wolfgangus is almoſt of the ſame opinion in his book of *Phiſiology Reformed*, p. 127. Bohnius ſays in his anatomy, that by reſpiration there enters into the blood ſubtile air; but that it hath no ſpring, though with relation to continual motion, which is proper to a ſpherical figure, it is in itſelf, ſays he, the cauſe of the elaſtic virtue of the air. Our Author obſerves, that we ſuppoſe a fact not true, when we ſuppoſe that air enters into the blood by reſpiration. He examines the reaſons, that Dr. Richard Lower, John Majow, and ſome others urge to prove, that it enters into the blood, and endeavours to confute them. He then explains the ſeveral Phænomena related by him, and concludes this diſſertation with obſerving, that the reaſon, which induced him to write, was to ſhew Phyſicians, that they ought not always to think that they have ſolved the difficulties propoſed to them, when they have called to their aſſiſtance, figures, pores, ætherial matter, ſalts, ſecret motions, and an infinite number of other terms, which properly ſpeaking are but pompous names for vain-glorious ignorance. In the *fourth* Diſſertation he propoſes to ſhew, that the Digeſtion of our aliments is not cauſed by an acid, ſalt, or ſharp liquor, or by any other diſſolvent. Van Helmont's and Veledius's Archeus pleaſes him as little. He owns no other cauſe of digeſtion than the motion of the food performed by the help of the tunicles of the ſtomach. In the *fifth* Diſſertation he treats of Inventors, and gives us rules to know, whether an Author had really diſcovered that which ſome ſay he has, and others ſay he has not diſcovered. He mentions as an inſtance, the pretence of ſome, that Hippocrates had diſcovered the circulation of the blood, which he declares to be falſe. He explains the word *period*, which Hippocrates uſed with relation to the blood, and proves that we groſsly deceive ourſelves, if we think that Hippocrates uſed this word in any other ſenſe than that of fluctuation. In this point our Author differs from Monſieur Dacier; who in the Preface to his tranſlation of Hippocrates pretends, that he perfectly knew this circulation. In the *ſixth* Diſſertation Dr. Pitcairne explains the various Phænomena of the circulation of the blood. He amply inquires into the effects of opium, and refutes Etmuller's opinion on the head. In the *ſeventh* Diſſertation he treats of the cure of fevers by evacuating medicines. He pretends, that the beſt way of curing a fever is to cauſe ſweat; and gives this reaſon for it, that the evacuation made by tranſpiration is much greater than that made by ſalts and urine; and that ſo it is eaſier to cure a fever by this way than by any other. He compares thoſe three kinds of evacuation together, and is of Sanctorius's opinion, that evacuation made by ſalts is of four parts, that of urine ſixteen, and that of tranſpiration forty. In the *eighth* Diſſertation he attacks the opinion of thoſe, who attempt to explain all by acid and alkali; and obſerves, that theſe do neither good nor harm; and relates ſeveral remarkable experiments to prove this.

[*D*] *His dictates to his ſcholars, which he was always at great pains to ſuppreſs.*] He ſhews ſome concern about this in his *Diſſertatio de Circulatione Sanguinis in Animalibus genitis & non genitis*, § 16. His words are:

rit. His friend Mr. Lindeſey upon reading with the Doctor, when very young, the known ſtory of the two Platonic Philoſophers, who promiſed to one another, that whoever died firſt, ſhould return a viſit to his ſurviving companion, entered into the ſame engagement with him. Some years after Pitcairne at his father's houſe in Fife dreamed one morning, that Lindeſey, who was then at Paris, came to him and told him, that he was not dead, as was commonly reported, but ſtill alive, and lived in a very agreeable place to which he could not as yet carry him. By the courſe of the poſt news came of Lindeſey's death, which happened very ſuddenly the very morning of the dream. After knowing this the Poem is eaſily underſtood, *Lindeſi, ſtygias jamdudum vectæ per Undas, &c.* An ingenious Fiction entitled, *Archimedis ad Regem Gelonem Epiſtola, Albæ Græcæ reperta*, is generally aſcribed to our Author, and the more probably ſo, ſince the chaſm at the end of it is ſuppoſed to be ſupplied with his *Diſſertatio de Inventoribus.*

are; *Evidens eſt virum illum doctiſſimum* [Etmullerum] *ſuo emendatiora fuiſſe editurum, ſi per fata aſpera licuiſſet; omniaque illa quæ titulum Praxeos Etmullerianæ nunc ferunt, in lucem eſſe protruſa ab hominibus inhoneſto quæſtui inhiantibus. Quod ideo commemoro, ne quis meæ eſſe credat, quæ Bibliopolæ tanquam diſcipulis meis dictata, me inſcio, forſitan emittant.* T.

PITHOM, a city in Egypt. It was one of the two cities which Pharoah cauſed the deſcendants of Jacob to build (*a*). If we may believe Sir John Marſham (*b*), it is the ſame with that which was called Peluſium, and with that which Manetho calls Abaris. That city of Abaris was called thus according to the antient Theology (*c*). It was ſituated in the diſtrict or diviſion of Sais on the Eaſt of the River Bubaſtis (*d*). Its agreeable ſituation determined Saltis, King of a certain nation who had ſubdued Egypt, to enlarge and fortify it. He kept there a garriſon of two hundred and forty thouſand men. In that city the ſame nation entrenched herſelf after ſhe had loſt again all the reſt of Egypt. They defended themſelves there a great while, but capitulated at laſt, and obtained the liberty to retire whitherſoever they pleaſed. They went into Syria and ſettled in Sudea (*e*). It appears from that diſcourſe of Manetho, that he meant the Iſraelites. He adds (*f*) that Amenophis, who about five Centuries after reigned over the Egyptians, wiſhed to ſee the Gods, and that a great Prophet gave him hopes that he ſhould have that comfort, in caſe Egypt was cleared of all ſorts of perſons infected with the leproſy, or ſuch other diſtempers. They gathered all thoſe people together, and found fourſcore thouſand of them: they were ſet about drawing and cutting ſtones along the Nile. Having bore that hard labour for ſome years, they petitioned the King to appoint them a city where they might live ſecure and quietly. He granted them the city of Abaris, which was then uninhabited, and had belonged to the Paſtors (*g*): it was called the city of Typho according to the antient Theology. They were no ſooner got into that city, but they thought of making an advantage of the place to revolt: they fortified it with care, and choſe for their Chief a Prieſt of Heliopolis, who changed his name of Oſarſiphus into that of Moſes: they were aſſiſted by the inhabitants of Jeruſalem, whoſe anceſtors had been in poſſeſſion of Abaris, *&c.* Their victories were great and cruel; but at laſt the King of Egypt vanquiſhed them, and drove them out of the country (*h*). You will meet with the refutation of theſe ſtories in Joſephus, and with ſome inſtances of Sir John Marſham's learning in my remark [*A*].

(*a*) Exod. chap. i. ver. 11.

(*b*) Marſh. *Chron. Can.* Sæculo 8. p. m. 107.

(*c*) Manetho, *apud* Joſephum, lib. 1. *contra Appium*, p. 1040.

(*d*) *Idem, apud eund. ibidem*, p. 1039.

(*e*) *Ex eodem, apud eund.* p. 1040.

(*f*) *Idem, apud eund. ibidem*, p. 1052.

(*g*) That is to ſay, to the Iſraelites, who, according to Manetho, had ſubdued Egypt, and whoſe King, Saltis, had enlarged and fortified the city of Abaris.

(*h*) Manetho, *apud* Joſephum, lib. 1. *contra Appion.* p. 1052, *& ſeq.*

[*A*] *You will meet with ſome inſtances of Sir John Marſham's learning in my remark.*] He obſerves (1), that the city of the Paſtors, named Abaris by Manetho, is called Peluſium by another Hiſtorian of Egypt (2). This is not accurate: that Hiſtorian obſerves only that the maimed and diſtempered perſons, who were driven out of Egypt retired to Peluſium, where they joined with 308 thouſand men, whom Amenophis had left there. Obſerve that Joſephus (3) made an advantage of the difference there is between Manetho and Chæremon as to the place, whither theſe lame and leprous perſons were ſent. Sir John adds that Ptolomæus Mendeſius (4) mentioned the city of Abaris (5), and that the fables concerning Typho belong to that city. The Lake Serbonide, continues he, where Typho had been hid (6), and the city Heropolis, where he was ſtruck with a thunder-bolt, were not far from theſe quarters (7). The name πιθὼμ or πιθὼμ given to one of the cities built by the children of Iſrael, alludes to the name of Typho. The Egyptians always called this Typho by the name of Seth (8), hence it is that they called Typho's city Sethron. The diſtrict or diviſion of Sethron was thus called from the name of that city. And therefore what we read in Joſephus is not true, namely, that the city of Abaris was built in the diſtrict of Sais: for it was ſituated on the Eaſt ſide of the River Babaſtius, and that diſtrict was ſituated in the Weſtern part of the Delta. It is better therefore to follow the Manetho of Africanus (9), quoted by Syncellus: for according to that quotation theſe people took Memphis, and built a city in the diſtrict of Sethron. Let us infer from thence, that the city of Abaris, of Typho, of Sethron, of Pithom, mentioned in Exodus, are the ſame which the Greeks called Peluſium. Theſe are Sir John Marſham's inferences.

(1) Marſh. *Chron. Can. Egypt.* Sæculo 8. p. 107.

(2) Named *Chæremon*, Joſephus, lib. 1. *contra Appion.* p. 1057, tranſcribes his words.

(3) Joſephus, *ubi ſupra.*

(4) Ptolom. Mendeſius, *apud* Euſebium, *Præparat. Evangelicæ*, lib. 10. cap. 12. p. 497, *A.*

(5) He calls it Ἄβαρις.

(6) Herodotus, lib. 3. cap. 5.

(7) Steph. Byſantinus, *in* Ἡρώ.

(8) Plut *de Iſide*, p. 357, *D.*

(9) *Rectius ex Manethone Africanus*, Marſh. *Chron. Can. Egypt.* Sæculo 8. p. 108. He quotes *Syncelus*, p. 61, *a.*

PITISCUS (BARTHOLOMEW), Preacher to the Elector Palatine, was born the 24th of Auguſt 1561 at Schlauna, a village in Sileſia near Grunberg. The bad circumſtances of his family determined the Miniſter of his native place to recommend him to the Lord of that village, as a lad proper for the ſciences, and who deſerved to be furniſhed with the neceſſary means to proſecute his ſtudies. That Gentleman promiſed to pay his expences, and ſent him to the ſchool of Grunberg. The young lad did ſoon excell above all his ſchool-fellows. At the age of eighteen he was ſent to Breſlaw, and entered as tutor in an honeſt man's family, who had a very fine library. He often ſhut

ſhut himſelf up there with Amandus Polanus, which proved very uſeful to them both. Having loſt his Mecænas, when it was time for him to go and viſit the Univerſities, he had the good luck to be aſſiſted by the generoſity of a Lady of the Proteſtant Religion (*a*), who at her own expence maintained a certain number of young men, who ſtudied Divinity. He choſe the Univerſity of Serveſta, being determined to it by the great reputation of Profeſſor Wolfgang Amlingus, and went thither in the year 1583. The next year he removed into the Palatinate, and after he had given there many inſtances of his great merit, he was appointed (*b*) one of the tutors to Prince Frederic IV. (*c*). He acquitted himſelf ſo ſucceſsfully of that employment, that Prince Caſimir, Adminiſtrator of the Palatinate, deſigned him for ſecond Preacher to his pupil, who, when he came to be of age, was ſo well pleaſed with his tutor's ſermons, that he appointed him firſt Preacher to the Court. Pitiſcus acquitted himſelf glorioufly of that employment till his death, which happened the 17th of July 1613 (*d*). We muſt not omit, that he made a great progreſs in Mathematicks [*A*], and that he publiſhed a book, in which he ſhewed it was very neceſſary that the Proteſtants ſhould ceaſe writing books of controverſy againſt each other [*B*]. He did it out of obedience; I mean, that there had been a conſultation upon that ſubject, after which he was ordered to take that work upon himſelf.

(*a*) Joachin of Bergue's wife.

(*b*) It was in the year 1588. Scultetus, *in Narrat. Apologet.* p. 11.

(*c*) He was afterwards Elector.

(*d*) Extracted from Melchior Adam, *in Vitis Theolog. German.* p. 833, *& ſeq.*

[*A*] *He made a great progreſs in Mathematicks.*] In the year 1599 he publiſhed in Latin five books of Trigonometry, which were reprinted with additions in the year 1612. We meet in that work with ſix books of aſtronomical Problems: one book *Problematum Geodæticorum ſive de agro plano metiendo ac dividendo*, i. e. "Problems concerning the ſurveying, "meaſuring and dividing land." *Problemata Geographica*, i. e. "Geographical Problems." One book *Problematum Gnomonicorum ac Architectonicorum, in quo ſe ait præcipua Architecturæ militaris myſteria reſeraſſe* (1), *i. e.* "Problems relating to Dialling and Architecture, "in which he ſays he has explained the chief myſte- "ries of military Architecture." Ticho Brahe had a great eſteem for our Pitiſcus, on account of his ſkill in the Mathematicks, and wiſhed that the number of Preachers well verſed in that ſcience, were greater: for he imagined that the ſtudy of Mathematicks would give them a more ſolid judgment, and make many controverſies vaniſh away. Here follow his words. *Doctiſſimi illius Bartholomæi Pitiſci de triangulis acutum & compendioſum libellum lubens accepi: rogoque ut illi ex me gratias agas. Optarem, plures ejuſmodi concionatores reperiri: qui Geometrica gnaviter callerent: forte plus eſſet in iis circumſpecti & ſolidi judicii, rixarum inanium & logomachiarum minus. Si is mihi aliquando ſcripſerit; & de iis ſtudiis mecum contulerit, inveniet reſponſorem non invitum* (2), i. e. "I have re- "ceived with pleaſure the moſt learned Bartholomew "Pitiſcus's ingenious and compendious book about "Triangles, and deſire you to give him thanks in "my name. I wiſh there were more ſuch Preachers, "well verſed in Geometry; this would perhaps give "them a more wiſe and ſolid judgment, and there "would be fewer empty controverſies and diſputes a- "bout words. If he ſhould write to me, and conſult "me about theſe ſtudies, he may be ſure that I will "anſwer him with all my heart." Tycho Brahe's wiſh, which you ſee here grounded on very good reaſons, is nevertheleſs liable to ſome inconveniencies. A pompous eloquence, ſupported with figures of Rhetorick, is neceſſary to all Preachers: a dry and conciſe way of arguing, after the manner of the Mathematicians, is not proper for them, and would not make on their audience ſuch impreſſions, as the condition of man requires. Obſerve, that Pitiſcus learnt of himſelf, without a Maſter, all that he knew of Mathematicks (3).

(1) See Voſſius, *de Scient. Mathem.* p. 306, *& alibi.*

(2) Tycho Brahe, *Epiſtola ad Conradum Aſſachum, apud* Melchior. Adamum, *in Vitis Theol.* p. 840.

(3) *Illud vero mirandum, quod homo Theologus, in Mathematum ſtudiis, nullo, niſi ſe magiſtro, eo uſque progreſſus eſt: ut editis ſcriptis, diſciplinæ illius gloriam magnis Matheſeos profeſſoribus præripuerit.* Melchior Adam, ibidem.

[*B*] *That the Proteſtants ſhould ceaſe writing books of controverſy againſt each other.*] In the year 1608, the Eccleſiaſtical Senate of the Elector Palatine, took into conſideration what remedies might be uſed againſt the fatal controverſies carried on among the Proteſtant Divines (4). Scultetus, Preacher to his Electoral Highneſs, and ſome others were of opinion, that it was neceſſary, for the good of the church, that for the future the Reformed ſhould ceaſe writing Apologies, *Antilogies*, and ſuch other pieces of religious controverſies; that nothing could be ſaid, nor wrote, but what had already been ſaid or written long ago; that the Confeſſions of Faith, with the Expoſitions of them, were ſufficient for any one who inquired ſincerely after the truth; that one could not meet with any inſtance of ſuch obſtinate controverſies among the Prophets nor among the Apoſtles; that that kind of books multiplied the controverſies inſtead of ending them: that the ſatyrical bitterneſs, which the Authors diſperſed throughout their works, was a ſport to the profane, made the Papiſts triumph, and inſpired many people with religious ſentiments. The Latin paſſage, which I ſhall now tranſcribe, expreſſes all this more at length, and with a greater ſtrength. *Nec componi, ſed multiplicari controverſias iſtis contentionibus: paucos veritatis inquirendæ, gloriolæ vanæ aucupandæ gratiâ multos in arenam diſputandi deſcendere: Diabolum hoc agere; ut totus Spiritus Theologicus, & quicquid ferè* DEI *providentia donorum huic ſeculo contulit, contentionibus impendatur: ut fratres ſtylo Satyrico ſe mutuò exagitent & deforment, utque adeò per iſſiuſmodi ſcriptiones bonâ à vocationis ſuæ officiis arceantur, mali in capitali, quo ab antagoniſtis diſſident, odio firmentur; denique mutuis iſtis convitiis, quibus libri inter ſe litigantium ſcatent, creari profanis riſum, Pontificiis jubilum, & magnæ auditorum parti omnis religionis contemtum* (5), i. e. "That the controverſies are not ended, "but rather encreaſed by thoſe diſputes: few enter "the liſt from a deſire to find out the truth, but ma- "ny from a vain ambition to gain ſome reputation: "that the Devil labours to get the whole Theological "ſpirit, and all the gifts, which God's providence "beſtowed on this age, waſted away in idle contro- "verſies; to make the brethen expoſe and defame "each other by their ſatyrical and bitter ſtyle; that "by that means the good may be drawn off from "the duties of their calling, and the wicked confirm- "ed in that mortal hatred, which they have once "conceived againſt their antagoniſts; laſtly, that "thoſe mutual reproaches, with which the books of "the contending parties abound, are a ſport to the "profane, and a triumph to the Roman Catholicks, "and inſpire a great part of the audience with a "contempt for religion." The concluſion was, that our Pitiſcus ſhould repreſent all this in the ſtrongeſt and moſt ſolemn manner in a publick work. He acquitted himſelf extremely well of the taſk (6). He exhorted the Proteſtants to join all together againſt the common enemy, and to renounce all their controverſies *de perſona Chriſti & de cœna Domini*, about the perſon of Chriſt, and the Lord's Supper; he repreſented to them, that nothing could hinder them from living together in a perfect union, notwithſtanding they differed about the ſenſe of ſome paſſages of the Scripture (7). That work did more harm than good: for, as though he had given a new ſignal of war, the Divines of Saxony, and thoſe of Tubingen, came from all quarters to take up arms, and maintained with an exceſſive warmth, that the Lutherans cannot make peace with thoſe who deny the oral manducation. *Verax & hic fuit, quod proverbii locum obtinuit, ſapientis effatum:* ſæpe optimè cogitata peſſimè cadunt. *Vix enim lucem publicam aſpexerat pia exhortatio illa, cùm, quaſi claſſicum cecinissent noſtri, ad arma undique concurritur in Saxoniâ & Sueviâ, magnoque ſtudio & labore orbi Chriſtiano demonſtratur: oralis manducationis in Euchariſtiâ patronos non poſſe pacem colere cum Reformatis* (8). Scultetus did very much wiſh for a reunion between the Lutherans and the Reformed. He exhorted the Divines of Wittenberg to it, both

(4) *Quænam triſtiſſimis Theologorum Evangelicorum certaminibus medicina reperiri queat.* Scultet. *Narrat. Apologet.* p. 45.

(5) Scultet. *Narrat. Apol.* p. 45.

(6) His book was wrote in the German tongue.

(7) Scultet. *Narrat. Apol.* p. 46.

(8) Idem, ibid.

ſelf. He publiſhed ſome other books [C].

(9) *Expoſitis malis, quæ ex mutuis Evangelicorum digladiationibus orirentur, atheiſmo auditorum, contemptu miniſtrorum verbi, jubilo Papiſtarum.* Idem, ibid. p. 72. ad ann. 1616.

both by word of mouth and by his letters: he repreſented to them the misfortunes which would attend their diſunion, namely, the Atheiſm of their Hearers, the contempt of the Miniſters, and the triumph of the Papiſts (9). But all was to no purpoſe: he was anſwered, that as for a political friendſhip it had been never refuſed to the Reformed, and never would be refuſed for the future; but as for a theological friendſhip, that is, a brotherly and chriſtian love, it would never be granted to them. *Fruſtrà omnia: Reſponſum enim: ſe in amicitiam politicam nos ſemper recepiſſe, recepturoſque deinceps; in Theologicam, hoc eſt, fraternitatem Chriſtianam nunquam* (10).

[C] *He publiſhed ſome other books.*] Moſt of them in the German tongue; but that which he wrote againſt a Jeſuit of Mentz, and which is intitled *Anti-Roſarium*, is in Latin. See Monſieur Baillet's *Anti's* (11).

(10) Ibem, ibid.

(11) Num. 219.

☞ PITS or PITSEUS (JOHN), a learned Engliſh Writer in the 17th Century, ſon of Mr. Henry Pits by Elizabeth his wife, ſiſter to Dr. Nicholas Saunders, was born at Aulton, a Market-town in Hampſhire, and educated at Wykeham's ſchool near Winchester (a). He was admitted Probationer-fellow of New College in Oxford in 1578, being then about eighteen years of age; but leaving that College before he was perpetual Fellow, which was to have been in 1580, he went beyond the ſeas, and at Doway was kindly received by Dr. Thomas Stapleton, who gave him advice relating to his ſtudies. Thence he went to Rheimes, and after one year ſpent in the Engliſh College there, was ſent to the Engliſh College at Rome, where he continued his ſtudies in philoſophy for ſeven years, and was ordained Prieſt. He returned then to Rheims, where he taught Rhetoric and Greek for two years. But the troubles in France induced him to retire to Lorraine, and he took the Degree of Maſter of Arts at Pont-a-muſſon, and ſoon after that of Bachelor of Divinity. Thence he went into Germany, and continued at Triers an year and an half, where, after he had performed certain exerciſes, he was made a Licentiate in Divinity. Thence, after he had ſeen ſeveral of the moſt conſiderable cities in Germany, he removed to Ingolſtadt in Bavaria, where he reſided three years, and took the Degree of Doctor of Divinity. He afterwards returned to Lorraine, where he was preferred by Charles Cardinal of Lorraine to a Canonry of Verdun. After two years ſpent there he received an invitation from Antonia, daughter to the Duke of Lorraine, and Ducheſs of Cleves, and was made Confeſſor to her; and that he might be the more ſerviceable to her, he learned the French language to ſuch a perfection, that he often preached in it. In her ſervice he continued twelve years; during which he had leiſure to turn over the Hiſtories of England, both Eccleſiaſtical and Civil; whence he made ſeveral collections and obſervations, which he digeſted into four volumes [A]. At the end of twelve years the Ducheſs of Cleves dying, our Author went a third time to Lorraine, where by the favour of John Biſhop of Toul, formerly his ſcholar, he was promoted to the Deanery of Liverdune of conſiderable value; which with a Canonry and

(a) Pitſeus, *Relation. Hiſtor. de Rebus Anglicis*, p. 817. and Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 405. 2d edit.

[A] *Digeſted into four volumes.*] One of theſe volumes was concerning the Kings, another of the Biſhops, a third of apoſtolical, and a fourth of the illuſtrious and learned men of England. The laſt was publiſhed by Dr. *William Biſhop*, at Paris 1619, in 4to, under the title of *Relationum Hiſtoricarum de Rebus Anglicis Tomus primus, quatuor partes complectens.* It is commonly quoted under the title of *Pitſeus de illuſtribus Angliæ Scriptoribus.* The firſt part contains *Prolegomena de Laudibus Hiſtoriæ; de Antiquitate Eccleſiæ Britanniæ; de Academiis, tam antiquis Britonum, quam recentioribus Anglorum.* The ſecond part contains the Lives and Characters of three hundred Engliſh Writers. The third is an *Appendix*; and the fourth contains fifteen Indexes. Mr. Wood (1) makes the following reflections upon this work. 1. That *according to the time, wherein it was written, things are expreſſed in eloquent Latin.* This is a very odd reflection, ſince that age was as remarkable as any for elegant Writers in the Latin tongue; an age, wherein *Aſcham*, *Muretus*, and *Buchanan* flouriſhed. 2. That the greateſt part of the work, eſpecially that concerning the Writers, is taken from *John Bale*'s book, *De Scriptoribus majoris Britanniæ*, though Pits (2) declares an abhorrence of him and his book. 3. That he omits Wickliffe and all the Wickliffiſts, together with the Iriſh and Scots Writers, who are for the moſt part mentioned by *Bale*; and in their room gives us an account of Roman Catholick Writers, eſpecially thoſe, who left England upon the Reformation made by Queen Elizabeth; which is the beſt and moſt deſired part of his book. 4. That ſeveral Writers in the *Appendix* are taken from Dr. *Thomas James's Ecloga Oxonio Cantabrigienſis*; of which book Pits makes uſe, when he informs us, in what libraries the manuſcrips of certain Authors mentioned by him are preſerved. 5. That though he pretends to give an account only of Roman Catholic Writers, eſpecially about the time of the Reformation, yet he ſets down ſome who were ſincere Proteſtants, or at leaſt more Proteſtants than Papiſts; as Sir *Anthony Cope*, who died in 1551; *John Redman*, who died the ſame year; *Thomas Key* or *Cay*, Maſter of Univerſity-College in Oxford, who died in 1572; *John Leland*, the Antiquary; *Robert Record*, the Mathematician; Dr. *Alb. Hill*, an intimate friend of *John Bradford* the Martyr; *John Cay*, the Antiquary of Cambridge; *Peter Morwyn* or *Morwyng*, of Magdalen College, &c. and in the *Appendix George Coryat*, rather a Puritan, than a ſtrict Conformiſt to the Church of England; *Roger* (whom he erroneouſly calls *Robert*) *Taverner*; *Timothy Bright*, M. D. of Cambridge, and Rector of Methley in Yorkſhire; *Thomas Mouffet*, M. D. *John Huntingdon*. 6. That whereas he pretends to follow *Leland's Collectanea de Scriptoribus Angliæ*, which he frequently quotes; it is only that he may avoid the naming of *Bale*, "for "whom all Roman Catholicks, nay zealous Proteſ- "tants, have little or no kindneſs at all, becauſe "his book is ſtuffed with revilings and ſuch language, "that befits rather a Huckſter at Billingſgate, than "the meaneſt or worſt of Scholars. The truth is, "our Author *Pits* never ſaw the ſaid *Collectanea*, he "being but twenty years of age, or little more, "when he left the nation; neither was it in his "power afterwards, if he had been in England, be- "cauſe they were kept in ſuch private hands, that "few Proteſtant Antiquaries, and none of thoſe of "the Church of Rome, could ſee or peruſe them." 7. That in the ſaid work are very many errors, miſnomers, &c. which he copied from *Bale*. 8. That whereas *Pits* pretends to ſet down only Engliſh Writers, he hath inſerted among them ſome, who are foreigners; as *Herbertus Liſinga*, born, as he ſays, in Suffolk; but falſely, "for the MS. which I follow, "ſays Mr. Wood, in my marginal notes and addi- "tions of and to the Biſhops of Norwich, mention- "ed by Francis Biſhop of Landaff in his book *de* "*Præſulibus Angliæ Commentarius*, ſaith, that he was "born *in Pago Oxinnenſi* or *Oximenſi in Normannia*."

(1) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 406. 2d edit.

(2) *Relat. Hiſt.* part. 1. p. 53, 54, &c.

and an officialſhip of the ſaid Church, he kept to his death, which happened at Liverdune October the 7th new ſtyle in the year 1616. He was interred in the Church there, and the following inſcription put over his grave: *Hic jacet D. Pitz, quondam Decanus, Officialis, & Canonicus hujus Eccleſiæ, Doctor SS. Theologiæ, qui deceſſit ex hac vitâ* 17 *Octob. an.* 1616. Beſides his *Relationes de Rebus Anglicis*, he publiſhed *De Legibus Tractatus Theologicus*, Triers 1592. *De Beatitudine* Ingolſtadt 1595. and *De Peregrinatione*, Lib. VII. Duſſeldorp 1604 in 12mo. dedicated to the Ducheſs of Cleves.

He ſaith likewiſe that *Joannes Erigena* was born in the city of St. David's in Wales; but the generality of writers affirm, that he was born in Ireland. 9. That in his *Appendix*, which is chiefly compiled from *Bale* and Dr. *Tho. James's Ecloga*, many writers are inſerted, who had been before-mentioned in the work itſelf, though under different names. Thus *Godfridus Hiſtoricus*, p. 844. is the ſame with *Godfridus Arturius* or *de Monmouth*, num. 212. and *Gualterius Cepton*, p. 846. is the ſame with *Gualterius Catton*, p. 449. and *Guilhelmus Califord*, p. 851. the ſame with *Guilhelmus Cockisford*, p. 524.

As for the other three volumes, which our Author had written, *viz.* that of the Kings, the other of the Biſhops, and the third of Apoſtolical Men, of England, they were not buried with him, as he deſired, in caſe he ſhould not live to finiſh them, but were preſerved among the Archives of the Church of Liverdune. One of the ſaid volumes, if not more, were made uſe of and quoted by *Edward Maihew*, a Benedictin Monk, and formerly ſcholar to our Author, in a book, which he publiſhed at Rheims in 1619, entitled, *Congregationis Anglicanæ Ordinis S. Benedicti Trophææ*. The other volume relating to the Biſhops of England, which our Author often refers to in his book *De Scriptoribus* is chiefly a collection from Biſhop *Godwin's Catalogue of the Biſhops of England*, printed in 1601, as Mr. Wood was informed by one, who peruſed the manuſcript (3). T.

(3) Wood, *ubi ſupra*, col. 408.

PLACE (PETER DE LA), in Latin *Plateanus*, or *a Platea*, *a native of the country of Angoumois* (*a*), *was from his youth ſo well educated in polite Literature, that he alone, of all his brothers, reſolved to apply himſelf to the ſtudy of the Law, wherein he made ſuch a progreſs, that he was not yet twenty two when he wrote a Paraphraſe on Actions* (*b*), *and about that time he began to plead at the bar of the Parliament of Paris, where he gained the reputation of a man of ſenſe, of eloquence, and eſpecially of a tender conſcience* (*c*). This was the reaſon why Francis I. appointed him his Advocate in the Court of Aids at Paris. He acquitted himſelf of his functions in that poſt with great honeſty; whereby Henry II. *himſelf choſe him* (*d*) *among many others for his firſt Preſident in the ſame Court of Aids.* He embraced in his heart the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches as ſoon as the year 1554 [*A*], and made a publick profeſſion of it after the death of Francis II. But the troubles which aroſe early after obliged him *for his own ſecurity to retire into a houſe of his in Picardy.* The publick tranquillity being reſtored in the year 1562, *he went to meet the King, in order to clear himſelf of ſeveral falſe imputations, which ſome ill deſigning perſons had laid upon him: when he had juſtified himſelf to his Majeſty's ſatisfaction, he went to pay his reſpects to* the Prince of Condé, *who from that moment truſted him with the direction, and ſuperintendency of the affairs of his family: from that time he had ſo great an affection for that Prince, that he ſpared neither his eſtate, nor his children, nor even his own perſon, to promote his Highneſs's dignity in every thing that related to it, ſo much was he devoted to his ſervice.* The civil broils, which aroſe afreſh five years after, obliged him *to leave Paris again, and retire into the Caſtle of Vé in Valois* (*e*), *where he underwent great perſecutions* [*B*]. The Reformed Church being ſuffered *to enjoy ſome peace*, he returned

(*a*) La Croix du Maine, *Bibl. Franc.* p. 408, ſays he was born at Angouleſme.

(*b*) See the end of the laſt rem.

(*c*) See the *Opuſcules de Loiſel*, p. 511, 512.

(*d*) In the year 1553, ſee the *Opuſcules de Loiſel*, p. 511.

(*e*) Belonging to his nephews, whoſe Guardian he was then, on the account of his wife the Lady Ragonde Luillier, P. de Farnace, *Vie de Place*, p. 15.

[*A*] *He embraced in his heart the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches as early as the year* 1554.] We ſee in the diſcourſe of his life that *God called him to his knowledge* at that time, *in a very ſurprizing manner.* "Being a ſchool-boy at Poitiers about twenty years "before, God gave him an opportunity to ſee John "Calvin, when he paſſed through that place with "Archbiſhop du Tillet (1); he heard that great man "with pleaſure, whilſt he ſpoke with great dignity "of the knowledge of God in general: but when "he came to ſpeak of the true worſhip of God, he "could not hear him any longer, being very zealous "for the religion in which he had been carefully "educated. There remained nevertheleſs ſome doubts "in his mind, which made him think that he might "very well be miſtaken: and he reflected often upon "this, as he has declared it ſince; which was as a "kind of preparation deſigned to nouriſh that ſeed, "till it came to ſpring out and bud at the time appointed by God. This happened one day as he "ſtood before his door: for a certain ſtranger, by a "wonderful providence of God, not being in the "leaſt acquainted with him, but ſeeing that he was a "man of diſtinction, and wanting to be aſſiſted in his "exceſſive poverty, applied very humbly to him, "and made him a long diſcourſe in good Latin, "explaining the cauſe of his miſery. De la Place "finding him a man of learning, conducted him "into his own ſtudy, that he might examine him "more leiſurely. This poor man then, as though "he had been ſent by God, began to expoſe very "freely the abuſes of the Church of Rome, and to "explain the true and only way to worſhip God. "Which de la Place having heard quietly enough, "honoured him with ſome preſents, and deſired him "nevertheleſs not to come to ſee him again, for fear "of the faggots, which were ready againſt thoſe, "who were in the leaſt ſuſpected of the Evangelical "Doctrine: and indeed that poor ſtranger was ſoon "after tried in the furnace at Paris. Now from that "time Peter de la Place never ceaſed conſulting both "the holy Scripture and the antient Doctors, and "even the ſchoolmen, that he might be able to remove thoſe difficulties, which nigl t and day perplexed his mind. Thus in a ſhort time God "touched his heart, and opened his eyes, that he "might ſee the light of the Goſpel, ſo that when "Francis II. died, he declared himſelf openly to "be one of thoſe who profeſſed the Reformed Religion (2)." Papyrius Maſſo's brother aſſerts (3), that Peter de la Place, and his brother Bertrand de la Place, and John du Tillet followed John Calvin to Lyons, who had infected them with his Hereſies at Angouleſme. This is not probable with regard to him, whoſe article I give here; for if he had followed Calvin to Lyons, the Author of his life would have known it, and would not have related a particular quite different from that.

(1) This du Tillet never was a Biſhop nor an Archbiſhop, but only Chancellor and Archdeacon of Angouleſme. See what Papyrius Maſſo's brother has added to *Calvin's Life*, at the end of the *Papyrii Maſſonis Elogia varia.*

(2) P. de Farnace, *Brief Recueil des principaux Poincts de la Vie de Meſſire Pierre de la Place*, p. 11 *& ſeq.*

(3) See Papyrius Maſſo's *Elogies*, in *Calvin's Life.*

[*B*] *He underwent great perſecutions.*] "Neither "the loſs of his place, nor the ſale of his perſonal "eſtate,

returned into his houſe, *and notwithſtanding all the reſiſtance he met with from a perſon, who during the war had been favoured with his poſt* [C], *he obtained again his place of Preſident, and enjoyed it without any blemiſh, being revered by all honeſt men, and dreaded by the wicked, till the maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's Day*, when he was murdered, as we ſhall relate hereunder (*f*) [D]. He wrote ſome books which have been

Traicté de l'Excellence de l'Homme Chreſtien, p. 68.

(*f*) Extracted from P. de Farnace, in his *Brief Recueil des principaux poincts de la Vie de Meſſire Pierre de la Place*, prefixed to the

" eſtate, nor the ſeizing of his real eſtate, grieved " him ſo much, and cauſed him ſo great a vexation " as the unworthy uſage he met with from one of " thoſe, from whom he ought naturally to have ex- " pected all kind of aſſiſtance, they being his near " relations. . . . A certain Counſellor of the Court . . " who had profeſſed the Reformed Religion, even " after the firſt commotions, knowing that God was " going to put his flock to a ſevere trial, revolted " immediately, and finding himſelf in ſome danger " by the threatnings that were made againſt thoſe " who had been Proteſtants, and to remove all ſuſ- " picions that he might ſtill retain ſome remorſe of " his apoſtacy, or ſome deſire to return among the " faithful, reſolved to commit a moſt notorious act, " which was, to perſecute Peter de la Place with all " kinds of calumnies and injuries, *who was guardian " to his nephews, the children of that Counſellor's wife ; " and who was alſo retired to a caſtle belonging to his " nephews. Whereupon the Counſellor in numberleſs " ſcandalous petitions, never ceaſed to invent and hint " to the Court a thouſand ſlanders and calumnies ; ſo " that at laſt he not only got de la Place ignominiouſly de- " prived of the guardianſhip, though abſent and unac- " quainted with theſe proceedings, but obtained alſo a " commiſſion, to ſeize both the caſtle and de la Place him- " ſelf. And this would have been executed accordingly, " in ſuch unhappy and tumultuous times, conſidering the " great ſpeed Tanchou and his bailiffs made, as " though it had been to take ſome robbers : but God raiſed " him a friend, who the night before their arrival gave " him notice of every thing. Whereupon, though he was " ſtill very much out of order, labouring under a continual " fever, yet he was obliged to riſe before break of day, " and to make his eſcape into the foreſt of Rez, which is " pretty near that caſtle, where he met with a ſtranger " who received him afterwards into his houſe : whereas " on the contrary that Counſellor, breaking through all " the laws not only of affinity, but alſo of humanity, " ſeized upon the caſtle, drove de la Place's children from " thence, plundered all that was left there, and ſent " Tanchou with his bailiffs after him : ſo that he was " obliged to wander ſome days in the woods, till at laſt " le Sieur de Bouchavane did him the kindneſs to receive " him ſecretly into his caſtle of Couſſy, and to hide him " there in a little room* (4)."

(4) P. de Farnace, *Vie du Preſ. de la Place*, p. 15 *& ſeq.*

[C] *The reſiſtance he met with from a perſon, who . . . had been favoured with his poſt.*] This perſon is no other but Stephen de Neuilly. We find in the Dialogue of the Advocates in the Parliament of Paris, that *he made himſelf firſt Preſident in the Court of Aids, when the Sieur de la Place was killed on St. Bartholomew's Day* (5). Let us ſee the marginal note which has been made on that paſſage of the Dialogue. " Miraumont, *tit. de la Cour des Aydes*, obſerves, that " the Sieur de Neuilly was appointed firſt Preſident " January the 11th 1569. of which office he per- " formed the functions ſince, on account of Monſieur " de la Place's abſence. And yet Paſquier in the " 16th book of his letters, page 245. writing to his " eldeſt ſon Monſieur Theodore Paſquier, ſays that " he was made firſt Preſident by Monſieur de Mayen- " ne, that is to ſay during the league." The difficulty urged in that marginal note is not ill-grounded ; for Paſquier (6) ſpeaks only of the poſt of Preſident *au Mortier*, which the Duke of Mayenne beſtowed on Stephen de Neuilly, who was already *firſt Preſident of the Court of Aids*. See above the article NULLY.

(5) *Opuſcules de Loiſel*, p. 487.

(6) Paſquier, *Lettres*, liv. 16. p. 245, of the 2d vol.

[D] *The maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's Day, when he was murthered, as we ſhall relate hereunder.*] Captain Michel, one of *King Charles the Ninth's Arquebuſiers, went at ſix of the clock in the morning to Peter de la Place's houſe. He was armed with an arquebuſe on his ſhoulder, and a piſtol at his girdle : and as a ſign that he was one of the murtherers, he had a napkin tied about his left arm. The firſt words he ſpoke were that Monſieur de Guiſe, by the King's command, had killed the Admiral, and ſeveral other Huguenot Lords, and as all the other Huguenots, of what quality ſoever they might be, were doomed to die, he was come to the Sieur de la Place's houſe, in order to preſerve him from that misfortune. But that he would have them ſhew him all the gold and ſilver, which was in the houſe* (7). The Sieur de la Place's anſwer made that Captain ſwear a great oath, and ſay, that *he commanded him to come and ſpeak to the King*. De la Place ſuſpecting then that *there was a great ſedition throughout the city, ſtole away by the back door, with an intention to retire into ſome neighbour's houſe. In the mean time moſt of his ſervants made their eſcape, and the Captain having received about a thouſand crowns, was going away, when Mademoiſelle des Maretz, the Sieur de la Place's daughter, deſired him to conduct her to ſome Roman Catholick friend, which he granted her, and did it accordingly. After this the Sieur de la Place having been refuſed entrance at three different places, came back into his own houſe, where he found his wife in the utmoſt conſternation* (8). He exhorted her to take patience, " and then ordered " to call the men and maid ſervants who remained " in the houſe ; when they were come into his room, " it being his cuſtom to make a kind of exhortation " to his family every Sunday, he began to pray, then " he read a chapter of Job, with Calvin's expoſition " or ſermon upon it, and diſcourſed a little on the " juſtice and mercy of God, who like a kind father " (ſaid he) tries his elect by ſeveral chaſtiſements, that " they may not be too much taken with the things of " this world. . . . . Then he began again to pray, " diſpoſing himſelf and his whole family, to ſuffer " the greateſt torments, and even death itſelf, rather " than do any thing againſt the glory of God. Hav- " ing finiſhed his prayer he was told that Monſieur " de Seneſcay Provoſt of the *Hotel*, was at the door " with his archers, requiring in the King's name " that they ſhould let them in, and declaring that he " came to preſerve de la Place's perſon, and to pre- " vent his houſe being plundered by the mob. Where- " upon the Sieur de la Place ordered to open him the " door, who being come in declared to him the " great ſlaughter that was committing on the Hugue- " nots throughout the city by the King's command, " adding theſe words mixed with Latin, that there " would not be one of them left, *qui mingat ad pa- " rietem, that piſſeth againſt the wall.* Yet that he " was expreſsly commanded by his Majeſty to pre- " vent him from ſuffering the leaſt harm, and even " to conduct him to the *Louvre*, becauſe the King " deſired to know from him ſeveral particulars relat- " ing to the affairs of the Reformed, of which he had " the management ; that he ſhould therefore get " himſelf ready to go and ſpeak to his Majeſty. The " Sieur de la Place anſwered, that he ſhould always " think himſelf very happy, if before he left this " world, he could give his Majeſty an account of all " his actions, and of his whole conduct. But that " conſidering the horrid maſſacre that was perpetrat- " ing throughout the city, it was impoſſible for him to " go to the Louvre, without a great and unavoidable " danger of his life ; but that he deſired him to ſecure " his perſon to his Majeſty, by leaving in his houſe " as many of his archers as he ſhould think. Seneſ- " cay granted him this, and left with him one of his " Lieutenants named Toutevoye, with four of his " archers. Soon after Seneſcay was gone, the Preſi- " dent Charon, then Provoſt of the Merchants of " Paris, came to de la Place's houſe, and having " ſpoke ſome time with him privately, he went " away, leaving him four of his archers, beſides " thoſe of Seneſcay (9). . . . . Seneſcay coming again " the next day about dinner time, declared to him " that he had a moſt expreſs and repeated command " from his Majeſty to bring him with him, and " that he would not be refuſed (10)." De la Place's prayers proving ineffectual, he deſired Seneſcay at laſt, *that he would be pleaſed to accompany him in perſon*, to which the other replied, *that being engaged in other buſineſ*

(7) De Farnace, *Vie du Preſ. de la Place*, p. 19.

(8) Ibid. p. 20.

(9) Ibid. p. 22 *& ſeq.*

(10) Ibid. p. 24.

been printed [*E*].

buſineſs he could not accompany him farther than about fifty ſteps (11). The Sieur de la Place's wife, fell on her knees before Seneſcay to beg of him that he would "accompany her huſband. Whereupon de la Place, "who never gave the leaſt ſign of faintheartedneſs, "took his wife up, and reproved her, telling her, that "they were not to have recourſe to the arm of men, "but to God alone: then turning himſelf he perceiv- "ed that his eldeſt ſon had put a croſs made of paper on "his hat, which he had done out of weakneſs, hoping "thereby to eſcape death: but his father rebuked "him ſeverely for it, and commanded him to take "off immediately from his hat that token of ſedi- "tion, repreſenting to him that the true croſs we "ought to bear is that of tribulations and afflic- "tions, which God ſends us as a certain pledge of "the happineſs and eternal life which he has pre- "pared for his children. Then finding that Se- "neſcay preſſed hard upon him to go to his Majeſty, "and being fully determined to ſuffer death, which "he ſaw was deſigned for him, he put on his cloak, "took his leave of his wife, recommending to her to "have above all things the glory and fear of God "before her eyes, and thus went out very chearfully: "being come to the ſtreet of the Glaſs-houſe *, "over-againſt Cock-ſtreet †, ſome murderers, who "had been waiting for him about three hours with "drawn daggers, killed him as a poor lamb, in the "midſt of ten or twelve archers of the Sieur Seneſ- "cay, who conducted him, and his houſe was plun- "dered five or ſix days after. The Sieur de la "Place's corps (his ſon being gone to Heaven) was "carried to the Town-houſe **, and put into a ſta- "ble, where his friend covered his face, and the next "morning it was caſt into the river (12)."

(11) P. de Farnace, *Vie du Preſident de la Place*, p. 25.

* *De la Verrie.*

† *La Rue du Coq.*

** *L'Hoſtel de Ville.*

(12) P. de Farnace, *Vie du Preſ. de la Place*, p. 26 *& ſeq.*

[*E*] *He wrote ſome books which have been printed.*] Soon after Francis the Second's death he *publiſhed a treatiſe of Vocation* (13), which he dedicated to Charles IX. and then *another treatiſe of the true uſe of Moral Philoſophy in the Chriſtian Doctrine*. During his firſt retirement *he applied himſelf entirely to the ſtudy of Divinity . . . . . He ſpent alſo ſome hours in drawing up an hiſtory of what happened in his time with regard both to civil and religious affairs, ſome ſpecimen of which was printed in the year* 1565, *though without his knowledge* (14). During his ſtay in the caſtle of Couſſy, he reflected ſeriouſly on *the excellency of the Chriſtian man*, and wrote a ſmall tract upon that ſubject, which he dedicated to the Queen of Navarre (15). The dedication is dated from Paris, May the 20th, 1572. The edition I make uſe of was printed in the year 1585, in 12mo. Here follows what we find in La Croix du Maine. "He wrote a very learned and excellent "treatiſe of Vocation, and of the manner of living "in every ſtation in which Providence places men; "it was printed at Paris for Frederic Morel, in the "year 1561, in 4to, and contains twenty-one ſheets. "That book has been reprinted ſince for Robert le "Mangnier, who has intitled it otherwiſe than it "was before; for the laſt title is thus: *Diſcours po- "litiques ſur la voye d'entrer deüement aux Eſtats, & "la maniere de conſtamment s'y maintenir & gouverner*; "i. e. *Political diſcourſes on the manner after which "every one ought to come to his particular calling, and "how he muſt conſtantly maintain and behave himſelf in "it*; the whole divided into chapters, (which was "done in the former edition). Some think that the "Sieur de la Place is the Author of a book intitled, "*De l'Etat de la Religion en France*, i. e. *Of the State "of Religion in France*, printed in the year 1557; "but I will not be poſitive that they are in the right, "for his name is not prefixed to that book (16)." I am apt to think there is a miſtake in theſe words, *in the year* 1557; for the firſt edition of this work of Peter de la Place, was printed in the year 1565, and the title of it is thus: *Commentaires de l'Eſtat de la Religion & Republique ſous les Rois Henry & François ſeconds, & Charles neufieme*, i. e. "An Account of "the State of Religion and of the Commonwealth "under the Kings Henry II. Francis II. and Charles "IX." Neither the Author's name, nor the Printer's, nor the place where it was printed, are ſet down. The work is divided into ſeven books, it begins with the year 1556, and ends with what happened towards the latter part of the year 1561: it contains 282 ſheets in 8vo. Let us not forget theſe other words of la Croix du Maine. "He was a man very "well verſed in the Law (as appears from his Latin "works, printed a great while ago, and which we "ſhall mention in another place) and beſides this, "he was alſo very eloquent (17)." Du Verdier Vau-Privas mentions but one Latin book of this Author. *Petri Plateani Angoliſmæi . . . . . Paraphraſis in titulos Inſtitutionum imperialium de Actionibus, Exceptionibus, & Interdictis. Scholiis ſeorſum margini adpoſitis, Pariſiis 4 apud Galeotum à Prato* 1548 (18), i. e. "Peter "de la Place of Angouleſme's . . . . . Paraphraſe on "the Titles of the Imperial Conſtitutions concerning "Actions, Exceptions, and Prohibitions. With mar- "ginal Notes by another Hand, 4to, at Paris, for "Gabriel du Pré, 1548."

(13) Ibid. p. 13.

(14) Ibid. p. 18.

(15) Idem, ibid.

(16) La Croix du Maine, *Bibl. Franc.* p. 408.

(17) La Croix du Maine, ibid.

(18) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, *Bibl. Franc.* p. 1038.

PLANTEVIT-LA-PAUSE (JOHN), in Latin *Plantavitius Pauſanus*, Biſhop of Lodeve, was born in the Caſtle of Marcaſſargues belonging to his mother, in the Dioceſe of Niſmes. He made a very great progreſs in the oriental languages, as appears from the books he has publiſhed [*A*]. He was not only born in the Reformed Religion, but had alſo been a Miniſter of the Church of Beziers (*a*). He turned Catholick in the year 1604, and was immediately ſent for to Court, where Henry the Great ſhewed him a great deal of kindneſs. He went to la Fleche, in order to go through a new courſe of Divinity under the Jeſuits. He returned from thence in 1609 to go to Rome (*b*). He was one of the Biſhops of Languedoc who engaged in Monſieur de Montmorenci's Rebellion (*c*). Moreri has committed ſome blunders [*B*].

(*a*) See the teſtimonials he gave to Fitz Simon, inſerted in that Jeſuit's *Britannomachia*, p. 122. He is erroneouſly called there *John Plantavil.*

(*b*) See the ſame Teſtimonials.

(*c*) See the paſſage from Rivet *in Jeſuita vapulante*, quoted by Colomiés, *Bibl. Orient.* p. 182.

PLATINA

[*A*] *The books he has publiſhed.*] Here follow the titles of ſome of them. *Florilegium Biblicum, Heb. Lat.* at Lodeve 1645. *Florilegium Rabbinicum, Heb. Lat. cum Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, printed in the ſame city, the ſame year. *Theſaurus Synonimicus Hebræo-Chaldæo-Rabbinicus*, printed alſo the ſame year in the ſame city. An Hebrew Lexicon. Monſieur Colomiés mentions a book of Michael Beraud, Miniſter at Montauban, upon Juſtification, againſt this Author (1).

(1) Colomiés, *Bibl. Orient.* p. 182.

[*B*] *Moreri has committed ſome blunders.*] 1. It appears plainly, from the teſtimonials which I have quoted, that the Sieur Plantevit-la-Pauſe celebrated the ceremony of his abjuration at Beziers, and not at Bourges. Honeſt Moreri has been no doubt miſled by the Latin word *Biterrenſi*, (of Beziers) which he thought was the ſame with *Bituricenſi*, (of Bourges). 2. I imagine, that by the ſame miſtake, we are told, that this Prelate *retired into the Caſtle of Margon, in the Dioceſe of Bourges, and that he died there May the 28th*, 1651. 3. One cannot ſay that this Prelate *behaved himſelf with a great deal of prudence*, from the year 1625, till 1648, when it is certain that he declared for the Rebels in the year 1632. It is leſs pardonable to omit ſuch a particular, than what relates to the Sieur de la Pauſe's being a Miniſter, his ſtudying at la Fléche, and ſome other particulars of that kind, of which we do not find the leaſt hint in Moreri's Dictionary. 4. This Expreſſion, *He applied himſelf particularly to the ſtudy* of Divinity *in the College of Foix at Toloſe*, is captious and very bad, for it leads us to believe this falſity, namely, that the College of Foix is a place where the Sciences are taught (2).

(2) Compare this with what is obſerved above, in the rem. [*B*] of the article BOSQUET (Francis).

[*A*] *He*

PLATINA (BARTHOLOMEW (*a*), Author of a Hiſtory of the Popes, flouriſhed in the 15th Century. He was born in 1421, in a village called *Piadena* [*A*], between Cremona and Mantua. He firſt embraced a military life (*b*), which he followed for a conſiderable time; but afterwards devoted himſelf to ſtudy, and made a conſiderable progreſs in it. He went to Rome (*c*) under the Pontificate of Calixtus III. (*d*), where getting himſelf introduced to Cardinal Beſſarion, he obtained ſome ſmall benefices of Pope Pius II. and afterwards was appointed apoſtolical abbreviator. Paul II. ſucceſſor of Pius II. removed all the abbreviators from their employments, notwithſtanding they had paid great ſums for the purchaſe of their places; and notwithſtanding that Platina moſt humbly beſought him to order their cauſe to be judged by the auditors of the Rota (*e*). The Pope was offended at the liberty Platina took on this occaſion, and accordingly gave him a very haughty repulſe [*B*]. Theſe unhappy men, thus diveſted of their employments, uſed their utmoſt endeavours, during ſome days, to obtain audience of the Pope, but were repulſed with the utmoſt contempt. Upon this Platina wrote a letter to him [*C*], in which he informed him, that he deſigned to travel up and down the world, in order to exhort Princes to convene a Council, to enquire whether the abbreviators ought to have been removed from their employments. This letter was conſidered as an act of rebellion, ſo that he was thrown into priſon, put in irons, and was left in this condition four months, expoſed to numberleſs inconveniencies [*D*]. He afterwards had his liberty, at the requeſt of Cardinal Francis de Gonzaga, but was ordered not to leave Rome. He continued quiet in it three years, but afterwards was perſecuted in a more cruel manner than before. Some perſons had perſuaded the Pope that Callimachus had engaged in a plot againſt him, and that Platina was one of the conſpirators. Many perſons were impriſoned, and put to the rack, on that account. Platina was treated with

(*a*) And not *Baptiſt*, as he is called by Jacobus Bergamenſis, Leandro Alberti, Floridus Sabinus, &c. See the authorities for this in Voſſius *de Hiſt. Lat* p. 589. See alſo the cloſe of the rem. [*H*].

(*b*) Volaterrannus, lib. 21. p. 777.

(*c*) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 19.

(*d*) And not Calixtus II. as Moreri ſays.

(*e*) Platina, *in* Paulo II. folio 150 *verſo*.

[*A*] *He was born in* 1421, *in a village called Piadena.*] I do not meet with any Author who mentions that date; but ſince Jacobus Bergamenſis and Maſſæus (1) fix his death under the year 1481; and that Raphael Volaterrannus (2), and Leandro Alberti (3), affirm that he died at threeſcore years of age, it follows that he was born in 1421. Thoſe who relate, like Moreri, that he was a native of Verona, are miſtaken (4), of which the following is a proof. *Idem fecit Theodorus Hexarchus Ravennas cui quidem in magiſtratu mortuo non ita multo poſt Joannes Platina ſucceſſit. Hunc ego crediderim dediſſe nomen meo natali ſolo quod Platina appellatur in agro Cremonenſi poſitum*, i. e. "The ſame was done by Theodore Exarch or Lieu-"tenant of Ravenna, who dying in his poſt, was "ſucceeded not long after by John Platina. I am "of opinion, that this latter gave the name to my "native place, which is called Platina, ſituated in "the territory of Cremona." Theſe are Platina's own words (5). The Italians do not call this village *Platina*, but *Piadena*, as is manifeſt from the Italian tranſlation of a journey into Italy, written in Latin by Andrew Schottus (6). I am of opinion, that Platina was ſo called from the place of his birth. The name of his family was *Sacchus* or *Saccus*.

(1) In *Chronic.* They ſay that he died of the plague.

(2) *Commentar. Urban.* lib. 21. p. 777.

(3) In *Deſcriptione Italiæ*, p. m. 626.

(4) Hofman, *in voce Platina*, & *Cave in Cartophylac. Eccleſiaſt.* edit. Lipſ. p. 369, are cenſured for this by Daniel William Mollerus, *Diſſert. de Platina*, p. 4. Sir Thomas Pope-Blount, *Cenſura Authorum*, p. 339, cites a long paſſage from Boiſſard *in Iconib.* where Platina is called *Veronenſis*.

(5) In *Vita Coronis*, folio m. 104. This Pope ſat in the Pontifical Chair in 686.

(6) *Da Cremona a Mantoua ſi va per una ſtrada piana e diritta ove ſi trova Piadena.* (In my edition of Vicenza 1622, it is *Pianeda*) *Patria di Bartolomeo Platina.*

[*B*] *The Pope was offended at the liberty Platina took, and . . . . gave him a very haughty anſwer.*] The Pope's anſwer was very much in an Anti-chriſtian caſt; he roundly declaring, that all the right, and all the laws, were comprized in his will. Here follows Platina's Latin (7): *Tentarunt tamen ii ad quos res ipſa pertinebat hominem è ſententia demovere: atque ego certe qui horum de numero eram rogando etiam ut cauſa ipſa judicibus publicis (quos Rotæ auditores vocant) committeretur. Tum ille torvis oculis me aſpiciens, ita nos inquit ad judices revocas? ac ſi neſcires omnia jura in ſcrinio pectoris noſtri collocata eſſe? Sic ſtat ſententia, inquit: loco cedant omnes, eant quo volunt, nihil eos moror: pontifex ſum, mihique licet pro arbitrio animi aliorum acta & reſcindere & approbare*, i. e. "In the mean time, "thoſe, whom that affair concerned, endeavoured to "make him change his reſolution: I alſo, being one "of them, begged that the cauſe might be tried "before the publick Judges, called Auditors of the "Rota. At theſe words, looking at me with a ſtern "countenance; is it thus, (ſaid he), that you appeal "from me to the Judges? as though you don't "know that all laws are centered in my breaſt? "Such is my decree: they ſhall all go hence whither-"ſoever they pleaſe. I am Pope, and have a right "to give a ſanction to, or diſannul, at pleaſure, the "acts of others."

(7) *In* Paulo II. folio m. 350 *verſo*.

[*C*] *Upon this Platina wrote a letter to him.*] The ſubſtance of it is as follows. *Ego vero*, ſays he (8), *tanta ignominia excitus quod mihi ac ſociis meis coram non licebat, id agere per literas inſtitui. Scripſi itaque epiſtolam his verbis. Si tibi licuit indicta cauſa ſpoliare nos emptione noſtra juſta ac legitima, debet & nobis licere conqueri illatam injuriam inuſtamque ignominiam. Rejecti à te ac tam inſigni contumelia affecti dilabemur paſſim ad reges, ad principes, eoſque adhortabimur ut tibi concilium indicant, in quo potiſſimum rationem reddere cogaris cur nos legitima poſſeſſione ſpoliaveris*, i. e. "I myſelf being "enraged at this great affront which was put upon "us, was determined to do that by letter, which my "Collegues and I were not permitted to do in his "preſence. I therefore wrote to him in the follow-"ing terms. If you had a right to diſpoſſeſs us, "without permitting our cauſe to be heard, of the "employments we had lawfully purchaſed; we on "the other ſide, ought to be permitted to complain "of the injuſtice we ſuffer, and the ignominy with "which we are branded. As you have repulſed us "ſo contumelioufly, we will go to all the courts of "Princes, and entreat them to call a Council, whoſe "principal buſineſs ſhall be, to oblige you to ſhew "cauſe, why you have diveſted us of our lawful "poſſeſſions." In my opinion, Platina's character may very well be known from this letter. It ſhews that he was very impatient and too conceited, but at this time ſincere; for ſince he did not ſcruple to inform the public of his conduct, though no ways agreeable to his duty, we may juſtly ſuppoſe, that he took a pleaſure in writing the truth It is certain that a Subject, who is removed from his place by his Sovereign, has no right to threaten that he will complain on that account to other Princes, and exhort them to get juſtice done him. The Pope is ſupreme in Rome, with regard to the putting down or eſtabliſhing of certain employments; and he cannot be ſubjected to a Council upon that account. Beſides, the threats employed muſt greatly offend the Pope in queſtion. He was threatened with a Council; which was treating him like a ſchool-boy, when a perſon ſays, that he will tell the Maſter of him. Farther, I would aſk any one, whether the putting down of a college or community of Sectaries, deſerves ſo much buſtle, and is of ſo much conſequence, as to merit the convening of a Council. But ſuch is the character of impatient men; they imagine that nothing is of greater conſequence to the world, than what is ſo to themſelves. Platina troubled his head very little about the reſt of the abuſes, but would have the Council chiefly employed in taking cognizance of the loſs which the apoſtolical Abbreviators had juſt before ſuſtained.

(8) Ibid.

REFLECTIONS on this Letter, which ſhew Platina's character.

[*D*] *He was expoſed to numberleſs inconveniencies.*] He was not permitted to have a fire in the depth of winter, though impriſoned in a tower which lay open to all the winds (9).

(9) *Revinctus compedibus & quidem graviſſimis media hieme ſine foco, celſa in turri ac ventis omnibus expoſita coerceor menſibus quatuor.* Platina, *in* Paulo II. folio 351.

[*E*] *The*

with as much ſeverity as the reſt: this conſpiracy was found to be a mere chimera, and yet not one of the priſoners was ſet at liberty; for the Court of Rome would have been aſhamed, to own her having treated perſons of merit with ſo much cruelty, on mere ſuſpicions [*E*]. When the charge of treaſon appeared too ill grounded, to inſiſt upon it, they turned the charge to that of Hereſy [*F*], which at laſt fell to the ground like the other. The priſoners were not ſet at liberty till a year after [*G*]. The Pope flattered Platina with the hopes that he would raiſe him to ſome good employment, and by that means prevented his leaving Rome. He ſpent two years in the vain expectation of the effect of theſe promiſes, after which the Pope died of the Apoplexy (*f*). Sixtus IV. his ſucceſſor, appointed Platina Librarian of the Vatican (*g*), whereby Platina found him-

(*f*) Extracted from Platina, *in* Vita Paulii II.

(*g*) The Vatican Library was ſet up by this Pope. Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 19.

[*E*] *The Court of Rome would have been aſhamed to own their having treated perſons of merit with ſo much cruelty, on mere ſuſpicions.*] I don't know whether, of all the defects found in man, vanity does not occaſion his committing the greateſt number of crimes. How many people begin an act of injuſtice, with a firm perſuaſion that they act juſtly? However, though they ſoon perceive the miſtake, pride not permitting them to own their fault, they proceed in their injuſtice, to prevent its being known that they began it without a cauſe. Every man chooſes to ſave his own reputation, rather than that of his neighbour; and hence ariſes the numberleſs ſhifts and cavils of ſuch informers, who are conſcious of their having calumniated others, and are afraid they ſhall be convicted on that account. Here we ſee a Pope, on account of a falſe punctilio of honour, obſtinately perſiſting in perſecuting men, who, contrary to his firſt ſuſpicions, were found innocent. *Chriſtophorus Veronenſis Pauli Medicus ad me veniens, bono inquit animo te eſſe jubet Paulus: ac de ſe bene ſperare brevique liberum futurum: ſciſcitor quando id fore ſperaret. Reſpondet homo liber audientibus omnibus qui tum aderant: non ita cito fieri poſſe ne levitatis & ſævitiæ argueretur pontifex, quod illos quos tanto tumultu concitato cepiſſet ac torſiſſet, ſtatim veluti innoxios dimitteret* (10), i. e. "Chriſtopher "of Verona, Phyſician to Pope Paul, coming to me "ſaid, Paul bids you be of good chear; to expect "the kindeſt treatment from him; and affirms "you will ſoon be ſet at liberty. I enquired, when "he imagined that would be. He anſwered, with "his uſual freedom, before all the perſons then pre"ſent: this cannot be done ſo very ſoon, leſt the "Pontiff ſhould be charged with being fickle and "cruel, in caſe he ſhould immediately diſcharge, as "being innocent, a ſet of men whom he had cauſed "to be ſeized in a tumultous manner, and put to the "torture." See the remark [*A*] and [*B*] of the article EXPERIENS.

(10) Platina, *in* Paulo II. folio 358.

[*F*] *They turned the charge to that of Hereſy.*] We are told this by Platina: *Neque hoc quidem contentus Paulus quos paulo ante conjurationis & majeſtatis accerſierat, eoſdem mutata ſententia ob divulgatam fabulam hæreſeos accuſat* (11). Pomponius Lætus was ſeized in Venice and carried to Rome. He was accuſed of changing the names of ſome young men, and giving them Heathen names in the place of their Chriſtian ones. It is pretended that he did this, in order to excite them the more to honour and virtue; but the only anſwer he made was this; what is it to you or the Pope, if I have a mind to call myſelf *Fennel*, provided I have no evil deſign in it? *Rogatus cur nomina adoleſcentibus immutaret, ut homo liber erat, quid ad vos, inquit, & Paulum, ſi mihi fœniculi nomen indo, modo id ſine dolo ac fraude fiat. Amore namque vetuſtatis antiquorum præclara nomina repetebat, quaſi quædam calcaria quæ noſtram juventutem æmulatione ad virtutem incitarent* (12). Farther, theſe priſoners were charged with having embraced the principles of Plato; of diſputing in a doubtful manner on the immortality of the ſoul, and the exiſtence of God; and of having too great a regard for the heathen ſyſtem. *Multa nobis objicit* (Paulus) *ſed illud potiſſimum quod de immortalitate animorum diſputaremus, teneremuſque opinionem Platonii . . . . in dubium, inquit Paulus, diſputando Deum vocabatis. . . . . Præterea vero Paulus crimini nobis dabat, quod nimium gentilitatis amatores eſſemus* (13). They anſwered, 1ſt, That, if they had an affection for Plato, they did but imitate the great St. Auſtin. 2. That all the Divines and Philoſophers of that age diſputed on thoſe very truths, and called them in queſtion, in order to diſcover the certainty of them; for it is a rule in diſputation, not to look upon the ſubject in queſtion as certain; but to ſuppoſe it, for ſome time, to be uncertain, in order to ſearch, with an unprejudiced mind, for the reaſons and foundation of the belief a perſon entertains of it (14). 3. That, according to St. Auſtin, a perſon's obſtinacy in defending his errors, is what makes him a Heretic; but that they had always paid obedience to the diſcipline of the church. Platina inſiſted particularly on the innocence of his actions; that he had never omitted Confeſſion, and receiving the Sacrament once a year; and that he had never let drop a ſingle word againſt the Apoſtles Creed, or that favoured ever ſo little of Hereſy. *Nullum mihi facinus impingi poteſt, non furtum, non latrocinium, non ſacrilegium, non depeculatus, non parricidium, non rapina, non ſimonia. Vixi ut Chriſtianum decebat: confeſſionem & communionem in anno ſemel præſertim intermiſi nunquam. Nil ex ore meo excidit quod contra ſymbolum eſſet, aut hæreſim ſaperet.* He obſerves, that no perſon ſhewed a greater fondneſs for heathen antiquities than the Pope himſelf, he purchaſing all the antient ſtatues he could meet with, to adorn his palace, &c (15). Notwithſtanding this, the Pope ſet a mark of ignominy on the name of Academician or Academic; and pronounced all thoſe Hereticks, who, from that time, ſhould mention the word Academy, either in jeſt or earneſt. *Veteres Academicos ſequebamur, novos contemnentes qui in rebus ipſis nil certi ponebant. Paulus tamen hæreticos eos pronunciavit, qui nomen Academiæ vel ſerio vel joco deinceps commemorarent. Junƈta eſt hæc ignominia Platoni; ipſe ſe tueatur* (16), i. e. "We followed the opinions "of the old Academics, deſpiſing the new, they "not allowing any certainty in the nature of things. "And yet Paul pronounced thoſe to be Hereticks, "who, from that time forward, ſhould mention the "word Academy, either joking or in earneſt. This "caſts an odium on Plato; let him defend himſelf." I have read in more than one Author, but I cannot now call any of them to mind, that this Pope was ſo great an enemy to the Sciences, that he forbid any perſon to uſe the word College or Academy. But thoſe who declared this, are groſsly miſtaken. For Paul II. did not condemn thoſe, who ſhould uſe the word Academy, in the ſignification of College or Houſe in which the Sciences are taught: He only condemned the ſceptical turn of mind of the Wits of his time, who, upon pretence of philoſophiſing in the manner of Plato, Founder of the antient Academy, made all things doubtful, and grew dangerous with reſpect to the foundations of the Goſpel.

(11) Ibid.

(12) Idem, ibid.

(13) Idem, ibid. folio 359.

(14) *In dubium, inquit Paulus, diſputando Deum vocabatis. Quod quidem omnibus Philoſophis & Theologis noſtrorum temporum objici poteſt, qui & animos & Deum & omnes intelligentias ſeparatas diſputandi ac veri inveniendi cauſa in dubium plerumque vocant.* Ibid. See the rem. [*L*], of the art. MALDONAT.

(15) *Cum nemo eo hujus rei ſtudioſior eſſet, quippe qui & ſtatuas veterum undique ex tota urbe conquiſitas in ſuas illas ædes quas ſub Capitolio extruebat congereret.* Ibidem.

(16) Ibid. folio 359 *verſo*, and folio 360.

[*G*] *The priſoners were not ſet at liberty till a year after.*] This proves Abbot Trithemius to have aſſerted a falſhood, he ſaying that our Platina was not releaſed out of priſon by Sixtus IV. till after the death of Paul II. *Multas à Paulo Papa II. calamitates ſuſtinuit, adeo ut bonis omnibus & dignitate ſpoliatus poſt equulei ſuſpenſionem in carcerem crudeliſſime detruſus, uſque ad mortem ipſius Pauli detentus ſit, qui à Sixto mox liberatus, &c* (17). When an Author writes the hiſtory of his own misfortunes, we ought to believe him, and not ſuppoſe that he has any occaſion to amplify matters. Trithemius ſhould have followed that maxim, and conſulted the life of Paul II. writ by the ſame perſon whoſe elogium he made. He then would have found the exact time he continued in priſon, and not have enlarged it, and thereby miſled many people to this day. *A. Paulo II. in carcerem conjectus, menſeſque quatuor ipſos detentus eſt, donec à ſucceſſore Sixto IV. liberatus* (18), i. e. "Paul II. threw him into "priſon, where he lay *four months, till he was ſet at* "*liberty by Sixtus* IV. *his ſucceſſor.*"

(17) Trithem. *de Scriptor. Eccleſ.* p. 356. Boiſſard ſays the ſame in Sir Thomas Pope-Blount, *Cenſ. Author.* p. 339.

(18) Boſius, *de comparanda Prudentia civili*, p. 377. Tom. 2. of the treatiſes *de ratione ſtudiorum*, collected and illuſtrated with a Commentary, by the learned Cremus, at Leyden 1696.

[*H*] *Here*

PLATINA (BARTHOLOMEW (*a*), Author of a Hiſtory of the Popes, flouriſhed in the 15th Century. He was born in 1421, in a village called *Piadena* [*A*], between Cremona and Mantua. He firſt embraced a military life (*b*), which he followed for a conſiderable time; but afterwards devoted himſelf to ſtudy, and made a conſiderable progreſs in it. He went to Rome (*c*) under the Pontificate of Calixtus III. (*d*), where getting himſelf introduced to Cardinal Beſſarion, he obtained ſome ſmall benefices of Pope Pius II. and afterwards was appointed apoſtolical abbreviator. Paul II. ſucceſſor of Pius II. removed all the abbreviators from their employments, notwithſtanding they had paid great ſums for the purchaſe of their places; and notwithſtanding that Platina moſt humbly beſought him to order their cauſe to be judged by the auditors of the Rota (*e*). The Pope was offended at the liberty Platina took on this occaſion, and accordingly gave him a very haughty repulſe [*B*]. Theſe unhappy men, thus diveſted of their employments, uſed their utmoſt endeavours, during ſome days, to obtain audience of the Pope, but were repulſed with the utmoſt contempt. Upon this Platina wrote a letter to him [*C*], in which he informed him, that he deſigned to travel up and down the world, in order to exhort Princes to convene a Council, to enquire whether the abbreviators ought to have been removed from their employments. This letter was conſidered as an act of rebellion, ſo that he was thrown into priſon, put in irons, and was left in this condition four months, expoſed to numberleſs inconveniencies [*D*]. He afterwards had his liberty, at the requeſt of Cardinal Francis de Gonzaga, but was ordered not to leave Rome. He continued quiet in it three years, but afterwards was perſecuted in a more cruel manner than before. Some perſons had perſuaded the Pope that Callimachus had engaged in a plot againſt him, and that Platina was one of the conſpirators. Many perſons were impriſoned, and put to the rack, on that account. Platina was treated with

(*a*) And not *Baptiſt*, as he is called by Jacobus Bergamenſis, Leandro Alberti, Floridus Sabinus, &c. See the authorities for this in Voſſius *de Hiſt. Lat* p. 589. See alſo the cloſe of the rem. [*H*].

(*b*) Volaterrannus, lib. 21. p. 777.

(*c*) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 19.

(*d*) And not Calixtus II. as Moreri ſays.

(*e*) Platina, *in* Paulo II. folio 150 *verſo*.

[*A*] *He was born in* 1421, *in a village called Piadena.*] I do not meet with any Author who mentions that date; but ſince Jacobus Bergamenſis and Maſſæus (1) fix his death under the year 1481; and that Raphael Volaterrannus (2), and Leandro Alberti (3), affirm that he died at threeſcore years of age, it follows that he was born in 1421. Thoſe who relate, like Moreri, that he was a native of Verona, are miſtaken (4), of which the following is a proof. *Idem fecit Theodorus Hexarchus Ravennas cui quidem in magiſtratu mortuo non ita multo poſt Joannes Platina ſucceſſit. Hunc ego crediderim dediſſe nomen meo natali ſolo quod Platina appellatur in agro Cremonenſi poſitum*, i. e. "The ſame was done by Theodore Exarch or Lieu-"tenant of Ravenna, who dying in his poſt, was "ſucceeded not long after by John Platina. I am "of opinion, that this latter gave the name to my "native place, which is called Platina, ſituated in "the territory of Cremona." Theſe are Platina's own words (5). The Italians do not call this village *Platina*, but *Piadena*, as is manifeſt from the Italian tranſlation of a journey into Italy, written in Latin by Andrew Schottus (6). I am of opinion, that Platina was ſo called from the place of his birth. The name of his family was *Sacchus* or *Saccus*.

(1) In *Chronic.* They ſay that he died of the plague.

(2) *Commentar. Urban.* lib. 21. p. 777.

(3) In *Deſcriptione Italiæ*, p. m. 626.

(4) Hofman, *in voce Platina*, & *Cave in Cartophylac. Eccleſiaſt.* edit. Lipſ. p. 369, are cenſured for this by Daniel William Mollerus, *Diſſert. de Platina*, p. 4. Sir Thomas Pope-Blount, *Cenſura Authorum*, p. 339, cites a long paſſage from Boiſſard *in Iconib.* where Platina is called *Veronenſis*.

(5) In *Vita Coronis*, folio m. 104. This Pope ſat in the Pontifical Chair in 686.

(6) *Da Cremona a Mantoua ſi va per una ſtrada piana e diritta ove ſi trova Piadena.* (In my edition of Vicenza 1622, it is *Pianeda*) *Patria di Bartolomeo Platina.*

[*B*] *The Pope was offended at the liberty Platina took, and . . . . gave him a very haughty anſwer.*] The Pope's anſwer was very much in an Anti-chriſtian caſt; he roundly declaring, that all the right, and all the laws, were comprized in his will. Here follows Platina's Latin (7): *Tentarunt tamen ii ad quos res ipſa pertinebat hominem è ſententia demovere: atque ego certe qui horum de numero eram rogando etiam ut cauſa ipſa judicibus publicis (quos Rotæ auditores vocant) committeretur. Tum ille torvis oculis me aſpiciens, ita nos inquit ad judices revocas? ac ſi neſcires omnia jura in ſcrinio pectoris noſtri collocata eſſe? Sic ſtat ſententia, inquit: loco cedant omnes, eant quo volunt, nihil eos moror: pontifex ſum, mihique licet pro arbitrio animi aliorum acta & reſcindere & approbare*, i. e. "In the mean time, "thoſe, whom that affair concerned, endeavoured to "make him change his reſolution: I alſo, being one "of them, begged that the cauſe might be tried "before the publick Judges, called Auditors of the "Rota. At theſe words, looking at me with a ſtern "countenance; is it thus, (ſaid he), that you appeal "from me to the Judges? as though you don't "know that all laws are centered in my breaſt? "Such is my decree: they ſhall all go hence whither-"ſoever they pleaſe. I am Pope, and have a right "to give a ſanction to, or diſannul, at pleaſure, the "acts of others."

(7) *In* Paulo II. folio m. 350 *verſo*.

[*C*] *Upon this Platina wrote a letter to him.*] The ſubſtance of it is as follows. *Ego vero*, ſays he (8), *tanta ignominia excitus quod mihi ac ſociis meis coram non licebat, id agere per literas inſtitui. Scripſi itaque epiſtolam his verbis. Si tibi licuit indicta cauſa ſpoliare nos emptione noſtra juſta ac legitima, debet & nobis licere conqueri illatam injuriam inuſtamque ignominiam. Rejecti à te ac tam inſigni contumelia affecti dilabemur paſſim ad reges, ad principes, eoſque adhortabimur ut tibi concilium indicant, in quo potiſſimum rationem reddere cogaris cur nos legitima poſſeſſione ſpoliaveris*, i. e. "I myſelf being "enraged at this great affront which was put upon "us, was determined to do that by letter, which my "Collegues and I were not permitted to do in his "preſence. I therefore wrote to him in the follow-"ing terms. If you had a right to diſpoſſeſs us, "without permitting our cauſe to be heard, of the "employments we had lawfully purchaſed; we on "the other ſide, ought to be permitted to complain "of the injuſtice we ſuffer, and the ignominy with "which we are branded. As you have repulſed us "ſo contumelioufly, we will go to all the courts of "Princes, and entreat them to call a Council, whoſe "principal buſineſs ſhall be, to oblige you to ſhew "cauſe, why you have diveſted us of our lawful "poſſeſſions." In my opinion, Platina's character may very well be known from this letter. It ſhews that he was very impatient and too conceited, but at this time ſincere; for ſince he did not ſcruple to inform the public of his conduct, though no ways agreeable to his duty, we may juſtly ſuppoſe, that he took a pleaſure in writing the truth It is certain that a Subject, who is removed from his place by his Sovereign, has no right to threaten that he will complain on that account to other Princes, and exhort them to get juſtice done him. The Pope is ſupreme in Rome, with regard to the putting down or eſtabliſhing of certain employments; and he cannot be ſubjected to a Council upon that account. Beſides, the threats employed muſt greatly offend the Pope in queſtion. He was threatened with a Council; which was treating him like a ſchool-boy, when a perſon ſays, that he will tell the Maſter of him. Farther, I would aſk any one, whether the putting down of a college or community of Sectaries, deſerves ſo much buſtle, and is of ſo much conſequence, as to merit the convening of a Council. But ſuch is the character of impatient men; they imagine that nothing is of greater conſequence to the world, than what is ſo to themſelves. Platina troubled his head very little about the reſt of the abuſes, but would have the Council chiefly employed in taking cognizance of the loſs which the apoſtolical Abbreviators had juſt before ſuſtained.

(8) Ibid.

REFLECTIONS on this Letter, which ſhew Platina's character.

[*D*] *He was expoſed to numberleſs inconveniencies.*] He was not permitted to have a fire in the depth of winter, though impriſoned in a tower which lay open to all the winds (9).

(9) *Revinctus compedibus & quidem graviſſimis media hieme ſine foco, celſa in turri ac ventis omnibus expoſita coerceor munſibus quatuor.* Platina, *in* Paulo II. folio 351.

[*E*] *The*

with as much ſeverity as the reſt: this conſpiracy was found to be a mere chimera, and yet not one of the priſoners was ſet at liberty; for the Court of Rome would have been aſhamed, to own her having treated perſons of merit with ſo much cruelty, on mere ſuſpicions [*E*]. When the charge of treaſon appeared too ill grounded, to inſiſt upon it, they turned the charge to that of Hereſy [*F*], which at laſt fell to the ground like the other. The priſoners were not ſet at liberty till a year after [*G*]. The Pope flattered Platina with the hopes that he would raiſe him to ſome good employment, and by that means prevented his leaving Rome. He ſpent two years in the vain expectation of the effect of theſe promiſes, after which the Pope died of the Apoplexy (*f*). Sixtus IV. his ſucceſſor, appointed Platina Librarian of the Vatican (*g*), whereby Platina found him-

(*f*) Extracted from Platina, *in* Vita Paulii II.

(*g*) The Vatican Library was ſet up by this Pope. Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 19.

[*E*] *The Court of Rome would have been aſhamed to own their having treated perſons of merit with ſo much cruelty, on mere ſuſpicions.*] I don't know whether, of all the defects found in man, vanity does not occaſion his committing the greateſt number of crimes. How many people begin an act of injuſtice, with a firm perſuaſion that they act juſtly? However, though they ſoon perceive the miſtake, pride not permitting them to own their fault, they proceed in their injuſtice, to prevent its being known that they began it without a cauſe. Every man chooſes to ſave his own reputation, rather than that of his neighbour; and hence ariſes the numberleſs ſhifts and cavils of ſuch informers, who are conſcious of their having calumniated others, and are afraid they ſhall be convicted on that account. Here we ſee a Pope, on account of a falſe punctilio of honour, obſtinately perſiſting in perſecuting men, who, contrary to his firſt ſuſpicions, were found innocent. *Chriſtophorus Veronenſis Pauli Medicus ad me veniens, bono inquit animo te eſſe jubet Paulus: ac de ſe bene ſperare brevique liberum futurum: ſciſcitor quando id fore ſperaret. Reſpondet homo liber audientibus omnibus qui tum aderant: non ita cito fieri poſſe ne levitatis & ſævitiæ arguretur pontifex, quod illos quos tanto tumultu concitato cepiſſet ac torſiſſet, ſtatim veluti innoxios dimitteret* (10), i. e. "Chriſtopher "of Verona, Phyſician to Pope Paul, coming to me "ſaid, Paul bids you be of good chear; to expect "the kindeſt treatment from him; and affirms "you will ſoon be ſet at liberty. I enquired, when "he imagined that would be. He anſwered, with "his uſual freedom, before all the perſons then pre-"ſent: this cannot be done ſo very ſoon, leſt the "Pontiff ſhould be charged with being fickle and "cruel, in caſe he ſhould immediately diſcharge, as "being innocent, a ſet of men whom he had cauſed "to be ſeized in a tumultous manner, and put to the "torture." See the remark [*A*] and [*B*] of the article EXPERIENS.

(10) Platina, *in* Paulo II. folio 358.

[*F*] *They turned the charge to that of Hereſy.*] We are told this by Platina: *Neque hoc quidem contentus Paulus quos paulo ante conjurationis & majeſtatis accerſierat, eoſdem mutata ſententia ob divulgatam fabulam hæreſeos accuſat* (11). Pomponius Lætus was ſeized in Venice and carried to Rome. He was accuſed of changing the names of ſome young men, and giving them Heathen names in the place of their Chriſtian ones. It is pretended that he did this, in order to excite them the more to honour and virtue; but the only anſwer he made was this; what is it to you or the Pope, if I have a mind to call myſelf *Fennel*, provided I have no evil deſign in it? *Rogatus cur nomina adoleſcentibus immutaret, ut homo liber erat, quid ad vos, inquit, & Paulum, ſi mihi fœniculi nomen indo, modo id ſine dolo ac fraude fiat. Amore namque vetuſtatis antiquorum præclara nomina repetebat, quaſi quædam calcaria quæ noſtram juventutem æmulatione ad virtutem incitarent* (12). Farther, theſe priſoners were charged with having embraced the principles of Plato; of diſputing in a doubtful manner on the immortality of the ſoul, and the exiſtence of God; and of having too great a regard for the heathen ſyſtem. *Multa nobis objicit* (Paulus) *ſed illud potiſſimum quod de immortalitate animorum diſputaremus, teneremuſque opinionem Platonii . . . . in dubium, inquit Paulus, diſputando Deum vocabatis. . . . . Præterea vero Paulus crimini nobis dabat, quod nimium gentilitatis amatores eſſemus* (13). They anſwered, 1ſt, That, if they had an affection for Plato, they did but imitate the great St. Auſtin. 2. That all the Divines and Philoſophers of that age diſputed on thoſe very truths, and called them in queſtion, in order to diſcover the certainty of them; for it is a rule in diſputation, not to look upon the ſubject in queſtion as certain; but to ſuppoſe it, for ſome time, to be uncertain, in order to ſearch, with an unprejudiced mind, for the reaſons and foundation of the belief a perſon entertains of it (14). 3. That, according to St. Auſtin, a perſon's obſtinacy in defending his errors, is what makes him a Heretic; but that they had always paid obedience to the diſcipline of the church. Platina inſiſted particularly on the innocence of his actions; that he had never omitted Confeſſion, and receiving the Sacrament once a year; and that he had never let drop a ſingle word againſt the Apoſtles Creed, or that favoured ever ſo little of Hereſy. *Nullum mihi facinus impingi poteſt, non furtum, non latrocinium, non ſacrilegium, non depeculatus, non parricidium, non rapina, non ſimonia. Vixi ut Chriſtianum decebat: confeſſionem & communionem in anno ſemel præſertim intermiſi nunquam. Nil ex ore meo excidit quod contra ſymbolum eſſet, aut hæreſim ſaperet.* He obſerves, that no perſon ſhewed a greater fondneſs for heathen antiquities than the Pope himſelf, he purchaſing all the antient ſtatues he could meet with, to adorn his palace, &c (15). Notwithſtanding this, the Pope ſet a mark of ignominy on the name of Academician or Academic; and pronounced all thoſe Hereticks, who, from that time, ſhould mention the word Academy, either in jeſt or earneſt. *Veteres Academicos ſequebamur, novos contemnentes qui in rebus ipſis nil certi ponebant. Paulus tamen hæreticos eos pronunciavit, qui nomen Academiæ vel ſerio vel joco deinceps commemorarent. Juncta eſt hæc ignominia Platoni; ipſe ſe tueatur* (16), i. e. "We followed the opinions "of the old Academics, deſpiſing the new, they "not allowing any certainty in the nature of things. "And yet Paul pronounced thoſe to be Hereticks, "who, from that time forward, ſhould mention the "word Academy, either joking or in earneſt. This "caſts an odium on Plato; let him defend himſelf." I have read in more than one Author, but I cannot now call any of them to mind, that this Pope was ſo great an enemy to the Sciences, that he forbid any perſon to uſe the word College or Academy. But thoſe who declared this, are groſsly miſtaken. For Paul II. did not condemn thoſe, who ſhould uſe the word Academy, in the ſignification of College or Houſe in which the Sciences are taught: He only condemned the ſceptical turn of mind of the Wits of his time, who, upon pretence of philoſophiſing in the manner of Plato, Founder of the antient Academy, made all things doubtful, and grew dangerous with reſpect to the foundations of the Goſpel.

(11) Ibid.

(12) Idem, ibid.

(13) Idem, ibid. folio 359.

(14) *In dubium, inquit Paulus, diſputando Deum vocabatis. Quod quidem omnibus Philoſophis & Theologis noſtrorum temporum objici poteſt, qui & animos & Deum & omnes intelligentias ſeparatas diſputandi ac veri inveniendi cauſa in dubium plérumque vocant.* Ibid. See the rem. [*L*], of the art. MALDONAT.

(15) *Cum nemo eo hujus rei ſtudioſior eſſet, quippe qui & ſtatuas veterum undique ex tota urbe conquiſitas in ſuas illas ædes quas ſub Capitolio extruebat congereret.* Ibidem.

(16) Ibid. folio 359 *verſo*, and folio 360.

[*G*] *The priſoners were not ſet at liberty till a year after.*] This proves Abbot Trithemius to have aſſerted a falſhood, he ſaying that our Platina was not releaſed out of priſon by Sixtus IV. till after the death of Paul II. *Multas à Paulo Papa II. calamitates ſuſtinuit, adeo ut bonis omnibus & dignitate ſpoliatus poſt equulei ſuſpenſionem in carcerem crudeliſſime detruſus, uſque ad mortem ipſius Pauli detentus ſit, qui à Sixto mox liberatus, &c* (17). When an Author writes the hiſtory of his own misfortunes, we ought to believe him, and not ſuppoſe that he has any occaſion to amplify matters. Trithemius ſhould have followed that maxim, and conſulted the life of Paul II. writ by the ſame perſon whoſe elogium he made. He then would have found the exact time he continued in priſon, and not have enlarged it, and thereby miſled many people to this day. *A. Paulo II. in carcerem conjectus, menſeſque quatuor ipſo detentus eſt, donec à ſucceſſore Sixto IV. liberatus* (18), i. e. "Paul II. threw him into "priſon, where he lay *four months, till he was ſet at* "*liberty by Sixtus* IV. *his ſucceſſor.*"

(17) Trithem. *de Scriptor. Eccleſ.* p. 356. Boiſſard ſays the ſame in Sir Thomas Pope-Blount, *Cenſ. Author.* p. 339.

(18) Boſius, *de comparanda Prudentia civili*, p. 377. Tom. 2. of the treatiſes *de ratione ſtudiorum*, collected and illuſtrated with a Commentary, by the learned Cremus, at Leyden 1696.

[*H*] *Here*

himſelf in his own element; and lived very happily in that ſtation, till the year 1481, when he was ſnatched away by the plague (*h*). He bequeathed to Pomponius Lætus, the houſe which he had built on *Mons Quirinalis*, with the Laurel grove, out of which the poetical crowns were taken (*i*). Here follows a catalogue of his writings [*H*]. Daniel William Mollerus, Profeſſor of the Univerſity of Altdorf, publiſhed a curious piece (*k*), which has been of great ſervice to me in the drawing up of this article. He obſerves, that Andrew Corthymius (*l*) has made three Platinas of one; he ſpeaking of Platina the Orator, Platina the Hiſtorian, and Platina a Father of the Church. He alſo obſerves, that Barthius imagines he perceived a very criminal myſtery, in Platina's not

(*b*) *Vide* the rem. [*A*], citat. (1).

(*i*) Jovius *Elog.* cap. 19.

(*k*) Entitled, *Diſputatio circularis de Platina.* Altdorf. d. 17. Febr. 1694.

(*l*) In *Florilegio Hiſtorico*, folio 204. num. 10. and folio 206. num. 4.

[*H*] *Here follows a catalogue of his writings.*] The moſt conſiderable of them is, the hiſtory of the Popes, from St. Peter to Sixtus IV. to whom he dedicated it. The Proteſtants approve of it well enough, and have ranked this Author in the catalogue of the witneſſes to the truth (19). See a paſſage from Illyricus hereunder. Some Roman Catholic Writers charge him with want of ſincerity and care: and yet Panvinius did not ſcruple to publiſh this hiſtory, with notes of his own; and to add to it the Lives of the Popes from Sixtus IV. to Pius IV. Cicarella, following the ſame plan, has joined to it the Lives of the Popes, from Pius V. to Clement VIII. The abovementioned work of Platina was firſt printed at Venice, in 1479, folio. Olearius (20) is therefore miſtaken, in ſuppoſing the edition of Nuremberg of 1481, to be the firſt. The Reader may ſee this remark in Mollerus's diſſertation (21), with a catalogue of ſeveral other editions. That which I make uſe of is not mentioned by him, and was printed at Lyons in 1512, 8vo. At the end of the work are the following words: *Excellentiſſimi hiſtorici Platynæ in vitas ſummorum Pontificum uſque ad Julium II. Ponti. Maxi. præclarum opus fœliciter explicit. Ludun. impreſſum à Gilberto de Villiers Borbonnio: impenſis honeſtiſſimi viri domini Vincentii de Prothonotariis & Conſtantini Fradin. Anno domini milleſimo quingenteſimo duodecimo. Die vero 22. menſis Februarii.* The beginning of this paragraph is very fallacious. It would lead one to believe, that Platina lived till the Pontificate of Julius II. and nevertheleſs it appears by ſome Latin verſes printed in the ſame year, and at the ſame printing-houſe, that Platina died under Sixtus IV. Bartholomew Ariſtophilus, Author of a Latin poem, inſerted in the collection of the funeral poems publiſhed in honour of Platina, ſays, in his ſhort preamble or introduction, that having ſucceeded, by the appointment of Sixtus, Platina, who was lately dead, as Librarian; and being lodged in the ſame apartment with Platina, he felt, &c. Mollerus has not omitted the catalogue of ſome German, Italian and French tranſlations of this work of Platina. He ſpeaks of a French verſion printed at Paris in 1516, folio; but takes no notice of a later tranſlation by the Sieur Coulon, and publiſhed at Paris in quarto, anno 1651. With regard to the paſſage of Illyricus, which I promiſed, it is as follows: *Etſi* Platina *turpiter & impudenter* Papis *adulatus ſit: tamen nimia ipſorum turpitudine ac malitiâ coactus aliquando, etiam ſubindicat* Babyloniæ Meretricis *nefanda ſcelera. In* Marcellino *queritur* Paparum *ſcelera eo excreviſſe, ut vix apud* Deum *miſericordiæ locum reliquerint: avaritiam, ſuperbiam, neglectum* Doctrinæ, *& Religionis ſimulationem, mores etiam in prophanis deteſtandos, propalam eſſe, ut inde laudem quærere videantur. In* Pontificibus *poſt milleſimum annum, ſubinde reperit,* Omnem pietatem & ſanctitatem à Papis ad Cæſares migraſſe (22), i. e. "Though Platina flattered the Roman Pontiffs in a ſhameful, impudent manner; he "yet is ſometimes forced, becauſe of their exceſſive "ſcandalous and wicked conduct, to mention the abominable crimes of the whore of Babylon. He "declares, in the Life of Marcellinus, that the Popes "were grown ſo extremely wicked, that there was "little probability of God's having mercy upon "them: that their avarice, pride, diſregard of "learning, hypocriſy, and vices, which would be "deteſted even in profane perſons, were become ſo "public, that one would conclude they were proud "of, and gloried in them. He frequently ſays, in "his Lives of the Popes, (after thoſe who lived after "the year of our Lord, one thouſand) that all piety "and ſanctity had ſhifted from the Roman Pontiffs to "the Emperors." I would willingly enough ſubſcribe to the judgment which Robert Chreyghton has formed of this work of Platina. *Platinam*, ſays he (23), *auctorem ſiccum & ſtrigoſum ſæpe verba, ſæpe ſenſus, multoties rerum experientia, nonnunquam integritas deſtituunt. Et quod magis miremur nunquam lapſus eſt gravius quam in Eugenii vita, ſub cujus temporibus floruit*, i. e. "Platina, a dry, jejune Writer, frequently wants words, "frequently ſenſe; experience very often, and ſometimes integrity: and, a circumſtance moſt to be "wondered at is, that he has not any where committed "greater miſtakes, than in the Life of Eugenius, under whoſe Pontificate he lived."

(19) See Simon Goulart, *in Catalogo Teſtium Veritatis*, vol. 1490.

(20) In *Abaco Patrolog.* p. 68.

(21) He might have obſerved, that Father Labbe, *de Script. Eccl.* Tom. 1. p. 174 has committed the ſame error as Olearius.

(22) Illyricus, lib. 19. *Catal. Teſtium Veritatis, apud* Pope-Blount, *Cenſ. celebr. Autor.* p. m. 339.

(23) Robertus Chreyghton, *Notis ad Sylveſtri Sguropuli Hiſtoriam Concilii Florentini*, ſect. 5. cap. 2.

Here follow the titles of the reſt of Platina's works. *De naturis rerum: Epiſtolæ ad diverſos: de honeſta voluptate & valetudine: de falſo & vero bono: contra amores: de vera nobilitate: de optimo cive: Panegyricus in laudem Beſſarionis: Oratio ad Paulum II. de pace Italiæ componenda & bello Turcico indicendo: de floſculis linguæ Latinæ.* There was printed at Lyons by Gryphius, in 1541, 8vo, at the end of *Cælii Apicii de re culinaria libri decem*, the following book, *P.* (24) *Platinæ Cremonenſis viri undecunque doctiſſimi de tuenda valetudine, natura rerum & popinæ ſcientia, ad ampliſſimum D. D. B. Rovarellam S. Clementis Preſbyterum Cardinalem libri decem.* This work was unworthy of its Author; and therefore I don't wonder that Sannazarius ridiculed it in the ſubſequent epigram:

Ingenia & mores vitaſque obituſque notaſſe
Pontificum, argutæ lex fuit hiſtoriæ.
Tu tamen hinc lautæ tractas pulmenta culinæ;
Hoc Platina eſt ipſos paſcere pontifices (α).

"When you deſcribe the genius, manners, lives,
"And deaths of Pontiffs, then you're an Hiſtorian:
"But when to kitchen-arts you turn your pen,
"Juſtly you're look'd upon to be their Cook.

(24) *A P* has been printed inſtead of *B.* Mollerus, p. 7. obſerves, that there is miſprinted, in the catalogue of Thuanus's library, p. 119. part 1. *John Bapt. Platinæ*, and p. 182. part 2. *Petri Platinæ.* Now this error was not made by thoſe who drew up the catalogue, but by thoſe who printed Platina's works.

§ (α) Sannazarius falſely ſuppoſed, that Platina, after having writ the Lives of the Popes, had deſcended ſo low as to write on Cookery. See the new *Menagiana*, Paris edition of 1715, p. 69 and 70. By the way, the laſt editions of Platina are not the moſt faithful. For inſtance, in Pope Cletus's Life, folio 13, in John Petit's edition of 1530, 8vo, we read *Uxorem habuit in Bythinia*, i. e. "He had a wife in "Bithynia," with which alſo agrees an old Italian tranſlation I have ſeen; whereas the following editions have corrupted it; *Uxorem non habens in Bithynia*, i. e. "Not having a wife in Bithynia." REM. CRIT.

The Lyons edition of 1541, was preceded by that of Colen 1529 and 1537, 8vo. The Italian book which I have ſeen, intitled *B. Scacchi Cuoco ſecreto di Papa Paolo II. Opera, dove ſi tratta di diverſe vivande, &c. con le figure in* 4. *Venet.* 1570, is not a tranſlation of Platina's ten books, *de tuenda valetudine & popinæ ſcientia.* This Italian work is cited after another manner by Lanzius: *Extat*, ſays he (25), *memorabilis liber artis Apicianæ* de culina & architriclini officio di M. Bartholomeo Scappi cuoco ſecreto di Papa Pio V. qui nunc præfectus eſt *(ait * ille)* noſtris intimis coquis, non ſine ejuſdem privilegio & approbatione inquiſitorum hæreticæ pravitatis, *Venetiis editus anno* M.D.LXXI. *ſed & ante hunc Bartholomæum extant Platinæ, Suetonii Pontificii de popinæ ſcientia libri* 10. *ad Cardinalem Rovarellam.* It is plain Lanzius was perſuaded, that his *Bartholomew Scappi*, called by others *Bartholomew Scacchi*, is not the ſame perſon with Platina, and he is right in his conjecture, B. Scappi's book containing a relation of the funeral obſequies of Paul III. at which the Author was preſent. I am to obſerve, that it is a thick quarto, divided into

(25) *Orat. contra Italiam*, p. m. 845, 846.

* M. Freher. *Comm. ad Conſtant. Donat.*

not mentioning either Chriſt's Reſurrection or Aſcenſion [*I*]. Varillas has committed ſome errors [*K*].

fix books, treating of the ſeveral ways of dreſſing fiſh, fleſh, &c. There are a great number of plates (26).

(26) This particular I procured from the Mazarine library.

With regard to the Hiſtory of Mantua, written by Platina, Mollerus (27) affirms, that Lambecius publiſhed it in 1674. He nevertheleſs owns, that he was not able to purchaſe one copy of it, though he made all the enquiries poſſible; and that Martin Defenbachius (28) affirms, that this work was never publiſhed. The original of this Hiſtory of Mantua was left, by the Author himſelf, to Gaudentius Merula, who ſent it to Oporinus, a Printer at Baſil, in order for him to print it. Oporinus died before he printed it, and left it to the eldeſt ſon of his good friend Theodorus Zwingerus (29). It is certain that Lambecius publiſhed it with notes, in Vienna, anno 1675, in 4to. In the 10th *Giornale de Letterati* 1676, we have an extract of it, by which we are informed, that this work is divided into ſix books, and not into ſeven, as Poſſevinus affirms (30), or into three, as Voſſius imagined (31); and that Lambecius, who affirms, in oppoſition to Trithemius, Angelus Rocca, Raphael Volaterranus, Boiſſard and Voſſius, that Platina's name was Baptiſt, and not Bartholomew, is refuted by a brief of the Pope, in the Vatican Library. It is the brief in which Platina is nominated Keeper of that Library, and he is named Bartholomew in it. This proof was not known to Voſſius. Wharton (32) obſerves, that Richard Flemyngus, who was well acquainted with Platina, and beſtowed the higheſt encomiums on him (33), calls him Bartholomew § (α).

(27) *De Platina*, p. 26.

(28) *De Henrico VII Imperat.* p. 47.

(29) Diſenbachius, ibid. *apud* Mollerum, p. 27.

(30) In *Apparatu Sacro.*

(31) *De Hiſtor. Latinis*, p. 589.

(32) *In Append. ad Cave, Hiſt. Literar. Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.* p. 153.

(33) *In* lib. 1. *Lucubrationum Tiburtinarum.*

§ (α) As alſo Benedictus Curtius (Benoît le Court) in his Commentary on the Decrees of Love *(les Arrets d'Amour;)* and Boiſſard in the title of an Epigram which he made on him, printed in the *Deliciæ Poetarum Galliæ*, Tom. 1.] REM. CRIT.

[*I*] *Barthius imagines he perceived a very criminal myſtery, in Platina's not mentioning either Chriſt's Reſurrection or Aſcenſion.*] Mollerus writes as follows. Improbitatis *alicujus Platinam accuſaturi ad* Caſp. Barth. animadverſ. in Guil. Briton. lib. 6. Philipp. p. 459. *provocare ſolent, quippe ubi verba reperire liceat ſequentia Auguſti hoc dictum (nempe* melius eſt Herodis porcum eſſe quam filium: *de quo vid.* Macrob. in jocis Auguſto lib. 2. c. 4) *illuſtravit renaſcentibus literis* B. Platina in primo ſuorum Pontificum nempe Domino & Deo noſtro Jeſu Chriſto. *Qui improbe tamen hoc & profane, quod vita ſervatoris obituque utcunque commemoratis, glorioſiſſimam reſurrectionem è mortuis & aſcenſionem in cœlum, ne uno quidem verbo attigit. Cauſa facile à ſagacibus hominibus odoranda* (34). i. e. "Such "perſons as charge Platina with impiety, alledge "Caſpar Barthius's Animadverſions, where, the following words are found immediately after this ſaying "Auguſtus, *it is better to be Herod's hog than his ſon:* "(for which ſee Macrobius) *B. Platina*, on the reviſ "val of Literature explained, *in the Life of his firſt* "*Pope, viz. of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* He yet acted the "part of a wicked and impious Writer, inaſmuch "as, though he ſpoke of our Saviour's Life and "Death, he yet does not mention a word of his "moſt glorious Reſurrection and Aſcenſion into Hea"ven; the reaſon of which may be eaſily gueſſed "by ſagacious perſons." Mollerus does not grant that Platina omitted the Reſurrection and Aſcenſion of Jeſus Chriſt; *Sed tamen Platinam*, ſays he, mortis & reſurrectionis Chriſti *meminiſſe ex principio ſtatim vitæ S. Petri inſpecto apparebit ubi verba occurrunt iſta:* poſt Chriſti mortem & reſurrectionem completis jam diebus Pentecoſtes Spiritum S. accepere diſcipuli, *i. e.* "It will yet appear, that Platina mentioned Chriſt's "Death and Reſurrection, by the peruſal of the be"ginning of St. Peter's Life, where we find the fol"lowing words: after the death and reſurrection of "Chriſt, the days of Pentecoſt being fulfilled, the "Diſciples received the Holy Ghoſt." The Reader ſees in what manner he proves that Platina has mentioned thoſe two myſteries; but then he ſeems to entertain a ſuſpicion, that there is ſome fraud in this Author's proceeding, upon pretence that the chapter which treats of Chriſt, ſays nothing with regard to the Reſurrection and Aſcenſion of the Meſſiah. He mentions, but without refuting them, the ſuſpicions ſome entertained, that Platina's intention was to increaſe the glory of the Popes. *Certum autem eſt in vitæ Chriſti deſcriptione neque reſurrectionis è mortuis neque aſcenſionis in cœlum mentionem ullam eſſe injectam, non tam ob brevitatis cauſſam, ut aliqui ſuſpicati ſunt, quam ut nonnullorum ex opinione, inſignior inſequentes Pontifices gloria maneret* (35). I will own, that all I comprehend here is, that many perſons make themſelves ridiculous, by an over affectation of ſagacity. Such perſons ſeek for political views or deſigns in the plaineſt and moſt indifferent matters. I would gladly hear from any perſon, the advantage which would accrue to the Popes, from Platina's mentioning Chriſt's Reſurrection and Aſcenſion, not in the chapter which treats of Chriſt, but in the following which treats of St. Peter. I am of opinion that Platina would be greatly ſurprized, were it poſſible for him to know that ſuch fineſſes are aſcribed to him, ſo unworthy of his country.

(24) Mollerus, *de Platina*, p. 23.

(25) Idem, ibid.

[*K*] *Varillas has committed ſome errors* (36)] The 1ſt is, his aſſerting that Platina was born in Cremona. 2d, Cardinal Beſſarion did not requeſt Platina to write the Lives of the Popes. 3d, The work in queſtion was not writ before the Pontificate of Pope Paul II. Theſe two falſities are clearly refuted by the dedication, in which Platina ſays twice, that he wrote the Hiſtory of the Popes by order of Sixtus IV. *Tu itaque Theologorum ac Philoſophorum princeps Maxime Pontifex hac hominum utilitate motus ſimulque dignitati eccleſiaſticæ conſulens, non fruſtra* MANDASTI *ut res geſtas Pontificum ſcriberem . . . . . ſi quid emolumenti ex hac ſcriptione noſtra perceperint, tibi ſoli Pontifex optime gratias agant, cujus ſanctiſſimo* IMPERIO *libenter* OBTEMPERAVI. 4*th, Paul II. did not appoint him his Secretary*; as being raiſed to that employment by Pius II. and diveſted of it by Paul II.

(36) In the *Anecdotes* of Florence, p. 171.

PLOTINA (POMPEIA), wife of the Emperor Trajan, has been honoured with great elogiums by ſome Authors. She was not handſome; and it appears by her medals that there was more gravity than charms in her face (*a*); but ſhe was prudent and modeſt. Trajan married her before Nerva had adopted him [*A*]. The words ſhe ſpoke at her firſt coming into the Imperial Palace are highly worthy of notice; going up the ſtair-caſe ſhe turned about to the people, and ſaid, that *ſhe went into the palace juſt ſuch as ſhe deſired to come out of it* (*b*) [*B*]. She conducted herſelf ſo well during the whole courſe

(*a*) Triſtan, *Comment. Hiſt.* Tom. 1. p. 428.

(*b*) Xiphilin. *in* Trajano.

[*A*] *Trajan married her before Nerva had adopted him.*] This is evident from the following words of Pliny's Panegyric. *Idem eſtis invicem*, ſays he to Trajan, *quod fuiſtis: probatis ex æquo, nihilque vobis felicitas addidit, niſi quod ſcire cœpiſtis, quam bene uterque veſtrum felicitatem ferat.* i. e. "You are mutually "the ſame to each other as what you uſed to be: "equally well ſatisfied; and proſperity adds nothing "to you, except the giving you an opportunity of "being ſenſible how well you both ſhould bear pro"ſperity." And a little after ſpeaking of Plotina and Marciana, he obſerves that they behaved, when living in the Emperor's palace, with as little pride as if they had not been perſons of quality: *Neque enim unquam periclitabuntur eſſe privatæ, quæ non deſierunt.* i. e. "Theſe will never be in danger of becoming "private women ſince they have ever conducted "themſelves as ſuch."

[*B*] *She ſaid, that ſhe went into the palace, juſt as ſhe deſired to come out of it.*] Moreri has diſguiſed Plotina's thought. He ſays *that ſhe proteſted, the firſt time ſhe went into the palace, ... that ſhe would re adily*

course of her reign, that she was not once murmured at (c). She refused the title of Augusta, so long as her Consort refused that of Father of his country *Pater Patriæ* (d). The counsels she gave to Trajan were of prodigious serviced to the Provinces, since they occasioned the redressing of numberless grievances under which the people groaned (e). The union which subsisted between hers and Marciana Trajan's sister, is a conspicuous proof of her wisdomand good temper; there being generally nothing seen but animosities and factions between the wives and sisters of Princes [C]. She was with Trajan when he died in Selinunta a city of Cilicia, the year of our Lord 117; and it was she who carried to Rome the ashes of her husband, accompanied by Tatian and Matidia, Trajan's niece (f). She did many good offices to Adrian [D], who was obliged to her for the Empire. There have always been so many slanderers in the world, that Plotina's modesty, and so many good and great qualities for which she was conspicuous [E], could not secure her from the venom of slanderous tongues. She was thought to entertain a passion for Adrian [F], and to this they ascribed his enjoyment of all the exalted posts to which he was raised. Some affirm that he was not adopted by Trajan

(c) Xiphilin. *in* Trajano.

(d) Plinius, *in* Panegyr.

(e) Aurel. Victor. *Epitom. in* Juliano.

(f) Spartian. *in* Adriano, cap. 5. p. m. 51.

readily go out of it whenever she should be desired to do it. But this was not her meaning. She wished that her exalted condition might not change her manners; and that, when she should be obliged to quit her post, she might have the same turn of mind and moderation, she found herself in, at her taking possession of the imperial palace. Such a wish is worthy of a great soul, and respects a happiness which is rarely met with. *Honores mutant mores*. i. e. "Honours change "people's manners."

[C] *There being generally nothing seen but animosities and factions between the wives and sisters of Princes*] Let us hear the Panegyrist of Trajan on this subject. *Nihil est tam pronum ad simultates quam æmulatio, in feminis præsertim: ea porro maxime nascitur ex conjunctione, alitur æqualitate, exardescit invidia, cujus finis est odium. Quo quidem admirabilius existimandum est, quod mulieribus duabus in una domo, parique fortuna, nullum certamen, nulla contentio est. Suspiciunt invicem, invicem cedunt: quumque te utraque effusissimè diligat, nihil sua putant interesse, utram tu magis ames. Idemque utrique propositum, idem tenor vitæ, nihilque ex quo sentias duas esse*. "i. e. "Nothing is so apt to breed "contentions as emulation, particularly in the fair-sex. "Now this passion, which arises chiefly from their "being near to one another, is fomented by their "equality, and is greatly encreased by envy, which "ever ends in hatred. It is therefore the more sur"prizing that two Ladies of the same quality should "live in the same house, without the least strife or "animosity. They mutually respect and bear with "one another: and as both have the strongest affec"tion for you, neither of them thinks herself con"cerned which of them is best beloved by you. "Their views, as well as their course of life, is the "same; and there does not appear any thing which "may distinguish them to be two persons." It would be impossible for a writer to give a more advantageous idea of the merit of two Princesses. Pliny had a wonderful talent in drawing characters; and he had reason to consider this concord as an advantage on which he might congratulate Trajan: for generally Princes are vastly unhappy in their family, how happy soever they may be in other respects, if a mother, a wife, a sister, a mother-in-law, a daughter, a daughter-in-law, &c. live under the same roof with them. These will put them to more trouble (nay, the half, the third part of this will do it) than their whole Government gives them. But when I see Panegyrists in this age, who represent Princes, not as they were, but as they should have been, according to the very sublime ideas of an orator; when I consider, I say, all this, I suspect that Pliny went very much beyond the truth.

[D] *She did many good offices to Adrian*.] It was she who brought about his marriage with Trajan's grandniece (1), and procured him a Government at the time when the expedition was carried on against the Parthians (2); afterwards his Consulship (3), and at last the Empire (4).

(1) Spartian. *in* Adriano, cap. 2. p. 23.

(2) Idem, cap. 4. p. 38.

(3) Idem, p. 40.

(4) Idem, p. 46.

[E] *The good and great qualities for which she was conspicuous*.] Pliny contrasts, whenever he has an opportunity for it, Trajan's perfections with the imperfections of other Princes. He does not omit that grand article of marriage. He says that many illustrious persons had dishonoured themselves on that occasion: but that, with regard to Trajan, it was one of the most glorious passages in history. *Multis illustribus dedecori fuit aut inconsultius uxor assumpta, aut retenta patientius, ita foris claros domestica destruebat infamia* (5), *& ne maximi cives haberentur, hoc efficiebat quod mariti minores erant. Tibi uxor in decus & gloriam cedit. Quid enim illa sanctius? Quid antiquius? Nonne si Pontifici Maximo deligenda sit conjunx, aut hanc, aut similem (ubi est autem similis) elegerit? Quàm illa nihil sibi ex fortuna tua nisi gaudium vendicat? Quàm constanter non potentiam tuam, sed ipsum te reveretur? . . Eadem quam modica cultu, quàm parca commitatu, quàm civilis incessu!* i. e. "Many illustrious men have "brought shame upon themselves, either by their "marrying inconsiderately, or their exercising too "much patience when they had a bad wife, by which "means their domestic infamy threw a shade over "the glory they gained abroad; and their being "weak husbands, prevented their being considered as "august citizens. But, to you your wife is an ornament "and glory. Who can be more devout than she is? "What woman descends from nobler ancestors? "Were the High-Priest himself to make choice of a "wife, would he not pitch upon her, or one like her, "(but where is there one such?) Is not the joy "which accrues to her from your good fortune all "she requires? How inviolably does she adhere to "your person, not to your power? . . . . . Then, "how modest is she in her attire? How slender her "retinue? How gracious her air!" He calls her, in "one of his epistles (6), a most holy woman: *Injungis mihi jucundissimum ministerium, ut ad Plotinam sanctissimam feminam litteræ tuæ perferantur*. i. e. "You enjoin me a most pleasing task, when you order "me to send your letter to Plotina, that most holy "woman."

(5) Compare this with what Tacitus says, chap. 24. book 3. *Ut valida divo Augusto in Remp. fortuna, ita domi improspera fuit ob impudicitiam filiæ ac nepotis quas urbe depulit.* See citat. (5), of the article LEWIS VII. and rem. [G], of the article HELOISE.

(6) The 28th of lib. 9.

[F] *She was thought to entertain a passion for Adrian*.] Dion tells us plainly so. Ἐξ ἐρωτικῆς φιλίας, *i. e.* "From love," (says he) in one place; ἐρᾶσης αὐτοῦ διαφερόντως, *i. e.* "had a violent passion for "him," (says he) in another. How malicious the world is! People cannot see a woman entertain an affection for a man, and use their utmost endeavours to heap honours and possessions upon him, but they instantly imagine that she entertains a criminal passion for him. A disparity with regard to age, so far from silencing the Satyrists, only sharpens their pen. Those assert, that when the Patroness is in the decline of her charms (a grandmother perhaps) if such a one shews an eagerness in making the fortune of a young man, it is a stronger indication of a criminal correspondence, than if she was but twenty. She would not be so fond in her old age, will a Satyrist say, if she did not think it incumbent on her to pay a young fellow for the nights he indulges her, and which he might have spent much more delightfully elsewhere; she would not be so forward to serve, recommend, and lay out money for a man, if she was not desirous that the tribute or amour should continue. In a word, the slander has an eye to the following verses of Juvenal.

Cum te summoveant qui testamenta merentur
Noctibus, in cælum quos evehit optima summi
Nunc via processus, vetulæ vesica beatæ (7).

(7) Juvenal, Sat. 1. ver. 37.

"When night-performance holds the place of
merit,
"And brawn and back the next of kin disherit;
"For such good parts are in preferment's way,
"The rich old madam never fails to pay
"Her legacies." DRYDEN.

Trajan [G]; but that Plotina, concealing his death, made another perſon ſpeak in his name in a feint tone of voice, in order that the people might hear that Adrian was declared that Prince's ſon and ſucceſſor. It does not appear that ſhe ever bore children. After her death, Adrian, who had always ſhewed himſelf very thankful for her favours [H], expreſſed an extraordinary grief on that occaſion. He put on mourning nine days: compoſed hymns, and built a temple in her honour (g); and put her in the catalogue of the Goddeſſes (b). He had before built a temple at Niſmes in her honour (i). The family and country of Plotina are unknown: and it is very ſurprizing that the Hiſtorians of that age ſhould have been ſo careleſs as not to make the leaſt mention of them. They alſo have been ſilent with regard to the time of her death. De Tillemont (k) fancies he had found a paſſage in Dion, whence it may be concluded that ſhe died in 129: but I would not adviſe any perſon to truſt to his conjecture, till ſuch time as he ſhews the reaſon for which he pretends to draw that concluſion. Moreri, who fixes Plotina's death in the year 122, cannot prove his aſſertion. As to what he adds, that Adrian built a *Temple*, a *Palace*, and an *Amphitheatre*, in her honour, at Niſmes, it would be equally difficult to prove it. Spartianus ſpeaks only of a Baſilica (l), but does not ſay whether or no Plotina was then living.

(g) Xiphilin. *in* Adriano.

(b) We meet with ſome inſcriptions in Gruterus's *Theſaurus*, where mention is made of the Prieſts of the Goddeſs Plotina, *Sacerdos Divæ Plotinæ*. See Triſtan's *Commentaries*, Tom. 1. p. 430.

(i) Spartan. *in* Adrian. cap. 12. p. m. 110.

(k) *Hiſt. de Empereurs, Vie d'Adrien*, p. m. 426.

(l) Spartian. *in* Adriano, cap. 12. p. m. 110.

[G] *Some affirm that he was not adopted by Trajan.*] Dion affirms (8), that Apronienus his father, who was Governor of Cilicia, had told him, that Trajan's death was concealed for ſome days, in order to give ſucceſs to the intrigue of his adoption; and that this incident was known, by this Prince's letter to the Senate, not ſigned by him, but by Plotina, a circumſtance which had never happened before. Dodwell refutes Dion in his learned lectures on Spartian (9). By the way, Dion is not the only Writer who ſays this. *Nec deſunt*, ſays another, *qui factione Plotinæ mortuo jam Trajano Adrianum in adoptionem adſcitum eſſe prodiderint, ſuppoſito qui pro Trajano feſſa voce loqueretur* (10), i. e. "Nor are Writers wanting who "declared, that Adrian, after Trajan's death, was "adopted by the intrigues of Plotina, ſhe having "ſuborned a perſon to ſpeak, in a feint tone of "voice, for Trajan." How difficult is it to refute a probable ſlander?

(8) *In* Adriano, *init.*

(9) Page 538.

(10) Spartan. cap. 4. p. 45.

[H] *Adrian .... had .... always ſhewed himſelf very thankful for her favours.*] Triſtan (11) relates, that *Adrian had left, by his will, very conſiderable legacies to Plotina, in caſe he ſhould happen to die firſt; which I learn*, adds he, *from the Law*; Si Auguſtæ legaveris, ff. de legat. & fidei commiſſ. *lib.* 2. *which relates it in manner following.* Si Auguſtæ legaveris, & ea inter homines eſſe deſierit: deficit quod ei relictum eſt, ſicuti divus Hadrianus in Plotina & proxime Imperator Antoninus in Fauſtinæ Auguſtæ perſona conſtituit, cum ea ante inter homines eſſe deſiiſſet quàm teſtator decederet. i. e. "If you bequeath a legacy "to the Empreſs, and ſhe die, that article of the "will is void, as Adrian ordained with regard to "Plotina; and lately Antoninus the Emperor with "reſpect to Fauſtina, ſhe leaving the world before "the Teſtator."

(11) *Comment. Hiſt.* Tom. 1. p. 430.

PLOTINUS, a Platonic Philoſopher, flouriſhed in the third Century. His genius was greatly ſuperior to the vulgar herd of Philoſophers, and his ideas were very ſingular and extraordinary. He was aſhamed of being lodged in a body, for which reaſon he did not care to tell the place of his birth (a), or his family. The contempt he had for every thing terreſtrial, was the reaſon why he would not permit any perſon to draw his picture [A]: and if his Diſciples had not met with one who drew it by memory, they would not have had the ſatisfaction they deſired. I am of opinion that he refuſed, from the ſame

(a) We nevertheleſs know, that he was born in Lycopolis, a city of Egypt. Eunapius, *in* Plotino.

(1) Οὐ γὰρ ἄρκει φέρειν ὃ ἡ φύσις εἰδώλου ἡμᾶς περιτέθεικεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰδώλα εἴδωλον συγχωρεῖν αὐτὸν ἄξιον πολυχρονιώτερον καταλιπεῖν, ὡς δή τι τῶν ἀξίων θεάτων ἔργων. *Quaſi vero non ſatis hanc imaginem ferre ſit quam natura nobis ab initio circumdedit: etiam cenſus imaginis hujus imaginem diuturniorem inſuper poſteris ut opus ſpectaculo dignum relinquendum?* Porphyr. *in* Vita Plotin. *init.*

[A] *He would not permit any perſon to draw his picture.*] Amelius, his Diſciple, was urgent with him to have it drawn, but all to no purpoſe; is it not enough (ſaid he) to drag after us, whitherſoever we go, that image in which nature has ſhut us up? Do you think that we ſhould likewiſe tranſmit, to future ages, an image of that image, as a ſight worthy of their attention (1). How noble is that thought! none but narrow minds can diſpute its being ſuch. Madam Des-Houlieres has writ ſome admirable verſes on the vanity, which prompts perſons to ſit for their pictures (2). The elevation and depth of her morality is admirable. A Lady, who thinks ſo nobly, ought to have lived in Plotinus's age, for our's was unworthy of her: mankind, in our age, have too mean ſouls; and pay too great a regard to the body and the goods of fortune. There are no Plotinus's now a-days. Madam Des-Houlieres herſelf yielded to the temptation of being drawn (3): ſhe felt a pleaſure in ſeeing herſelf grown young again, by Mademoiſelle Cheron's * pencil; and to think ſhe ſhould not be unknown, in that reſpect, when ſhe ſhould exiſt no more. Here follows what ſhe ſaid of the Lady who painted her.

Elle me rend enfin mes premieres couleurs;
Par ſon art la race future
Conoîtra les preſens que me fit la nature:
Et je puis aſperer qu'avec un tel ſecours,
Tandis que j'errerai ſur les ſombres rivages,
Je pourrai faire encor quelque honneur à nos jours.
Oui je puis m'en flater: plaire & durer toûjours
Eſt le deſtin de ſes ouvrages.

" Her colours paint me in youth's lovely bloom:
" By her ſweet art, ages to come will ſee
" The preſents which from nature I receiv'd.
" I've room to hope, that, by her charming aid,
" I ſtill may do ſome honour to our age,
" Whilſt, pale, I wander round the dreary coaſt.
" My hopes are juſt: whate'er her pencil forms,
" (Happy effect!) muſt pleaſe and laſt for ever."

To grow young again in painting, and in ſculpture, (will it be ſaid) is a trifle: to be pleaſed (will it be farther ſaid) at the reflection that future ages will not be ignorant that we once were young and beautiful, is contenting ourſelves with honours that are entirely chimerical. But who knows this better than the Lady in queſtion; and does not ſhe, from thence, draw the moſt delicate part of her reflection? Here follows the laſt verſes of her Poem.

Hé, comment pourrois-je pretendre
De guerir les mortels de cette vieille erreur,
Qu'ils aiment juſqu' à la fureur,
Si moi qui la condamne ai piene à m'en defendre?
Ce portrait dont Apelle auroit été jaloux,
Me remplit malgré moi de la flateuſe attente,
Que je ne ſaurois voir dans autrui ſans couroux.
Foible raiſon que l'homme vante!
Voilà quel eſt le fond qu'on peut faire ſur vous:
Toûjours vains, toûjours faux, toûjours pleins d'injuſtices,
Nous crions dans tous nos diſcours
Contre les paſſions, les foibleſſes, les vices
Où nous ſuccombons tous les jours.

" Ah!

(2) They are printed in the *Mercure Galant*, for November 1693.

(3) When I wrote this, ſhe was living. She died the 17th of February 1694.

* Mademoiſelle le Hay, and Mademoiſelle Cheron, are the ſame perſon. From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 973. col. 2.]

ſame principle, to make uſe of ſeveral things which were thought very conducive to health [*B*]: but it was another reaſon which prompted him to reject the uſe of clyſters, to which he was adviſed, as being an excellent remedy for the colic; he not thinking it becoming, or ſuitable to the gravity of an old Philoſopher, to employ ſuch a remedy (*b*). He began very early to ſhow a great ſingularity both in his taſte and manners: for, at eight years of age, at the time when he went to ſchool, he uſed to run to his nurſe, and uncover her breaſt to ſuck, which he uſed to do very greedily; but he diſcontinued that practice, upon her chiding him for it, and telling him that he was troubleſome. At twenty eight years of age he had a ſtrong deſire to apply himſelf to the ſtudy of Philoſophy, on which occaſion he was recommended to the moſt famous Profeſſors of Alexandria, but he was not ſatisfied with their Lectures, and was always very melancholy at his return from them. A friend of his being informed of the cauſe of his diſtaſte, did not find a better remedy than to take him to Ammonius's Lectures, in which he was not miſtaken in his conjectures, for the inſtant Plotinus heard that Philoſopher, he confeſſed to his friend that this was the man he was in ſearch of. He ſpent eleven years together under that excellent maſter, and became a great Philoſopher. The excellent learning he had imbibed, only inſpired him with a ſtronger deſire to acquire ſtill more, and to hear the Perſian and Indian Philoſophers: for which reaſon he did not let ſlip the opportunity with which the war the Emperor Gordianus intended to wage againſt the Perſians furniſhed him (*c*). Accordingly he followed the Roman army, but in all probability repented of it, becauſe it was with great difficulty he ſaved his life by flight, after the Emperor had been ſlain. He was then thirty nine years of age. The year following he went to Rome, and read Lectures of philoſophy of that city. He indeed there taught thoſe particulars which he had learnt from his maſter Ammonius; but he did not follow the example of Erennius and Origen, his fellow-pupils, who having promiſed (as he did) not to impart to the publick the moſt excellent particulars in which Ammonius had inſtructed them, had nevertheleſs forfeited their word. As for Plotinus, he continued ten years in Rome, without writing one book; but having afterwards writ twenty, he ſhewed them to ſuch only as he knew to be perſons of judgment. In the fiftieth year of his age Porphyry became his Diſciple, who being ſo fine a genius, muſt neceſſarily be employment enough for him. Porphyry was not ſatisfied with ſuperficial anſwers, but required to have all difficulties explained thoroughly; and therefore Plotinus, to treat things with the greater accuracy, was obliged to write ſome books [*C*]. He wrote four and twenty in the ſix years that Porphyry was his Diſciple; and theſe twenty four added to the twenty one which he had writ before Porphyry's arrival, together with the nine which he compoſed after that this Diſciple had left Rome, make in all fifty four books. They are divided into ſix Enneas's, and are all upon very abſtruſe ſubjects [*D*]. They exhibit three different ages

(*b*) Καὶλιαχῦ δὲ νόσου πολλάκις παρατεινούμενος ὅτε κλυστῆρος ἐνίσχυτο, οὐκ εἶναι πρὸς τὸ πρεσβυτέρῳ λέγων ὑπομένειν πάς ταῦτας θεραπείας. *Proinde cum ſæpe colico vexaretur morbo, ſemper clyſteres renuit negans decere ſenem curationes ejuſmodi.* Porphyr. *in* Vita Plotini, p. 1. The Tranſlator, inſtead of *Colico*, ſhould have read *Cœliaco.*

(*c*) In 243.

" Ah! how ſhou'd I pretend to cure proud mortals
" Of a vain error they ſo dearly love,
" If I, who cenſure it, am weak as they?
" This portrait, which had made Apelles jealous,
" Inſpires proud hopes (I yet attempt to check;)
" Hopes I deſpiſe in others, and deteſt.
" How weak is reaſon! man's eternal boaſt!
" What man can truſt to thy deluſive aid!
" Tho' vain, falſe and unjuſt, ſtill we exclaim
" Againſt thoſe paſſions, vices, and injuſtice,
" To which (ſtrange creatures!) we are daily victims."

This greatly ſets off the victory which Plotinus gained over ſo general a weakneſs: and all true Philoſophers ought to rejoice, that ſo noble a triumph ſhould have been reſerved for one of their greateſt heroes. Plotinus's picture was drawn, I confeſs; but then he knew nothing of the matter; Amelius brought an excellent painter into the ſchool. This painter gazed upon Plotinus as long as ever he thought proper, and drew him from the idea he had formed to himſelf of him in his mind, and the portrait was extremely like. Amelius had taken the pains, to cauſe all ſuch features to be retouched, as required correction (4). Here follows another triumph of Plotinus. He could never be prevailed upon to inform any perſon of the day or month in which he was born (5), and for this reaſon, becauſe he did not deſire to have it celebrated with feaſts and ſacrifices: and yet he himſelf never failed to celebrate thoſe of Socrates and Plato after the ſame manner (6). Was not this deſpiſing that idle vapour immortal fame?

(4) Idem, Porph. *in* Vita Plotini, p. 2. *C.*

(5) See Porphyr. *in* Plotinus's Life.

(6) See the ſame *Life.*

CHARACTERISTICKS of a Coquet.

Not knowing whether I ſhall meet with a better opportunity of employing a remark which I read in *Furetieriana*, I may juſtly introduce it here. " Coquets are eaſily known by their dreſs, by the people who viſit them, their ſervants, their way of ſpeaking; and they alſo are known by the number of copies they cauſe to be taken of their portraits. " One of theſe Ladies having ſat for her picture to " Mademoiſelle le Hay, cauſed five copies to be taken " of it. Heavens! (ſays a Gentleman) what can " make this woman order ſo many portraits to be " drawn? *Quoniam multiplicatæ ſunt iniquitates ejus,* " (becauſe her ſins are multiplied) replied Mademoiſelle le Hay very agreeably (7)."

(7) *Furetieriana*, p. 171. Dutch edit.

[*B*] *He refuſed . . . . . to make uſe of ſeveral things which were thought very conducive to health.*] He never made uſe of preſervatives or baths, and did not even eat the fleſh of tame animals (8). He eat but little; and abſtained very often from bread, which, joined to his intenſe meditation, kept him very much from ſleeping (9).

(8) Οὔτε τὰς θηριακὰς ἀνθιδοῦναι λαβεῖν ὑπέμεινε. μὴ δὲ τῶν ἡμέρων ζώων τὰς ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τροφὰς προσήσθαι λέγων. λουτροῦ δὲ ἀπεχόμενος. *Neque theriaca antidota unquam accepit, cum nec ex animalium quoque manſuetorum corporibus capere eſcam ſe diceret. Abſtinebat & balneis.* Porphyr. *in* Vita Plotin. p. 1.

(9) Idem, p. 6. *ſub fin.*

[*C*] *Plotinus, to treat things with the greater accuracy, was obliged to write ſome books.*] It is ſcarce poſſible to determine any queſtion merely by conferences or verbal diſputes: both ſides may very probably miſtake the queſtion, and they forget the beginning before they are at the end. I therefore don't wonder that Porphyry ſhould reduce his Maſter to the neceſſity of writing down his thoughts. Plotinus owned that this was the true method of inſtructing a pupil thoroughly; but he likewiſe found it very neceſſary to hear objections, and exerciſe himſelf by way of conference, before he applied himſelf to writing. Such is the anſwer he made to one who complained of Porphyry's frequent interrogations and replies. *Niſi dubitationes interrogante Porphyrio diſſolvamus, commentari oratione perpetua quicquam in librum non valebimus* (10), *i. e.* " Unleſs I ſolve the doubts which are " raiſed by Porphyry, it would be impoſſible for me " to write, in the form of a book, a continued diſ- " ſertation." He diſputed three days together on the doubts propoſed to him by Porphyry, with regard to the manner in which our ſouls are united with our bodies.

(10) Idem, p. 6.

[*D*] *His writings are divided into ſix Enneas's, and are*

ages of the mind of their Author [*E*]. His manner of compoſing was much of the ſame caſt with the ſingularity which was peculiar to him [*F*]; on which account he ſtood in great need of a faithful friend to reviſe his writings. He made choice of Porphyry for this purpoſe, preferable to Gentilianus Amelius, who had been his Diſciple twenty four years, and for whom he had a great eſteem, as the reader may ſee elſewhere (*d*). The Romans paid ſuch a regard to Plotinus as is incredible, many of the Senators becoming his Diſciples; and ſome of them, not only frequented his auditory very aſſiduouſly, but quitted the magiſterial functions, to lead a philoſophical life; and inſpired ſome perſons of the other ſex with a ſtrong love for the ſtudy of philoſophy. A Lady (*e*) inſiſted upon his living in her houſe; and both ſhe and her daughter took a great pleaſure in hearing him. He had the reputation of being a man of ſuch great abilities and virtue at the ſame time, that many perſons of both ſexes, when they found themſelves dying, uſed to entruſt to him, as though he had been a Guardian Angel, their eſtates and their children (*f*). Plotinus never refuſed thoſe troubleſome offices. He often had the patience to examine, with other perſons, the accounts of guardians. He was the arbitrator of numberleſs law-ſuits, on which occaſions he always behaved with ſuch rectitude of mind and humanity, that he did not create himſelf one enemy during the twenty ſix years he reſided in Rome. However, he did not meet with the ſame juſtice among all perſons of his profeſſion; for a Philoſopher of Alexandria (*g*), who was ambitious of being thought of the firſt claſs, uſed his utmoſt endeavours to bring him into contempt, and even had recourſe to necromancy to ruin him. I ſhall obſerve, in the notes, in what manner it is pretended, that the magical operations of this man were rendered ineffectual [*G*]; and ſhall take ſome notice occaſionally of Plotinus's familiar ſpirit, and

(*d*) In the art. AMELIUS.

(*e*) She and her daughter's name was *Gemina*.

(*f*) Πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἀνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες ἀποθνήσκειν μέλλοντες τῶν συγγενεστάτων φερουσι τὰ ἑαυτῶν τέκνα ἄρρενάς τε ὁμοῦ καὶ θηλείας, ἐκείνῳ παραδιδοσαν μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης οὐσίας, ὡς ἱερῷ τινι καὶ θείῳ φύλακι. *Multi quinetiam viri multæ & mulieres generis nobilitate pollentes cum morti jam propinquarent, filios ſuos tum mares tum fœminas una cum omni eorum ſubſtantia Plotino tanquam ſacro cuidam divinoque cuſtodi tradebant atque commendabant.* Porphyr. *in* Vita Plotini.

(*g*) Named *Olympius*.

are all upon very abſtruſe ſubjects.] We are obliged to Porphyry for the order, the diviſion of the title of Plotinus's works. Moſt of them turn on the moſt high-flown ideas in Metaphyſicks; and this Philoſopher ſeems, in certain points, not to differ much from Spinoza, in ſome particulars. There are very few ages in which Spinoza's doctrine has not been taught. That impious man had only the wretched advantage of being the firſt who reduced it, according to the geometrical method, into a ſyſtem. What did Plotinus mean, when he wrote two books to prove, Τὸ ὂν πανταχοῦ ὅλον εἶναι ἓν καὶ ταυτὸ, *Unum & idem ubique totum ſimul adeſſe* (11)? Is not this teaching, that the Being, which is every where, is one and the ſame thing? Spinoza deſires no more. Plotinus enquires, in another book, whether there are many ſouls, or only one; *Utrum omnes animæ una ſint*. He applied himſelf aſſiduouſly to the ſtudy of ideas: he wrote a book, to enquire whether there are ideas of ſingular things; and another to prove, that intellectual objects are not out of the underſtanding: ὅτι οὐκ ἔξω τοῦ νοῦ τὰ νοητὰ, *quod intelligibilia non ſint extra intellectum*.

(11) Porphyr. p. 4, C.

[*E*] ..... *They exhibit three different ages of the mind of their Author.*] The firſt and laſt books he wrote are greatly inferior to the reſt. We perceive, in the firſt, a ſpirit and ſtrength that is not yet come up to its full maturity; and, in the laſt, a ſtrength which is paſt its maturity; but in the books writ between theſe two, we perceive a ſtrength which has attained the higheſt point of its maturity. Thus we have three ranks of books, twenty-one in the firſt, twenty-four in the ſecond, and nine in the third. Of theſe nine, the five firſt were writ with more ſpirit than the four laſt; ſo true it is, generally ſpeaking, that the mind has the ſame degrees of viciſſitude as the body. We know an Author's age by the touches or ſtrokes of his pen, almoſt as eaſily as by the features of his face (12). Here follow Prophyry's words, according to the Latin tranſlation. *Quemadmodum verò conſcripti ſunt alii quidem in ætate prima, alii verò in ipſo vigore vitæ, alii denique defeſſo jam corpore, ſic ferme libri vim ſimilem ipſi declarant. Primi namque unus atque viginti, ſi cum proximè ſequentibus conferantur, leviorem vim habere videntur, nondum ſatis conſtans robur habentem. Qui vero medio tempore compoſiti ſunt, virtutis florem præferunt ad ſummum uſque vigentem. Taleſque ſunt quatuor & viginti (exceptis quibuſdam paucis) perfectiſſimi. Ultimi denique novem remiſſiorem jam referunt facultatem; idque poſtremi quatuor magis quam antecedentes quinque declarant.* This tranſlation is by Marſilius Ficinus. This learned Gentleman had no ſooner ended his verſion of Plato's works, but he was informed by John Picus, Count of Mirandula, that Coſmo de Medicis was deſirous of having Plotinus tranſlated. Marſilius did not know this, becauſe Coſmo did not think it proper to deſire him to give a verſion of thoſe two Authors at the ſame time; and had thought it more juſt to inform him of his deſires with regard to Plotinus, after he ſhould have ended his tranſlation of Plato. Marſilius undertook this new taſk and completed it. He not only tranſlated Plotinus, but alſo drew up the ſummary and analyſis of each book (13). Theſe are called the Commentaries of Marſilius Ficinus. That word is fallacious on this occaſion; for the Reader expects critical notes in the Greek text, and explanations of the Author's difficult paſſages and intricate thoughts; this is what we underſtand by the word Commentary, but it is here taken in a quite different ſenſe. I thought it incumbent on me not to let my Reader, as Moreri has done, be miſled by this ambiguous expreſſion.

(12) Baillet, in Tom. 1. *Jugemens des Savans*, p. 381 & *ſeq.* has many curious particulars about this.

(13) His Latin verſion (without the Greek) and his Commentary printed at Baſil in 1559, folio.

[*F*] *His manner of compoſing was much of the ſame caſt with the ſingularity which was peculiar to him.*] He never uſed to read over his compoſitions after he had writ them; he writ a bad hand, and did not divide the ſyllables; he was no ways accurate in the orthography; he devoted his whole attention to things and thoughts, and obſerved this cuſtom all his life-time. But here follows a ſurpriſing circumſtance. He meditated ſo deeply, that he uſed to diſpoſe, or plan out, a whole work from beginning to end; and purſued the thread of his reflections ſo exactly, that he did not make the leaſt alteration when he wrote. One would have concluded, that the interior original of his work was the rule of his pen, as exactly as a written original is the rule of a Copiſt. He never loſt ſight of his meditation, whenever any perſon came to interrupt him about buſineſs; but would turn his mind to that affair; would enquire into it, and end it, without quitting the ideas of his compoſition; ſo that, after thoſe who had interrupted him were gone away, he had no occaſion to peruſe the laſt lines of his work, in order to know where he was, and reſume the ſeries of his thoughts. The ideas had always continued preſent to his mind: this gave him an opportunity of writing on, without looking into his papers to ſee where he had left off; and made the connexions as well as if he had not once ſtirred out of his place (14).

(14) See Porph. *in* Vita Plotini.

[*G*] *I ſhall obſerve .... in what manner it is pretended, that the magical operations of this man were rendered ineffectual.*] He found by experience, that his incantations returned upon himſelf; which obliged him to confeſs to his friends, that Plotinus's ſoul was endued with prodigious ſtrength, ſince it retorted, on his enemies, the darts they ſhot at him. The moſt ſurprizing circumſtance is, Plotinus perceived the magical devices which were carrying on againſt him, and the effect they would have on their Author. *At the inſtant I am ſpeaking*, ſaid he to his friends,

and the ſurprizing ſagacity which is aſcribed to Plotinus [*H*]. The Emperor Gallienus and Salonina the Empreſs had a very high regard for him; and had it not been for the oppoſition of ſome jealous and malicious courtiers, a requeſt of his would have been granted, viz. to have a city (*b*) in Campania rebuilt, and yielded up to him with the whole territory belonging to it. His intention was to ſettle a Colony of Philoſophers there, and to have it governed by the ideal Laws of Plato's Commonwealth. Some envious perſons accuſed him of acting the plagiary with regard to Numenius: but Amelius took up the pen to invalidate that accuſation. Longinus, who had been prejudiced againſt our great Philoſopher, had afterwards a high eſteem for his writings, but owns at the ſame time, that they are very obſcure [*I*]. He wrote againſt his treatiſe of ideas, and againſt Porphyry's anſwer in defenſe of that treatiſe. Plotinus laboured under various illneſſes the year before he died; an inflammation in his throat which made him ſo hoarſe that he could ſcarce ſpeak; ulcers in his hands and feet, and a great weakneſs in his ſight. Finding himſelf in this condition, he left Rome, and was conveyed to Campania, to the heirs of a friend of his, who furniſhed him with neceſſaries of every kind: and had alſo the conſolation to know that Caſtricius (*i*), whoſe eſtate was in the neighbourhood, did not let him want any thing. He died in the nobleſt manner that it is poſſible for a Heathen Philoſopher to do, he ſpeaking as follows, as he breathed his laſt: *I ſtrive with the utmoſt of my power, to return that part in me which is divine, to that which is ſo divine in the whole univerſe* (*k*). He died at ſixty ſix years of age, the third year of the Emperor Claudius II. that is, the year of Chriſt 270. The moſt favourable account poſſible was given of the happy ſtate of his ſoul [*K*]. Amelius,

(*b*) It was to be called *Platonopolis*.

(*i*) One of his Diſciples.

(*k*) Φάσας πειρᾶσθαι τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν θεῖον ἀνάγειν πρὸς τὸ ἐν τῷ παντὶ θεῖον . . . . ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα. *Equidem jam annitor, quod in nobis divinum eſt ad divinum ipſum quod viget in univerſo religere, ſpiritumque his verbis emiſit.* Porphyr. *in* Vita Plotini.

Olympius's body is ſhrivelled like a purſe; and his limbs are bruiſed by their colliſion one againſt another. Porphyry, who relates this as an undoubted fact, endeavours to confirm it by the following ſuppoſition. He declares that Plotinus was under the protection of a genius ſuperior to that of other men; and that this genius was not one of thoſe who are called Demons, but of the Order of thoſe called Gods. He informs us, that an Egyptian Prieſt conjured up, in the Temple of Iſis in Rome, Plotinus's familiar ſpirit, in preſence of Plotinus himſelf; and that he perceived, that the ſpirit which appeared was a God, and not merely a Demon. That he immediately congratulated Plotinus upon that excellent prerogative (15): that he prepared to put ſeveral queſtions to that ſpirit, but that he vaniſhed in an inſtant, becauſe a common friend of theirs, whom they had brought to ſee this ſight, killed the birds which were given him to hold. Plotinus knowing that his familiar ſpirit was of ſo eminent an order, directed more intenſely towards him the eye of his underſtanding. He even wrote a book on familiar ſpirits, in which he made a careful enquiry into the cauſe of their difference or diſparity. I ſpecify all theſe things upon a double account, firſt, to give my readers a ſmall ſpecimen of the Platonic Doctrine concerning Genii; ſecondly, to inform thoſe who peruſe this work, that the Doctrine of Guardian-Angels, ſo much ſpoken of in the Church of Rome, and which is a practical Doctrine, and accompanied with the whole train of religious worſhip, is much more antient than the Chriſtian Religion. No ſyſtem is better adapted to bring the Doctrine of the Platoniſts (duly rectified) into repute, than the Doctrine of occaſional cauſes. I know not what may happen: but it is my opinion that mankind will be forced, one time or other, to abandon mechanical principles, unleſs they aſſociate to them wills of the intelligent Beings or Spirits; and, to ſay the truth, no Hypotheſis is better adapted to account for events, than that which admits of ſuch an aſſociation, I mean eſpecially ſuch events as go by the names of caſualty, fortune, good luck, ill luck; things, the cauſes whereof are doubtleſs, regulated and determined by general laws that are unknown to us; but which, probably are only occaſional cauſes, like to thoſe which make our ſouls act on our bodies. See the learned Dodwell's Diſſertation on the genius or fortune of the Emperors (16). To return to Plotinus, I muſt obſerve that the ſuperiority of his tutelar genius puffed him up very much. Amelius deſiring him to ſhare in his devotions, I mean, in the ſacrifices which he uſed to offer up on ſolemn feſtivals: *it is their buſineſs*, replied Plotinus, *to come to me, and not for me to go to them.* No one could gueſs the reaſon of this haughty anſwer, nor dared to aſk him the reaſon of it (17). Was ever a more haughty theology than this heard of?

Of Plotinus's FAMILIAR SPIRIT.

(15) Μακάριος εἶ θεὸν ἔχων τὸν δαίμονα καὶ ὁ τοῦ ὑψιμέδοντος γένους τὸν συνόπλα. *Beatus es, o Plotine, qui habeas pro Dæmone Deum neque ex inferiori genere ſis ducem ſortitus familiarem.* Porphyr. ibid.

(16) *Prælect.* 2. *ad Spartiani Hadrianum*, p. 174 & *ſeq.*

(17) Ἐκεῖνος δεῖ πρὸς ἐμὲ ἔρχεσθαι, οὐκ ἐμὲ πρὸς ἐκεῖνους. τοῦτο δὲ ἐν τοίαις διανοίαις οὕτως ἐμεγαλήγορησεν οὐτ' αὐτοὶ δυνηῆναι δυνάμεθα, οὔτ' αὐτὸν ἱρέσθαι ἐτολμήσαμεν. *Illos decet ad me, non me ad illos accedere. Qua vero mente tam excelſa de ſe loqueretur neque intelligere ipſi potuimus, neque auſi ſumus interrogare.* Porphyr. *in* Vita Plotini.

[*H*] *I ſhall take ſome notice . . . . of the ſurprizing ſagacity which is aſcribed to Plotinus.*] A widow (18), a woman of an unblemiſhed character, who, with her children, lived in his houſe, had loſt her necklace. Plotinus ſent for all the ſervants, when after ſurveying them attentively, that is the fellow, ſays he, pointing to one of them who ſtole the necklace. The thief however denied the fact, notwithſtanding that he was whipped very ſeverely; but at laſt he confeſſed, and reſtored what he had ſtole. He foretold in a ſurprizing manner the fate of his pupils; he judging that Polemon would be amorouſly inclined, and not long lived, both which things were verified. Porphyry had formed a reſolution to kill himſelf, but Plotinus divined it, upon which he went to him that inſtant, and diverted him from his deſign (19). By the way, though Plotinus had applied himſelf very intenſly to the ſtudy of aſtrology, he yet did not depend on his own predictions (20); he knowing that they were mere chimeras, and he frequently refuted the Aſtrologers.

(18) Named *Chione*.

(19) Porphyr. p. 8.

(20) Idem, p. 10.

[*I*] Longinus *owns that his* writings *are very obſcure.*] He ſought very induſtriouſly for all Plotinus's books; and, in order to have them very correct, he deſired Porphyry to lend him his copy, but at the ſame time wrote to him as follows. *Hoc equidem tibi tum præſenti, tum procul abſenti, tum habitanti Tyrum ſemper ſignificavi me ſcilicet non multa admodum Plotini librorum argumenta capere: ipſam vero ſcribendi formam intelligentiarumque frequentiam & quæſtionum diſpoſitionem admodum philoſophicam me amare ſupra modum atque venerari* (21). i. e. "I always obſerved to you, when "we were together; when we were at a great diſ"tance one from the other, as well as when you "lived in Tyre, that I did not comprehend many of "the ſubjects treated of by Plotinus in his books; "but that I was extremely fond of his manner of "writing, the variety of his knowledge, and the "order and diſpoſition of his queſtions, which is al"together philoſophical." This little ſpecimen ſhews his exalted genius. This ſingle paſſage proves Longinus's exquiſite diſcernment and judicious penetration. It cannot be denied but that moſt ſubjects which this Philoſopher examines are incomprehenſible; nevertheleſs we diſcover in his works a very elevated, fruitful, and capacious genius, and a cloſe way of reaſoning. Had Longinus been an injudicious Critic; had he not poſſeſſed an elevated and beautiful genius, he would not have been ſo ſenſible of Plotinus's obſcurity. This is not a paradox in any manner. No perſons complain leſs of the obſcurity of a book, than thoſe whoſe thoughts are confuſed, and have a ſhallow underſtanding.

(21) Idem, Porphyr. *in* Vita Plotini, p. 10.

[*K*[*The moſt favourable account poſſible was given of the happy ſtate of his ſoul.*] Apollo was fired with ſo ſtrong a poetical rapture, when Amelius came to conſult him, with regard to the fate of his late maſter,

lius, who had the curioſity to enquire about it, of the Oracle of Apollo, received it, and ſpread it among his intimate friends (*l*).

(*l*) Extracted from *Plotinus's Life*, written by Porphyry.

ter, that he made him an anſwer containing fifty verſes. Here follows the ſubſtance of the explication which Porphyry gives of it. Apollo declares, that Plotinus had been peaceable, gracious, and vigilant; that he had perpetually elevated his ſpotleſs ſoul towards God; that he had loved God with his whole heart, that he had diſengaged himſelf to the utmoſt of his power, from this wretched life; and that elevating himſelf with all the powers of his ſoul, and by the ſeveral gradations taught by Plato, towards that ſupreme Deity which ſurpaſſeth all underſtanding, he had been enlightened by him; he had enjoyed the viſion of that ſupreme Being, without the help or interpoſition of ideas, but as he is in himſelf, and according to that nature which is above all comprehenſion (22). Porphyry ſtops here, to tell us that he himſelf, once in his life, had been favoured with the viſion, at ſixty eight years of age; that the end to which Plotinus directed all his thoughts was, to unite himſelf with the great God who fills the whole univerſe; and that he had attained that end four times, not in power only, but by an unutterable efficacy, during the ſix years which he (Porphyry) had kept him company (23). Have we not here the unitive way of life of the Myſticks or Enthuſiaſts, ſo much ſpoken of? May we not accuſe them of ſtealing from the Platoniſts? Do not we here ſee alſo the ſeeds of Quietiſm? But to return to the Oracle. Plotinus had enjoyed this advantage, that whenever he deviated from the right path, the Gods conducted him back to it, by darting their light into his mind; ſo that it might have been ſaid, that in writing his books, he had been illuminated with the celeſtial rays. Thus far as to what concerns his life. After his death, he went to the aſſembly of the bleſſed, were charity, joy, and a love of the union with God reign. He had viſited the three judges of the other world, Minos, Radamanthus, and Æacus; not to give them an account of his actions, but to converſe with them and the reſt of the Gods who viſit them: in a word, he enjoyed the life of the bleſſed. I will not make any apology for the length of theſe remarks; imagining, that the reader will be well pleaſed to ſee collected in one place, not only ſuch particulars as relate to Plotinus's perſon, but alſo thoſe relating to his tenets, ſo far as is requiſite to give a general idea of them.

(22) Ἐφάνη ἐκεῖνος ὁ μήτε μορφὴν μήτε τινα ἰδέαν ἔχων, ὑπὲρ δὲ νοῦν καὶ πᾶν τὸ νοηθὲν ἱδρυμένος. *Ipſi protinus coruſcavit Deus ille nec formam nec ideam aliquam habens, ſed ſuper intellectum univerſumque intelligibile in ſe ipſo conſiſtens.* Porphyr. *in* Vita Plotini.

(23) Τέλος γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ σκοπὸς ἦν, τὸ ἑνωθῆναι καὶ πελάσαι τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ. ἔτυχε δὴ τέτρακις τε ὅτε συνῆμεν αὐτῷ, τοῦ σκοποῦ τούτου, ἐνεργείᾳ ἀῤῥήτῳ, καὶ οὐ δυνάμει. *Finis namque Plotino fig-* *numque erat quo aciem mentis intenderet propinquare conjungique ipſi Deo omnibus ubique præſenti: quater autem dum cum ipſo verſarer hunc finem eſt aſſecutus, non potentia duntaxat, inquam, ſed actu quodam ineffabili conſecutus.* Idem, ibid.

☞ POCOCKE (EDWARD). We muſt reſerve the article of this great man to the Appendix at the end of this work; the large account of his Life, to be prefixed to a new edition of his works, not being yet publiſhed.

POINET (JOHN) Biſhop of Rocheſter, and afterwards of Wincheſter, in the 16th Century [*A*], was very ſtrongly attached to the Reformation under the reign of Edward VI. and wrote among other books a treatiſe on the marriage of Prieſts, and an apology for that treatiſe (*a*). He was obliged to leave his native country under Queen Mary, and retired to Straſburg, where he died at about forty years of age, the 11th of April 1556 (*b*). He had there writ a book which was printed 1557, entitled, *Diallacticon viri boni & literati de veritate, natura, atque ſubſtantia corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti in Euchariſtia* (*c*). He therein endeavoured to reconcile the controverſies relating to the Euchariſt, and eſpecially thoſe of the Lutherans and Zuinglians. I ſhall ſpeak of this work hereunder [*B*]. Poinet was perfectly well ſkilled in the Greek tongue, and pretty well

(*a*) *Epitome Bibl.* Geſneri, p. m. 487, *ex* Balæo.

(*b*) Freherus, *in* Theatro, p. 169, *ex Godwino de Præſ. Angl.*

(*c*) It contains 83 leaves in 8vo.

[*A*] *He was Biſhop of Rocheſter, and afterwards of Wincheſter.*] He was tranſlated to the latter See, the 26th of April 1551, *and had a revenue of two thouſand marks ſettled upon him* (1). Poinet was put into the room of Gardiner, who had been diveſted of his Biſhoprick for refuſing to aſſert the King's ſupremacy (2); but he likewiſe was forced to quit it for Gardiner, who was reſtored to it under Queen Mary in 1553 (3).

(1) Burnet's *Hiſt. of the Reformation of the Church of England, under the year* 1551. p. m. 165. See alſo Mr. de Larrey, *Hiſt. d'Anglet.* Tom. 1. p. 690, in which the Printers have put *Pointe* for *Poinet*.

(2) Burnet, ibid.

(3) Ibid. ad ann. 1553. p. 588.

[*B*] *I ſhall ſpeak of this work hereunder.*] I have already mentioned the title, and the time in which it was printed. I ſhall add, that there was annexed to it the famous treatiſe of Bertram, *De corpore & ſanguine Domini ad Carolum Magnum* (4) *Imperatorem, ante D.CC. annos æditus.* The place where it was printed is not mentioned. The Preface was not writ by the Author. He only drew up a ſhort advertiſement, in which he foretold very exactly the fate of his book, *viz.* that none of the contending parties would approve it; and that, by his attempting to pacify thoſe who were engaged in war, he ſhould incur the indignation of both ſides: and compares himſelf to a man who ſhould receive a wound, whilſt he was endeavouring to ſeparate the combatants. *Author Lectori. Pacem aliorum quærere pulchrum eſt, & habet certam promiſſionem Dei: Beati pacifici. Sed vereor hoc dum cupidè fector, ne quod iis qui pugnas diruunt evenire ſolet, idem mihi quoque accidat. Illi dum aliorum ſaluti conſulunt, ipſi reportant vulnera. Et ego dum id operam do, ut diſſidentes redeant in gratiam, ab iiſdem fortaſſe nullam inibo gratiam. Id ſi fit, illius exemplo me levabo qui dixit, Si hominibus placuiſſem, Chriſti ſervus non eſſem. Vale ac ſtude Chriſto placere.* We ſhould, perhaps, not have known who wrote that Preface, had not John Sturmius declared it to be his. *Quære quæ præfatus ſum ante annos viginti in Diallacticum P.* (5) *Poneti Epiſcopi Wintonienſis* (6). This work was inſerted in the firſt volume (edition the firſt) of Theodore Beza's tracts (7). The French Tranſlator of it affirms, in his Preface addreſſed to the *Vidame* of Chartres, that he had communicated his deſign to ſome Proteſtant Miniſters (8). Theſe, perhaps, were of opinion, that ſuch a book would be ſeaſonable, at a time when a medium was ſought for, to re-unite the Roman Catholicks and Proteſtants. It is to be obſerved, that the Tranſlator aſcribes this work to Anthony Cooke, who had been King Edward the VIth's Preceptor (9). This Biſhop's opinion is explained in a book writ by Andrew Rivetus (10). Read alſo the following words of John Couſin, Biſhop of Durham. *Paulò ante hanc conſcriptam Apologiam* (Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ à Joh. Juello Epiſcopo Sariſburienſi) *prodierat* Dialacticon celeberrimi Viri Johannis Poineti *Epiſcopi* Wintonienſis *de Veritate, Naturâ, atque Subſtantiâ Corporis & Sanguinis Chriſti in Euchariſtiâ; quod non alio conſilio edidit, quàm ut fidem & doctrinam Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ illuſtraret. Et primò oſtendit* Euchariſtiam non ſolùm figuram eſſe Corporis Domini, ſed etiam ipſam Veritatem, Naturam, atque Subſtantiam in ſe comprehendere; idcirco nec has voces Naturæ & Subſtantiæ fugiendas eſſe; veteres enim de hoc Sacramento differentes ita loquutos fuiſſe. *Secundò quærit,* an voces illæ, *Veritas, Natura, & Subſtantia,* communi more in hoc myſterio à Veteribus intelligebantur, an peculiari & Sacramentis magis accommodatâ ratione? Neque enim obſervandum eſſe ſolùm, quibus verbis olim Patres uſi ſint, ſed quid iſtis ſignificare ac docere voluerint. *Et licet diſcrimen ipſe cum Patribus agnoſcat, inter Corpus Chriſti formam humani corporis naturalem habens, & quod in Sacramento eſt Corpus myſticum, maluit tamen diſcrimen illud* ad modum præſentiæ & exhibitionis, *quàm* ad ipſam rem ſubjectam, hoc eſt Corpus Chriſti verum, *accommodari; quum certiſſimum ſit non aliud Corpus in Sacramento fidelibus dari, niſi quod à Chriſto pro fidelium ſalute in mortem traditum fuit. Tertiò denique,* Spiritualem hîc intelli-

(4) It ſhould be *Calvum*.

(5) It ſhould be *Joannis*.

(6) Sturmius, in part. 3. *Antipappi quarti*, p. 176.

(7) See Rivet. *in Grotianæ Animadv. Diſcuſſ.* Tom. 3. Oper. p. 1132.

(8) Idem, ibid.

(9) Idem, ibid. and in *Annotat. in Conſultat. de Religione*, p. 948.

(10) *Annotat. in Conſult. de Religione*, ibid.

well verſed in the German and Italian (*d*). He tranſlated ſome Italian works of Ochinus (*e*). He was an excellent preacher, for which he was greatly admired by King Edward (*f*). I ſhall quote the anſwer which was made to the charge of his having carried away another man's wife, though he himſelf was married [*C*].

(*d*) Freher. *in* Theatro, p. 169.

(*e*) *Epit. Bibl.* Geſneri, p. m. 487.

(*f*) Freher. *in* Theatro, p. 169.

intelligentiam, juxta communem & conſentientem veterum Patrum interpretationem, requiri *ſtatuit*, & carnalem omnem cogitationem exeludi (11). i. e. " A " little before Biſhop Jewell's apology or vindication " of the Church of England was publiſhed, there " came out the *Diallacticon* of the famous John Poinet, " Biſhop of Wincheſter, concerning the reality and " ſubſtance of Chriſt's body and blood in the Eucha- " riſt; which he publiſhed with no other view, than " to exhibit in a clear light the faith and doctrine of " the Church of England. He ſhews, *in the firſt* " *place*, that the Euchariſt is not merely the type and " figure of our Lord's body; but that it alſo includes " its reality, nature, and ſubſtance; that therefore " theſe words *Nature* and *Subſtance* are not to be re- " jected, ſince the fathers in their treating of this " ſacrament, employed them. He enquires, *in the* " *ſecond place*, whether theſe words *Reality*, *Nature*, " and *Subſtance*, were taken in his myſtery by the " fathers, agreeably to their uſual ſignification; or " in a peculiar ſenſe, and ſuch a one as is better " adapted to the ſacraments? Nor are we to obſerve " merely, what expreſſions were employed by the fa- " thers, but in what ſenſe they intended to have them " underſtood. And though he was ready to acknow- " ledge, with the fathers, a difference between Chriſt's " body which had the natural form of a human body, " and his myſtical body in the ſacrament; he yet " was prompted to conclude, that this difference " ought to be applied to the manner in which it is " preſent and exhibited, rather than to the thing it- " ſelf, that is, to the true body of Chriſt; it being " very certain, that no other body is adminiſtered to the " faithful in the ſacrament, than that which Chriſt " devoted to death to ſave them. *Thirdly and laſtly*, " he aſſerts, that this is to be taken in a ſpiritual " ſenſe, agreeably to the general and unanimous in- " terpretation of the Fathers, to the excluſion of e- " very carnal thought." Poinet lays great ſtreſs on the authority of the Fathers, who ſpeak in ſtrong terms of the preſence of our Lord's body in the ſymbols of the Euchariſt, and he entirely rejects the opinion which was aſcribed to the Zuinglians; but he nevertheleſs diſapproves of thoſe who admit of the oral manducation of the body of Chriſt Jeſus. He is willing to admit the word tranſubſtantiation, provided it be underſtood in a certain manner, to the excluſion of oral manducation. *Vident ſubſtantiam quoque à nobis præſentem affirmari, & communionem noſtram cum Chriſto naturaliter, & ut ita dicam, ſubſtantialiter prædicari, ſed has voces, non ut philoſophi, ſed ut theologi loquuntur, intelligi oportere. Nec de Tranſubſtantiationis vocabulo, quanvis barbaro miniméque neceſſario litigaremus, ſi modò talem ſubſtantiarum tranſmutationem interpretentur, qualem veteres agnoſcebant, ſacramentalem videlicet, qualis etiam in homine fit per Baptiſmum regenerato, qui novus homo factus eſt, & nova creatura, qualis etiam fit quum nos in carnem Chriſti convertimur, quibus Patres antiqui utebantur exemplis. Voces ipſas non tantopere fugimus, quanquam earum quoque ratio habenda eſt, ſed ſignificationem eam quam Patres ipſi docent, atque adeò flagitant, nos quoque requirimus: & ſolam σαρκοφαγίαν, id eſt, carnis vorationem, quam nullo pacto probant, ſed ut ſtultam & impiam condemnant, rejicimus ut alienam à Scripturis, alienam à Patrum interpretatione, denique cum vera fide ex diametro pugnantem, ac ſpiritualem ſenſum in hac carne edenda neceſſarium eſſe judicamus, ipſum Chriſtum authorem ſequuti, & conſenſum probatiſſimorum, qui habentur, interpretum* (12). He had no reaſon to think he ſhould ſatisfy the Roman Catholicks, by his allowing of a term which he modified in that manner. But with regard to ſuch as deſired that a miracle ſhould be ſuppoſed in the Euchariſt, he might imagine that they would be ſatisfied with his Hypotheſis or Doctrine, provided they only required a mighty miracle in general: for the doctrine he inculcates, is one of the moſt incomprehenſible that could be propoſed. He admits a real and ſubſtantial preſence of the body of Chriſt Jeſus, which nevertheleſs is only ſacramental; and he declares, that by the virtue of this preſence, the bread in the Euchariſt may purify our ſouls, and unite us into one body with our Redeemer. *Quòd ſi nonnulli miraculum requirunt (nam Patres aliquot Euchariſtiam ingens miraculum nominant) non minùs profectò mirandum eſt panem & vinum creaturas terrenas, & corpori tantùm paſcendo natas, eam virtute benedictionis myſticæ vim inſitam, adeóque potentem efficacitatem poſſidere, ut & animos & corpora mundent, alant, ſanctificent, atque ad immortalitatem præparent, ut nos membra Chriſti & unum cum illo corpus conficiant. Imò plus ponderis habet hoc miraculum, plus dignitatis, majorem utilitatem, ac magis myſteriorum rationi congruentem, quàm ulla poteſt craſſa tranſubſtantiatio, aut animalis & humana complecti σαρκοφαγία* (13). The Catechiſm of the Proteſtant Churches, written by Calvin, does not vary very much from the opinion of this Biſhop of Wincheſter: weigh well the following words: *Thus, I doubt not, as* Chriſt Jeſus *promiſes and repreſents, but he will make us partake of his own ſubſtance, to unite us with him in one life.* Maſt. *But how can this be, ſince the body of Chriſt Jeſus is in Heaven, and we are in this earthly pilgrimage?* Schol. *It is by the incomprehenſible virtue or power of his Spirit, which joins together things ſeparated by diſtance of place* (14).

I obſerved elſewhere (15), that this *Diallecticon* was re-printed with the work of a Phyſician, who endeavoured to reconcile the controverſies with reſpect to the Euchariſt, and who had ſome very peculiar notions concerning this important tenet.

[*C*] *I ſhall quote the anſwer which was made to the charge of his having carried away another man's wife, though he himſelf was married.*] Sanders, after ſaying that one Poynet was appointed to the See of Wincheſter, of which Stephen Gardiner had been deprived, adds, " This fine Prelate, accounting it a ſmall thing " to marry one wife, now that he was a Biſhop, " did likewiſe carry away the wife of a certain " Butcher then living; but ſhe was taken from him " by the Parliament of that Kingdom, as no ways be- " longing to him, and reſtored to her huſband. It " was owing to this, that when ſome time after, a " man of Quality ſaid to Biſhop Gardiner, partly " by way of joke, and partly by way of ridicule, " you expect, perhaps, that the time will come " when your Biſhoprick ſhall be reſtored to you; " the Biſhop anſwered, and why ſhould not I expect " to recover my Biſhoprick, as well the Butcher " has recovered his wife? For it was the ſame perſon " who ſeized upon Stephen Gardiner's Biſhoprick, " and who carried away the Butcher's wife (16)." This is the charge, and Biſhop Burnet anſwers it as follows: " The falſeneſs of this ſtory is clearly " evinced by the anſwer that Dr. Martin gave in " the beginning of Queen Mary's reign, to a book " that Poinet had writ in the defence of the mar- " ried Clergy; Martin's anſwer is writ with ſo " much ſpite, and ſo many indecent reflections, that " though it is not reaſonable to believe all he ſays, " yet it is almoſt a certain argument, that this ſtory " concerning Poinet is a forgery; ſince, if it was a " thing ſo public as our Author makes it; Martin " muſt have heard of it, eſpecially living in Gar- " diner's houſe; and it is not to be imagined that if " he did know it, he would have concealed it: ſo " this, and the jeſt that hangs upon it, muſt paſs as " one of the flouriſhes of our Author's pen (17)."

(11) John Cofinus, *Epiſcopus Dunelmenſis, Hiſt. Tranſubſtant. Papalis*, cap. 2. num. 4. p. 9 & *ſeq.*

(12) *Diallacticon*, folio m. 81.

(13) Idem, folio 82.

(14) *Catechiſme de Geneve*, Sect. 53.

(15) In the rem. [*L*] of the art. HARCHIUS, towards the cloſe.

(16) Sanders's book of the *Engliſh Schiſm*, p. 216.

(17) Burnet's *Hiſt. of the Reformation*, p. 396.

POITIERS (DIANA DE), miſtreſs of Henry II. and daughter of Count de Saint Vallier [*A*], made very ill uſe of the credit ſhe enjoyed, either with regard to her heaping

[*A*] *She was the daughter of Count de Saint Vallier.*] His name was John (1) de Poitiers, and he was of a very antient family; for one Aymar of Poitiers, " thus ſirnamed, either becauſe he was deſcended

(1) Not *Aymar*, as he is called by Mezerai, *Hiſt. of Henry* II. in the beginning.

ing up riches, or her raiſing to, or removing from employments, whomſoever ſhe pleaſed. The world could ſcarce believe, as ſhe was ſo far advanced in years, that it was poſſible for her to captivate ſo ſtrongly a young Prince's heart, without the aſſiſtance of magic [*B*]. But ſome perſons of judgment do not give this reaſon for it, and make extremely good reflections on the power of an old Courtezan [*C*]; and do not omit taking

" from the Counts of Poitiers, or upon ſome other " account, married, about the year 1184, the heireſs " of the houſe of Valentinois, in return for his ha- " ving aſſiſted his mother, a widow, againſt the Bi- " ſhop of Valence, who was her potent enemy . . . " The Aymar in queſtion had from Raymund Count " of Thoulouſe, his relation, the Earldom of Divis, " about the year 1190; and thus theſe two Earl- " doms united during two centuries, in the houſe of " Poitiers, and were poſſeſſed by ſeven Counts ſuc- " ceſſively. Lewis II. the laſt of them, having no " male iſſue, and very little affection for Charles " Lord of St. Vallier, his uncle by the father, who " was to ſucceed him or his; beſides, having run " himſelf very much in debt by his ill manage- " ment, and riotous conduct, made over and aſſign- " ed, to Charles Dauphin of France, and his ſuc- " ceſſors, the Earldoms in queſtion, in conſideration " of an hundred thouſand crowns, on condition that " they ſhould remain inſeparably united to Dauphine. " After his death, which happened in the ſame year " 1419. Lewis, ſon of Charles de Saint Vallier, at- " tempted to aſſume the title and poſſeſſion of it; " but the Dauphin, now raiſed to the throne, obli- " ged him to give up all his pretenſions to him, " in conſideration of ſeven thouſand florins yearly " rent, to him and his heirs for ever (2)." With regard to Saint Vallier, our Diana's father, he was ſeized, as having engaged in the conſpiracy of the Conſtable Charles of Bourbon; and would have been beheaded at the Greve (a place in Paris where criminals are executed) had not his daughter, as we are told, ſaved his life, by indulging Francis I. the laſt favour, as it is called. Mezerai ſpeaks of this as follows in his large Hiſtory (3): *Saint Vallier was pardoned on the ſcaffold, (when brought to the Greve to be executed) on account of the beauty of Diana his only daughter.* In another place (4) he ſpeaks as follows of the Diana in queſtion. *The charms of her beauty had been ſo powerful ever ſince the year* 1524, *that the whole Court had interceded for her father, found guilty of the rebellion of Charles de Bourbon; ſo that, on her account, King Francis ſent him a pardon when brought to the ſcaffold.* We cannot infer, from theſe two paſſages, that the daughter's chaſtity was a ſacrifice offered by Francis I. in order to obtain the father's pardon. But here follows a third paſſage, in which the Hiſtorian in queſtion expreſſes himſelf very clearly, with reſpect to the oblation of that propitiatory victim. " Saint Vallier was tried, and he was ſen- " tenced to loſe his head; but being brought upon " the ſcaffold, at the Greve, inſtead of being be- " headed a pardon was brought him. It is ſaid that " the King ſent it him, after having taken from " Diana his daughter, then about fourteen years of " age, her moſt valuable treaſure; a ſweet exchange " to thoſe perſons who value honour leſs than life, " or who make it conſiſt in the ſplendors of a favour " that is more envied than it is innocent (5)." The Author of the amours of the Kings of France does not ſpeak ſo plainly; but then he ſays enough for any perſon to underſtand him. I ſhall quote his own words, becauſe they include ſome circumſtances relating to the hiſtory of our Diana. She was the daughter, ſays he (6), " of John of Poictiers, Lord " of St. Vallier, who, when ſhe was very young, " left her in the family of the Counteſs of Angou- " leme, after which ſhe entred into the ſervice of " Queen Claude, in quality of maid of honour. St. " Vallier was not miſtaken in the deſign he had " formed, of procuring ſome protection at Court, " by the charms of his daughter; for it may be " affirmed that ſhe ſaved his life, by the ſeveral " ſprings ſhe ſet in motion. St. Vallier had joined " in the rebellion of the Conſtable of Bourbon, and " had been ſo unfortunate as to be taken priſoner. " He then was tried, and ſentenced to loſe his head: " Diana was thunderſtruck at this news, that ſhe " thought it would be incumbent on her to ſet every " engine at work, to ſave her father from ſuch im- " minent danger. Accordingly ſhe went and threw " herſelf at the King's feet, all diſſolved in tears, and " beſought his Majeſty to pardon him to whom ſhe " owed life. She appeared ſo ſweetly mournful on " that occaſion, that all her demands were complied " with; and inſpired him with love, under the " maſk of pity. She preſerved the conqueſt till the " fatal expedition made by the King in Italy; and " this Prince in queſtion endeavoured to conceal his " infidelity from the Counteſs of Château-Briant, for " whom he had always a great regard."

[*B*] *Without the aſſiſtance of magic.*] Thuanus ſeems inclined to believe this. *Diana . . . . . amiſſo viro, is fuit Ludovicus Brezæus Magnus Normanniæ Seneſcallus, cum jam inclinata eſſet ætate, philtris & magicis, ut creditur, artibus adeo ſibi animum Henrici devinxit, ut is nunquam alienata voluntate ad exitum uſque vitæ in amore illo conſtanter perſeveraverit* (7). i. e. " Diana's huſband (Lewis de Brezé great Seneſ- " chal of Normandy) being dead; ſhe tho' advanced " in years, is ſuppoſed to have ſo ſtrongly captivated " the heart of Henry, by philters and incantations, " that he bore a conſtant affection for her till his " death." Mezerai gives an exact account of all the reaſons, which induced the world to conclude that this woman had employed necromancy, but does not ſeem perſuaded of the truth of this. " The graces " of her mind, and her cunning increaſed in propor- " tion as time took away the moſt lovely features " of her face; ſo that, at the age of thirty five, " when ſhe ſhould have preferred virtue to beauty, " ſhe gained an abſolute poſſeſſion of Henry's heart. " And as it is uſual for people, in order to bring a " greater odium on Princes, and make the mean " condeſcention of Princes who abandon themſelves " to them more excuſable, to affirm that their affec- " tion was gained by magical arts: ſome related, " that ſhe had bewitched him with philters. And " indeed, it was a ſhameful thing to ſee a young " Prince adore a faded face, and full of wrinkles; " a head, the hair of which was turning gray; eyes, " whoſe luſtre was half eclipſed, ſometimes blood- " ſhot, and running; in a word, who was ſaid to " be the infamous leavings of many others: and peo- " ple had juſt reaſon to wonder, that neither time, " honour, ſage advice, nor even ſome other object, " among ſo many exquiſite beauties he might have " choſen, could divert his eyes from her. But it is " neither new nor ſo ſurprizing a circumſtance, to " ſee a man captivated in this manner without the " aſſiſtance of magic arts: a numberleſs multitude " of examples have been ſeen of this (8); and it is " not difficult to find ſome reaſons for it (9), which " reaſons will be ſeen in the following remark."

[*C*] *Extreme good reflections on the power of an old Courtezan.*] Here follows the ſequel of the words of Mezerai juſt cited. " Not to mention thoſe occult " qualities, like to thoſe of the loadſtone, which " meeting in certain perſons, unite them cloſely by " an equal and reciprocal conſent, or by ſubjecting " one to the other: it is obſerved that phlegmatic per- " ſons are conſtant in their loves, though they are " ready enough to abandon their other paſſions and " deſigns. Add to this, a man's firſt ties or engage- " ments are ſeldom or never broke off; for which " reaſon, it is no leſs dangerous for a young man juſt " coming upon the ſtage of the world, to meet with " a cunning artful woman, than for an ignorant pilot " to come againſt a rock. Then, the ſuſpicion he " had harboured with regard to the fidelity of his " wife, threw him with greater fondneſs into the " arms of another woman. To conclude, in love as " in war, the ſtratagems of perſons in years being " no leſs dangerous than the vigour and efforts of " the young: we are not to wonder that he ſhould " be ſo ſtrongly captivated by the artifices of ſo ex- " perienced

(2) Mezerai, *Hiſt. de Charles* VI. p. 578. vol. 2. folio ad ann. 1418.

(3) Tom. 2. p. 936. ad ann. 1523.

(4) *Hiſt. of Henry* II. in the beginning, p. 1058. Tom. 2.

(5) Mezerai, *Abrege Chronol.* Tom. 4. p. m. 520. ad ann. 1523.

(6) Tom. 1. p. 195. See alſo in the rem. [*P*], an error of his.

(7) Thuan. lib. 3. p. 58. ad ann. 1547.

(8) See the rem. [*H*], of the art. CALIGULA; and rem. [*F*], of the art. CYRUS; and rem. [*A*], of the art. DELLIUS: likewiſe the articles LAIS, LAMIA.

(9) Mezerai, *Hiſt. of France*, at the beginning of Henry II. p. 1058. vol. 2. in folio.

taking notice of the amorous complexion of our Diana [*D*]. The greateſt ſcandal proceeded from its being firmly ſuppoſed, that the ſole reaſon why ſhe abandoned herſelf to the amorous wiſhes of Francis I. was to ſave her father's life *(a)* [*E*]; and therefore the publick was filled with the higheſt indignation, to ſee a woman, who had been ſucceſſively a concubine to both father and ſon, enjoy the greateſt credit and authority in the Kingdom. It is thinking wildly, to ſuppoſe that the intimacy between Henry II. and this woman, did not exceed the bounds of Platonic Love [*F*]. She appeared a long time at Court,

(a) See the rem. [*A*].

" perienced a woman." Ovid, who was ſo great a maſter in the amorous art, might have ſuggeſted a new reflection to our French Hiſtorian; and perhaps Mezerai would not have omitted it in a Latin work.

Nec quotus annus eat, nec quo ſit nata require
Conſule: quæ rigidus munera Cenſor habet.
Præcipuè, ſi flore caret, meliuſque peractum
Tempus, & albentes jam legit illa comas.
Utilis, O juvenes, aut hæc, aut ſerior ætas;
Iſte ferat ſegetes: iſte ſerendus ager.
. . . . . .
Hoc quoque militiæ eſt: hoc quoque quærit opes.
Adde, quod eſt illis operum prudentia major:
Solus & artifices qui facit, uſus adeſt.
Illæ munditiis annorum damna rependunt:
Et faciunt curâ, ne videantur anus.
Utque velis, venerem jungunt per mille figuras.
Inveniat plures nulla tabella modos (10).

(10) Ovid. *de Arte amandi*, lib. 2. p. 191.

" Her age enquire not, nor the year when born,
" Nor who the reins of Government then held.
" If ſhe no longer is in life's gay bloom,
" And ſilver hairs begin to ſhade her head;
" O youths, a woman thus advanc'd in life,
" Suits better, and diſpenſes ſweeter joys.
. . . . . .
" The toil is great, and great is the reward.
" Add that, in love affairs, they're better ſkill'd.
" Experience makes them knowing in the bliſs.
" Time's injuries by art they can repair;
" By art they ſeem as in the prime of youth.
" In every act of Venery they pleaſe,
" Nor are the looſeſt pictures better teachers."

A woman, who is *the infamous leavings of many others*, had been brought up in a good ſchool. Such a one is much abler to perform her exerciſes, and can play the game to the beſt advantage. However this be, the Hiſtorian had reaſon to ſay, that examples of the great power of an old Courtezan are not rare. See the marginal note (8).

[*D*] *They do not omit taking notice of the amorous complexion of our Diana.*] " We might juſtly conſi-
" der it as enchantment without *charms*, the paſſion
" of a young King for a woman of forty, and who
" had had two or three children by her huſband. . . .
" The King loved her becauſe ſhe had a ſenſibility
" in love; and this diſpoſition prompted her, ſome-
" times to ſeek for the height of pleaſure elſewhere,
" as ſhe found in him, the height of riches and ho-
" nours." Theſe are Mezerai's words (11): he inclines us to compare, in this reſpect, Henry II. to a monarch, who, in all other reſpects, was infinitely beneath this Prince in merit. We read in Suetonius that Caligula, in the bloom of life, was diſtractedly fond of Ceſonia, who was far from young, and had had three children by her huſband; but then ſhe was of a moſt laſcivious caſt (12). Ovid, one of the greateſt maſters in this affair, hints plainly enough that ſuch a complexion makes up, with regard to a man venereally inclined, for a thouſand other things: and that as the inſenſibility of a chaſte wife is very diſagreeable, ſo the eager warmth of a lewd miſtreſs is wonderfully poignant. This is one of the ſad cauſes of conjugal infidelity.

(11) *Abrege Chronol.* Tome 4. p. 643. ad ann. 1547.

(12) See citation (28) of the art. CALIGULA.

Odi quæ præbat, quia ſit præbere neceſſe,
Siccaque de lana cogitat ipſa ſua (13).
Quæ datur officio, non eſt mihi grata voluptas?
Officium faciat nulla puella mihi.
Me voces audire juvat ſua gaudia faſſas,
Utque morer memet ſuſtineamque roget.
Aſpiciam Dominæ victos amentis ocellos,
Langueat, & tangi ſe vetet illa diu (14).

(13) *Confer quæ Martialis Epigram.* 61 and 105. lib. 11.

(14) Ovid. *de Arte amandi*, lib. 2. ver. 692.

" I hate thoſe joys neceſſity muſt yield,
" But burn for ſuch a melting nymph diſpenſes,
" When, all diſſolving, ſhe the pleaſure tells,
" And urges me to check the mighty bliſs:
" To ſee ſtrong glances from her eye-balls dart,
" And ſoft intreating me to ſpare her beauties."

All this ſhews that Mezerai hit right: the laſcivious turn of the Seneſchal made up for what was wanting with regard to youth.

[*E*] *It was firmly ſuppoſed, that the ſole reaſon why ſhe abandoned herſelf to the amorous wiſhes of Francis* I. *was upon no other account but to ſave her father's life.*] Beſides what has been touched upon this ſubject, in the firſt remark of this article, I ſhall mention a circumſtance related by Thuanus, concerning the pannic with which Count de Saint Vallier was ſeized. This unhappy Gentleman being led to the place of execution, was ſeized with ſuch dread, that he fell dangerouſly ill. They were forced to bleed him ſeveral times, all which, with the good news of a pardon, was yet incapable of recovering and curing him: ſo that Saint Vallier's fever afterwards became a proverb. *Diana . . . . . patrem habuit Joannem Pictavienſem Sanvalerium, qui Caroli Borbonii conjurationis particeps, cum apud Sacerdotem ſecreto rem confeſſus eſſet, à Sacerdote delatus, & ad mortem damnatus eſt: cum ad ſupplicium duceretur, ex pavore in tam acutum febrem incidit, ut venia in gratiam filiæ, quæ pulcritudine ſua multorum procerum gratiam demeruerat, à Franciſco impetrata, vix ad mentem & ſanitatem ſæpius miſſo ſanguine reduci potuerit, unde Sanvaleriana febris apud nos in proverbium abiit* (15). Some affirm (16), *that he ſaw death ſo near him, and was ſo greatly terrified on that occaſion, that, when brought back to his houſe* (17), *a continual fever ſeized him with ſo much violence, that it killed him.* Thuanus relates, that St. Vallier was impeached by the Prieſt, to whom he had revealed, in confeſſion, his plot; but moſt Hiſtorians agree, that it was diſcovered to Francis I. by his Norman Gentlemen who had engaged in that conſpiracy. Some charge them with following, in this, the inclination which thoſe of their country are ſaid to have: *Franciſcus Lutetia profectus ad Fanum Petri Monaſterienſis . . . . appulit . . . . ibi duo Borbonii domeſtici natione Normani (quæ natio vulgo ut parum fida notari ſolet) Argugius ac Matigno Borbonium cum Cæſare conveniſſe atque adverſus Franciſcum multa moliri indicant* (18). Others ſay, that the conduct of their confeſſor forced them to reveal that ſecret. Varillas has followed the laſt opinion. Matignon and Argouges, ſays he (19), " having informed, in confeſſion, a
" Pariſh-Prieſt of their country, that they had en-
" gaged in a conſpiracy againſt the Government, he
" commanded them to go and acquaint the King of
" it; and to ſet them an example, he himſelf ſet
" out immediately to give information of it to Breze,
" great Seneſchal of Normandy. Matignon and
" Argouges, thinking themſelves ruined, rode poſt,
" and overtook the King at St. Peter le Moniſtier,
" where throwing themſelves at his feet, they obtained
" their pardon by giving an exact account of every
" thing they knew with reſpect to the negotiation
" between the Emperor and the Conſtable."

(15) Thuan. lib. 3. p. 58. ad ann. 1547.

(16) Father Anſelme, *Palais de l'Honneur*, p. 555.

(17) See the rem. [*P*].

(18) Belcarius, lib. 17. num. 46. p. 530.

(19) Varillas, *Hiſt. de Francis* I. lib. 4. p. 269.

[*F*] *It is thinking wildly to ſuppoſe that the intimacy between Henry* II. *and this woman, did not exceed the bounds of Platonick Love.*] I wonder how le Labourer could prevail with himſelf to believe ſuch a chimera: but we muſt hear him. He will informs us of a particular, that is curious enough with regard to the riſe of his paſſion; and we ſhall find that he owns, at leaſt, that our Diana was one of the miſtreſſes to Francis I. *He was the more ſtrongly invited to go thither*, ſays he (20), (ſpeaking of the running at the ring in which Henry II. delighted, " by the love he
" bore

(20) *Addit. aux Memoires de Caſtelnau*, Tom. 1. p. 276.

Court, under the title of great *Senechalle*, and afterwards under that of Ducheſs of Valentinois. The firſt of theſe two names ſuited her, becauſe ſhe had been married to Lewis de Brezé, great Senechal of Normandy, by whom ſhe had two daughters, whom ſhe got married very advantageouſly [G]. With regard to the other title, ſhe aſſumed it on account of Henry the IId's beſtowing on her the Dukedom of Valen-

" bore to Diana de Poitiers, Ducheſs of Valentinois " his miſtreſs, who had been the firſt object of his " inclinations, and had rouzed him. It is ſaid that " King Francis his father, who had firſt loved that " Lady, diſcovering his diſſatisfaction, after the " death of his ſon Francis the Dauphin, at the heavy " diſpoſition of his ſon Prince Henry; ſhe ſaid to " the King, that he wanted to be in love, and that " ſhe would make him her ſpark. The King, " whoſe affections were divided between her and the " Ducheſs of Eſtampes, conſented to it; but though " the Court was extremely licentious at that time, " we yet ought to ſuppoſe, that nothing was tranſact- " ed between them that could give the leaſt handle " to ſlander; and that it was merely from a ſpirit " of calumny, that ſome perſons were prompted to " throw, into the apartment of Henry II. a writing, " containing the imprecation and curſe uttered a- " gainſt Reuben (21); and even (22) it is not cer- " tain, that Diana of Poitiers ſuffered this friendſhip " to exceed the bounds of generous eſteem and gal- " lantry. A proof of this is, ſhe had had children " by Lewis de Brezé Count de Maulevrier, Seneſchal " of Normandy, her huſband; and King Henry II. " left behind him as well legitimate as natural chil- " dren, and yet it is not obſerved that any ſprung " from the loves." The proof alledged by Le Laboureur is far from ſtrong; or, to ſpeak more juſtly, it is inſignificant, and even makes againſt him; for, at this rate he ought not to have ſaid, that Francis I. *divided his affections between Diana of Poitiers and the Ducheſs of Eſtampes*. We do not read that this Prince, who had ſeveral children, had ever any by Diana, who was not ſo old when he had a paſſion for her, as when ſhe was miſtreſs of Henry II. I do not oppoſe to this proof the advanced age of Diana (according to Varillas) when the Dauphin began to entertain a paſſion for her. I am not of opinion that ſhe was near ſo old as this Hiſtorian affirms her to be; but I ſhall only obſerve two particulars; 1ſt, that Diana de Poitiers might have become barren, before the age of forty, by leading too incontinent a life; 2dly, that a widower and widow, though each had had children in their firſt marriage, are often found to have none in ſuch a conjunction.

(21) Chap. xlix. ver. 4. of *Geneſis*.

(22) This *even* is ſuperfluous here, ſince the Author does not ſay any thing afterwards ſtronger than what goes before.

If a perſon were deſirous of not ſuppoſing an inceſtuous commerce, he had better follow Varillas than Le Laboureur. It were better, I ſay, to deny that the Lady in queſtion had had any affair with the father, than to deny her having had one with the ſon. However this be, let us conſider the words of the firſt of theſe two Authors. " I expect to be ac- " cuſed, for having made no mention of the pre- " tended inceſt of the Ducheſs of Valentinois in queſ- " tion with both father and ſon, that is, with King " Francis I. and King Henry II. But to this I an- " ſwer two things; 1ſt, that among the Authors of " that age, which I ſaw in his Majeſty's library, in " a collection containing thirty-ſeven volumes, I do " not meet with one Catholic Writer, who ſays a word " of this inceſtuous commerce; but that theſe having " been as careful not to mention a word of this, as " the Calviniſts have ſhewed a headſtrong paſſion in " relating the ſeveral particulars of it. Not to men- " tion that theſe Calviniſts do not agree in their " ſatyrs; ſince ſome affirm that this Ducheſs, who " was then known only by the name of Diana of " Poitiers, gave herſelf up to King Francis I. on the " ſole view of ſaving, by yielding up her virginity, " the life of the Lord of Vallier, her father, who " otherwiſe would have been beheaded, in a few " days, for having joined in the rebellion of the " Conſtable of Bourbon; whilſt others aſſert, that " ſhe proſtituted herſelf to the Conſtable of Montmo- " rency, firſt Miniſter and Favourite of Francis I. " (23)." If he has no better grounds for this, than for what he adds with regard to the origin of the hatred of the Calviniſts for the Ducheſs of Valentinois, he has loſt his cauſe; for it is quite ridiculous to ſuppoſe it to proceed from the Ducheſs's will (24), rather than to the cruel perſecution which they ſuffered under a reign, in which the whole adminiſtration was carried on according to the caprice of this woman. This doubtleſs is the ſophiſm, *à non cauſa pro cauſa*.

(23) Varillas, *Præf. de l'Hiſt. de Henri* II.

(24) By which ſhe diſinherited the Duke of Bouillon, her ſon-in-law, in caſe he ſhould go over to the Proteſtant Religion.

[G] *She had two daughters by him, whom ſhe got married very advantageouſly.*] Frances de Brezé, the eldeſt, married in 1538, Robert de la Marck, 4th of that name, Duke of Bouillon, Sovereign Prince of Sedan, created Marſhal of France in 1547 (25). Louiſa de Brezé, the great Seneſchal's other daughter, was married to Claudius of Lorrain, Duke of Aumale (26), brother to the Duke of Guiſe who was killed by Poltrot. Varillas is very erroneous here (27). He ſuppoſes that, in the beginning of Henry the IId's reign, the Ducheſs of Valentinois and the Cardinal of Lorrain, endeavoured reciprocally to unite their intereſt, in order to ſtrengthen and increaſe their authority; and that the Cardinal, in this view, propoſed a marriage between the Prince of Joinville, his elder brother, with the Ducheſs's eldeſt daughter; but this not ſucceeding, the Ducheſs was obliged to be content with marrying her eldeſt daughter with Duke d'Aumale, the Cardinal's younger brother; after which ſhe married her ſecond daughter to the ſon of Marſhal de Fleuranges, Prince of Sedan (28). Now this is confounding times and things; for Diana of Poitier's eldeſt daughter married Robert de la Marck, Prince of Sedan, in 1538 (29). Nor could Henry Robert of la Marck, their ſon, have married, in 1558, the Duke of Montpenſier's daughter (30), if her mother had married in the reign of Henry II. I ſay nothing of Antoinette de la Marck, ſiſter of Henry Robert, who was married to Damville, ſecond ſon of the Conſtable of Montmorency, in 1558, according to Varillas (31); for as he obſerves that ſhe was *almoſt marriageable*, he would eſcape the force of my objection, and I don't know how old the Lady was then. Having got a friend (32) to conſult Mr. d'Hozier, a Gentleman perfectly well ſkilled in Genealogies and Hiſtory, I am informed that Frances de Brezé, Diana de Poitier's eldeſt daughter, married in 1538, Robert de la Marck; and that Louiſa de Brezé, her ſecond daughter, married Claude of Lorrain, Duke of Aumale, in 1546 (33); for *William of Poitiers, her uncle, ſpeaks of her as wife to that Prince, in the will made by him the 12th of March* 1546. Preſident de la Place obſerves, that Duke d'Aumale married in the reign of Francis I. by the ſame token, that the King would not permit the bride to *be dreſſed, on the day of her nuptials, as a Princeſs* (34). This ſhews the miſtakes of the modern Hiſtorian of Admiral Coligni. He ſuppoſes that the Conſtable of Montmorency, having again regained the ſummit of the royal favour, after the death of Francis I. had a mind to marry Coligni to the heireſs of Laval: but Coligni did not approve of the propoſal; and put d'Andelot his brother in his room. The Conſtable imagined, that Coligni had refuſed it, becauſe of the paſſion he had entertained for Mademoiſelle de Brezé, and therefore deſired that young Nobleman *not to viſit that young Lady ſo often; or to do this at leaſt with a deſign only to try whether ſhe would be of the ſame temper with her mother* (35). He nevertheleſs viſited her as aſſiduouſly as before. This Author, after relating a variety of intrigues, tells us, that Diana having two daughters to diſpoſe of in marriage, caſt about for huſbands, whoſe intereſt might contribute to ſupport her's (36); when thinking the Prince of Joinville a good match, ſhe ſpoke to the Cardinal of Lorrain about it. He adds (37), that Coligni obſerved to this Prince, that ſuch a marriage would be diſhonourable to him, upon which he did not purſue that affair; and that Diana afterwards married her daughter to Duke d'Aumale, that Prince's younger brother. See the remark [Q]. I am ſurprized

(25) Anſelme, *Hiſt. des Officiers de la Couronne*, p. 179.

(26) Idem, *Palais de l'Honneur*, p. 448.

(27) *Hiſt. de Henri* II. liv. 1. p. 44, 49. ad ann. 1547.

(28) Ibid. p 49.

(29) Father Anſelme, *Hiſt. des grans Officiers*, p. 179.

(30) Ibid.

(31) *Hiſt. de Henri II.* liv. 7. 7. p. 301.

(32) Mr. Janniçon, Advocate of the Council.

(33) It is perhaps, by computing the beginning of the year from Eaſter.

(34) *Commentaires de l'etat de la Religion & Republique*, folio 59 *verſon.* edit. 1565.

(35) *Vie de Gaſpard de Coligny*, liv. 2. p. 87. edit. 1686.

(36) Ibid. p. 102.

(37) Ibid. p. 106.

Valentinois. I am of opinion, that ſhe was not ſo old as Varillas affirms [*H*], at the time that ſhe ſet up for Head of a Party, in oppoſition to the Ducheſs of Eſtampes, in

prized at all the particulars related by this Author, and the vaſt Commentaries which he builds on a few words of Brantome. He is a faithful Imitator of Varillas, an Author who will ſpoil a numberleſs multitude of Authors, unleſs ſome remedy be applied. But not to ſpeak of theſe hiſtorical miſtakes, I ſhall only obſerve, that Diana de Poitiers had no daughter to diſpoſe of in marriage, when Henry II. her lover aſcended the Throne the 31ſt of March 1547; for, as I have already obſerved, the eldeſt of her two daughters was married in 1538, and the youngeſt in 1546.

[*H*] *I am of opinion, that ſhe was not ſo old as Varillas affirms.*] We will tranſcribe his words, obſerving only, that what follows relates to the year 1544. "Diana of Poitiers was the Dauphin's miſtreſs, as "the Ducheſs (38) was in that quality to the King. "But this was the only thing in which they reſem- "bled one another, both with regard to the body and "the mind. The Ducheſs had never been more "beautiful than ſhe was at that time. She had not "loſt one of thoſe charms, for which ſhe was thought, "by the niceſt Judges, and even by the Emperor "himſelf, the moſt finiſhed beauty in Europe; and "Diana of Poitiers had ſcarce one of thoſe features "which one and twenty years before, had ſaved St. "Vallier her father's life. The Ducheſs was but "one and thirty, and Diana of Poitiers was ſuſpect- "ed to be near threeſcore, the care that was taken "to conſult the pariſh regiſter for her birth, having "been to no purpoſe. . . . . The Ducheſs . . . . ſpoke "with great freedom of Diana; whereas the latter "concealed, under feigned demonſtrations of reſ- "pect and complaiſance, the indignation ſhe har- "boured at being ſo much deſpiſed. The ſame "freedom of ſpeech had made the Ducheſs ſay, that "ſhe was born the ſame day that Diana of Poitiers "was married. The words gave ſo much the more "offence, as they might be true; and reproached "Diana with being equally incapable of giving or "receiving love, as it was known that it was a long "time before ſhe could get a huſband (39). She ne- "verthelefs concealed her reſentment ſo long as the "King enjoyed perfect health; but the inſtant ſhe "perceived that his Majeſty was upon the decline, "ſhe hinted to the Ducheſs, that the time was at "hand in which ſhe ſhould be revenged of her (40)." I don't know where this Author picked up theſe ſtories, but I very much queſtion the truth of them. I one day heard ſome perſons ſpeak of this in manner following. Firſt (was it ſaid) had Diana de Poitiers been forty years of age, at the time of Saint Vallier's trial, it is not probable that Hiſtorians would have mentioned her as a tid-bit with regard to Francis I. A married woman, or widow, will ſooner paſs for a handſom woman, at forty years old, than a maid from the ſame age. The former are better ſecured from the odious name of old woman, than the latter is of that of old maid; and, through an ill effect of prejudice, the former will be thought a more ſuitable match than the latter. Secondly, Mezerai ſays, that Diana was but fourteen years of age when ſhe ſaved her father's life (41), which is infinitely more probable than to ſuppoſe her forty. A Reader does not ſo eaſily believe, that the life of a criminal was exchanged for a faded virgin-flower; as if he is told, (which Mezerai does) that the perſon who made that barter was but fourteen; and this even better pleads the apology of Francis the Firſt. Thirdly, If Diana de Poitiers was near ſixty years of age in 1544, ſhe muſt have been threeſcore and fifteen when Henry II. died; that is, on the day of the famous tournament on which this Prince received his death's wound, his dreſs would have been black and white, *on account of the lovely widow whoſe humble ſervant he was* (42): an old woman of threeſcore and fifteen years of age would have been ſerved on the foot of the lovely widow. Would the Proteſtants, who were ſo cruelly perſecuted by that woman, and who revenged themſelves in their writings, have omitted her very advanced age? A young Monarch, diſtractedly in love with an old woman of ſeventy, is ſo proper a ſubject for ridicule, that every one of the ſatyrs which were publiſhed againſt Henry II. would have cenſured him in the moſt unmerciful and drole manner, on his crazy antiquated miſtreſs, had the Ducheſs of Valentinois been ſo far advanced in years. The ſilence of the Satyriſts, who only obſerve that Diana was in the autumn of life, that is, between forty and fifty, ſeems to me a ſtrong argument againſt Varillas. But this is not the ſtrongeſt part of the objection. More ſtreſs was laid on what Brantome relates in his *Memoires des Dames Galantes*. He ſays (43) that, two years after this Prince's death, the enemies of the Ducheſs of Valentinois ſought her friendſhip. She conſequently muſt have lived, at leaſt, to ſeventy-ſeven years of age; how then, according to Brantome, came ſhe to die at ſeventy years and a half old (44)? Fourthly, It is ſcarce probable that, in 1544, the Ducheſs of Eſtampes was but one and thirty; if this were true, ſhe was but thirteen when ſhe was miſtreſs to Francis I. Not to inſiſt upon this; but ſhe was Maid of Honour to the Queen Regent before the King fell in love with her; and I queſtion very much whether, in that age, when children were educated leſs expeditiouſly than in this, a young Lady of twelve years would have been qualified to be one of the Maids of Honour to the Queen-Regent. Fifthly, I confeſs that jealouſy prompts Court-Ladies, as well as others, to employ paſſionate expreſſions, and to vent ſtrange untruths: but when perſons ſee themſelves expoſed to the piercing eyes of a faction who are her enemies; they endeavour not to relate particulars which are abſolutely abſurd, nor palpable falſhoods known to the whole Court. Now it cannot be ſaid that the Ducheſs of Eſtampes had kept that guard upon her tongue, in caſe ſhe preſumed to ſay, that ſhe was born on the day in which Diana de Poitiers married. Not one perſon in the French Court but knew the date of the Ducheſs's diſhonour; King Francis the Firſt's return from Spain being too ſignal an æra to be forgot. Now this was alſo the very time in which Mademoiſelle de Heilli began her intrigues. The Court remembered almoſt as well the pardon ſent to Saint Vallier on the ſcaffold; conſequently they knew the date of Diana de Poitiers's diſhonour; and were not ignorant that the æra's of the intrigues of the two Ladies in queſtion, were not far diſtant one from the other. Since therefore it was known to the whole Court, that Saint Vallier's daughter did not marry the great Seneſchal of Normandy, till after Francis I. had enjoyed her (45), we muſt conclude that the Ducheſs of Eſtampes acted very ridiculouſly, in caſe ſhe ſpoke the words which Varillas puts into her mouth; *I was born on the ſame day that Diana of Poitiers married:* for this might eaſily have been proved an abſolute falſhood and a trifling jeſt. The Reader will ſee hereunder (46), that none of theſe reflections are juſt.

The Author of the Amours of the Kings of France has copied all theſe errors of Varillas, and even increaſed them, by referring to the year 1547 (47), what the other had referred to 1544, which gives riſe to ſeveral new falſities. Mademoiſelle de Heilli was but ten years of age when the King lay with her, and Saint Vallier was pardoned in 1526. Eſpernai and Chateau-Thierri were taken, and the treaty of Creſpi was concluded after the year 1546. Here follows another error of that Author. He ſays (48), that Francis I. *grew inſenſible to all the reſt of the Court-Ladies*, upon his being fired with a paſſion for *Mademoiſelle d'Heilli*, immediately after his return from Spain; and that *Diana, who had been long married to Lewis de Brezé, Seneſchal of Normandy, endeavoured to conſole herſelf for the loſs of that Prince's affection, by the teſtimonies which the Dauphin gave her of his affection.* The Reader is to know, that Henry II. was but eight years of age when his father returned from Spain in 1526: alſo, that he was not Dauphin till 1536; and that Diana was a widow when the Dauphin fell in love with her. Hence let him judge if the Author of the Amours of the Kings of France is very accurate.

(38) The Ducheſs of Eſtampes.

(39) This is a falſity. See the rem. [*P*].

(40) Varillas, *Hiſt. de Francis I.* liv. 11. p. 97. Dutch edit.

(41) *Abrege Chronol.* Tom. 4. p. 520. This agrees with what he ſays in Tome 2. of his hiſtory at large, p. 1058, that Diana, tho' 53 years of age, ingratiated herſelf into the Dauphin's affections. La Planche, in his *Hiſtory of Francis II.* agrees with this. *In her juvenile years*, ſays he, p. 14. *ſhe ſaved her father's (St. Vallier) life, by giving up her maidenhead; and afterwards, by an unhappineſs fatal to France, ſhe won the heart of Henry II. when in her declining years.*

(42) Brantome, *Eloge de Henri II.* p. 39. of Tom. 2.

(43) Tom. 2. p. 328.

(44) Ibid. p. 228.

(45) This is falſe. See the rem. [*P*].

(46) In the rem. [*P*].

(47) Tom. 1. p. 204. edit. of 1695.

(48) p. 187.

[*I*] *The*

in the reign of Francis the Firſt. Many very ſingular particulars are related, both of the reſolution ſhe diſcovered after the death of Henry the Second [*I*], and the duration of her beauty [*K*]. She was a mortal enemy to the Proteſtants [*L*]; and, doubtleſs, the religious zeal which ſuch a woman ſhewed, was one of the moſt remarkable ſcenes of the grand comedy that is played on the ſtage of the world. If there be any particular in Brantome's Memoirs, not only flat, but even worthy of being had in deteſtation, it is his groveling condeſcention, in praiſing this Ducheſs, and in applauding the

[*I*] *The reſolution ſhe diſcovered after the death of Henry II.*] Brantome gives us the following account on that head. "The Ducheſs of Valentinois, when "King Henry II. was near his end, and little hopes "were entertained of his recovery, was ordered to "retire to her hotel in Paris, and not to come again "into his bed-chamber, leſt ſhe ſhould diſturb him in "his godly thoughts, and becauſe ſome perſons en-"vied her. Being withdrawn, orders were ſent her "to reſtore ſome rings and jewels which belonged "to the Crown. Immediately ſhe aſked the meſſen-"ger whether the King was dead; and upon his an-"ſwering that he was not, but would certainly die "very ſoon, ſhe ſpoke thus; I would have my ene-"mies know, that ſo long as the King lives, I do "not fear them, nor will obey them till he has left "the world. My courage is as yet invincible; but, "when once he ſhall have breathed his laſt, I will not "ſurvive him. How bitter ſoever my life may be here-"after, it yet will be ſweet in compariſon of the loſs "I ſhall ſuſtain; and therefore, whether my Sove-"reign be living or dead, I don't fear my enemies. "This Lady, in this behaviour, diſplayed the great-"eſt generoſity; but then, will it be objected, ſhe "did not die, according to her promiſe. She never-"theleſs was brought very near death; and indeed, "it was better for her to live than die, as ſhe thereby "ſhewed her enemies that ſhe did not fear them; "and that, having ſo often ſeen them in a poſture "of humility and trembling before her, ſhe was de-"termined not to do the ſame; and indeed, ſhe "diſcovered ſo much reſolution and intrepidity of "mind, that they could never ruffle her; nay, in "two years, they courted her friendſhip more than "ever; and were reconciled to her, as is the cuſtom "of the great, whoſe friendſhips and enmities are "not laſting; but whoſe differences are as eaſily "made up, as thoſe of thieves in a fair, and love "and hate one another with the ſame eaſe and in-"difference, which we little people do not; for we "muſt either fight, revenge ourſelves and die; or "put an end to our conteſts by very delicate and ſo-"lemn agreements; and notwithſtanding this, we are "no better friends than before (49)."

(49) Brantome, *Dames Galantes*, Tom. 2. p. m. 327.

The difference which Brantome obſerves between the manner in which the great are reconciled, and how little people carry on their quarrels, recalls to my memory what was ſaid to a Pariſian in the time of the wars between the houſe of Orleans and that of Burgundy. "During this war, matters were carried "on with ſo much heat, that after ſeveral ſieges had "been ſuſtained and cities ruined, a peace was pro-"jected, and concluded at Auxerre. For as the "Duke of Burgundy ſaid to a Pariſian, who was "come to wait upon him; WE WHO ARE OF THE "BLOOD ROYAL, AND RELATED TO THE KING, "FALL OUT WITH ONE ANOTHER WHENEVER WE "PLEASE; AND ARE ALSO RECONCILED WHEN-"EVER WE THINK PROPER. Monſtrelet ſays far-"ther, that a Burgundian ſaid, THAT IT WAS "GREAT FOLLY IN MEN TO KILL ONE ANOTHER "FOR THE SAKE OF PRINCES, WHO RECONCILE "DIFFERENCES WHENEVER THEY PLEASE (50)."

(50) Rouillard, *Hiſt. de Melun*, p. 515.

[*K*] *The duration of her beauty.*] Brantome informs us of this. "I ſaw the Ducheſs of Valentinois at "ſeventy years of age, as beautiful, freſh and love-"ly, as when ſhe was but thirty; and therefore it "is no wonder that ſhe was beloved by one of the "greateſt and moſt valiant Monarchs of the Uni-"verſe. This I may ſay freely, without injuring "that Lady's beauty; for every Lady who has won "the affections of a mighty King, it is an indicati-"on that ſhe is miſtreſs of all perfections; and in-"deed beauty, the gift of Heaven, ought not to be "beſtowed ſparingly on Demi-gods. I ſaw the Lady "in queſtion ſix months before her death, when ſhe "ſtill poſſeſſed ſo many charms, that I am perſua-"ded the moſt obdurate heart could not have with-"ſtood them, though ſhe, before, had broke her leg "in a ſtreet in Orleans. She then rode with as much "dexterity as ever; but the horſe fell under her. "One would have concluded, that the great pain "ſhe felt would have diſguiſed her features; but ſo "far from it, her beauty, her graces and majeſtic "air, were as conſpicuous as ever. She had an ex-"tremely white ſkin, and never uſed to paint; but "it is ſaid, that ſhe uſed to drink every morning, "ſome broths compoſed of potable gold, and other "things, with which good Phyſicians and learned "Apothecaries are acquainted, for as to myſelf, I "know nothing of the matter. It is my opinion, "that had this Lady lived to the age of an hundred, "ſhe would never have been an old woman, ſo re-"gular and beautiful were her features, and ſo "ſtrong and vigorous her conſtitution. It is pity "that earth ſhould cover ſo lovely a body (51)."

(51) Brantome, *Dames Galantes*, Tom. 2. p. 328.

[*L*] *She was a mortal enemy to the Proteſtants.*] Beza aſcribes the cruel perſecutions, which the Proteſtants ſuffered in the reign of Henry II. to the counſel of three perſons, the Cardinal of Lorrain, the Ducheſs of Valentinois, and Marſhal St. André. *The Cardinal*, ſays he (52), *had his Majeſty's conſcience at his diſpoſal*; the Ducheſs *poſſeſſed his body, for which ſhe was ſtrongly ſuſpected to deal in magical arts, ſince ſhe had paſſed her life with diſreputation; and had nothing in herſelf which could with reaſon (if there is any thing like reaſon in ſuch paſſions,) attract or preſerve the heart of ſuch a Prince. Theſe three being always at the King's ear, in order to perſuade him of the truth of two things, viz. that the Proteſtant Religion was an enemy to Monarchy of every kind, and Kingly power, and the cauſes of all confuſion; the other, that the true way of making amends, before God and Men, for the ſeveral vices which were committed, in which they themſelves indulged him, was, to extirpate the adverſaries of the Romiſh religion; theſe, I ſay, prevailed ſo far, that even in the very beginning of his reign, he made it his chief ſtudy and buſineſs, to perſecute and deſtroy with the utmoſt violence, the churches which the late King his father had begun to invade.* Here follows a paſſage from Brantome. *Above all, ſhe was a very zealous Catholic, and bore a ſtrong hatred to the Proteſtants, which is the reaſon why they hated, and calumniated her to ſuch a degree* (53). But nothing can be more remarkable than what is related by Varillas (54). "In the Will made by her, when ſhe was the moſt "in favour, and which ſhe did not revoke, at her "death, ten or twelve years after; ſhe declared, "in the chief article, that ſhe was ſo firmly devoted "to the Catholic religion, that ſhould it unfortunate-"ly happen that the Ducheſſes of Aumale and Bou-"illon, her daughters, for any cauſe or pretence "whatſoever, ſhould quit it, and embrace any of the "new opinions, ſhe would diſinherit them, and give "all her eſtates to the hoſpitals of the ſeveral places in "which they ſhould be ſituated. In caſe only one "of her daughters ſhould leave the Catholic Faith, "ſhe would give her the other half of her eſtate, which "would have been her right, had ſhe not changed "(55); and, if her relations ſhould not take due "care to ſee her laſt will exactly complied with, ſhe "conjured the Parliament of Paris, by the good of-"fices ſhe had formerly done it, with reſpect to "King Henry II. to ſupply whatever might be left "wanting by her relations." The Hiſtorian obſerves, that this article of the Will was not executed; for the Ducheſs of Bouillon made an open profeſſion of the Proteſtant Religion, and nevertheleſs ſhared her mother's eſtate equally with the Ducheſs of Aumale. The Author takes occaſion from thence to applaud the

(52) *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſtique*, liv. 2. p. 68.

(53) Brantome, *Eloge de Henri II.* Tom. 2. of his *Memoirs*, p. 9.

(54) *Hiſt. de Henri II.* liv. 1. p. 36 and 37.

(55) The Author expreſſes himſelf ſo ill, that we are forced to gueſs his meaning.

the exceſſive complaiſance of Henry II [*M*]. Thuanus has been far from employing ſuch ſhameleſs flattery; he branding, in a due manner, the memory of the Conſtable of Montmorency [*N*], who, notwithſtanding his great pride, was yet ſo mean as to cringe to that proſtitute. But Mezerai did not flatter on this occaſion [*O*]. She has been applauded for not carrying her vengeance to as high a pitch as ſhe might have done, againſt the Ducheſs of Eſtampes, after the death of Francis I. (*b*). The mighty poſſeſſions ſhe had accumulated were of great ſervice to her, after the death of Henry II. She employed them in order to ſoften the Queen-mother, and retired to her fine houſe at Anet; but not (as we are told) till after having been ſeverely reprimanded by Catharine of Medicis (*c*). This Queen was frighted at the offer which Tavannes made her, to cut off the Ducheſs of Valentinois's noſe. *She told him that it would be his ruin*; to which he anſwered, that he would die with pleaſure, could he thereby *ſuppreſs vice, the bane of the King, and that of France* (*d*). To conclude, I will examine the account of thoſe who affirm, that ſhe ſaved her father's life by giving up her virgin-flower; and will produce ſome dates to ſettle the diſputes of certain Hiſtorians [*P*]. It is a ſhame that they ſhould diſagree about incidents that are ſo very recent.

(*a*) Varillas, *Hiſt de Henri II.* liv. 1. p. m. 33, 44.

(*c*) See the rem. [*O*].

(*d*) *Memoires de Tavannes*, cited by le Laboureur, *Addit. de Caſtelnau*, Tom. 2. p. 573.

The

the generoſity of the Guiſes, *ſo true it is*, ſays he, *that the houſe of Guiſe has ſometimes exerted ſuch acts of diſintereſtedneſs and generoſity, as are not found in the Princes of other families.* He ſoon after overthrows the foundation, on which he had raiſed this elogium (56). But we have nothing to do with that here. Here follows another paſſage, which plainly ſhews the averſion the Ducheſs had to the Proteſtants. "She did not care to expreſs her thoughts to d'Andelot; for though ſhe had not ſcrupled to live, for twenty years, in ſuch a commerce with her Sovereign as was prohibited by the Laws of the Goſpel; ſhe nevertheleſs was ſo conſcientiouſly ſcrupulous, that ſhe did not dare ſo much as to ſpeak to perſons ſuſpected to be Hereticks (57)." How ridiculous was this conduct! I intreat my Readers to reflect a little on this whimſical zeal, ſo very common.

(56) He ſays, p. 49. *That the Cardinal of Lorrain, who was very wary, took care to inſert, in the contract of Count d'Aumale, ſome clauſes ſo very advantageous to that Count, that he afterwards inherited the greateſt part of his mother-in-law's eſtate.*

(57) Varillas, *Hiſt. de Henri II.* lib. 7. p. 301. ad ann. 1558.

[*M*] *Brantome had the groveling condeſcention to applaud the exceſſive complaiſance of Henry* II.] Tho' Brantome expatiates ever ſo much on the Ducheſs of Valentinois's courage; though he ſays that ſhe was handſome till the age of ſeventy, and that ſhe rode a horſe well, no perſon will be angry with him on that account. But it is intolerable to hear him ſay, that ſhe "adviſed, inculcated, and perſuaded the King "to nothing but what was great, exalted and generous ..... (58). That ſhe was very gracious, "charitable to the poor, vaſtly devout; and accordingly, that her motto was a grave, as living only "in God; and that the French ought to pray, that "God may never let the King have a worſe favourite "than ſhe was (59). The prodigious donation, which "his Majeſty, at his acceſſion to the throne, beſtowed on the Ducheſs of Valentinois, on the eſtabliſhment of all the officers of France, as is the "cuſtom in every new reign, was thought a very "ſtrange thing. An immenſe ſum aroſe from this, "by reaſon of the long reign which Francis I. enjoyed. Such a Monarch might juſtly make ſo great "a donation to ſuch a Lady, this being an eſcheat, "which made no part of the King's revenues, ariſing "from demeſnes, ſubſidies, or taxes; and the Monarchs of that age uſed to beſtow ſuch eſcheats "very freely, as I have been informed by perſons of "credit, and were blamed if they applied them to "their own uſe. With theſe they uſed to reward "their ſervants; but our later Monarchs have kept "them for themſelves, and farmed them to ſupply "their neceſſities. Farther, the Lady in queſtion "did not make an ill uſe of the money ſo ariſing, "ſhe building the beautiful palace of Anet, which "will be a perpetual ornament to France (60)." Theſe words fill one with indignation. We are leſs offended at the elogiums which Francis de Billon has beſtowed on her, and which amount to this, that ſhe was a woman of her word, and beneficent (61).

(58) Brantome, *Elog. de Henri II.* lib. 7. p. 301. ad ann. 1558.

(59) Ibid. p. 11.

(60) Ibid. p. 10.

(61) See the book entitled, *Le Fort inexpugnable de l'Honneur du Sexe feminin conſtruit par Francois de Billon Secretaire*, printed in 1555. folio 170.

[*N*] *Thuanus ..... has branded in a due manner the memory of the Conſtable of Montmorency.*] I ſhould enervate the force of his expreſſions, if I attempted a tranſlation of them, for which reaſon I will ſet them down in the original. *Hæc violenta & acerba regni initia ſub miti & moderato principe & qui alieno potius quam ſuo ingenio uteretur, facile Miniſtris tributa ſunt: ſed præcipue Dianæ Pictavienſi ſuperbi & impotentis animi feminæ, apud quam plurimum gratia valebant Lotharingi fratres & Santandreanus ..... Hujus feminæ arbitrio omnia regebantur, & Momorantius ipſe, ut auctoritatem & potentiam, quam apud regem obtinebat, incolumem tueretur, morem gerere, & prudentiam ad turpe obſequium flectere ſatagebat; peſſimo exemplo ſummi imperii ad impotentis feminæ libidinem proſtituti; quæ poſtremo ut jam in homines, ſic & in ærarium quod hominibus imperat, poteſtatem arripuit, expulſo Joanne Vallo ſanctioris ærarii quæſtore, & in ejus locum ſuffecto Blondo Rupicuriano homine ſuo* (62). He afterwards mentions the methods by which this blood-ſucker extorted money from the people, to ſatiate his avarice (63). De Mezerai obſerves that the King, *at the caprice and pleaſure of this artful woman in queſtion changed the whole face of the Court* (64).

(62) Thuan. *Hiſt.* lib. 3. p. 58.

(63) See Lewis de Reinier, Sieur de la Planche, in his *Hiſt. of Franis II.* p. 14.

[*O*] *Mezerai did not flatter on this occaſion.*] Here follow his words, ſpeaking of the ſtate to which things were reduced, after the death of Henry II. *The Ducheſs of Valentinois did not continue long at Court, after the* Keeper of the Seals, Bertrandi. *She was ſent away upon the arrival of Olivier whom ſhe had turned out; and ſhe was obliged to give up, ignominiouſly, the keys of the King's cloſet, and the jewels belonging to the Royal Family which were given to the reigning Queen. This however was not done to ſatisfy Olivier, but to ſatiate the juſt reſentment of Catharine, who could no longer ſuffer, without reflecting a diſgrace upon herſelf, a woman who had ſo long deprived her of her huſband's heart. The reader will ſuppoſe that this Princeſs would not permit her to go without reproaches, and the ſevere treatment ſhe deſerved. By the credit and intereſt of Duke d'Aumale, her ſon-in-law, ſhe did not meet with harſher uſage; ſhe being obliged to him for the preſerving the great wealth ſhe had amaſſed by the forfeited eſtates of criminals, the ſale of benefices, and other unjuſt methods, becauſe ſhe promiſed to conſtitute him her ſole heir: however, ſhe was forced to give up to the Queen-mother her fine Seat of Chenonceaux on the Cher* (65). This is an extract, (but ſoftened pretty much) of the Sieur de la Planche's account (66).

(64) *Hiſt. de France*, Tom. 2. p. 1058. ad ann. 1547.

(65) Ibid. Tom. 3. p. 6.

(66) Page 15 and 16 of *Hiſt. de l'eſtat de France, tant de la Republique que de la Religion, ſous le Regne de François II.*

[*P*] *I will examine the account of thoſe who affirm, that ſhe ſaved her father's life by giving up her virgin-flower, and will produce ſome dates, to ſettle the diſputes of certain Hiſtorians.*] I am informed by Mr. d'Hozier, that ſhe married the great Seneſchal of Normandy the 29th of March 1514. Mezerai aſſerts a notorious falſity, in relating that the King ſent a pardon to Saint Vallier, *after bereaving his daughter Diana, then about fourteen, of her moſt valuable treaſure* (67). He doubtleſs means that ſhe gave up her virgin-treaſure to Francis I. He therefore is miſtaken in two particulars: he did know that, in 1523, ſhe muſt have been, at leaſt, twenty years old; and that ſhe had been a woman eight or nine years. It is very plain that his words are only a paraphraſe upon thoſe of la Planche cited by me (68). He gives the following judgment of that Hiſtorian: *Regnier de la Planche*, ſays he (69), *was ſon to the Lieutenant General of Poitiers, was an artful man, and of a ready wit, but of a miſchievous turn of mind, which had imbibed Calvin's opinions; beſides, he was the confident of Marſhal de Montmorency, and conſequently an enemy to the Guiſes.*

(67) Mezerai, *Abregé Chronol.* Tom. 4. p. 520. ad ann. 1523.

(68) Rem. [*H*], citat. (41).

(69) Mezerai, *Hiſt. de France*, Tom. 3. p. 26.

The circumſtance which has been aſſerted in a book printed at Baſil in 1698, that the Duke of Guiſe intended to marry our *Senechalle*, is falſe [Q]. This is one of the miſtakes

It is no wonder that a man of this character did not enquire, whether Diana de Poitiers was long married to the great Seneſchal at the time that ſhe ſaved her father's life. Thoſe who diſcover ſomething myſterious in the minuteſt particulars, imagine that Francis I. had ſome reaſon to expreſs himſelf in manner following, in the pardon he granted to St. Vallier. *Whereas our dear and truſty couſin, Counſellor and Chamberlain, Count de Maulevrier, great Seneſchal of Normandy, and the relations and friends of John de Poitiers, Sieur of St. Vallier, have lately very humbly beſought and intreated us to take pity and compaſſion on the ſaid Poitiers Sieur of St. Vallier*, &c. Care was taken, ſay theſe ſpeculative men, not to mention the leaſt particular of the affinity or relation between the great Seneſchal and the criminal. Care was taken not to ſay that he made interceſſion for his wife's father: they were afraid that this would raiſe in people's minds ſuch ſuſpicions and calumnies as they juſtly dreaded, conſidering the youth and beauty of the Lady who had interceded for her father's life. But laying aſide theſe idle ſubtilties, I will now examine Varillas's remark. He has *not met*, ſays he (70), *with one Catholic, who has ſpoke of this inceſtuous commerce; thoſe of the old religion* (the Roman Catholicks) *have aſſiduouſly declined ſpeaking of it, as the Calviniſts have been paſſionate in the particulars they relate concerning it*. He ſpeaks only of the writers of that age, *whoſe works conſiſt of thirty ſeven volumes*. I wiſh I had time to examine, whether there were any books, great or ſmall, written by Catholicks in the reign of Francis I. or Henry II. which mention the cauſe of the pardon that was indulged to St. Vallier; and I exhort all thoſe who have an opportunity for it, and may have any intereſt in that affair, to enquire into it. However Varillas cannot deny but that the Roman Catholic Writers, in the 17th Century, mention the paſſion which Francis I. entertained for the great Seneſchal's Lady. Le Laboureur does not deny it (71). Mezerai ſpeaks more clearly of this than la Planche, and we have quoted a modern Author, who never was a Proteſtant, and who confirms what is to be found in the pieces which are called Huguenot Libels. I have given his words (72), but did not obſerve that it is a falſity in him to aſſert, that young Diana entered *into the ſervice of Queen Claude, in quality of maid of honour*. This Queen was the daughter of Lewis XII. married Francis I. the 14th of May 1514, and was not Queen till January following. Now Diana was married to Lewis de Brezé the 29th of March 1514, and therefore was not maid of honour to Queen Claude. A friend (73) has been ſo good as to inform me, that ſhe loſt her huſband in 1531; and raiſed to his memory a magnificent Mauſolæum, in the Church of Notre-Dame, in Roan; that ſhe died in 1566, aged ſixty ſix years and twenty ſeven days, and that her body was depoſited at Anet. Beſides, Hilarion du Coſte (74) obſerves, that ſhe died the 26th of April 1566. The reſult of all this is, that ſhe was born the 31ſt of March 1500; and that the Ducheſs of Eſtampes romanced very ridiculouſly, when ſhe declared herſelf ſo very young in compariſon of Diana de Poitiers her rival. This will give me occaſion to rectify ſuch particulars, as are not very accurate in the paſſages cited above, with regard to the Ducheſs of Valentinois's age.

The Franciſcan whom I cited hints clearly enough at the inceſtuous commerce. I will quote pretty largely from him, as we ſhall thereby meet with ſeveral particulars which belong to this article. "After the death of Lewis de Brezé her huſband, King Henry II. who loved her tenderly, and was entirely wrapt up in her, created her Ducheſs of Valentinois, which title ſhe enjoyed till the day of her death, which happened the 26th of April 1566; and was buried in the noble Chapel ſhe had built at her ſeat at Anet, (which the Poets of that age called Dianet) after having divided her poſſeſſions between her ſecond daughter Louiſa, Ducheſs of Aumale, and the children of her eldeſt daughter. She ordered, by her will, in caſe ſhe died at Paris, that her body ſhould be firſt carried to the Church of the *Filles Penitentes*, and from thence to Anet; and ſhewed the averſion ſhe entertained at the Proteſtant Religion. The emblems or devices of Diana, Ducheſs of Valentinois, were more ſuitable to Diana Ducheſs of Angouleſme. The firſt was a dart or arrow (a ſymbol of the arms of the chaſte Diana, Goddeſs of hunting) with the following Latin words on a ribbon which ſurrounded the dart, CONSEQUITUR QUODCUMQUE PETIT, SHE OBTAINS WHATEVER SHE ASKS. By this emblem, ſhe hinted at the credit and favour ſhe had with regard to King Henry II. and the aſcendant ſhe had over that Prince, who could not refuſe any thing ſhe requeſted; as likewiſe over all the Grandees of that Kingdom, and King Francis I. ſhe having obtained, from that Monarch, a pardon for her father the Lord of St. Vallier, who, for aiding the retreat of Charles Duke of Bourbon out of France, was ſeized by order of the above-mentioned Monarch, and ſentenced to loſe his head, which yet was not executed, his Majeſty having ſent him a pardon, at the ſolicitation of that Lady (75). . . . . Diana had alſo another device, *viz.* a tomb, or grave, whence iſſued an arrow ſurrounded with ſome branches and ſhoots of a tufted tree, with the following motto; SOLA VIVIT IN ILLO, *i. e.* SHE LIVES IN HIM ONLY; intimating, that the bare hope of a reſurrection makes us live in the depths of the grave. Neither this beautiful emblem, nor the third, which was a Diana, victorious over Cupid, whom ſhe had felled, and put under her feet, with the following Latin inſcription *; OMNIUM VICTOREM VICI, *i. e.* I HAVE VANQUISHED HIM WHO CONQUERS ALL THINGS, were really uſed by Diana Ducheſs of Valentinois, but by Diana Ducheſs of Angouleſme (76)." It is to be obſerved, that all the Authors cited by me miſrepreſent the pardon which was obtained for St. Vallier. It was not ſo full as was imagined, the criminal, though his life was ſpared, having been ſentenced to perpetual impriſonment, during which he ſuffered great hardſhips. Here follow the words of his pardon (77): *We make it known for theſe cauſes, and having conſidered the ſaid ſervices, and chiefly that which was done us by the great Seneſchal* (78), *as it has been ſaid; we have, with our certain knowledge, full power, and royal authority, committed the ſaid puniſhment of death into that hereafter-mentioned*, viz. *that the ſaid de Poitiers ſhall be ſhut up and impriſoned for ever between four ſtone walls, built above and beneath, in which there ſhall be only a little window, through which food ſhall be given him. In all other things the contents of the ſentence ſhall remain in full force, and be entirely put in execution.* If any one ſhould infer from thence, that whatever is related concerning the favours which Diana indulged is falſe, he will be told, that Francis I. ordered a ſuperſedeas to be drawn up, commanding the Parliament to *detain the ſaid St. Vallier in the place where he was impriſoned* (79), till his Majeſty ſhould pleaſe to order otherwiſe. Paſquier may be cited, who *was perſuaded that had not St. Vallier been ſnatched away by death, he would at laſt have been reſtored to all his honours* (80). If it ſhould be added, that this priſoner's crime was one of thoſe which leaſt merited pardon, it will be anſwered, that the leaſt favour which the Lady granted was paid to its full worth, and even beyond it; her father being concerned in a conſpiracy levelled againſt even the perſon of that Monarch. This the King declares in his pardon (81).

[Q] *What has been aſſerted; . . . . that the Duke of Guiſe intended to marry our* Seneſchalle, *is falſe.*] It is related in Tom. II. (82) of the *Mélange critique de Literature*, that the *Ducheſs of Valentinois was the cauſe of the diviſion* between *Admiral de Colligny and the Duke of Guiſe*, which, *at laſt*, was *productive of ſuch aſtoniſhing and fatal effects. Theſe two Noblemen playing one day at tennis, the Admiral ſaid to the Duke of Guiſe*, that he was ſurpriſed a man of his quality and wiſdom would marry a whore, ſpeaking of that Ducheſs. The Duke of Guiſe who loved her, could not bear theſe words; *but entertained a hatred againſt the*

(70) See rem. [F], citat. (23).

(71) See the rem. [F].

(72) Citation (6) above.

(73) Mr. Janniſon, Advocate of the Council at Paris.

(74) *Eloges des Dames Illuſtres*, Tom. I. p. 519.

(75) *Hilarion de Coſte*, ibid.

* In the cabinet of the medals of the library of the Franciſcans, in the *Place Royale*.

(76) Hilarion de Coſte, *Eloges des Dames illuſtr.* Tom. I. p. 520.

(77) See the *Recueil de divers Memoires*, printed at Paris in 1623, p. 58.

(78) A prieſt having informed him, that two Norman Gentlemen had told him, in confeſſion, of a conſpiracy, he ſent notice to the Court of it, and took the depoſitions of the two Gentlemen in queſtion.

(79) In the conciergerie of the Palais, in Paris.

(80) Paſquier, *Recherches de la France*, lib. 8. chap. 39. p. m. 741.

(81) The ſaid great Seneſchal . . has diſcovered to us the plots carrying on againſt our perſon, our children, and our kingdom. *Recueil de Memoires*, p. 58.

(82) Page 113.

miſtakes ſo common in converſation on theſe occaſions, perſons of the beſt memory ſometimes miſtake one period for another, fathers for ſons, and daughters for mothers, &c.

the Admiral; became afterwards his profeſſed enemy, and endeavoured to ruin him; ſo that the whore, *as the Admiral called her, on the quarrel which broke out on her account, was perhaps more the cauſe of the maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's Day, than Religion, which probably was only a handle; this Herodias had perhaps demanded the Admiral's head . . . . .* (83). *I am of opinion that this private quarrel contributed greatly to the maſſacre. The circumſtance which contributes the more to make me conclude this is, becauſe ſeveral Hiſtorians affirm, that the Duke of Guiſe had been often heard to ſay, ſince the maſſacre, that matters had been carried to greater lengths than he intended, and that he did not deſign miſchief againſt any perſon except the Admiral.* It is ſuppoſed, in this narrative, that the Duke of Guiſe in queſtion, who was deſirous of marrying Diana de Poitiers, often declared, that the maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's Day was carried farther than he intended. Now this is blending the father with the ſon; for the Duke of Guiſe, who is repreſented as in love with Diana of Poitiers, had been dead above nine years, at the time that this maſſacre was perpetrated. But the greateſt error is in ſaying, that the Duke of Guiſe, who had been the Admiral's intimate friend, was in love with the Ducheſs of Valentinois, &c. Nothing can be falſer than this, and here follows the cauſe of this miſtake. The Admiral adviſed againſt marrying the Ducheſs of Valentinois's daughter; which was taken as if he had intended to oppoſe the exaltation of the Guiſes, and this was one of the cauſes why theſe two friends became enemies. I will here quote an Author who lived at that time. "The "firſt cauſe of the enmity of the late Duke of "Guiſe was this: the late Duke of Guiſe, your fa- "ther (84), deſired that the Duke d'Aumale ſhould "marry, in order to exalt your family, the ſecond "daughter of the Ducheſs of Valentinois. The "Duke of Guiſe, your brother, could not approve of "this marriage: however, as he did not dare, for "fear of the King, to oppoſe it openly, he addreſſed "the Admiral, and deſired his advice (in a friendly "way) with regard to the anſwer he ſhould make, "when that affair ſhould be mentioned to him, he "added, with tears, that be the conſequence what it "would, he would never conſent to it. The Admi- "ral did all that lay in his power to comfort him; "and after ſome diſcourſe together, his concluſion "was, that it would be better to enjoy an inch of "authority with honour, than a fathom without it, "and then they left one another. But the Duke of "Guiſe, ſo far from approving the advice which he "himſelf was the moſt forward to promote, that, in "order to exaſperate King Henry againſt the Ad- "miral, he ſaid to Marſhal de Vielle-ville, their "common friend, that he could never have believed "that the Admiral would have envied his exaltation, "by endeavouring to divert him from that marri- "age (85)."

It was the moſt neceſſary to rectify this, as perſons of great learning might have been miſled by it, and imagine that this was a very curious piece of ſecret hiſtory, with regard to the cauſes of the maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's Day. The learned Authors of the *Acta Eruditorum* (86), who have given an extract of the *Mélange Critique de Litterature*, conſider, as a very remarkable incident, what has been related above concerning Admiral de Colligni, and the Duke of Guiſe who entertained a paſſion for the Ducheſs of Valentinois, &c. One can never be too careful of preventing certain readers from being impoſed upon.

(83) *Recueil de Memoires*, p. 114.

(84) Theſe words are addreſſed to the Cardinal of Lorrain.

(85) *Reſponſe à l'Epiſtre de Charles de Vaudemont Cardinal de Lorraine . . . . maintenant ſimple Gentilhomme de Hainault*, printed in 1565. See alſo *Memoires de Brantome*, p. m. 146. vol. 3. in the diſcourſe of Admiral Chaſtillon.

(86) See *Acta eruditor*, June 1698. p. 293, 294.

POLITIANUS (ANGELUS) was born at Monte Pulciano (*a*) in Tuſcany, the 14th of July 1454. He was one of the moſt learned and moſt polite Writers of his time [*A*]. He ſtudied the Greek tongue under Andronicus of Theſſalonica *, and made a great progreſs in that language (*b*). It is aſſerted that he was educated in polite learning with Marſilius Ficinus, at the charge of Coſmus de Medicis [*B*]. The firſt work which gained him a reputation was a Poem on Julian de Medicis's Tournament [*C*]. It was generally acknowledged that he ſucceeded better than Luke Pulci an illuſtrious Poet, who in a work of the ſame kind deſcribed the Tournament of Laurence de Medicis Julian's

(*a*) In Latin, *Mons Politianus*.

* Now *Salonichi*.

(*b*) Voſſius *de Hiſt. Latin.* p. 628.

[*A*] *He was one of the moſt learned and moſt polite Writers of his time.*] Men do not differ much in their opinion as to this particular, and there never was perhaps an Author, who knew ſo well how to make all his brethren concur in their favourable ſentiments of him, as Politianus. Can there be any thing more to his honour? The two Scaligers have beſtowed great elogies on him. You will meet with this, and with ſeveral other honourable paſſages in Pope Blount (1). Conſult alſo Monſieur Baillet (2), Barthius (3), and Mr. Crenius in the Preface which he has prefixed to the new edition of Caninius's *Helleniſmus*, printed at Leyden 1700.

[*B*] *It is aſſerted that he was educated . . . . at the charge of Coſmus de Medicis.*] Boiſſard will be my voucher. *Is ſumptu*, ſays he (4), *et promotione Coſmi Florentinorum Principis, cum Marſilio Ficino bonis literis inſtitutus eſt.* i. e. "He was educated in Polite Lite- "rature with Marcilius Ficinus, at the charge and "under the protection of Coſmus Duke of Florence." I cannot tell whence Monſieur Varillas borrowed the following particulars. "He was of Florence, and "his parents were ſo poor, that he was obliged to "wait on Julian and Laurence de Medicis, when they "went to ſchool, and to carry their books, that he "might have an opportunity to peruſe them (5)." It is not true that Politianus was of Florence, as Meſſieurs Varillas and Bullart aſſert (6); he was of Monte Pulciano (7). Obſerve, 1. that Coſmus de Medicis died in the year 1464: ſo that Politianus could not enjoy that patron's favours longer than till he was ten years old. 2, That Marſilius Ficinus was a full grown man when Coſmus died; ſo that Bullart does not expreſs himſelf well. Politianus aſſerts ſomewhere in his works, that being ſtill very young (8) he ſtudied the Platonick Philoſophy under Marſilius Ficinus, and Ariſtotle under Argyropylus.

[*C*] *The firſt work which gained him a reputation was a Poem on Julian de Medicis's Tournament.*] Let us quote Paul Jovius. *Politianus à prima ſtatim juventa admirabilis ingenii nomen adeptus eſt; quum novo illuſtrique poemate Juliani Medicis equeſtres ludos celebraſſet, Luca Pulcio nobili poeta omnium confeſſione ſuperato, qui Laurentii fratris ludicrum equeſtris pugnæ ſpectaculum, iiſdem modis, & numeris decantarat* (9). i. e. "Politia- "nus being ſtill very young gained the reputation of "a wonderful genius, having celebrated Julian de "Medicis's Tournament in a noble Poem of a new "kind: it being univerſally acknowledged that he "excelled therein Luke Pulci an eminent Poet, "who had ſung in a Poem of the ſame nature the "Equeſtrian Games or Tournament, which Laurence "Julian's brother had given." This paſſage intimates that Luke Pulci's Poem was written before Politianus's; and we are confirmed in that opinion when we conſider that Julian de Medicis was younger than Laurence. Monſieur Varillas and Monſieur Baillet have underſtood that paſſage in this ſenſe. "Julian "de Medicis had carried the prize in a Tournament, "and wanted a Paranymph not inferior to Luke "Pulci, who had ſignalized himſelf on a like occa- "ſion, in commending Laurence de Medicis. Poli- "tianus undertook it, and having obſerved, that "Pulci's Poem was not of the ſame ſtrength through- "out the whole . . . . . he plundered the moſt beau- "tiful thoughts from the antient Panegyriſts . . . . .

(1) Pope Blount, *Cenſura Author.* p. 357.

(2) Baillet, *Jugemens ſur les Critiques Gramm.* Num. 315. *Jugemens ſur les Traduct. Lat.* Num. 817, and *Jugemens ſur les Poetes*, Num. 1227.

(3) Barthius, *Adverſ.* lib. 47. cap. 5.

(4) Boiſſard, *in* Iconib. *apud* Pope Blount, *Cenſura Author.* p. 357.

(5) Varillas, *Anecdotes de Florence*, p. 193.

(6) Bullart, *Academ. des Scienc.* Tom. 1. p. 277.

(7) Leand. Alb. *Deſcript. Italiæ*, p. m. 89.

(8) *Tenera adhuc ætate.* Politian. *in fine* Miſcellan.

(9) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 38. p. 88.

Julian's brother. The account he wrote ſome time after of the conſpiracy of the Pazzi's was infinitely eſteemed (*c*). Being appointed Profeſſor of the Latin and Greek tongues at Florence, he was ſo much commended and applauded, that the ſtudents left the ſchool of Demetrius Chalcondyles a Greek by nation [*D*], and a very learned man, but whoſe Lectures were but dry and barren if compared with thoſe of Politianus. The other works which Politianus publiſhed, I mean his Latin tranſlation of Herodotus, his Miſcellanies, his Latin Poems, encreaſed his reputation more and more. If he had lived longer he would have enriched the Republick of Letters with many excellent works (*d*), but he died in 1494 at the age of forty years [*E*]. If what is related of the

(*c*) Extracted from Paul Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 38.

(*d*) See the face to his works, written by *Aldus Manucius*; you will meet with ſome extracts of it in Geſner's *Biblioth.* fol. 45.

" and wrote ſuch a noble piece, that having read it, " Pulci out of ſhame and ſpite had a mind to ſuppreſs " his own Poem (10)." Monſieur Baillet relates the ſame particular in other words (11): but if we may believe the ſame Paul Jovius, who in another work of his gives a more full account of theſe two Tournaments, that of Laurence was inferior to Julian's, and Pulci did not write his Poem till after he had ſeen Politianus's (12). *Ejus glorioſi laboris præmium fuit triumphus Politiani divini poetæ carminibus celebratus. Nec* MULTO POST *Laurentius ut fraternis laudibus æquaretur, novum ſpectaculum periculoſiſſimæ pugnæ edidit. . . . . Hujus quoque ſpecioſiſſimi certaminis memoriam Pulcius* (13) *ipſe Politiani æmulus perjucundo edito poemate ſempiternam fecit.* i. e. " The reward of that " glorious and difficult action was its being cele- " brated in verſe by that divine Poet Politianus. " Soon after Laurence de Medicis, who was deſirous " to rival his brother's glory, gave a new ſhew of " that dangerous Tournament. . . . . The memory " of this pompous fight was alſo tranſmitted down " to poſterity in a moſt agreeable Poem written by " Pulci, Politianus's rival." I do not know that this Author ever aſſerted, that Pulci out of anger and ſhame would ſuppreſs his Poem. This is perhaps a mere invention of Varillas, as well as the pretended method which Politianus followed to outdo a Poem, which was not yet in being.

(10) Varillas, *Anecdotes de Florence*, p. 194.

(11) Baillet, *Enfans Celebres*, chap. 27.

(12) Jovius, *in Vita Leonis X.* lib. 1. p. m. 15.

(13) A few lines higher he called him *Aloyſius Pulcius*: in his *Elogies* he calls him *Luke*. There were at that time at Florence three brothers, all three good Poets, namely, *Luke*, *Lewis*, and *Bernard Pulci*.

[*D*] *The ſtudents left the ſchool of Demetrius Chalcondyles a Greek by nation.*] Paul Jovius acquaints us with this particular, *Tantos de ſe excitavit clamores favente juventute ut Demetrius Calchondyles vir Græcus præſtantique doctrina, uti aridus atque jejunus à Diſcipulis deſereretur* (14). We ſhall now give an inſtance of the exceſſive liberty, which Monſieur Varillas gave himſelf in his Paraphraſes. " When Argyropilus, " ſays he (15), had left the Profeſſor's chair of the " Greek tongue at Florence, Politianus ſeized it; " and as he was a man of an incomparable genius, " who left no ſtone unturned to compaſs his deſign, " he exerted his talents ſo well, and flattered his au- " dience ſo artfully, that he got all the Greeks ex- " cluded, who were come to diſpute the chair with " him. Chalcondyles, though a very humble man, " and but little careful of his own glory, could not " brook the affront that was put on thoſe of his own " nation. He made intereſt with Laurence de Me- " dicis, who had already pitched upon him to teach " his children the Greek tongue, and got leave to " teach it publickly in oppoſition to Politianus, and " at the ſame time with him, in order to ſee which " of them two ſhould get more ſcholars. But the " rough accent, of which Chalcondyles could never " get rid, and the difficulty he had to pronounce " ſome Latin words, made him contemptible in " compariſon of Politianus, whoſe agreeable voice, " and gallant expreſſion, raviſhed all them that heard " him. Laurence de Medicis, who would by all " means keep Chalcondyles at Florence, was obliged " to procure him ſcholars, and endeavoured to per- " ſuade Politianus to behave with more civility to- " wards him. Laurence de Medicis did afterwards at- " tempt to reconcile them together, but he found " by his own experience, it was an eaſier taſk to give " peace to all Italy, than to eſtabliſh it between two " learned men. However, he prevented them from " ſhewing their reſentment againſt each other pub- " lickly during his life time." All this is grounded on the following paſſage from Paul Jovius. *Demetrius Chalcondyles . . . . . ſcholam Florentiæ inſtauravit, deſertam ab Argyropylo, & à Politiano deficientibus Græcis occupatam; ſed ambitioſa, peracrique æmulo, multis bonis, maliſque artibus ſuggeſtus locum, & nomen defendenti Demetrius ceſſit; Latina præſertim facundia inferior, & ob id rareſcente auditorio à juventute deſtitutus, quandoquidem vel apprimè doctus, facilè jejunus, & hebes; laſcivis & delicatis auribus videri poterat: quibus Politiani decantatis, & varios ſpargentis flores, jucunda argutaque vox, & ſalſa comitas mira dulcedine placuiſſet. Sed manſit Demetrio honeſtus gratiæ locus apud Laurentium, vel infeſto, & obliquè ſemper inceſſente Politiano, qui quum neminem è Latinis ſibi parem pateretur, Græcis ipſis eruditior exiſtimari volebat. Diviſit idcirco munera Laurentius, ut emulationis lites dirimeret: & filii præceptorum contentione ad diſcendum accenderentur* (16). i. e. " Demetrius Chalcondyles . . . . . reſtored at Florence " the ſchool, which Argyropylus had forſaken, and " which Politianus had ſeized, the Greeks having " abandoned it. But Chalcondyles yielded the chair " to his ambitious and moſt crafty competitor, who " defended it by all manner of means whether juſt or " unjuſt: for Chalcondyles was inferior to him, chiefly " with regard to the knowledge of the Latin tongue; " ſo that his ſchool grew thin, being left by moſt of " the youths; for though he was very learned, yet " he might appear dry and barren to nice and dainty " ears, who were mightily pleaſed with the clear and " charming voice, and ſmart wit of the celebrated " Politianus, who ſpread flowers throughout his " diſcourſes, and had a moſt agreeable and ſweet " ſtyle. However, Demetrius obtained an honour- " able employment from Laurence, notwithſtanding " the ſpite and hatred of Politianus, who was con- " tinually attacking him indirectly: for as he could " bear no equal among the Latins, ſo he would be " thought more learned than the Greeks themſelves. " Laurence divided therefore their functions, to ſup- " preſs the quarrels occaſioned by their rivalſhip, " and that his children might be encouraged to ſtudy " by the very diſputes of their teachers." Examine that paſſage from Paulus Jovius as much as you pleaſe, you will never find in it, that Politianus got all the Greeks excluded, who would diſpute the chair with him, nor that Chalcondyles looked upon it as an inſufferable affront; nor that Laurence de Medicis procured him ſcholars. I find the laſt period of Paul Jovius dark; it ſignifies Laurence divided the employments, in order to ſuppreſs the quarrels occaſioned by the rivalſhip, and to encourage his children to ſtudy, by the diſputes of their teachers. I think theſe two motives are not well conſiſtent together. Monſieur Bullart relates that Chalcondyles *was forced to quit his place, by the envious caballing of Politianus, who by his artifices had him turned out*; and that Laurence de Medicis *gave them different employments in order . . . . . to ſuppreſs the cauſe of that dangerous emulation* (17).

(14) Paulus Jovius, *in Elog.* cap. 38. p. m. 88.

(15) Varillas, *Anecdotes de Florence*, p. 179, 180.

(16) Paulus Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 29. p. m. 69.

(17) Bullart, *Academ. des Sciences*, Tom. 1. p. 281.

[*E*] *He died in* 1494 *at the age of forty years.*] At Florence the 24th of September (18). Volateranus's account is more acurate than Paul Jovius's; the latter pretends that he was entered upon his 44th year (19); but the former gives him but forty years (20). Several Authors are miſtaken as to the time of his death, which they place under the year 1509: amongſt them are Eber (21), and Reuſnerus (22), as Voſſius obſerves. Nathan Chytræus gives us the following epitaph of Politianus, as though it had been tranſcribed from his tomb in St. Mark's Church at Florence.

(18) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 629.

(19) *Vitæ quadrageſimum quartum ætatis annum attigerat.* Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 38. p. 89.

(20) *Deceſſit quadragenarius*, Volateran. lib. 21. p. 777. See a paſſage from Marſilius Ficinus *in Voſſius de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 629.

(21) *In* Faſtis, *apud* Voſſium, *ubi ſupra.*

(22) *In* Diario Hiſtorico, *apud eund. ibid.*

Politianus in hoc tumulo jacet Angelus, unum
Qui caput, & linguas, res nova, tres habuit.
Obiit an. 1509, Septemb. 24.

i. e. " In this tomb lyeth Angelus Politianus, who " had indeed but one head, but, oh wonder! three " tongues: he died September the 24th, 1509." This is what we read in page 110 of the *Variorum in Europa*

the cauſe of his death were true [F], it might be ſaid that his morals anſwered the homelineſs of his face, rather than the beauty of his genius [G]. Some of his Poems were ſo much admired, that ſeveral learned men took the pains to write Commentaries

ropa Itinerum deliciæ, (the delights of ſeveral travels made in Europe) collected by Nathan Chytræus, in the ſecond edition, printed in the year 1599, *apud Chriſtophorum Corvinum*, in 8vo. But Father Mabillon aſſerts, that there is no epitaph on Politianus's tomb (23). For the reſt he agrees with Chytræus, placing that tomb in St. Mark's church at Florence, and Politianus's death under the year 1509. The Bernardine Saint Romuald follows the ſame chronology (24). But it has been effectually refuted by the learned Voſſius, who urges this argument, namely, that John Picus of Mirandola, Hermolaus Barbarus, and Politianus died the ſame year. The continuator of Palmerius aſſerts it as a matter of fact, and there is a letter of Marſilius Ficinus, in which the death of Politianus is lamented, as happening ſoon after John Picus's. Now it is univerſally acknowledged, that John Picus died in the year 1594. Theſe are Voſſius's arguments. To which we may add, that Peter Crinitus, Politianus's ſcholar, teſtifies, that the three learned men, mentioned above, died the very ſame year that Charles VIII. invaded Italy (25). This is hinting very plainly, that they died in the year 1494.

(23) Mabill. *in Muſæo Ital.* Tom. 1. p. 178.

(24) Pierre de St. Romuald, *Abrege Chronol.* Tom. 3. p. 262. under the year 1509.

(25) Crinitus, *de Honeſta Diſcipl.* p. 15. cap. 9.

[F] *If what is related of the cauſe of his death were true.*] Let us tranſcribe Monſieur Varillas's expreſſions (26). "Death .... ſurpriſed him at the age "of forty-two (27). As he could not gratify the cri- "minal paſſion he had conceived for one of his ſcho- "lars of a very eminent rank, it threw him into a vio- "lent fever. In the height of his fit, he compoſed "a ſong on the object that charmed him, got out "of his bed, took a lute, and began to ſing it in a "tune ſo tender and paſſionate, that he expired juſt as "he was finiſhing the ſecond ſtanza, the very ſame "day (28) that Charles VIII. paſſed the Alps, to go "and conquer the Kingdom of Naples." Thus that Author was pleaſed to tranſlate the following paſſage from Paulus Jovius. *Ferunt eum ingenui adoleſcentis inſano amore percitum, facilè in letalem morbum incidiſſe. Correpta enim cithara, quum eo incendio, & rapida febre torreretur, ſupremi furoris carmina decantavit; ita, ut mox delirantem, vox ipſa, & digitorum nervi, & vitalis denique ſpiritus, inverecunda urgente morte, deſererent* (29). *i. e.* "It is reported, that being paſſionately in "love with a young man of quality, it threw him in- "to a mortal diſtemper: for taking up his lute whilſt "he was in the height of a burning fever, he began "to play upon it a ſong on the object of his love: ſo "that beginning ſoon to rave, his voice, his ſtrength, "and life itſelf left him, and he died a diſgraceful "death." Some aſſert, that being unable to bear the violence of his paſſion, he beat his head againſt a wall, and daſhed his brains out (30). But the death of this man of wit is alſo related after another manner. "He did not end his days very honourably; "here follows what Monſieur Balzac ſays of him, in "one of his letters. We have now a true account of "Politianus's death, which Cardinal Bembo has miſ- "repreſented in the epitaph he drew up for him. As "he was ſtanding on the top of a ſtair-caſe, ſinging "upon his lute a ſong he had made formerly for a "girl with whom he was in love, and coming to "ſome very moving lines, his lute dropt out of his "hands, and he fell down ſtairs and broke his "neck. The Cardinal aſſerted in his epitaph, that "he died as he was ſinging ſome doleful verſes on "the death of Alexander Duke of Florence, whom "his Couſin Laurence had wickedly killed (31)." There is a moſt notorious falſity in theſe laſt words; for that Alexander Duke of Florence was killed forty three years after Politianus's death. The epitaph (32) of the latter, written by Peter Bembo, acquaints us, that he died whilſt he was ſinging doleful verſes on the death of Laurence de Medicis. Monſieur Bullart relates a falſity, when he pretends that *Cardinal Bembo* aſſerted that Politianus *fell down ſtairs as he was ſinging on his lute an elegy which he had compoſed on the death of Laurence de Medicis* (33). This Cardinal's verſes, which he tranſcribes, contains nothing concerning that fall. What does a man mean by quoting paſſages, which moſt plainly refute his own aſ-

(26) Varillas, *Anecdotes de Florence*, p. 196.

(27) He ought to have ſaid at the age of 40.

(28) This is not true: Charles the VIIIth paſſed the Alps before the 24th of September 1494.

(29) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 38. p. 89.

(30) *Vulgo fertur obiiſſe Politianum fœdi amoris impatientia capite in parietem illiſo.* Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 629.

(31) Pierre de St. Romuald, *Abrege Chronol.* Tom. 3. p. 262, under the year 1509.

(32) It is in Paul Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 38. p. 90, 91.

(33) Bullart, *Academ.* Tom. 1. p. 278.

ſertions? Obſerve, that ſome perſons pretend, that the ſtory mentioned by Paulus Jovius is a mere ſlander. Read this noble paſſage of Pierius Valerianus. *Angelus Politianus, nullius ignarus eruditionis, & diſciplinæ, cùm in adverſa Medicorum procerum tempora incidiſſet, inclinantibus jam Petri, quem ipſe litteris inſtituerat, rebus, in eam incidit ægritudinem, ut in multis, & variis moleſtiis, cogitationibuſque, conſolationem nullam admittere voluerit, atque ita demum dolore, mœſtitiaque confectus expirarit. Quodque illi longè fuit infelicius conficta in eum turpitudinis fabula maledicentiſſimis obtrectationibus proſciſcus, calumniatuſque eſt, utque ea gens promptiſſima eſt ad inſimulandum in invidiam Petri ipſius ignominioſam aliam mortis voluntariæ cauſam univerſo terrarum orbi magna cum ejus infamia propalarunt* (34). i. e. "An- "gelus Politianus, who was well verſed in all kinds "of learning and ſciences, happened to live in thoſe "days when the Princes of Medicis met with misfor- "tunes and the affairs of Prince Peter, whom he him- "ſelf had educated in Polite Literature, began to de- "cline; which vexed him to ſuch a degree, that he "could receive no comfort in the many and great "difficulties under which he laboured, and died at "laſt with grief. But what adds to his misfortune "is that ſhameful ſtory, by which ſome ſlanderous "backbiters have traduced and diſgraced him; for "theſe people being very much inclined to accuſe "others, and out of malice againſt Peter de Medicis, "have publiſhed to the whole world that there was "another cauſe of his voluntary death, very much "to his diſgrace." According to this account Politianus died only with grief, occaſioned by the declining condition of the houſe of Medicis. Philoſophy may indeed find herein a natural defect, but not a moral one.

(34) Pierius Valerianus, *de Litterator. infelic.* lib. 2. p. 70, 71.

[I] *It might be ſaid, that his morals anſwered the homelineſs of his face, rather than the beauty of his genius.*] It is probable that his ſtrong affection for the houſe of Medicis expoſed him to the moſt ſhameful ſlanders, whilſt the Florentines being extremely fond of their Republican Liberty, inſulted that baniſhed family, and giving a looſe to their ſatyrical humour, publiſhed a thouſand Paſquils. Let us not aſſert therefore, that Paul Jovius's ſtory is well grounded. But let us boldly affirm that Politianus had contracted an habit of that pride and envy, which learning does but too often produce. We have ſeen (35) that in order to keep his poſt againſt his antagoniſt, he employed indifferently good and bad methods. We ſhall now ſee an account of his haughty and envious temper. *Erat diſtortis ſæpe moribus, uti facie nequaquam ingenua & liberali, ab enormi præſertim naſo, ſubluſcoque oculo perabſurda, ingenio autem aſtuto, aculeato, occulteque livido, quum aliena ſemper irrideret, nec ſua, vel non iniquo judicio expungi pateretur* (36). i. e. "His face looked often deformed, being neither "handſome nor agreeable, but rather very ugly, "on account of his very big noſe, and his being "almoſt blind of one eye: but he had a crafty "genius, and ſharp wit, and was ſecretly envious "and backbiting, finding always fault with what "others wrote, and unable to ſee his own writ- "ings cenſured, though they deſerved it ever ſo "much." If you chooſe rather to read Monſieur Varillas's Paraphraſe, here it follows. "He had a "very ugly face, for his noſe was extremely big "and long, and he ſquinted with his left eye. "His genius was crafty and ſlily ambitious. He "never diſſembled more artfully, than with "thoſe, who admitted him into their familiarity; "nothing raiſed his indignation higher, than to "hear others commended: he was envious both "of his friends and of his enemies. No man could "write to pleaſe him; he found fault with all "the works of others, though he could not bear "to be cenſured himſelf: one might ſometimes "perceive that he was ſenſible of his own miſ- "takes, and that it was only out of malice he refuſed "to own the truth: for he never confeſſed that he "had been in the wrong (37)."

(35) Above, quotation (16).

(36) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 38. p. 89.

(37) Varillas, *Anecdot. de Florence*, p. 193.

[H] *Several*

Commentaries on them [*H*]. Let us not forget to obſerve that he was a Prieſt, and a Canon of Florence (*e*), and tutor to Laurence de Medicis's children (*f*). He is charged with ſpeaking very indecently of the Bible [*I*], for which reaſon ſome propoſe it as a queſtion, whether or not he muſt be reckoned among the Atheiſts [*K*]. Others vindicate him by denying the fact (*g*). I can eaſily believe what is reported of his taſte with regard to the Pſalms of David, and the Odes of Pindar [*L*]. He has alſo been charged

(*e*) See the rem. [*I*].

(*f*) Volaterran. lib. 21. p. 777.

(*g*) See the rem. [*I*].

[*H*] *Several learned men took the pains to write Commentaries on* his Poems.] Nicholas Beroaldus commented (38) Politianus's *Sylva*, entitled *Ruſticus*, the countryman. Francis Sanchez, Profeſſor at Salamanca, that Grammarian whom Scioppius has ſo much commended, publiſhed notes in the year 1554 on Politianus's four Sylva's. John Alexander Braſſicanus publiſhed at Nuremberg in the year 1534 a Commentary on the *Sylva*, entitled *Nutricia*, *the nurſing*, or *education*. Jodocus Badius added notes of his own to Politianus's works, which he publiſhed at Paris in 1519 in folio. He added alſo to them Francis Sylvius's remarks on Politianus's Epiſtles. Theſe Epiſtles were reprinted in 4to by the ſame Badius in the year 1526, with the ſame obſervations. Braſſicanus makes heavy complaints againſt a certain Plagiary. *Meminit*, ſays he (39), *et Politianus in* Nutritiis, *ubi quidam nugator arrogantiſſimus noſtra ante nos dixit: Expungendus jam & plane radendus è Philologiæ faſtis, quoniam, ut Cicero dixit, maluit improbè tollere quàm humaniter ſumere & agnoſcere*. i. e. "Politianus mentions in his *Nutricia* a certain proud and "impertinent trifler, who publiſhed our own thoughts, "before we publiſhed them ourſelves. He muſt be "entirely blotted out and eraſed from the liſt of Phi"lologers, ſince, as Cicero expreſſes it, he choſe ra"ther to ſteal wickedly, than to borrow civilly, and "to acknowledge the favour." One would think this complaint is made againſt a robber of manuſcripts.

(38) His *Commentary* was printed at Baſil in the year 1518. See Crenius, *Animadv. Philolog.* part. 3. p. 55. but inſtead of *Beroaldus*, read there *Beraldus*.

(39) Jo. Alexander Braſſicanus, ſchol. in Petronium.

[*I*] *He is charged with ſpeaking very indecently of the Bible.*] Lewis Vives is perhaps the firſt who laid that imputation upon him. *Angelus Politianus*, ſays he (40), *totam ſacram lectionem aſpernabatur*. i. e. "Politianus ſlighted the reading of the holy Bible." Melanchthon has expreſſed himſelf in ſtronger terms; for he aſſerted, that Politianus having read the Scripture but once, complained that he never employed his time ſo ill. *Melanchthon ait ſemel ſolum ſacras literas legiſſe, dixiſſeque nullum ſe tempus pejus collocaſſe* (41). Thouſand and thouſand Writers have related this over again (42). Voſſius explodes it as an incredible fact (43), and urges two reaſons againſt it; 1. That Politianus was a Prieſt and a Canon of Florence; 2. That he preached the Lent Sermons during an whole ſeaſon, as appears from theſe words. *Cum per hos quadrageſimæ proximos dies enarrandis populo ſacris literis eſſem occupatus, perlegi tamen libros carminum tuorum, quos mihi pro ſingulari humanitate tua mutuoque inter nos amore dedicaveras* (44). i. e. "Though this "laſt Lent I was buſy with explaining the holy Scrip"ture to the people, yet I read your Poems, which "out of your ſingular kindneſs, and as a token of "our mutual friendſhip, you have dedicated to me." Some perſons (45) think that Voſſius's ſecond argument is a full refutation of what Melanchthon relates; but others make no account either of his firſt or of his ſecond argument. *Hæc ratio nimis tenuis videbitur iis qui norunt quantopere Atheiſmus ſeu Epicureiſmus ſive Libertiniſmus graſſetur inter Sacerdotes non tantum Canonicos & Monachos papales, ſed etiam inter Prælatos, Cardinales, Pontifices* (46). i. e. "That argument (the "firſt) will appear but weak to thoſe, who know "how much Atheiſm, or Epicuriſm, or Libertiniſm, "prevails not only among the Prieſts, Canons, and "Monks, but alſo among the Prelates, the Cardinals, "and the Popes themſelves." This is what Voetius objects againſt the firſt argument; here follows what he urges againſt the ſecond. *Quaſi vero poſtilliſtæ coram populo iſtic concionantes ut plurimum abſque lectione ſcripturæ, ex inſpectis legendis, poſtillis, homiliariis, dormi ſecurè, theſauris pauperum concionatorum & ſimilibus myrotheciis prædicare non ſoleant. Prædicavit etiam aliquando coram populo Cæſar Atheorum Vaninus, quod tamen illum è numero profanorum non eximit* (47). i. e. "As though theſe ſorry preachers who preach before "the people could not do it without reading the "Scripture, ſince they have their legends, notes, col"lectors of homilies, common-places, treaſures of "indigent preachers, and ſuch other helps. Vanini, "that ringleader of the Atheiſts, preached ſome"times; yet this did not hinder him from be"ing reckoned among the Atheiſts." That Author obſerves, that we ought not to imagine Melanchthon and Mornai acted only from a ſpirit of party, when they ſpoke ill of Politianus; for, adds he, Gabriel Putherbeus, a moſt paſſionate Author againſt the Reformed, laid the ſame imputation on Politianus (48). But I muſt tell the Reader that this Putherbeus does not only tranſcribe Lewis Vives word for word, and that Du Pleſſis Mornai quotes no other voucher but the ſame Vives (49). Theſe are not therefore different witneſſes: the whole matter in this reſpect reſts upon the teſtimony of one ſingle Author.

(40) Ludov. Vives, *de Veritate Fidei Chriſt.* lib. 2. p. 264. edit. Baſil. 1544.

(41) Voſſius, *de Poet. Lat.* p. 80. He quotes Tom. 3. *Declamationum*, p. 545.

(42) Monſieur Teiſſier, among others, in his *Addit. aux Eloges*, Tom. 1. p. 11. but inſtead of quoting Melanchthon, he quotes Vives, who does not ſay what he relates.

(43) Voſſius, *de Poet. Lat.* p. 80.

(44) Angelus Politianus, epiſt. 10. lib. 4. *ad Joannem Gottium Raguſinum*, folio m. 106.

(45) Boxhornius, *in Monument. illuſt. Viror. apud* Pope-Blount, *Cenſ. Auth.* p. 359. *Borremanſ. Var. Lect.* p. 126.

(46) Voetius, *Diſp. Theolog.* Tom. 2. p. 1273.

(47) Idem, ibid. p. 1274.

(48) Putherbeus, *de tollendis & expurgandis malis Libris*, lib. 1. p. 81.

(49) Mornai, *Verité de la Religion*, chap. 26. folio m. 356.

Monſieur Crenius has lately preſented the publick with the obſervation, which his great reading has furniſhed him with, concerning this particular relating to Politianus. He does not think Voſſius's arguments are of any weight, could he quote ſome authorities, by which it appears that the preachers of thoſe times did not much dwell on the holy Scripture (50). What he quotes from the *Ariſtarchus Philoſophicus* (51), a book but little known in this country (52), is very curious. I have read in Manlius's Common-places, which are for the moſt part extracted from Melanchthon's Lectures, that it was the reading of the Breviary, which Politianus ſpoke of with ſo much contempt. *Politianus Canonicus Florentinus interrogatus an legiſſet horas Canonicas? dixit ſemel perlegi iſtum librum & nunquam pejus collocavi tempus* (53). i. e. "Politianus being aſked whether he read the "Breviary, anſwered, I have read it once, and never "employed my time worſe."

(50) Thom. Crenius, *Animadv. Philolog. & Hiſt.* part. 3. p. 22. *& ſeq.* edit. of Leyden 1698.

(51) Written by Henry Ernſtius, Counſellor to the King of Denmark, and printed at Hamburg, 1678, in 8vo.

(52) *Admodum raro & inde hic poucis noto.* Crenius, *Animadv.* part. 3. p. 25.

(53) Joan. Manlius, *in Locor. Commun. Collectan.* Titulo *de Satisfact.* p. m. 99.

[*K*] *Some propoſe it as a queſtion, whether or not he muſt be reckoned among the Atheiſts.*] Voetius aſks whether Politianus muſt not be ſuſpected of a Lucianic Neutrality, or of Epicuriſm (54), and he anſwers that Mornai relates Politianus complained he never ſpent his time worſe than in the reading of the Scripture (55). He adds that he does not know after what manner this Critick and ſome others died, but that conſidering what kind of ſtudy they applied themſelves to, one may conjecture that they were like the Philoſopher Averroes, who being out of conceit with Chriſtianity, choſe rather that his ſoul ſhould be with the Philoſophers. Obſerve, that Mornai does not ſay what Voetius aſcribes to him. Moſt Authors abound with that kind of falſities, which are owing to their truſting to the quotations of others, without giving themſelves the trouble to compare them with the originals. Let us not omit theſe words of the Bernardine Monk Peter de Saint Romuald. *Some have wrote that* Politianus *profeſſed Atheiſm ſecretly with Marſilius Ficinus, and Domitius Calderinus a Prieſt* (56).

(54) Voet. *Diſp. Theol.* Tom. 1. p. 206.

(55) *De Politiano refert Pleſſeus in libro de veritate religionis Chriſtianæ, quod diceret nunquam ſe bonas horas ſuas pejus collocaſſe quam in lectione ſcripturæ ſacræ.* Idem, ibid.

[*L*] *I can eaſily believe what is reported of his taſte with regard to the Pſalms of David, and the Odes of Pindar.*] He did not deny that the Pſalms contained many good and beautiful things, but he pretended that the ſame things were expreſſed in Pindar in a more grand and agreeable ſtyle. It is pretended this was reported by one of his ſcholars. Let us tranſcribe Melanchthon's words. *Dionyſius Capnio, qui adoleſcens audivit Angelum Politianum, narrabat eum interrogatum aliquando quid de Pſalmis Davidis ſentiret, et ad quid prodeſſe eorum lectionem judicaret, reſpondiſſe, ſibi vero placere illa antiqua carmina, et continere ea partim honeſta præcepta, partim graviſſimas conciones de providentia, et de ſceleratorum pœnis; partim querelas de infirmitate hominum utiles ad frænandos immoderatos impetus: partim hiſtorias ejus gentis. Sed addidit Politianus hanc collationem*

(56) Pierre de Saint Romuald, *Abrege Chronol.* Tom. 3. p. 262. under the year 1509.

charged with Plagiariſm [*M*]. George Merula among others was one of his Antagoniſts.

tionem, res eaſdem dulcius & ſplendidius narrari in odis Pindaricis, ibi pingi Ixionem in rota clamantem,

Diſcite juſtitiam moniti, & non ſpernere divos.

Ibi deſcribi Bellerophontem propter priores victorias factum inſolentiorem, & vehi Pegaſo intra cælum volantem, id eſt, res non neceſſarias ambitioſe moventem, excuti à Pegaſo & dejici in Ciliciam. Ibi celebrari Pelei caſtitatem, qui expetitus ab Acaſti conjuge, & ab ea falſo accuſatus, & objectus Centauris, ſervatur accepto gladio divinitus. Denique multas imagines pulcherrimas, multas hiſtorias, & graviſſima præcepta tradi. Hæc Politiani oratio & ſi ſpecioſa eſt, tamen eſt hominis ignorantis diſcrimen inter genera doctrinarum, inter legem & Evangelium (57). i. e. " Dionyſius Capnio, who in his youth ſtudied " under Angelus Politianus, related, that he being once " aſked what he thought of the Pſalms of David, " and in what reſpect a man might be improved by " reading them, anſwered, that he liked thoſe an- " tient Poems well enough; that they contained good " precepts of morality, weighty diſcourſes concerning " providence, and the puniſhment of the wicked; ſome " complaints of the weakneſs of men, proper to re- " ſtrain the immoderate paſſions; and ſome particu- " lars of the Hiſtory of his own nation. But Poli- " tianus added, that the ſame things are expreſſed " more agreeably, and more nobly in Pindar's Odes; " that there Ixion is repreſented on his wheel crying " aloud,

" *Learn Righteouſneſs, and dread th' avenging Deities.*

" There Bellerophon is deſcribed, who growing au- " dacious by his former victories, and pretending to " ride to Heaven on Pegaſus, that is to ſay, to dive " haughtily into unneceſſary myſteries, was thrown " from Pegaſus, and whirled down into Cilicia. " There Peleus's chaſtity is deſcribed, who being " courted by Acaſtus's wife, and falſely accuſed by " her, and expoſed to the Centaurs, is preſerved by " receiving a ſword from the God. Laſtly, there we " meet with many beautiful images, many hiſtories, " and moſt uſeful precepts. That diſcourſe of Poli- " tianus is indeed plauſible enough, but yet it ſhews " that he did not know how to diſtinguiſh the ſeveral " kinds of doctrines, and the law from the goſpel." Manlius, in the book which I have already quoted, does not aſcribe this judgment to Politianus, but to Lazarus Bonamicus. *Lazarus Bonamicus vir doctus cum eſſet interrogatus quomodo ei placeret Pſalterium, reſpondit placere ſibi, recitari enim ibi egregias ſententias de providentia: ſed tamen nihilo melius eſſe quam Pindari poëma* (58), i. e. " Lazarus Bonamicus, a learned man, " being aſked how he liked the pſalms, anſwered, " that he liked them well, becauſe they contain ma- " ny noble ſentences concerning Providence; but yet " that they were not better than Pindar's poems." We do not find in that paſſage, that Pindar is ſet above David; they are both ſuppoſed to be equal. And yet the Commentator on Gaffarel aſſerts, on the credit of a German Divine, that Bonamicus eſteemed Pindar's poems more than the pſalms of David. *Ejuſdem blaſphemiæ veneno correptus fuit* Lazarus Bon-Amicus *Italus, qui vociferabat* ſe Odas Pindaricas præferre Hymnis Davidicis. *Vid. beatus Dn.* Selneccerus *Explicat. in* 1 *Cor.* viii. p. 496 (59). He had obſerved juſt before, that Politianus had uttered the ſame blaſphemy. This ſhews that Melanchthon, or thoſe who tranſcribed from him, varied in their accounts, as it is almoſt always the caſe, when aſſertions are grounded only on hear-ſays. Peucer has inſerted into a letter (60), what I have quoted above from Melanchthon.

[*M*] *He has alſo been charged with Plagiariſm.*] All the world has heard it reported, that he appropriated to himſelf the Latin tranſlation of Herodian made by Tiphernas, and he only altered here and there a paſſage in it. Leo X. uſed to ſay, that this calumny was ſpread by thoſe who envied Politianus's reputation. *Quamquam æmuli eam tranſlationem, uti nos à Leone Pontifice accepimus, Gregorii Tiphernatis fuiſſe dicerent quod paſſim inducto fuco, & falſis nevorum coloribus interlita alieni ſtyli habitum mentiretur* (61). This is all that Paul Jovius tells us. I would be very glad if any perſon could let me know on what authorities the following account is grounded. " He (*Politianus*) " publiſhed a tranſlation of Herodian, which had " not all the ſucceſs he expected: for though it was " generally admired, yet there was a report ſpread, " that Politianus had found it among the papers of " the celebrated Gregory of Citta di Caſtello, which " he had bought, and that report was grounded on " ſuch ſuſpicions, as were but indifferently anſwer- " ed. Pope Leo X. who ſtudied then under Politi- " anus, and heard all that was urged for and againſt " him at his father's table, being deſired, twenty " years after, by the Academicians of Rome, to tell " them his opinion of that matter, anſwered doubt- " fully, and confeſſed, that the ſtyle of that tranſla- " tion was by no means like that of Politianus's o- " ther works, and ſavoured much more of the flou- " riſhes and artifices, which Gregory of Citta di Ca- " ſtello was wont to uſe in his writings. However " (as though he feared to have ſaid too much) he " added, that this Gregory wrote nothing that came " up to the tranſlation of Herodian (62)." I am very much inclined to believe, that the Author of this account had no other Voucher but Paul Jovius, whoſe words he has enlarged upon, and paraphraſed according to his own fancy, and as though he had been writing Romances. However it be, he has not underſtood them; for the flouriſhes and artifices which were obſerved in the tranſlation, were not imputed to Tiphernas, but to Politianus. If Leo X. had ſpoke upon this matter as Monſieur Varillas pretends, Paul Jovius would not have exploded that change as unworthy to be credited (63). Obſerve, that the beſt Criticks exploded it; they found the ſame genius and the ſame character throughout the whole tranſlation of Herodian. Tiphernas was not capable to perform ſuch a maſter-piece (64). It had coſt Politianus leſs trouble to tranſlate the whole work, than to give to another's tranſlation the air and turn, which is obſervable in this.

It is not ſo eaſy to clear him with regard to other charges of Plagiariſm. For what anſwer could one make to theſe words of Budæus? *Plutarchus in eo libro, quem de Homero compoſuit; qui liber nondum Latinus ex profeſſo factus eſt, licet Politianus, vir ille quidem excellentis doctrinæ, ſed animi non ſatis ingenui, ex eo libro rerum ſummas ad verbum tranſcribens, quaſique flores præcerpens, non erubuit id opus pro ſuo edere, in quo nullam præterquam tranſcribendi ac vertendi operam navaverat* (65), *i. e.* " Plutarch, in that book which he wrote " concerning Homer, and which has not yet been " profeſſedly tranſlated into Latin, though Politianus, " a man of eminent learning indeed, but not ſo can- " did and honeſt as could be wiſhed, tranſcribing the " moſt remarkable things word for word from that " book, as though he had been gathering flowers " from it, was not aſhamed to publiſh it as a work " of his own, though all the ſhare he had in it, con- " ſiſted only in tranſlating and tranſcribing it." Budæus had related a ſtory which has been printed, and which contains a notorious piece of knavery. The ſtory is as follows. Politianus diſplayed in a pompous manner, before his audience, ſeveral things which he had extracted from Herodotus, as though they were the fruits of his own learning. John Laſcaris happened to be one of his Hearers, and took him aſide to reprove him for his boldneſs. I could never have thought, anſwered Politianus, that a Greek, like you, had been ignorant of the artifice by which the eſteem of the publick is acquired. There were but three or four of you among my whole audience, who had read Herodotus; and what is that number, if compared with that crowd of ſcholars, who admire me, and exalt me to the ſkies? I hope you will not be ſo ill-natured as to attempt to ruin my reputation with them; but if you attempt it, I am perſuaded, you will not meet with great ſucceſs. Let us relate this in the very terms of the original. *Non poſſum mihi temperare, quin tibi nunc referam, quod Budæus noſter de Angelo Politiano quondam nobis domi ſuæ narrare ſolebat, idque ſe ex Jano Laſcare, qui Politiani fuerat æqualis, crebrò audiviſſe confirmabat. Cùm enim Politianus*

(57) Melanchth. *in Epiſtola ad Adamum Cratonem,* præfixa *Exegeſi Nicolai Aſclepii Barbati de antiquo & profundo conſilio Dei.*

(58) Manlius, *in Locorum Commun. Collectan.* Titulo *de vet. & nov. Teſtamento,* p. 81.

(59) Gregorius Michael, *Præpoſitus Regius Flensburgenſis, Notis in Jacobi Gaffarelli Curioſitates,* p. 110.

(60) Peucer, *Epiſt. ad Chriſtoph. Carlowitz.* See *Saldenus de Libris,* p. 434.

(61) Paulus Jovius. *Elog.* cap. 38. p. 88.

(62) Varillas, *Anecdotes de Florence,* p. 195.

(63) Paulus Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 117. p. 259.

(64) Henry Stephens has cenſured it very much. Conſult Crenius, *Animadv. Philolog. & Hiſt.* part. 3. p. 12 & *ſeq.*

(65) Budæus, *Annotation. in Pandectas,* folio m. 151 *verſo.*

Antagoniſts [*N*]. Some aſſert that he was extremely abuſed by the Poet Marullus [*O*]. They have juſtly given him a place in the Hiſtory of the illuſtrious Children; but Monſieur

Politianus Florentiæ Interpretationem Homericæ Iliados in magna celebritate aggrederetur; non ſine ingenti oſtentatione quæ de Homeri Poëmate perſcripta ſunt ab Herodoto, auditoribus ſuis è ſuggeſto recitabat, quo tempore Herodoti liber Græcè ſcriptus, à nullo adhuc converſus in linguam Latinam, nec Typographorum formis excuſus erat. Itaque Laſcaris, qui tum honoris causâ auditorum numerum augebat, cum paucis quibuſdam aliis Græcè doctis hominibus, qui non ignorarent unde omnia, quæ pro ſuis recitaverat, hauſiſſet. Is igitur paulo poſt ad hominem converſus, eumque ſeducens, Dic mihi quæſo, inquit, Politiane, quo ore Herodoti Opus inſigne, quod ante tot ſæcula conſcriptum eſt, in tanto cœtu, ut tuum recitaſti? Cui mox ſubridens Politianus, Nunquam, inquit, putaſſem, Jane, hominem Græcum adeò ejus artificii rudem & ignarum eſſe, quo apud multitudinem exiſtimatio & fama comparari ſolet. Quaſi vero, inquit, non ſatis intelligam tres aut ſummum quatuor fortaſſis vos hîc adeſſe, quibus Herodoti libros aliquando inſpicere contigerit. Sed quænam hîc ſit turba nobis applaudentium & in cœlum laudibus ferentium vides, apud quos ſi exiſtimationem noſtram (quod minimè ſpero) vel tantillum lædere volueritis; Oratio profectò veſtra non multum fidei ponderiſque habitura eſt (66). Let us not omit what relates to his Miſcellanies. He ſhewed the manuſcript of them to his friends, by which means that work was very much talked of even before it was printed: but ſome perſons ſpread a bad ſtory abroad, namely, that Politianus had enriched his work with all that he could plunder from a certain compilation, intitled, *Copiæ Cornu* (*the Horn of Plenty*), and compoſed by Nicholas Perot; it was aſſerted, that the orignal was lent to him by the Duke of Urbino, who imagined it would be acceptable to Laurence de Medicis. Politianus hearing of all this, put off the printing of his work; in the mean time Nicholas Perot's book was publiſhed, which made all the ſlanders vaniſh away; for they who compared it with Politianus's Miſcellanies, could not find that the latter had plundered the former. Politianus gives a full account of all this towards the end of his book: here follow only ſome of his words. *Fit concurſus, & in manibus* (Copiæ Cornu) *Effunditur, excutitur; quid multa? Calumnia me liberat. Vidiſſes continuò nonnullorum vultus lugubre quiddam tacentes —— & erubeſcentes.——Tantum conſtiterit in præſentiarum, non idem ſpectâſſe me, quod ejus voluminis autorem, nec par utrique deſtinatum præſtitumque faſtigium. Quòd ſi locos eoſdem pro re natâ forte uterque tractavimus, (id autem incidere alicubi fuit neceſſe,) craſſior tamen inter nos, quàm inter Pyramum Thyſbenque paries* (67), i. e. "Men flock together: the *Cornu-* "*copiæ* is in their hands, they pour it out, they ex- "amine it, in a word, it clears me from the ſcanda- "lous imputation. You would have ſeen the faces "of ſome betraying a ſecret ſorrow, ... and bluſh- "ing with ſhame. . . . . Let it be ſufficient to ob- "ſerve at preſent, that I had not the ſame deſign "with the Author of that work, and that the ſame "honour was not deſigned for us both, nor gained by "us both. And if we happen to handle the ſame "ſubjects (as it muſt have happened ſometimes) there "is yet a thicker wall between us, than there was "between Pyramus and Thyſbe." Notwithſtanding this, Hereſbachius has uſed Politianus as a notorious Plagiary (68). Obſerve, that Politianus himſelf complained, that he was expoſed to the plunder of Plagiaries (69): he threatens to proſecute them, in order to ſtrip them of their plunder.

(66) Franciſcus Duarenus, *Operum*, p. 1478. edit. 1584. *apud* Colomeſium, *in* Opuſcul. cap. 31. p. m. 66. *N. B.* The ſubſtance of this paſſage is contained in the words before it.

(67) Politian. *in fine* Miſcellan. *apud* Thomaſium, *de Plagio Literario*, p. 235.

(68) Hereſbachius, *in Præfat. librorum ſuorum de re ruſtica furaciſſimum vocat Politianum, atque in Panepiſtemone aliorum non intellecta congeſſiſſe.* Thomaſius, ibid. p. 235, 236.

(69) Idem, Politianus, ibid. *apud eumdem*, p. 234.

[*N*] *George Merula, among others, was one of his antagoniſts.*] He was a Profeſſor in the College of Milan, "and did not ſpare even Politianus, though "Politianus had gained ſuch a reputation as raiſed "him above his equals. He ſhewed him, that na- "ture had beſtowed upon him all the qualities a "man can want to become learned, yet ſhe could not "make him ſuch: he pointed out to him above "thirty conſiderable blunders, which dropt from his "pen, and gave him notice charitably, (as he ſaid) "that a man, who pretended to be the firſt in the "Republick of Letters, muſt have read more, and "ſtudied more, than all the reſt together (70). . . . . "Politianus was the perſon who got moſt by his "(*Merula*'s) death. He had publiſhed the firſt *Cen-* "*tury* of his Miſcellanies § (α), and Merula taking "offence at the great pride, which appeared in the "word *Century*, threatened Politianus with whole "regiments of authorities and paſſages, which he "would ſend out againſt him, to prove the contrary "of whatever he aſſerted: but he had time only to "make the rough draught of his intended work (71)." We meet in Paulus Jovius with ſome hints relating only to the latter part of this account (72): we muſt examine where the foundation of the reſt is to be found. Obſerve, that Politianus wrote very ſharp letters to Merula (73), and ſeemed to wiſh that Lewis Sforza would give that adverſary leave to publiſh his Criticiſm.

(70) Varillas, *Anecdote ſde Florence*, p. 192.

(71) Ibidem. p. 193.

(72) *Politiano obiter vehementi metu liberato, cum in miſcellaneam ejus centuriam cohortes & alas qua impetu obruerent emiſſurus eſſe diceretur.* Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 37. p. 87.

(73) See the 11th book of Politianus's *Letters*.

§ (α) A letter of Peter Crinitus to Alexander Sartius, inſerted in p. 384 of the 1ſt vol. of Politianus's works, printed by Gryphius, in the year 1550, contains ſome paſſages of the 2d part of Politianus's Miſcellanies, written, ſays Crinitus, at the requeſt and for the ſake of Sartius; but ſtoln from the Author by a perſon, who thus was the cauſe why the publick had till that time been deprived of ſo uſeful a work. That ſecond part contained, among other things, twenty chapters, the titles of which are ſet down in the ſame letter. And indeed the title of the Baſil edition 1522, is *Centuria una* (one Century), and not like the other editions *Centuria* 1, which is equivocal, and leads the Reader to think that the ſecond Century of theſe Miſcellanies is extant. The ſecond letter to the ſame Peter Crinitus, contains the titles of eight other chapters of that ſame ſecond Century, which it is ſaid there has been ſeen in the manuſcript by ſeveral of the Author's friends. Let us obſerve, that that ſecond letter ends with an epigram, in which the Author makes Politianus ſpeak in ſuch terms, as prove moſt evidently that he died in the year 1494. Here follow the five laſt lines of that epigram.

Is ille ego Angelus Politianus ſum,
Fovit benigno me ſinu Flora, & illic
In fata ceſſi, Partheneopeos reges
Cum Gallica arma irruerent mirabunda.
Tu, vale, & hoc ſis meriti memor noſtri.

i. e. "I am that ſame Angelus Politianus, whom "kind Flora cheriſhed in her boſom: I died when "the dreadful army of France invaded the Kingdom "of Naples. Farewell, and remember this our kind- "neſs to you." Crit. Rem.

[*O*] *He was . . . . . abuſed by the Poet Marullus.*] This is what the Bernardine Saint Romuald relates. *Marullus*, ſays he (74), *has uſed him very ill under the name of Mabilius.* This may ſignify two things, either that Marullus took the name of Mabilius in the lines he wrote againſt him, or that he called Politianus thus. I have again looked over his poems, but I have met with none under that name. Thoſe of Politianus, do not incline me to think that the Monk is in the right. I find among them moſt cutting epigrams *in Mabilium Novatum Inſubrem, againſt Mabilius Novatus an Italian*; but they contain nothing that hints they were levelled at Marullus. And how could he be hinted at there under the name of *Inſuber*, ſince he was born at Conſtantinople? Though I have not read this Mabilius's poems, yet I think that Politianus was very much abuſed in them. What makes me judge thus is, that Politianus gives him the moſt horrid language. Here follow ſome inſtances of it.

(74) Saint Romuald, *Abrege Chronol.* Tom. 3. p. 262. under the year 1509.

Si jam carmina noſtra te, Mabili,
Urgent ad laqueum miſer crucemque,
Ne quæſo propera mori, tuum ne
Fraudes carnificem ſuo lucello:
Namque eſt percupidus tui, ac libenter
Is tantum tibi dempſerit laboris.
Quid? noſtin hominem? negas: at idem eſt
Aurem qui ſecuit tibi ſiniſtram (75).

(75) Politianus, *in Libro Epigrammatum.*

i. e. "If my verſes, Mabilius, nettle thee to the "quick, and force thee to look for a rope to hang

(*b*) See his *Origines Italiennes*, under the word *Polizziano*, and the 14th chapter of his *Anti-Baillet*.

(*i*) See the end of the 8th book, p. m. 349.

Monſieur Varillas, who was the occaſion of it, has not been accurate in his chronological account [*P*]. I have ſome obſervations to make againſt Moreri [*Q*]. Let us obſerve, that they who pretend that Politianus's family-name was *Baſſo*, or *Baſſus*, are miſtaken. Monſieur Menage (*b*), grounded on the authority of a Letter of Monſieur Magliabechi, proves that *his name* was *Cino* and not *Baſſo*. He is called *Meſſer Agnolo da Montepulciano* in Machiavel's Hiſtory of Florence (*i*), and we read in an oration of Majoragius that he changed his name of *Angelus de Monte Pulciano* into that of *Angelus Politianus*,

" thy ſelf, pray, do not be ſo much in haſte to die,
" leſt thou ſhould'ſt rob the hangman of his wages:
" for he longs to have thee in his hands, and is
" willing to ſave thee ſo much trouble. What?
" do'ſt not thou know the man? Thou ſay'ſt no.
" Why 'tis the ſame who cut thy left ear off."

Mabilius had bantered Politianus about his neck that was awry; here follows what Politianus replied.

Sed quid te cruciat reflexa colla
Si interdum gero? num parum videtur
Si pronos ſtatuis tuos cinœdos
Si pronum ſtatuent miſer Mabili
Mox te carnificis manus, velut nunc
Pronum te ſtatuunt Mutoniati.

i. e. " Why ſhould you be vexed at my neck's be-
" ing ſometimes awry? If you think it a ſmall mat-
" ter to lay down your .... the hangman's hands
" will ſoon lay you down, &c."

The following lines abound ſtill more with opprobrious language.

Hæres relictus à parente ſordido
Ille impudicus, temulentus aleo,
Spurcus, lutoſus, pedecoſus, hiſpidus,
Pannoſus, unctus, horridus, caprimulgus,
Edax, ineptus, inſolens Mabilius
Uno expatravit patrimonium die,
Gula helluante, cunnilingis oſculis,
Vorace culo, & exfututa mentula.

You ſee in theſe laſt lines, a wicked and odious imitation of Catullus and Martial's licentiouſneſs; men, who abuſed too much a maxim of the Stoicks relating to the uſe of words (76), and

Apud quos
Nomen adeſt rebus, nominibuſque pudor.

Politianus indulged himſelf too much in that bad imitation in ſome other of his poems, and eſpecially in his invective againſt an old woman who had loſt all the ſigns of youth, except laſciviouſneſs (77). That poem contains almoſt all the thought of two Odes of Horace (78), but expreſſed more at length. The laſt lines abound with obſcenity, which is ſo much the more ſhocking, that immediately after we meet with two hymns to the bleſſed Virgin, which are full of devotion. This bad order muſt not be imputed to the Poet; it is owing to thoſe who publiſhed his works. But to return to Mabilius, I ſhall obſerve, that we meet with his epitaph among Politianus's poems.

Flecte viator iter, fetet nam putre Mabili
Hac fovea corpus conditur atque animus.

i. e. " Turn away travellers, for Mabilius ſtinks al-
" ready: in this hole both his body and his ſoul lye."

If this be not a good argument againſt Peter de Saint Romuald, it ſeems however to be a proof that he was miſtaken: for Marullus lived ſome years after Politianus's death. But let us not lay any ſtreſs on that method of arguing; one can give ſuch opprobrious language in an epitaph, and one meets with ſuch a large field that way, that ſome Poets have falſely ſuppoſed the death of an adverſary, in order to expatiate on that common topic. I muſt not conceal from the Reader, that a very able man, who wrote notes on Sannazarius's (79) poems, believes that Marullus and the Mabilius of Politianus are one and the ſame man.

[*P*] *Mr. Varillas .... has not been accurate in his chronological account.*] Politianus " had ſuch a won-
" derful genius, that the world never ſaw his fellow
" ſince Ovid. He was hardly twelve years old when
" he wrote ſuch beautiful poems, that one would
" have thought they were written in the age of A-
" lexander, or of Auguſtus. And when he took it into
" his head to impoſe upon the learned, and to make his
" own productions paſs for ſome fragments of Ana-
" creon or of Catullus, which he had found by chance
" in ſome old Manuſcripts of the Medicean library,
" even the beſt Judges could not diſcover the cheat
" (80)." Monſieur Baillet gives a fuller account of the ſame particular in his hiſtory of celebrated children (81), among whom he has juſtly given our Politianus a place; for though what Monſieur Varillas relates were not true, yet we know from other Authors, that Politianus was very young when he wrote his Greek poems, which, in the opinion of the Criticks, are better than his Latin poems, which he compoſed much later (82). But here follows a chronological error. It was propoſed to Virginia des Urſins, " to marry her daughter, who was but twelve
" years old, to Laurence de Medicis, Peter's eldeſt
" ſon, who was not yet fifteen.... The nuptials were
" not celebrated with much pomp, becauſe the ſitu-
" ation of affairs was not proper for it. However,
" there were many Epithalamiums made, among
" which that which Angelus Politianus wrote, who
" being but of the Bridegroom's age, wrote verſes
" worthy of Auguſtus's age, was the moſt liked. Some
" days after, the report of Coliogne's arrival, forced
" young Laurence from his wife's arms, obliging
" him to get on horſe-back to learn the military
" art under his father-in-law (83)." Laurence was born in 1448: ſo that Politianus was four years older than him. Machiavel, who is a little more to be credited than Varillas, aſſerts that the nuptials of Laurence de Medicis with Clarence des Urſins were celebrated with very great pomp and magnificence after the peace (84), that is to ſay, when the war which Coliogne waged againſt the Florentines was quite finiſhed. He does not ſet down the year when that marriage was celebrated, which is a very great fault in an Hiſtorian; but we may infer from his account, that it was in the year 1471; Laurence was therefore twenty-three years old at that time. Judge then how much pains Monſieur Varillas took to acquaint himſelf with chronology. He has placed all the moſt conſiderable events of that war of Coliogne after the death of Peter de Medicis, Laurence's father (85). Did he not read in Paulus Jovius, that the peace was made before Peter de Medicis died (86).

[*Q*] *I have ſome obſervations to make againſt Moreri.*] 1. There is no accuracy in theſe words. *Laurence de Medicis kept Angelus Politianus* at Florence, *who was already a Prieſt.* This is hinting to us, that this was the firſt favour, which Politianus received from the houſe of Medicis. Now this is falſe, for we have ſeen above (87), that he ſtudied at the expence of Coſmus, Laurence's grand-father. 2. He ſhould not have ſaid that Laurence *appointed him Tutor to Coſmus de Medicis's children*; he appointed him Tutor to his own children (88). It would be a curious thing to ſee a man put his grand-father's children under the care of a Tutor. 3. John de Medicis, *who was afterwards Pope Leo X.* was the ſon of this Laurence, and not of Coſmus. 4. To ſay that Politianus *wrote thoſe beautiful Greek and Latin Epiſtles, of which the learned ſpeak with ſo much commendation*, ſuppoſes that the publick has ſeen a certain number of Greek Epiſtles written by that Author. Now I am very much miſtaken, if you can meet with above one in the collection of his letters. Moreri was probably miſled by the following paſſage from Volaterranus, which he had read in Voſſius (89): *Mihi ſolebat Epiſtolas tum Græcas tum Latinas ſcribere, ſed ſermone*

(76) Ὁ σοφὸς συνθυρήματων ἔσω. *Sapiens ſine circuitu omnia efferat.*

(77) It begins thus. *Huc huc iambi arripite mi jam mordicus*
Anum hanc furenti Percitam libidine
Tentiginoſam, catulientem ſpurcidam.

(78) The 8th of the Epods, *in anum libidinoſam*, and the 13th of the ſame book, *ad mulierem fœdam & anum.*

(79) See the notes on Sannazar, p. 229. edit. of Amſterdam, 1689.

(80) Varillas, *Anecdotes de Florence*, p. 194.

(81) Baillet, *Enfans celebres*, p. 89, 90.

(82) *Gærcis vero quæ puerum ſe conſcripſiſſe dicit, ætatem minus prudenter appoſuit ſuam. Tam enim bona ſunt ut ne virum quidem Latina æque bene ſcripſiſſe putem.* Jul. Cæſar Scaliger, *Poet.* lib. 6. p. m. 740.

(83) Varillas, *Anecdotes de Florence*, p. 40.

(84) Macchiavel, *Hiſt. Florentine*, lib. 7. p. m. 289.

(85) See his 2d book of the *Anecdotes de Florence.*

(86) Jovius, *in* Vita Leonis X. lib. 1. p. 14.

(87) In the rem. [*B*].

(88) See the 2d Letter of the 4th book of Politianus, folio m. 94.

(89) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 628.

(k) The 66th and 67th of the 1ſt book.

Politianus. Obſerve that Sannazarius in two ſatyrical Epigrams (*k*) which he wrote againſt him, calls him *Pulicianus*, alluding to the word *Pulex*, a Flea.

mone vernaculo plures quod frequenter faciebat occupatus, ne naſus aliquis ſtylo offenſus impræmeditato, præjudicatæ jam de eo opinioni officeret (90). i. e. "He uſed to "write Greek and Latin letters to me, but more in "his mother-tongue, chiefly when he was buſy, leſt "ſome nice Critics being offended at his unelaborate "ſtyle, might prejudice the good opinion, which "has already been conceived of him." Whereupon Moreri, without conſidering the matter, took it into his head that Politianus wrote Greek letters, which have been publiſhed. Take notice by the by of Politianus's precaution. He knew that he was already famous for the politeneſs of his ſtyle, and that, to keep up his reputation, he ought to write nothing but what was elaborate. But as his great occupations did not ſuffer him to ſpend much time in writing a letter, he choſe to write often in Italian; for we muſt think that he uſed his other friends as he did Volaterranus. Such was the great ſlavery, which they put themſelves under, who gain the reputation of writing a letter in a polite ſtyle. They dare no longer to write familiarly and careleſsly to their friends. They are ſenſible that their letters will be ſhewed, and if they be not well written they will be contemned. Balzac did often groan under that heavy yoke; and I have read that a man of wit envied the happineſs of his Attorney, becauſe he could with impunity begin with, *I have received yours, and write you theſe lines* (91). The Manutius's and the Latiniſts of their ſtrength found themſelves reduced to ſuch a ſad neceſſity, that one ſingle letter coſt them whole months (92). I do not wonder therefore at what Volaterranus tells us in the paſſage quoted above. Obſerve that this ſlavery extended ſometimes even to diſcourſes held in converſation (93). But let us return to Moreri. 5. One cannot ſay that Politianus *had a ſhare in the misfortunes* of the Medicis, *which was felt by all the men of letters who were at Florence:* for he died whilſt Peter de Medicis was ſtill Sovereign in his native country. It is thought indeed that he grieved when he foreſaw that that Lord would not be able to keep his ground conſidering the turn which the publick affairs were like to take: however it be, Paulus Jovius thinks him happy, becauſe he died before the downfal of that family (94). 6. It has not been aſſerted that he made away with himſelf, *becauſe he could not win the heart of a certain Lady.* They impute to him a more criminal paſſion, as I have related above (95). Do not mind the paſſage quoted from Saint Romuald. 7. Paulus Jovius cannot be ſaid to give credit to thoſe ſtories; he only relates them, without aſſerting the truth of them, and makes uſe of the word *ferunt, it is reported:* he is only to blame for not adding that the report was not certain; for he knew no doubt that men's opinions were divided in that reſpect; and that is enough to oblige an Hiſtorian not to ſay, *there was ſuch a ſlander ſpread abroad,* without adding, *but ſome maintain it was a mere calumny.* 8. Ludovicus Vives has not ſaid what Moreri aſcribes to him (96).

(90) Volaterr. lib. 21. p. 777.

(91) *Preface des Oeuvres de Sarraſin*, p. 46.

(92) See Scioppius, *de Stilo Hiſt.* p. m. 61, 62.

(93) You will find in the *Menagiana*, p. 164 of the 1ſt Dutch edit. the following paſſage concerning a converſation between ſome learned men. *Every one endeavoured . . . to ſpeak well: for, contrary to what is practiſed at preſent, men took care to ſpeak correctly, and not to make blunders in their diſcourſes held in aſſemblies. At laſt, every one being retired, I remained alone with Balzac, who taking me by the hand, ſaid, now we are alone, let us talk freely, and not fear to make Soleciſms.*

(94) *Eo præpropero vitæ exitu profecto felix fuit quod imminentem convulſæ Medicæ domus ruinam effugerit.* Jovius, p. 89.
(95) In the remark [*F*]. (96) It is the ſame thing which Voetius aſcribes to Mornai, in the remark [*K*].

POLITIANUS (JOHN ANGELUS), born in the ſame city with the preceding, taught Logic at Poitiers towards the beginning of the 17th Century. Monſieur Daillé was one of his ſcholars (*a*). He wrote two books of controverſy againſt his countryman Cardinal Bellarmine [*A*]. This makes me think that he renounced Popery, and turned Proteſtant.

(a) See *la Vie de Mr. Daillé*, p. 4.

[*A*] *He wrote two books of controverſy againſt his countryman Cardinal Bellarmine.*] The firſt is entitled *Philoſophia Euchariſtica de potentia & voluntate Dei ex tertio libro Bellarmini de Euchariſtia, expoſita & refutata.* i. e. "An Expoſition and Refutation of the "Euchariſtical Philoſophy concerning the Power and "Will of God, extracted from the third Book of "Bellarmine concerning the Lord's Supper." At Amberg 1604 in 4to. The other is entitled, *Philoſophiæ ſeu potius Sophiſticæ Euchariſticæ Bellarmini pars altera refutata.* i. e. "A Refutation of the ſecond "Part of Bellarmine's Euchariſtical Philoſophy or "rather Sophiſtry." At Amberg 1606, in 4to.

POLITIANUS (ANTHONY LAURENTINUS), was Profeſſor of Logic in the Univerſity of Piſa (*a*). He was at Padua in the year 1604, as appears from the Dedication of the ſecond edition of his Dialogue *De Riſu* (*b*), of Laughter, to which he aded a Treatiſe *De Cœlis eorumque motibus*, of the Heavens, and their motions, and his book *De Natura Logicæ*, of the Nature of Logic. His mother was deſcended from the family of St. Agnes (*c*). She is a Saint, for whom the inhabitants of Monte Pulciano have a very great devotion (*d*).

(a) See the dedication of his dialogue *de Riſu.*

(b) The 1ſt is of Franckfort; 1ſt uſe that of Marpurg, 1606, in 8vo.

(c) Ant. Laurent. Politianus, *de Riſu*, p. m. 134.

(d) Leand. Albertus, *Deſcript. Italiæ*, p. 89.

POLONUS (MARTIN), Penitentiary to Pope Nicholas III. and a Dominican Frier, flouriſhed in the 13th Century. Some ſay he was Archbiſhop of Coſenza, others ſay of Benevento; but they cannot give good proofs of their aſſertion. However, it is certain that he was promoted to the Archbiſhoprick of Gneſna, June the 22d 1278 (*a*), by Pope Nicholas III. and that he was going to take poſſeſſion of it when he died at Bologna the ſame year or the next. He was buried in the Convent of his Order in the ſame city (*b*). He is the Author of a Chronicle of the Popes and the Emperors, which extends from Jeſus Chriſt, and from Auguſtus, to Pope John XXI. who died in the year 1277 [*A*]. We meet there with the Hiſtory of Pope Joan, and yet ſome learned

(a) *Decimo Kalendas Julii* ſay Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 486, and F. Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſ.* Tom. 2. p. 62. But Spondanus, ad ann. 1278, n. 18. uſes the phraſe, *Decimo Kalend. Junii*, the 23d of May.

(b) See F. Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſ.* Tom. 2. p. 62; and Starovolſ. *in Elogiis centum Polonorum*, p. 30.

[*A*] *He is the Author of a Chronicle . . . . . which extends from Jeſus Chriſt . . . . . to Pope John* XXI. *who died in the year* 1277.] They who imagined that it extended to the year 1320, did not know that he died, when Nicholas IV. was Pope in the year 1278 or 1279. Volaterranus did not know it neither; for he made him flouriſh under Pope John XXII. (1). He was no doubt miſled by a copy containing an Appendix, in which the Hiſtory is carried on to the year 1320. That Appendix, which was in the manuſcript of the Abbey of Fuld, was printed with Martin Polonus's Chronicle in the Baſil edition 1559. Suffridus Petri, in the edition of Antwerp 1574, aſcribed it erroneouſly to our Martin, and it is probably by a miſtake

(1) See his words in the rem. [*E*].

learned men do not think that paſſage was wrote by Polonus [*B*]. Others imagine he take of the ſame kind that Cocceius aſſerted our Martin was ſtill living in the year 1320 (2). There are ſome manuſcripts, in which this Chronicle extends only to Clement IV. whoſe Pontificate began in the year 1265, and ended in the year 1271. The Cologne edition was printed from one of theſe manuſcripts (3). But yet let us not imagine that the continuation to the year 1277 came from another hand than Martinus Polonus; for he himſelf obſerves in his Preface, that he carried on his Chronicle to Pope John XXI. incluſively. *Ego Frater Martinus Polonus Papæ Pœnitentiarius & Capellanus ex diverſis Chronicis & geſtis ſummorum Pontificum & Imperatorum præſens opuſculum uſque ad Joannem* XXI. *Papam deduxi incluſivè.* i. e. "I Frier Martin of Poland, Penitentiary and "Chaplain to the Pope, have drawn up this work "from ſeveral Chronicles and Hiſtories of the Popes "and Emperors, and have continued it to Pope John "XXI. incluſively." Let us ſay rather, that he gave more than one edition of his work, and that the firſt extended only to Pope Clement IV. and that he made additions to it afterwards, which continued the Chronicle to Pope John XXI. and that the manuſcripts which end with Clement IV. were tranſcribed from the firſt edition. There is in the library of Vienna a manuſcript, in which we meet with theſe words, *Uſque ad Gregorium Papam* X. *deduxi incluſivè.* i. e. "I have carried on this work to Pope Gregory "X. incluſively:" whereupon Lambecius makes this remark: *Quod autem Chronicon Martinianum hic dicitur pertingere ad Papam Gregorium* X. *incluſive, non eſt intelligendum de anno obitus ejus, qui fuit annus Chriſti* 1276, *ſed de initio Pontificatus, ſive anno Chriſti* 1271, *quo is poſt Papam Clementem* IV. *electus eſt. Hoc enim manifeſtè apparet ex ipſo illo codice, utpote de Gregorio* X. *nihil aliud antiqua manu ſcriptum cernetur, quàm hoc,* Gregorius natus Lombardus de civitate Placentia ſedit. . . . . *Quæ autem deinceps ſequuntur, multò recentiori manu adjecta ſunt* (4). i. e. "What is obſerv-"ed here that the Hiſtory is continued to Pope Gre-"gory X. incluſively, muſt not be underſtood of "the year of his death, which was A. D. 1276, but "of the beginning of his reign, or the year of "Chriſt 1271, when he was choſen Pope after Cle-"ment IV. This appears plainly from the manu-"ſcript itſelf, where nothing is written of Pope Gre-"gory X. in an old hand but this, *Gregory born in "Lombardy, of the city of Placenza ſat* . . . . . What "follows has been added by a much more modern "hand."

This muſt make us underſtand, 1. That the edition, which I call the firſt, extended to the Pontificate of Pope Clement IV. and not to the end of it in the year 1271 (5), as Voſſius imagined; 2. That there was a ſecond edition which extended to the beginning of the Pontificate of Gregory X. and another to Pope John XXI. But here ariſes a difficulty: there is a manuſcript in the library of Vienna, which contains theſe words, *Uſque ad Quartum Honorium Papam deduxi incluſivè* (6). i. e. "I have continued it to Pope Ho-"norius IV. incluſively." Honorius IV. was elected in the year 1285, and died in the year 1287. How can this be made to agree with the opinion of thoſe who place Martin Polonus's death under the year 1278, or 1279? Might not this have afforded Blondel an argument to vindicate himſelf againſt the perſon (7), who cenſured him for making his Martinus live till about the year 1290 (8). The learned Conringius aſſerts, that it is certain Martin Polonus continued his chronicle to the year 1285 (9).

The Abbot Ughelli (10), acknowledging on the one hand that Martin Polonus, Archbiſhop of Gneſna, was a Dominican, denies that he wrote the Chronicle, and aſcribes it to another Martin, who was a Ciſtercian Monk, Archbiſhop of Coſenza, and Penitentiary to Innocent X. but his opinion cannot be defended, ſince ſeveral manuſcripts of that Chronicle contain expreſly theſe words, *Ego Frater Martinus Ordinis Prædicatorum; I Frier Martin, of the Order of the Dominicans.* They are alſo to be met with in the prologue of the alphabetical index to the decrees and the decretals, which is commonly called *Martiniani*, and of which Martinus Polonus is reckoned to be the Author (11).

[*B*] . . . . *We meet there with the hiſtory of Pope Joan; and yet ſome learned men do not think that paſſage was wrote by Polonus.*] This is a controverſy, which men never fail to touch upon, whenever they write for or againſt the hiſtory of Pope Joan: but there will always be ſome difficulties remaining, as long as no perſon is able to produce the very original of Polonus. The Manuſcript copies, in which Pope Joan is mentioned, and thoſe in which ſhe is not mentioned, are not proper to determine the queſtion poſitively and to a demonſtration: for if one urges that Pope Joan's ſtory has been omitted in thoſe manuſcripts, in which it is wanting, another replies it has been foiſted in thoſe manuſcripts, in which it is found. Each of theſe two anſwers has ſome probability, and is ſupported by ſome arguments. The prejudices of the heart are more capable to determine a man, than the knowledge of the mind. It muſt nevertheleſs be owned, that there are ſome Roman Catholicks, who aſcribe that paſſage to our Martin, and that all the Proteſtants do not aſcribe it to him. Dr. Cave, an Engliſh Divine, aſſerts, that the ſtory of Pope Joan has been foiſted into Polonus's Chronicle, by another hand. Let us tranſcribe his whole paſſage; you will ſee that he explodes as a mere fable, all that relates to Pope Joan, and that ſome very good manuſcripts do not mention her in the leaſt. *Nihil illud* (Chronicon Martini Poloni) *magis famoſum reddidit, quàm decantatiſſima illa de Joanna Papiſſa, ſeu fabula, ſeu narratiuncula. Sanè fabulam eſſe, & Martini Chronico intruſam nullus dubito, præſertim cùm in pleriſque vetuſtis Codicibus MSS. deſideretur. In IV Codicibus MSS. Bibliothecæ Cæſareæ deſiderari, in totidem etiam reperiri ingenuè fatetur Cl. Lambecius* *. *Deerat etiam in antiquiſſimo Codice, quem Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ donavit Urbanus VIII cujus meminit Leo Allatius* Confut. fab. de Joan. Pap. num. 7. *ut alios taceam; certè Martini Chronicon non unam interpolationem paſſum eſſe eruditi dudum obſervarunt. Editum eſt hoc* Chronicon Baſil. 1559. *deinde cum notis Petri Suffridi,* Antverp. 1574. *in* 8. *Denique è vetuſtiſſimo MS. & ipſi Scriptori, uti ferunt, penè coætaneo, ſumma fide & diligentia expreſſum, in lucem emiſit Joannes Fabricius Cæſar, Monachus Præmonſtratenſis,* Colon. 1616. *fol. in qua editione Hiſtoria de Joanna Papiſſa non comparet* (12). i. e. "Nothing "has made that Chronicle (of Martin Polonus) more "famous than the moſt celebrated fable or ſtory of "Pope Joan. I am perſuaded it is nothing but a fa-"ble, which has been foiſted into Martin's Chronicle, "eſpecially becauſe it is wanting in the moſt antient "manuſcripts. Lambecius confeſſes ingenuouſly, that "as it is not to be met with in four manuſcripts of "the Emperor's library, ſo it is to be found in four "others. It is alſo wanting in a moſt antient copy, "which Pope Urban VIII. lodged in the library of "the Vatican, and which Les Allatius mentions, in "his *Refutation of the ſtory of Pope Joan, num.* 7. not "to mention other manuſcripts in which it is alſo "wanting: and indeed, the learned have obſerved "long ago, that there are ſeveral interpolations in "Martin's Chronicle. It was printed at Baſil in "1559, and then at Antwerp 1574 in 8vo, with Peter "Suffridi's notes. And at laſt at Cologne 1616, fo-"lio, from a very antient manuſcript, almoſt of the "ſame time with the Author himſelf, as they ſay; "it was publiſhed with the utmoſt fidelity and care "by John Fabricius Cæſar, a Monk of the Order of "St. Auguſtin: the hiſtory of Pope Joan is not to be "found in that edition." Monſieur du Pin is one of thoſe, who think that the ſtory of Pope Joan is an addition made to Polonus's Chronicle (13).

However, it is certain, that the Proteſtants have not inſerted that addition; it is to be met with in ſome manuſcripts which have been written long before Luther was mentioned; for Antoninus Biſhop of Florence, and Platina, who lived in the 15th century, have related the ſtory of Pope Joan, quoting Martin for it: there are ſome Authors of the 14th century, who have quoted Martin *(13) for the ſame particular. It was therefore a notorious temerity, and a profound ignorance in Florimond de Remond, who charged Herold with having added that ſtory to the edition of Polonus's Chronicle (14): he means the edition of Baſil publiſhed by the care of John Heroldus

(2) *Coccius in Catalogo Scriptorum quem ſuo Theſauro præmiſit.* Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* p. m. 485.

(3) *Cl. Joannis Fabricii Cæſaris, Canonici Gladbachenſis,* Idem, ibidem.

(4) Lambecius, lib. 2. *Bibliotb. Vindobon.* apud Sandium, *Notis in Voſſium de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 175, 176.

(5) There is in Voſſius 1251, which is a miſtake either of the Author or of the Printers. Neither F. Labbe, nor Sandius, have taken notice of that miſtake.

(6) Lambecius, lib. 2. *Bibliotb. Vindobon. apud* Sandium, *Notis in Voſſium de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 176.

(7) F. Labbe, *in Addendis* ad Tom. 2. *de Script. Eccleſ.* p. 759.

(8) Blondel, in his Latin treatiſe on *Pope Joan*, p. m. 6. obſerves, that in his French treatiſe, p. 17. he aſſerts that Martin Polonus died about the year 1270.

(9) Conringius, *Animadv. in Bullam Innocentii X.* p. m. 329.

(10) *In Italia Sacra, in Catalogo Archiepiſcoporum Conſentinor.* See Sandius *in Voſſium de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 174.

(11) See Sandius, ibidem.

(12) Cave, *de Script. Eccleſ.* Tom. 1. p. 739, 740. edit. Lond. 1688.

(13) Du Pin, *Biblioth.* Tom. 10. p. m. 82.

*(13) See Spanheim, *de Papa fœmina*, p. 165, and Mareſius *in Examine de Papa fœmina*, p. 22.

(14) Florimond de Remond, *l'Anti-Papeſſe*, chap. 2. num. 5. folio m. 367. See alſo Father Oudin, *in Supplem. de Script. Eccleſ.* p. 550.

* *Comment. Bib. Vindob.* lib. 2. cap. 8. p. 869.

(c) See the rem. [C].

he is the first who wrote any thing concerning that story (c). He has been blamed as Heroldus, in the year 1559, and which contains the Chronicles of Marianus and of our Martin. These two Chronicles had never been printed before. Monsieur Maimbourg would have been guilty of the same blunder, if we were to give credit to Monsieur Jurieu. " It is proper to observe, that the Sieur Maim- " bourg exposes himself to be soundly ridiculed, " when he charges us with contriving that monstrous " story, and *with inserting it into the Chronicles of* " *the Monks Marianus Scotus, Sygebertus, and Martin* " *the Polander* †. There never was a more rash and " inconsiderate assertion. There are still copies of " those Authors to be seen, in which that story is " told, and which were printed above twenty years " before Luther was mentioned. All the antient " manuscripts agree in this; and though it were " true that it is not to be found in two or three co- " pies, as the Sieur Maimbourg asserts, it would be " more probable that these few manuscripts were " corrected by those who were offended at that story, " and thought it odious (15)." In order to form a true judgment of that censure, it must be known what expressions Monsieur Maimbourg used. *The fable of Pope Joan*, says he (16), was never true *but in the person of that Pope John* (17). *For as he acted with so much weakness, and suffered himself to be so wretchedly imposed upon by an half-man* (18), *who was more cunning than he, he was called a woman, and Pope Joan, by a most cutting raillery, much like those Pasquins, which through the insolent freedom of slanderers, are pretty often posted up at Rome against the Popes, for much slighter reasons. But some time after, in those most dark and ignorant ages, that raillery was taken for a truth, and simple persons imagined that a woman disguised in the habit of a man, had, by surprise, been raised to St. Peter's throne. However, neither the time nor the circumstance of such an odd and improbable story was yet mentioned; till in the latter ages, some more rash Writers, and afterwards the Hereticks, with a design to abuse the Church of Rome, having often differed upon that subject, some placing the story in one time, some in another, agreed at last, for the most part, to place it between Leo X. and Benedict III. It is even very probable that they themselves invented that monstrous fable, and foisted it into the Chronicles of Marianus Scotus, Sigebertus, and Martin the Polander. For there is no hint of it in the most antient manuscripts and copies of these three Authors, except perhaps in those of the first.*

† *Hist. du Schisme des Grecs, an.* 881.

(15) Jurieu, *Apologie pour la Reformation*, Tom. 2. p. 38, 39. edit. in 4to.

(16) Maimbourg, *Hist. du Schisme des Grecs.* lib. 2. p. 198. of the 1st vol. Dutch edition.

(17) That is to say, John VIII.

(18) That is to say, Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who was an Eunuch.

If you compare this Author's words with those of his Censurer, you will find that Monsieur Jurieu did by no means pretend to these two qualities, which are requisite in a good Censurer, I mean equity and accuracy. These two qualities require that a man should put upon the expressions, he designs to censure, the sense which they necessarily imply. Now Monsieur Maimbourg's expressions do not necessarily signify, that the Hereticks invented the story of Pope Joan, and foisted it into the Chronicles of Marianus, Sigebertus, and Martin the Polander. That Author had just been mentioning two sorts of Writers, some Catholicks, and the other Hereticks. He might therefore mean that the former invented and inserted that story; why then is he censured as though he meant only the latter? This is not the only blunder of Mr. Jurieu: he pretends that there are copies of Marianus Scotus, Sigebertus, and Martin the Polander, *printed above twenty years before Luther was ever mentioned.* This is a piece of ignorance. Marianus Scotus, and Martin Polonus, were not printed before the year 1559; and there is no edition of Sigebertus mentioned, which is more antient than that of Paris 1513. It is not true that *all the antient manuscripts agree* (19), nor that Maimbourg asserts, that the story is extant *only in two or three copies.* We have seen, that without determining any number, he says in general, *the most antient manuscripts.*

(19) See the rem. [B] of the art. POPE JOAN.

If this Censurer had had a less superficial knowledge of the books, which have been published on both sides in this controversy, he would not have dared to assert that pretended agreement between all the antient manuscripts. There is nothing more false than that *agreement*; read only with regard to Marianus and Sigebertus, the remarks [B] and [C] of the article POPE JOAN, and with regard to Polonus what I have quoted from Dr. Cave (20), and what I am going to add. " Josias Simbler (21), Minister at " Zurich, who has made additions to Conrad Ges- " ner's Bibliotheque, confesses that he has read four " copies of this Martinus, which are still to be seen at " this day in the library of Dresserus (22), quite dif- " ferent from one another, some larger, or contain- " ing more than the others. I have an old one " which does not agree with that of Suffridus Petrus " Leovadiensis (23) Frisius has printed in the year " 1573, who confesses that he had collected with a great " deal of care from several places, the antient copies " he could meet with, in order to correct the gross " blunders and errors, which through the ignorance " or malice of some men, were crept into that Au- " thor's Chronicle. I cannot sufficiently wonder, " says he, how so many things could get into that " Martinus's work, such as it is in the first edition, " which things are wanting in the manuscripts, and " which Martinus never thought of, much less " would he have wrote them down. And if they " had dropt from his pen, he would have betrayed " every where his ignorance, and want of sense (24)." Here follows what we read in an English Writer, who was a strenuous assertor of the history of Pope Joan. *Doctor* Bristow * . . . . . *relates, that some years ago, a certain Protestant, (who is reckoned to be an eminent Historian) shewed a manuscript of that same book of Martinus, written in a very good letter, desiring that they would point out to him the passage where that story is told; but it was not in the text, but only in the margin, and written by another hand; which having seen, he said,* I see now that that Author also foils you (25). The English Writer will not allow that authority; he asserts, that it is impossible *to shew any one copy* of Polonus's work, *either printed or manuscript,* where the history of Pope Joan is wanting (26). And yet here follows what Dr. Burnet (27) observes. *I do not believe the story of Pope Joan, having seen in England, with my own eyes, a manuscript of Martinus Polonus, one of the most ancient Authors who are used to be quoted upon that subject, which manuscript seems to have been wrote soon after the Author's death, and in which that story is, not in the text, but only in the margin, where it is even writ by a different hand from that of the text* (28). Who could question but that manuscript is the same, which Dr. Bristow mentions? Spanheim (29) quotes John Chiflet, who mentions an old Manuscript of Martin Polonus, in which there is not a word of Pope Joan. The manuscripts of that Chronicle, which are lodged in the library of Leyden, differ very much from that (30), since they have the same particulars concerning Pope Joan, which are in the printed copies (31). They are also to be found in a manuscript, which a Monk who turned Protestant shewed to a Professor of Groningen. *Nec diu est quod meis oculis usurpavi vetustissimum Martini codicem in charta pergamena scriptum, quam secum Coloniâ detulit R. V. D. Micaël Ruckertius olim Philosophiæ Lector inter Recollectos Colonienses, nunc Dei gratiâ Verbi Divini fidelis dispensator in Oostfrisia, in quo extabat hæc eadem narratio* (32). i. e. " It is not long since I saw with " my own eyes, a most antient manuscript of Martin's " Chronicle, written on parchment, which the Re- " verend Michael Ruckertius, formerly Reader of " Philosophy among the Recollects of Cologne, and " now a Minister of the Gospel in East-friesland, " had brought with him from Cologne; that manu- " script has the history of Pope Joan." It is therefore certain, that all the antient manuscripts do not agree.

(20) Above, quotation (12).

(21) It should be *Simler.*

(22) Simler's words are, *ejusdem* (Martini Poloni) *exemplaria quatuor copiosiora multo quam expressum extant in Bibl. Dresseri.* Florimond has not translated them faithfully.

(23) He should have said *Suffridus Petri Leovardiensis.*

(24) Florimond de Remond, *l'Anti-Papesse*, chap. 2. num. 6. fol. 367 *verso.*

* In his answer to Dr. Fulke, chap. 10. qu. 54. p. 373.

(25) Cooke, *de la Papesse*, p. 61, 62.

(26) Ibidem, p. 61.

(27) Now Bishop of Salisbury. That is to say, when Mr. Bayle was writing this.

(28) Burnet, *Voyage*, p. m. 300.

(29) Spanheim, *de Papa fœmina*, p. 60, 61.

(30) Idem, ibid. p. 66, 67.

(31) Ibid.

(32) Sam. Maresius, *in Exam.* p. 22. edit. Gron. 1658.

Let us make some reflections on that diversity, and trace the origin of it. I begin with two propositions. 1. To shew that the History of Pope Joan is to be found in very antient manuscripts of Polonus's Chronicle, is no proof of his mentioning it. 2. To shew that that story is not to be found in very antient manuscripts, does not prove that he did not mention it. The truth of these two propositions appears from this, namely, that some pieces may possibly have been added to, or blotted out of an Author's works soon after his death. Additions and subtractions are two methods equally frequent of corrupting manuscripts, as appears from an hundred instances.

SOME CONSIDERATIONS on the cause of the difference there is between several manuscripts.

So that, as long as the original of Polonus is not produced, there will be no means of diſcovering with any certainty whether the difference there is between the manuſcript copies of his Chronicle be owing to an addition or an omiſſion.

It is by no means probable, will the Proteſtants ſay, that the Hiſtory of Pope Joan was foiſted into the manuſcript, and it is very probable that it was afterwards left out: for it is a ſcandalous ſtory, which loads the Papal See with ſhame. And therefore, as they who tranſcribe manuſcripts, were concerned for the honour of the Popes, they found it their intereſt to ſuppreſs that ſtory, and by no means to add it to the work. This diſcourſe has ſome probability; but it proves too much, and makes it difficult to anſwer this queſtion, how came the Hiſtory of Pope Joan to be left out in ſo many manuſcripts? Where was the zeal of Tranſcribers? How can that contradiction in their conduct be accounted for? Here is another difficulty. You pretend that Anaſtaſius the Librarian, that Marianus Scotus, that Sigebertus, that Martin Polonus, *&c.* have publiſhed that ſcandalous ſtory: and yet they were very good Papiſts; they were Prieſts or Monks, entirely devoted to the Church of Rome. Why ſhould they have leſs zeal than their Tranſcribers? Or why ſhould their Tranſcribers have been more ſcrupulous than they had been? Were not moſt of the Writers, who have told the ſtory of Pope Joan, very much addicted to the Catholick Religion? Can a man be more zealous for it than St. Antoninus was, who yet has inſerted it into his work? Here is another difficulty. That tradition was ſo well eſtabliſhed, that no man oppoſed it. Antoninus, who was contemporary with Luther, is the firſt who exploded it as a mere fable. The Council of Conſtance did not cenſure John Hus for alledging the fact (33), which proves evidently, that the fathers of that Council did not queſtion but a woman had been Pope. It follows from thence that the Roman Catholicks uſed themſelves to conſider that accident, as a thing which was by no means prejudicial to their Religion. What could then give riſe to the ſcruples, which determined ſome Tranſcribers to omit that paſſage in the manuſcript of Polonus's Chronicle? If the Church of Rome had been tired with outrages and objections upon that ſubject, as happened ſince the Reformation, it would be much eaſier to underſtand that the zealots for Popery laboured to ſuppreſs thoſe Writings, in which Pope Joan was mentioned; nay, in ſuch a caſe, they had been obliged to ſay that the fact is not true, or at leaſt that it is very doubtful. But we do not find that the Sectaries inſiſted on that article. Ockam in the 14th Century (34), and the Huſſites in the 15th (35), urged that fact as a proof that the Church can err. Æneas Sylvius anſwered, that the ſtory of Pope Joan is not certain, and that there would be no error, *de jure*, or *of right*, in the caſe. That objection made but little noiſe in thoſe times, and induced no man to take a reſolution to maintain the negative, and to trace the ſtory of Pope Joan up to its origin, in order to deſtroy the foundations of it. What could then occaſion the conſpiracy of the Tranſcribers, againſt the pages where the Chronologers had wrote that Hiſtory? Laſtly, and this is my laſt difficulty; what could have blinded them ſo as to make them ſpare ſo many other hiſtories, much more ſcandalous and diſgraceful than that, to exert all their zeal againſt that only? Have they not left in thoſe manuſcripts, and in an infinite number of others, the Hiſtories of Popes who were illegally choſen, Schiſmatical, Simoniacs, Adulterers, Magicians, *&c.* I do not give this for demonſtrative arguments: I would not aſſert, that never was any perſon whatſoever, who caſtrated ſome manuſcripts, in order to conceal the diſgraceful Hiſtory of a woman-Pope: I pretend only to oppoſe probable arguments, to probable arguments, and thereby to warn the readers that they ought not to be too poſitive with regard to the cauſe (36) why, according to ſo many perſons, the ſtory of Pope Joan is wanting in ſeveral eminent manuſcripts of the Chroniclers.

But, will ſome ſay, if Marianus, Sigebertus, Martin Polonus, *&c.* did not mention the woman-Pope; how comes it that her ſtory is to be found in ſo many antient manuſcripts of their Chronicles? Is there the leaſt probability, that the Monks, who in thoſe ages were the chief proprietors of the manuſcripts, and who did moſtly tranſcribe them, would have diſperſed ſuch a ſtory by foiſting it into books in which it was not originally? Had the Sectaries, as for inſtance the Huſſites, any occaſion to add it to thoſe works? Did they not find that tradition ſufficiently eſtabliſhed? Who denied it? Who oppoſed it? Did the firſt of their antagoniſts (37), who examined the objection they grounded on that ſtory, dare to aſſert poſitively, that the fact was not true? If therefore the addition could come neither from the zealous Papiſts, nor from the Hereticks, we muſt infer from thence, that the manuſcripts in which the woman-Pope is mentioned, agree in that reſpect with the original; and that thoſe, in which ſhe is not mentioned, have been caſtrated of that paſſage. This is an objection, which by its probability is capable to impoſe upon us; but there is nothing in it proper to convince thoſe who want to have good proofs. It ſuppoſes falſely, that no man could inſert the ſtory of Pope Joan in the manuſcripts of Sigebertus, Polonus, *&c.* without having a deſign to prejudice the Church of Rome. There are ſeveral other reaſons, which might engage the Tranſcribers to foiſt that addition into their copies.

The taſte which prevails at this day of preſerving editions which have additions, before thoſe that have none, has been common in all ages. We ought therefore to think there were always perſons, who choſe rather to have a Sigebertus with the ſtory of the woman-Pope, than a copy, in which that ſtory was wanting: ſo that the Tranſcribers might be ſure, that a copy into which that ſtory was foiſted would ſell better, than a copy in it was not inſerted, and which on account of that omiſſion would be thought caſtrated. And as before the art of printing was invented, the preparing of copies required a great deal of time, and books were very dear, men were ſparing of the time of the Tranſcribers, and of the purſe of the buyers; ſo that for the ſake of many perſons, they endeavoured to make one Chronicle ſerve inſtead of two or three; and with this view inſtead of tranſcribing ſeveral Chronicles, they added to one only what they found moſt remarkable or ſingular in all the reſt. Hence it came perhaps, that the monſtrous ſtory of a woman-Pope being delivered of a child in the midſt of a proceſſion, was added to Anaſtaſius, to Marianus Scotus, and to Sigebertus. It is alſo probable, that a curious man having bought a Sigebertus or a Martinus Polonus, in which he did not find the ſtory of Pope Joan, would add it in the margin, tranſcribing it from ſome other Chronicle; and that copy might ſome years after ſerve as an original to ſome Writer, who tranſcribing it would inſert into the text what he found in the margin (38). Who would dare to deny but there were in thoſe times ſome perſons more deſirous to have a work than provided with money to buy it? What did they do in ſuch a caſe? They borrowed a Chronicle, and tranſcribed it themſelves, and if they did not meet in it with ſome particulars, which other Hiſtorians mentioned, they added them, every one in its proper place, and by that means they made one ſingle manuſcript ſerve for the ſame purpoſes as many would do. Such a manuſcript might paſs from a private man's ſtudy into the great Libraries of ſome Univerſity or Monaſtery, or ſerve as an original for Tranſcribers before the invention of printing.

Thus you ſee we have made ſome ſuppoſitions, which are all probable, and from which it appears that though Sigebertus and Polonus had not related the ſtory of Pope Joan, yet we might find it in ſome antient manuſcript of their Chronicles, nor could we ſuſpect that the Authors of the addition had any wicked deſign againſt the Holy See. By theſe obſervations it appears, that there is nothing more natural than the difference which is ſaid to be between the old manuſcripts: ſome of them were faithfully tranſcribed from the original, either immediately or mediately; in theſe the ſtory of the woman-Pope is wanting: the others were tranſcribed from ſome copies, which had been adorned with the addition of that fable.

What we have related elſewhere (39) concerning the manuſcripts of Athanaſius, and what Onuphrius (40), and Dr. Burnet (41) declares, leaves us no room to doubt but ſeveral things were written in the margin of ſome copies, which the Authors of them had not mentioned.

One may make a particular obſervation concerning the

(33) See Monſieur de Launoi, epiſt. 8. part. 4. p. m. 355.

(34) See Mareſius, *in Examine*, p. 22.

(35) See Launoi, epiſt. 8. lib. 4. p. 355.

(36) That cauſe is, that out of the zeal for Popery, men omitted the ſtory of Pope Joan.

(37) Æneas Silvius. See the rem. [*E*], of the article POPE JOAN.

(38) Compare this with what I obſerve in the rem. [*B*] of the art. POPE JOAN.

(39) In the rem. [*A*] of the art. POPE JOAN.

(40) See the rem. [*A*] of the ſame article.

(41) Above, quotation (28).

the difference there is between the ſeveral manuſcripts of Martin Polonus's Chronicle. We have ſeen above that he gave ſeveral editions of it; and we may be certain, that he did not only add a continuation to his work in every new edition of it, but that he alſo reviſed and corrected the whole, making alterations and additions. Some manuſcripts of theſe different editions being preſerved (42), ſome muſt of courſe be larger than the others, and we muſt meet here and there with divers particulars, which are wanting in the others. Such a difference would unavoidably be obſerved in the manuſcripts, though the Tranſcribers had been never ſo careful and honeſt. It muſt not therefore be pretended, generally ſpeaking, thoſe manuſcripts, which want ſome particulars that are to be found in others, were unfairly tranſcribed: for beſides the reaſon I have already mentioned, here follows a conjecture which is very probable. All they who tranſcribed Martin Polonus's Chronicle did not do it with a deſign to ſell copies of it. A man might tranſcribe it for his own private uſe; if he were not rich, he would chooſe to take that trouble rather than ſpend money to buy the book. Such a man might mind the things rather than the expreſſions; and to have ſooner done he may have omitted what ſeemed uſeleſs to him, abridged ſome Phraſes, and put his own expreſſions inſtead of thoſe of the original. A man writes much faſter, when he furniſhes himſelf his expreſſions, than when he tranſcribes another's: for the neceſſity of ſtopping every moment, to caſt your eyes on a manuſcript, makes you loſe a great deal of time, and you gain a great deal, if you only write down your own thoughts. A Tranſcriber, who takes the ſenſe of an whole period, and expreſſes it according to his own particular taſte, will finiſh in one day, what would require two if he followed a manuſcript word for word. Suppoſe that ſuch a copy of Martin Polonus was afterwards tranſcribed, we underſtand eaſily that the copies of the Chronicle will differ from each other, and that the difference will not be owing to any ill deſign, nor to any piece of knavery. Thoſe, who make large collections, and tranſcribe whole pages of a book into their Common-places, will eaſily grant what I ſuppoſe here; they will remember that to have ſooner done, they have not tranſcribed word for word, they have omitted, they have altered many words. Even the Authors who quote long paſſages take often that liberty to leſſen the tireſome fatigue of tranſcribing (43). There is ſometimes a little artifice in this, but not always. What ſhall I ſay of ſo many omiſſions, which Tranſcribers make without being aware of them, eſpecially when two periods not far diſtant from each other begin with the ſame word? They read their copy over with ſome attention, but they too often ſave themſelves the trouble of comparing their tranſcript line after line with the original; and unleſs the omiſſions plainly and in a groſs manner ſpoil the ſenſe, or break the connexion, they imagine that all is well. Now it is certain, that there are ſome periods or half periods, which being left out of a book, do not ſo ſpoil the ſenſe but that there may ſtill remain a tolerable meaning.

Let us infer thence that the difference between manuſcripts is not always owing to a diſhoneſt deſign: ſeveral innocent cauſes may concur to produce that difference, though I muſt confeſs that there has often been ſome fraud at the bottom. See what Spanheim obſerves concerning the manuſcripts of Sigebertus. *Collato eo codice* (Bibliothecæ Leidenſis) *cum aliis, ac præcipuè cum iis quibus uſus eſt Aubertus Miræus, Gemblacenſi, Lipſiano, &c. patet non pauca addita, mutata, detracta, quædam etiam paſſim in noſtro deſiderari ex eo genere quæ Romæ inviſa, & quæ Baronius exagitat in Sigeberto* (44). i. e. "By comparing the manuſcript "of the Library at Leyden, with others, and eſpe- "cially with thoſe which Aubert le Mire uſed, with "that of the Abby of Gemblours, with that of Leip- "ſic, &c. it appears that many things have been "altered, added, omitted, and that there are ſome "things wanting in ours, but things which are odi- "ous to Rome, and for which Baronius is angry "with Sigebertus." You ſee that among thoſe things, in which the copies differ, he places additions and omiſſions, and that ſome of thoſe omiſſions relate to ſuch particulars, as the Court of Rome diſlikes, and which betray a writer too partial in favour of thoſe Emperors, who had quarrels with the Popes. There is room to think that ſuch particulars have been omitted by an unfair deſign, by ſome Tranſcribers prepoſſeſſed in favour of a party. But we ought not to judge thus with regard to thoſe additions, omiſſions, or alterations, which have no manner of connexion with ſchiſms, or diſputes. We muſt judge of this as we do of the mutilations or corruptions of the manuſcripts of the antient Heathens. There are in ſome manuſcripts of Cicero or of Livy ſome things, which are wanting in other manuſcripts; no intereſt, no prejudice, no paſſion could make a Tranſcriber omit them: his only crime is that he was lazy or ignorant, *&c.*

In order to judge rightly whether a Tranſcriber left out or added ſome things from a ſpirit of party, we muſt know which were the ſtate or religious factions what could ſway him, and of what conſequence the paſſages left out or added may be with regard to thoſe factions. If they could neither hurt nor ſerve any of the parties, it muſt be ſuppoſed that there was no knavery in the addition nor in the omiſſion; but one may ſuppoſe the contrary, when they relate particularly to ſome controverſy which raiſed people's paſſions. Wherefore Martin Polonus's manuſcripts would be ſuſpected of a fraudulent mutilation or addition, if they had been made ſince the Proteſtants and the Roman Catholicks began to write on the queſtion of the woman-Pope with ſo much heat and paſſion. But ſince they are anterior to that controverſy, and made when the hiſtory of that woman was not contradicted, one does not ſee that a falſe zeal, partiality, diſhoneſty, muſt have determined the Tranſcribers to ſuppreſs it. It might happen that ſome perſon left it out, becauſe he took it for a ridiculous ſtory. See the margin (45).

A ſpirit of party is a ſtrange kind of fury: there are ſome readers ſo angry and paſſionate, that they tear off every leaf of a book in which they meet with ſomething diſgraceful to their Sect. Judge by this what they would do, if ſuch or ſuch manuſcripts fell into their hands. It is impoſſible to deſcribe the havock, which that paſſion has made in the antient Libraries (46). And why would they not have dared to falſify manuſcripts, ſince men dare at this time to falſify ſecond editions, even whilſt the Author is ſtill living (47). I have been told for certain, that the third volume of the Revolutions of England (48) reprinted in Holland, has been ſpoiled in ſeveral places, ſometimes by additions, and ſometimes by omiſſions.

I muſt not forget to obſerve, that ſome perſons think that the ſtory of Pope Joan has been added to Platina's work. This is Bernartius's opinion. *For,* ſays he *, *I have heard from Anthony Hetweld, a man of reputation, and a Magiſtrate of Lovain, that one Engelbertus Boonius, a grave man, and Dean of a conſiderable Church in Germany, told him ſeveral times that he had ſeen many antient manuſcripts of* Platina, *in the Vatican at Rome, and that he had examined them very carefully, and yet could never find one word in them concerning the woman-Pope* (49). Alexander Coock urges very good objections againſt this. *How comes it,* ſays he (50), *that thoſe antient manuſcripts are in ſuch a large number and ſo odd in the Vatican, ſince printing was already in uſe, and* Platina *died in the year* 1481? *How comes it, that neither* Onuphrius, *nor* Bellarmine, *nor* Baronius, *who had ſuch a free acceſs to the Vatican Library, could never find thoſe manuſcripts? What is the reaſon that no man, ſince* Bernartius, *ever urged that objection againſt* Platina? Onuphrius, Bellarmine, *and* Baronius, *acknowledging that that ſtory is in* Platina, *it makes me believe that* Bernartius *calumniated the Magiſtrate, or that the Magiſtrate calumniated the Dean, or that the Dean impoſed upon the Magiſtrate. For if he had had ſuch manuſcripts, ſome of theſe perſons would have ſhewed them to the world before this time.* Spanheim (51) does not deny the fact which Bernartius aſſerts; on the contrary, he makes an advantage of it to ſhew by that inſtance, that it was cuſtomary to caſtrate manuſcripts. For my part I would not deny, that there were in the Vatican ſome faithful copies of Platina's work, which did not contain the ſtory of Pope Joan. It ſeems very probable to me, that that Author ſhewed his manuſcript, and ſuffered ſome copies to be taken of it, ſome

(42) Since at this time ſeveral Authors quote firſt editions, without knowing that there are others with corrections and additions; it might eaſier ſtill be unknown in those ages, that there were ſome editions of Polonus more complete than the firſt, ſo that the copies of the firſt were multiplied.

(43) See in the rem. [B] of the art. VOLKELIUS, what has been obſerved concerning a quotation from Monſ. Stoupp's book.

(44) Spanheim. *de Papa fœmina*, p. 54, 55.

(45) *Unuſquiſque quæ ipſe digna memoria judicabat addidit: erraſitque quæ ſibi indigna lectu videbantur. Allatius Symm.* p. 417. ſpeaking of Martin Polonus's chronicle, *apud* Spanhem. *de Papa fœmina*, p. 63.

(46) See the preface of Laurent Bouchel, *in Decreta Eccleſ. Gallic.* Rivet quotes him in his *Remarques ſur la Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité*, p. 602, of the 1ſt vol.

(47) See the rem. [F] of the art. PELLISSON, and the rem. [D] of the art. ANCILLON.

(48) By Father d'Orleans a Jeſuit.

HOW it comes that ſome manuſcripts of Platina want the ſtory of Pope Joan.

* *Impudens aliquis nebulo interpolavit ſcripta Platinæ. Audivit ex Antonio Hetueldio, amplisſimo laudatisſimoque viro, conſulari Lovanienſi, dixiſſe ſibi ſæpius Engelbertus Boonius ... vidiſſe ſe Romæ in Bibliotheca Vaticana, antiquiſſima Platinæ exemplaria manuſcripta, ſedulo examinaſſe, & de Joanne fœmina ne literam quidem reperiſſe.* Bernartius, de utilitate legendæ, hiſt. lib. 2. p. 111.

(49) Coocke, *de la Papeſſe*, p. 46, 47.

(50) Coocke, ib. p. 47, 48.

(51) Spanhem. *de Papa fœmina*, p. 64.

as a credulous Hiſtorian, and a man of very little judgment [C]. It is unqueſtionable that he was ſirnamed *Polonus*, becauſe he was a Polander, or becauſe he paſſed for ſuch [D]. Voſſius ought to have aſſerted poſitively, that Martinus Carſulanus whom Volaterranus has mentioned in the beginning of his twenty ſecond book is the ſame with him

ſome years before he publiſhed it. It is probable that after he ſuffered it to be tranſcribed, he reviſed and corrected it, and made additions to it, and that the Hiſtory of the woman-Pope was one of theſe additions. So that it is very poſſible, that there were ſome manuſcripts of Platina ſeen in the Vatican, in which that ſtory was not related. But as Onuphrius, Bellarmine, and Baronius, did not doubt but the edition in which it was related, was faithful, they would ſcorn to urge ſuch manuſcripts; for it would have been to no purpoſe. It muſt even be confeſſed that Platina's teſtimony does not much hurt the cauſe which theſe three Authors aſſerted; for it is proper to perſuade us that there never was a woman-Pope, rather than that there was one. Coeffeteau did not omit that article. " One Martinus Polonus is charg-
" ed with being the firſt who expoſed it to the view of
" all Chriſtendom, and Platina, whoſe words du
" Pleſſis borrows, confeſſes that he took it from him,
" adding even theſe words, which inſtead of con-
" firming du Pleſſis in his opinion, ſhould ſhake his
" belief, and make him doubt, or rather condemn
" his whole narration. *What I ſay of it* † *is a com-*
" *mon report, and the Authors of it uncertain, and very*
" *little famous, ſo that I thought it proper to give only*
" *a ſhort and plain account of it, that I might not be*
" *thought to have obſtinately omitted what is related by*
" *almoſt all,* (underſtand this of the later Writers) *for if*
" *even the wiſe delight in follies, let us err with the*
" *people, though it be plain that this particular is one of*
" *thoſe things which are thought to be poſſible.* Is not
" this a moſt glorious foundation of a monſtrous
" ſtory? And though a man had thought it true, is
" not this ſufficient to make him diſbelieve it (52)?"

If there were ſome inſtances, by which it appeared that an Author came into trouble and made himſelf odious, by relating the ſtory of Pope Joan, one might imagine that Platina omitted that ſtory in the copies which he ſhewed to the Pope and the Cardinals. But at that time Authors were not put to any trouble upon that account; every one had the liberty to ſpeak of it with impunity. What could then have occaſioned Platina's precaution of having two kinds of copies, the one for the Court, and the other for his intimate friends? We can eaſily gueſs why Monſieur Varillas has not publiſhed all that he had written, and which an hundred perſons had ſeen in the manuſcript copies of his hiſtories (53). He was afraid of being ill uſed. When it ſhall be proved that Platina, who has related pretty freely ſome things much more odious than the ſtory of Pope Joan was in his time, did not dare to mention it publickly, it will be time enough to confeſs that his book was printed only from the copy deſigned for his intimate friends.

[C] *He has been blamed as a credulous Hiſtorian, and a man of very little judgment.*] Here follows another paſſage from Coeffeteau (54), " The moſt antient of
" thoſe who have ſtained their writings with that
" ſhameful ſtory, was one Martinus Polonus (55) a
" Ciſtercian Monk, who ends his Chronicle with
" Nicholas III. about the year 1278. It is from
" him Platina borrowed it, both of them ſpeaking
" of it only from common report without any other
" knowledge. Du Pleſſis in order to aſſert Polonus's
" authority, told us above *, *that as he had been Peni-*
" *tentiary to Pope Nicholas* III. *and afterwards Arch-*
" *biſhop of Coſenza* †, *we ought to give him more credit,*
" *and have more reſpect for him, than we ſeem to do.*
" But as we honour his titles, ſo we know that they
" do not always render a man a perfect Annaliſt, or
" a good Chronicler: which is very plain from his
" very writings; for when you read them it is eaſy
" to judge that he was a good plain man, who
" collected as ſo many oracles the ſtories related by
" the common people, which he inſerted into his
" works, without any judgment. But beſides, he
" himſelf ſpeaks of that ſtory of Pope Joan ſo coldly
" and careleſsly, that he makes it quite doubtful.
" *This,* ſays he ſpeaking of that monſter, *was a wo-*
" *man, as it is aſſerted,* ut aſſeritur. Naudé uſes him
" worſe ſtill. *Without minding,* ſays he (56), *the dif-*
ference there is between the manuſcripts or the additions that have been made to this Martinus Polonus, it is more proper to concludes that his authority can by no means hurt Sylveſter, both becauſe of the preceding argument, and becauſe he has related ſo many fabulous ſtories in his Chronicle, that a man who can believe what he relates of Sylveſter, muſt be as light of belief as weak of judgment. I call to witneſs thoſe ſtories, which he has extracted from the book De Infantia Salvatoris *(of our Saviour's infancy) and thoſe he borrowed from the* Hiſtory of Pilate, *of the Greeks who intended to ſteal the corps of St. Peter and St. Paul, his ſtory of Sylveſter's Dragon, which killed ſix thouſand perſons every day, of another which was ſo big that eight couple of oxen could not drag it to the place where it was to be burnt; of Aitus of Britany, of the Prophet Merlin, of the woman-Pope Joan, of the golden Letters, which weighed an hundred pounds a piece, and which Charles the Great gave to twenty three Monaſteries which he had founded, and a thouſand other ſtories of the ſame kind, which are proper only to lull children aſleep, whilſt the nurſes are rocking the cradle.* Alexander Coocke ſuppoſes this objection is urged againſt him. " Know, that (as Bellarmine * and
" N. D. † obſerve) he was a very ſimple man,
" and that in Dr. Harding's judgment ** his writ-
" ings are idle and impertinent, without any ap-
" pearance of truth. Nay, know again *that he is*
" *proper only to tell ſtories,* for this is the cenſure which
" Bernartius †† paſſes upon him (57)." To which it is anſwered, that *he was* * *learned in the holy Scriptures, and not unacquainted with the ſecular Doctrine,* and that *he was a man, on whom* Platina † *depended very much in point of Hiſtory,* and whom he judged worthy to be eſteemed as a man of great learning and good morals (58). Coocke examines afterwards five inſtances which are urged as ſo many proofs of Martinus Polonus's ignorance, and aſſerts that he is calumniated; and that Bernartius and Florimond de Remond charge him with theſe five blunders. I have not got Bernartius's book (59), but I know that Florimond de Remond is here unjuſtly accuſed, for he has not charged Martinus Polonus with theſe blunders, but another Martinus, as will be plain to all thoſe who will read the following paſſage. " Hav-
" ing examined with all the care that the place where
" I am would allow, all that can be ſaid upon this
" ſubject, I happened to light on an old manuſcript,
" containing the Lives of the Popes and Emperors,
" the Author of which is named Martinus: there
" I met with this mitred Joan. I cannot tell whe-
" ther it be owing to their having the ſame name,
" that Martinus Polonus has been made to ſay, what
" that other Martinus wrote, whoſe work was never
" printed that I know of, nor could I diſcover any
" thing concerning him but that he was a German.
" There is ſome likelihood in this, eſpecially conſi-
" dering the difference there is in the manuſcripts
" mentioned by Simbler. There is another Chro-
" nicle of one Martinus, which abounds with ſilly
" ſtories (60)." The inſtances which Remond gives of this laſt particular are the five blunders, of which Coocke has cleared our Polonus. You muſt obſerve that Du Pleſſis has mentioned another Martinus of the *Order of the Minorites,* who wrote a *Chronicle entitled* Flores Temporum (the Flowers of the Times) where Pope Joan is mentioned (61). Blondel places him towards the end of the 15th Century (62).

[D] *He was ſirnamed* Polonus, *becauſe he was a Polander, or becauſe he paſſed for ſuch.*] He was of the noble family of the Streperi, *Streporum,* if we may believe Starovolſcius, who adds that he was then both the firſt and the only Polander, who gained a reputation by his writings, for which reaſon he was ſirnamed *Polonus. Quod primus tum ex Polonis, idque ſolus, ſcriptis inter extraneos inclaruerit, unde & Polonus, à gente cognominatus eſt, ac ſi Scylurus ille Scytha, quod alium è Scythia parem ſibi ingenio non habuerit* (63). There

(53) The paſſages omitted in his hiſtories of Francis I. and Charles IX. have been in the edit. printed in Holland.

(54) Coeffeteau, *Reponſe au Miſtere d'Iniquité,* p. 505.

(55) Father Mabillon, *Muſæi Ital.* Tom. 1. p. 27. ſays alſo *Martinum Polonum primum eſſe hujus fabulæ ſi non auctorem, ſaltem narrationem,* Serarius is of the ſame opinion, in chap. 42 of the 1ſt book of his *Hiſtory of Mentz*; but ſee the rem. [K] of the art. POPE JOAN.

* Page 165, towards the end.

† This cannot be; for Nicholas III. made him Archbiſhop of Gneſna, and not of Coſenza.

† Here follow Platina's words in Joanne 8. folio m. 140. *Hæc quæ dixi vulgo feruntur: incertis tamen & obſcuris auctoribus: quæ ideo ponere breviter, & nude inſtituì: ne obſtinate nimium & pertinaciter omiſiſſe videar: quod fere omnes affirmant: erremus etiam nos hac in re cum vulgo: quamquam appareat ea quæ dixi ex his eſſe: quæ fieri poſſe creduntur.*

(52) Coeffeteau, *Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité,* p. 504, 505.

(56) Naudé, *Apolog. des grands Hommes,* p. m. 559, 560.

* *Lib.* 3. *de Rom. Pont. cap.* 24.

† 3. *Controv. part.* 2. *c.* 3. *n.* 29. *p.* 399.

** *Reſponſe au Cartel de l'Eveſque Jewel.*

†† *Martinus Polonus fabulis tantum celebrit, cætera obſcurus homo.* Lib. 2. de militare legend. hiſt. p. 113.

(57) Coocke, *de la Papeſſe,* p. 63.

* *Tritbem. de Script. Eccleſ. verbo, Martin.*

† *Vir magnæ doctrinæ ſingulariſque vitæ.* Platina in Victor. 3.

(58) Coocke, *de la Papeſſe,* p. 64.

(59) *De Utilitate legendæ Hiſtoriæ.*

(60) Florimond de Remond, *l'Anti-Papeſſe,* chap. 2. num. 6. folio 367 *verſo.*

(61) Du Pleſſis, *Myſtere d'Iniquité,* p. 102.

(62) Blondel, *in Examen Quæſt. de Papa fœmina,* p. m. 8.

(63) Simon Starovolſcius, *in Centum Polonor. Elog.* p. 29.

him who is the ſubject of this article [*E*]. You muſt obſerve that his Chronicle is called the Martinian Chronicle, and that it was printed in French at Paris, with the additions of Verneron Canon of Leige, and with thoſe of the *Chronographer Caſtel*, in folio, by Anthony Verard (*d*).

(*d*) Du Verdier, *Biblio. Franç.* p. 897.

There is in the Library of Vienna a manuſcript of this Martin, in which he aſſerts that the city of Oppaw in Bohemia was his native place. *Ipſe Martinus in Præfat. Codicis MS. cujuſdam Bibl. Viennenſis, ſe ipſum ait de Regno Bohemiæ oriundum, patria* Opimenſem, *vel ut in alio MS. ut et codice Monaſterii Gamingenſis rectius legitur*, Oppavienſem, *obſervante Lambecio lib. 2. Bibl. Vindob.* (64). Poland was at that time better known in Italy than in Bohemia, nor did men mind much a geographical accuracy. So that a man was eaſily looked upon as a Polander, when he was of ſome country in the neighbourhood of the Kingdom of Poland. They who aſſert that our Martin was a Polander and of the city of Carſula or Corſula (65) do not much examine what they ſay, for if he were of that city he would be an Italian (66). They blend together what Volaterranus aſſerts, that he was of Carſula, and what others maintain that he was born in Poland; but Volaterranus was miſtaken.

(64) Sand. *Animadv. in Voſſium, de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 173.

(65) F. Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſ.* Tom. 2. p. 62. and Dr. Cave, *de Script. Eccleſ.* p. 739. are among thoſe.

(66) Volaterran. lib. 21. p. m. obſerves that Carſula is now called Caſcina: and in book 6. p. 199. he obſerves that it is a city of Umbria.

[*E*] *Martinus Carſulanus, whom Volaterranus has mentioned in the beginning of his twenty ſecond book, is the ſame with him, who is the ſubject of this article,*] Volaterranus expreſſes himſelf thus: *Pontificum Romanorum, ſeu Temporum eorum hiſtoriam ſcripſere . . . . . Vincentius et Martinus Carſulanus, Ordinis ambo Prædicatorum, Jo. XXII. tempore* (67). i. e. "Vincentius "and Martinus of Carſula, both Dominican Friers, "who flouriſhed in the time of Pope John XXII. "wrote the Hiſtory of the Popes, or of their times." He had ſaid in another place (68), where he gives a Catalogue of the illuſtrious Dominican Friers, *Martinus Pœnitentiarius urbis, patria Carſulanus, quam Caſcinam vocant, Chronicam ſcripſit, quam Martinianam vocant, Jo. XXII. tempore.* i. e. "Martinus Peni-"tentiary to the city, born at Carſula, now called "Caſcina, wrote a Chronicle which is ſtyled the "*Martinian*. he lived in the time of Pope John "XXII." It is plain that in theſe two paſſages he means the ſame Martinus, and yet Voſſius queſtions it (69). He commits a greater blunder ſtill, ſince he imagines that Volaterranus ſpoke of one Vincentius Carſulanus in the beginning of his twenty ſecond book. He confeſſes that he does not know that Author (70). How could he know him, ſince he is a mere chimera? Volaterranus ſpeaks of the ſame Vincent of Beauvais, whom he had mentioned in the twenty firſt book (71).

(67) Volaterran. lib. 22. *init.* p. 783.

(68) Idem, lib. 21. p. 759.

(69) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* lib. 2. cap. 60. p. 485. and cap. 54. p. 507.

(70) *De eo nihil ultra occurrit.* Idem, ibid. p. 507.

(71) Page 759.

POMPONATIUS (PETER) was born in Mantua the 16th of September 1462 (*a*). He was ſo little in ſtature that he was almoſt a dwarf (*b*); but he poſſeſſed an exalted genius, and was conſidered as one of the moſt excellent Philoſophers of the age in which he lived. He taught philoſophy in Padua with great reputation, having for his antagoniſt the famous Achillini, whoſe puzzling objections would frequently have confounded him, had it not been for his ſkill in parrying them by ſome joke [*A*]. During the dreadful war in which the Venetians were engaged againſt the league of Cambray, he withdrew to Bologna, and taught Philoſophy there. He had three wives, and but one daughter (*c*), to whom he gave a portion of twelve thouſand Ducats (*d*). I know that he did not die in 1512 (*e*), as Moreri affirms; but then I myſelf do not know the date of his death. All I know is, that ſome relate that he died in a very advanced age (*f*), and that, according to others, he died of the ſtrangury at Bologna in the ſixty third year of his age (*g*). His body being conveyed to Mantua was honourably interred there by the appointment of Cardinal Hercules of Gonzaga (*h*). This great Philoſopher was brought into trouble by the Monks on account of his book on the Immortality of the Soul [*B*], and I knew a Profeſſor of Philoſophy, who had made himſelf vaſtly formidable by that means. He was a man of no depth, and would have eaſily been puzzled in publick diſputations, if he had not made uſe of jokes, and even buffooneries, which ſet the aſſembly a laughing. By this means the ſtrongeſt objections fell to the ground; and he was ſo firmly perſuaded that this was the beſt way of anſwering, that he even uſed to employ them, when he was able to employ arguments that were both ſerious and ſolid. But after all, perſons of good ſenſe are not ſatisfied with the method uſed by theſe jokers; they are diverted at it no leſs than others, but nevertheleſs they decree the honour of the triumph to thoſe who merit it. Paulus Jovius obſerves, that Achillini uſed to come off victorious in diſputation, by the inſurmountable force of his doctrine, though Pomponatius his antagoniſt diverted the company by his jokes, and employed many ſly tricks. *Æmulum in corona veteratorie diſputantem, & riſum ſalſa dicacitate ſæpius excitantem, ipſo invicto doctrinæ robore ſuperabat* (4). I ſhall obſerve, by the way, that Pomponatius, who was a cunning mortal, prevailed upon many of the pupils of Achillini, who was a plain downright man, and unfit for intrigues, to leave him, and become his (Pomponatius's) auditors (5).

(*a*) Lucas Gauricus, *in Schemat.* tract. 4. folio 57 *verſo.*

(*b*) *Erat puſillus corpore homuncio quodammodo nanus.* Idem, ibid.

(*c*) Idem, ibid.

(*d*) Idem, ibid.

(*e*) See the cloſe of the rem. [*B*].

(*f*) *Obiit ſenio confectus.* Lucas Gauricus, *in Schemat.* tract. 4. folio 57 *verſo.*

(*g*) *Sexageſimo tertio ætatis anno ſtranguria obortâ Bononiæ fato functus eſt.* Jov. *in Elog.* cap. 71. p. m. 165.

(*h*) Idem, ibid.

[*A*] *His ſkill in parrying them by ſome joke.*] I am informed of this by Paulus Jovius. *In coronis*, ſays he (1), *confeſſuque doctorum, quum exercitatione perutili ad prætoriam porticum diſputaretur, ita mirus evadebat, ut ſæpe ancipiti, & cornuto Achillini enthymemate circumventus, ſuperfuſo facetiarum ſale, adverſarii impetum, ex illis gyris, & mæandris explicatus eluderet.* i. e. "In "large companies of people, and aſſemblies of learn-"ed men, whilſt uſeful diſputations were carrying "on, he made ſuch admirable evaſions, that being "frequently preſſed, by a fallacious and knotty ar-"gument, he would throw out his jokes, and there-"by eluding the force of his adverſary, extricated "himſelf out of the maze into which he had been "led." Nothing can be more advantageous, in diſputation, than this talent of Pomponatius. If a perſon has no good anſwer to make to an argument; finds it quite puzzling and unanſwerable, ſuch a one will extricate himſelf, provided he can but hit upon ſome joke; he will get the laughers on his ſide in ſuch a manner, that the confuſion due to himſelf, will fall upon his adverſary.

(1) P. Jovius, *in Elog.* cap. 71. p. m. 164.

Solventur riſu tabulæ, tu miſſus abibis (2).

"He laugh'd and jear'd at, you diſcharg'd the "Court." CREECH.

(2) Horat. ſat. 1. lib. 2. ver. *ult.*

It is on theſe occaſions that we prove the following maxim:

Ridiculum acri
Fortius & melius magnas plerunque ſecat res (3).

"A waggiſh ſneer
"Doth nick the great ones more than a ſevere." CREECH.

(3) Idem, ſat. 10. lib. 1. ver. 14.

(4) Jovius, *in Elog.* cap. 57. p. 134.

(5) *Ipſo Pomponatio acri æmulo inſidioſa ambitione, ſcholam ejus depopulante. Erat enim à ſumma ingenii ſimplicitate ambiendi, adulandique prorſus imperitus.* Idem, ibid.

[*B*] *This great Philoſopher was brought into trouble by the Monks, on account of his book on the immortality of the ſoul.*] Here follows a paſſage from Paulus Jovius: *Exorto bello Veneto, poſt Achillini mortem Bononiæ profeſſus eſt; ubi cucullatos ſacerdotes contra ſe in caput, & nominis famam vehementiſſimè concitavit; edito ſcilicet volumine, quo animas poſt corporis mortem interituras ex ſententia Ariſtotelis probare nitebatur; ſecutus Aphrodiſæi placita, cujus dogmate ad corrumpendam juventutem, diſſolvendamque Chriſtianæ vitæ diſciplinam, nihil peſtilentius induci potuit* (6). We here find that Paulus Jovius

(6) Jovius, *in Elog.* cap. 71. p. 164.

and was ſuſpected to entertain impious notions. Notwithſtanding the clamours raiſed and the books that were publiſhed againſt him, he yet could not be prevailed upon

vius acts the part both of an Hiſtorian and a Judge on this occaſion. He ſays, not only that Pomponatius, by endeavouring to prove that, according to the doctrine of Ariſtotle, the ſoul of man is not immortal, was therefore preſented by the Monks; but that it is likewiſe the moſt pernicious doctrine poſſible, and the moſt apt to corrupt youth, and Chriſtian morality. He is certainly infinitely more in the right, when he acts as an Hiſtorian, than when he gives his judgment; for it is not at all material, whether Ariſtotle believed the ſoul's mortality; or whether he laid down principles, according to which it cannot well be proved that it is not mortal. If therefore Pomponatius aſſerted only this, that according to Ariſtotle's principles, it muſt neceſſarily be inferred, that it dies with the body, his opinion is no ways pernicious in its tendency, provided that he himſelf believes the immortality of the ſoul. But he believes it directly and expreſsly. He examines the hypotheſes of Ariſtotle; he produces what may be ſaid *pro* and *con* as to thoſe hypotheſes; he exhibits the philoſophical reaſons which were brought, in that age, as ſo many proofs either of the ſoul's immortality or mortality. He takes notice wherein the ſtrength or weakneſs of the argument lyes on both ſides; and afterwards concludes, that as there is no demonſtrative reaſon or argument to prove the ſoul's mortality or immortality, this queſtion ought to be conſidered as doubtful. Now as it belongs to God (ſays he) to determine thoſe doubtful queſtions which men diſpute about; let us enquire whether he teaches that the ſoul is immortal, and keep to his determination, as a definitive and infallible ſentence. He afterwards proves by the old and new Teſtament, that there is another life after this, and declares that he builds his faith upon them. His words are as follow (7): *His itaque ſic ſe habentibus, mihi (ſalva ſaniori ſententia) in hac materia dicendum videtur, quòd quæſtio de immortalitate animæ eſt neutrum problema, ſicut etiam de mundi æternitate: mihi namque videtur quòd nullæ rationes naturales adduci poſſunt cogentes animam eſſe immortalem, minuſque probantes animam eſſe mortalem, ſicut quamplures Doctores tenentes eam immortalem declarant . . . qua propter dicemus ſicut Plato 1 de Legibus certificare de aliquo cum multi ambigunt ſolius eſt Dei; cum itaque tam illuſtres viri inter ſe ambigant, niſi per Deum hoc certificari poſſe exiſtimo. . . . .* (8) *Quapropter dico quòd ante donum vel adventum gratiæ, multifariam per Prophetas, & bona ſupernaturalia hanc quæſtionem Deus terminavit, ut manifeſtè per vetus Teſtamentum eſt videre; noviſſimè autem per Filium, quem conſtituit hæredem univerſorum, per quem fecit & ſæcula, eam quæſtionem dilucidavit, ſicut ſcribit Apoſtolus Epiſt. ad Hebræos. . . . . .* (9) *Quantò lux diſtat à lucido, & veritas à vero, & quantò cauſa infinita eſt potior effectu finito, tantò efficacius hoc demonſtrat immortalitatem animæ; quare ſi quæ rationes probare videntur mortalitatem animæ, ſunt falſæ & apparentes, cum prima lux, & prima veritas oſtendant oppoſitum; ſi quæ verò videntur probare ejus immortalitatem, veræ quidem ſunt & lucidæ, ſed non lux & veritas; quare hæc ſola via inconcuſſa & ſtabilis eſt, cæteræ vero ſunt fluctuantes. . . . .* (10) QUARE INDUBIE (11) *ipſam immortalem eſſe aſſerendum eſt: verùm ea non via incedendum eſt, quâ hujus ſeculi ſapientes inceſſerunt, qui cum ſapientes ſe dixerunt ſtulti facti ſunt, quiſquis enim hac via procedet ut exiſtimo ſemper incertus & vagus fluctuabit.* To be impartial, can we juſtly charge a man who argues in this manner with being impious? Can we accuſe him of not believing the immortality of the ſoul? Might it not be aſſerted, by the ſame way of reaſoning, that all Divines doubt the truth of the Trinity, the incarnation, tranſubſtantiation, the reſurrection, and all the tenets in general, the proofs of which are drawn only from revelation; if they, at the ſame time, do not affirm, that they are diſcovered to us by the light of natural reaſon? Shall not the ſacred writings, if once fully admitted, as the word of God, as ſtrongly convince us of the truth of the ſoul's immortality, as a geometrical demonſtration (12)? But I will go no farther than to ſay, that Paulus Jovius has formed a very wrong judgment of this work of Pomponatius. Had he ſaid, in general, that the doctrine which denies the immortality of the ſoul is deſtructive to good manners, he would have aſſerted a thing that is looked upon as a common notion, but which nevertheleſs is not as certain and true in reality as it appears to be; for if we enquire into the manners of the Chriſtians, their lewdneſs, their knaviſh tricks, and the many arts they employ to get money or employments, or to ſupplant their competitors, it will be found that it would be impoſſible for them to be more wicked, though they even did not believe any thing with regard to a life to come. It will be found, generally ſpeaking, that they refrain only from ſuch actions as are attended with infamy, or a capital puniſhment, two curbs, which would as ſtrongly check, *cæteris paribus*, the wickedneſs of an impious man, as theirs. But this is a ſubject that would require a particular treatiſe.

INCIDENTS concerning Pomponatius's treatiſe *de Immortalitate Animæ*.

When I conſider that Pomponatius acknowledged publickly, that the light of reaſon cannot prove, with certainty, our immortality, I know not what to think of the diſtinction, which it is ſaid he once made before his Judges. La Mothe le Vayer relates this affair in manner following. " Such a dexterous con- " duct was more ſucceſsful, not long ſince, to Pom- " ponatius the Philoſopher, who, having declared " with a peripatetick liberty and warmth, that he " did not believe the immortality of the ſoul, was " proſecuted by the Inquiſition; however, he got " off by the following explanation, that he did not " believe it, properly ſpeaking, ſince he knew it de- " monſtratively, as he declared in a very long ſpeech " made before his Judges, who had formerly been his " pupils, and whoſe favour he wanted pretty much at " that time (13)." I ſhould rather think that he diſtinguiſhed, before his Judges, between faith and knowledge, than between knowledge and opinion; I mean, that he owned to them, that he did not know, demonſtratively, that the ſoul is immortal; but that he believed it as an article of faith revealed in ſcripture, and determined by councils (14). However that be, it is ſaid that he was not diſpleaſed that a refutation ſhould be written to his work; and wiſhed that the pernicious venom, with which it was interſperſed, might be deſtroyed by the antidote of Javellus's anſwer. This is what is obſerved by Anthony Sirmond the Jeſuit, againſt a man who had printed, in France, Pomponatius's treatiſe without this anſwer. *Quem repugnante autore, neſcio quis curioſus, aut impius, novis typis juſſerat in lucem exire ſolitarium & ſine reſponſione Javelli, quam ipſe Pomponatius ſcriptâ ad eum Epiſtolâ ita olim comprobârat, ut palam rogaret edici, ſe quoque ſuffragante, perſperſum libro ſuo venenum hoc antidoto niſi diluatur, peſtiferum eſſe, ac toti humano generi extimeſcendum* (15). I am of opinion, that this Philoſopher thought of this charitable office very late; he defending his book, twice againſt Niphus, and once againſt Ambroſe, Archbiſhop of Naples. Sirmond the Jeſuit relates this particular (16); but he ſays nothing of the book which Contarinus publiſhed in 1516, againſt that of Pomponatius, and which that Philoſopher judged to be very ſolid. *Edidit juvenis adhuc (trigeſimum enim tertium ætatis annum tunc agebat) librum contra judicium Petri Mantuani doctoris ſui . . . . . argumenta autem illa firma ad probandum & gravia fuiſſe, opuſque totum valde elaboratum perſpicitur, quia acutiſſimus ille phyſicus in libro, quo defendit opinionem illam ſuam acriter oppugnatam ab eo quem inſtruxerat, tradit eum librum & doctiſſimum omnium & uberrimum eſſe, qui omni tempore materiam illam perſecuti ſunt: additque videri prorſus eum divina opera & manu fabricatum fuiſſe* (17). i. e. " When he was but in " the thirty-third year of his age, he publiſhed a " work in oppoſition to the tenets of Pomponatius, " whoſe pupil he had been. . . . It is evident, that " the arguments he brought in proof of his aſſertions " were ſtrong and weighty, and that the whole " work was finiſhed with great accuracy and pains; " ſince that moſt ſagacious Naturaliſt, in the book " in which he defends his opinion, that was ſo ſtrong- " ly attacked by his pupil, declares, that his work " was

(7) Petrus Pomponatius, *de Immortalitate Animæ*, cap. 15, & ult. p. m. 124.

(8) Idem, ibid. p. 125.

(9) Idem, ibid. p. 126.

(10) Idem, ibid. p. 128.

(11) I am to obſerve, that the title of his laſt chapter is, *in quo ponitur ultima concluſio in hac materia, quæ ſententia mea videtur indubie ſuſtinenda.*

(12) See citat. (46) and (47) of the art. PERROT (NICHOLAS.

(13) La Mothe le Vayer, *Dialogue de la Diverſité des Religions*, p. m. 294, 295. It is the laſt of the 5 dialogues of Horatius Tubero.

(14) *Animam eſſe immortalem eſt articulus fidei, ut patet per Simbolum Apoſtolorum & Athanaſii.* Pomponat. *de Immortal. Animæ*, p. 126.

(15) Antonius Sirmondus, *de Immortal. Animæ*, p. 1 and 2. printed at Paris in 1635, 8vo.

(16) Idem, ibid. *in Appendice*, p. 19 and 20.

(17) Johan. Caſa, *in Vita Gaſparis Contareni*, p. m. 184.

upon to change his opinion. He made more than one reply; and, inſtead of giving ground, he advanced ſtill farther, adhering invariably at the ſame time to his firſt corrective [*C*], *viz.* that the Divine Authority of the Scriptures was to him an immoveable foundation,

" was the moſt learned and copious of any that had " ever been compoſed on that ſubject; and adds, that " it really appeared to him as a divine compoſition." Why therefore did he not deſire that the anſwer of Contarinus ſhould be ever after printed with his treatiſe, as it is ſaid he wiſhed with regard to Javellus's anſwer? Niphus had wrote againſt Pomponatius by order of Pope Leo X. whilſt others, on the contrary, ſay Pomponatius drew up the treatiſe in queſtion, only to pleaſe that Pope. Theſe are refuted by la Mothe le Vayer. I ſhall give a conſiderable quotation with regard to what he ſays on that ſubject; and the Reader will therein find ſome remarks which will illuſtrate my text. " I need not carry theſe " conſiderations (18) to a greater length, as the Rea- " der may peruſe what was writ on this ſubject, up- " wards of an hundred years ſince, by thoſe mighty " adverſaries Pomponatius and Niphus. On this oc- " caſion, I muſt deſire my Readers to rank, among " the dreams of Poſtel (who is known to have had " very dangerous intervals) the aſſertion he preſumed " to make, viz. that the only motive which prompt- " ed Pomponatius to engage in that diſpute, was, " to pleaſe the Roman Pontiff *, whom he mentions " in very diſreſpectful terms. For the truth, on the " contrary, is, that Niphus was made choice of by " Pope Leo X. to whom he dedicates his work, and " whom Poſtel hints at, as one of the moſt learned " men of his time, and as able to defend a cauſe ſo " far as it can be defended. And indeed it muſt be " confeſſed, that he has done every thing that could " be performed in favour of a cauſe which had ſo " many diſadvantages; being confined, as it has been " mutually agreed upon by them, directly within the " bounds of the Peripatetic Philoſophy. Pompona- " tius jokes upon him for it, ſaying, that he had " imitated a Phyſician of Milan, who ordered all " the herbs growing in a meadow to be put into a " bath; firmly perſuaded that ſome one or other " of them would cure his patient; and that he, in " like manner, had employed all kinds of arguments, " though ever ſo weak and fallacious, in order to " ſee whether the readers would be ſatisfied with " one or other of them. The beſt of all is, that the " only queſtion was with regard to Ariſtotle's Phi- " loſophy, which, after all, cannot be more preju- " dicial to truth than what he has writ concerning " the eternity of the world, or of the quin- " teſſence of the Heavens, which is laughed at " in ſchools (19).". Spondanus having mentioned the prohibition of Leo X. to the Philoſophers, with regard to their teaching that the ſoul of man is mortal, and but one, in all men (20), obſerves, that it is thought Pomponatius had been the occaſion of promulgating that bull. *Occaſionem autem prædictæ de philoſophis ſanctioni dediſſe dicitur* Petrus Pomponatius *Mantuanus, Jovii in philoſophiâ præceptor: qui enarrans Ariſtotelem & Averroëm Bononiæ, animas poſt corporis mortem interituras ex ſententiâ Ariſtotelis probare conatus, juventutem valdè corruperat; ſe eo tuens quòd philoſophicè loqueretur, ſed aliter, cùm Chriſtianus eſſet, ſentiret* (21). i. e. " Peter Pomponatius of Mantua, " under whom Jovius learnt philoſophy, is ſaid to " have been the occaſion of the bull juſt now men- " tioned, with regard to the Philoſophers. Pompo- " natius, whilſt he explained Ariſtotle and Averroes " at Bologna, had corrupted the minds of youth to " a great degree, by endeavouring to prove that, ac- " cording to Ariſtotle, the ſoul dies with the body; " making the following defenſe for himſelf, that " he then ſpoke as a Philoſopher; but that as a " Chriſtian his opinion was different." Theſe words are not accurate, they ſuppoſing that Pomponatius taught like Averroes, that all men have but one ſoul, in certain reſpects, than which nothing can be falſer. Any one who peruſes his book will find that after having given Averroes's opinion, in the third chapter; he declares, in the beginning of the fourth, that it is abſurd and monſtrous; and the reaſon why he does not refute it is, becauſe Thomas Aquinas has demonſtrated the ſtupidity of that opinion, and put the Averroiſt beyond a poſſibility of making a reply. He has defeated them in ſuch a manner, ſays he, that the only thing they can do is, to rail at him (22). Referring therefore his readers to Thomas Aquinas, he contents himſelf with ſhewing that Averroes did not find that chimera in Ariſtotle. *Quamvis hæc opinio tempeſtate noſtra ſit multùm celebrata, & fere ab omnibus pro conſtanti habeatur eam eſſe Ariſtotelis, mihi tamen videtur quod nedum in ſe ſit falſiſſima, verum inintelligibilis, & monſtruoſa, & ab Ariſtotele prorſus aliena; imò exiſtimo quòd tanta fatuitas nunquam fuerit nedum credita, verum excogitata: Et primò quidem de ejus falſitate nihil novi intendo adducere, ſed tantùm lectorem remittere ad ea quæ Latinorum decus Divus Thomas Aquinas . . . . . ſed quoad ſecundum hæc paucula quæ mihi plenam fidem faciunt adducere ſtatui, videlicet hoc alienum eſſe ab Ariſtotele, verùm hoc eſſe figmentum, & monſtrum ab Averroe conflctum* (23). i. e. " Not- " withſtanding that this opinion prevails greatly in " our age, and is almoſt generally thought to be " that of Ariſtotle, it yet appears to me not only " very falſe in itſelf, but unintelligible and mon- " ſtrous, and quite oppoſite to Ariſtotle's way of " thinking: nay, I am firmly perſuaded that ſuch a " ridiculous conceit was never believed, nor even " thought of: and firſt, I ſhall not mention any thing " with regard to the falſity of it, but only refer my " readers to thoſe particulars which Thomas Aqui- " nas, that ornament of the Latin Authors. . . . . " Secondly, I ſhall take notice of a few things which " have fully convinced me, that Ariſtotle never en- " tertained ſuch an opinion, and that it is a monſtrous " forgery, invented by Averroes." Notwithſtanding this it may be ſaid, that he was one of thoſe who gave occaſion to the bull promulgated by Pope Leo X. He did not pay much regard to it. It was read and approved by the Fathers of the Lateran Council, in the eight Seſſion in December 1513, and he wrote his book *De Immortalitate Animæ* in 1516 (24); whence, by the way, it may be inferred, that Moreri, Konig, and ſeveral other Writers, are miſtaken in fixing the date of his death to 1512. According to the ſcheme of his nativity mentioned by Gauricus, he was born in 1462. Now, according to Paulus Jovius, he died in the ſixty third year of his age, and conſequently he died in 1525. According to Paul Freherus (25) he flouriſhed in 1530, which is a miſtake.

[*C*] *He made more than one reply; and inſtead of giving ground he advanced ſtill farther, adhering invariably at the ſame time to his firſt corrective.*] Having no other book of Pomponatius by me but that *De Immortalitate Animæ*, I am not able to give the chronological Hiſtory of the diſpute which that piece occaſioned. All I can do is, to employ the account given by le Noble. I do not look upon it to be quite accurate, there being ſeveral omiſſions in it; but I am of opinion that all the particulars related by him are true; and we muſt reſt contented with theſe when we are not able to procure any more (26). " This treatiſe (27) made a great deal of noiſe; be- " ing publiſhed in Venice, Pomponatius adds that " the Monks, whom he calls *Cucullati*, inveighed " ſtrongly againſt his Doctrine (28). Theſe *Cucul- " lati* railed very heartily at Pomponatius in their " Sermons, calling him a downright Heretic: cauſed " the peruſal of that treatiſe to be forbid by the Pa- " triarch whom that Philoſopher calls a man of a " moſt holy life, but very ignorant in Philoſophy and " Divinity; and afterwards the bookſellers, by a De- " cree of the Senate, were forbid to vend it. . . . . A " man of learning . . . . . wrote with great temper " againſt this treatiſe . . . . (29) Pomponatius wrote " an anſwer to this Author, and entitled it *Apologia*. " In the two firſt books of this apology he anſwers, " article by article, to all the arguments brought " againſt his Doctrine; and refutes them, and again proves

(18) Whether Ariſtotle teaches the immortality of the ſoul.

* Lib. 1. *de orb. concord.*

(19) La Mothe le Vayer, *de l'Immortalite de l'Ame*, p. 136, 137. Tom. 6. of his works in 12mo.

(20) The form of the Bull is given in the article SPINOZA, remark [*L*], towards the concluſion.

(21) Spondanus, *Annal. Eccleſ.* ad ann. 1513. num. 20. p. m. 308.

(22) *Tam lucus Inter, tam ſubtiliter adverſus hanc opinionem invehitur, ut ſententia mea nihil intactum, nullamque reſponſionem quam quis pro Averroe adducere poteſt impugnatam relinquat; totum enim impugnat, diſſipat, & annihilat, nullumque Averroiſtis refugium relictum eſt, niſi convitia & maledicta in Divinum & Sanctiſſimum virum.* Pompon. de Immortal. Animæ, p. 8, 9.

(23) Idem, ibid.

(24) *Finis impoſitus eſt huic tractatui per me Petrum filium Joannis Nicolai Pomponatii de Mentua die 24 menſis Septembris anno Chriſti* 1516 *Bononiæ*, Pomponat. ibid.

(25) *In Theatro*, p. 1441.

(26) Le Noble, *Tableaux, des Philoſophes*, Tom. 2. p. 80.

(27) That *de Immortalite Animæ.*

(28) Ibid. p. 81.

(29) Ibid. p. 82.

foundation, on which he grounded his belief of the ſoul's immortality. His book on Incantations was alſo thought very dangerous [*D*]. He did not fail of advocates (*i*); but ſome bring him off no otherwiſe than by ſuppoſing that he became a convert from atheiſm [*E*]. If the impious tenets which have been laid to his charge were grounded only

(*i*) See the rem. [*E*].

" proves that Ariſtotle did not believe the immorta-
" lity of the ſoul, and that it could not be proved by
" the light of nature. He greatly blames in the
" third book the paſſionate manner of writing of
" brother Ambroſe of Naples, of the Order of the
" Hermits of St. Auſtin, and who a few days before
" had been made a Biſhop. He complains of him
" for this, that preaching his Lent ſermons in the
" Cathedral of Mantua, he had ſpoke very injurioufly
" of him, from the pulpit, and publickly called him
" a Heretic and impious wretch; and falſely charg-
" ed him with not believing the reſurrection or the
" immortality of the ſoul. He therefore declares,
" that he does believe the ſoul's immortality, and is
(30) Some words are wanting here, viz. *that it is, becauſe it is the authority of God, and that he has it, or ſomething like it.*
" ready to die in defenſe of that truth, but (30) that
" he revealed it to men, and not becauſe it is taught
" us by the light of reaſon; and that, in caſe bro-
" ther Ambroſe will inſtruct him, in order to make
" him change his opinion, he is ready to receive his
" inſtructions." He afterwards relates, that the Patriarch of Venice wrote a letter to Peter Bembus, (who was at Rome,) the ſubject of which was, *to deſire him to cauſe the Pope to condemn the treatiſe in queſtion on the immortality of the ſoul.* Bembus read it, *and did not find any thing in it contrary to the faith; nevertheleſs, as the duty of his employment enjoyned him to do it, he communicated it to the Maſter of the Apoſtolical Palace, who, after peruſing it, pronounced, as Bembus had done, that it did not contain any thing contrary to the opinion of the moſt famous Doctors of the Chriſtian Religion* (31).

(31) Le Noble, *Tableaux des Philoſophes*, Tom. 2. p. 83.

" (32) After this, as Writers commonly grow
" warm, by much diſputing, and carry matters too
" far, he (33) aſſerts, and endeavours to prove, that
(32) Ibid. p. 84.
" the notion of the ſoul's immortality is contrary to
(33) i. e. Pomponatius in his *Apology*.
" the principles of natural reaſon; and that nothing
" can be more injurious to the faith than to attempt
" to prove it from natural reaſons . . . . (34). After
(34) Le Noble, *Tableaux des Philoſoph.* Tom. 2. p. 85, 86.
" that Pomponatius had writ the apology in queſ-
" tion, there was publiſhed, in oppoſition to his firſt
" treatiſe on the immortality of the ſoul, a new book
" written by a Philoſopher named *Auguſtin Niphus*,
" and Pomponatius anſwered it in another treatiſe
" called *Defenſorium*, in which he ſhews Niphus's ig-
" norance; and continues to prove more ſtrongly
" than he had done before, the particulars aſſerted
" by him, and concludes his work with the follow-
" ing words: if Jeſus Chriſt is riſen we ſhall ariſe;
" if we riſe, the ſoul is immortal. Now it is certain
" that Jeſus Chriſt is riſen, and therefore it is true
" that the ſoul is immortal. This, ſays he, is the
" only ſolid way of reaſoning by which we are able
" to prove the ſoul's immortality; whoever is not
" contented with it is unworthy of the Chriſtian
" name; ſuch a one does not know the excellency of
" the faith which ought to have the firſt place in all
" our diſputes; and which alone is ſufficient to eſta-
" bliſh, in a ſolid manner, particulars which cannot
" be maintained by any other methods."

The Reader will ſee hereunder, that Mr. le Noble cenſures ſome of Pomponatius's thoughts.

[*D*] *His book on incantations was alſo thought very dangerous.*] He therein ſhews, that he does not believe any of thoſe things which are written on magic and ſorcery; and he lays prodigious ſtreſs on I know not what virtues which certain men have had, by which they produced miraculous effects. He gives a great many examples of this; but his adverſaries do not admit them to be true, or free from magic; and are ſurpriſed that Zacutus ſhould think himſelf obliged in conſcience to believe them. Let us hear Theophilus Raynaud (35). *Exempla quæ ad ſpecialem aliquorum hominum proprietatem individualem ad miros effectus præſtandos, præſertim ſanationum, à Pomponatio addenſantur; vel fabuloſa ſunt, vel Magica, ut Addreas Laurentius capite* (36) *illo* 4. *contendit. Ridiculè autem Zacutus* (37) *dicta q.* 53. *inter* magnos autores quibus fidem abrogaſſe piaculum propè eſſe dicit, *numerat Pomponatium in Opere de Incantationibus, exempla illa recenſentem.* i. e. " Pomponatius brings many " examples to prove, that there is a certain peculiar " and individual virtue in ſome men, for performing " ſurprizing things, eſpecially for curing diſeaſes; " but theſe are either falſe, or performed by necro- " mancy, as is aſſerted by Andrew Laurentius. But " Zacutus is ſo ſilly as to rank Pomponatius, with re- " gard to thoſe examples, in his book on Incanta- " tions, among thoſe great Authors whom he thinks " it a crime not to believe." He refers us to his *Theologia Naturalis*, where he writes as follows againſt the work in queſtion of Pomponatius (38): *Nec minor Pomponatii culpa, qui* (39) *idem conatus in opere de incantationibus ad extremum tamen ſubjicit opus ſuum correctioni Eccleſiæ, à qua ut rectè ſupra divinavit* (40) *Carpentarius aliud expectare non potuit, quàm unam lineam à principio ad finem uſque ductam. Ita enim factum eſt, collocato ante aliquot annos, inter reprobata, illo opere, in quo Buccafferr. l. de divinat. per ſomnum lect.* 29. *ait aſſeri à Pomponatio,* multa falſa, & multas ac magnas nugas. i. e. " The like cenſure falls upon Pompo- " natius, who endeavouring the ſame thing in his " book on incantations, did yet at laſt ſubmit it to the " cenſure of the Church, from which nothing could " be expected, (as Carpentarius exactly gueſſed above,) " but that it would order the whole to be expunged. " This happened in all reſpects, for not many years " ſince, this book, in which Buccaffer affirms that " Pomponatius advances many falſe and very trifling " particulars, was condemned." One of the brethren of this Jeſuit had writ in ſtill ſtronger terms. *Pomponatii de Incantationibus opuſculum certè miratus fui tam diu tolerari ab Eccleſiâ; nunc recens & meritò in Romano Indice damnatur, veriſſimum enim; quod ab Ant. Mirandulano * ſcriptum hoc opere Pomponatium, ſe nec philoſophum bonum, nec quod fœdius Chriſtianum bonum exhibuiſſe, cum effectus omnes mirificos cœlorum influctionibus adſcribit adeò ut velit & religiones & leges earumque latores ab iis dependere. Quod prorſus impium* (41). i. e. " I was " ſurprized that the treatiſe on Incantations was ſo " long tolerated by the Church: but it has lately " been very juſtly put into the catalogue of prohi- " bited books, for Antonius Mirandula's aſſertions " are true, *viz.* that Pomponatius, in the work in " queſtion, has not ſhewed himſelf a good Philoſo- " pher; nor even (which is ſtill worſe) a good Chriſ- " tian, by his aſcribing all extraordinary and won- " derful effects, to the influence of heavenly bodies: " ſo far as to conclude, that all religion, laws, and " legiſlators, depend on them, which is a very im- " pious opinion." Pomponatius, ſpeaking of the cures which are aſcribed to the virtue of relicks, ſays a thing that appears at firſt offenſive, but which may yet have a favourable conſtruction put upon it, according to the received opinions. He ſays that the bones of a dog would as ſurely work a cure, in caſe the ſick perſon who truſts in the virtue of relicks, ſhould have his imagination as ſtrongly impreſſed, with regard to ſuch bones, as the bones or aſhes of Martyrs (42). The controverſial Writers of the Church of Rome, not being able to deny but that ſome fictitious relicks have wrought miracles, as is pretended, ſay, that the pious intention of thoſe who have recourſe to them, procured them ſuch a recompence from God.

(35) Theophil. Raynaudus, *de Stigmatiſmo ſacro & profano*, ſect. 2. cap. 4. p. m. 321, 322.

(36) Book 1. *de Strumis.*

(37) *Medicorum principum Hiſtoriæ*, lib. 1.

(38) Idem, *in Theolog. naturali*, diſtinct. 3. queſt. 2. art. 5. num. 139. p. m. 200, 201.

(39) i. e. To reject what is ſaid of the Devil's Operation.

(40) i. e. *digr.* 4. *in Alcino.*

* Lib. 6. *de ſingulari certamine.*

(41) Mart. Delrio, *Diſquiſit. Magicar.* lib. 1. cap. 3. p. m. 22.

[*E*] *But ſome bring him off no otherwiſe than by ſuppoſing that he became a convert from Atheiſm.*] Helidæus, a famous Phyſician of Forli, uſed to ſay that his Maſter Pomponatius was an Atheiſt; but John Wierus hopes that he did not die ſuch. *Pomponatium ante redditum ſpiritus extremi halitum reſipuiſſe ex ſingulari Dei miſeratione, nec permanſiſſe ἄθεον, ſperare volo. Talem etenim fuiſſe, à clariſſimo medicinæ ornamento D. Helidæo Forolivienſi, ejus olim diſcipulo non ſemel auditum eſt* (43). Voetius informs us, that Gratarolus defended Pomponatius, and is ſo juſt as not to give into the common opinion. He owns that moſt Romiſh Writers, and ſome Proteſtant Authors, look upon our Philoſopher as an Atheiſt (44). He lays ſome ſtreſs on the obſervation made by his Advocate, viz. that

(42) *Pomponatius dicere non veretur in ſanatione acquiſita ex veneratione Oſſium Divis aſcriptorum, ſi eſſent oſſa canis & tanta & talis de eis haberetur imaginatio, non minus ſubſequeretur ſanitas.* Jo. Wierus, *de Præſtig. Dæmonum*, lib. 5. cap. 17. p. m. 402. He cites Pomponatius's book *de Incantamentis*, lib. 2. cap. 12.

(43) Wierus, ib. lib. 6. *in Epilogo Operis*, p. m. 569.

(44) Voet. *Diſputat. Theolog.* Tom. 1. p. 197.

only on his book concerning the Immortality of the Soul, no accuſation was ever more impertinent [*F*]; nor a more ſignal inſtance of the unjuſt prepoſſeſſion of thoſe who perſecute

that Pomponatius laid down the principle of the ſoul's mortality, no otherwiſe than on Ariſtotle's hypotheſis: but he ought to have ſaid that this is a plain proof of our Author's innocency, unleſs he intended to conceal his pernicious tenets under that cover. Voetius alledges that reſtriction. Gul. Gratarolus Medicus Italus *(quem propria ſcripta uno volumine in* 8. *Baſileæ edita, & teſtimonium* Bezæ in epiſtolis, *ut &* in dedicatione libelli *cujuſdam, aliorumque præterea doctorum virorum ſuffragia, quorum familiaritate Baſileæ & alibi uſus eſt, à pietatis zelo commendant) eum contra calumniatores tuetur, & piè pro eo tempore vitam cum morte commutaſſe ſcribit : in* epiſtol. dedicator. *Operibus Pomponatii anno* 1567. *Baſil. editis præfixâ. . . . Illud penitus conſiderandum, quod reſpondet : Eum ex mente Ariſtotelis negaſſe animæ immortalitatem : quod, ut illi cum aliis philoſophis ac Theologis ita judicantibus commune fuit* (Plutarcho, Galeno, Aphrodiſæo, Juſtino Martyre, Theodoreto, Origene, Nyſſeno, Nazianzeno, Cajetano in 3. de Anima) *ſic non debet hic fraudi eſſe : niſi probari poſſet illum ſub hoc ſchemate ſubdolè & tutò voluiſſe hunc Atheiſmum ſpargere in animos auditorum. Niſi itaque alia ex dictis, ſcriptis, factis ejus certior demonſtratio ſuppetat, utique in benigniorem partem, immo in optimam accipienda ſunt illa, quæ ille pro modulo & conditione ſua de Fato, Providentia Dei, & prædeſtinatione conſcripſit : in quibus ſi non rei dignitati, & ſolidis Theologis per omnia ſatisfaciat, ſaltem hoc præſtat, ne nigra Atheiſmi nota illi tam peremtoriè inuratur. Hæc ego in re dubia poſtquam omnia ejus opuſcula præſertim modo nominata videre contigit : qui ante multos annos ex lectione ſolius tract.* de Incantationibus *(ubi placitis Avicennæ & Averrois nimis adhæreſcens, in ſupernaturalibus quibuſdam ſatis miſerè fluctuat) & ex communi aliorum judicio ſiniſtram magis de illo opinionem conceperam* (45). i. e. "William Gratarolus, an Italian Phyſician, who "was greatly eſteemed for his religious zeal, as is "manifeſt from his own compoſitions printed at Baſil in one volume 8vo, from the teſtimony given "by Beza, in his epiſtles, and from the dedication "of a certain book, and the teſtimonies of other "learned men, with whom he was intimate at Baſil "and elſewhere; this Gratarolus, I ſay, undertakes "his defenſe againſt thoſe who ſlandered him; and, "in the dedication to Pomponatius's works, printed "in 1567, declares that he died a pious death, conſidering the age in which he lived. . . . But we "ought to weigh very attentively, that paſſage in "which he anſwers, that Pomponatius denied the "ſoul's immortality, in compliance with the principles of Ariſtotle, which circumſtance, as it was "common to him with other Philoſophers and Divines, as Plutarch, Galen, Aphrodiſæus, Juſtin "Martyr, Theodoret, Origen, Nyſſenus, Nazianzen, "and Cajetan, ought therefore not to be imputed "to him for a crime; unleſs it could be proved, "that he employed that method, in order that he "might inſtil Atheiſm without danger to himſelf, "into the minds of his Auditors. Unleſs therefore a "ſtronger proof can be brought out of his ſayings, "compoſitions or actions, a more favourable conſtruction (nay the beſt poſſible) ought to be put upon "thoſe pieces, which he wrote, in his manner, concerning fate, providence, and predeſtination; in "which pieces, if he does not come up, in every reſpect, to the dignity of his ſubject, and the ſatisfaction of ſound Divines, he at leaſt ought not to "be ſo peremptorily branded with the ſtigma of Atheiſm. Such is the opinion I have entertained, "after having read over all his works, eſpecially "thoſe abovementioned: whereas, many years before, by reading only his book concerning Incantations, (wherein, by adhering too cloſely to the "opinions of Avicenna and Averrois, he is unaccountably at a loſs with regard to ſome ſupernatural "things) and from the common diſcourſe of others, "I had formed a much more diſadvantageous idea "of him." I muſt not omit the epitaph which ſome perſon made on our Philoſopher: *Hic ſepultus jaceo. Quare? neſcio: nec ſi ſcis aut neſcis curo. Si vales, bene eſt: vivens valui. Fortaſſe nunc valeo. Si aut non, dicere nequeo* (46). i. e. "Here I lye interred. "Wherefore? I know not; nor do I care whether "you do or no. If you are in good health, it is well: "I my ſelf, when living, was ſo. I perhaps may "be well now: but whether I am, or not, is un-"known to me."

(45) Voet. *Diſputat. Theolog.* Tom. 1. p. 198.

(46) König, *Biblioth.* p. 654.

[*F*] *If the impious tenets, which have been laid to his charge, were grounded only on his book concerning the immortality of the ſoul, no accuſation was ever more impertinent.*] Firſt, it is at moſt but a perſonal injury, to aſſert that Ariſtotle's principles lead us to a belief of the Soul's immortality. Whoever makes ſuch an aſſertion, does at moſt, an injuſtice to a man who was tutor to the Conqueror of Aſia, and founder of a flouriſhing ſect. But can this be called an impiety? Secondly, as Ariſtotle is not alive, and conſequently cannot give an account of his faith, nor clear up the ambiguities and equivocations which are to be found in his writings, any perſon is allowed to take up the pen againſt him, if he finds, in Ariſtotle's compoſitions, as many, or more plauſible reaſons to ſhew that he taught the ſoul's mortality, than to ſhew that he taught the immortality of it. Nothing therefore, in ſuch a caſe, can be more offenſive, than for a perſon to propoſe, as a doubtful point, Ariſtotle's opinion on this important article; and to chooſe either ſide of the queſtion, according as he finds himſelf moſt affected by the reaſons given by him, for or againſt the ſoul's immortality. If ſuch a perſon as we are ſpeaking of ſhould not hit exactly upon his ſenſe, this would be doing Ariſtotle injuſtice; but then this would be only a material injury, which the old Philoſopher would be obliged to pardon, by aſcribing it to his inaccuracy, his variations and contradictions. *The moſt famous of all his Commentators* (47) *and ſo many after him, as the two St. Gregory's, Leſcot, Cajetan, and Simon Portius, have acknowledged, that one muſt neceſſarily infer the ſuppoſition of the* ſoul's immortality, *from that Philoſopher's doctrine* (48). He therefore muſt have advanced ſuch maxims as give any one a fair pretence of charging him with that impious tenet. Nothing therefore can be more ridiculous, than to aſſert that no perſon, without being guilty of impiety at the ſame time, can form ſuch a judgment of Ariſtotle's doctrine; and conſequently the pretended impiety of Pomponatius would be grounded on very groſs miſtakes. No one even ought to ſuſpect that he deſigned to do any thing injurious to the memory of the mighty Stagyrite. Thirdly, I obſerve, that it is allowable in a perſon to aſſert, not only that his works furniſh proofs of his believing the ſoul's immortality, but alſo that his ſyſtem, in the manner in which the Schoolmen have thought fit to explain him, and as he is ſtill explained in Schools and Univerſities, cannot give any proof of the ſoul's immortality, but can furniſh many arguments for the contrary. For the chief part of this ſyſtem is, 1ſt, That natural bodies conſiſt of two ſubſtances, one whereof is called matter, and the other form. 2d, That the form of all natural bodies, man excepted, is a corruptible being, which periſhes regularly whenever the compound periſhes; that is, whenever a ſtone, a tree, a dog, &c. are changed into ſome other ſpecies of natural body. From hence it neceſſarily follows, that, according to this ſyſtem, no proof can be given of the ſoul's immortality; for, to do this, proofs muſt be given of its immateriality: now how could this be ſhewn, ſince they own that the ſouls of brutes, though endued with the faculty of ſenſation, diſcernment and deſire, is nevertheleſs material? It is to be obſerved, that in Pomponatius's time, no other ſyſtem of Philoſophy was known, but that of Ariſtotle; ſo that to aſſert, that the immortality of the ſoul could not be proved from Ariſtotle's principles, and to aſſert that it could not be proved from philoſophical reaſons, was one and the ſame thing. This circumſtance goes a great way towards excuſing, and even juſtifying Pomponatius's treatiſe; and eſpecially as neither the Platoniſts, nor any other ſect, furniſhed better proofs. Des Cartes's ſyſtem is the only one which has laid down very ſound principles on this head. He eſtabliſhes

(47) It is Alexander Aphrodiſæus.

(48) Le Mothe le Vayer, *de l'Immortalite de l'Ame*, p. m. 139.

ſecute Philoſophers; ſince our Author did not doubt of the Soul's Immortality; but maintained,

bliſhes it as a principle, that all thinking ſubſtances are diſtinct from matter; from whence it neceſſarily follows, that our ſoul is a ſpirit, or a ſimple and indiviſible ſubſtance, and conſequently immortal. No Carteſian, in this age, would ſcruple to aſſert, that according to the principles of the old Philoſophy, one ſolid proof cannot be brought in favour of the ſoul's immortality. Now would it not be ridiculous to affirm, that a Carteſian who ſhould advance ſuch an aſſertion, is an impious wretch and an Atheiſt? For what reaſon, therefore, was Pomponatius ſo ill uſed? It will be anſwered, that a Carteſian profeſſedly acknowledges that his ſyſtem furniſhes a demonſtrative proof of the ſoul's immortality; but Pomponatius did not acknowledge any ſyſtem which furniſhes ſuch an argument. Such a diſtinction cannot be admitted, but by ſuppoſing that this Philoſopher was acquainted with Des Cartes's ſyſtem, and rejected it; but as he was not acquainted with it, his only fault lyes in his not inventing a ſyſtem, according to which, whatever thinks is incorporeal and ſpiritual. This is the fault of a numberleſs multitude of orthodox men, and conſequently is a chimerical fault. Add to this, that although he had rejected the ſuppoſition, according to which every thinking ſubſtance is diſtinct from matter, he would have done nothing but what is done, in this age, by perſons of the moſt exalted underſtanding, and who relying, as Pomponatius did, entirely on the authority of the holy ſcriptures, cannot be juſtly charged with irreligion (49). Laſtly, I obſerve, that no conduct is more unworthy of a Divine, than to charge a Philoſopher with being impious, who declares, that in order to free our minds from the uncertainty of human reaſon, we ought to have recourſe to God's word, as containing the true foundation, and the moſt certain proofs of the immortality of the human ſoul (50). Now this Pomponatius did, and for this he was cruelly perſecuted by the monkiſh tribe. How ſcandalous was all this!

I go farther, and even ſay that the Carteſians, convinced of the ſoul's immortality, from the evidence they find in the principles of their Philoſophy, act very wiſely, in adviſing their Readers to have recourſe to faith, *as an anchor of the ſoul, both ſure and ſtedfaſt, and which entereth into that within the vail* (51), that is, to ground their belief of this doctrine on the authority of God, which is the true remedy for all doubts and uncertainties, and an infallible ſupply to the obſcurity of our reaſon. For, if they entertain right notions of things, they ought to believe that what appears ſo evident to them, does not appear ſo to a great number of Philoſophers who oppoſe it. I have read in a work of Arnauld's, that Gaſſendi's reply to Des Cartes has made many people, in Naples, incredulous with regard to the ſoul's immortality (52), becauſe Gaſſendus has employed the utmoſt efforts of his genius, to weaken Des Cartes's argument, with regard to this tenet; which proves that the Carteſian principle is not evident to every one. It is even true, that ignorant people, who ſhould make uſe of the ſenſe which nature has given them, could never be ſure of the ſoul's immortality, whilſt they ſaw the greateſt Philoſophers at variance on that head. Would an ignorant man be blameworthy, for reaſoning in manner following? Were Des Cartes's proofs or arguments evident, Gaſſendi could not oppoſe them in ſuch a manner as would ſatisfy multitudes; for had Gaſſendi writ ſuch a book, wherein, employing all his parts and learning, he had attempted to ſhew that the whole is not greater than its parts; and that, if things equal are ſubſtracted from things equal, the remainder is not equal, no perſon could have been prevailed upon to believe his aſſertions were true: ſince, therefore, he and ſeveral other great Philoſophers have followers, when they oppoſe Des Cartes's doctrine, they muſt neceſſarily oppoſe a doctrine that is not evidently true; it is therefore obſcure in ſome reſpects; it appears true to ſome, and falſe to others; how therefore will it be poſſible for a man altogether illiterate, and unuſed to diſputation, to determine with any certainty? Some of theſe great men muſt be miſtaken; and therefore, which party ſoever I ſide with, I run the hazard of being led into an error. People ought to argue in this manner, when they find learned men divided in opinion. However, ſuppoſing they ſhould do this, how would it be poſſible for them to get clear of their uncertainties? A good method, with regard to the ſoul's immortality, is to have recourſe to revelation. A Carteſian, therefore, who ſhould imitate Pomponatius, ought to be conſidered as a wiſe man, and charitable with regard to his neighbour. It will be well, in him, to maintain for ever invariably the truth of his principle; and to make the beſt anſwer he can, to thoſe who may object that ſubſtances diſtinct from matter are perhaps of ſuch a nature, as to be able to preſerve their exiſtence, without having any thought, and therefore that ſpirituality is not a neceſſary proof of immortality; for if the life of the ſoul conſiſts in thought, it is certain that a total ceſſation of thought would be the death of the ſoul; for which reaſon the ſoul might die without ceaſing to be a ſpiritual ſubſtance, as dogs die without ceaſing to be a corporeal ſubſtance; but after all, it would be praiſe-worthy in him, to adviſe his neighbour to rely on the word of God. I am to obſerve, that the elder Scaliger, one of the greateſt genius's of his age, and who was never thought a Free-thinker, acknowledged, with Pomponatius, that it is a matter of faith, to know whether there be a life to come; this, ſays he, has been always ſuſpected or believed, but it is ſtill a matter of diſpute (53).

I will conclude with a paſſage of the diſpute which has been carrying on for ſome years, between a Proteſtant Miniſter of Rotterdam, and another of Utrecht. The former (54) owns, that though he believes that matter *is not capable of any ſenſation or knowledge, he has no* diſtinct idea, *no* clear perception, of that truth; and that he cannot prove it to thoſe who deny it. *That which I perceive therein*, ſays he, *is confuſed and indiſtinct . . . .* (55). *Can Mr. Saurin and his rational Collegues put their hands on their hearts, and affirm, that they have a clear perception, and a diſtinct idea of the ſoul's immortality? Are not theſe propoſitions clear in appearance, viz.* that every thing which has a beginning muſt end; *that a Being, whoſe duration is divided by months, days and years, cannot be eternal; otherwiſe it would be infinite, and, in that infinite duration, there would be an infinite number of moments, and nevertheleſs there would be but an infinite number of days and years; there therefore would be as many months and years as moments, which is a palpable abſurdity. An impious man calls theſe clear perceptions, and they appear to him ſuch.* This Miniſter ſeems to have pretty near the ſame deſign with Pomponatius; he would have us miſtruſt our reaſon, and rely on the authority of God (56). Here follows the anſwer made by his Antagoniſt (57). *I anſwer, that I have that clear perception and that diſtinct idea of* the ſoul's immortality. *I know that the ſoul is a ſpiritual and indiviſible ſubſtance, which can never be deſtroyed but by annihilation. I know that there is a Providence, a ſupreme juſtice, a ſupreme felicity, a natural morality; in fine, a great number of truths, which are neceſſarily connected with the immortality of the ſoul; and which, were the ſoul mortal, would conſequently be ſo many chimeras. Should a Chriſtian Philoſopher be leſs orthodox than Plato; and in drawing a parallel between the antient Philoſophers, give the preference to Epicurus . . . .* (58). *Jurieu refutes himſelf, by ſaying that* theſe perceptions are clear in appearance: *for if they are clear in appearance, nothing can be concluded from them in favour of thoſe which are really clear.*

Here follow ſome remarks on this paſſage of Mr. Saurin; 1. Mr. Jurieu ſuppoſes evidently, that in order for us to know, *by a diſtinct idea*, and a *clear perception*, the ſpirituality of the ſoul; we muſt clearly underſtand, that *matter is not endued with ſenſation or knowledge*. Why then does not Saurin make ſome reply to this? Ought he not to declare that he has a diſtinct idea, a clear perception, which informs him, that it is impoſſible that an extended ſubſtance ſhould be endued with ſenſation? 2. It is not ſufficient to know

(49) See rem. [*M*], towards the cloſe of the art. of the firſt DICÆARCHUS, and rem. [*L*] of the article PERROT (Nicholas).

(50) *Hæc ſola via inconcuſſa & ſtabilis eſt; cæteræ vero ſunt fluctuantes.* Pompon. *de Immort. Anim.* cap. *ult.* p. m. 126. See what Ablancourt ſays on this ſubject, in the beginning of the rem. [*L*] of his art. PERROT (Nicholas) *Sieur d'Ablancourt.*

(51) *Epiſtle to the Hebrews*, chap. vi. ver. 19.

(52) See the rem. [*G*].

(53) In this manner I have tranſlated, with ſome latitude, the following words: *Cæterum eſſe alterum eſſe ab hoc eſſe adeo neſcimus ut quotidianis vel ſuſpicionibus vel perſuaſionibus res etiamnum ſit controverſa, ſola fide res agatur.* Scaliger adverſus Cardanum Exercit. 307. cap. 33. p. m. 990. Compare this with the citations (48), (49), (50), of the art. PERROT (Nicholas).

(54) Jurieu, *Religion du Latitudinaire*, p. 393.

(55) Ibid. p. 394.

(56) *Note.* He does not require that we ſhould know this authority by a clear and diſtinct idea, *i. e.* That we ſhould know evidently, that God has revealed this or that to us.

(57) Saurin, *Juſtification de ſa Doctrine*, p. 467.

(58) Ibid. p. 468.

maintained, on the contrary, that it is a moſt true doctrine, and which he firmly believed. He only aſſerted that the natural reaſons aſſerted for it are not ſolid and ſatisfactory. Now although an advantageous uſe may be made of the opinion he oppoſed, and that we ought to applaud and encourage ſuch Philoſophers as endeavour to enforce the human reaſons alledged for the Soul's immortality [G]; yet ſince they are only philoſophical arguments, every perſon ought to enjoy the liberty of diſputing concerning them;

know, that the Soul *cannot be deſtroyed but by annihilation*. The ſame may be ſaid of extenſion, and yet trees and brutes are mortal. He therefore ſhould have ſaid, *I know that the ſoul cannot exiſt without thought; the diſtinct idea which I have of ſpiritual and indiviſible ſubſtance teaches me, that, were it diveſted of thought, it would exiſt no longer*. 3. Plato and Epicurus are introduced improperly; this is ſuppoſing that Jurieu is no leſs orthodox than Plato, and that he prefers the doctrine of Epicurus to that of the other antient Philoſophers. Now all this is falſe. He admits the immortality of the ſoul, but then he does not give a clear idea and diſtinct perception of it; that is, (according to his meaning) an idea as evident as that which makes us underſtand the property of numbers, and the connexion between local preſence and the extenſion of matter. Did Plato admit the ſoul's immortality by ſo clear an idea as this? When a man declares, that he believes as the common people do, that is, that his perſuaſion goes greater lengths than his evidence, it is unjuſt to charge him with unbelief. He is ſafe with regard to his orthodoxy, ſince he believes what ought to be believed; all that would be ſaid againſt him is, that he does not act like a Philoſopher. 4. The diſtinction between ideas clear in appearance, and ideas clear in effect, is trifling; for the clearneſs of ideas eſſentially includes a relation to our minds, and is never abſtracted or ſeparated from appearance; and they are always termed clear from appearance. But it is otherwiſe with truth. An object may be true and appear falſe; but an idea which appears obſcure is neither really nor apparently clear. So that if clear ideas of the ſoul's immortality are inconſiſtent with ideas apparently clear, Jurieu's reflection is ſolid, ſo far is he from refuting himſelf as his antagoniſt affirms. 5. Saurin is greatly to blame in not anſwering the objection, for he might have confounded Jurieu in that reſpect. He ſuppoſes very falſely, that thoſe who aſſert that *whatever has a beginning muſt end*, go upon this, that an infinite duration would contain as many months and years as moments. He ſuppoſes that this ſeems a great abſurdity to them. But he ought to know that Atheiſts teach, that the duration of matter never had a beginning, and will never end; and therefore they do not look upon the neceſſity of admitting a numberleſs multitude of moments, and a numberleſs multitude of months, years and ages, *&c.* as a good reaſon for rejecting a doctrine.

[G] *Though an advantageous uſe may be made of the opinion which* Pomponatius *oppoſed; and that we ought to applaud and encourage ſuch Philoſophers as endeavour to enforce the human reaſons alledged for the ſoul's immortality.*] What I have to ſay on this ſubject cannot be more clearly or more nobly expreſſed than in the words of a Divine, a Follower of Des Cartes; for which reaſon I ſhall not employ any other Commentary (59). "It is ſaid that there has "been diſcovered at Naples, a ſet of men, who, by "the peruſal of Gaſſendus's works, have been led "into Epicurus's error, *viz.* that the Soul is mortal. "It muſt be confeſſed, that the book of *Inſtances* of "that Philoſopher, in oppoſition to the metaphyſical "meditations of Des Cartes, may be too apt to "lead ſuch young perſons as are not well confirmed "in the Chriſtian Faith, into that pernicious error; "becauſe he has therein exerted the utmoſt efforts "of his genius, to ſhew that reaſon does not furniſh "us with any ſolid proofs which may prevent our "believing, that there is no other diſtinction between "our ſouls and bodies, than between a thin and ſubtile body and a groſs one. I know, on the contrary, that there are ſome devout perſons who believe, that we ought to conſider what Des Cartes "has writ upon that ſubject as an effect of God's "providence, who thought proper to put a ſtop to "the propenſion, which many perſons, in theſe later "times, ſeem to have to irreligion and free-thinking, by a method ſuited to their diſpoſition. The "perſons I mean are thoſe, who will admit of nothing but what may be known by the light of "reaſon, who have an extreme unwillingneſs to begin with faith; who look upon moſt perſons of "a pious turn of mind as weak in their underſtandings; and who can never have any ſenſe of religion, from their being prepoſſeſſed with the following notion (which in moſt of them is an effect "of the completion of their corrupt morals) that "whatever is ſaid of the life to come is mere fiction, "and that the ſoul dies with the body. One would "conclude therefore, that the beſt way to remove "the chief obſtacle to the ſalvation of the people in "queſtion, and to prevent the ſpreading of their "infection, would be, to diſturb them in their falſe "tranquillity, which is wholly grounded on their "firm perſuaſion, that it betrays a weak underſtanding to believe that the ſoul ſurvives the body. "Now have we not reaſon to believe that God, who "diſpoſes of his creatures at pleaſure, and who conceals, beneath human means, the wonderful orders "of his providence, has in view the reclaiming of "thoſe unbelievers, by forcing them to entertain a "juſt diffidence of their falſe ideas, when he raiſed "up a man who was ſo excellently well qualified by "nature to work upon them; a moſt extraordinary "penetration of mind for diving into the moſt abſtracted ſciences; a ſtrong application to philoſophy only, about which they do not entertain any ſuſpicions; "who openly proteſts to diveſt himſelf of all vulgar "prejudices, a quality they are very fond of; and who, "by that very means, muſt convince the greateſt "unbelievers, (provided they will but open their "eyes to the light which is preſented to them) *viz.* "that nothing can be more repugnant to reaſon, "than to believe that the ſoul muſt die with the "body. And how has he ſhewn this? By laying "down from clear principles, and ſuch as are grounded wholly on natural ideas, to which every man "of ſenſe muſt conſent, *viz.* that the ſoul and body, "*i. e.* that which thinks, and that which has extenſion, are two ſubſtances entirely diſtinct; ſo that "it is impoſſible that extenſion ſhould be a modification of thinking ſubſtance, or thought a mode "of extended ſubſtance. This only being ſtrongly "proved (as it is exceedingly well in Des Cartes's "meditations) there is no free-thinker, if he has but "a tolerably-juſt way of thinking, can be perſuaded, "that the ſoul dies with the body." For *&c.* (60).

The reader ſees, by this long paſſage quoted from Arnauld, the advantage which may accrue to religion from the hypotheſis oppoſed by Pomponatius; it may be employed againſt certain free-thinkers, who will ſee before they will believe, and who deſpiſe the obſcure arguments brought by Divines. Now nothing can more effectually reclaim the perſons in queſtion, than to convince them of the truth of the ſoul's immortality: this is an inlet into the right path; and if we once bring them ſo far, very happy conſequences may be expected. Pomponatius could not have worked upon them in that reſpect, but would rather have ſtrengthened them in their error; and conſequently his hypotheſis is more hurtful than advantageous, in that particular conflict whereby he propoſes to convert the ſort of people in queſtion: and, to ſay the truth, it would have been much more praiſeworthy in him, if inſtead of ſo painfully examining the arguments of the Ariſtotelians, he would have ſought for better proofs of the ſoul's immortality than ſuch as appeared weak to him. It is to be obſerved, that Arnauld produces this particular incident with regard to Des Cartes and Gaſſendus, to ſhew the wrong judgment of the Inquiſition of Rome. The

(59) *Difficultez propoſées à Mr. Steyaert*, part. 9. p. 81 *&* *ſeq.*

(60) Arnauld adds here a ſhort but excellent application of what he attempted to prove, &c.

them, to examine and give his opinion of them. The anſwer Pomponatius made to the objection, *viz.* that to inculcate the doctrine of the ſoul's mortality would prompt men to indulge in vices of every kind [*H*], is remarkable. I know not if we ought to believe

(61) *Difficultez propoſées à Mr. Steyaert*, part. 9. p. 85.

The *Licenſers of books at Rome*, ſays he (61), *had not a juſt regard to the advantage of religion, when they inſerted, in their* Index, *Des Cartes's work, in which he proves the ſoul's immortality by natural reaſons, in a more ſolid manner than ever was done before; and, at the ſame time have not put one of Gaſſendus's into it, even that wherein he uſed his utmoſt endeavours to deſtroy all thoſe proofs; which is to deprive thoſe, who have no faith, of every human method of diſengaging themſelves from the pernicious prejudices they entertain againſt that important truth. Is not this allowing them to ſwallow the poiſon, and preventing their taking an antidote? This they have likewiſe done by inſerting in their* Index *another piece of Des Cartes on the ſame ſubject: for one of his Diſciples, who had left him with regard to metaphyſical truths, having aſſerted, in a paper paſted up publickly, that were it not for revelation one might conclude that thought is only a modification of matter; Des Cartes thought it incumbent on him to refute this dangerous opinion, and ſhew its abſurdity: and yet this very book is prohibited in the* Index, *under the following title:* Notæ in programma quoddam ſub finem anni 1654, in Belgio editum; *though the paper paſted up is not mentioned there. Once again, is not this not to forbid a perſon to poiſon himſelf, and at the ſame time to forbid the taking an antidote?*

I quoted, in the remark [*C*], an Author, whoſe cenſure of Pomponatius requires ſome reſtriction His words are as follow: "In which (62) it may "be ſaid that Pomponatius certainly carried things "too far, and countenanced too much the ſentiments "and inclinations of free-thinkers: we even cannot "forbear to charge him with being inſolent, when "he preſumes to ſay, that it is unworthy of a Chriſ-"tian to attempt to prove the ſoul's immortality by "philoſophical arguments; ſince, on the contrary, "nothing better prepares Heathens for receiving the "light of the Goſpel, than to firſt prove to them, "that reaſon teaches us that the ſoul is immortal; "and in conſequence of this, that men muſt endea-"vour to make themſelves happy after this life; "whereas, nothing would be a greater obſtacle to "the converſion of idolaters and free-thinkers, than "for them to believe according to the light of rea-"ſon, the ſoul muſt be mortal (63) . . . . (64). Here "follow the words (65), which were cenſured. It is "ſo far from being unworthy of a Chriſtian to en-"deavour to prove the ſoul's immortality by natural "reaſons, that nothing, on the contrary, confirms "him more in the truth of his religion, than when "philoſophical reaſons concur with the tenets of "faith, though the tenets of faith ought always to "be ranked firſt. I therefore was in the right to "affirm, that Pomponatius was guilty of inſolence, "in aſſerting that it is unworthy of a Chriſtian, to "ſeek for other reaſons, to prove the immortality of "the ſoul, than thoſe taken from revelation."

(62) *i. e.* By what Pomponatius ſays, *that nothing can be more injurious to faith, than to attempt to prove it by natural reaſons.*

(63) Le Noble, *Tableaux des Philoſophes*, Tom. 2. p. 84, 85.

(64) Ibid. p. 86.

(65) *i. e.* Thoſe in the rem. [*C*], above, at the end of the citation from le Noble.

EXAMINATION of le Noble's cenſure of Pomponatius.

I will hear examine this cenſure. Pomponatius's words, as they are couched in le Noble's book, may be taken in the following ſenſe; that a Chriſtian who endeavours to ſhew to unbelievers, that reaſon and ſcripture agree in teaching the immortality of the ſoul, does an injury to faith, and becomes unworthy of the name he bears. But in Pomponatius's book, I believe they ſignify, that a Chriſtian who has recourſe to any arguments but the authority of God, (becauſe he does not find that revelation, without the help of the light of nature, can remove his uncertainty) commits an inſult on revelation, and believes in a manner unworthy of the Chriſtian name. Such I conjecture to be the true ſenſe of that author's meaning. Not having his defenſes or apologies, I therefore am not able to be poſitive about it, and muſt therefore only be content with probability. What was the ſtate of the queſtion between him and his antagoniſts? It was to know whether he deſired to be looked upon as an heretic and an impious man, for having aſſerted that the philoſophical arguments in favour of the ſoul's immortality are not valid proofs; and that this doctrine can be proved only by revelation. The queſtion therefore was not to know, what judgment we are to form on thoſe who endeavour to reclaim ſuch free-thinkers as are madly fond of Lucretius, and have the higheſt contempt for the word of God: the queſtion was not to know, whether thoſe who offer philoſophical reaſons to thoſe pretended free-thinkers, and who endeavour by that way, (the only one that can work upon them) to bring them out of the ſnares of irreligion, do any thing injurious to the faith, and make themſelves altogether unworthy of the Chriſtian name. The queſtion was about ſuch Chriſtians as have recourſe to the light of nature for their own uſe, and to remedy their perſonal wants; a wavering ſet of people, and who know not which ought to be preferred, revelation or reaſon; who at leaſt do not rely on God's authority, unleſs it be confirmed by philoſophical arguments. To ſay that ſuch people act injuriouſly with regard to revelation, and do not behave as Chriſtians, is certainly to form a reaſonable judgment of them, and does not deſerve the cenſure which I examine in this place; for theſe perſons, ſtrictly ſpeaking, are not yet Chriſtians; they are as yet undetermined; they offer to believe the doctrine of paradiſe and hell, provided better proofs are given them than the Goſpel. They are not ſatisfied with God's authority; they require to have the promiſes of ſcripture ratified by the light of nature, otherwiſe they give no credit to them. In caſe the matter ſtands as I imagine it does, all my readers will own that Pomponatius has been unjuſtly cenſured; but the cenſure would be juſt, on the firſt ſenſe abovementioned.

I do not deny, but that he might have been told, that he was not a fit man to convert thoſe who believe the mortality of the ſoul, and who conſider the Goſpel no otherwiſe than as a human compoſition; and therefore his philoſophy had not the ſame advantage as that of his adverſaries. Had he been ſincere, he would have owned this; and have owned that, unleſs he imitated thoſe phyſicians, who, to prevail on their patients to take a doſe, aſcribe more virtues to it than they know it to have, he could not have maintained to unbelievers, that the mortality of the ſoul is certainly contrary to the reaſons which philoſophy furniſhes. He perhaps could not have diſapproved the charitable behaviour of ſuch Philoſophers as ſhould imitate thoſe Phyſicians; he would have contented himſelf with ſaying, that he was rather for a perfect ſincerity; but after all, he might have obſerved to his adverſaries, that with reſpect to the reſurrection and ſeveral others, they ſhould be obliged to deal with unbelievers, as he would have dealt with them as to the doctrine of the ſoul's immortality.

[*H*] *To inculcate the doctrine of the ſoul's mortality, would prompt men to indulge in vices of every kind.*] It is the laſt objection, which Pomponatius ſtarted to himſelf. He anſwers (66), that ſince mankind have naturally a love for happineſs, and bear a hatred to miſery, it is ſufficient, in order for the making an honeſt man, to ſhew him that the felicity of life conſiſts in practiſing virtue, and miſery in practiſing vice. He adds, that thoſe, who teach the doctrine of the ſoul's mortality, open a way for the attaining the moſt perfect virtue, which is that whoſe aim or view is not the meeting with a reward, or the eſcaping puniſhment. *Quare perfectius aſſerentes animam mortalem melius videntur ſalvare rationem virtutis quàm aſſerentes ipſam immortalem, ſpes namque præmii, & pœnæ timor, videntur ſervilitatem quandam importare, quæ rationi virtutis contrariatur* (67). He ſays alſo that the doctrine of the ſoul's immortality ought to be propoſed to perſons of a brutal caſt of mind: and that probably ſome Authors taught that tenet, though they themſelves did not believe it, and did this in the view of checking the ſenſual inclination of that kind of men. *Exiſtimandum eſt multos viros ſenſiſſe animam mortalem, qui tamen ſcripſerunt ipſam eſſe immortalem: ſed hoc feciſſe ex pronitate virorum ad malum,*

(66) Pomponat. *de Immortal. Animæ*, cap. 14. p. 120.

(67) Idem, ibid. p. 121.

believe what is asserted by some Authors, that the work in question was sentenced to the flames by the Venetians, and disowned by its Author [*I*]. The boldness and prepossession of a Lutheran Civilian is inexcusable [*K*], in his asserting that our Philosopher used to read publick Lectures against the soul's immortality; and that he was an infamous

malum, qui parùm, aut nihil habent de intellectu, bonaque animi non cognoscentes, nec amantes, tantùm corporalibus incumbunt: Quare hujusmodi ingeniis necesse est eos sanare, sicut & medicus ad ægrum, & nutrix ad puerum ratione carentem se habent (68). But these several remarks do not remove the difficulty, and are very poor solutions. Now here follows a more rational reflection, it being grounded upon experience. He says, that a great number of knaves and wicked wretches believe in the immortality of the soul, and that many holy and just people do not believe in it (69). *Neque universaliter viri impuri ponunt mortalitatem, neque universaliter temperati immortalitatem Nam manifestè videmus multos pravos homines credere, verùm ex passionibus seduci, multos etiam viros sanctos & justos scimus mortalitatem animarum posuisse. Plato namque* 1. *de repub. dicit Simonidem Poëtam virum divinum & optimum fuisse, qui tamen eam mortalem asseverat: Homerus quoque, ut Aristoteles* 2. *de anima refert, existimavit sensum ab intellectu non differre: quæ autem fuerit Homeri dignitas quis ignorat? Hippoc. quoque & Galen. viri doctissimi & optimi hujus perhibentur opinionis: Alexander Aphrodisæus, magnus Alsarabius, Abubacher, Avempace, ex nostratibus quoque Plinius Secundus, Seneca, innumerique alii hoc sensere; Seneca namque lib.* 7. *Epistolarum ad Lucilium epist.* 54. *quæ incipit, longum mihi comitatum dederat mala valetudo, manifestiusque in de consolatione ad Martiam affirmat ipsam esse mortalem: multosque alios studiosos & viros doctissimos* (70) *connumerat ejusdem opinionis fuisse.* i. e. "Nor "do all the vicious in general firmly believe the soul "to be mortal, nor are all the virtuous persuaded of "its immortality: for we manifestly see that many "wicked men believe the latter, but are led away "by their passions; and on the other side, we know "that many holy and just men have believed the "soul to be mortal. For Plato tells us, in the first "book of his Commonwealth, that Simonides the "Poet, though a Divine and a most excellent man, "did nevertheless affirm that the soul is mortal. "Homer also, as we are told by Aristotle in his "second book on the soul, was of opinion that sen-"sation did not differ from understanding; and who "does not know how great a man Homer was? Those "very learned men, Hippocrates and Galen, were "of the same opinion: as were also Alexander "Aphrodisæus, the great Alfarabius, Abubacher, "Avempace; and among our countrymen, Plinius "Secundus, Seneca, and numberless others: Seneca, "in the seventh book of his epistles, epistle 54, to "Lucilius, which begins in the following manner, "*Longum mihi comitatum dederat mala valetudo*; and "he affirms still more clearly, that the soul is mor-"tal, in his consolatory address to Martia; and enu-"merates many studious and learned men, who en-"tertained the same opinion."

(68) Pomponat. *de Immortal. Animæ*, cap. 14. p. 120.

(69) Idem, ibid. p. 119.

(70) It is certain that Seneca evidently supposes the soul's immortality in these two places; but I did not observe that he gives a catalogue of those who entertain that opinion.

[*I*] *I know not . . . . whether the work in question was sentenced to the flames by the Venetians, and disowned by its Author.*] This is asserted by Theophilus Raynaud. *Venetos illud opus addixisse ignibus nec de* immortalitate *sed* de mortalitate animæ *fuisse inscribendum tradit Sylvester*, lib. 5. de Strigimagis, cap. 5. *expostulans quod à se approbatum eum librum dixisset Pomponatius, quod negat se unquam cogitasse* (71). i. e. "Sylvester relates in his treatise *De Strigimagis*, book "5. chap. 5. that the Venetians sentenced the book "in question to the flames; and that the proper title "of it would have been, not of *the immortality of the "soul*, but *the mortality of the soul*; and complains of "Pomponatius for affirming that he gave his appro-"bation to that book, which he declares he never "intended." He had just before declared, that it is pretended Pomponatius himself condemned his book; but that people differ with regard to the motives which prompted him to it, some ascribing it to a desire he had of skreening his reputation; others, that he did it in compliance with the intreaties of his friends; and others again, from a principle of conscience, his mind being better enlightened. *Pomponatius, mutata mente, opus suum de eo argumento improbasse dicitur, variantibus sententiis, an id amicorum precibus dederit, an famæ suæ ac nomini caverit, an ex animo audierit Ecclesiam, & palinodiam cecinerit, ut conscientiæ faceret satis* (72). He had just before said also, that all books, which assert, that it is not possible to prove the immortality of the soul by natural reasons, ought to be condemned; he affirming, that they make way for an absolute denial of its immortality. He is much less equitable in this assertion, than where he acknowledged before, that the Philosophers, whom a Bishop of Paris condemned in 1227, and who were condemned just before, under Leo X. by the Council of Lateran, were not so absurd as to maintain, that the soul, absolutely speaking, is mortal and immortal; immortal according to divinity, and mortal according to philosophy. He explains the true sense of their doctrine; they admitting absolutely the immortality of the soul on account of Revelation, and otherwise would have thought it mortal. *Animam ergo absolutè videntur agnovisse immortalem, quòd ita apertè ferant fidei scita; quamvis nisi de animæ rationalis perpetuatione fide docerentur, solaque naturali ratione consulta, negaturi fuissent immortalitatem.* This he acknowledges partially in favour of Pomponatius, and cites a book in which this restriction is proved. It is that which Cardinal Contareni, this Philosopher's disciple, wrote against his master. *Non absolutè ac simpliciter, mortalem animam censuisse videtur* (Pomponatius) *sed duntaxat si ratio nuda consuleretur, ut liquet ex opere Contareni Cardinalis*, de immortalitate, *conscripto adversùs Pomponatium, ipsius quondam Contareni in Philosophicis Magistrum. Nec aliud censuerim voluisse illos ejusdem ævi Philosophastros, damnatos à Lateranensi Consilio sub Leone X. & alios longè antè à Stephano Parisiensi Episcopo, anno* 1277. *vel potius* 1227. *in rescripto quod extat*, tomo 5. Bibl. Margarini, pag. 1319. *æque damnatos, quòd assererent, animam rationalem, secundum fidem esse immortalem; at secundum Philosophiam, esse mortalem* (74). Boccalini, according to his usual custom, jests on this distinction of Pomponatius. He supposes, 1. That this impious man being sentenced to the flames by Apollo, protested that he believed the doctrine of the soul's mortality, only as a Philosopher. 2. That Apollo, having a regard to that protestation, bid the executioner burn him only as a Philosopher (75).

(71) Theophil. Raynaudus, *de malis & bonis Libris*, num. 43. p. m. 26.

(72) Idem, ibid.

(73) *Jure libri ob doctrinæ reprobæ fermento vitiati, suffixione digni sunt habiti.* Idem, ibid.

(74) Idem, ibid. num. 42. p. 25, 26.

(75) Boccalin. *Ragguagli di Parnaso*, centur. 1. cap. 90. p. m. 306.

The reader has seen above (76) the treatment which his book met with, and that it was not burnt.

(76) Rem. [*C*], citat. (28).

[*K*] *The boldness and prepossession of a Lutheran Civilian is inexcusable.*] His name is Godelmannus, and his words are as follow. *Petrus Pomponatius Mantuanus philosophus & Epicureismi defensor magusque nefarius, in Academiis Italiæ publicè contra animæ immortalitatem disputavit: scripsit de fato & de incantatione libros, in quibus de verborum magicorum, imaginum, characterum, & imaginationis occulta potestate impie satis disputavit* (77). i. e. "Peter Pomponatius, a Philosopher of "Mantua, a stickler for the Doctrine of Epicurus, "a wicked Necromancer, disputed publickly in the "Universities of Italy, against the doctrine of the "soul's immortality: he wrote some books concern-"ing Fate and Necromancy, wherein he disputes im-"piously concerning the occult virtue or power of "magical words, images, characters, and imagina-"tion." 1st. It is false to assert that Pomponatius disputed publickly against the immortality of the soul, in the Universities of Italy. He cannot be charged with this but by virtue of the sophism, *à dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter.* i. e. "The under-"standing what is meant in a particular sense, *in a "general one.*" He asserted that the hypothesis of Aristotle did not furnish any proof of the soul's immortality; and he opposed all the arguments of those who attempt to prove, by this Philosopher's doctrine, that our soul is immortal; but then he did not assert the mortality of the soul simply and absolutely. It is therefore evident, that this Lutheran Civilian was neither just nor equitable. 2d, A good Writer would never

(77) Godelmannus, lib. 1. cap. 8. *de Magis* apud *Joh. Christian. Frommannum de Fascinatione*, lib. 1. part. 2. sect. 3. cap. 2. p. m 327.

infamous Magician who vented certain impious particulars concerning the occult virtue of ſorcery and of the imagination. By the way, he uſed to apply himſelf to the ſolution of difficulties ſo very intenſely, that he never once thought of ſleeping, eating, drinking, or ſpitting. It made him almoſt diſtracted, and a laughing-ſtock to every one. He himſelf tells us this [*L*].

(*k*) See the beginning of the rem. [*I*].

Since the firſt edition of this article, I have ſeen, in the work cited by Theophilus Raynaud (*k*), that Sylveſter Prierias really affirms, that Pomponatius's book was burnt in Venice (*l*). He adds that, could he have had his will, all nations would have treated his pernicious work in the ſame manner as the Venetians did. He had refuted Pomponatius's opinion before it was printed; but as his work had not then appeared in publick, he inſerted it in a work quoted by Theophilus Raynaud. He publiſhed it in 1521. He obſerves that two Friers had wrote with great ſolidity againſt Pomponatius's treatiſe. The name of the one was Bartholomew of Piſa, and the other Jerom Fornarius Bachalarius. This by way of Supplement (*m*).

(*l*) *Silveſt. Prierias de Strigimagarum, Dæmonumque mirandis*, lib. 1. (and not lib. 5. as Theop. Raynaud cites, the book being divided only into three books) cap. 5. p. 19. edit. Rom. 1575, 4to.

(*m*) *Vide* the rem. [*B*] and [*C*].

never aſſert, that Pomponatius, a notorius Magician, denied the doctrine of the ſoul's immortality. Mankind are ſo much perſuaded in general, that if there are Demons or Devils, the ſoul muſt neceſſarily be immortal, and commonly ſuppoſe ſo great a connexion between theſe two tenets, that none but a madman will ever charge a perſon with adhering to the doctrine of Epicurus, and believing in magic, without making ſome reflections on this paradox. He muſt expect that his Readers will be ſurprized at them; muſt believe that they will underſtand nothing in this connexion, but will quite puzzle and confound them. An Author who does not foreſee this muſt be quite ſtupid; and if he foreſees it, and does not attempt to clear up this vaſt difficulty, he ſcarce knows what he is about. Hence it may be concluded, that Godelmannus deſerved to be ſtrongly cenſured. 3d. He refutes himſelf; for he complains of a tract of Pomponatius, in which all the effects that are aſcribed to magic, or ſome other compact with the Devil, are aſcribed to other cauſes. Thus this Author, in the ſame period, charges Pomponatius with being a Magician, and of writing a book againſt magic. An Author who writes in this manner is inexcuſable for not taking an obſervation like the following: Pomponatius was a cheat, for he believed in magic, and practiſed it, and yet he refuted it in his books, to prevent his being reputed a Magician.

[*L*] *He himſelf tells us this.*] Not being able to reconcile ſome maxims of Ariſtotle, with our free-will, he cries out, this is what vexes me, hinders me from ſleeping, and makes me diſtracted. *Iſta ſunt quæ me premunt, quæ me anguſtiant, quæ me inſomnem & inſanum reddunt* (78). He ſays that, like a ſecond Prometheus, chained on mount Caucaſus, he is tortured with continual uneaſineſs; and can never eat, drink, ſleep, &c. and is become the laughing-ſtock of every body. *Perpetuis curis & cogitationibus rodi, non ſitire, non fameſcere, non dormire, non comedere, non expuere, ab omnibus irrideri* (79). He would better deſerve a pardon, were the ſubject of his anguiſh leſs blameable; but to ſee a man torturing himſelf to reconcile another man with reaſon, is quite inexcuſable. Should a Divine endeavour, at the hazard of his health, and even of his life, to reconcile the ſcripture and truth when they ſeem to diſagree, ſuch an attempt is laudable and heroical; for as there is ſuch an agreement, it may be preſumed that he will diſcover it. But can ſuch hopes be entertained with regard to the ſentiments of a particular perſon, who is liable to err, and who ſwallows it down as greedily as fiſhes do water?

(78) Pomponat. *de Fato*, lib. 3. cap. 7.

(79) Idem, ibid.

PONCET (MAURICE), Doctor of Divinity in the Univerſity of Paris (*a*), a Benedictine Monk *of the Abby of St. Peter* at Melun his native place, *and Curate of St.* ASPAIS in the ſame city, and then *of St. Peter des Arſis at Paris* (*b*), was one of the celebrated Preachers in the 16th Century. He preached with all the boldneſs imaginable againſt the vices which prevailed at the Court of Henry III. We have obſerved in another place (*c*), that he was conducted to Melun, becauſe of the invective he delivered from the pulpit March the 26th 1583, againſt the new fraternity of penitents eſtabliſhed by that Monarch. The paſſage which I have tranſcribed from Peter Matthieu is to be met with word for word in the Journal of Henry III. with the anſwer which you will find hereunder, and which Poncet is ſaid to have made to the Duke of Epernon [*A*]. Others pretend it was made to the Duke of Joyeuſe at another time (*d*) [*B*], which to

(*a*) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, *Biblioth. Franc.* p. 862.

(*b*) Roulliard, *Antiquez de Melun*, p. 627.

(*c*) In the rem. [*O*] of the art. HENRY III.

(*d*) At the time of the Duke of Joyeuſe's wedding, in the year 1581.

[*A*] *The anſwer . . . . which Poncet is ſaid to have made to the Duke of Epernon.*] Poncet being arreſted, that Duke went to ſee him, " and with a ſmile, ſaid " to him, Well, our Maſter, they ſay that you make " people laugh, who come to hear your ſermons; " this is not very well done; a Preacher like you " ought to preach with a deſign to edify, and not " to make men merry. Sir, anſwered Poncet, without being daunted in the leaſt, I would have you to " know, that I preach only the word of God, and " that none come to my ſermons in order to laugh, " unleſs they be wicked men or Atheiſts. And indeed I never made ſo many perſons laugh, as you " have made men ſhed tears. A bold anſwer for a " Monk, to a Lord of the Duke of Epernon's quality; and it was indeed judged to be very much to " the purpoſe, conſidering the time when it was " made (1)."

(1) *Journal de Henri III.* under the year 1583. p. m. 67. See alſo Pierre Matthieu, *des derniers Troubles*, p. 15.

[*B*] . . . . *Others pretend it was made to the Duke of Joyeuſe at another time.*] Here follows a paſſage in which Monſieur le Laboureur relates that fact, to which he adds a Reflection which is not leſs ſmart, than the Benedictine's repartee. " There were at " that time (2), ſome Preachers who ſpoke pretty " freely in their ſermons, and who in the number of " crimes reckoned the cruel or licentious maxims of " the Politicians. Doctor Poncet, among others, an " eloquent and very zealous man, was bold enough " to think that Kings and great men were within " the province of his Miſſion; and the Sieur de " Brantome obſerves of him, that once he grew ſo " warm about that maxim, he who cannot diſſemble, " cannot reign, that he did not ſcruple to aſſert, *that* " *ſuch a maxim was downright Atheiſm, which* " *would carry Kings and Princes directly to the Devil,* " *and make them perfect tyrants. He was,* adds the " ſame Brantome, *as bold a Preacher as ever got into* " *the pulpit. And it happened once, that Monſieur de* " *Joyeuſe, at the time of the great expence, pomp and* " *magnificence of his nuptials, met him in the ſtreet and* " *told him, Monſieur Poncet, I never knew you before* " *this time, and I am very glad to meet you, for I heard* " *of you, and I have been told how well you knew* " *to make people laugh, when you preach. He anſwered* " *with as much moderation as the other had ſpoken with* " *paſſion, Sir, it is but reaſonable that I ſhould make* " *them laugh, ſince you make them weep ſo much, by the* " *ſubſidies, and the other great expences of your fine* " *wedding, which the people groan under upon your* " *account. Monſieur de Joyeuſe was obliged to with-* " *draw, though he had a great mind to ſtrike him; but* " *if he had touched him ever ſo little, the people, who* " *are*

(2) That is, under the reign of Henry III.

to me ſeems more probable [C]. Poncet feared leſt they ſhould carry him to the Caſtle of Loches as they had threatned to do ſome time before (e). He was therefore very well pleaſed when they only confined him in the Abby of St. Peter at Melun. His misfortune did not continue long, he got leave to return to Paris, *and to ſerve his Pariſh of St. Peter des Arſis; but he abated nothing of his antient liberty of preaching, and continued till his death in that firm reſolution* (f). He died November the 23d 1586 (g). He publiſhed ſome works [D], and it is very probable that his manner of preaching had ſomething in it of that burleſque [E], which rendered little Father André ſo famous in the next Century.

(e) Roull. *Antiquitez de Melun*, p. 627.

(f) Idem, ibid. p. 628.

(g) Ibidem.

I add that the Bernardine Monk, Peter de Saint Romuald, has commended him very much for an action which deſerves no commendation at all. It was his adviſing not to tranſlate the holy Scripture into vulgar tongues [F]. The book he wrote upon that ſubject is very deſpicable, if we may depend upon Monſieur Arnauld's authority [G].

PONTIUS

" *are ſtubborn and zealous for their licentious Preachers,* " *whom they naturally love when they talk freely, began* " *to flock together, and would have played him and his* " *attendants ſome ugly trick, for Poncet was very much* " *beloved at Paris.* Here is a ſmart reply, which is " worth more than a Biſhoprick in hiſtory, and by " which the Duke of Joyeuſe might learn, that a " Prieſt who is an honeſt man, and who values " the good of the publick above his own private " intereſt, is an unruly horſe, who far from being " dazzled by the ſplendor of greatneſs, is rendered " more fierce by it, and muſt not be approached but " with caution, leſt he ſhould kick. That anſwer " made every one merry, and the Duke's friend did " not pity him, without blaming him alſo for thus " venturing himſelf in the ſtreet with a mere Mi- " niſter, when he had ſo many men at his devotion, " who had fat livings, and who would have looked " upon it as an honour to be ridiculed by him, from " whom they might have expected ſome farther " preferment (3)."

(3) Le Laboureur, *Addit. aux Memoires de Caſtelnau*, Tom. 2. p. 58, 59.

[C]——*Which to me ſeems more probable.*] For it is agreed, that when he was arreſted he feared leſt they ſhould ſend him to Loches, according to the foregoing threatnings. Would that fear, which he confeſſed himſelf he was under (4), have ſuffered him to make ſuch a ſmart and diſobliging anſwer to his Prince's favourite? It is infinitely more probable that he made that anſwer, when he enjoined a perfect liberty in the open ſtreet, where he knew very well that the inhabitants of Paris would have openly defended him againſt any inſult that had been offered him. Let us therefore ſtick to Brantome's account, and obſerve by the by with how much inaccuracy the memory of ſuch events is preſerved, which produces afterwards the difference that is obſervable in the writings of the Hiſtorians.

(4) See the *Antiquitez de Melun*, p. 627.

[D] *He publiſhed ſome works.*] Three books of the Eccleſiaſtical Oration or Prayer, in the form of a contemplation, at Paris 1568 in 8vo. A remonſtrance to the Nobility of France, concerning the advantage and quiet which the King affords his people, and the inſtruction he ought to receive that he may govern as he ought to do, at Paris 1572 in 8vo. A Funeral Oration delivered the 31ſt of Auguſt 1574 in the Church of *Brecy-le-Buiſſon*, at the funeral of *Meſſire* Euſtachius de Conſtance, Viſcount of Aulchy, at Paris 1564 8vo. A diſcourſe of advice to *Meſſire* Peter de Gondy Biſhop of Paris, concerning a propoſal he made to the Divines about tranſlating the bible into the vulgar tongue, at Paris 1578 in 8vo. Familiar Meditations on the Hiſtory of the Incarnation, at Rheims 1574 in 8vo. (5).

(5) Extracted from Du Verdier Vau-Privas, *Biblioth. Franç.* p. 862.

[E] *It is very probable that his manner of preaching had ſomething of the burleſque in it.*] I have three reaſons to think ſo. 1. The expreſſions, which he uſed in the ſermon for which the King baniſhed him (6), have no gravity in them. That young and tender laſs, who was kept ready for the night's entertainment of the penitents, is a quite comical ſtyle. Secondly, it is unanimouſly reported, that the favourite, whoſe reproof Poncet anſwered ſo ſmartly, cenſured him for making his audience laugh. 3. Laſtly, the manner, in which his countryman and panegyriſt James Roulliard endeavours to ward off the blow, makes me think that he was to anſwer thoſe, who found it ſtrange that Poncet ſhould expreſs his thoughts in a jocoſe or bantering way. *Beſides his learning and piety, which are acknowledged by all the world,* thus ſpeaks Roulliard (7), *he had the particular gift of preaching with a great deal of freedom againſt the vices of his time, making more account of the unqueſtionable truth of God's words, than of the threatenings of the great men, and the continual danger of his life. It is true that he uſed to expreſs himſelf with ſuch a grace, that what made unthinking people laugh as though it had been ridiculous, was by the wiſe aſcribed to a great art, by which this brave preacher uſed to render his ſevere reproofs more acceptable, and to ſupport himſelf the longer in his miniſterial functions, in which he was ſo uſeful to the Church. Whereas otherwiſe either the paſſionate courtier, or ſome other perſon of this ſilly world would have attempted to ruin him at once.* You ſee very plainly, that that apologiſt does not dare to deny that people laughed when his Poncet preached. Can it then be queſtioned that his ſermons ſavoured a little of the burleſque? If he had boldly cenſured the diſorders of the Court, but in a grave manner, he would indeed have pleaſed his audience very much, but yet he would have made no man laugh.

(6) See above, quotat. (68), of the art. HENRY III.

(7) In p. 627, of his *Antiquez de Melun.*

[F] *Peter de S. Romuald commends him for ..... adviſing not to tranſlate the holy ſcripture into vulgar tongues.*] This Bernardine Monk, who extolls him upon that account, admires chiefly the argument grounded on the ill uſe that can be made of the ſcripture, of which he gives two inſtances which are very ſtrange. " Maurice Poncet, ſays he (8), was highly " eſteemed in his time for his deep learning, his emi- " nent piety, and the remarkable zeal, with which " he reproved vice, not only in his fervent ſer- " mons, but alſo in his writings againſt the Free- " thinkers, and the Hereticks, as appears chiefly by " the advice he gave the illuſtrious Peter de Gondy " Biſhop of Paris, concerning the tranſlating of the " holy Bible into the vulgar tongue; aſſerting that " it was not to be permitted, for ſeveral weighty " reaſons, and among others, in order to avoid the " danger to which the ſcripture would be expoſed of " being refuted and deſpiſed, becauſe of the ambi- " guity, obſcurity, and various expreſſions which oc- " cur in every language, which might furniſh wick- " ed or ignorant perſons with an opportunity to ruin " themſelves, as it happened in the laſt Century to " a painter in Pruſſia, who having bought a bible " tranſlated into the German tongue by Luther, and " read what Lot had done with his daughters, did " the ſame with his own: and as it was alſo the " caſe of a woman of the city of Munſter, when " that city was beſieged by the Biſhop, who is alſo " the temporal Lord of it: that woman having read " the ſtory of Judith tranſlated into her own lan- " guage, took it into her head to go and kill that " Biſhop, in order to deliver from the danger of " death thoſe of her Sect who had made themſelves " maſters of the city: but ſhe was taken, and found at " the expence of her own life, that *the letter* of the " holy ſcripture *killeth*, and that *the ſpirit giveth life* *." (8) Pierre de S. Romuald, *Journal Chronolog.* under the 23d of November, p. 575, 576.

[G] ..... *The book he wrote upon that ſubject is very deſpicable, if we may depend upon Monſieur Arnauld's authority.*] We have ſeen in another place (9), what his opinion was concerning a book wrote by Peter Lizet. He had no better opinion of our Maurice's work for ſpeaking of the collection, entitled, *Collectio*

* 2 Cor. iii. 6.

(9) In the rem. [B] of the art. LIZET.

PONTIUS (CONSTANTINE), burnt in effigy at Seville in 1559, was called Conſtantine de la Fuente, in Latin *Conſtantinus Fontius.* Some perſon having miſtaken a P inſtead of an F, that Doctor is much better known by the name of Conſtantinus Pontius [*A*], which is not his name, than by his true one. However this be, he was a man of great merit, Doctor of Divinity, Canon of Seville, and Preacher to Charles V. (*a*). He followed Philip III. into England, which doubtleſs was the cauſe why he imbibed the doctrine of the Proteſtants, for which he was ſeized by the Inquiſition, and ſentenced to die; but did not live till the *Auto de fé*, on which he was to have been publickly executed. The Spaniſh Hiſtorians generally ſay that he laid violent hands on himſelf, but others ſay that he was ſnatched away by ſickneſs; but all writers agree, that the Inquiſition exhibited an effigy that repreſented him, and which was burnt on the day of the *Auto de fé* (*b*). Several affirm that he was Confeſſor to Charles V. that he attended him when on his death-bed, and till he breathed his laſt; but we have ſhewn above (*c*), that he was only his preacher, and that he was impriſoned before that Emperor died. He wrote ſome books [*B*], which the Spaniſh Inquiſition inſerted, without exception, in their catalogue of prohibited books (*d*). He is mentioned in the martyrology of the Proteſtants [*C*].

(*a*) Nicol. Antonio, *Bibliotb. Scriptor. Hiſpan.* Tom. 1. p. 196.

(*b*) See Nicol. Antonio, ibid.

(*c*) Remark [*C*] of the article CARRANZA, and rem. [*S*], num. 1. of the art. CHARLES V.

(*d*) *Conſtantino de la Fuente Autor condenado: todas ſus obras en qualquier lengua, y eſpecialmente* la Confeſſion del Pecador, *Ind. lib. prohib.* p. m. 229.

Beza,

lectio quorumdam gravium Authorum, qui ex profeſſo vel ex occaſione ſacræ Scripturæ, aut divinorum officiorum in vulgarem linguam tranſlationes damnarunt (10). i. e. "A collection of ſome grave Authors, "who have either occaſionally or expreſly condemned "the tranſlation of the bible, or of the Church "Liturgies into vulgar tongues:" Speaking, I ſay, of that collection, he obſerves, that "it is a mere "rhapſody of the moſt impertinent Authors who "wrote upon that ſubject, mixed with a few good "ones. . . . . It contains a book of the Preſident "Lizet. . . . . The writing of a Dominican Frier "who was Inquiſitor at Toulouſe (11). . . . . The "remonſtrance of brother Maurice Poncet . . . . the "bare title of which is enough to ſhew what may be "expected from it (12). DISCOURS DE L'AVIS *donné à R. Pere en Dieu Meſſire Pierre de Gondy Evéque "de Paris. Par Frere Maurice Poncet, Docteur en "Theologie.* i. e. "*A diſcourſe of advice given to the "R. Father in God, Peter de Gondy, Biſhop of Paris, "by brother Maurice Poncet, Doctor of Divinity*; who, "as we have obſerved already, urges as one of the "ſtrongeſt reaſons why the bible ought not to be tranſlated into French, that the French tongue is a "barbarous language, which cannot be ſubjected to "any rules of grammar (13). . . . . How will the "Archbiſhop of Paris, who has done the French "Academy the honour to be one of his members, "be able to maintain, that it was well done to publiſh at this time ſo ridiculous a judgment of the "moſt beautiful language in Europe (14)?"

(10) It was printed at the expence of the Clergy in the year 1660.

(11) Arnauld, *Defenſe des Verſions*, p. 160, 161.

(12) Ibidem, p. 162.

(13) Ibidem, p. 162.

(14) Ibidem, p. 162.

[*A*] *By the name of Conſtantinus Pontius.*] So he is called by Thuanus. Father Paul (1) calls him alſo by the ſame name, and was not cenſured for it by Pallavicino, though he took notice of ſome errors ccommitted with regard to our Spaniard. See the remark [*C*] of the article CARRANZA; and the remark [*S*] of the article CHARLES V. Num. I.

(1) *Hiſt. du Concile de Trente*, lib. 5. p. 426. edit. 1629, 4to.

[*B*] *He wrote ſome books.*] A ſummary of the Chriſtian Doctrine, printed in Spaniſh at Antwerp. Six Sermons on the firſt Pſalm of David, printed in the ſame tongue, and in the ſame city, anno 1556 (2). A Catechiſm at large. The Confeſſion of a Sinner. Commentaries on Solomon's Proverbs, on Eccleſiaſtes, on Solomon's Song, and on Job. Don Nicholas Antonio (3) ſeems to think, that theſe Sermons were not made on the firſt Pſalm, but the fiftieth; and that they are the ſame with the confeſſion of a ſinner. However, he is miſtaken, for this confeſſion is a prayer not quite ſo long as a Sermon. It is in the book of martyrs (4).

(2) *Epit. Bibl. Geſneri.*

(3) *Bibl. Script. Hiſp.* Tom. 1. p. 196.

(4) Book 8. fol. 507 *verſo*, & *ſeq.*

[*C*] *He is mentioned in the martyrology of the Proteſtants.*] We there find that Egidius, Conſtantine Fontius, and Varquias, were the *firſt who, about the ſame time, diſcovered, or revealed, the darkneſs with which Spain was overſpread* (5). They are called the *three pillars of truth.* They preached in Seville with great zeal and ſucceſs. Egidius was promoted, by Charles V. to the Biſhoprick of *Tortona* (6); but the Inquiſition was ſo much offended at it, that they proſecuted him with great ſeverity, and during a long time, to prevent his promotion to that See. Whilſt this proſecution was carrying on, Fontius was in the Netherlands, Preacher and Confeſſor (7) of Charles V. Returning to Seville after Egidius's death, "he reſumed his "wonted employment with great courage; and the "affection, which the people had before diſcovered "for him, and for his preaching, was no ways leſſened. Notwithſtanding the weakneſs of his body, "he nevertheleſs diſcharged the duties of his employment; invigorating himſelf with the uſual "remedies which God diſpenſes, to reſtore the body "to its ſtrength and health. He had ſeveral encounters with the Prieſts and Monks, and with "Waldeſſo Archbiſhop of Seville, Preſident of the "Conclave of the Inquiſition. And notwithſtanding that his adverſaries were ſtrongly animated againſt him, yet he ſo dexterouſly warded off all their "blows, that they could not prevail with him to "make an open confeſſion of his faith, in order to "get the better hold of him. But at laſt God forced "from him, in the following manner, an entire "declaration of his truth; putting a ſtop to all his "ſubtilties and ſhifts, which he had employed in oppoſition to his conſcience (8). The diſcovery was "made, by his prohibited books falling into the "hands of the Inquiſition, though he employed the "utmoſt endeavours to conceal them. They found "many other books, a large one written with his own "hand, in which he treated of the following doctrines, "as the Inquiſitors declared by their ſentence, which "was publickly pronounced, *viz.* of the State of "the Church, of the true Church, and that of the "Pope, whom he called Antichriſt: of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, and the invention of the "Maſs, with which he ſaid the world was bewitched, becauſe of their ignorance of the ſacred writings: of man's juſtification; of purgatory, which "he called a wolf's head, and a monkiſh invention "to fill the belly: of bulls and the Pope's indulgences; of the merit of good works; of confeſſion; and ſeveral other points. This book being ſeen and produced, the Inquiſitors aſking whether it was his own hand-writing, he anſwered "them roundly, that the whole was his hand-writing, and the contents of it true. He ſaid to "them, give yourſelves no farther trouble in ſeeking for witneſſes againſt me; you have a full declaration of my faith, and therefore diſpoſe of me "as you pleaſe. He was afterwards kept in priſon "two years together, where he fell ſick, through "the ill treatment he met with (though he little "valued his having bad diet) and of the great grief "which the diſperſion of his Church brought upon "him; and alſo becauſe the burning rays of the ſun "made his priſon as hot as a furnace; ſo that at "laſt a looſeneſs, attended with the gripes, brought "him to his end, and winged his vertuous ſoul to the "Lord. . . . . They ſpread reports, that he had laid "violent hands on himſelf; he opening a vein with "a piece of broken glaſs, to avoid the ignominious "death prepared for him. Children likewiſe, after "his death, ſung ſongs on that ſubject, which were "written by the baſe agents of the Inquiſition. On "the day appointed for the triumph, his dead body "was dug up, covered with ſtraw, as though it had "been

(5) *Hiſt. des Martyrs*, liv. 8. folio 505 *verſo*, edit. of 1582, folio.

(6) It ſhould be *Tortoſa*. See art. CHARLES V. rem. [*S*], num. 2.

(7) The Spaniſh Hiſtorians declare that he was not his Confeſſor. See the rem. [*S*], num. 1. of the article CHARLES V.

(8) *Hiſt. des Martyrs*, folio 506 *verſo*.

Beza, who called him Conſtantinus Pontius, and ſays that he was many years Confeſſor to Charles V. and that he was burnt in Seville (e); did not recollect exactly the circumſtances which he had read in that martyrology. I have read a Latin diſcourſe containing the life and death of this Spaniard (f), and he is there called *Conſtantinus Fontius*. The editor of this diſcourſe declares it to have been writ by *Reginaldus Gonſalvius Montanus Hiſpanus*. It is there related that our Conſtantine had been pretty wild in his youth [D]; but that he afterwards reformed, and behaved extremely well: however, he did not leave off one thing, which was in ſome meaſure a fault, which was this; being of a very jovial temper, and maſter of the moſt lively wit, he took a little too much liberty in joking. A conſiderable number of his ſmart ſayings were in vogue. The Hypocrites and ſorry Preachers of that age were commonly the ſubject of his moſt ſatyrical touches. He taught himſelf in the utmoſt perfection, the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew tongues; and every part of learning requiſite to form a good preacher. He was admirably well ſkilled in all the beauties of his native language; and had ſo eloquent a talent in preaching, that he drew together a numberleſs multitude of auditors, inſomuch that people had ſcarce an opportunity of ſeating themſelves conveniently, tho' they went three or four hours before he came into the pulpit (g). He was quite free from avarice and ambition; refuſed a rich canonry that was offered him in Toledo, and could not forbear jeſting at the time that he refuſed it [E]. When after the death of Dr. Giles (b), he was appointed to preach in the Cathedral, he did it before he had recovered his health; but found himſelf ſo extremely weak in the middle of his ſermon, that he was

(e) Beza, *in Icon.* folio 90.

(f) It is the book entitled, *Hiſpanicæ Inquiſitionis & Carnificinæ Secretiora*, and publiſhed at Amberg, in 1611, *per Joachimum Urſinum, Anti-Jeſuitam.*

(g) *Concionabatur ut plurimum octava hora, tantus erat populi concurſus, ut quarta, ſæpe etiam tertia noctis hora, vix in templo inveniretur commodus ad audiendum locus.* Hiſpan. Inquiſit. Secret. p. 254.

(b) He is called *Egidius* in the rem. [C].

" been a ghoſt. It was then ſet in a chair, with one of " its hands lifted up, with the other on the chair, the " whole being as artificially contrived as poſſible (9)."

(9) *Hiſt. des Martyrs*, folio 507.

The Latin Author, whom I quote in the following remarks, acknowledges alſo that Fontius, by his ſubtile anſwers, eluded the proſecution of the Inquiſition; but that he at laſt gave over all his ſubterfuges and evaſions, when his manuſcript was ſhewn him. *Raptus ad Inquiſitoriam arcem, etſi ex controverſiis præcedentibus omnium adverſariorum animos habebat vehementer exulceratos, tamen acutiſſimis ſuis reſponſis omnes eorum cavillos facilè, more ſuo, eludens, ad apertam fidei confeſſionem, ex qua periculum, ut ipſi exoptabant, crearetur, trahi non poterat: atque evaſiſſet tandem, ut ſæpè anteà, ipſorum manus, ni mirabili quodam Providentiæ ſuæ artificio rotundam confeſſionem veritatis ſuæ, Deus ab invito & modis omnibus tergiverſante extorſiſſet* (10). . . . . *Viſo hoc libro Conſtantinus interrogatus ab Inquiſitoribus, an propriam manum agnoſceret, quùm per multos dies, conquiſitis undique ſubterfugiis, conatus illorum eluſiſſit, agnoſcens porrò Dei voluntatem, quæ omnem tergiverſandi amplius occaſionem ſibi præcidiſſet, agnoſco (inquit) manum meam, ac proinde fateor, me iſta omnia ſcripſiſſe, quæ & vera eſſe ingenuè profiteor* (11). i. e. " Being forced away by the Inquiſition, though " he had ſtrongly animated his enemies againſt him, " by his former diſputes; he nevertheleſs, by his very " ſubtile anſwers, eaſily eluded their cavils; and " could not be prevailed upon to make an open con- " feſſion of his faith, by which they hoped to have " the opportunity they had ſo long wiſhed for, of " ruining him. He even would, at laſt, as he had " frequently done, have got ſafe from them, if God, " through a ſurprizing turn of his providence, in " ſpite of all his perpetual evaſions, had not forced " from him an ample confeſſion of his faith. . . . . " This book being ſhewn to Conſtantine, and the " Inquiſitors aſking him whether he knew his own " hand writing; after he had eluded all their at- " tempts, during many days, by numberleſs eva- " ſions, perceiving now it was God's will that he " ſhould no longer employ ſubterfuges; I acknow- " ledge, (ſays he) my hand-writing; and confeſs " that all theſe particulars were written by me, and " I ſincerely believe they are all true."

(10) *Hiſp. Inquiſit. Secretiora*, p. m. 262.

(11) Ibid. p. 264.

[D] *Our Conſtantine had been pretty wild in his youth.*] The words of the Latin Author are as follow: *Juventutem quidem tranſegit pro ſtudioſorum juvenum libera educatione non admodum laudatam, ſed quæ, quò minùs, quod ætatis ſubſequutum eſt, quàm laudatiſſimum extiteret, haud impedimento fuerit. Probatos enim ſatis mores, ut erat ingenio mirè feſtivo, & in jocis peracuto, una ſubinde jocandi licentia vel in provectiore ætate corrumpebat* (12). i. e. " As a liberal education had " been beſtowed upon him, he did not ſpend his " youth very laudably; but this did not prevent his " paſſing the ſucceeding years in a manner worthy " of the higheſt commendation. However, being " of a very pleaſant diſpoſition, and maſter of a " great fund of raillery, he ſometimes, even in his " more advanced years, prejudiced the good charac- " ter he otherwiſe had, by his ſharp jeſts." Had he not been endued with ſhining talents, which expoſed him to envy, he perhaps would never have been accuſed for thoſe faults of his youth: but having acquired great reputation by his eloquence and learning, he could not eſcape cenſure. His friends perſuaded him to diſpute for a Canonry (13), in the Metropolitan Church of Seville; and he had a competitor, who took it into his head to raiſe perſonal objections to him; and who raked together very induſtriouſly all the ſchool-boys tricks that might reflect an odium upon him, and every thing in general that deſerved cenſure in his juvenile conduct; his marriage, and an irregularity with regard to ordination, &c. *Competitor & eruditione & authoritate, & ipsâ demum gratiâ Capituli Conſtantino nullo modo comparandus, ad exceptiones perſonales conatus omnes convertens ſuſcitavit ei ineptias omnes juventutis ſuæ, contracta videlicet, antequam ſacris initiaretur, matrimonia, neque ritè ſacris initiatum, neque rectè atque ordine Magiſterii & Doctoratus inſignia accepiſſe* (14). It were to be wiſhed that young perſons, who flatter themſelves with one day making a figure in the world, would remember ſuch examples. This would be a reſtraint to them they; would be afraid, in the midſt of their glory, of being upbraided with the follies of their youth. Such perſons as might excuſe thoſe faults, would ſay, at the ſame time, that it were better they had not wanted ſuch indulgence. This is a diſagreeable circumſtance, and a ſubject of mortification of which an enemy makes the greateſt advantage.

(12) Ibid. p. 253.

(13) *Canonicatus Concionalis ſeu (ut vocant Magiſtralis.* Ibid. p. 259.

(14) Ibid. p. 261.

[E] *Could not forbear jeſting at the time that he refuſed it.*] The chapter of Toledo ſent a deputation to him, by which he was deſired to accept the place of Preacher at the Metropolitan Church. Conſtantine replied, that he was greatly obliged to them for the honour they did him, and that he would endeavour to be grateful for it; but that he would do nothing that might diſturb the repoſe of his anceſtors. *Cæterum parentum avorumque ſuorum oſſa ante multos annos ſepulta conquieſcere, ſe vero nolle quicquam admittere, occaſione cujus à ſancta illa quiete interturbarentur* (15). To underſtand this jeſt, the reader is to know that, at this time, the chapter of Toledo had a great quarrel with the Archbiſhop Siliceus, a perſon of mean extraction, and who had been raiſed, by favour, to that exalted employment (16). The Prelate in queſtion uſed to perſecute the chief Canons, and diſgraced them publickly, upon pretence of their being deſcended from Jewiſh families (17). He cauſed ſuch enquiries to be made as were injurious to the memory of a great many perſons, who had been buried an hundred years before, and in that manner diſturbed the repoſe of the dead. Fontius's joke

(15) *Hiſp. Inquiſit. Secretiora*, p. 255.

(16) *Qui ex aratro & glebis, neque virtute, neque eruditione, ſed (ſi ita dici licet) fortunæ potius temeritate ad ſummam totius Hiſpaniæ, ſecundum regem ipſum, dignitatem convolarat.* Ibid. p. 256.

(17) Ibid.

was forced to do a thing for which there was no precedent [*F*]. The director of the house of Doctrine, having there founded a theological lecture, our Constantine was raised to that employment, on which occasion he acquitted himself very well (*i*) [*G*]. The reader will find, in the remark [*C*], the catastrophe of his life; and in the last remark, a story he told to Cardan, concerning apparitions [*H*].

(*i*) Extracted from *Hispan. Inquisit. Secretiora*, p. 251 & *seq.*

joke hinted at that particular. *Ea occasione neque à centum annis sepultis parcebatur, inquirente malo archiepiscopo, & quidem sub prætextu religionis, in parentes, avos, atavos canonicorum, eosque ad originum rationes pessimè è suis sepulchris revocante. Eas non minus impias quàm stultas contentiones, ex sua ipsius vocatione occasione arrepta, Constantinus tempestivè admodum illo conciso Laconismo perstringebat* (18). The Reader will not be displeased to be informed, occasionally, of this part of Siliceus's history.

(18) Ibid. p. 256.

[*F*] *He was forced to do a thing for which there was no precedent.*] He ordered, once or twice, some wine and water to be brought him when in the pulpit, and drank a glass to recover his spirits. His auditors had so reverential an esteem for him, and he had acquired so great an authority over them, that they all excused this unprecedented action. *Delatus in templum viribusque adeò exhaustus, ut in medio concionis filo uno atque altero limphati vini haustu vires ad pergendum in concione reficeret, novam neque unquam anteà visam licentiam summâ viri tum gratiâ, tum authoritate, quâ pollebat, excusante* (19).

(19) Ibid. p. 258.

[*G*] *He was appointed to read the theological lectures ... on which occasion he acquitted himself very well.*] My Latin Author relates, that Pontius made admirable lectures on some of the books of scripture. I will quote his words, in order that the Reader may be the better informed of the circumstances of the compositions of this Protestant Spaniard. *Accepit primò Solamonis libros, Proverbia, Ecclesiasten, & Cantica canticorum, atque his mirabili eruditione explicatis, librum Jobi est aggressus, quem ultra medium interpretando perduxit. Extant ipsius in hos libros prælectiones omnes manu scriptæ opera Bab. diligentissimi cujusdam ex auditoribus exceptæ, quas cum vulgaverimus, deprehenso quanto intervallo post se relinquat eos omnes, qui hactenus in eos libros quippiam ediderunt, de summa viri eruditione certius judicari poterit* (20). i. e. "He first undertook "the books of Solomon, the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, "and the Song of Songs, and having displayed great "learning in explaining them, he then set about the "book of Job, and went through above half of it. "All his lectures on the abovementioned books "are still extant, all writ by a very diligent hand, "as taken from some of his auditors. When these "shall be published, it will then appear how far he "surpasses all who ever wrote any thing upon the "books in question: and the better judgment may "be formed of the learning of this extraordinary "man." It hereby appears, that there was a design to publish this work, and it accordingly was published. See the remark [*B*].

(20) Idem, ibid.

[*H*] *A story he told to Cardan concerning apparitions.*] In case what Cardan relates is true, our Constantine spoke of Apparitions, not on hearsay, but as an eye-witness. "*Vigebat olim in Hispania hæc ars* (Necromantia) *publicèque docebatur in Salamantica academia, nunc verò publicis legibus sublata est. Unde ibi aliqua adhuc artis experimenta supersunt. Narrabat mihi Don Constantinus Fontanus Hispanus theologus, & ab exomologesi Principis Philippi Hispaniarum, dum in Vagliadolit civitate Hispaniæ, in domo typographi, quæ male ob strepitus audiebat nocturnos, diversaretur, prima nocte incubum sensisse: sed cùm olivas nigras in cœna comedisset, naturale existimasse, cùm incubus inter morbos numeretur. Sequenti nocte super lecto videt auditque feles concertantes, quod quanquam durum videretur, quia tamen esse poterat, & hoc naturale esse duxit. Tertia autem nocte cùm nondum dormitum isset, de hisque dissereret, tubæ vocem quasi in aure audivit. Existimans sibili speciem esse, pueros videbat, qui ibi astabant ridentes: tum vox illa cubiculum circumire cœpit, perfectoque circuitu sub lecto se abdidit, ibi diu strepens, cùm nihil videretur* (21). i. e. "The "art of Necromancy was formerly very much practised "in Spain, and was taught publickly in the University "of Salamanca; but it is now suppressed by the laws, "and some instances of it are still remaining in that "country. I was told by Don Constantine Pontanus, "a Spanish Divine, and Confessor to Philip King of "Spain, that whilst he (Constantine) lodged at a "Printer's house in Valladolid, which was reported to "be haunted in the night-time, he was troubled with "the Night-mare the first time he lay there: but "that having eaten black olives for supper, he "thought it to be a natural effect of that, as the "Night-mare is judged to be a disease. The night "after he saw and heard cats clawing one another on "the bed, and though this was a very disagreeable "spectacle, yet as such a thing might be, he like-"wise did not look upon it as supernatural. On the "third night, being not yet fallen asleep, and pon-"dering these several things, he heard, as it were, "a trumpet in his ear: imagining this to be a kind "of whistling, he saw a company of boys who stood "laughing there. Then that voice began to wind "about the room; and having gone quite round, "went under the bed, where it long resounded, tho' "nothing was to be seen all the time." What Cardan relates concerning the schools of magic, that had formerly been in Spain, was asserted by a Magician mentioned by Thuanus. See the article TIRESIAS, remark [*K*].

(21) Card. *de Subtilit.* lib. 19. p. 691. edit. Lugd. 1580. in 8vo.

☞ POOLE (MATTHEW), a very learned Writer in the 17th Century, was born in the city of York (*a*) in the year 1624 (*b*). He was son of Francis Poole, Esq; of that city; and his grandfather was descended of the antient family of the Pooles of Sprinkhill in Derbyshire; and being obliged to retire from thence on account of his inclination to the Reformation, he lived at Sike-house, and afterwards at Drax-Abbey in Yorkshire, near which place Mr. Matthew Poole had an estate of 100*l. per ann.* left him by his father, who married the daughter of Alderman Toppin of York (*c*). Our Author was educated at Emanuel College in Cambridge, under the learned Dr. Worthington, and took the Degree of Master of Arts (*d*), in which Degree he was incorporated in the University of Oxford, July the 14th 1657 (*e*). He succeeded Dr. Anthony Tuckney in the Rectory of St. Michael le Quern in London, about the year 1648 (*f*). In 1658 he set on foot a project for maintaining youths of great parts, studiousness, and piety, at the Universities [*A*], and had the approbation of the heads of houses in

(*a*) Calamy's *Account of the Ministers, &c. ejected or silenced after the Restoration in* 1660. vol. 2. p. 14. edit. 1713.

(*b*) He was in his 56th year, when he died in Octob. 1670. Calamy's *Continuation of the Account*, p. 15.

(*c*) *Account*, ubi supra.

(*d*) Ibid.

(*e*) Wood, *Fasti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 118. 2d edit.

(*f*) Dr. Calamy tells us, that he had continued in it about 14 years, when he was ejected in 1662. *Continuation*, ubi supra.

[*A*] *In* 1658 *he set on foot a project for maintaining youths of great parts, studiousness and piety, at the Universities.*] He gives an account of this design in the following piece: *A Model for the maintaining of students of choice abilities at the University, and principally in order to the Ministry. Together with a Preface before it, and after it a Recommendation from the University; and two serious Exhortations recommended unto all the unfeigned lovers of piety and learning, and more particularly to those rich men, who desire to honour the Lord with their substance:* 1658 in 4to. The *Model* is dated April 1 1658, and is as follows. 1. That a subscription be made. 2. That because subscriptions of this nature, though happily begun, have hitherto failed, lest it should happen so in this case (whereby the whole design would be frustrated, and youths

(g) *Account*, ubi supra.
(b) Wood, *ubi ſupra*.

in both of them, and ſolicited the affair with ſo much vigour, that in a ſhort time 900*l. per ann.* was procured for that purpoſe; but this deſign was laid aſide at the Reſtoration (*g*). He was ejected from his living for Non-Conformity on St. Bartholomew's Day 1662 (*b*). He was ten years employed in finiſhing his *Synopſis Criticorum Bibliorum* (*i*), the (*i*) *Account*, ubi ſupra.

youths of excellent parts hopefully planted at the Univerſity forced to remove, beſides many other inconveniences) it is earneſtly deſired, that thoſe, whoſe eſtate will bear it, will ſubſcribe for eight years, or more, or for ever. 3. That the money collected be diſpoſed of by perſons choſen to be Truſtees, not exceeding the number of fifty, whereof thirty to be gentlemen or citizens of eminency, and twenty to be Miniſters in or within five miles of the city of London, of which number any ſeven to be a *Quorum*, whereof three to be Miniſters. And that theſe Truſtees do ſolemnly engage themſelves to proceed in all things without partiality, as they ſhall judge beſt for the publick good, and not be biaſſed by any favours or recommendations or reſpects whatſoever. And that when any Miniſter, who is a Truſtee dieth, or refuſeth to act further in the buſineſs, or removeth ten miles from the city of London, or by the reſt of the Truſtees is judged to deſerve diſmiſſion from this truſt, the reſt of the Truſtees, or any nine of them, (notice being given to the generality of the Truſtees of the meeting, and of the end of it) being met together, proceed to chooſe another. And that they ſolemnly engage themſelves to chooſe one, whom for piety, diſcretion, learning, fidelity, activity, publick ſpiritedneſs, ingenuity, and other neceſſary qualifications, they judge fit for the work. And that when any other of the Truſtees, to wit, gentlemen or citizens die, or refuſe to act further, or are by the reſt judged unfit to continue in this truſt; the reſt of the Truſtees or any nine of them, (notice being generally given to the Truſtees of the meeting, and of the end of it) being met together, proceed to chooſe another; and that they chooſe one of conſiderable quality, wiſdom, known integrity, and affection to the advancement of religion and learning. 4. That the Truſtees do chooſe a Treaſurer (being a perſon of unqueſtionable fidelity) from year to year upon the 21ſt day of March, to begin to exerciſe his truſt March the 25th following, who ſhall be accountable to the Truſtees once a quarter, or to any ſeven or more of them. And that the Treaſurer's diſcharge be ſufficient to any that ſhall pay the money. And that the Treaſurer ſhall not diſpoſe of any of the money, but according to the direction of the ſaid Truſtees or any ſeven of them, (whereof three to be Miniſters) met together for that purpoſe, (notice being generally given of ſuch a meeting) to be expreſſed in writing in a book to be kept for that uſe by one of the Truſtees appointed by the reſt. 5. That the Truſtees, or any five of them, (whereof three to be Miniſters) appointed by the reſt, or any nine of the reſt met together, notice ſtill being generally given to the Truſtees of the meeting, ſhall go about to ſchools in or within twenty miles of the city of London, or thereabouts; and ſhall confer with the ſchool-maſters, and out of ſix of the moſt ingenious boys being ſtrictly examined, two of the beſt be choſen. And ſo to go from one ſchool to another. And becauſe we would not have the benefit of this work confined to London, and the adjacent parts; but as we hope for help from divers perſons in the ſeveral countries; and as for the future any county is capable of enjoying ſuch Miniſters, as through God's bleſſing ſhall be ſent forth by the care of the Truſtees; ſo for the preſent we would have ingenious boys of any county to be capable of it; and therefore if any lad of rare parts from any place be recommended and found to be ſuch, that care may be taken to maintain him, and inſtruct him more perfectly in ſome eminent ſchool, where the Truſtees think fit, and ſo ſend him to the Univerſity; or that for this preſent time (but no more) the ſtudents be picked out of the moſt ingenious ſcholars of the firſt or ſecond year, that now are in the Univerſity, ſix out of twelve; and that more reſpect be had to their parts, than learning, ſeeing learning may be added. And that for ſuch as ſhall be choſen, if they have any parents or ſuch friends as have a power to diſpoſe of them, both the ſtudents and their parents, or ſuch friends, ſhall promiſe in writing, that they will ſubmit to the Truſtees for the education of ſuch ſtudents, both as to the manner of it and the time, as both are expreſſed in the model. 6. That the boys ſo choſen be ſent to the Univerſity, and be there placed under ſuch tutors as the Truſtees ſhall chooſe, who ſhall be men as near as may be, eminent both for godlineſs and learning, and care of their pupils; which tutors ſhall have for their encouragement four pounds a year for tuition for each of theſe ſtudents. That there they have ten, or fifteen, or twenty pounds a year allowed them, as the Truſtees ſhall think fit, till they be Bachelors of Arts; and, if need require, and the Truſtees ſee fit, that they be conſidered for their degree, (as alſo afterwards for their Maſter of Arts degree) and after they are Bachelors (if they have been very diligent, *&c.*) twenty or thirty pounds a year, as the Truſtees think fit. And that they ſhall be obliged to ſtudy to be eminent in the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and other Oriental languages, and in the ſeveral arts and ſciences, ſtill reſerving a power to the Truſtees to conſider the differences of the parts or diſpoſitions of lads, and accordingly to accommodate them as they ſee cauſe. And that over and beſides their ordinary Univerſity-exerciſes, they be tied to ſpecial exerciſes in theſe things, as ſhall be thought fit by the Truſtees, and ſuch learned men in the Univerſity, as they ſhall adviſe with, as the making of ſpeeches, verſes, epiſtles, *&c.* in the languages, holding diſputations, and making Lectures in the Mathematicks, Civil Law, *&c.* 8. That they have their allowance continued for eight years, and that they intend and direct their ſtudies towards the Miniſtry, and if contributions come in ſufficiently above what ſhall ſuffice for the yearly maintenance of twenty ſcholars at the Univerſity in order to the Miniſtry, ſome more eminently able be picked out of the reſt, (whoſe inclinations are rather to continue at the Univerſity, and who are fitter for it) who ſhall be allowed to take Fellowſhips, if it ſhall pleaſe any College to beſtow them upon them, and alſo have ſuch allowance as the Truſtees ſhall judge, (according to the excellency of their parts and learning, and the nature of their work, and their having or wanting other maintenance) upon theſe conditions: firſt, that they be obliged to take no pupils, if they are fellows, but by the conſent of the Truſtees, till they are Maſters of Arts, and then not too many. Secondly, that as every one's genius leads him, and as he is judged fit, ſo he principally proſecute ſome one kind of ſtudy, one to be the Linguiſt, and principally for Greek, and for Jewiſh and Rabbinical learning; another the Hiſtorian and Antiquary; another the Philoſopher and Mathematician; another the Polemical Divine, one or more; another the practical and caſuiſtical Divine; another the Univerſaliſt. Thirdly, that each of thoſe employ themſelves (when occaſions ſhall require, and the Truſtees ſhall reaſonably deſire) in ſuch works, as ſhall be uſeful and neceſſary. And if there be a ſufficiency of contributions above what ſhall ſuffice for thoſe before mentioned ends, the reſt be employed as the Truſtees ſhall think fit; provided always it be employed for the apparent advancement of learning and piety. And whereas divers, after they have been four years at the Univerſity, are forced through poverty to go away, before they commence Bachelors, or preſently after, and to enter into the Miniſtry, while they are raw; that a ſpecial regard be had to ſuch, as during thoſe four years have moſt approved themſelves, and are moſt eminent, both for learning and godlineſs, that they have an allowance for their degree, and alſo to ſupport them at the Univerſity three or four years more; provided it be beſtowed upon ſuch Bachelors, as do truly intend to enter into the Miniſtry. 9. That once in a year the Truſtees, or any five of them appointed by the reſt, whereof three to be Miniſters, go to the Univerſity, and there (with the help of ſome able Univerſity-man) find out their poſterity; that if any excell the reſt, *&c.* the Truſtees ſhall give them

the two firſt volumes of which were printed at London 1669 in folio, and three more afterwards. Beſides this great work, he publiſhed ſeveral other books [*B*]. While he was engaged in drawing up his *Synopſis* and *Annotations*, it was his common method to riſe very early in the morning, about three or four a clock, and take a raw egg about eight or nine, and another about twelve, and then continue his ſtudies till the afternoon was pretty far advanced; then he went abroad, and ſpent the evening at the houſe of ſome friend in chearful converſation (*k*). When Dr. Oates's Depoſitions concerning the Popiſh Plot were printed, Mr. Poole found his name in the liſt of thoſe perſons, who were to be cut off, on the account (as was ſuppoſed) of what he had written againſt the Papiſts in his *Nullity of the Romiſh Faith*. But he gave not the leaſt credit to this, till one night having been at Alderman Aſhurſt's, when he went home, he took one to bear him company; and when he came to the narrow paſſage, which leads from Clerkenwell to St. John's Court, there were two men ſtanding at the entrance, one of whom, as Mr. Poole came along, cried out to the other, *here he is*; upon which the other replied, *let him alone*,

(*k*) *Continuation*, p. 15, 16.

them ſuch encouragement as they ſhall ſee fit; and that if there be evidence of the idleneſs, or diſſoluteneſs, or any depravedneſs of any of them, the Truſtees, either then, or at any other time after admonition and trial for ſo long time, as they ſhall think fit, may withdraw the exhibition from them, and chooſe others in their place. 10. That once in a year there be two or three picked out of the Students by the Truſtees, to come up to London (their charges being born) to do ſome learned exerciſes in the city, if the Truſtees think fit, and as they think fit; that ſo the Contributors may ſee ſome fruit of their coſt, and others may be excited and encouraged. 11. That there be an accurate method of ſtudies preſcribed for them, (with ſome latitude for the variety of their genius's) that ſo no time may be loſt that way. 12. That their Tutors be deſired to have a ſpecial eye upon them, as to their godlineſs; and to preſs them to a diligent attendance upon all means publick and private conducing thereunto. 13. That after eight years well ſpent there, the Truſtees and Contributors do by themſelves and friends endeavour to promote them to a place anſwerable to their merit. 14. That the addition or alteration of circumſtances be left to the wiſdom of the Truſtees, or any nine, or more of them, whereof four to be Miniſters; provided that notice be given to the Truſtees generally of the meeting, and of the end for which the meeting is appointed; and provided always, that the ſubſtantials remain untouched, to wit, the bringing up of eminent ſcholars at the Univerſity, in order to the Miniſtry, and (if contributions come in ſufficiently) the leaving of others at the Univerſity, according to the eighth article. 15. That there be two or three choſen out of the Univerſity, who ſhall be intreated to take ſome inſpection over them. 16. That thoſe of the Truſtees, who ſhall be choſen by the reſt for any of the publick work, ſhall have their charges born them. And that all charges incidental to the work in the management of it, ſhall be allowed out of the ſtock. 17. "And although our great aim in this buſineſs is "the bringing up of ſcholars of eminent parts and "learning, and the ſupplying the church with choice "Miniſters, and ſuch as, through God's bleſſing, "may be pillars of the Church; yet becauſe the ordinary neceſſities of the Church are alſo to be provided for, eſpecially ſeeing the deplorable conditi- "on of Ireland and Wales, and ſome deſolate parts "of England, cries loud for our aſſiſtance; the Truſtees therefore (after proviſion made for the fore- "mentioned branches of the deſign) ſhall endeavour "to take care about the maintenance of poor ſcholars "of competent abilities and good inclinations (though "it may be not eminent parts) at the Univerſity, "and ſhall allow them what they ſee fit. And ſuch "Lads, as alſo their parents, or ſuch friends as have "the diſpoſe of them, before they be admitted, "ſhall in writing engage themſelves to be willing to "be diſpoſed of by the Truſtees, and to be ſent into "Ireland or Wales, or ſome deſtitute parts of England, as the exigencies of the Church require; "provided always, that they ſhall not be ſent to any "ſuch places, unleſs there be competent encouragement "for them, of which the Truſtees ſhall be Judges. "18. For our brethren in any counties, who ſhall "be pleaſed to contribute to this work, we deſire, "that to their former favour they would add this, to "take ſome care for the payment of their monies in "London quarterly; and either to appoint ſome per- "ſons in London, from whom it may be expected "quarterly, or elſe to ſend it in to the Treaſurer."

Then follows a Teſtimonial in favour of the model, ſigned by ſeveral Heads of Houſes in Cambridge, viz. *John Worthington*, *John Arrowſmith*, *Anthony Tuckney*, *Benjamin Whichcot*, *Ralph Cudworth*, and *William Dillingham*.

[*B*] *He publiſhed ſeveral other books.*] I. *The Blaſphemer ſlain with the ſword of the Spirit: or, a Plea for the Godhead of the Holy Ghoſt, wherein the Deity of the Spirit is proved againſt the Cavils of* John Biddle. Lon. 1654, in 12mo. II. *A Model for the maintaining of Students*, mentioned in the remark [*A*]. III. *A Letter to the Lord Charles Fleetwood.* London 1659, in one ſheet in 4to. It was delivered to Fleetwood, on the 13th of December the ſame year, in reference to the juncture of affairs at that time. IV. Quo Warranto: *A moderate Debate about the preaching of unordained Perſons; Election, Ordination, and the Extent of the Miniſterial Relation, in Vindication of the* Jus Divinum Miniſterii, *from the Exceptions of that late piece*, entitled, The Preacher ſent. London 1659, in 4to. Written by the appointment of the Provincial Aſſembly at London. V. *Evangelical Worſhip*, a ſermon preached before the Lord Mayor, Auguſt the 26th, 1660, London 1660, in 4to. VI. *Vox Clamantis in Deſerto*; a Latin piece written on occaſion of the ejectment of the Miniſters for Non-conformity in 1662. VII. *The Nullity of the Romiſh Faith: or, a Blow at the Root of the Romiſh Church; being an Examination of that fundamental Doctrine of the Church of Rome, concerning the Churches Infallibility, and of all thoſe ſeveral Methods, which their moſt famous and approved Writers have uſed for the Defence thereof. Together with an Appendix tending to the Demonſtration of the Solidity of the Proteſtant Faith; wherein the Reader will find all the material Objections and Cavils of their moſt conſiderable Writers, viz.* Richworth (*alias* Ruſhworth) *in his* Dialogues, White *in his treatiſe* de Fide *and his* Apology for Tradition, Creſſy *in his* Exomologeſis, S. Clara *in his* Syſtema Fidei, *and Captain* Everard *in his late Account of his pretended Converſion to the Church of Rome, diſcuſſed and anſwered.* By Matthew Poole, *Miniſter of the Goſpel.* Oxford 1666, in 8vo, and London 1679, in 8vo. The *Epiſtle Dedicatory* to Arthur, Earl of Donegal, Lord Viſcount Chicheſter of Carickfergus, is dated Sept. 1665. In the *Preface* he tells us, that if he "had known of any Author, "who had in ſo ſhort a compaſs and plain method "contracted and diſſolved the ſtrength of the Popiſh "Cauſe in this great point, he had willingly ſuperſeded. Nor did I, *ſays he*, intrude myſelf into this "work, but was invited to it by divers worthy and "learned friends, and afterwards incouraged in it by "the approbation of ſuch perſons, whoſe Judgments "I think almoſt all the learned part of England doth "reverence. Here is a new plea, viz. concerning "the ſufficiency of the teſtimony of the preſent "church, and the infallibility of the oral tradition, "not at all conſidered by Mr. *Chillingworth*, nor "fully diſcuſſed by any other that I know of, except "the ingenious Lord *Falkland*, who handles it quite "another way, and hath left room for ſome glean- "ings

alone, for there is ſomebody with him. As ſoon as they were paſſed, Mr. Poole aſked his companion, whether he had heard what thoſe men ſaid; he anſwered, that he had. *Well*, replied Mr. Poole, *I had been murdered to night, had not you been with me.* This made him give heed to what he had diſregarded before, and raiſed in him ſuch an apprehenſion of his danger, as cauſed him ſoon to retire into Holland (*l*), where he died about the middle of October 1679 (*m*), in the 56th year of his age (*n*). Dr. Calamy tells us (*o*), that whether he died by a natural death, has been doubted by ſeveral; and that the ſtory above related, which came from Mr. Charley, who was Mr. Poole's companion, when he was laid in wait for, confirms the ſuſpicion. He was interred in a vault under the Church, which belongs to the Engliſh Merchants at Amſterdam (*p*). Mr. Wood obſerves (*q*), that he left behind him the character of *clariſſimus Criticus & Caſuiſta*, i. e. "A very celebrated Critic and Caſuiſt;" and Dr. Calamy tells us, that he was "very facetious in converſation, very true to his friend, very ſtrict in his piety, "and univerſal in his charity."

(*l*) *Continuation*, p. 16.

(*m*) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(*n*) *Continuation*, p. 15.

(*o*) Ibid. p. 16.

(*p*) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(*q*) *Account*, ubi ſupra.

" ings after his harveſt. Nor is it debated by Mr. " *Stillingfleet*, whoſe Adverſaries led him to things " of another nature. And beſides it is known to di- " vers, that this treatiſe was prepared for the preſs " before Mr. *Stillingfleet*'s excellent diſcourſe came " out, though retarded by ſome unhappy occur- " rences, which it is needleſs here to recount." He then takes notice, that *the Papiſts will pretend, that the Doctrines, which he charges upon them, and the Teſtimonies, which he alledges againſt them, are only the particular opinions of private Doctors, and not of the whole Church.* His Defence is this; 1. *The Authors, which are here introduced, are not pedantic Writers, but ſuch as are of prime note and higheſt eſteem in the church of Rome, and the moſt zealous and conſiderable champions of their cauſe, and ſuch, for the generality of them, whoſe writings came forth with the character of their church's approbation upon them; concerning whom it will be very difficult to perſuade any intelligent man, either that ſuch perſons did not underſtand the ſenſe of the church of Rome, as well as the Objector; or that they did knowingly contradict the Doctrine of their church, or would be permitted ſo to do, without any cenſure upon them.* 2. *The teſtimonies of thoſe Authors are undoubtedly ſufficient for that end, for which I alledge them; which is to ſhew the falſeneſs of thoſe doctrines, and the weakneſs of thoſe arguments, which are diſbelieved and diſproved by their own learneded and ſtouteſt champions; by which it may appear to all impartial perſons, that it is not the ignorance nor prejudice of Proteſtants, (as ſome of their Writers have the effrontery to aſſert,) which make them reject the Popiſh tenets; but merely the want of truth and evidence therein, confeſſed, (as you will ſee all along in the following treatiſe) by their own brethren; and that it is a deſperate madneſs in any Papiſt to hazard his everlaſting concernments upon ſuch principles, as ſo many of their acuteſt ſcholars do publickly diſavow. And that this is really the caſe of the unhappy Romaniſt, I refer thee to the ſubſequent diſcourſe.* VIII. *Dialogues between a Popiſh Prieſt and an Engliſh Proteſtant, wherein the principal points and arguments of both Religions are truly propoſed and fully examined.* London 1667, in 8vo, reprinted ſeveral times afterwards. IX. *A ſeaſonable Apology for Religion, on* Matth. xi. 19. London 1673, in 4to. X. Some ſermons of his are publiſhed in the volumes of the *Morning Exerciſe*; one upon the *Satisfaction of Chriſt* in that at St. Giles's; another about the right method of application to the ſick, for their good, on the part of Miniſters and People, in that at Cripplegate; another upon *Detraction* in the *Supplement to the Morning Exerciſe at Cripplegate*; and another *againſt an external and infallible Judge in the Church of God*, in that againſt Popery. XI. He wrote a Poem and two Epitaphs upon Mr. Jeremy Whitaker; two others upon the death of Mr. Richard Vines; and another on the death of Mr. Jacob Stock. XII. He wrote a Preface to twenty poſthumous Sermons of Mr. Nalton's, together with ſome account by way of character of him. XIII. He alſo wrote a volume of *Engliſh Annotations on the Holy Scripture*; but was prevented by death from going farther than the 58th chapter of Iſaiah. Others undertook to complete that work. Mr. Wood (1) has miſtaken their names; for he mentions Dr. *Bates*, Dr. *Jacomb*, Mr. *Clarkſon*, and Mr. *Alſop*, as perſons concerned in it; and ſays, that he does not doubt but that Dr. *John Owen* alſo had his ſhare it. But we ſhall give a true liſt of the perſons who completed that work, from Dr. Calamy (2). The 59th and 60th chapters of Iſaiah were done by Mr. *Jackſon* of Moulſey. The notes on the reſt of *Iſaiah* and on *Jeremiah* and *Lamentations* were drawn up by Dr. *Collinges*: *Ezekiel* by Mr. *Hurſt*; *Daniel* by Mr. *Cooper*; the *Minor Prophets* by Mr. *Hurſt*; the *four Evangeliſts* by Dr. *Collinges*; the *Acts* by Mr. *Vinke*; the Epiſtle to the *Romans* by Mr. *Mayo*; the two Epiſtles to the *Corinthians* and that to the *Galatians* by Dr. *Collinges*; that to the *Epheſians* by Mr. *Veale*; the Epiſtles to the *Philippians* and *Coloſſians* by Mr. *Adams*; the Epiſtles to *Timothy*, *Titus*, and *Philemon*, by Dr. *Collinges*; that to the *Hebrews* by Mr. *Obadiah Hughes*; the Epiſtle of St. *James*, two Epiſtles of St. *Peter*, and the Epiſtle of St. *Jude*, by Mr. *Veale*; three Epiſtles of St. *John* by Mr. *Howe*; and the Book of the *Revelations* by Dr. *Collinges*. Theſe *Annotations* were printed at London 1685, in two volumes in folio. T.

(1) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 747. 2d edit.

(2) *Account*, p. 15.

POPE (JOAN), held the Holy See, they ſay, between Leo IV. who died the 17th of July 855, and Benedict III. who died the 8th of April 858. It is by no means probable that Anaſtaſius the Librarian, who lived in that Century, mentioned this woman-Pope [*A*]. Several perſons think that Marianus Scotus, who lived two hundred years

[*A*] *It is by no means probable that Anaſtaſius the Librarian . . . . . mentioned this woman-Pope.*] There are nevertheleſs ſome Manuſcripts of that Anaſtaſius, which contain the whole ſtory; but that alone is no proof; for it cannot be denied that Tranſcribers have added many things to an Author's works, which were not in the original. Panvini aſſerts, that *in the old books containing the lives of the Popes, written by Damaſus, by the Librarian, and by Pandulphus of Piſa, that woman is not at all mentioned, but only in the margin, between Leo IV. and Benedict III. where that ſtory is inſerted by a later Author, written in another hand quite different from the reſt* (1). Blondel, who has ſeen in the King of France's Library a manuſcript of Anaſtaſius, which contains the ſtory of the woman-Pope, has found that that paſſage is certainly an additional piece tacked to the original. *Having read it over and over again,* ſays he (2), *I have found that the elogium of the pretended woman-Pope is expreſſed in the very words of Martinus Polonus* (3), *Penitentiary to Innocent IV. and Archbiſhop of Coſenza, an Author who lived four hundred years after Anaſtaſius, and who was beſides ſo credulous as to relate all ſorts of fabulous ſtories. for that no man may imagine that he tranſcribed what he has inſerted in his Chronicle, either from Anaſtaſius, or from any other Author who lived ſince the year* 900, *it muſt be obſerved, that the very diſcourſe, which is ſo wretchedly foiſted into Anaſtaſius's work, proves its own ſpuriouſneſs, both by its agreeing perfectly with Martinus Polonus's ſtyle, and by the very things he ſuppoſes, without fearing leſt they ſhould ſerve to convict him of impoſture.* He gives ſome inſtances of theſe things, and then

(1) Onuph. *in Addit. ad Plat.* quoted by Coeffeteau, *Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité*, p. 506.

(2) Blondel, *Eclairciſſement de la Queſtion, Si une Femme a eſte aſſiſe au Siege Papal de Rome, &c.* p. 6 and 7.

(3) We ſhall examine this in the rem. [*K*].

years after, is the firſt who mentioned her. Some others imagine that he did not ſay

then he adds a moſt ſolid argument, which is that the ſtory of the woman-Pope is inconſiſtent with Anaſtaſius's account of Benedict the Third's Election. " The Elogiums of Leo IV. and Benedict III. as they " are contained in the manuſcript of the Royal Li- " brary, ſwelled as it is with the ſtory of the woman- " Pope, are expreſſed in the ſame words as they are " in the edition of Mentz; whence it follows una- " voidably that (according to Anaſtaſius's intention, " violated by the bold attempt of thoſe who inter- " mixed their own dreams with his narration) it is " abſolutely impoſſible any perſon ſhould have held " the See of Rome between Leo IV. and Benedict III. " for he obſerves that *after the Prelate Leo was taken* " *out of this world, the whole Clergy*, the chief of the " men, and the people of Rome *reſolved*, mox, *imme-* " *diately to elect Benedict, that they went immediately* " illico, *to meet him who was praying in St. Caliſtus's* " *Chapel*, and that after *they had placed him on the* " *Pontifical Throne*, and ſigned the Decree of his " Election, *they ſent him to the moſt invincible Emperors* " *Lotharius and Lewis*, the firſt of whom (according " to the unanimous teſtimony of all the contemporary " Writers) died the 29th of September 855, 74 days " after Pope Leo (4)." Is it not true that if we read in a manuſcript, that the Emperor Ferdinand II. died in the year 1537, and that Ferdinand III. ſucceeded him immediately, and that Charles VI. ſucceeded to Ferdinand II. and held the Empire two years, after which Ferdinand III. was elected Emperor, we would ſay, it is impoſſible that the ſame Writer ſhould have ſaid all this, and that the Tranſcribers muſt have impertinently joined together what was related by different perſons? Muſt not a man be mad or drunk, or dreaming, who ſhould relate, that Innocent X. being dead, Alexander VII. was directly appointed to ſucceed him, that Innocent XI. was Pope immediately after Innocent X. and kept the See above two years, and that Alexander VII. ſucceeded him? Anaſtaſius the Librarian had been guilty of ſuch a piece of extravagancy, if he were the Author of all that is to be met with in the manuſcripts of his works, which mention the woman-Pope. Let us conclude therefore that all that relates to that woman is a ſpurious piece, which comes from another hand.

(4) Blondel, *Eclairciſſement, &c.* p. 9, 10.

Monſieur Sarrau, a zealous Proteſtant and a learned man, paſſed the ſame judgment, after he had examined the manuſcript of the King's Library with the utmoſt attention. He inferred from the account which is given there of Benedict the Third's being elected immediately after the death of Leo X. that the ſtory of the woman-Pope was tacked to it by a man who made an ill uſe of his leiſure (5) He expreſſed himſelf to that purpoſe in the letters he wrote to Salmaſius, and ſupported his opinion by ſeveral other arguments. *Venio ad Papiſſam. Quicquid de Papiſſâ confidentius dicas, intricatiſſimum eſt omne id negotium. Sederit illa, nec ne, longior eſt diſquiſitio, nec unius Epiſtolæ. Jam autem quæro tantum, num Anaſtaſii Bibliothecarii legitimus ſit fœtus Vita illa, quam apud te nuper tranſmiſi. Ut eam cenſeam* ὑποξολιμαῖον, *præter allatas jam rationes, hæ ſuadent* (6). i. e. " I " come now to the woman-Pope. Whatever you " may ſay of her with any confidence, this is a very " perplexed queſtion. It would be too long to exa- " mine whether ſhe exiſted or not, nor can it be exa- " mined in one ſingle letter. I will only enquire at " preſent, whether Anaſtaſius the Librarian be the " Author of that life, which I have ſent you lately, " or not. I am perſuaded that it was a mere addi- " tion, not only from the reaſons I have already " urged, but alſo from the following." One of theſe reaſons ſeems to me a demonſtration. The ſtory of the woman-Pope is not ſet down in the manuſcript of Anaſtaſius, as a matter of fact, the truth of which the Author warrants, but he uſes the expreſſions, *it is aſſerted that*, &c. *it is ſaid that*, &c. Would a contemporary Author ſettled at Rome, ſpeak thus of a Pope's life, the events of which were ſo ſtrange and ſurprizing, as thoſe of that pretended woman-Pope's were? *Si Anaſtaſius hanc Hiſtoriam conſcripſit, rem ſua ætate, ſe vivo & Romæ degente, geſtam literis mandavit. Atque de re tamquam parum comperta, & ſibi tantùm ex famâ cognitâ loquitur hic Auctor cum ait*, ut aſſeritur, ut dicitur. *Qui ità loquitur, non curat ſuo teſtimonio fidem haberi, quaſi dicat*, credat qui voluerit, fides ſit penes Auctores. *An autem credibile eſt virum doctum & ſagacem de adeo ſingulari ſui temporis eventu, non inquiſiviſſe diligenter, ut ad poſteros res notabiles, utque maximè in dubiâ fide cum ſuis omnibus circumſtantiis, dimanaret* (7)? i. e. " If " Anaſtaſius wrote that ſtory, he was giving an ac- " count of what happened in his time, during his " life, and whilſt he lived at Rome. But that Au- " thor ſpeaks of it as of an uncertain fact, which he " had only from common report, ſince he ſays, *as it* " *aſſerted, as it is related.* An Author, who ſpeaks " thus, does not care that men ſhould give any credit " to his teſtimony, as though he had ſaid, *believe it,* " *who will, let the Authors of the report anſwer for it.* " But is it probable, that a man of learning and " judgment, ſhould not have examined matters care- " fully, that the moſt remarkable events, eſpecially " thoſe which ſeem to be incredible, might be tranſ- " mitted down to poſterity with all their circum- " ſtances?" I do not think that at this time any Author, nay, though he lived in the remoteſt parts of the North, would be capable to uſe theſe expreſſions, *they ſay, it is reported*, if he were relating that Alexander VII. ſucceeded to Innocent X. and Clement IX. to Alexander VII. Theſe are facts, which cannot be darkened but by a long ſucceſſion of years; they are always attended with a full certainty, ſo that no man can be ſilly enough to relate them from an hearſay.

(5) *Inde patet quod de ea* (Joanna) *ibi dictum eſt, aſſumentum eſſe hominis otio abuſi.* Sarravii Epiſt. 138. p. 144. edit. *ult.* 1697.

(6) Idem, *Epiſt.* 140. p. 145.

(7) Idem, ibid. p. 146. See alſo *Epiſt.* 146. p. 151.

Theſe are ſuch ſtrong reaſons to perſuade us, that Anaſtaſius did not mention the woman-Pope, that if a man would refute them, it is not enough for him to urge that there are ſeveral manuſcripts which agree with that in the King of France's library (8); he would be obliged to produce the very original of Anaſtaſius: for in ſuch a caſe, rather than to argue and diſpute, men would chooſe to believe on the credit of their own eyes, that that Author made himſelf ridiculous, by relating inconſiſtent facts, and uſing moſt ſillily an *hear-ſay*. To object that that Writer is not accurate, and that there are variations and inconſiſtencies in his accounts (9), is not untying the knot; for it is certain that no inference can be drawn from thence with regard to thoſe things of which he was an eye-witneſs. They who write the Hiſtory of paſt ages conſult ſeveral Authors, and borrow one thing from one, and another from another. So that if they want judgment, they tack inconſiſtent facts together. But this never happens to them with regard to events which are freſh and new, and ſo remarkable as the inſtallations of the Popes. As to thoſe who aſſert, that the particles *mox* and *illico* have been inſerted into the text of Anaſtaſius by another hand (10), they muſt be anſwered, that by ſuch an evaſion a man might reject all the authorities which puzzle him, and hiſtory would be reduced to a frightful ſcepticiſm. There is another reaſon, but a very ſtrong one, which does not ſuffer us to admit the conjecture of thoſe men, and which is, that there are proofs grounded on paſſages in other contemporary Authors, from which it appears that Benedict III. was the immediate ſucceſſor of Leo IV. and that the interval between the death of the one, and the inſtallation of the other, was but ſhort (11). It is therefore reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that Anaſtaſius uſed the particles we have mentioned.

(8) See Colomies, in his *Melanges Hiſtoriques*, p. 56.

(9) Mareſius, *in Examine Quæſt. de Papa Fœmina*, p. 31, 32, 155; and Coocke, *Traite de la Papeſſe*, p. 106 *& ſeq.*

(10) Mareſius, ibid, p. 156, 176.

(11) See Blondel, *Eclairciſſement, &c.* p. 39 *& ſeq.* and Father Labbe, *in Cœnotaphio everſo*, p. 848 *& ſeq.* Tom. *de Script. Eccleſ.*

An EXAMINATION of what Salmaſius uſed to ſay concerning the edit. of Anaſtaſius, publiſhed by the Jeſuits of Mentz.

Let us examine a fact, which has made a great noiſe, and is grounded, I think, only on the converſations of Salmaſius. " Marc Velſer, one of the chief " Magiſtrates of Augſburg, having ſent to the Jeſu- " its of Mentz in the year 1601, the manuſcripts of " Anaſtaſius, in order to have it printed; they de- " ſired Marquardus Freherus, Counſellor to his Elec- " toral Highneſs at Heidelberg, to aſſiſt them in that " undertaking: they having promiſed him that they " would faithfully publiſh all that ſhould be commu- " nicated to them, he ſent them two manuſcripts of " Anaſtaſius, which had the life of the pretended " woman-Pope. But thoſe Gentlemen got only two " copies printed with that life, and omitted in all the " reſt

" reſt of the edition, what had been ſent to them: " ſo that that Life was not printed in the other co- " pies, and Freherus has been obliged to complain, " in a kind of Manifeſto which he cauſed to be print- " ed, of the trick they had played him (12)." This is what Blondel heard Salmaſius ſay in the year 1640 (13). *I was moſt particularly ſorry*, continues he (14), *that as no man could ſhew Freherus's Manifeſto, nor the copies which the Jeſuits cauſed to be printed for him, nor the manuſcripts which he furniſhed them with from the library of Heidelberg, which have no doubt been buried in the ruins of the Palatinate, or carried by the Bavarians whither ſoever they pleaſed, it ſhould be thus out of our power to know what they contained.* Meſſieurs Rivet (15), Sarrau (16), Des Marets (17), Spanheim (18), and Boecler (19), heard Salmaſius ſay the ſame thing, and they have been ſure, on his credit, to charge the Jeſuits of Mentz with foul play in this caſe. It muſt paſs for an unqueſtionable matter of fact, that Salmaſius ſaid what is aſcribed to him; but it may be queſtioned, whether his memory, how good ſoever it was, did not miſlead him. It would be much more civil and charitable to impute that defect to him, than to accuſe him of impoſture, as Father Labbe does (20). However it be, if Salmaſius's ſtory were true, we ſhould have here the ſtrongeſt prodigy, that ever appeared in the world. The Jeſuits would have committed a notorious fraud in a point controverted between the Catholicks and the Proteſtants; Marquardus Freherus being moſt baſely impoſed upon in that affair, would have complained of it to the publick; he would have had the eaſieſt and moſt unexceptionable method, a man can wiſh for, who has a mind to load a deteſted impoſtor with infamy; he might have ſhewed all the world, how the manuſcripts agreed with the two copies, that were ſent him as a preſent, and how theſe two copies differed from all the reſt, and yet there would not have been one ſingle Author, who mentioned that notorious and publick cheat of the Jeſuits. Du Pleſſis Mornai, whoſe literary correſpondence extended over the whole Proteſtant world, and who had a moſt particular intelligence in the Palatinate, muſt have been unacquainted with that printed letter of Marquardus Freherus; for he has not mentioned it in the chapter concerning Pope Joan (21). Rivet, who of all men was the moſt curious of all books of controverſy, would not have been better informed than Du Pleſſis Mornai, when he refuted Coeffeteau who denied the ſtory of that woman-Pope. Conrad Deckher, who publiſhed a book in the Palatinate to ſupport that fable, would have known nothing of that ſtory of the edition of Anaſtaſius. One Urſinus, who took upon him the title of the Anti-Jeſuit, and who publiſhed in the ſame country ſeveral very ſatyrical works againſt the Jeſuits, would have ſaid nothing of that ſtory. David Pareus, Profeſſor at Heidelburg, who was continually diſputing with the Jeſuits, and particularly with ſome Fathers of the College of Mentz, would have ſpared them in that reſpect, though the war between them was carried on with the utmoſt bitterneſs. The controverſies between the Proteſtants and the Jeſuits were never managed with more heat and paſſion, eſpecially in Germany, than during the thirty firſt years of the 17th Century, and in the infinite number of books of controverſy and of libels, which were publiſhed againſt the Jeſuits during that time, there would not be one ſingle book, in which they are charged with the fraud committed in the edition of Anaſtaſius. Whence could ſo univerſal a moderation ariſe? Would they have made it a law to themſelves at Heidelberg, ſince the printing of the edition of Anaſtaſius in 1602, to the ruin of the Library in 1622, never to ſhew to any men the copies of which the Jeſuits had made a preſent, and to prevent their being collated with the other copies? Did all men agree to burn Marquardus Freherus's publick complaint, and even to forget it entirely? How comes it, that Salmaſius, the only perſon who had not that gift of forgetfulneſs, never mentioned that impoſtor in the works he publiſhed, and would ſpeak of it only to his friends in converſation? The queſtions one might aſk upon that ſubject are infinite: Father Labbe has urged ſome of them moſt unmercifully, and in the moſt unanſwerable manner againſt Monſieur Des Marets (22). Theſe queſtions ariſe naturally in every one's mind, and yet it does not appear that any of thoſe learned men, who publiſhed what Salmaſius told them by word of mouth, concerning the conſequences of that edition of Mentz, ever thought of propoſing thoſe queſtions to him. Spanheim, who was not unacquainted with Father Labbe's objections, did not anſwer any thing whatſoever. I wonder, and do not wonder at it in different reſpects. But though I be but a dwarf, if compared with thoſe Coloſſus's, I think, that if I had had the honour to hear Salmaſius ſay what he told them, I would have deſired him to give me ſome reaſons for that prodigious ſilence of all the Authors, who wrote againſt the Jeſuits ſince the year 1602. See the margin (23).

If an honeſt man ſhould tell me for certain, that in the year 1664 he heard Monſieur Arnauld ſay, what I am going to relate, I would anſwer him boldly thus: I believe that Monſieur Arnauld told that ſtory, ſince you aſſure me of it, as having heard it yourſelf: but I do not believe that what he told you is true; it is one of thoſe general diſcourſes held in converſation, in which things are moſt wretchedly confounded and blended together. We have a thouſand inſtances of it in the Scaligerana and in the Menagiana. Here follows the ſtory, which I frame and ſuppoſe with no other view but to make a compariſon.

In the year 1644 (24) Meſſieurs du Puy ſent from Rome to the Jeſuits a manuſcript of a Council, in which there was a deciſive paſſage in favour of the efficacious Grace. The Jeſuits had given their word of honour, that they would omit nothing that was in the manuſcript: they cauſed two copies to be printed faithfully from it, and left the deciſive paſſage out of all the reſt. They ſent the manuſcripts back to Meſſieurs du Puy, and made them a preſent of the copies, which were not falſified. Meſſieurs du Puy coming to know the impoſtor, complained of it in a letter that was printed. This is what I ſuppoſe Monſieur Arnauld told very ſeriouſly in the year 1664.

There is no man of ſenſe but ought to have aſked him, how it happened that no body ever boaſted to have ſeen Meſſieurs du Puy's letter? How comes it, that they have not called upon the Jeſuits to ſend ſome perſons to be preſent at an aſſembly in which the manuſcript ſhall be collated with the true copies they had ſent as a preſent, and with the reſt of the edition? Why have they not drawn up an authentick deed before a publick notary, that they might have a moſt unqueſtionable proof of the fraud? And you, who have wrote ſo much againſt the Jeſuits, why have you never charged them with falſifying the manuſcript of a Council? Since the controverſy about Janſeniſm produced ſo many works againſt the Jeſuits, how comes it that there is not one ſingle Author, who complained of the omiſſion of that paſſage? What head of Meduſa has ſo benumbed the hand and the memory of an infinite number of Anti-Moliniſts, that none of them ever printed the leaſt thing upon that ſubject. Is it that they entered into a confederacy together, to ſpare the Jeſuits the diſgrace which they deſerve? But why ſhould they ſpare them in this reſpect, ſince they omit nothing that can give them the leaſt advantage over thoſe adverſaries? Laſtly, is it any ways probable, that men who muſt at leaſt earneſtly wiſh that they be not ſurprized in the fact, would have impoſed upon Meſſieurs du Puy in ſo groſs a manner, that the cheat muſt unavoidably be diſcovered to the eternal ſhame of their whole ſociety?

It is impoſſible to remove thoſe difficulties; they make ſo deep an impreſſion on the mind, that unleſs a man be entirely blinded by a fantaſtical prepoſſeſſion in favour of Monſieur Arnauld's honeſty, and the certainty of his memory, he will always think his ſtory as a mere fiction.

But though Salmaſius's ſtory were true, it would ſignify nothing as to the main point. For what has been obſerved with regard to the manuſcript of the French King's Library, would be equally ſtrong againſt the manuſcript of the Palatine Library. One might prove by the ſame arguments, that ſtory of the woman-Pope has been foiſted into both thoſe manuſcripts, and conſequently that Anaſtaſius is not the Author

(12) Blondel, *Eclairciſſement*, &c. p. 3 and 4.

(13) Blondel meant Salmaſius, as Colomies obſerves, *Melanges Hiſt.* p. 55, 56.

(14) Blondel, *Eclairciſſement*, &c. p. 5.

(15) Rivet. *Crit. Sacri*, lib. 3. cap. 14. See alſo Spanhem. *de Papa fœmina*, p. 292.

(16) Idem, ibid.

(17) Mareſius, *in Examine Quæſtionis*, p. 178.

(18) Spanhem. *de Papa fœmina*, p. 292.

(19) Boecler, *in Commentar. de Rebus Seculi noni, apud* Spanhem. ibid.

(20) Philippus Labbe, *in Cenotaphio everſo*, p. 929 & *ſeq.*

(21) In his *Myſtere d'Iniquité*, printed in the year 1611.

(22) Labbe, *in Cenotaphio everſo*, p. 929 & *ſeq.*

(23) Daniel Francus, p. 145, *de Indicibus Librorum expurgandorum*, relates all Father Labbe's objections; and the only anſwer he makes is, his deſiring thoſe, who may have Freherus's Letter, to produce it.

(24) I ſuppoſe that time here, and then the year 1664, as the year in which Monſieur Arnauld told the ſtory; that the parallel may be more exact, there being twenty years between the edition of Anaſtaſius and the deſtruction of that library of Heidelberg.

say one word of her [B]; however it be, what he obſerves is very inconſiderable; for he only takes notice that in the year 853, *Joan a woman*, ſucceeded Pope Leo IV. *and ſate two years, five months, and four days* (a). Sigebertus, who died in the year 1113, gave a more

(a) See Blondel, p. 17. of the *Eclairciſſement de la Queſtion, Si une Femme a eſté aſſiſe au Siege Papal de Rome.*

thor of it. We ſhall ſee hereunder (25) what may be inferred from the ſilence of contemporary Authors.

(25) In the rem. [G].

[B] *Several perſons think that Marianus Scotus . . . . is the firſt who mentioned her. Some others imagine that he did not ſay a word of her.*] Let us quote Coeffeteau. "Several learned men, who eſteem Marianus Scotus "a pretty good Chronologer, ſuſpect the Lutherans "of falſifying the copy from which they printed his "work. For it is certain that that ſtory is not to be "met with in the antient manuſcripts. And Miræus, "a Canon of Antwerp, a man of learning, and par- "ticularly well verſed in Hiſtory, who has lately "publiſhed Sigebertus, aſſerts that there is an old "manuſcript of Marianus, written on parchment, "which the Reverend Abbot of Gemblours, named "*Ludovicus Sombechus*, has ſent him, in which that "ſtory of the pretended woman-Pope has not been "inſerted, either in the text, or in the margin; "which is alſo teſtified by him, who publiſhed the "Krantzius at Cologne (26). Nay, Serrarius ſays, "that he ſaw at Francfort a manuſcript, in the hands "of Latomus, who ſhewed it him, in which the ſtory "is not related in a poſitive manner, as in that of "Baſil, which the Calviniſt Heroldus has publiſhed, "but from a common report, *ut aſſeritur* (27)." You muſt obſerve, that the edition of Marianus, which Heroldus procured, was made from that manuſcript of Latomus (28). Now by the Jeſuit Serrarius's own confeſſion that manuſcript does not differ from the printed edition, but with regard to the words, *ut aſſeritur, as is reported.* It contains therefore all the reſt; and conſequently there are ſome manuſcripts of Marianus which mention the woman-Pope, though it cannot be ſaid that the Lutherans made that addition; for it is unqueſtionable that Latomus's manuſcript was not falſified by the Lutherans. It was a Prieſt who procured it, and he took it from a Library belonging to a Church (29). But, will ſome aſk, whence comes that difference in the manuſcripts of Marianus? Why do we meet in ſome with the ſtory of Pope Joan, and why do not we meet with it in the others? I anſwer that that diverſity may be owing to an *addition* as well as to a *ſubtraction*, and that in order to know whether or not Marianus be the Author of the ſentence concerning the woman-Pope, we muſt have his own original manuſcript. If we ſhould meet with it there, he muſt have wrote it; if we ſhould not meet with it, it would be a proof that it is a ſpurious piece foiſted into the manuſcripts in which it is found. But as we have not the original manuſcript, it is impoſſible to determine any thing by that means. I may be aſked another queſtion: is it more probable that what relates to Pope Joan was omitted by ſome Tranſcribers, than it is probable that it was added by others? It is a difficult matter to anſwer that queſtion poſitively; for there are arguments on both ſides. Some pretend that it is probable that certain Tranſcribers, thinking the period concerning a woman-Pope too ſcandalous, omitted it for that reaſon; others on the contrary being ſurprized at the ſingularity of the ſtory, would not have it wanting in their Marianus, and ſo added it to it. There are readers, who are uſed to write a great many ſupplements in the margin of a Chronicle or of a Calender. If a bookſeller was to reprint that Chronicle from ſuch a copy, he would inſert all thoſe marginal notes in his new edition, putting every one of them in its proper place, nor would he always give himſelf the trouble to diſtinguiſh them from the antient text. This was more likely to happen before the art of printing was invented: books were dearer then, and men choſe rather to write in the margin of a book the ſupplements which another book could afford, than to be at the expence of buying two different works. Now theſe marginal additions were generally tranſcribed into the text when a new copy was taken. Let us put here a remark of Florimond de Remond. "Thoſe books . . . . . which like "Chronicles, are made up of incoherent or looſe parts, "are very much ſubject to the gloſſes of thoſe into "whoſe hands they fall. We meet generally with a "thouſand and thouſand chaſms in them, which are "filled up by the firſt who lights on them, and with "any thing he meets with, which proves often a "downright falſity. Every one writes under each "reſpective year, what, in his opinion, was omitted "by the Author, who could not take notice of all "that is diſperſed throughout the vaſt multitude of "books we have, and amidſt the confuſed heap of "things which happened in the paſt ages. Is there "any of us who is not commenting over and over "again the chronology of the learned Pontac, and "that of Genebrard, that great maſter of languages, "becauſe they have both omitted ſome particulars, "perhaps out of an overſight, or perhaps deſignedly? "If theſe books, thus commented upon, happen "afterwards to fall into the hands of ſome printer, "he will be ſure to make all paſs under the name "of the firſt Author, who is nevertheleſs innocent "of the blunders which the Commentator may have "made (30)."

(26) His name is *Gervinus Calenius*: he ſtyles himſelf *Legum Licentiatus*. He publiſhed the *Saxonia* and *Metropolis* of Albert Krantz, at Cologne, in the year 1574.

(27) Coeffeteau, *Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité*, p. 506.

(28) It is certain that John Herold. cauſed *Marianus* to be printed at Baſil in the year 1550, from the original which was ſent him from Francfort by John Latomus, Dean of St. Bartholomew's church in that ſame city. Flor. de Remond, *l'Anti-Papeſſe*, chap. 2. num. 4. folio 366.

(29) See the foregoing quotation.

(30) Remond, *l'Anti-Papeſſe*, chap. 5. num. 3. folio 175 *verſo.*

We may underſtand by this how the ſtory of the woman-Pope happens to be related at length in the manuſcript of Anaſtaſius. I confeſs, that for the ſame reaſon it ſhould alſo be at length in the manuſcript of Marianus, and not in two or three words only. But it muſt be obſerved, that the practice I have mentioned was more * frequently uſed with regard to the manuſcripts deſigned for the Libraries of Univerſities and Churches. Whole Corporations or Societies had not the ſame reaſons to be ſaving, which private men had. Now it might happen that all the manuſcripts of Marianus, which were deſigned for the uſe of private perſons, were loſt, and that thoſe of Anaſtaſius paſt from the ſtudy of a private man into publick libraries. I do not urge all this as convincing arguments, nor even as unanſwerable conjectures; but what can one do better upon ſuch uncertain ſubjects, and about which we walk only in the dark? See the margin (31).

* I believe there is an error of the preſs in Bayle's French Dict. the connexion ſeems to require that we ſhould read *leſs frequently.*

What I ſhall now obſerve is not ſo problematical. In caſe Marianus did not mention a woman-Pope, yet what we read of her in the manuſcripts of that Author cannot be imputed to the Lutherans; for theſe manuſcripts are unqueſtionably more antient than Luther. That Reformer appeared in the world at a time when printing was common, and people did not much ſpend their time in tranſcribing manuſcripts: and upon the whole, all ſkilful judges knew very well how to diſtinguiſh whether a copy was made in the 16th Century, or a long time before. Let us ſay therefore, that if the Chronicle of Marianus was made a few lines longer, by the addition of Pope Joan's ſtory, the addition comes from the Roman Catholicks.

(31) I expatiate more on theſe conjectures, in the rem. [B] of the article POLONUS.

This you will ſay is againſt all probability; they muſt have been infinitely more inclined to blot out the ſtory of that woman, where-ever they met with it, than to inſert it where they did not find it. They were ſenſible that it was a great diſgrace to their Church. But I anſwer that this objection, which has ſomething ſpecious in it, is after all nothing but a fair phantom; for if the ſtory of a woman-Pope be a mere fable, it was forged in the midſt of Popery, and they who publiſhed it firſt were Prieſts and Monks. It has been admitted and believed by Authors who were very much devoted to Popery: as for inſtance, by Antoninus Archbiſhop of Florence, one of the Saints of the Roman Catholick Church. Numberleſs Writers have related it ſincerely, without ſo much as ſuſpecting it might do any prejudice to the Holy See; and even ſince the Sectaries of Bohemia had drawn an argument from it (32), men continued to relate it, and they did not begin to refute it ſeriouſly, till the Proteſtants pretended to urge it as a very ſtrong objection. There are many other things, which the Zealots of Popery were concerned to ſuppreſs (33), and which they have not ſuppreſſed, tho' they were infinitely more ſcandalous and diſgraceful than the ſtory of Pope Joan.

(32) See in the rem. [E] what Æneas Silvius anſwered to the Biſhop of the Taborites.

(33) See the rem. [G].

[C] *Some*

more particular account; but ſome perſons aſſert that the paſſage is ſpurious [C], and ground their aſſertion on ſome manuſcripts in which it is wanting. Martin Polonus, who died

[C] *Some perſons aſſert that the paſſage in* Sigebertus *is ſpurious.*] What I have obſerved concerning the manuſcripts of Marianus may be applied to the manuſcripts of Sigebertus, a Monk of Gemblours, who died in the year 1113. Here follows what we read in the Chronicle of this Sigebertus, printed at Paris in the year 1113. *John Anglicus* (or l'Anglois) *Pope. The common report is, that this John was a woman, and that none knew it but one of her moſt intimate friends, who uſed to lye with her, and that at laſt, even whilſt ſhe was a Pope, ſhe was got with child, and was delivered. This is the reaſon why ſhe is not reckoned among the Popes, and does not encreaſe the number of the Popes of that name* (34). There are ſome manuſcripts of Sigebertus, which contain nothing of that paſſage. Miræus aſſerts, that *of four different manuſcripts, one of which is that which is lodged in the Library of the Abby of Gemblours, of which Sigebertus was a Monk, which manuſcript is the original, or at leaſt has been tranſcribed from the very manuſcripts which Sigebertus made uſe of to publiſh his work, none mention Pope Joan in the leaſt, not even in the margin, though there be many things in them, which have been added of late. Wherefore,* ſays he, *it is certain, that that fable is falſely aſcribed to our Sigebertus* (35). Add to it theſe words of Florimond de Remond. "The impoſture which "we ſay was committed with regard to Sigebertus, "appears plainly by comparing his Chronicle with "an antient Author named William de Nangiac (or "Nangis) who wrote a Chronicle, which extends to "the year 1302, in which that of Sigebertus is "tranſcribed from one end to the other, without the "leaſt omiſſion; and yet the ſtory of that woman-"Pope is the only particular that is not to be met with "in it. Why would he have omitted it, ſince the "original, which he was tranſcribing, might have "diſcovered the fraud? That manuſcript is ſtill to "be ſeen at this time in the Abby of Gemblours "near Louvain, if it eſcaped the fury of the men "of this age. Our Sigebertus was a Monk in that "Abby: his work is kept there very carefully by "the Monks, in order to ſhew it as a curious book, "to the learned men who come to ſee their Convent. "It is written by Sigebertus's own hand, and contains "nothing of that new Pope. That learned Corde-"lier, Father Protaſius, declared to me upon oath, "that he ſaw it, and aſſerted that it does not men-"tion one word of that ſtory, which is alſo teſtified "by Onuphrius, Genebrard, and others. It is a "thing which may be examined, if ſome incredu-"lous perſon will take the trouble to do it. The "ſame Onuphrius writes, that the ſame ſtory is "wanting alſo in the antient manuſcripts of Sige-"bertus, which are in Italy, and were tranſcribed "from the original at Gemblours; they are to be "ſeen in the old Libraries (36)." Alexander Coocke (37) has made ſome remarks againſt that paſſage of Florimond de Remond, but they do by no means prove, that the manuſcript of Gemblours is not antient, *&c.* Authors muſt be ſo juſt towards each other, that if one aſſerts there is ſuch a manuſcript in a publick Library, the other ſhould not deny it, unleſs he knew for certain that it is falſe (38): for it muſt not be ſuppoſed that an Author would have the impudence to relate a falſity, when he knows that it will be eaſily and fully diſcovered (39). Could not an adverſary give ſome traveller the commiſſion to aſk, that they would ſhew him the manuſcript of Sigebertus? Is this ever refuſed? Do not the Library-keepers take a pleaſure to ſatisfy all the curious in this reſpect? I do not ſee therefore that Coocke had any reaſon to treat with contempt what Florimond de Remond aſſerts concerning Father Protaſius. I think he does only cavil, when he obſerves (39*) that Bellarmine, who aſſerts that Molanus ſaw the manuſcript of Gemblours, *does not tell us to whom* Molanus *ſaid it, nor in what work it is written. So that,* concludes he, *there is not one ſolid argument urged to prove that there is one ſingle manuſcript in which that ſtory is wanting, much leſs that it has been foiſted into the copies in which it is to be found.* Why did he not conſult the dialogues of a man of his own nation? He would have read there, that Molanus declared as an eye-witneſs to Alanus Copus, that the manuſcript of Gemblours contained nothing concerning the woman-Pope, and that if it was not the original hand-writing of Sigebertus himſelf, it was at leaſt a copy taken from that original. This would have rendered ſeveral of Coocke's remarks uſeleſs. Obſerve that it is aſſerted that ſeveral impertinent ſtories have been foiſted into Sigebert's Chronicle, from the work of one Walfrid of Monmouth. Read theſe words of Alanus Copus. *Antiquiora Sigeberti exemplaria nullam hujuſmodi narrationem complectuntur: & ſatis præterea conſtat, illius hiſtoriæ multa aſcititia & plane vana ex, neſcio, cujus Galfridi Monumetenſis libro aſperſa* (40). Let us not forget to obſerve, that Spanhemius acknowledges, that the words of Sigebertus, quoted above according to the Paris edition 1513 are a parentheſis, which may be omitted without any prejudice to the Author's narrations, or to his chronological calculations; for he aſcribes to Benedict III. immediately after Leo, the very ſame year which in the parentheſis is aſcribed to Joan (41). Spanhemius confeſſes alſo very ingenuouſly, that the parentheſis is not to be found in the manuſcript of Leyden (42): it is a very antient manuſcript, and of the year 1154, if one may believe the title of it.

Blondel does not determine any thing with regard to the controverſy about the manuſcript of Sigebertus; but he hints very plainly, that he thinks it is probable that Sigebertus did not mention the woman-Pope. One of his reaſons is as follows (43). "Vin-"cent of Beauvais, and William de Nangis (44) "(who from year to year have inſerted his own "words into their collections, and particularly what "he writes under the year 854 concerning Benedict "III. and his Anti-Pope Anaſtaſius, and under the "year 857 concerning Nicholas I.) do not tranſcribe "the clauſe which relates to the woman-Pope." This reaſon is very ſtrong, and proves at leaſt, that theſe tranſcribers made uſe of a copy, in which Joan was not mentioned. I know it is anſwered, that he ſkipped over that paſſage, becauſe Sigebertus himſelf relates, that ſome perſons *do not reckon her among the Popes, and therefore ſhe does not encreaſe the number of the Popes of that name* (45). That ſame Anſwer is alſo uſed againſt the argument which Blondel infers from the ſilence of ſeveral celebrated Hiſtorians, who do not in the leaſt mention the woman-Pope. It is obſerved that ſome Popes have been blotted out of the catalogue of the Biſhops of Rome (46): and Beda is quoted, who tells us that two Anglo-Saxon Kings made themſelves ſo odious, that it was thought proper to make their memory periſh, and to connect together in the Chronicles of the Kingdom, the reign which preceded and the reign which followed that of theſe two Apoſtate Princes (47). *Ita referente Bedâ in Hiſt. Anglo-Saxonum* *, *adeo fuit exoſa memoria Regum paris, Oſrichi & Earfridi,* propter apoſtaſiam, *ut* cunctis placuerit, Regum tempora computantibus, ut ablata de medio Regum perfidorum memoria, idem annus ſequentis Regis regno aſſignaretur. But ſuch anſwers cannot ſatisfy an unbiaſſed mind: for the very obſervation of Sigebertus ought to have engaged thoſe Authors who tranſcribed his account, to mention the woman-Pope. They ought after his example to have related that Pontif's ſtory, and then to have added, that ſhe is not reckoned amongſt the Popes, *&c.* But as they did not ſpeak thus, it is a proof that they did not meet with that paſſage in Sigebertus's work. Let us obſerve farther, that if there had been a decree by which it was ordered, that the woman-Pope's name ſhould be eraſed out of all the publick records, and her ſtatues pulled down, this had been one of thoſe remarkable circumſtances which the Writers of Chronicles never fail to mention. There was ſuch a decree againſt Domitian's memory, who notwithſtanding this had had a place among the Emperors in all the Hiſtories. That every Decree of the Senate is one of the circumſtances which the Hiſtorians took a particular care to tranſmit to poſterity. Spanhemius, who quotes Procopius (48), might have quoted Sueto-niu

(34) Sigebert. *Gemblacenſis, in Chronico,* ad ann. 854. I make uſe of the words of the French Tranſlator, Alexander Coocke, p. 80. The Latin he quotes is as follows. *Johannes Anglicus, fama eſt hunc Johannem fœminam fuiſſe & uni ſoli familiari cognitam qui eam complexus eſt, & gravis facta peperit Papa exiſtens. Quare eam inter Pontifices non numerant quidam, ideo nomini numerum non facit.*

(35) Coeffeteau, *Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité,* p. 507. He quotes Myreus, in edit. Sigeb. ad ann. 854.

(36) Flor. de Remond, *l'Anti-Papeſſe,* chap. 6. num. 5. folio 376.

(37) Coocke, *Traite de la Papeſſe,* p. 82, &c.

(38) Compare this with what Monſieur Arnauld obſerves in the 3d vol. of the *Morale Pratique,* p. 472, &c.

(39) I do not pretend to deny that Authors may be ſometimes barefaced enough to do ſuch a thing; but one muſt not ground a general rule upon this.

(39*) Coocke, *Traite de la Papeſſe,* p. 82.

(40) Alanus Copus, *Dialogo* 1. cap. 8. p. 37. edit. Ant. 1573. in 4to.

(41) Spanh. *de Papa fœmina,* p. 53.

(42) Ibid. p. 52.

(43) Blondel, *Eclairciſſement, &c.* p. 69. In the Latin edit. of his work, p. m. 42. he adds to theſe, Albericus, a Monk of the three Fountains, *Sigeberti exſcriptor, qui de Joanna ſilet.*

(44) See what Genebrard obſerves, ad ann. 858. p. m. 539. *Chronica Guliel. Nangiaci, in quibus cum totus Liber alioqui Sigeberti exſcriptus ſit, hoc unum deſideretur.* i. e. "Though Sige-"bertus's whole "work be tranſ-"cribed in Will. "de Nangis's "Chronicle, "yet that ſtory "alone is want-"ing in it."

(45) *Qui dicuntur Docto Anacritæ exſcripſiſſe Sigebertum, nec tamen Joannæ meminiſſe, ut Albericus, Vincentius Bellovacenſis, Gulielmus Nangiacus, non ideo illam omiſerunt, quod de ea tacuiſſet Sigebertus, ſed quod ipſo Sigeberto judice, verbis modo relatis,* nomini numerum non faceret.

(46) See Spanh. *de Papa fœmina,* p. 38 *& ſeq.*

(47) Idem, ibid. p. 40.

* Lib. 3. cap. 1.

(48) Spanhem. *de Papa fœmina,* p. 40. He quotes Procop. cap. 8. *Hiſtor. Arcanæ.*

died *about the year* 1270, *that is to ſay*, 184 *years after Marianus* (*b*), improved the ſtory much more. He aſſerted " that the Joan mentioned by Marianus was called *Anglus*, " and that ſhe was *a native of Mentz:* that being got with child ſhe was delivered in a " full proceſſion *between St. Clement's Church and the Coloſſus*, and, in deteſtation of her " crime, the proceſſion going round about, never paſſed again through that Street. " Theodoric de Niem, who wrote . . . about 328 years after the death of Marianus . . . " has added of his own invention, *that a ſtatue* was ſet up to preſerve the memory of " that accident. William Brevin, who wrote * concerning the ſeven moſt conſiderable " Churches at Rome, and Baptiſt Platina, who died in the year 1480, 395 years after " Marianus . . . . (to improve the ſtory) have invented the particular of the cloſe-ſtool, " on which (as they ſay) the Pope is obliged to ſit in order to have his ſecret parts " handled. And above an hundred years after, others have alſo thought it proper to " contribute ſomething of their own to that ſtory, aſſerting that the pretended " Joan was a *Sorcereſs*, that ſhe *crowned the Emperor Lewis II.* &c. So that 460 years " were ſcarce ſufficient to give a complete form to that bear, of which Marianus was de- " livered (I know not how)." Thus ſpeaks David Blondel, who though he was a Miniſter, did not ſcruple to call that ſtory of the woman-Pope a mere fable, and to write books in order to refute it (*c*). It is a ſtory, ſays he (*d*), *which has been entirely patched up of ſeveral pieces, and improved in time.* We ſhall relate that ſtory hereunder from the account of thoſe, who have moſt carefully collected together all the particulars relating to it [*D*]. Men would no doubt have tacked new circumſtances to it from time to time,

(*b*) Blondel, *Eclairciſſement*, &c. p. 17, 18.

* About the year 1470.

(*c*) See the rem. [*I*] of the article BLONDEL (David).

(*d*) Blondel, *Eclairciſſement de la Queſtion ſi une Femme*, &c. p. 17.

nius (49). What he tranſcribes from Beda the Hiſtorian confirms this. And upon the whole, it is certain, that if the Annaliſt underſtood the true deſign of ſuch a decree, and will anſwer the real intention of the Senate, who would have the memory of a tyrant obliterated, they ought to mention ſuch a diſgraceful decree. It is by no means probable, that they, who inflict ſuch a puniſhment on an Uſurper, wiſh that no man ſhould ſpeak either good or ill of him; this would be ſhewing a regard for him, and ſecuring him from the diſgrace he deſerves. Now they could not deſign this without being inconſiſtent with themſelves, and conſequently they muſt wiſh, that what they decree againſt his memory, may ſerve to make him be deteſted in all the future ages: they wiſh therefore that their ſentence againſt him may be expreſsly recorded in the hiſtory of their country.

(49) Sueton. *in Domitiano*, cap. *ult.*

Let us add, that there is a vaſt difference between blotting a man's name out of the catalogue of the Popes, and making no mention at all of him. The Anti-Popes are not in that catalogue; they who took the name of Clement are not reckoned among the Clements. And yet the Annaliſts do not omit the actions, intruſion and diſorder of thoſe falſe Popes. Monſieur des Marets * puts this queſtion; was there not in France a Charles X. whom the Leaguers ſet up againſt Henry IV? And yet no Hiſtorian has reckoned him among the King's of France (50). But this is a fallacious argument. For though the Hiſtorians do not reckon him among the Kings, yet they relate what the Leaguers did for him. The queſtion is not here whether Joan was a Pope of right (*de jure*): the queſtion is only about the matter of fact: did ſhe uſurp the Papal See after the death of Leo IV. or not? Did ſhe keep it during two years? Did ſhe loſe it by her death, when ſhe was delivered of a child in the ſtreet? An Hiſtorian, who looks upon her as a falſe Pope, may indeed give her no place among the Popes called John, and reckon Leo IV. for the 102d Pope (51), and Benedict III. for the 103d. But he is under a neceſſity to give an account of the interreign of that Uſurper. The French Hiſtorians begin the reign of Charles VII. at the death of Charles VI. and do not reckon Henry VI. of England a among the Kings of France, but yet they do not conceal that after the death of Charles VI. Henry VI. was proclaimed King of France. How diſhonourable ſoever ſuch particulars may be, yet they are too publick and notorious to be entirely omitted in the Annals of a country.

* In Latin *Mareſius.*

(50) Sam. Mareſius, *in Examine Queſtionis*, p. 45, 46.

(51) The number belonging to that Pope is very differently ſet down. See Blondel, *in Examine*, p. 17.

Let us conclude from thence, that to ſuppoſe that the remark of Sigebertus prevented the Tranſcribers from copying his account of the woman-Pope, is committing the ſophiſm *à non cauſa pro cauſa*, i. e. " Arguing from what is not the cauſe as though it " were the cauſe of an effect." One muſt therefore look for better anſwers than that of Des Marets is.

We have ſeen above (52), that the ſame difficulties are raiſed with regard to Martin Polonus, as with regard to Marianus and Sigebertus.

(52) In the rem. [*B*] of the art. POLONUS (Martin).

[*D*] *We ſhall relate that ſtory . . . . from the account of thoſe, who have moſt carefully collected together all the particulars relating to it.*] There are but few particulars wanting in that account, which I ſhall now tranſcribe from a work of John Creſpin. " JOHN " the Eighth of that name, who took upon him " the name of *Anglois* or *Anglus*, becauſe of one " *Anglus*, a Monk of the Abby of Fuld, whom he " loved entirely, was a Pope as to his office, but by " his ſex a woman. That girl, a German by na- " tion, and firſt called Gilberta, pretended to be " a man, dreſſed herſelf in men's clothes, and went " to Athens with her lover the Monk. Having " made there a very great progreſs in the ſciences, " ſhe went back to Rome after the Monk's death, " and ſtill continued to conceal her ſex. Now as ſhe " had a very quick genius, and ſpoke with a good " grace, and readily in the publick diſputations and " lectures, and as ſeveral perſons were amazed at her " great learning, every one loved her extremely, and " ſhe knew ſo well how to win the hearts of all, " that after the death of Leo ſhe was choſen Pope. " Being inſtalled in that office ſhe admitted others " into holy Orders (as they call them) after the man- " ner of the other Popes: ſhe made Prieſts and Dea- " cons; ſhe ordained Biſhops and Abbots; ſhe ſung " Maſs, ſhe conſecrated Churches and Altars, ſhe " adminiſtered the Sacraments, ſhe preſented her feet " to be kiſſed, and performed all the other actions " which the Popes of Rome are wont to do: and " her acts were not void at that time.

" Whilſt that woman was on the Papal See, the " Emperor Lotharius being pretty old took the " Monk's habit, and Lewis the Second of that name " coming to Rome received the Imperial Sceptre " and Crown from her hand, together with the " bleſſing of St. Peter. . . . . Now whilſt ſhe was " thus in poſſeſſion of that high dignity, ſhe was got " with child by a certain Cardinal a Chaplain of " hers, who knew very well of what ſex ſhe was: " and as ſhe was going in a ſolemn proceſſion to the " Lateran Church, ſhe was delivered of that child " thus got by fornication, between the Coloſſus and " St. Clement's Church, in the midſt of Rome, even " in a moſt publick Street, before a crowd of people, " and died on the ſpot in her very delivery, in the " year of our Lord 857. On the account of ſuch a " ſin, and becauſe ſhe was thus delivered in publick, " ſhe was deprived of all the honours, which are " uſed to be paid to the Popes, and buried without " any Pontifical Pomp. . . . . Now that the Popes " and anointed Fathers may ſeem to deteſt ſuch a " crime, they turn another way when they come to " that place; it being a very ſuſpicious place on " account of the bad omen. . . . . But that the " holy Fathers may avoid ſuch an inconveniency for

time, had not the Roman Catholicks attempted at laſt to refute it, which put an end to all farther improvements. Nevertheleſs Writers, who adhered otherwiſe to Popery, have believed that ſtory. Æneas Sylvius, who was Pope in the 15th Century, under the name of Pius II. is the firſt who called it into queſtion; he did even touch but ſlightly upon it,

" the future, they have ordered that a Deacon ſhould " through a cloſe-ſtool handle the ſecret parts of " every perſon who ſhould be choſen Pope, that it " might be known whether he be male or not. But " at this time, whilſt they are Cardinals, and before " they be raiſed to the Papal Dignity, they beget ſo " many baſtards, that no man can call their virility " into queſtion, ſo that there is no longer any occa- " ſion for ſo holy a ceremony (53)."

(53) Creſpin, *l'Etat de l'Egliſe*, p. m. 242, &c.

Theſe laſt words allude to the following Latin lines of Joannes Pannonius, which Monſieur du Pleſſis has tranſcribed in his Hiſtory of Popery (54).

(54) *Hiſtoria Papatus*, p. m. 164.

Non poterat quiſquam reſerantes æthera claves
Non exploratis ſumere teſticulis.
Cur igitur noſtro mos hic nunc tempore ceſſat?
Ante probat quod ſe quilibet eſſe marem.

In French,

Prendre les cleſs des cieux perſonne ne pouvoit,
Sans monſtrer ſes teſmoins d'une couſtume ſale.
Pourquoy ceſte couſtume aujourd'huy ne ſe void?
Chacun auparavant ſe monſtre eſtre bon maſle.

" No man of old the keys of Heav'n could ſeize,
" But he, whoſe privy parts had firſt been view'd.
" What then could make that antient cuſtom ceaſe?
" That they're true men their baſtards have well ſhew'd."

Florimond de Remond is the Author who furniſhes me with that French tranſlation of Pannonius's lines: he quotes them to convict thoſe of falſity, who aſſerted that that practice was ſtill in uſe. *Our adverſaries*, ſays he (55), ... *tells us that to prevent the Papal Dignity from coming again to the diſtaff, it is ſtill cuſtomary at this time to examine the ſecret parts of the Popes who are elected, the perſon who touches them crying aloud with great alacrity* he is worthy to be made a Pope. *The Centuriators, giving an account of that ſhameful cuſtom, aſſert that with great rejoicing they cry*, he has got ſome, he has got ſome. *On which ſubject Pannonius wrote theſe lines, which though they deſerve to be ſuppreſſed, yet ſince our adverſaries make ſome account of them, I was willing to tranſcribe them here tranſlated into our own language, that the reader may be convinced of their inconſiſtencies and calumnies, from their own Authors.* Theſe lines of *Pannonius prove, that that practice was not in uſe in his time. The Centuriators and Bale himſelf dare no longer maintain the contrary. But then they give immediately a fine reaſon indeed, why that practice is aboliſhed, a reaſon worthy of the religion they profeſs.* That cuſtom of viſiting the Popes, *ſay they*, is now aboliſhed and ſuppreſſed becauſe it is no longer neceſſary; ſince their Concubines and Harlots ſhew abundantly what they are (56).

(55) Florimond de Remond, *l'Anti-Papeſſe*, chap. 18. num. 1. folio 410 *verſo*.

(56) Ibidem, folio 411.

He obſerves that (57) that John Creſpin has tranſcribed *John Ballée's* * expreſſions *word for word*. But yet we do not read in Creſpin's account this particular, which we meet with in the others, *that learned and cunning woman is ſaid to have written a book of magic* (58). The ſame Florimond quotes the following paſſage from James Curio's Chronicle: *Benedictus III. being choſen after that proſtitute, ſucceeded to that wicked office after his ſecret parts had been handled; that there might be no miſtake, as there had been one a little before with regard to Joan* (59). He gives us alſo Bocaccio's account, and does not forget to obſerve that it does not agree with that of the other Authors. " Bo- " caccio ..... in his book of the illuſtrious women " has cauſed the pictures of that monſter to be drawn " being delivered in a general proceſſion in the arms " of her Cardinals, and has got ſome lines engraved " at the bottom of the print, which being tranſlated " out of Latin into French are as follow.

(57) Ibid. chap. 3. num. 5. folio 370 *verſo*. edit. 1599, in 4to.

* Thus Florimond de Remond writes *Bale's* name.

(58) Ibid. num. 3.

(59) Ibid. num. 6.

" *Jane ſçavante en dol, ſçavante aux ſainctes lettres,*
" *Par grand' ſubtilité, fut de nom Pape faict:*
" *Mais ayant enfanté au milieu de ſes Preſtres.*
" *Monſtra bien qu'elle eſtoit femme fine en effaict.*

i. e. " Joan full of art, and well ſkilled in Divinity, " was by her dextrous wit raiſed to be Pope: but " being delivered of a child in the midſt of her " Prieſts, ſhe ſhewed that ſhe was indeed a cunning " woman.

" But he ought to have ſaid on the contrary,

" *Monſtra qu'elle n'eſtoit femme fine en effaict.*

i. e. " She ſhewed indeed that ſhe was no cunning " woman.

" Bocaccio relating that fine ſtory at length, aſſerts, " *that ſhe was a German woman, and ſtudied in Eng-* " *land with a young ſcholar who was her ſweetheart,* " *who being dead, ſhe would not abandon herſelf to ano-* " *ther, but went to Rome, where ſhe raiſed every body's* " *admiration, both by her learning and her morals: ſo* " *that after the death of Leo V. ſhe was choſen Pope.* " *But God*, ſays he, *pitying his people, would not ſuffer* " *it to be ſo wickedly impoſed upon by a woman. So that* " *the Devil, who had inſpired her with ſo much boldneſs* " *as to undertake that wickedneſs, tempted her to commit* " *fornication when ſhe was raiſed to that high dignity.* " *She did not want opportunities to indulge her deſire, ſo* " *that ſhe was ſoon after got with child. Oh the great* " *wickedneſs! oh the unheard of patience and goodneſs* " *of God! But ſhe, who had enchanted all the world,* " *loſt her wit, and could not conceal her delivery: for* " *as ſhe had not time enough to ſend for a mid-wife, her* " *child dropped from her as ſhe was performing divine* " *ſervice. And becauſe ſhe had thus impoſed upon the* " *world, that wicked woman being all in tears was ſent* " *into a dark priſon by the command of the Fathers.* " This Florentine does not agree with the other wri- " ters, as to the education, ſucceſſion, and death of " that woman-Pope (60)." Remond has not omitted the new particular, with which a Monk has adorned that ſtory. *Being locked up in his Monaſtery he has repreſented the woman-Pope as loaded with more diſgrace and infamy than any other had done before him. I mean Baptiſt Mantuanus* (61), *who ſpeaks thus of her.*

(60) Ibid. chap. 3. num. 1. folio 368 *verſo*.

(61) Lib. 3.

Je vy en un gibet ceſte fine femelle,
Qui traveſtie en homme, & faignant un ſainct zele,
Juſqu'au ſiege Papal, par ruſe eſtoit montée:
Or avoit ſur ſon chef ceſte putte effrontée,
Le triple diademe, & ſon paillard eſtoit
Aupres d'elle pendu, qui ſon mal deteſtoit.

i. e. " I ſaw on a gallows that crafty woman, who " being dreſſed in men's clothes, and affecting a " great zeal, was by her artifice raiſed to the Papal " Throne. That impudent harlot had the tripple " Crown on her head, and near her hung her gallant, " who curſed her fate."

This writer, in order to make the ſtory more pleaſant, added to it, that the head groom of the Pope's ſtables was hanged with her (62), *which particular no Writer ever mentioned but him* (63). Here follows a paſſage from Monſieur du Pleſſis Mornai (64). " Another Martin " (65), of the Order of the Minorites, in his Chro- " nicle, entitled, *Flores Temporum*, adds, that this " Joan being about to lay a ſpirit, and aſking the " Devil when he would depart from that body, he " anſwered her in theſe two lines:

" *Papa pater patrum, Papiſſæ pandito partum*
" *Et tibi tunc dicam de corpore quando recedam* *.

i. e. " *Tell me when a woman-Pope will be delivered* " *of a child, and I ſhall tell you when I ſhall leave* " *that body.* This was wrote about the year 1370." Coeffeteau obſerves that a Miniſter named Angelocrator

(62) Alexander Coocke, in his *Refutation of Florimond de Remond's book*, p. m. 31. quotes theſe three lines from Mantuanus. *Hic pendebat adhuc Sextum mentita virilem*
Fœmina, cui triplici Phrygiam diademate mitram
Extollebat apex, & Pontificalis adulter. Tom. 3. lib. 3. Alfonſi. fol. 48. edit. Francof. 1573. He adds that Mantuanus *does not ſpeak of a Groom of a Stable, but in general of one who had committed adultery with her; nor does he mention any hanging but in Hell; which is probable enough.*

(63) Flor. de Remond, *Anti-Papeſſe*, chap. 22. num. 4. folio 426 *verſo*.

(64) Du Pleſſis, *Myſtere d'Iniquité*, p. 162.

(65) He had juſt been ſpeaking of Martin Polonus.

* *Chronic. Martini Minoritæ ultimæ. Impreſ. An.* 1486.

it, and as it were with fear; but Aventine denied it positively [*E*]. Since that time Onuphrius Panvini (*e*), Bellarmine (*f*), Serarius (*g*), George Scherer (*h*), Robert Persons (*i*), Florimond de Remond, Allatius, Monsieur de Launoi, Father Labbé, and several others (*k*), have refuted at length that old tradition. Cardinal Baronius shewed a great esteem for Florimond de Remond's work, but he was in the wrong to assert, that it bore the Hereticks down so effectually, that they were ashamed they ever mentioned that story [*F*]. This is so false, that even at this time the Protestants publish books in which they assert this history of Pope Joan. I imagine, that if some traditions favourable to the Popes were refuted by such strong arguments as those that are urged against the tradition

(*e*) *In Notis ad Platinam.*

(*f*) *De Romano Pontif.* lib. 3. cap. 24.

(*g*) *Rerum Mogunt.* lib. 1.

(*h*) In a treatise wrote on purpose. 508.

(*i*) *In Libro de tribus Controversionibus Angliæ*, part. 2. cap. 5.

(*k*) See the list which Father Labbe gives of them, in the 1st vol. *de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.* p. 837 *& ſeq.*

crator asserts, that *she was delivered in a procession, and that the Devil spoke those fine verses in the air* (66). Let us take notice that Rivet confessed in the year 1615, that he had not yet heard any thing of Angelocrator (67); and yet he was a man who had published a chronological work in 1601, with a great pomp, and who in 1618 was sent a Deputy to the Synod of Dort (68).

Here follows another particular, which seems to have been invented to answer those who object that so artful and cunning a woman as this was would have found out some manner to keep her fault secret. "God who would not suffer that such an abominable "wickedness should go unpunished, sent an Angel "to that woman-Pope, who told her that her sin "would be forgiven, provided she were delivered in "the open street without any assistance, and without "calling to any woman to come and help her in that "urgent necessity. That this would be instead of "a penance to her, and that *amende honorable* as a "punishment. Which she did accordingly, to obey "God's command. That Author had heard that "story from some old woman at Rome, for they "who have been willing to take the trouble to en-"quire into that matter, have told me for instance, "that several persons do still relate, that the Angel "left it to her choice, either to be delivered privately "and without disgrace, and to go to Hell, or to be "delivered publickly and to go to Heaven (69)." Florimond de Remond gives this as a particular, which a German Author, whom he does not name, has related, and then he adds; *she was then very conscientious at that rate, since she chose to be delivered in the procession, though without confessing her sin, or acknowledging how she had imposed upon the Church. The story is not thus, says Scheremberg, she was delivered at Court, being seated on her See. . . . . I do not know how Serres* (70) *came to take it into his head that they built a house on the spot of ground where that strange accident happened, which, says he, was pulled down some time ago, though the stool be there still. . . . . Some have still more improved the story, with a design to make her delivery the more remarkable. They assert that the last scene of that wretched woman's life was acted not only in publick, in a procession, but in that solemn procession, which we celebrate on the day, which we call* Corpus-Christi-Day, *or the Festival of God's Body. Gio. Saxon a German has given a loose to his imagination upon this subject. There are pictures in several places of Germany, and prints in many books, and Ecclesiastical Histories in Geneva, in which that woman is represented under a canopy, holding the holy Sacrament, with her child coming from between her legs. . . . . Ignorant men, who did not know, that in the time of that woman-Pope, whom they object to us, the Festival of the holy Sacrament was not yet established, and was not appointed for many years after* (71).

(66) Coeffeteau, *Reponse au Mystere d'Iniquité*, p. 500. He cites the 8th book of the Chronicle of Angelocrator. *in Joann. 8. Papiſſ.*

(67) Rivet, *Remarques ſur la Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité*, part. 1. p. 594.

(68) See Vossius, *de Scient. Mathemat.* p. 402.

(69) Flor. de Remond, *l'Anti-Papeſſe*, chap. 23. num. 3. fol. 429.

(70) It is the Author of the *Inventaire de l'Hiſtoire de France.*

(71) Remond, *l'Anti-Papeſſe*, cap. 23. folio 429 *verſo.*

[*E*] *Æneas Sylvius . . . . . is the first who called it into question. . . . . Aventine denied it positively.*] This Sylvius "observed the 20th of August 1451 * to "Juan de Carvajal Cardinal of St. Angelo, in the "conclusion of his reply to Nicholas Bishop of the "Taborites, that in the election of that woman for "a Pope *there was no error in a matter of faith, nor* "*de jure* (of right) *but only an ignorance with regard* "*to a matter of fact; and also that that story was not* † "*certain* (72)." Samuel des Marets observes that this Author expresses himself very faintly, and that in some other of his works he seems to have thought that the story of that woman-Pope was true. *Eo quidem recurrit, ut dicat historiam non esse* certam, *sed tam timidè, ut satis appareat eum non loqui ex animi sententia. Ut si quid hic putarit incerti, magis forte ad circumstantias & nomen proprium hujus mulieris spectet, quam ad rei ipsius substantiam* (73). . . . . *Quin ipse Doctiſſ. Anacrita* (74). pag. 10. *Pium II. id est, hunc Æneam Sylvium, accenset iis Pontificibus qui Johannæ Pontificatum videntur agnoviſſe, eo quod* Joannæ nomen cæteris Pontificum nominibus permixtum in Dominico Senensi, scriptæ ad Joannem Carvajal epistolæ immemor vel pœnitens prostare passus est. *Et quod amplius est ipse Æneas Sylvius Pontifex tandem factus hanc Historiam exscripsit in* 6. *mundi ætate, pag.* 170. *operis Historici impressi Norembergæ anno* 1493. *per Kobergerum, inquit Johannes Gerhardi Augustanæ Confessionis Theologorum Doctissimus,* Loco de Eccl. edit. in 4. p. 1004 (75). i. e. "He goes even so far as to say, that "that story is not *certain*, but so faintly as to shew "sufficiently he does not speak from his heart. So "that if he imagined there was any thing uncertain "herein, it related perhaps rather to the circum-"stances of the story, and the woman's firname, than "to the story itself. . . . . Nay, the most learned "Critic himself reckons Pius II. that is to say, "Æneas Sylvius, among the Popes, who seem to have "owned the story of Pope Joan, because *he suffered "her name to be placed among those of the other Popes "in the Register of Sienna, as though he did not remember his letter to Juan Carvajal, or repented of what "he wrote to him.* And what is stronger still, the "same Æneas Sylvius being at last chosen Pope, "transcribed that story in the 6th age of the world, "p. 170. of his historical work printed at Nuremberg in the year 1493, as is asserted by John Gerhardi, the most learned man of all the Divines of "the Augsburg Confession."

(72) Blondel, *Eclairciſſement ſur la Papeſſe*, p. 11.

* *Epiſt.* 130.

† *Neque certa Hiſtoria eſt.*

(73) Sam. Maresius, *Examen Quæſt. de Papa fœmina*, p. 8.

(74) That is to say, David Blondel.

(75) Maresius, *Exam. Quæſt.* p. 13.

As for Aventine, I desire all my readers to take notice of the false reasoning of the English Doctor, who has refuted Florimond de Remond's book. Here follow his words. *I grant that* John Aventine (76), *explodes in general* that story of the woman-Pope, *but he gives no reasons why he explodes it thus. And farther* Bellarmine *slights him as an Author who deserves but little credit* *, *and* Baronius *exposes him not only as a scabby sheep, but also as a beast tainted with heresy, and entirely destitute of piety and learning* †. *And several of your Popes have prohibited* ** *his history as unworthy to be read: and therefore I do not conceive how his exploding that story of Pope Joan without any reason, can in the least prejudice the truth of it* (77). You see that in order to discredit the authority of Aventine, he makes an advantage of the slanders with which two Cardinals have loaded him. But on the contrary Aventine must be looked upon as a proper witness because of these very slanders (78); for Bellarmine, Baronius, and several others cry him down for no other reason but because he took a delight in abusing the Court of Rome, and we have seen above (79) that he was a true Lutheran in his heart. We must say therefore that if he had found the least probability in the story of the woman-Pope, he would have asserted it, and taken from thence an opportunity to laugh at the expence of the Popes. Such is the wrong way of arguing into which a man will fall, when, in treating a controverted point, he cavils at every thing, and will never give up the least article whatsoever.

(76) In the 4th book of the *Annals of Bavaria.*

* *Joh. Aventin. author parum probatæ fidei*, says Bellarmin. *Append. ad lib. de Sum. Pont.* cap. 10.

† *Infectam hæreſis Scabie beſtiam pietate & doctrina omnino deſertam.* Baron. An. To. 10. ad. 996. num. 54.

** *In Indicibus lib. prohibitorum.*

(77) Coocke, *de la Papeſſe*, p. 10.

(78) See F. Labbe, *de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.* Tom. 2. p. 920.

[*F*] *Baronius . . . . was in the wrong to assert that* Florimond de Remond's work *bore the Hereticks down so effectually, that they were ashamed they ever mentioned that story.*] "He looks upon it as the best work "that was ever wrote upon that subject §; and pro-"tests he would with all his heart have inserted it "into his Annals, had not the book been a little "too large. For by that work the Author, as the "Cardina

(79) In the rem. [*H*] of the art. AVENTINE.

§ *Præ cæteris commendandus fama nobilis Florimondus*, Baron. *Annal.* Tom. 10. ad ann. 853. num. 62.

tion of Pope Joan, they would appear to deſerve the utmoſt contempt, even to thoſe who are the moſt ſtrenuous aſſerters of that ſtory. So certain is it, that the ſame things ſeem true or falſe to us according as they are favourable to our party or to the oppoſite party.

" Cardinal obſerves again, has ſo thoroughly con-
" founded the whole band of Hereticks, who uſed
" formerly to upbraid the Catholicks with that ſtory,
" that they are now aſhamed of what they have
" ſaid *. *Poſſevinus* is of the ſame opinion; for he
" obſerves, that Remond has killed the Hereticks
" quite; and that ſince the publication of that book,
" they have not one ſingle word to ſay for them-
" ſelves †: they dare no longer mention a Pope
" Joan (80)." Baronius and Poſſevinus were not well informed: Florimond de Remond's book was deſpiſed by the Proteſtants, and did not make them alter their opinion. A Miniſter of Bearn wrote againſt it. See what Florimond anſwers him in the ſecond edition of his work (81). He ſpeaks *of a certain man . . . . to whom alſo he ſhall not be forced to reply no more than to that other*, adds he, *who under the fictitious name of Jeſſean Count of Malta, has made his cauſe worſe by his very defenſe. This man in his Codicil promiſes us many wonders, and among other things to expoſe the dreams and ſilly arguments of him, who wrote a book to ſhew that the ſtory of Pope Joan is nothing but a vulgar error* (82). Monſieur du Pleſſis Mornai knew what Remond wrote, and yet he declared himſelf ſtrongly for thoſe who hold that the ſtory of the woman-Pope is true, and he urged all their arguments. It was in a book which he publiſhed in 1611 (83). Coeffeteau refuted it as well as he could (84): but he was refuted in his turn by Andrew Rivet (85), who aſſerted that there is nothing in the Hiſtory of Pope Joan *capable to deprive us of our judgment, or of a good conſcience, if we hold that to be true, as we do ſtill, though the Monk* (86) *ſhould run mad for it, which has been tranſmitted down in writing to poſterity* (87). The book in which he ſpeaks thus was printed in the year 1615: it was then but three years after Conrad Decker had publiſhed a book at Oppenheim, *De Papa Romano & Papiſſa Romana quod Joannes octavus fuerit mulier & puerpera*. i. e. " Of the Pope of Rome, and of the
" woman-Pope, proving that John VIII. was a wo-
" man, and bore a child;" and it was but five years ſince Vignier a Miniſter of Blois, had aſſerted the ſame opinion (88). James Capel, a Miniſter and Profeſſor of Divinity at Sedan, maintained (88*) in the year 1619 that the ſtory of Pope Joan is true; it was in his anſwer to Father Coton's objections. Alexander Coocke made a book on purpoſe to anſwer Remond, and to vindicate the Hiſtory of the woman-Pope, and to anſwer all the objections of the Roman Catholicks. His work was tranſlated out of Engliſh into French, and printed at Sedan in 1633. Another Engliſhman, Profeſſor of Divinity at Weſel, publiſhed a book of the ſame kind, and about the ſame time (89). There is no man but knows that David Blondel's work was anſwered in the year 1655 by an Advocate of Rouen, and in the year 1651 by a Miniſter of Groningen, and that the great Salmaſius had promiſed to refute it (90). It is well known alſo that Hottinger wrote a treatiſe on purpoſe to ſupport the tradition of the woman-Pope; and that Zuinger, Profeſſor of Divinity at Baſil, maintained the ſame opinion in his book *De Feſto Corporis Chriſti*, printed in the year 1685. Mr. Megerlin, Profeſſor of Mathematicks at Baſil, had but lately aſſerted the ſame Theſis in his *Diſquiſitio Chronologica de Joanna Papiſſa, (Chronological enquiry concerning Pope Joan.)* Spanhemius, Divinity Profeſſor at Leyden, publiſhed a pretty large book in 1691, to ſupport the ſame opinion (91). I could mention ſeveral other Proteſteſtants (92), who ſince Florimond de Remond have aſſerted the tradition which he endeavoured to refute. Nothing therefore is more frivolous nor more falſe, than the commendation which Baronius and Poſſevinus beſtowed upon Remond, namely, that he has ſilenced the Proteſtants, and loaded them with ſhame.

We meet with the ſame extravagancy in theſe words of Father Maimbourg (93). " The moſt
" learned Miniſters of the pretended Reformed Re-
" ligion were aſhamed that thoſe of their own party
" ſhould admit ſuch a groſs error, which is a diſgrace
" to all thoſe who maintain it, either out of igno-
" rance, or out of paſſion, or becauſe they think
" themſelves under ſome obligation to aſſert it.
" Blondel, one of the ableſt men among them
" has even laboured to underceive them in a learned
" diſſertation which he wrote upon that ſubject.
" Some of the ſame Sect, as for inſtance, Samuel
" des Marets, took offence at it, and attempted to
" refute it, on purpoſe to aſſert ſuch a palpable falſity,
" which has now loſt all its credit. But the late Fa-
" ther Labbe,* a learned Jeſuit, to whom we are in-
" debted, among other learned works, for the great-
" eſt part of the laſt compilation of the Councils
" of the Paris Edition, has ſo effectually diſarmed
" him, and ſo well puniſhed his inconſiderate igno-
" rance, in his refutation (94) of that fable, which
" is to be met with in the eighth volume of his Coun-
" cils, that I cannot think any of that Miniſter
" of Groningen's brethren will venture again to
" enter the liſt, in order to defend ſo bad a cauſe,
" which is ſo abſolutely given up by all men of
" ſenſe even among the Proteſtants. For they ac-
" knowledge at laſt ſincerely, that there was never
" any other Pope Joan but this John VIII. to whom
" that ridiculous name was given, becauſe he ſhewed
" ſo little courage in aſſerting the decrees of a gene-
" ral Council, and of his Predeceſſors againſt Pho-
" tius." All this abounds with exaggerations and downright falſities. For ſince Father Labbé's treatiſe has been publiſhed, the Proteſtants have continued to write as they did before, in defenſe of the ſtory of Pope Joan. In the year 1662 they reprinted at Helmſtad *Hiſtoria Joannis VIII. Romani Pontificis, virum primum ſimulantis, poſtea ſexum ſuum partu in publica via edito prodentis, à Jeſuitarum in primis technis vindicata*. i. e. " The Hiſtory of John VIII. Pope
" of Rome, who firſt pretended to be a man, and
" then betrayed her ſex being delivered of a child
" in the publick ſtreet; vindicated chiefly againſt
" the objections of the Jeſuits." To this work were added ſome collections of Berneggerus relating to the ſame ſubject (95). This being only a new edition, I do not inſiſt upon it. But to the Authors I have already mentioned, I ſhall add John Lehman, who publiſhed at Wittemberg in 1669, *Infelix puerperium Joannis Pontificis*. (i. e. *The unhappy delivery of Pope John*) and John Daniel Artopæus, who wrote a treatiſe, *De Joanne VIII. Papiſſa, (of John VIII. a woman-Pope)* printed at Leipſic in 1673 (96), and Mr. Maier (97), who in his treatiſe *De Pontificis Romani Electione, (of the Election of the Popes)* (98), printed at Hamburg in 1690, admits and ſupports the opinion, that there has really been a woman-Pope, tho' he acknowledges that the arguments of Allatius and Blondel had formerly raiſed ſome difficulties in his mind. Could I forget Monſieur Miſſon (99), who argues ſtrongly, and at ſeveral times for the common tradition, and who ſhews even a great contempt for Blondel's arguments, and acquaints us (100), *that an Engliſh Doctor has lately compoſed a work upon this ſubject of the woman-Pope, which has not yet been printed, and in which he urges with a great deal of ſtrength an authority extracted from the Chronicles of the antient Monaſtery of Canterbury*. He quotes (101) Monſieur le Sueur a French Miniſter as one of the aſſertors of the Hiſtory of the woman-Pope, and as one of thoſe who has alledged the ſtory of the two copies of Anaſtaſius ſent to Marc Freherus. The book in which Monſieur le Sueur does this is an Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, the ſeventh part of which, which treats of the ninth Century, was printed at Geneva in 1686.

It is true that there have been ſome Miniſters, who gave no credit to what is related concerning the woman-Pope (102.) Peucer, if we may truſt to Remond's authority, did not believe it neither. *He ſhewed that he was more conſcientious than the reſt*, theſe are Remond's words, *and though he was an enemy to the Catholick Religion and the holy Fathers, yet he judged that what was reported of Pope Joan was a mere*

* *Sic confecit monſtrum iſtud, ut novatores pudeat quæ ſcripſerunt vel ſomniaſſe.* Idem.

† *Prorſus confodit hæreticos qui commentum illud ſparſerunt in vulgus, ut amplius ea de fabula biſcere non audeant.* In Apparat. Sac. *verbo* Florimondus.

(80) Coocke, *de la Papeſſe*, p. 2 and 3.

(81) Florimond de Remond, *l'Anti-Papeſſe*, chap. 7. num. 5. folio 380 *verſo*. He deſcribes him only by theſe two letters, *R. T.* and replies to him towards the end of his work.

(82) Ibid. chap. 2. num. 3. folio 365 *verſo*, and folio 366.

(83) Intitled, *Myſtere d'Iniquité*. See there, p. 161, &c.

(84) In his *Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité*, p. 504, &c.

(85) In his *Remarques ſur la Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité*, 1 part. p. 590.

(86) That is to ſay, Coeffeteau.

(87) Rivet, *Remarques ſur la Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité*, p. 590. He held the ſame opinion when he anſwered the Jeſuit Petra Sancta, in the year 1635. See his works, p. 587.

(88) See the rem. [L].

(88*) See his *Inſtruction Chreſtienne reponſive au 1 Tome de l'Inſtitution du P. Coton*, p. 514 & *ſeq.*

(89) See the rem. [B] of the art. FRANC.

(90) See the rem. [I] of the art. BLONDEL (David).

(91) Intitled, *de Papa fœmina inter Leonem IV & Benedictum III. Diſquiſitio Hiſtorica.*

(94) It is the diſſertation intitled, *Cenotaphium Joannæ Papiſſæ . . . everſum*, which he has inſerted at the end of the 1ſt vol. *de Script. Eccleſ.* printed at Paris in the year 1660.

(95) See Sagittarius, *Introd. in Hiſt. Eccleſ.* p. 686.

(96) See Sagitt. ibid.

(97) John Frederic, Profeſſor of Divinity at Kiel, and at Hamburg.

(98) Page 244 & *ſeq.*

(99) In the 2d vol. of his *Voiage d'Italie*, p. 178 & *ſeq.* p. 202 & *ſeq.* and p. 306. edit. of 1696.

(100) Preface to the 3d vol.

(101) Page 203 of the 2d vol. SOME PROTESTANTS who did not believe the ſtory of Pope Joan.

(102) See the rem. [I] of the art. BLONDEL (David), towards the end.

(92) See the names of ſome of them in the *Introductio in Hiſtor. Eccleſ.* of Gaſpar. Sagittarius, p. 686, and in the rem. of the article RADULPHUS, towards the end. (93) Maimb. *Hiſt. du Schiſme des Grecs*, liv. 2. under the year 881. p. 202, 203. of the 1ſt vol.

party [G]. It was owing to the ſame inſtance of prepoſſeſſion, that the controverſy concerning

mere fable, and would give it no place in his Chronicle. He followed perhaps Melanchthon's Memoirs, who was the moſt modeſt man of all thoſe who ſwerved from the Church (103). The Jeſuit Gretſer (104) has quoted ſome paſſages from a ſmall piece compoſed by a Proteſtant, and printed in 1588 with this title, *Simplex narratio indicans et exponens meretriculam quandam Anglam nunquam Papam fuiſſe, neque unquam in rerum natura extitiſſe, et unde figmentum illud originem duxiſſe credatur.* i. e. "A plain account, ſhewing that a "certain Engliſh Proſtitute was never a Pope, and "did never exiſt in nature, and explaining what is "thought to have given riſe to that ſtory." Let us not omit Curcellæus, an Arminian Profeſſor at Amſterdam, who declared himſelf for Blondel's opinion, whoſe Latin book, in which the ſtory of the woman-Pope is refuted, he cauſed to be printed. He obſerved farther in the Preface which he added to it (105); 1. That Boxhornius (106) Profeſſor at Leyden had given his approbation plainly enough to Blondel's opinion; 2. That he was told that George Calixtus (107) and Herman Conringius, both celebrated Profeſſors at Helmſtad, approved it alſo. He quoted (108) a paſſage from Nicholas Vignier, by which it plainly appears, that that learned Proteſtant Hiſtorian did not believe the ſtory of Pope Joan. I add that Geſſelius, a Phyſician of Utrecht, approved David Blondel's book (109), and that Dr. Cave and Dr. Burnet (110) think the tradition of the woman-Pope is fabulous. I add alſo that Schoockius, Profeſſor in the Univerſity of Groningen, was one among thoſe who maintained the ſtory of Pope Joan publickly and with ſome warmth, but that at laſt he acknowledged the falſity of it (111). He had declared in one of his works that he had altered his opinion, and yet, to avoid giving offence, he cut out that paſſage, and cauſed other leaves to be printed inſtead of it, according to the advice of his Collegues: but when Blondel's work was publiſhed, he did not think it proper to be ſo cautious any longer, and printed in a ſecond edition, what he had ſuppreſſed in the firſt; and he confeſſed that having compared every one of that Miniſter's arguments, with the anſwers that were made to them, he had found the anſwers were of no weight at all, and ſerved rather to confirm than to refute Blondel's opinion (112). *Legi & expendi poſtea quam diligenter, quæ τῷ πάνυ Blondello ab exceſſu objecta fuerunt: Sed ingenue profiteri debeo, hæc omnia mihi videri κωφὰ βέλη. Reſponſiones minus ſolidæ adverſariæ ſententiæ firmandæ magis quam evertendæ ſerviunt* (113). We ſhall ſee hereunder (114) what has been obſerved of Caſaubon.

After all, it is but juſt to acknowledge that Florimond de Remond's work is not bad in its kind, and I do not think that any perſon had better refuted the ſtory of the woman-Pope before him. But yet he has committed many blunders (115), and uſed too many digreſſions, and too many declamations. I ſhall tranſcribe here an abſtract from a letter, by which it appears that Juſtus Lipſius judged that his arguments were very convincing. *De quæſtiuncula quod petis, ſuper pontifice Joanna fœmina, ut nugantur; vides, quid ſentiam cum appello nugas. Revera fabella eſt haud longè ab audacia & ineptiis Poëtarum. Vis clarè tu & conſortes illi rem videre? Adito Librum gallicè nuper ſcriptum & editum Burdigalis,* Auctore Florimundo Remundo, *Conſiliario Regio, qui totus eſt in hoc argumento, auctor ipſe ad me miſit & ita planè omnia exſecutus eſt, ut nobis nihil reliqui ſit, præter credere & aſſentiri* (116). *i. e.* "You conſult me about that little ſtory (of Pope "Joan). How they trifle! You may judge what I "think of it, ſince I call it a trifle. It is indeed but "a fable, not much unlike the bold fictions of the "Poets. If you and your Collegues have a mind to "be fully acquainted with this matter, read a French "book written and publiſhed at Bourdeaux, by *Flori-*"*mond de Remond*, Counſellor to the King, which is "entirely upon that ſubject, he has ſent it to me, and "has handled his ſubject ſo well, that we have no-"thing elſe to do but to ſubmit and believe." Let us obſerve, that there are many perſons, who aſſert that the Jeſuit Richeome is the true Author of that work (117). And yet there is a prodigious difference as to the manner of writing, between Richeome's works and this; and it is by no means probable, that the blunders, which are to be met with in the book publiſhed under Florimond de Remond's name, could drop from the pen of a man, whom the Jeſuits conſidered at that time, as the beſt French Writer.

[G] *The ſame things ſeem true or falſe to us, according as they are favourable to our party, or to the oppoſite party.*] This maxim cannot be called into queſtion but by thoſe, who behold the things of this world without any attention, and without reflecting ſeriouſly upon what paſſes before their eyes. That diſtemper of prepoſſeſſion would not be very dangerous, if men would determine themſelves in favour of their particular inclination, in ſuch caſes only in which the arguments which affect the underſtanding are equal on both ſides: but men go much farther: the party to which they are addicted carries the ſcale, though the arguments for it be a great deal weaker, than thoſe which are urged againſt it. This is, no doubt, the reaſon why it is difficult for Judges to acquit themſelves of their duty as they ought to do. Montagne had a very juſt thought upon this ſubject. "Though a "Judge be never ſo well reſolved to do juſtice, un-"leſs he be moſt attentively cautious, which few per-"ſons care to be, his mind will be eaſily biaſſed. "His inclination for a friend, for a relation, the im-"preſſion a beautiful woman makes on his heart, a "ſpirit of revenge, and not only theſe powerful mo-"tives, but even a fortuitous inſtinct, which makes us "favour one party rather than the other, without "the concurrence of our reaſon, fixes our choice "between two ſubjects otherwiſe alike; theſe things, "I ſay, may influence his judgment, determine him "for or againſt a certain cauſe, and bear the ſcale "down (118). . . . I have heard of a Judge, who "when he met with a great oppoſition between Bar-"tolus and Baldus, on ſome point ſubject to many "controverſies, uſed to write in the margin of the "book, *a queſtion for a friend*; that is to ſay, that "the matter was ſo intricate, and ſo much contro-"verted, that if he had ſuch a cauſe to judge, he "might give it for the party he liked beſt. Had it "not been for want of wit and underſtanding, he "might have put every where, *a queſtion for a friend.* "The Lawyers and Judges of our time find means "enough to give any cauſe whatſoever ſuch a turn as "they think fit. That boundleſs ſcience, depending on "the authority of ſo many different opinions, and re-"lating to ſuch an undetermined ſubject, cannot but oc-"caſion an exceſſive variety of judgments. Nor is there "indeed a caſe ſo plain, but the Judges differ in their "opinions about it. What one Court has determined, "another Court determines quite contrarywiſe, and "even the ſame Court at different times. Of which "we ſee daily ſeveral inſtances; by that licentiouſ-"neſs, which is a diſgrace to the ceremonious autho-"rity of our Courts of Juſtice, and tarniſhes their "glory, I mean that licentiouſneſs of not adhering "to the decrees, and going from one Court to ano-"ther, for the determination of one and the ſame "cauſe (119)."

There are few perſons, who have power enough over their own heart, not to bear the ſcale down by the weight of their friendſhip, when the arguments are perfectly equal on both ſides. Friendſhip carries it generally even, when the reaſons of the party we like are the lighteſt. Hatred is more active ſtill; and Iſidorus of Peluſium obſerves very well, that *if Favour is ſhort-ſighted, hatred and anger are ſtone-blind* (120). Blondel obſerves, that men *took a pride in making the truth* of that maxim *appear* in their controverſies about the woman-Pope (121). Is it not well known that Bellarmine, Baronius, and many more who wrote againſt the ſtory of that woman, maintain with might and main ſeveral traditions, as ill, or even worſe grounded than that? The ſtrength of the negative argument, the ſilence continued for ſeveral ages, the inconſiſtencies, the credulity, and a thouſand other defects of the vouchers, do not hinder Baronius from taking the affirmative ſide of the queſtion, and even from falling into a paſſion againſt thoſe who are of another opinion, ſo that whilſt he is pleading his own

(103) Flor. de Remond, *l'Anti-Papeſſe*, chap. 6. num. 5. folio 378.

(104) Gretſ. *in Examine Myſterii Pleſſæani*, p. 301.

(105) Pag. 322.

(106) In his *Univerſal Hiſtory.*

(107) F. Labbe, *de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.* Tom. 1. p. 932, reckons him among the aſſertors of the ſtory of Pope Joan, and he is in the right, for there is in Calixtus's book, *de Conjugio Clericorum*, a long digreſſion, in which he vindicates the ſtory of the woman-Pope.

(108) P. m. 319.

(109) Timannus Geſſelius, *Hiſt. Sacra & Eccleſ.* Tom. 2. edit. *ult.* 1661. in 4to. See F. Labbe, *in Cenotaphio everſo*, ad calcem Tom. 1. *de Script. Eccleſ.* p. 986.

(110) I have quoted their words in the rem. [B] of the art. POLONUS.

(111) Martin. Schoock. Fab. Hamel. *in Præf.* and in cap. 22. part. 2. edit. Gron. 1662.

(112) Idem, *in Præf.*

(113) Schoock. Fab. Hamer. part. 2. cap. 12. p. 124.

(114) In the rem. [L].

(115) There is a liſt of them in Blondel's works *upon this queſtion.*

(116) Lipſius, *Epiſt. ad Aub. Miræum*, inſerta in *Not. Miræi ad Sigebertum, apud* Gretſer. *in Myſta Salmurienſi*, p. 300.

(117) See the rem. [C] of the art. REMOND.

(118) Montage, *Eſſais*, liv. 2. chap. 12. p. m. 426, 427.

(119) Ibidem, p. m. 460, 461.

(120) Iſid. Peluſiota, lib. 1. epiſt. 310, quoted by Blondel, *Eclairciſſement, &c.* p. 79.

(121) Blondel, ibidem.

concerning the woman-Pope was thought to be of the greateſt conſequence againſt the Church of Rome (*l*), but after all it would be but a mere trifle (*m*) : for the objections that may be grounded upon it, are not more perplexing than thoſe which are grounded on

(*l*) Coocke, *de la Papeſſe Jeanne*, p. 273.

(*m*) Blondel, *Eclairciſſement*, &c. p. 96.

cauſe he looks upon thoſe objections to be very bad, which he urges as very ſtrong arguments when he is arguing againſt his antagoniſts. Is not this judging of things according to one's paſſion, and turning them now one way, and then another, according as one is influenced by his intereſt and prepoſſeſſion ?

Can it not be ſaid, that they, who maintain with ſo much warmth, that the ſtory of the woman-Pope is true, mind the intereſt of their own cauſe more than the weight and ſtrength of the argument ? For if they were not biaſſed, would they not remember, that the ſilence of contemporary Writers appeared often to them an invincible argument againſt a thouſand traditions, which the Church of Rome admits ? Could they ſay with a good conſcience, that if a tradition, diſhonourable to the Albigenſes, were ſupported by the ſame proofs, and refuted by the ſame objections as that of Pope Joan, they would paſs the ſame judgment on thoſe proofs and objections, as they do in the controverſy relating to that woman-Pope ? Is it not certain that in ſuch a caſe they would laugh at thoſe proofs, and look upon the objections as demonſtrative arguments ? Would they not aſſert, that thoſe arguments cannot be evaded but by downright cavils, and that the pains which ſome people might take to invent exceptions, would be in reality like the artifice of an attorney, who labours only to make a cauſe depend for ever ?

To a man void of all prepoſſeſſion the negative argument would be a ſufficient reaſon for exploding the whole romance of the woman-Pope. I do not pretend to ſuppoſe thereby, that with regard to all kinds of facts the ſilence of the contemporary Writers is a good reaſon to reject them. One cannot pretend this but with regard to remarkable events, as for inſtance Charles the Fifth's retirement into a Convent, and with regard to material and capital circumſtances of an action, which could be unknown to no man, and which it would be abſurd to hope that future ages will have not the leaſt knowledge of. I place in that rank the manner in which Henry II. Henry III. and Henry IV. died, the firſt being killed in a Tournament, the ſecond being murdered by a Monk during the Siege of Paris, and the third aſſaſſinated in his coach in the open ſtreet of the ſame city. It is impoſſible to conceive that all the Hiſtorians who lived in the 16th and 17th Century, ſhould have been obſtinately bent, or conſpired together not to ſay a word of Charles the Fifth's abdication, or of the tragical circumſtances of the death of theſe three Henry's. Take notice that I do not conſider here the ſilence of contemporary Writers in general ; I know very well that it is poſſible that the Authors of pious or moral books, who lived in the 16th or 17th Century, ſhould mention occaſionally ſeveral actions of theſe four Princes, without telling us how and where they died : I ſpeak only of thoſe, who wrote either the particular Hiſtory of thoſe Monarchs, or the Hiſtory of Spain and France, or the general Hiſtory of Europe. It were a prodigy or a monſter more ſtrange than all thoſe which Livy mention, not only, if all theſe Hiſtorians were ſilent with regard to the particulars I have been ſpeaking of, but even if ſeven or eight of the moſt conſiderable Writers had omitted them. Let us put the caſe that in the 24th Century there will be but ſeven or eight of the beſt Hiſtorians extant, who lived under Charles V. and under Henry IV. or a little after, and that they who ſhall be alive at that time, do not meet with the leaſt hint of Charles the Fifth's abdication, and of the murthers of Henry III. and Henry IV. but in ſome pitiful Annaliſt of the 19th Century ; I maintain that they would be the moſt raſh and the moſt credulous of all men, if they ſhould give credit to that Annaliſt, and to an hundred others, who had tranſcribed from him. This may eaſily be applied to the controverſy about the woman-Pope. I have prevented the objection of thoſe, who might take it into their head, that all the Annaliſts who lived in thoſe days, are not now extant. It is enough for my purpoſe, that we have ſtill ſome of the moſt conſiderable. But in order to ſhew people evidently, that it was impoſſible the Hiſtorians of the 9th Century ſhould have ſuppreſſed ſo extraordinary a particular, as the raiſing the pretended Joan to the Papal Throne, I ſhall uſe a little fiction. I ſhall ſuppoſe that an Author of the 11th Century gave us the following account.

Charles the Great wiſhed ſo paſſionately to be ſucceeded by a ſon, that he was extremely vexed to ſee that his wife was barren. She proved pregnant at laſt ; he was overjoyed at it ; but as ſhe was delivered of a daughter only, his uneaſineſs came again upon him, and not truſting much to futurity, he reſolved to make his daughter paſs for a ſon, and called her name Pepin. Six years after the Queen was pregnant again, and was delivered of a male child : but that the publick might know nothing of the cheat that was put upon them, the father and mother continued to conceal the ſex of their firſt child ; ſo that after the death of Charles the Great, his daughter, who paſſed for a man, was crowned without any difficulty. The impoſture was diſcovered the third year of her reign, after this manner. She had ſummoned her Parliament to meet, and as ſhe was going thither with all the pomp imaginable, her labour-pains came upon her, ſhe was delivered before that auguſt aſſembly, and died on the ſpot. This appeared ſo abominable, that the Parliament deteſted that place, and would no longer meet there. They alſo took the neceſſary meaſures to prevent ſuch an accident for the future, and it was ordered that before the Coronation one of the twelve Peers of the Kingdom ſhould put his hand in a proper place to know whether the perſon to be crowned were a man or a woman. This is a ſtory which reſembles that of the woman-Pope as much as can be.

Let us not urge the parallel too rigorouſly, let us weaken it : we do not want to improve all the advantage we have. Let us ſuppoſe that the Annaliſt ended the ſtory otherwiſe, and related that the ſecond year of that Pepin's reign, Prince Lewis, who was really Charles the Great's eldeſt ſon, claimed the Crown, becauſe Pepin was but a daughter, who by the Salic Law could not inherit the Crown. The Civil War which aroſe on that occaſion was very ſevere ; Pepin refuſed to ſuffer himſelf to be viſited, but the city of Paris revolting, he was taken by force in his Palace, and ſtript quite naked, and it being found out of what ſex he was, he was dethroned, and confined to a Convent, and Lewis was raiſed to the Throne in his ſtead.

This ſtory is ſo ſurprizing, whether it be related after the firſt manner, or after the ſecond, that as it is not to be met with in any Author of the 9th Century or even of the 10th, it deſerves to be exploded, as a ſtory which is much like that of John Paris, or of Peter of Provence, and the beautiful Maguelonne, or of Lancelot of the Lake, &c, for it is morally, and even phyſically impoſſible, that all the contemporary Hiſtorians ſhould omit the ſtory of that Pepin, and ſuppoſe that Lewis the Debonnair was the immediate Succeſſor of Charles the Great, and that we ſhould not meet with any deed belonging to the reign of that diſguiſed woman ; not one ſingle letter wrote nor received, not one Embaſſador ſent, no peace concluded, no war declared. See the margin (122). I had rather a man ſhould tell me, that in the year 1694, the Engliſh took Marſeilles and Toulon, putting all on fire, and to the ſword, as far as the very gates of Arles, and then retired loaded with plunder : that all this is very true, though neither the newspapers of that year, nor any other book or pamphlet on the affairs of that time mention one ſingle word of it.

(122) I make that obſervation, becauſe it does not appear, that the woman-Pope, during the two years and four months ſhe is ſuppoſed to have kept the Papal See, anſwered any letter, wrote any, or received any, or did the leaſt thing in the world, though ſhe is ſuppoſed to have had ſo much wit. F. Labbe, *Cænotaphio everſo*, p. 925, 926, urges that argument very ſtrongly, and in a jocoſe manner.

A REFUTATION of the objections made againſt the negative argument.

The ſtrength of the negative argument will appear more plainly, after we ſhall have refuted thoſe who endeavour to account for that great ſilence of the contemporary Hiſtorians. They obſerve that that woman's Popedom was thought to be ſuch a diſgrace to

on facts and principles acknowledged by the Roman Catholicks themſelves. Beza mentioned the woman-Pope in his Oration at the Conference of Poiſſi. Somebody has aſſerted

to the Church of Rome, that it was prohibited to mention her: wherefore the Authors were ſilent upon her ſubject, ſome out of fear, others out of zeal. But one may make ſuch a reply to that argument as overthrows it entirely.

I. It may be obſerved in the firſt place, that it is not true that the ſtory of that woman was looked upon as a diſgrace to the Roman Catholick profeſſion, nor as an event which did in the leaſt affect the rights of the Church of Rome: for according to her principles, thoſe rights do not depend from the perſonal qualifications of the Popes. Joan's crime conſiſted only in her not living chaſtely, but not in her being delivered in the midſt of the ſtreet. Such a delivery would have been the effect of chance, or of imprudence, and could not conſequently aggravate the moral fault ſhe had committed. She is therefore guilty only of not keeping her virginity. How then can you pretend, that for this reaſon Rome muſt acknowledge herſelf loaded with ſuch an infamy, as ought to be blotted out of the memory of man; Rome, I ſay, which does not conceal the wicked lives of ſeveral Popes, who before and after they were elected, abandoned themſelves to a ſtill more abominable diſſoluteneſs. The election of Joan was honourable to the Romans, for ſhe was a perſon eminent for her learning and her morals (123). Not to have known her ſex was an error only as to matter of fact, and an innocent error; for no man can be anſwerable for the ſecret amours of a diſguiſed woman. It is ſo true that the ſtory of the woman-Pope is no diſgrace to the Church of Rome, that Monſieur Jurieu himſelf, for all he is Monſieur Jurieu, acknowledges it. *I do not find*, ſays he (124), *that it concerns us much to prove the truth of that ſtory of Pope Joan. Though the Papal See had been filled by a woman, the Electors taking her for a man, and though that woman had been afterwards delivered of a child in a publick proceſſion, as it is ſuppoſed ſhe was, this, in my opinion, would not be a ſtrong preſumption againſt the Church of Rome: and the advantage we might reap from it is not ſo great as to deſerve that we ſhould enter into a ſmart controverſy upon that ſubject. I find even that that ſtory, after the manner it is related, does more honour to the Roman See than it deſerves. It is reported that this woman-Pope had ſtudied very well, that ſhe had a great deal of learning, capacity, and eloquence: that ſhe was admired at Rome for thoſe noble talents, and that ſhe was unanimouſly choſen, though ſhe appeared there only as a young ſtranger, unknown, without any friends, and without any other recommendation but her own merit. I maintain, that to ſuppoſe a young man, and a ſtranger, was raiſed to that high dignity on the account of his merit only, is doing a great deal of honour to the See of Rome: for it is well known that no man was ever promoted to it but by cabals and factions.* You ſee there a Miniſter, who adds weight to the following obſervation of Florimond de Remond. "But ſuppoſe the Church had been ſo "unfortunate as that a woman was raiſed to the See "of Rome, ſince ſhe roſe to it by her policy and "artifices, and impoſed upon all the world by the "ſhew and appearance of her virtue and holy life, "the blame ought to be laid upon her alone, and "not upon the Electors, who going the common way "to work, and acting with ſincerity, without cabals "and without ſecret practices, cannot be charged "with being concerned in the fraud (125)." That Author adds, that *this accident, if it were true, would not be ſo monſtrous, as what has been practiſed by thoſe, who have called themſelves Reformed, Evangelicks, and Puritans, who have not only ſuffered, but even appointed, nay, forced ſome Queens and Princeſſes to ſtyle and declare themſelves Heads of the Church in their States and Dominions, diſpoſing of every thing that is holy and ſacred, and of all the Church-Preferments according to their own will and pleaſure.* He had no doubt read that reflection in Alanus Copus (126), or in Genebrard (127).

II. It may be replied in the ſecond place, that it is by no means probable that Rome ever forbad to mention ſo publick and extraordinary an event as that was. Such a prohibition had been very ineffectual. Men are not uſed thus to expoſe their authority by orders of ſuch a nature as not to be obeyed, and which are more proper to give people an itch of ſpeaking, than to ſtop their mouth (128).

III. Add to this, in the third place, that if either zeal or fear had been the cauſe of the Hiſtorian's ſilence, we ſhould not find that the firſt, who publiſhed the ſtory of Pope Joan, were perſons entirely devoted to the Catholick party, and more likely to be puniſhed than any others, for they were Monks. It is certain, that moſt of thoſe who related that ſtory, were very good Papiſts, and not in the leaſt inclined to publiſh ſlanders againſt their Church.

IV. Obſerve in the fourth place, that the diſorders of the Court of Rome, infinitely more diſgraceful than that girl's exaltation to the Papal See would be, have been ingenuouſly deſcribed by many Authors, who were very zealous for the Court of Rome (129).

V. I aſſert in the laſt place, that it cannot be ſuppoſed without inconſiſtency, that there was a prohibition ever to mention the woman-Pope; for ſuch a prohibition would be utterly inconſiſtent with the chief particulars of the whole relation. Blondel has not omitted that obſervation: here follow his words. "Several perſons ..... imagined they could vindi- "cate Marianus's romance againſt the objection "grounded on a ſilence which continued above two "hundred years, by aſſerting that the Authors, who "lived ſince the year 855 to the year 1050, forbore "mentioning that ſtory, becauſe they were aſhamed "of it; wherefore they choſe rather to alter the "ſucceſſion of the Popes, by a wilful ſilence, than "by relating an odious truth, to preſerve the exe- "crable memory of that proſtitute, who (as it is "pretended) diſgraced the ſucceſſion of the Popes "by intruding herſelf into it. For not to urge now, "that the contemporary Authors (as we have proved "above) relate ſome true particulars inconſiſtent with "that ſuppoſition, which was born after their death; "they who dwelt at Rome, as Nicholas I. and Wil- "liam, and Anaſtaſius the Librarian, had been very "weak, if they had imagined, that by means of "their ſilence and their ſhame, they could bury in "oblivion that infamy, which is ſuppoſed to have "filled Rome with aſtoniſhment, indignation, and "ſcandal, to ſuch a degree, that ſhe could not be "ſatisfied but by immortalizing the effect of her "juſt reſentment, and giving perpetual proofs of it "to poſterity, by ſetting up a ſtatue repreſenting the "cauſe of her anger, by making the proceſſion march "another way, and by introducing a cuſtom unheard "of before, and not very decent (130)." Florimond de Remond had urged the ſame argument a long time before (131). And yet Monſieur du Pleſſis Mornai took no manner of notice of it. *Onuphrius aſſerts, that Anaſtaſius, who lived at that time, does not mention it; nor Regino, nor ſeveral others, who came after them. To all which it may be anſwered, that to argue ab auctoritate negative, is no concluſive way of arguing. Ranulphus alſo in his Polychronicon would anſwer him*, that this ſtory was omitted by them, becauſe it is diſgraceful (132). Coeffeteau's anſwer with regard to theſe words of Ranulphus is remarkable. "This would be ſomething, ſays he (133), if theſe "Authors had not filled the Roman See with a true "Pope at that time, and had left a vacant interval "long enough to make that proſtitute be delivered "of her baſtard. But farther, where is here the "conſcience of the Reformed? They pretend that "in order to ſhew how much that infamy was deteſt- "ed, and to perpetuate the memory of that ſcandal, "there was a Chapel built at Rome on the ſpot where "Joan was delivered, and a ſtatue of marble ſet up "there repreſenting the fact, and the uſe of indecent "chairs introduced, that ſuch a thing might never "happen for the future: and yet they aſſert that "the Hiſtorians did not dare to mention it out "of reſpect for the Popes. Is there the leaſt ap- "pearance or ſhadow of truth in ſuch incoherent "ſtuff?" Rivet, who refuted Coeffeteau, and followed him almoſt ſtep by ſtep, replied nothing to that paſſage. I have not yet met with any ſolution as to

(123) *Cum in urbe & vita & ſcientia magnæ opinionis eſſet.* Martin. Polonus.

(124) Jurieu, *Apologie pour la Reformation*, Tom. 2. p. 38. edit. in 4to.

(125) Flor. de Remond, *l'Anti-Papeſſe*, chap. 11. num. 5. folio 391.

(126) He pretends that the Engliſh, who appointed Queen Elizabeth Head of the Church, committed a greater crime than that of the Electors of the woman-Pope would have been. See the 8th chapter of his firſt Dialogue, p. 39.

(127) Genebrard. *Chron.* lib. 4. ad ann. 858. p. m. 540.

(128) See Flor. de Remond, *l'Anti-Papeſſe*, chap. 28. folio 442.

(129) See the ſame, ibid. chap. 15. num. 2. folio 402 *verſo*.

(130) Blondel, *Eclairciſſement*, &c. p. 78, 79.

(131) Remond, *l'Anti-Papeſſe*, chap. 22. num. 1. and chap. 24. num. 6.

(132) Du Pleſſis Mornai, *Myſtere d'Iniquité*, p. 161.

(133) Coeffeteau, *Repunſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité*, p. 505, 506.

asſerted in a printed book, that *the whole Papal Tribe looked with ſhame, at the bare recital of that Hiſtory (n).* Florimond de Remond maintains (*o*), that this is falſe, and wiſhed

(*n*) See Flor. de Remond, in his Treatiſe of *l'Anti-Papeſſe*, chap. 6. num. 6. folio m. 378 *verſo*.

(*o*) Ibidem.

to this particular in the writings of thoſe who vindicate the ſtory of the woman-Pope. They have imitated Homer,

Who what he can't improve he lets alone (134).

(134) *Et quæ Deſperat tractata niteſcere poſſe, relinquit.* Horat. *de Arte Poet.* ver. 149.

A REFUTATION of an Author who endeavoured to ſolve the contradiction, which is objected.

This muſt not be underſtood as though I pretended to aſſert, that I know of no man who attempted to remove the contradiction. I know that Alexander Coocke has examined it, and imagined that he extricated himſelf pretty well out of it (135); but I know alſo, that it had been better for the cauſe he aſſerted, if he had ſaid nothing. He ſuppoſes, that there were different opinions; ſome thought it was proper to bury the ſtory of the woman-Pope in oblivion, others maintained it was neceſſary to ſet up publick monuments to perpetuate the memory of it. He quotes two inſtances of ſuch a diverſity of opinions, the one is, that *there were ſome Papiſts in France who denied that* John Chaſtel *was inſtructed by the Jeſuits to murder* Henry IV. *King of France, becauſe they would not make the Jeſuits odious: and yet there were others at Paris who helped to ſet up the pyramid near the Court-hall, by which the whole is notified* (136). The other inſtance is, that there were ſome perſons who *judged*, that the writing preſented to Paul III. concerning the reformation of abuſes, *deſerved to be placed among the publick records; others thought it deſerved rather to be burnt; which appears evidently from this, namely, that the ſaid memorial is inſerted in the edition of the Council, which* Crab *publiſhed in the year* 1551, *and yet it is put in Paul the Third's Index of prohibited books . . . . and was left out of the edition of the Councils publiſhed by* Dominicus Nicolinus *at Venice,* auſpiciis Sixti Quinti, *by the authority of* Sixtus V. *in* 1585, *and alſo out of* Severinus Binnius's *edition, printed at Cologne in* 1606 (137).

(135) Coocke, *de la Papeſſe*, p. 148.

(136) Ibidem.

(137) Ibid. p. 149, 150.

In order to refute this whole diſcourſe, I obſerve, 1ſt, that Coocke's ſuppoſition alters the ſtate of the queſtion. The queſtion was, whether the Authors who were ſilent during two hundred years, were influenced by their reſpect for, or fear of, the Holy See. It has been ſuppoſed, that the immediate ſucceſſors of the woman-Pope forbid to mention that ſcandalous accident, and that Anaſtaſius, and the other Hiſtorians who wrote before Marianus Scotus, ſubmitted to that prohibition, either out of zeal for the honour of the church, or for fear of coming into trouble (138). It is plain that this ſuppoſition claſhes with thoſe public monuments, which, it is pretended, were ſet up, and with the new ceremonies which were introduced at Rome, they ſay, with regard to the annual proceſſions, and the election of Popes. 2d. I obſerve in the ſecond place, that though the whole ſtate of the queſtion be altered, the abſurdity is not removed thereby; for if Anaſtaſius, for inſtance, had been one of thoſe who voted, that it was neceſſary, for the honour of the church, to conceal the ſtoryof the woman-Pope, he would nevertheleſs have mentioned it, after the contrary advice had ſo far prevailed, that the whole city and church of Rome added weight to it, by publick monuments, and by annual and perpetual regulations. What had an Hiſtorian's ſilence availed in ſuch a caſe? What a caprice, or rather, what a folly had it not been to omit, out of reſpect for the holy See, a particular, the memory of which the whole church of Rome immortalized openly, and in the moſt publick manner? I obſerve in the 3d place, that the inſtances, which Coocke urges, are nothing to the purpoſe; for they who had wiſhed that there had been no pyramid ſet up on John Chaſtel's account, and that the Jeſuit had not been diſgraced, were perſonally concerned in that affair, either on account of their friendſhip for that ſociety, or becauſe they did not think the Jeſuits guilty. But Anaſtaſius, and the other Hiſtorians, were not perſonally concerned in the buſineſs of the woman-Pope; they did not care for her honour or reputation; and they did not in the leaſt queſtion the truth of the fact. Beſides this, when the opinion for erecting a pyramid was carried, the Hiſtorians, who were the moſt devoted to the Jeſuits, mentioned it, and could not have concealed it, without making themſelves ridiculous. If the memorial preſented to Paul III. was publiſhed at firſt, and then ſuppreſſed, it was becauſe the Court of Rome did ſoon made the opinion of thoſe prevail, who wiſhed it might be ſuppreſſed. But the ſame cannot be ſaid of the monuments concerning the woman-Pope: for it is pretended that they ſubſiſted during many centuries. The compariſon would be tolerable, if ſome private perſons had ſuppreſſed the memorial, and the Court of Rome had cauſed it to be printed with the moſt authentick approbations ſhe can add to what ſhe deſigns to make publick *ad æternam rei memoriam*, to perpetuate the memory of an event for ever.

(138) It is true, that Anaſtaſius and the other Hiſtorians do not deny that accident, but they are ſilent about it. They ought to have mentioned it, ſays Coeffeteau: but this is the queſtion between us. We ſay on the contrary, that they were obliged to conceal it, both by the authority of the Popes who ſat, then, and by cuſtom, and by conſidering the time when they wrote. The Popes would not ſuffer that their Writers ſhould diſcover that infamy to thoſe who called their authority into queſtion, and have concealed it as much as lay in their power, that they might not expoſe themſelves to be ridiculed by the Greeks. Rivet, *Remarques ſur la Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité*, part. 1. p. 595.

Samuel Des-Marets, who calls the contradiction objected by Blondel, a little quirk (139), does not extricate himſelf out of it better than Coocke. He aſſerts, that among thoſe who omitted the ſtory of the woman-Pope, ſome did it, becauſe they did not think it proper to inſert her name in the catalogues of the Popes, and the others, becauſe as they had a great veneration for the Holy See, they were aſhamed of that ſcandalous accident: but that they did not imagine their omiſſion could obliterate the memory of an event, which was atteſted and immortalized by publick monuments. We have ſhewed above (140), that though our Joan was thought unworthy to have a place in the catalogue of the Popes, and to be reckoned among them, yet the Hiſtorians could not forbear mentioning her falſe Popedom, the fact being too notorious and too extraordinary to be omitted. And as to that veneration for the Holy See, and to that ſhame, which are ſuppoſed to have induced ſome Annaliſts not to ſay one word of an event, of which the whole city of Rome immortalized the memory moſt publickly, they are ſuch odd and ſenſeleſs paſſions, that we ought not to think thoſe Writers capable of them, who ſaid nothing of Joan Anglus's Papacy. An Hiſtorian who has any ſenſe, does not ſuppreſs a truth for the ſake of thoſe, who are pleaſed to make it publick, or when he knows that his ſilence can do no good, and will only expoſe him to ridicule, as a man ſwayed by a fooliſh ſhame. Whoever therefore takes upon him the office of a conciliator in this caſe, loſes his labour (141). The contradiction objected by Blondel is a knot that cannot be untied. *Qui vetuſtiorum (de fœdo ejuſdem exitu, excitatis ad perpetuam memoriam monumentis publicè, ſi Deo placet, conteſtato) diſſimulationem pudori imputandum autumant, ἀσυγκλωστα κλώθειν merito cenſeantur. Quis enim . . . . Nicolaum primum, Hincmarum, Adonem, Anaſtaſium, Luitprandum, alioſque, quibus cum Romanis optimè conveniebat, id ſe conſecuturos ſperaſſe fingat; ut (quod famoſa ſtatuarum propalam proſtantium erectio, ſcrupuloſa in proceſſionum ſolennibus ſceleris conſciæ viæ declinatio, ſtercorariæ ſedis ad explorandum Paparum ſexum decreta in poſterum inceſſio, urbi & orbi indefinenter ebuccinabant) illatum per ſummum nefas Eccleſiæ Romanæ dedecus tacendo eluerent* (142)? i. e. "They who imagine that the ſilence of the antients "(concerning her diſgraceful death, atteſted, as they "pretend, by publick monuments erected on purpoſe "to perpetuate the memory of it) muſt be aſcribed "to ſhame, may well be ſaid to connect together "inconſiſtencies. For who . . . can imagine that "Nicholas I. Hincmar, Ado, Anaſtaſius, Luitprand, "and others, who agreed perfectly well with the "Romans, hoped that they would blot out the diſ"grace caſt on the church of Rome by that moſt "wicked action, if they did but omit to mention it, "when it was continually proclaimed, not only to "the city, but to the whole world, by the ſetting up "of a publick monument, by the ſolemn proceſſions "ſcrupulouſly avoiding the ſtreet where the woman "was delivered, and by the ceremony of the cloſe"ſtool appointed to examine of what ſex the Popes "are."

(139) *Valeret utcunque hæc doctiſſimi Viri argutiola.* Mareſius, *Examine Quæſtionis, &c.* p. 51.

(140) In the rem. [C].

(141) *Pergit pugnantia ſecum Frontibus adverſis componere.* Horat. Sat. 1. lib. 1. ver. 102. *i. e.* "He goes on attempting to reconcile together things "that are inconſiſtent."

(142) Blondel, *in Examine Quæſtionis de Papa fœmina*, p. m. 32.

The paſſage from Monſieur du Pleſſis contains ſomething, which makes us again reflect on the great influence of prepoſſeſſion. *To argue* ab authoritate negative, *from authority negatively*, ſays he, *is no concluſive way of arguing. An impertinent logick this with regard to Hiſtory*, replies Coeffeteau (143). *Nay, it is rather*

(143) Coeffeteau, *Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité*, p. 505.

wiſhed the Prelates had *checked* Beza's *audaciouſneſs, and expoſed his impoſture*; but they had ſo many other ſubjects much more important to examine, that they had been to blame had they loſt their time in diſputes about a matter of fact of ſo little conſequence. And farther, it is not true that Beza adorned *his Oration with that ſtory* (*p*). He did not enter into particulars. Moreri is miſtaken when he aſſerts as *a very remarkable thing*, that among

(*p*) Flor. de Remond, *l'Anti-Papeſſe*, chap. 6. num. 6. folio m. 378 *verſo*.

ther arguing affirmatively; for all theſe Authors, as Anaſtaſius, Ado of Vienna, Rhegino, William the Librarian, and the others, even the Author of Vignier, if it be him, who was lately printed under the name of Luitprand, were under an obligation, as faithful Hiſtorians, to ſet down ſo memorable an event, which happened in their time, ſince it belongs to the Hiſtory they were writing: and their not mentioning it, as much as they had aſſerted, that ſuch an event never happened: add to this, that what ſome of them relate, overthrows the whole ſtory. Pray, conſider with attention, what Andrew Rivet replied. " If this be impertinent logick " with regard to Hiſtory, why do they find fault " with this argument; St. Peter was never at Rome, " ſince neither the Acts of the Apoſtles, nor his own " Epiſtles, nor St. Paul's, mention his journey thi- " ther? *I anſwer*, (replies Bellarmine, and the queſ- " tion is about a point of hiſtory) *that no concluſion* " *can be inferred*, ab auctoritate negative. *For though* " *Luke, Paul, Seneca do not ſay that Peter was at* " *Rome, it does not follow from thence that he never* " *was there: for theſe three Authors were not obliged to* " *ſay every thing; and three witneſſes, who affirm a* " *fact, are more credible, than a thouſand who ſay no-* " *thing of it, provided the latter do not deny what is* " *aſſerted by the former*. Now it is certain, that A- " naſtaſius, and the others, do not deny that ſtory; " they are only ſilent about it (144)." A remarkable inſtance this, which ſhews how much the intereſt of a party is apt to miſlead us! The ſame way of reaſoning ſeems good to us when we uſe it, and bad when it is uſed againſt us. The Roman Catholicks will not admit the negative argument, when it is urged with regard to the queſtion of St. Peter's going to Rome; and they pretend it is a convincing argument with regard to the queſtion of the woman-Pope. The Proteſtants, who judge it a demonſtrative proof with regard to the former of theſe queſtions, will not hear it mentioned with regard to the latter, and in order to refute it they even urge what Bellarmine and other Jeſuits obſerve to overthrow it (145). The anonymous Author (146) of the *Judicium* (147) *de Samuelis Mareſii Joanna Papiſſa reſtituta*. i. e. " An Examination of Samuel des Maret's woman- " Pope reſtored;" made a parallel between Sibrand Lubbert's controverſy with Bellarmine, and Samuel des Marets's with Blondel. The ſubject of the former of theſe controverſies is, whether St. Peter was at Rome or not; and the ſubject of the latter, whether or not there was a woman-Pope. Whence ariſes this conſequence, if Bellarmine be a caviller, Des Marets muſt be one alſo.

(144) Rivet, *Remarques ſur la Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité*, Tom. 1. p. 595.

(145) See Coocke, in his treatiſe *de la Papeſſe*, p. 141, &c. and Samuel Mareſius, *in Examine Quæſt. de Papa fœmina*, p. 44, and p. 20.

(146) It is Daniel Zwickerus. See *Bibl. Antitrinitariorum*, p. 152.

(147) It is a piece containing 22 pages, printed at the end of Curcellæus's *Quaternio Diſſertationum Theologicarum*, at Amſt. 1659, in 8vo.

(148) Jurieu, *Apologie pour la Reformation*, Tom. 2. p. 40.

What can be the reaſon why another Miniſter, who would not affirm that there has been a woman-Pope (148), though the ſtrongeſt arguments, which are urged againſt that tradition, very weak? Was not this owing to his prepoſſeſſions, and to a party intereſt? For he would judge thoſe arguments ſo ſtrong to confute ſome ſatyrical ſtory publiſhed againſt the Valdenſes, that he would load any Monk with reproaches, who ſhould refuſe to yield to ſuch arguments. It muſt be confeſſed, that it is chiefly with regard to matters of controverſy that a man's underſtanding is a bubble to his heart.

This produces among other bad effects a diſadvantageous opinion, which is reciprocally entertained of the oppoſite party. They look upon each other as ſtubborn perſons, who will not ſwerve a jot from the opinions they have once received, and who chooſe rather to uſe evaſions, than to ſubmit to reaſon. When a man obſerves that this ſpirit runs through the works deſigned to maintain that there was a woman-Pope, he is apt to think that the Authors act from the ſame principle, when they argue either againſt the Pope's ſupremacy, or againſt tranſubſtantiation, and that though the arguments urged to ſupport theſe two doctrines were as clear as the ſun at noon day, they would nevertheleſs contradict them, and think they have refuted them abundantly, if they can but alledge ſuch cavils as are alledged by thoſe who aſſert the ſtory of the woman-Pope. Whence it is judged, that gentle means will prove ineffectual with ſuch people, and that their obſtinacy deſerves all the ſeverity of penal laws. When on the other hand one ſees the Roman Catholicks never ceaſe writing books to ſupport the moſt ill grounded traditions, as for inſtance, Lazarus's arrival in Provence, Dennis the Areopagite's Apoſtolſhip, &c. one is inclined to think that the ſame ſpirit moves them to explode the moſt convincing arguments that can be urged againſt Tranſubſtantiation. Is there any thing more plain than the facts, by which are proved the alterations which have happened in the belief of the Church (149)? And yet the Roman Catholick Writers deny them with the utmoſt confidence, and even ſtyle them impoſſible (150). How could the Proteſtants forbear calling this a downright obſtinacy?

A very learned Calviniſt, who followed Blondel's opinion, would not ſcruple to grant what I have been obſerving here, for he remarks that by aſſerting with ſo much warmth, that there has been a woman-Pope, one gives the Roman Catholick Controverſiſts room to confirm their followers in their falſe opinions, and to make them hate the Proteſtants, as though theſe had nothing ſtronger to urge againſt the other Popiſh Doctrines, than what they urge to ſupport the ſtory we ſpeak of. *Si dicere liceat, quod res eſt, Papani Doctores dum vident quoſdam ex Noſtris, pro Joannæ Papiſſæ Hiſtoria, ut vera, velut pro aris atque focis digladiari, argumentum inveniunt ad confirmandos cæcos ſuos ſectatores, eoſque ab Orthodoxa doctrina alieniores reddendos. Cum enim non difficulter, imo ſufficienter, (licet non deberent ipſi) commentum hoc deſtruere queant, facile ſimplicioribus perſuadent, ejuſdem notæ eſſe reliqua, quæ illi, quos per calumniam hæreticos vocant, adverſus dogmata ſuæ Eccleſiæ, quam ſolam contendunt eſſe Catholicam, adducere conſueverint* (151). i. e. " If I " may ſpeak the truth, when the Popiſh Doctors ſee " that ſome of our people contend for the truth of " the woman-Pope, as it were for their God and " their country, it gives them an opportunity to con- " firm their blind followers in their opinions, and to " render them more averſe to the orthodox doctrine: " for as they can without difficulty, and effectually " confute that ſtory (though it does not become them " to do it) they make the unwary believe that all the " other arguments are of the ſame ſtamp, which " they, whom they ſlanderouſly ſtyle Hereticks, ob- " ject againſt the doctrines of their Church, which " alone, as they pretend, is the Catholick Church." You will ſee hereunder (152), that this is not ſaid at random; I ſhall quote a Capuchin, who in order to convict the Proteſtants of obſtinacy, urges the controverſy about the woman-Pope as an inſtance of it. I do not hink there is any reaſon to charge David Blondel with raſhneſs, becauſe the arguments urged againſt the ſtory of the woman-Pope determined him to take the negative ſide of the queſtion. But if on account of the other arguments that can be oppoſed to thoſe, it were thought he deſerved to be condemned, in ſuch a caſe the condemnation ſhould be grounded on his not ſtanding neuter. This is the courſe ſome perſons take: they leave the queſtion about the woman-Pope undetermined; they do not affirm what Martin Polonus has ſaid of her, and neither do they deny it. This ſeems to them a prudent behaviour: but do they behave thus in all other caſes? Do they ſuſpend their judgment, till ſuch arguments be offered to them, againſt which they cannot invent the leaſt reply? By no means; on an hundred other occaſions they are ſatisfied with the moſt trifling reaſons, when they happen to ſuit with their prepoſſeſſions.

The ſame defect is daily obſerved in the news-mongers. Is there any report ſpread, which is favourable to the enemy, and ſupported by a great ſhew of probability; they argue againſt it as much as they can,

(149) See among other works written by the Miniſters, *the Hiſtory of the Church*, which Monſieur Baſnage publiſhed (in French) in the year 1699, in two volumes in folio.

(150) The Gentlemen of Port-Royal wrote ſeveral books to that purpoſe with regard to the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation; and a Dr. of the Sorbonne named *Langevin*, has aſſerted it with regard to all the articles of faith. The *Journal des Savans* for Feb. the 6th, 1702, contains an account of his book.

(151) Martin. Schoockius, *Præf. Fabulæ Hamelenſis*, folio *ult.*

(152) In the rem. [*I*].

among ſo many perſons who have maintained the ſtory of Pope Joan, *there is not one ſingle Frenchman* (g) [*H*]. Let us obſerve, that the multitude of authorities cannot be looked upon as a proof, ſince the moſt antient witneſs lived above two hundred years after the fact, and ſince it is inconſiſtent with ſome unqueſtionable facts, which are reported by contemporary Authors [*I*]. Colomies cenſures Blondel for thinking, that the ſtory of the woman-Pope, which is to be met with in a manuſcript of Athanaſius, was *ſet down in the very words of Martinus Polonus*. He ſhews that an Hiſtorian who lived before that Martinus has related what we read in that manuſcript; but upon the whole that particular is

(g) Moreri, under the word Joan VII. (John VII.) Pope.

and will not believe it, but when the fact is evidently unqueſtionable? I have often told them, that their reſiſtance could not be ſufficiently commended, provided it were attended with two conditions: the one that they would be content with ſuſpending their judgment without taking the negative ſide of the queſtion, the other that they would be as hard of belief when any news is ſpread abroad, which is diſadvantageous to the enemy. But in ſuch a caſe they are credulous to an exceſs; the ſtrongeſt appearances of falſity do not make the leaſt impreſſion on their minds; they oppoſe them as much as lies in their power, without remembring that there are daily much weaker appearances, which they urge as unanſwerable proofs againſt ſuch news as they do not like, and which on that account they think unworthy to be credited. They ſuffer themſelves to be taken at the firſt onſet by the Gazettes of their own country, and will undergo four or five aſſaults from thoſe of the enemies country. An exceſſive credulity in ſome reſpects, and an exceſſive incredulity in ſome other reſpects, agree ſo well together in one and the ſame man, that the one is often the cauſe of the other.

[*H*] *Moreri . . . . . aſſerts . . . . . that among ſo many perſons, who have maintained the ſtory of Pope Joan, there is not one ſingle Frenchman.*] There is in theſe words of Moreri a truth and a falſity. It is certain that numberleſs perſons have related that ſtory (153): but it is falſe that there is no Frenchmen among them. Moreri might have avoided that blunder, if he had conſulted Florimond de Remond's *Anti-Papeſſe*; for he would have read there the following words. "Our French Hiſtorians and Annaliſts, walking in "the old road, have mentioned ſomething of her. "For in order to adorn their works, they would in"ſert that fine piece into them. One of them aſ"ſerts, that ſhe was a beautiful maiden, of a great "GENIUS (it is his own word) that ſhe was a native of "England, and fell in love with a young ſtudent. "Then rehearſing the whole ſtory he aſſerts, that "it was her Valet-de-Chambre, who playing the "fool with her ſpoiled her ſhape, and that as ſhe "was one day riding on horſe-back thro' the city ſhe "was delivered of a child, and died on the ſpot, af"ter ſhe had held the See of Rome two years, five "months, and four days; and that after her death "Nicholas I. was choſen Pope; which happened in "the year 858. Wherein he gave the lie to all "thoſe who wrote before him. One of her Cardi"nals, according to that Author, making ſport with "his maſter's or miſtreſſes's life conſecrated her "memory in that noble line,

(153) See the rem. [*B*] of the art. FRANC.

"*Papa pater patrum papiſſa peperit partum* (154).

"i. e. The Pope the Father of the Fathers being a "woman was delivered of a child." If the Author of the Annals of Aquitain, whom he quotes, be John Bouchet, as it is very likely, he muſt have uſed an edition printed either before or after that which I make uſe of (155); for in mine I find only this. *After this Pope Leo, who held St. Peter's See eight years, a woman of England was raiſed to the Papal Dignity, who was miſtaken for a man and named John. She was born at Mentz, and when ſhe was twelve years old ſhe dreſſed herſelf in men's clothes, and went to ſtudy at Athens, where ſhe made a very great progreſs; thence ſhe went to Rome in the ſame dreſs, where ſhe was ſo much eſteemed that the Cardinals, thinking ſhe was a man, choſe her Pope; ſhe held the Holy See thirteen months, or thereabout, and in the thirteenth month, being got with child by a certain Valet-de-Chambre of hers, as ſhe was going to St. John of Lateran's Church, ſhe was taken with her labour-pains, between the Theatre of Coloſſus, and St. Clement's, and died immediately after ſhe was delivered. It is ſaid that ſince that time, whenever a Pope is choſen, it is the cuſtom to aſk one of the Cardinals, whether the perſon choſen has his genitals or not* (156). Florimond de Remond's quotation is perhaps wrong, and inſtead of the Annals of Aquitain he ſhould have quoted the Annals of France by Nicole Gilles (157). He complains alſo of another Writer whom he does not name, and then of the Sieur du Haillan, *who would not publiſh his hiſtory in France, without inſerting the ſtory of Joan into it, of which* Gaguin, or Paul Æmilius, *do not make the leaſt mention*. He acknowledges however, that du Haillan confeſſes *that ſome deny what is related of her*. He thinks Stephen Paſquier more blameable, who, *in his noble enquiries, ought to have enquired after the truth, that he might not deface the beauty of his writings with ſuch an ugly ſtory* (158); *for after ſo many authorities, and ſo convincing proofs as I had already publiſhed, there was no room left to mention the name of Pope Joan any longer*. He cenſures afterwards the Hiſtorian de Serres, *who quoting only Platina's authority, has altered his paſſage*, and omitted the words, *they ſay*, and thoſe, *the ſtory has been tranſmitted to us by uncertain Authors, who deſerve but little credit*. Florimond is in the right to tell him, *that Authors muſt be quoted faithfully and not by halves*.

(154) Florimond de Remond, *l'Anti-Papeſſe*, chap. 4. num. 4. folio 372 *verſo*.

(155) That of Poictiers, printed by Enguilbert de Marnef, 1557, in folio.

(156) Bouchet, *Annales d'Aquitaine*, 2 part. folio m. 60.

(157) We meet there with the ſame words and the ſame things, which Flor. relates. See thoſe *Annals*, folio 66 of the Paris edit. 1538, by Nicholas Conteau, in folio.

(158) Paſquier, in his Recherches, liv. 3. chap. 4. p. m. 163, and chap. 7. p. 178, and liv. 6. chap. 5. p. 465. But making a good uſe of Florimond's cenſure, he wrote a long letter (in liv. 12. p. m. 829, &c.) in which he took in ſome meaſure the negative ſide of the queſtion.

As de Serres was a Miniſter, I confeſs that he cannot be alledged as a witneſs againſt Moreri, who no doubt meant only French Roman Catholicks. But the other Writers quoted by Remond have all the qualities requiſite to afford me a good argument. I may quote, beſides them, the Author of the *Arbre des Batailles* (159) (the Tree of Battles,) and Martin Franc (160), and Nicole Gilles (161), and Raviſius Textor (162), and the Preſident Fauchet (163), &c. I do not know whether I might not add to them Du Verdier Vau-Privas, who relates the ſtory at length (164), without affirming or denying it: but then he ſhews ſufficiently that he thinks it very doubtful.

(159) See the rem. [*B*] of the art. FRANC.

(160) See the rem. [*A*] of his article.

[*I*] *That multitude of authorities cannot be looked upon as a proof, ſince the moſt antient witneſſes lived above two hundred years after the fact, and ſince it is inconſiſtent with . . . . . contemporary Authors.*] They who refute the ſtory of the woman-Pope prove moſt evidently, that ſhe cannot be placed between Leo IV. and Benedict III. They bring chronological demonſtrations of this, which they ſupport by very plain paſſages from the Authors who lived in the ninth Century. Whence it follows, that the firſt, who two Centuries later mentioned the woman-Pope, deſerves no credit; and that they, who have related the ſame ſtory afterwards, have only tranſcribed one another, without tracing it up to its firſt origin, and without examining the matter in the leaſt, and conſequently we ought not to lay any ſtreſs on their multitude. Blondel ſhall now obſerve the ſame to you in other words. "So that, ſays he (165), Marianus "is the firſt and only ſpring, from which the ſtreams "of the poſterior Writers are derived: and after I "have ſo plainly made out the inexcuſable defect of "that Writer, I do not think it neceſſary to exa"mine thoſe who only tranſcribed from one another, "without knowing whether the firſt was well inform"ed or not. Though the witneſſes ſhould ariſe by "hundreds, or by thouſands, to give ſuch ill con"trived diſpoſitions, no man of ſenſe would make "any account either of their number, which ought "never to outweigh truth and reaſon, or of their "diſcourſes, which in reality would be nothing elſe "but a mere echo of the firſt idle talk, which might "have been eaſily convinced of impertinence and "falſity, if they who related it had been more de"ſirous to ſtudy the hiſtory of the ninth Century, "than

(161) In the *Annals of France.*

(162) *In Officina.*

(163) In the *Antiquitez Françoiſes*, in the *Life of Charles the Bald*, folio 53, of the Paris edit. 1602, in 8vo.

(164) In the 3d vol. of his *Proſopographie*, p. 1667, &c.

(165) Blondel, *Eclairciſſement*, &c. p. 70, 71.

is more proper to ſupport than to refute Blondel's opinion [K]. They who wrote with a deſign to prove the falſity of that ſtory, have endeavoured to trace the origin of it, and have alledged ſeveral conjectures. Some have obſerved that Pope John VIII. acted with ſo much weakneſs in the cauſe of Photius, that it was thought he deſerved to *be called a woman rather than a man* (r). This was Baronius's opinion. But Aventinus imagines that the ſtory is owing to Pope John the Ninth being choſen by the credit of Theodora, *a noble and haughty proſtitute* (s), whoſe minion he was. Onuphrius Panvinius thinks the ſtory aroſe from Pope John XII. who uſed to *carry always a whole tribe of proſtitutes after him, of whom he loved Joan Rainiera moſt paſſionately*, ſo that ſhe governed him abſolutely, for which reaſon *ſome banterer called her afterwards the woman-Pope* (t). Bellarmine pretends the fable came originally from a report which was ſpread abroad, that a woman had been Patriarch of Conſtantinople (u). Allatius aſſerts, that one Thiota, who ſet up for a Propheteſs in Germany in the 9th Century, gave riſe to that ſtory. Blondel, having refuted theſe conjectures, declares that we ought not *to exert our wit in ſuch needleſs enquiries into a ſubject, which it is not worth while to examine* (x). *What a laborious taſk would it be for us*, adds he (y), *if we were obliged to find out what vouchers and authorities the Writers of ſo many romances had, which till this day are believed by the greateſt part of mankind?* He gives ſeveral inſtances of this. I do not believe he was in the right, to explode all the conjectures that have been publiſhed concerning the origin and foundation of that romance of the woman-Pope. I will be ſo bold as to aſſert, that the Proteſtants, who have ſo much exclaimed againſt him, and who have looked upon him as a falſe brother, have not done him juſtice, and did not well underſtand the intereſt of their own party. It ſignifies but little to them whether that woman exiſted or not: a Miniſter, who is none of the moſt tractable, confeſſes it (z). But it concerns them very much not to give their adverſaries room to look upon them as obſtinate men, who will not ſwerve a jot from the opinions they once entertained. They could lawfully object the ſtory of the woman-Pope as long as it was not refuted. They were not the inventors of it; they met with it in ſeveral works compoſed by very good Papiſts: but ſince it has been refuted by very ſtrong arguments, they ſhould have given it up, and not uſed their whole art and induſtry to prolong the controverſy; for it was teaching their adverſaries how to call all kinds of facts into queſtion, and ſhewing them a method to maintain the tradition that there has been a Pope Cyriacus, who abdicated his dignity in order to go and expoſe himſelf to martyrdom at the head of eleven thouſand virgins (aa). If they had followed Blondel's example, they would have ſhewn by a noble inſtance, that they underſtand reaſon,

(r) Blondel, *Eclairciſſement*, &c. p. 85.

(s) Ibidem, p. 87.

(t) Ibidem, p. 88.

(u) Pope Leo XI. teſtifies it, *Epiſt.* 1. cap. 23. See Blondel, ibid. p. 89. Compare this with what Father Mabillon relates in his *Muſæum Italicum*, Tom. 1. p. 27. and conſult Spanhemius, *de Papa fœmina*, p. 12 & *ſeq.*

(x) Blondel, *Eclairciſſement*, &c. p. 92.

(y) Ibidem, p. 93.

(z) Monſieur Jurieu, you will meet with his own words in the rem. [G].

(aa) See Monſieur de Launoi, *Epiſt.* 8. part. 4. p. m. 356, where he compares that tradition with that concerning Pope Joan.

" than to exert that ſlanderous eloquence, which St. " Jerom in his time would have called *caninam facun-* " *diam* (a ſnarling eloquence)." Some pages lower he gives ſeveral inſtances of falſe traditions, and particularly *of the Siege before Paris under Lewis the Debonnaire's reign, by the Giant Iſaurus, whoſe tomb is ſtill ſhewed in the Monaſtery of St. Germain* (166); and then he concludes thus. " Let it be ſufficient " for us, that all theſe are nothing but mere ſtories: " that though all men ſhould take them for oracles, " it would not be in their power to alter their na- " ture. And on the other hand, though the truth " (oppreſſed by the tyranny of prepoſſeſſions, affront- " ed by the Romans, and betrayed by oblivion, or " by the cowardice of men) would be for ſome time " unknown, and diſdained, neither its being left " unfollowed could be a diſgrace to it, nor the endea- " vours of its enemies make it fall from its native " dignity, nor the fair appearance of fables eclipſe " its divine light (167). . . . . Since therefore it is ſo " conſiſtent with itſelf in the writings of the Au- " thors, who lived between the years of Chriſt 850 " and 1050, ſince their accounts agreeing together " compoſe a well connected body, and ſet the events, " which are controverted, in ſo clear a light, as tho' " they had wrote them down with a beam of the " ſun, and ſince the later Writers abound with con- " tradictions and incoherencies, being inconſiſtent " both with the antecedent Authors and with them- " ſelves, methinks that their opinion (of how long a " ſtanding ſoever it may boaſt) deſerves no better " treatment, than to be (by the common conſent of " all thoſe who know how to yield to reaſon) cry'd " down like baſe and uſeleſs coin (168)."

(166) Blondel, ibid. p. 93, 94.

(167) Ibidem, p. 94.

(168) Ibidem, p. 95.

The particular nature of the ſtory of the woman-Pope does very much leſſen the weight of the great number of Writers who mentioned it. The fact is uncommon, extravagant, ſingular in all its circumſtances. It is proper for thoſe who give catalogues of learned women, and of lewd women, and of women who diſguiſed their ſex. It is proper for thoſe who collect inſtances of God's judgments, and for thoſe who take a pleaſure in writing merry ſtories. Authors of all ſorts might make uſe of it. We ought not therefore to wonder that ſo many perſons inſerted it into their writings, and took it all along for granted that it was true. Men do not much examine thoſe traditions, which may ſerve as an ornament to the ſubject they treat of.

We have mentioned above (169) ſome circumſtances, which, with regard to this ſubject, add a great weight to the negative argument.

(169) In the rem. [G].

[K] *Colomies cenſures Blondel. . . . . He ſhews that an Hiſtorian who lived before Martinus Polonus, has related . . . . but upon the whole, that particular is more proper to ſupport than to refute Blondel's opinion.*] " Blondel was very much miſtaken, when he ima- " gined that the Life of that woman, ſuch as it is " in the Anaſtaſius of the King's library, was ſet " down in the very words of Martinus Polonus. For " how can that be, ſince Gervaſius Tilberienſis, an " Author an hundred years more antient than Mar- " tinus Polonus, in a work intitled *Otia Imperialia*, " (the Imperial ſports) wrote for the diverſion of the " Emperor Otho IV. which I read in manuſcript at " Mr. Voſſius's, relates the Life of the woman-Pope " in the very ſame words with the Anaſtaſius of the " King's library; adding only, that the ſtory of that " woman was to be met with in a few chronicles " only, *Et in paucis Chronicis*, ſays he, *invenitur*. If " Mr. Blondel had ſeen that Author, he would per- " haps have forbore writing; but he was not more " acquainted with him, than with Amalricus Auge- " rii, who lived in the year 1362, and wrote a Chro- " nicle of the Popes, dedicated to Urban V. wherein " he ſpeaks thus of the woman-Pope: *Joannes dictus* " *Anglicus, natione magnanimus* (I think we ought to " read *Maguntinus*) *poſt Dominum Leonem Papam in* " *Romanum Pontificatum fuit aſſumptus; & poſt B. Pe-* " *trum Apoſtolum ponitur Papa centeſimus decimus*. i. e. " John ſirnamed the Engliſhman, born at Mentz, " was raiſed to the Papal Dignity after Leo X. He is " reckoned the 110th Pope after St. Peter. The " learned Scrivenerius had that Hiſtorian in manu- " ſcript (170)." I ſhall make two obſervations on that paſſage. The firſt is that Gervaſe of Tillebery did

(170) Colomies, *Melanges Hiſt.* p. 57, 58. See Blondel's words in the rem. [A], quotat. (2).

reaſon, and that they are unjuſtly charged with obſtinacy [*L*]. They might have boaſted that they did not keep up the other controverſies from a ſpirit of contradiction, but becauſe no ſolid anſwer is made to the difficulties they urge *(bb)*. Launoi and ſome other Writers, who refute ill grounded traditions, do indeed vex and offend many people, but then they do a great honour to their Church, who cannot afterwards be charged with tyrannizing

(*bb*) Upon all this ſee the rem. [*G*].

did not live an hundred years before Martin Polonus; for he dedicated his book to Otho IV. (170), who was elected Emperor in the year 1198, and died in 1218. Blondel aſſerts that Martin Polonus *died about the year* 1270; it was in the year 1278, as Voſſius has proved it (172). My ſecond obſervation is, that if Blondel had known that Gervaſe of Tillebery mentioned the woman-Pope in the very words of the manuſcript of Anaſtaſius, this would not have hindered them (as Colomies ſuppoſes) from the refuting the ſtory of that woman; on the contrary, it would have afforded him wherewithal to confirm himſelf in his opinion. He would have ſaid that Martin Polonus tranſcribed from a very bad original, namely, from a Chronicle deſigned to divert the Emperor in his leiſure hours, and for that purpoſe filled with a thouſand ridiculous ſtories. After this manner Gabriel Naudé diſcredits all that the ſame Martin Polonus has related concerning the magical arts of Pope Sylveſter II. *for it it certain that he tranſcribed all that he has ſaid of him from the chronological accounts of that Galfridus, who lived about the year* 1150, *and from one Gervaſe, who was Orator to the city of Arles, and Chancellor to the Emperor Otho III.* (173), *but for the reſt the greateſt inventor of fables, and the moſt notorious liars, who ever ſet pen to paper; as there is no room to queſtion, after the bare reading of the book which he compoſed,* De Otiis Imperatoris, *where all that he relates is ſo monſtrous, and ſo far from reaſon, and from the ordinary or extraordinary poſſibility of things, that Æſop's Fables, and Amadis's ſtories are infinitely more credible* (174). Let us remember the Fables he related concerning Virgil's pretended Magic, and how Naudé cenſured him for it (175). Martin Polonus confeſſes, that Gervaſe, that is to ſay Gervaſe of Tillebery (176), is one of thoſe from whom he extracted materials for his Chronicle.

(171) Theodor. *à Niem*, lib. 2. *de Schiſm.* cap. 19. p. m. 97.

(172) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 486.

(173) He ought to have ſaid Otho IV.

(174) Naudé, *Apolog. des grands Hommes*, chap. 19. p. m. 558, 559.

(175) See the rem. [*I*] of the art. VIRGIL.

(176) See Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 486.

[*L*] *They are unjuſtly charged with obſtinacy.*] You have ſeen in the remark [*G*] ſome reflections, which tend to ſhew that the controverſies about the woman-Pope give the Roman Catholicks an opportunity to ſay that the Proteſtants are ſtubborn men. Some readers might think perhaps that I ſpoke thus only by mere gueſs. This determines me to give here ſome practical proofs of what they would make paſs for mere ſpeculations. A Capuchin Preacher, who publiſhed a book of controverſy in the year 1611, aſſerted (177), that *one cannot better repreſent the humour and way of dealing of our Miniſters, who pretend to write*, than by applying to them what *St. Athanaſius being weary to confound the Hereticks, without converting them, ſaid of thoſe of his time* * ; though they be refuted, they never acknowledge it. Though they have nothing now to urge, yet they are not aſhamed; but being barefaced, like lewd women, they become impudent in their impieties againſt all (178). "A "plain and direct anſwer is made to the Miniſters, "continues the Capuchin, without leaving their "doubts and impoſtures any room to make a pertinent reply. One ſhews before their eyes, one ſounds in their ears, one makes their hands feel, "that their objections are ill grounded, that their "hiſtories are nothing but fables, that their anticipated belief is unreaſonable. No matter for "that, they repeat again their antiquated fancies, "as though they were quite new, without ſhame, "without any ground, without conſcience. If they "can but fill their books with that old ſtuff, and "impoſe upon ſome ſilly perſons, they are ſatisfied: "they ſhew that the wiſe man was in the right to "ſay †, *though thou ſhouldſt bray a fool in a mortar, among wheat with a peſtle, yet will not his fooliſhneſs depart from him* (179)."

(177) Sylveſter de Laval, a Capuchin Preacher, *les juſtes Grandeurs de l'Egliſe Romaine*, liv. 3. chap. 5. p. 68, 69.

* Athanaſ. *Orat. 4. contr. Arrian.* ἀτε γὰρ ἐλεγχόμενοι παύονται, ὅτε ἀποροῦντες ἐπιρέπονται, ἀλλ' ὡς ὄφις πόρπις, ἀπτναισχύν τισαν πρὸς πάντας ἐν ταῖς αἱρέσεσιν.

(178) Sylveſter de Laval, *Grandeurs de l'Egliſe Romaine*, liv. 3. p. 68.

† Proverbs xxvii. 22.

(179) Sylveſter de Laval, ibid. p. 69.

Now here follows the inſtance, by which he endeavours to prove that unjuſt accuſation. "It is impoſ"ſible for them to reply to the ſolid diſcourſes, evi"dent arguments, and unqueſtionable witneſſes, "which the Catholicks have a thouſand times alledged, in order to prove, that what their Fathers pre"tended to aſſert concerning Pope Joan, is a mere "ſtory, and a wicked ſlander. The Sieur Caſaubon, "the moſt learned man among the pretended Re"formed, and who by the ſtudy of polite Literature "has acquired modeſty, and won the friendſhip of ſe"veral men of learning and honour, particularly of "Thuanus, laughs at that ſtory. I have ſeen them "agree together, that after reading Onuphrius's "Annotation on the Life of John VIII. in Platina §, "it is impoſſible to believe, that this pretended Joan "was ever in being, as the ignorant imagine. Bel"larmine, Genebrard, Florimond de Remond, and "fifty other Catholicks, have written upon that ſub"ject, ſince Onuphrius, and have made the matter "out ſo evidently, that if there can remain any doubts "about it, we have reaſon never to believe any man "living. And yet after all this, little Vignier (180) "was ſure to repeat that ſilly ſtory, in order to ſwell "his ſeditious book. His theatre, which was to be "the thick foreſt of all the ſlanders of his party, "had not been complete without that falſity. What "can we do with him? What ſhall we ſay both to "him, and to thoſe who believe him, but what they "themſelves ſing at their meetings:

§ *Onufr. apud Platin. annot. ad Joh.* 8.

(180) In the 27th chap. of the 2d part of his *Theatre de l'Antichriſt*, printed in the year 1610, in folio, and reprinted in 8vo in the year 1613.

Juſques à quand gens inhumaines
Ma glorie abattre taſcherez?
Juſques à quand empriſes vaines,
Sans fruict, & d'abuſion plaines,
Aymerez-vous & chercherez (181)?

(181) Sylveſter de Laval, ibid. liv. 3. p. 99 and 70.

That is to ſay, according to T. Sternhold's tranſlation,

"O mortal man how long will ye
"My glory thus deſpiſe?
"Why wander ye in vanity,
"And follow after lies*.

* Pſ. iv. 3.

After this the Capuchin ſpends ſixteen pages in refuting the old traditions, and concludes with theſe words: "It muſt be therefore for want of ſhame "or ſenſe, and for want of true or probable objecti"ons, that the reformed Miniſters, after ſo much "certainty and evidence, dare to repeat that fooliſh "ſtory again. I think, that without wronging them, "one may very well tell them, and thoſe who reſem"ble them, that they ſhew that to be fulfilled, which "the Apoſtle foretold was to happen **. *The time "will come, when they will not endure ſound doctrine, "but after their own luſt ſhall they keep to themſelves "Teachers, having itching ears, and they ſhall turn away "their ears from the truth, and ſhall be turned unto fa"bles.* On the contrary for that reaſon, they who "have any wit, and fear God, ought to remember "what the ſame St. Paul wrote another time to Ti"mothy †, *Refuſe profane and old wives fables, and "exerciſe thyſelf rather unto godlineſs.* For in conſci"ence one cannot call the Miniſter's Hiſtory of Pope "Joan, any thing elſe but a *profane fable, and an old "woman's ſtory* (182)."

** 2 Tim. iv. 3, 4.

† 1 Tim. iv. 7.

(182) Sylveſter de Laval, liv. 3. p. 86, 87.

Theſe two quotations from the Scripture are ſufficient to ſhew, that his judgment was not extraordinary: for thoſe paſſages may be urged againſt his church, who for ſome centuries did not in the leaſt queſtion the truth of that fable. A Proteſtant, whom I have quoted above, alledges that credulity is an argument of the Church of Rome's Antichriſtianiſm. *Nec quando hanc foveo ſententiam* (non extitiſſe Papiſſam) *patrocinor Papiſmo aut Babyloni adulor. Abſit; quicquid alii ſentiant, meam opinionem ei confundendæ, præ altera ſervire credo. Quod enim à pluribus ſeculis Papani conſtanter crediderint, Johannam Papiſſam Eccleſiæ præfuiſſe, completum eſt vaticinum Apoſtoli, 2 Theſſ.* xi. minantis iis efficaciam erroris, immittendam à Deo, ad hoc ut crederent mendacio (183). *i. e.* "Though I aſ"ſert that there never was a woman-Pope, yet I do "not pretend thereby to flatter Popery or Babylon:

(183) Martin. Schoockius, *in Præfatione* Fabulæ Hamelenſis, fol. *ult.*

rannizing over the mind with regard to that kind of ſubjects; whereas they who will obſtinately maintain thoſe traditions diſgrace their own Church.

" God forbid! for whatever others may think, I am " perſuaded that my opinion is more proper than the " contrary opinion, to confound the Papiſts; for " ſince they have conſtantly believed, during ma- " ny ages, that a woman-Pope preſided over the " Church, they ſhew thereby that the Apoſtle's pro- " phecy is fulfilled, who threatens them (2 Theſſ. xi.) " that *God ſhall ſend them ſtrong deluſion, that they " ſhould believe a lie.*"

I cannot forbear obſerving, that Athanaſius's words, quoted by the Capuchin, are a common topic, which all parties uſe, in order to exclaim againſt their adverſaries's obſtinacy. They might be retorted upon that Capuchin: for how many things has he aſſerted, which had been refuted an hundred times over and over again? There prevails every where, more or leſs, a certain ſpirit of contradiction, which does not ſuffer men to give up their former arguments. One would look upon them, as tho' they had received them on the ſame terms, which certain Lacedæmonian women required from their ſons, when they gave them their bucklers; *ſuffer yourſelf to be killed, rather than loſe it* (184). Let us make another compariſon. It ſeems they conſider them as a ſacred depoſitum, or as a talent, which they are obliged to improve upon pain of malediction, or laſtly, as an eſtate intailed, which is perpetually to deſcend from father to ſon, ſo that they muſt be as ſcrupulous with regard to the alienation of it, as Naboth was (185). However it be, there are a thouſand controverſies, in which the weakeſt arguments are continually repeated. It is to no purpoſe to refute them, they reſemble nature, which it is in vain to expel, ſhe will ſtill return (186); or they *are like thoſe troubleſome inſects; the more we ſtrive to drive them away, the more obſtinately they purſue us* (187). Prudent Diſputants do not act after this manner; their prepoſſeſſion is not ſo great as to hinder them from preceiving the ſtrong and weak ſide of an argument; they follow the example of wiſe warriors, who abandon thoſe poſts which they cannot defend to any purpoſe.

(184) Ἢ τᾶν ἢ ἐπὶ τᾶς, *aut hanc, aut ſuper hac.* " Bring " this back, or " be you brought " back upon it." ταύταν αὖζε, ἢ μὴ ἴσω, *aut hanc ſerva aut peri.* " Keep this or " die." Plut. *in Inſtitutis Laconicis*, p. 241, F.

(185) *The Lord forbid it me* anſwered Naboth to Ahab, who wanted to buy his vineyard) *that I ſhould give the inheritance of my fathers unto thee.* 1 book of Kings, chap. xxi. 3.

(186) *Naturam expellas furca, tamen uſque recurret.* Horat. *Epiſt.* 10. lib. 1. ver. 24. (187) Father le Tellier ſays this of the adverſaries of the Jeſuits, in his *Defence des nouveaux Chretiens*, p. 22. Add to this the following line from Horace, Sat. 5. lib. 2. ver. 83. *Ut canis à corio nunquam abſterrebitur uncto.*

(*a*) And not *Poclain*, as in Moreri.

POQUELIN (*a*) (JOHN BAPTIST) a famous Comedian, known by the name of MOLIERE, was ſon of a Valet-de-Chambre, the King's upholſterer, and was born at Paris about the year 1620. He went through the ſtudy of the Claſſics under the Jeſuits, in the College of Clermont. He was deſigned for the bar; but *at his quitting the law-ſchools, he made choice of the actor's profeſſion, from the prodigious fondneſs he had for the Drama* (*b*); *his whole ſtudy and application being directed to the ſtage.* His firſt Comedy was the *Etourdi*, which he exhibited publickly in the city of Lyons in 1653. *Being ſome time after in Languedoc, he waited upon the Prince of Conti, and offered him his ſervice. That Prince favoured him with a moſt gracious reception; ſettled ſalaries upon his company; and took them into his ſervice, both for himſelf and the States of Languedoc.* Having ſpent the Carnaval at Grenoble in 1658, *he went and ſettled in Roan. He ſpent the ſummer there; and after taking ſome journies privately to Paris, he was ſo happy as to pleaſe his Majeſty's brother, the Duke of Orleans, who having granted him his protection, and taking his company of Comedians for his own, preſented him in that quality to the King and Queen.* This Company *played, for the firſt time, before their Majeſties, and the whole Court*, the 24th of October 1658, on a ſtage erected for that purpoſe, in *the Guard-room of the old Louvre*, and had the good fortune to pleaſe, and therefore *his Majeſty commanded him to ſettle in Paris. The hall of the* Petit Bourbon *was granted, in order for him to exhibit plays alternately with the Italian players. In October* 1660 the hall of the Palace Royal was granted him (*c*), and a penſion of 1000 Livres was ſettled upon him in 1663. In 1665 his company was taken altogether into his ſervice, and he continued till his death to exhibit plays which were greatly applauded. His laſt Comedy was the *Malade Imaginaire*, which was played the fourth time the 17th of February 1673, on which day he died [*A*]. Theſe particulars I have extracted from his life prefixed to his

(*b*) See the rem. [*G*].

(*c*) See the rem. [*H*].

[*A*] *On which day he died.*] The chief character of Moliere's laſt comedy is a ſick perſon who pretends to be dead. Moliere played this part, and conſequently was obliged, in one of his ſcenes, to repreſent a dead man. A great number of people declare that he expired in that part of the play; and that when he was to make an end of it, by ſhewing that it was nothing but a feint, he could neither ſpeak, nor riſe up, and that he was found really dead. This unuſual circumſtance was looked upon as wonderful, and ſuggeſted to the Poets a great number of witty conceits and ingenious alluſions; which, very probably, was the reaſon why ſo much credit was given to this ſtory. Some perſons even gave a ſerious turn to their thoughts, and made many moral reflections on that incident. But Moliere did not really die after this manner; he having time enough, though very ſick, to make an end of his part. The following particulars are related in his life. " The 17th of Fe- " bruary 1673 (1), the fourth night of the repreſen- " tation of the *Malade Imaginaire*, he was ſo great- " ly troubled with his defluxion, that he could ſcarce " act. However, he went through it, but with great " torture, and the ſpectators were ſenſible that he was " far from being the character he acted; for indeed, " as ſoon as the play was done, he got home as quick " as poſſible; and had ſcarce got to bed, when the " continual cough, which tormented him, grew ſo " violent, that a vein in his lungs broke. The in- " ſtant he found himſelf in this condition, he de- " voted his whole thoughts to Heaven, immediately " after which he was ſpeechleſs; and was choaked, " in half an hour, by the great quantity of blood he " vomited up (2)." But not to conceal any particular, I muſt here inform the reader, that according to other writers, Moliere was not able to hold out till the play was done; and they were obliged to carry him away before. " Moliere died ..... after a " very ſurprizing manner. He had been very much " indiſpoſed for a long time, which was aſcribed to " the uneaſineſs he met with from his wife, and " ſtill more to his great application. One evening " that he was to play the *Malade Imaginaire*, (the " imaginary ſick man) which was then a new Drama, " and the laſt he had writ; he was very much out of " order when he began, and was going to put the " play off on account of his indiſpoſition: however, " obſerving there was a full houſe, and being un- " willing to diſmiſs the audience, he ſtrained him- " ſelf, and played almoſt to the end, not perceiving " that

(1) Correct in Moreri, 1672. I ſhall obſerve, occaſionally, that, in the ſame article, we muſt read *Polixene*, inſtead of *Polixene*.

(2) Moliere's *Life* prefixed to his works, printed at Bruſſels in 1694.

his works. I perhaps ſhould rather have not taken any thing from it ; that book being better known, and in more hands than my Dictionary will ever be ; and therefore, by copying from that Life, I ſhall not inform any perſon of any new particulars. A circumſtance, which I have been aſſured by many, is not related there, is, viz. that the only motive of his going upon the ſtage was, to enjoy the company of an Actreſs for whom he had contracted a violent fondneſs. I leave the Reader to conjecture, whether this particular was omitted becauſe it was not true, or from fear that it would prejudice his character. Several perſons declare, that his Comedies ſurpaſs, or equal, the moſt beautiful pieces of that kind written by the antient Greeks and Romans [*B*]. It is no wonder that he ſo juſtly repreſented domeſtic feuds, and the torments of jealous huſbands, or of thoſe who have reaſon to be ſo ; it being aſſured that no man ever experienced this more than Moliere [*C*]. Theſe circumſtances I borrow from a printed book, ſome particulars of which

" that he grew worſe : but in that part where he " acted the ſick man, he grew ſo very weak, that " the audience thought he was really dead, and thoſe " about him could ſcarce make him ſtand upon his " legs. He then was adviſed not to go on, but to " get to bed. However, he reſolved to go through " with his part, if poſſible ; and as a great part of " it was played, he thought he might proceed to the " end without doing himſelf much harm ; but the " ſtrong deſire he had to oblige the publick was at- " tended with very fatal conſequences ; for as he was " ſpeaking of Rhubarb and Sena in the ceremonial " of the Phyſicians, he vomited blood, which fright- " ing the audience and his fellow Comedians, he was " carried home inſtantly, where his wife followed " him into his bed-chamber. She pretended to take " on grievouſly, but all the endeavours that were " uſed to recover him were to no purpoſe. He died " a few hours after, having vomited up all his " blood (3)." The Poets, I obſerved before, did not let ſlip this opportunity of ſhewing their wit ; and handed about a great number of little pieces : " but " among the ſeveral pieces writ upon his death, " none were more applauded than the four Latin " verſes following, which were thought proper to be " preſerved.

(3) See the book entitled, *La fameuſe Comedienne, ou Hiſtoire de la Guerin, auparavant femme & veuve de Moliere*, p. 38, 39.

" *Roſcius hic ſitus eſt triſti Molierus in urnâ,*
" *Cui genus humanum ludere, ludus erat.*
" *Dum ludit mortem, Mors indignata jocantem*
" *Corripit, & mimum fingere ſæva negat* (4).

(4) *Vie de Moliere*, folio *3.

" Here, in this tomb, fam'd Moliere is interr'd,
" The Roſcius of his age, whoſe chief delight
" Was, in his hum'rous ſcenes, to paint mankind.
" But whilſt he mimick'd death, that cruel power
" Snatch'd him from life, and made him what he
feign'd."

To theſe Latin verſes I will add the following French Epitaph (5)'

(5) It is in vol. 1. of the *Mercure Gallant*, of 1673. Therein are inſerted ſeveral more ſuch pieces, with a funeral oration (in a waggiſh ſtrain) in proſe.

Cy git qui parut ſur la Scene
Le ſinge de la vie humaine
Qui n'aura jamais ſon égal,
Qui voulant de la Mort, ainſi que de la Vie,
Eſtre l'imitateur dans une Comedie,
Pour trop bien reüſſir, y reüſſit fort mal ;
Car la Mort en eſtant ravie,
Trouva ſi belle la copie.
Qu'elle en fit un original.

" Here lyes a man, who on the Theatre,
" Mimick'd, with matchleſs art, our various foibles.
" But ſtriving once to imitate grim death,
" He, or ſo well or ill perform'd his part,
" That death, delighted at ſo great a copiſt,
" Seiz'd it, to make it an original."

[*B*] *Several perſons declare, that his Comedies ſurpaſs, or equal, the moſt beautiful pieces of that kind, written by the antient Greeks and Romans.*] Perrault has drawn upon himſelf a great number of adverſaries, for having ſtrongly oppoſed thoſe who aſſert, that no Authors, in this age, are comparable to Homer, Virgil, Demoſthenes, Cicero, Ariſtophanes, Terence, Sophocles, and Euripides. This diſpute has occaſioned a great number of treatiſes that contain a great number of particulars. But the anſwer to Perrault's parallel is not yet publiſhed, nor is it known when it will be. I believe I may aſſert, that with regard to the ſeveral productions of the pen, there are few things in which ſuch numbers of people have acknowledged the ſuperiority of this age, as in Comedies. The reaſon, perhaps, of this is, that all perſons are not capable of reliſhing the graces and delicate touches of Ariſtophanes, who yet are ſtruck with the wit and charms of Moliere ; for it muſt be granted that, in order to form a juſt judgment of the Greek Comic Writers, we ought to be perfectly acquainted with the imperfections of the Athenians. There is a ridicule common to all ages and nations ; and a ridicule peculiar to certain ages and nations. Some ſcenes of Ariſtophanes appear inſipid to us, which, perhaps, charmed the Athenians, becauſe they were acquainted with the imperfections which thoſe ſcenes ridiculed. It was an imperfection, which we, perhaps, do not know ; it was the ridicule, either of ſome particular incidents, or of ſome tranſient taſte or paſſion, which might have been common at that time, but may be unknown to us, though we have an opportunity of conſulting the originals. Such are the obſtacles, which will not allow us to admire the Poet in queſtion according to his merit, neither in Greek nor in Latin ; nor in the moſt faithful and politeſt tranſlations that can be made of them. Now Moliere has not this diſadvantage. We know what he aims at, and we eaſily perceive whether he deſcribes juſtly the ridicule of our age ; and nothing eſcapes us that is well drawn by him. One would even conclude, that, with regard to thoſe thoughts, thoſe delicate ſtrokes of raillery which affect all polite ages and nations, he is more copious and abundant than Ariſtophanes and Terence. This is a very conſiderable prerogative ; for the preſent age cannot be accuſed of wanting taſte for the beautiful paſſages of the Latin Poets. Shew Ladies of wit certain thoughts in Horace, Ovid, Juvenal, *&c.* tranſlated into old French, *&c.* though ever ſo flat a verſion ſhould be made of them ; yet, if it be faithful, the Ladies in queſtion will own that thoſe thoughts are beautiful, delicate, and witty. Some beautiful ſtrokes of wit are in vogue in all ages : and one would conclude that Moliere abounds more in thoſe than the Comic Poets of antiquity. There are ſome beauties which would be loſt in verſions, or in a country whoſe taſte differed from that of the French ; but a great many others may be transferred into all kinds of tranſlations, and will pleaſe Readers of all taſtes, provided they underſtand the eſſence of good thoughts. See the article AMPHITRIO (6).

(6) Rem. [*B*].

[*C*] *It being aſſured, that no man ever experienced more . . . . the torments of jealous huſbands, or of thoſe who have reaſon to be ſo.*] I have read in a little book printed in 1688, that (7) *Moliere's wife was courted more in proportion, than he was applauded* ; that ſhe was *daughter to the late Mrs. Bejard, a ſtrolling Actreſs, who was engaged in intrigues with ſeveral young ſparks of Languedoc, at the auſpicious time when her daughter was born : for which reaſon*, adds the Author, *it would be extremely difficult, (ſhe having ſuch a crowd of gallants, to ſay who was her father ; all we know is, that her mother uſed to declare, that during the irregular life ſhe led, ſhe never admitted any but perſons of quality, Moliere excepted,) and that for this reaſon her daughter ſprung from very noble blood ; and indeed the only thing ſhe recommended to her was, to abandon her charms to none but perſons of figure. She was thought to be Moliere's daughter, though he was afterwards her huſband. However,*

(7) Hiſtory of *La Guerin*, formerly Moliere's wife and widow, p. 6.

which I ſhall tranſcribe (*d*). The moſt ſurprizing circumſtance is, we are told that his wife was his daughter (*e*). He wrote verſes with prodigious facility (*f*); but then he took

(*d*) See the rem. [C].

(*e*) See the rem. [C].

(*f*) See Boileau's ſecond Satyr.

However, the truth of this is not very well known . . . . (8). Moliere *married young Mrs. Bejard ſome time after* he had ſettled his company at Paris; *he wrote ſome dramatic pieces*, and among the reſt, La Princeſſe d'Elide, in which his wife, who acted the part of the Princeſs (9), *made ſo ſhining a figure, that he had but too much reaſon to repent his having hazarded her in the midſt of the gay young Courtiers. For, ſoon after ſhe was at Chambor, where the dramatick piece abovementioned was played by the King's order, ſhe grew diſtractedly fond of Count de Guiche, and Count de Lauzun of her. Moliere was told* (10), *that his great aſſiduity in endeavouring to divert the publick, deprived him of the opportunity of enquiring into his wife's conduct; and that whilſt he ſtrove to divert every one, every one ſtrove to divert his wife. And now jealouſy awaked, in his boſom, the tenderneſs, which the application to his ſtudies had lull'd aſleep. Immediately he flew to his wife, to whom he made heavy complaints; reproaching her with the great care with which he had brought her up; the paſſion he had ſtifled, his behaviour towards her, which was that of a lover rather than of a huſband; whilſt ſhe, in return for ſo many favours, made him the laughing-ſtock of the whole Court. His wife, burſting into tears, confeſſed to him that ſhe had had an inclination for Count de Guiche; but proteſted, with an oath, that her crime was wholly in the intention; and that he ought to pardon the firſt falſe ſteps of a young woman, who generally, for want of experience, is guilty of ſuch miſconduct; but aſſured him, that the indulgence he had ſhewed her had made ſo great an impreſſion on her mind, that ſhe ſhould never be guilty of ſuch foibles for the future. Moliere, perſuaded of her virtue by her tears, begged a thouſand pardons for his being angry with her; and told her with great mildneſs, that it is not enough for people's reputation that they were juſtified by an unblemiſhed conſcience; but that it was alſo neceſſary people ſhould not do any thing, that might make the world ſuſpect their conduct, eſpecially in an age when the publick is ſo apt to form diſadvantageous judgments, and no ways inclined to judge favourably of things* (11). She began *her old trade more openly than ever. . .* (12). "Moliere being told, by ſome who were glad to make "him uneaſy, of his wife's conduct, repeated his "complaints with more violence than ever, and even "threatened to confine her in a monaſtery. Moliere's "wife, exaſperated at his reproaches, wept, fainted "away, and obliged her huſband, who was doatingly fond of her, to repent his having put her into "that condition. He did all that lay in his power "to recover her, by conjuring her to conſider that "love was the only cauſe of his anger; and that ſhe "might judge of the mighty aſcendant ſhe had over "him, ſince that, notwithſtanding he had ſuch juſt "reaſons to be diſſatisfied with her behaviour, he "yet was ready to forgive her, provided ſhe would "ſhew a more reſerved conduct for the future. One "would imagine, that ſo unuſually-kind a huſband "would have ſtruck her with remorſe, and prevailed "with her to reform her conduct; nevertheleſs, "kindneſs had a contrary effect upon this woman; "and the fear ſhe was under, leſt ſhe ſhould never "meet again with ſo favourable an opportunity for her "to live apart from him, made her ſpeak in a very lofty "ſtrain; ſaying to him, that ſhe knew very well "who it was that told him all thoſe falſe ſtories; that "ſhe was quite weary of being charged daily with a "thing of which ſhe was innocent; that he needed "but prepare matters for their ſeparation; and that "ſhe hated him, becauſe he had always been engaged "in a ſecret correſpondence with de la Brie (13), "who lived in their houſe, and had never left it "ſince their marriage. Notwithſtanding the utmoſt "endeavours were uſed to ſoften Mrs. Moliere, ſhe "continued inexorable; from that inſtant ſhe entertained a dreadful averſion for her huſband; and "when he had a mind to make uſe of the privileges, "which the marriage-ſtate entitled him to, ſhe treated him with the utmoſt contempt. In fine, ſhe "carried matters ſo far, that Moliere, who now began to be ſenſible of her depraved inclinations, "conſented to the ſeparation which ſhe had been deſiring perpetually ever ſince their jarring; ſo that they "agreed to part, without addreſſing the Parliament "for that purpoſe. In the mean time, it was with the "greateſt reluctance that Moliere came to a reſolution not to live with his wife; and at the ſame "time that reaſon made him conſider her as a woman, whoſe conduct made her unworthy of the "eſteem of a man of honour; tenderneſs, on the other ſide, made him ſenſible, that it would be a "grief to him, to ſee her ſpend her days without enjoying the privileges which a wife juſtly claims. "He was one day reflecting on this, in his garden "at Auteuil, when Mr. Chapelle, a friend of his, "who was come thither accidentally to take a walk, "went up to him, and found him more melancholy "than uſual, for which reaſon he enquired ſeveral "times what it was that made him ſo. Moliere, "who was aſhamed to diſcover ſo little patience, "with regard to a misfortune that was ſo much in "vogue, forbore ſatisfying him as long as he could; "but having at that time his heart full, a ſtate well "known to perſons who have been in love, he gave "way to the deſire he had to give himſelf eaſe; and "frankly confeſſed to his friend, that the behaviour, "he had been obliged to uſe towards his wife, was "the cauſe of the grief which oppreſſed him. Chapelle, who imagined that he had a ſtrength of "mind ſuperior to things of that nature, laughed at "him; ſaying, that it was ſtrange that he, who "could draw ſo happily the imperfections and foibles "of other men, ſhould himſelf be guilty of a weakneſs which he ridiculed daily; and made him ſenſible, that nothing could be ſo ridiculous as to "love a perſon who makes no return of kindneſs. "With regard to myſelf, ſays he, I own that had "I had the ill fortune to be in the like condition, "and ſhould be ſtrongly perſuaded that the perſon I "loved, indulged her favours to others, the contempt "I ſhould have for her, would be ſo great, that it "would cure me infallibly of my paſſion. Beſides, "you have one ſatisfaction, which you muſt be without, in caſe ſhe was miſtreſs; and revenge, which "generally ſucceeds to love, in an injured lover's "breaſt, may compenſate for all the uneaſineſſes "which your wife brings upon you, ſince you have "no more to do, but to ſhut her up in a monaſtery; "and this, at the ſame time, will be a ſure method "to make you eaſy in your mind. Moliere, who "had liſtened calmly enough to his friend, interrupted him, with aſking, whether he had ever been in "love? I have, replied Chapelle; but then it was "in ſuch a manner as became a man of ſenſe; but "I ſhould never have been ſo very much troubled about a thing, which reaſon had adviſed me to do, "for my happineſs ſake, and I bluſh to ſee you ſo "very wavering. I ſee plainly, replied Moliere, "that you was never in love; and that you took "the ſhadow of that paſſion for the paſſion itſelf. I "will not produce a numberleſs multitude of examples, which would make you ſenſible of the power "of that paſſion. I will only give you a faithful account of the perplexity I myſelf am under, in order to ſhew how little a man is maſter of himſelf, "when love has once gained ſuch an empire over "us, as our natural diſpoſition uſually gives. To anſwer what you obſerve, with regard to the perfect "knowledge you ſay I have of the human mind, "which you think manifeſt from the characters I "every day exhibit on the ſtage; I will own that I "have made their foibles my chief ſtudy; but if I "learnt that the danger may be ſhunned, experience "has taught me but too well, that it is impoſſible "to fly from it. This I judge daily by myſelf." He then gives the ſtory of his marriage, and, after making ſome reflections, he adds (14): *I therefore am reſolved to live with her as though ſhe was not my wife: but if you knew how greatly I ſuffer, you would pity me. My paſſion is riſen to ſuch a height, that I cannot forbear being very much concerned for her; and when I conſider how impoſſible it is for me to ſuppreſs what I feel, I ſay to myſelf, ſhe perhaps finds as great difficulty to check the inclination ſhe has to be a coquet, and then I am more diſpoſed to pity than blame her. You doubtleſs will*

(8) Hiſtory, &c. ibid. p. 12.

(9) Ibid. p. 13.

(10) Ibid. p. 16.

(11) Ibid. p. 18.

(12) Ibid. p. 19.

(13) This was an Actreſs belonging to the company which Moliere found ſettled at Lyons, the firſt time he played in that city. He fell in love with that woman; was beloved by her, and got her into his company. *Hiſtoire de la Guerin*, p. 8.

(14) *Hiſt. de la Guerin*, p. 28.

took too great a liberty in coining new words and expreſſions [*D*], and he frequently was guilty of barbariſms [*E*]. Baillet (*g*) ſhews what judgment we ought to form of his abilities.

(g) *Jugemens ſur les poetes*, Tom. 5. num. 1520.

Some

will obſerve to me, that no one but a Poet could love after ſuch a manner; but my opinion is, that there is but one ſort of love; and that perſons who have never been ſenſible to ſuch delicacies, have never felt a real paſſion. . . . (15). *Are you not ſurprized that my reaſon ſhould only make me ſenſible of my weakneſs, without being able to triumph over it? I on the other ſide will own to you, (ſaid his friend to him) that you are a greater object of compaſſion than I took you to be; but I hope time will give you eaſe: and in the mean time exert your utmoſt endeavours for that purpoſe.*

(15) *Hiſt. de la Guerin*, p. 30.

Such was the fate of this fine genius. In the midſt of the acclamations of the whole Court, at the ſame time that he had attained the moſt exalted reputation, and was the admiration of all France and foreign countries, he was tortured with numberleſs domeſtick uneaſineſſes. His marriage deprived him both of his honour and repoſe; he even had not the ſatisfaction to hate the thing which cauſed his anguiſh, I mean the perſon who was the cauſe of all his troubles. It was on this occaſion one might ſay, Phyſician, cure thyſelf: Moliere, you who divert the publick ſo happily, cannot you divert yourſelf? You, who laugh at every body, who give ſuch excellent advice to poor cuckolds, why do not you take advantage of it firſt? He perhaps may have ſaid a thouſand times with Horace (16), I had rather be thought the meaneſt of all Writers, and have my mind at reſt, than to be ſo great a genius, to be ſo much admired, and ſuffer theſe numberleſs uneaſineſſes.

(16) *Prætulerim ſcriptor delirus inerſque videri, Dum mea delectent mala me vel denique fallant, Quam ſapere, & ringi.* Horat. lib. 2. *Epiſt.* 2. ver. 125.

[*D*] *He took too great a liberty in coining new words and expreſſions.*] The reader will pleaſe to take notice, that only the exceſs of this liberty is found fault with; for to ſay the truth, people do not deny but that he frequently introduced them very happily, and in ſuch a manner as enriched our language. He has brought into vogue ſome phraſes and words that are of a moſt pleaſing turn; and any Grammarian who ſhould think the contrary, would deſerve the ſame treatment with him who cenſured the Poet Furius for inventing certain Latin words which ſhortened expreſſion, and did not grate upon delicate ears. Read the following words of Aulus Gellius. *Non hercle idem ſentio cum Cæſellio Vindice grammatico, ut mea opinio eſt, haud quaquam inerudito. Verum hoc tamen petulanter inſciteque; quod Furium veterem poetam dedecoraſſe linguam Latinam ſcripſit hujuſcemodi vocum fictionibus, quæ mihi quidem neque abhorrere à poetica facultate viſæ ſunt, neque dictu profatuque ipſo tætræ aut inſuaves eſſe; ſicuti ſunt quædam alia ab illuſtribus poetis ficta durè & rancidè. Quæ reprehendit autem Cæſellius Furiana, hæc ſunt; quod terram in lutum verſam* luteſcere *dixerit, & tenebras in noctis modum factas* nocteſcere, *&c.* (17). i.e. "I indeed am not of the "ſame opinion with Cæſellius Vindex the Gram- "marian, whom I take to be a learned man. How- "ever, he has diſcovered a great deal of preſumption "and ignorance, in aſſerting that Furius the old "Poet, deformed the Latin tongue by his new-coined "terms of that kind, which yet I take to be alto- "gether conſiſtent with poetical diction, nor harſh, "nor inharmonious when ſpoke; as certain others "are, of a grating obſolete ſound, though invented "by diſtinguiſhed Poets. Thoſe which Cæſellius "cenſures in Furius are the following, *viz.* his cal- "ling *luteſcere*, earth changed to clay; and *nocteſcere*, "darkneſs, after the manner of night." By the way, there is no better mint for the coining of new words than the ſtage; for if it produces any new expreſſions which are favourably received, great numbers of people learn them immediately; and by often repeating them, ſpread them among the publick. Good Writers cannot juſtly be diſputed the right of coining new words, ſince otherwiſe languages would remain jejune, barren, and flat. See what Voſſius (18) and ſeveral other Writers ſay on this ſubject (19). It ought therefore, generally ſpeaking, to be granted, that Moliere had a right to improve dramatic ſubjects with new coined words, as he had acquired ſo great a reputation by his plays: but that which may be ſaid againſt him is, that he abuſed his right or power; for it muſt be remembred, that the Writers on ſuch kind of ſubjects are not ſo ſenſible of the poverty of a language, as thoſe who write on dogmatic ſubjects. *It muſt be confeſſed,* ſays Arnauld (20), *that perſons are more ſenſible of the want which our tongue has of certain words, when they write on learned ſubjects, than when they ſpeak or write on common things.* Theſe are his words, in a preface where he accounts for the liberty he took in inventing the words *philoſophiſmes, philoſophiſtes, advertance.* It is certain that comic Poets are not ſo excuſable as Philoſophers who coin words, they being under an indiſpenſible neceſſity of doing this. Read the following complaint of Lucretius.

(17) Aulus Gell. lib. 18. cap. 11. p. m. 494, 495.

(18) Voſſius, *Inſt. Orat.* lib. 4. cap. 1. p. m. 442.

(19) Theoph. Raynaud, *de malis ac bonis Libris*, num. 427, p. m. 243, quotes a great number.

(20) Arnauld, Preface to the 5 *Denonciation du Peche Philoſophique.*

Nec me animi fallit, Graïorum obſcura reperta
Difficile inluſtrare Latinis verſibus eſſe,
(Multa novis verbis præſertim cum ſit agendum,)
Propter egeſtatem linguæ, & rerum novitatem (21);
. . . . . .
Nunc & Anaxagoræ ſcrutemur Homœomeriam,
Quam Græci memorant, nec noſtra dicere lingua
Concedit nobis patrii ſermonis egeſtas (22).

(21) Lucret. lib. 1. ver. 137.

(22) Idem, ibid. ver. 830.

" I'm ſenſible the Latin is too poor,
" To equal all the riches of the Grecian ſtore:
" New matter various nature ſtill affords,
" And new conceptions do require new words.
. . . . . .
" Now let's examine with a curious eye
" Anaxagoras his philoſophy,
" By copious Greece term'd Homœomery:
" For which our Latin language, poor in words,
" Not one expreſſive ſingle voice affords."

CREECH.

The reaſon why he wanted words, was not becauſe of the laws of quantity; for thoſe who wrote philoſophical books in proſe, complained alſo of this penury. *Quanta verborum nobis paupertas, imo egeſtas ſit, nunquam magis quam hodierno die intellexi. Mille res inciderunt, cum forte de Platone loqueremur, quæ nomina deſiderarent, nec haberent: quædam vero cum habuiſſent, faſtidio noſtro perdidiſſent. Quis autem ferat in egeſtate faſtidium* (23)? i. e. "I never perceived in a more "ſenſible manner, than I do at this very time, the "great poverty, or rather want of words, in the "Latin tongue. A thouſand particulars occurred "(whilſt we were talking about Plato) for which no "names could be found; and ſome which had had "names, were loſt, by our ridiculous diſtaſte. But "ſurely can any thing be more abſurd than for thoſe "in want to affect diſtaſte?" We may obſerve, by the way, the double cauſe, to which Seneca aſcribes the penury of languages; the one is, that we have not yet found out certain words; and the other, that ſeveral grew out of uſe. But we ſhould alſo obſerve that the Romans at the time even when they wrote only Epigrams, complained of their not being able to find words they wanted (24); whence it may be concluded, that Moliere might have had the ſame want, and for that reaſon was obliged to have recourſe to invention. Laſtly, it may be obſerved, that the birth of one word proves commonly the death of another (25). This is true chiefly with regard to the French, whence it may be inferred that our language will for ever be poor and barren.

(23) Seneca, *Epiſt.* 58. *init.* p. m. 266.

(24) See Pliny Junior, *Epiſt.* 18. lib. 4.

(25) Juſt as in the productions of nature, where *generatio unius eſt corruptio alterius.*

[*E*] *He frequently was guilty of barbariſms.*] I could quote an hundred inſtances of this, but will confine my ſelf to two, extracted from a piece, which is prefixed to his works in ſome editions. It is a compliment of thanks to the King. He has given it a moſt delightful turn; and it is, perhaps, as good a ſmall piece as ever he wrote. Weigh well the four verſes following addreſſed to his Muſe.

Vous pourriez aiſément l'étendre (26),
Et parler des tranſports qu'en vous font éclater

(26) That is, your compliment.

Les

Some are of opinion, that Moliere cannot claim the glory of being an Inventor, and that he made a good uſe of the comedies which the Italians play'd at Paris [*F*]. It is falſely aſſerted, that Boileau changed his note after the death of this great comic Writer; certain ignorant Cenſors declaring, that he applauded him when living, but cenſured him when dead. The truth is, he ſtill continued to applaud him when he was in his grave. He only accuſed him of ſhewing too much complaiſance for the pit; a cenſure that was juſt in ſome reſpects, but unjuſt in the whole [*G*]. The verſes which Father

Les ſurprenans bienfaits, que ſans les meriter
Sa liberale main ſur vous daigne repandre.

" With eaſe you might extend it, and deſcribe
" The tranſports which, in your all-grateful mind,
" Ariſe, when you reflect that, undeſerv'd,
" His liberal hand ſtill heaps new favours on you."

The Author's meaning in theſe lines, is, that his muſe had been indulged the greateſt kindneſs, tho' ſhe was no ways deſerving of them: but they ſignify, according to the grammatical conſtruction, that tho' the King did not deſerve thoſe favours, he nevertheleſs beſtowed them on Moliere's Muſe. This is certainly a barbarous expreſſion. Here follows the other example.

Les Muſes ſont de grandes prometeuſes,
Et comme vos ſœurs les cauſeuſes
Vous ne manqueriez pas ſans doute par le bec.

" Fam'd are the Muſes for their promiſes;
" And like your pratling ſiſters, ſurely you
" Would ne'er want chat——."

The Author's meaning is, that his Muſe would be like her ſiſters, who are very talkative; but, according to the grammatical conſtruction, it plainly ſignifies nothing but this, that ſhe would be a very pratling Muſe, though her ſiſters are of a very different character. It muſt be obſerved, that by *barbariſm*, I do not mean words or expreſſions borrowed from other languages, and unknown to the French; but a diſpoſition of words contrary to the laws of grammar, and which are looked upon as barbarous by our beſt Grammarians.

In the ſame Poem we find *Marquis repouſſable*, a barbarous expreſſion. We alſo meet with *prevenant amas*, another barbarous expreſſion; the word *prevenant* being only uſed in a figurative ſenſe, and does not ſignify a man who went before or out-ſtript others.

[*F*] *Some are of opinion, that Moliere . . . . . made an advantageous uſe of the Comedies which the Italians played at Paris.*] I ſhall prove this aſſertion from an anonymous book, but no matter for that; ſince it is in print, that is ſufficient to juſtify my aſſertion; for the only circumſtance I am to prove is, that ſome perſons affirm that the Italian Comedies exhibited at Paris were Moliere's originals. Read what follows, which is ſuppoſed to be ſpoke by Harlequin. " If " the Italian players had never come into France, " Moliere would perhaps have never been the man " he is. I am ſenſible that he was perfectly well " acquainted with the antient comic Writers: but " after all, he took his firſt hints from our ſtage. " You know that his *Cocu Imaginaire* is the *Ritratto* " of the Italians; Scaramouch interrupted in his " amour, gave riſe to his *Fâcheux*; his *Contre-temps* " is only *Arlequin*, *Valet étourdi*, and ſo of moſt of " his plays; and in theſe latter times, is not his " *Tartufe* our *Bernagaſſo?* He indeed excells in his " characters: and his plays appear to me ſo very ju- " dicious, that they ought to be read to young per- " ſons, as ſo many leſſons for giving them a true " notion of the world. And yet theſe excellent " Italian originals produce nothing in this age (27)-"

(27) *Livre ſans Nom*, (a nameleſs book) divided into 5 dialogues, printed at Paris, and in Holland, in 1695. p. 6. of the Dutch edit.

[*G*] *Boileau accuſed him of ſhewing too much complaiſance for the pit; a cenſure that was juſt in ſome reſpects, but unjuſt in the whole.*] Moliere was dead when Boileau applauded him in one of his Epiſtles (28), as much, or more, than he had done in the ſatyr he had addreſſed to him (29). It is therefore a very unjuſt aſſertion, to ſay that Boileau applauded him merely out of policy, and for fear of being ridiculed by him publickly, if he ſhould ſay nothing to his advantage, or preſume to criticiſe him. But (will it be ſaid) he cenſured him when he had no cauſe to be under any apprehenſions, and conſequently the ſuſpicion entertained of him ſeems to be well grounded. I anſwer, that it is not. I am of opinion that had he writ his Art of Poetry during Moliere's life, he would have introduced in it the cenſure I ſhall quote hereunder. It was, as it were, eſſential to his ſubject. It includes a very juſt obſervation, which ought to be made an inviolable maxim, in caſe plays were writ only to be printed. But as they are deſigned chiefly for the ſtage, and to be played before all ſorts of people, it is not juſt to require their being writ according to Boileau's taſte. His words are as follow:

Eſtudiez la Cour, & connoiſſez la ville,
L'une & l'autre eſt toûjours en modeles fertile.
C'eſt par là que Moliere illuſtrant ſes écrits
Peut-eſtre de ſon Art eût remporté le prix;
Si moins ami du peuple en ſes doctes peintures,
Il n'euſt point fait ſouvent grimacer ſes figures,
Quitté pour le bouffon, l'agreable & le fin,
Et ſans honte à Terence allié Tabarin.
*Dans ce ſac ridicule où Scapin * s'envelope,*
Je ne reconnois plus l'Auteur du Miſanthrope (30).

* In one of Moliere's Plays.

(30) Deſpreaux, *Art. Poetique*, Cant. 3. ver. 391 *& ſeq.*

" Study the Court, and learn to know the city,
" For both, in models, are moſt fruitful found.
" Moliere, with theſe, illuſtrating his ſcenes,
" Perhaps, o'er all had triumph'd in his art,
" If, to delight the rabble, he had not drawn
" Some characters diſtorted and groteſque;
" Had not writ force; neglected pleaſing wit;
" And join'd the ſtroller's jeſts with charming Terence.
" When waggiſh Scapin's hid within the ſack,
" How far this differs from the *Miſanthrope!*

[" I ſhall give a little anecdote with regard to the " two following verſes cited above, from Boileau:

" *Dans ce ſac ridicule ou Scapin l'envelope.*
" *Je ne reconnois plus l'Auteur du Miſantrope.*

A perſon of good ſenſe obſerved to me, many years ſince, that they ought to be read thus;

" *Dans ce ſac ridicule où Scapin s'enveloppe,*
" *Je ne reconnois plus l'auteur du Miſantrope.*

" When waggiſh Scapin hides him in the ſack,
" How far this differs from the *Miſanthrope!*

" His reaſon for this correction was, Scapin does " not hide himſelf in a ſack, in Moliere's dramatic " piece entitled the *Cheats of Scapin*, but hides *Ge-* " *ronte* in it, which character Moliere himſelf played. " The perſon in queſtion was firmly perſuaded that " Boileau, who could not be ignorant of that cir- " cumſtance, had writ *l'enveloppe*, (hides or wraps him " in;) and that *s'enveloppe* (hides or wraps himſelf in) " was an error of the preſs. This obſervation did " not ſlip my memory, for which reaſon I began to " make that correction, thirty years ſince, in all the " editions wherein I met with this verſe. But Mr. " Broſſette, Boileau's friend, (who obliged the world " with his notes on that Poet's works) ſeeing that " correction in the margin of my Boileau, (printed " in 1716, with curious and uſeful notes by Mr. Bro- " ſette above-mentioned) aſſured me that, though this " correction was ſo very juſt and natural, yet Boileau " had always written *s'enveloppe*, though he knew that " it aſſerted a falſity; and that the other expreſſion, " though ſo very eaſy and natural, had never occur- " red to him *."]

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. vol. 4. p. 977. col. 2.

(28) The 7.

(29) The 2.

(b) See Tom. 2. of *Obſervations de Mr. Menage ſur la Langue Françoiſe*, p. 15.

(i) Ibid. p. 12.

Father Bouhours compoſed in praiſe of Moliere (*b*), are, in the judgment of Menage, the beſt he ever wrote (*i*). I do not know whether the Italians approve of the Italian tranſlation of his Comedies by one of their countrymen ſettled in Germany (*k*). It is more difficult, in works of this kind, than in others, to transfer, into a verſion, all the beauties of the original. By the way, what I ſaid concerning the fondneſs which our Moliere had for the ſtage, is found, with ſome other circumſtances, in a work of Perrault [*H*]. The reader will doubtleſs be pleaſed to know what became, after Moliere's death, of the Company of Comedians over whom he had preſided [*I*]; a circumſtance that will greatly contribute to ſhew the merit of this great player.

(*k*) His name is *Nicolas di Caſtelli*, and he ſtyles himſelf *Secretary to the Elector of Brandenbourg*. He printed this tranſlation at his own expence at Leipſic, anno 1698, in 4 vol. 12mo.

Boileau blames Moliere for calculating his plays, not only for perſons of a delicate taſte and a ſound judgment, but likewiſe for the vulgar. But Moliere had his reaſons for this; and might have anſwered what Harlequin is ſuppoſed to have ſaid on the like occaſion. His words are theſe. "Thoſe humorous "ſtrokes, ſaid I, are not diſagreeable in your Co- "medies; but unhappily they are not equally good. "I own it, (replied he) but they nevertheleſs divert "certain young ſparks, who come to our play-houſe "with no other deſign but to laugh; who laugh at "any thing, and frequently without knowing why. "We frequently play to ſuch people, and we are ob- "liged to give them ſtrokes of humour and jeſts "adapted to their capacity, otherwiſe we ſhould often "play to empty benches. I am ſorry, ſays I, that "you have almoſt laid aſide your old plays; they "were applauded by all perſons of good ſenſe; ſe- "veral reflections in them were of great uſe in "morality; and your ſtage was a place where, I "may preſume to ſay, vice was ſo effectually ridi- "culed, that the ſpectators were prompted to love "virtue, merely from rational motives. Were we "to play, (continued he) none but our old plays, we "ſhould have very thin houſes; and I ſhall make the "ſame anſwer to you as Cinthio did formerly to St. "Evremont; that good players, acting excellent plays, "would be ſtarved (31)" It muſt be conſidered, that actors are at a great expence; and that plays are intended to divert the common people as well as Senators (32). They conſequently ought to be adapted to the taſte of the publick in general, that is, they ought to be written in ſuch a manner as may invite multitudes to ſee them; otherwiſe, were they a perfect compound of uncommon thoughts, and exquiſitely delicate reflections, they would ruin the actors and be of no ſervice to the common people.

(31) *Livre ſans Nom*, p. 4 and 5.

(32) Conſider well the following words of Terence, from the prologue to the Andria.

Poeta quum primum animum ad ſcribendum appulit
Id ſibi negotii credidit ſolum dari
Populo ut placerent quas feciſſet fabulas.

General OBSERVATIONS againſt thoſe who cenſure this Dict.

Not only thoſe who criticize Moliere may be anſwered by ſuch reflections: a great number of other books are alſo found fault with, for people's not conſidering the various uſes for which they are deſigned; and their meeting with a thouſand particulars which they would have had the Author ſuppreſs. What is this thing to me, (ſays one) what is it to me, (continues another) that ſuch a man had a bad wife; of what uſe are ſuch a number of quotations, ſo many jovial thoughts, and philoſophical reflections, &c. Such are the contiuual complaints of thoſe who cenſure this Dictionary: but thoſe perſons will permit me to ſay, that they want the moſt eſſential circumſtance neceſſary for forming a right judgment of this work. They did not know that it was calculated for all ſorts of readers; and that, had it been written agreeably to the taſte of the greateſt Puriſts (33), it would thereby have gone out of its natural ſphere. Theſe people do not conſider, that had I kept to their notions of purity, I ſhould have writ a book, which, indeed, would have pleaſed them, but then it would have diſpleaſed hundreds of other people, and have grown mouldy in the bookſeller's warehouſe. It would have been a melancholy affair for him, to have had two huge folio volumes, that had contained nothing but what affords entertainment to ſuch as pretend to gravity and an exquiſite taſte; and who would have the moſt copious ſubjects explained by monoſyllables. Let them make the ſame reflection, which Socrates did at the ſight of a fair (34). We will ſuppoſe this; but ſtill the fair will be what it ought to be.

(33) Give me leave to call by this name, the moſt ſtrict obſervers of the laws of perfection, with regard to the taſte of a few, or the choice of wits.

(34) *Quam multis rebus ego non egeo!* How many things have I no occaſion for? Vide Eraſmum *in* Apophth. p. m. 168.

[*H*] *The fondneſs which our Moliere had for the ſtage, is found, with ſome other circumſtances, in a work of Perrault.*] Moliere is one of thoſe illuſtrious men whoſe portraits Mr. Begon (35) cauſed to be engraved, and their hiſtorical elogiums to be drawn up and publiſhed. Perrault, the Author of thoſe elogiums, affirms, that *Moliere was born with ſo ſtrong a paſſion for the ſtage, that no endeavours which might have been uſed could prevent his turning actor. He had no ſooner gone through his courſe of ſtudies, in which he was extremely ſucceſsful, but he joined with ſeveral young perſons of the ſame age and inclination with himſelf, and took a reſolution to form a company, in order to go and act plays in country towns. His father . . . . deſired all his friends to diſſuade him, if poſſible, from his reſolution*; but not being able to make any impreſſion on him, either by the remonſtrances or promiſes they made him in his name, *he ſent to him the maſter, who had educated and boarded him, during the firſt years of his ſtudies. . . . . But his maſter, ſo far from perſuading him to quit the ſtage, was prevailed upon, by young Moliere, to turn actor. . . . . Having completed his Company, he went and played at Roan, and from thence at Lyons, where having pleaſed the Prince of Conti,* &c. (36). The reſt of the elogium is very curious.

(35) Intendant of Juſtice and of naval affairs.

(36) Perrault's *Hommes illuſtres*, p. 79.

[*I*] *The reader will doubtleſs be pleaſed to know what became, after Moliere's death, of the Company of Comedians, over whom he had preſided.*] I met with the following particulars on this ſubject, in Chappuzeau. This Company, before it was ſettled in the *Palace Royal*, had acted with great applauſe at Paris, on the *foſſez de Neſle*; and at St. Paul's in Lyons, and in Languedoc. They were juſtly looked upon as the beſt Company of country players. The two Bejars (brothers) and du Parc were ſome of his principal actors. Du Croiſi, who headed a company of country players, and le Grange a very good player joined with them. They acted for ſome time in the hall of the *Petit Bourbon*, by an agreement made between them and the Italian players, who were already ſettled there. Afterwards they were admitted into the Theatre of the *Palace Royal*, and *played in it* till the beginning of Lent 1673. Moliere dying at that time, four players belonging to his Company joined with thoſe of the Hotel of Burgundy; and as thoſe left there were not in a capacity to continue, his Majeſty was pleaſed to make but one Company of that of Marais (37), and the other of the *Palace Royal*. Mr. Colbert was ordered to pitch upon the beſt actors was ſtill continued in the Company of the *Palace Royal*, as well as the moſt ſkilful in that of Marais, and to make one good Company of theſe, to be called the King's Company of Comedians. It was ſettled in the *Hotel du Roi*, in Mazarine Street (38); and acted for the firſt time, publickly, on Sunday the 9th of July 1673. The players were forbid to act in the *Palace Royal*, and *on the* ſtage of Marais. I am to obſerve that Moliere, who was the chief ſpeaker of the Company belonging to the *Palace Royal*, reſigned that office to la Grange, ſix years before his death (39).

(37) It was eſtabliſhed in 1620, and called the King's Company.

(38) Otherwiſe called, *des foſſez de Neſle*.

(39) Extracted from a book, entitled *Le Theatre Francois*. It is writ by Chappuzeau.

PORCIA, the daughter of Cato of Utica, had a ſoul ſo well framed, that ſhe eſcaped the influence of the bad examples which her mother and her aunts gave her [*A*], and

[*A*] *She eſcaped the influence of the bad examples which her mother and her aunts gave her.*] Cato of Utica was unfortunate with regard to his relations of the fair ſex: there was in that reſpect ſomething very odd and unlucky in his fate. He had two Uterine ſiſters both named Servilia; the one was the mother of

and imitated only her father's vertues. She applied herſelf very much to the ſtudy of Philoſophy, and gave ſtrong proofs of an exalted courage; for gueſſing that her huſband Brutus was making preparations for ſome conſiderable undertaking, ſhe cut herſelf with a knife in order to ſhew by her conſtancy and patience in ſuffering pain that ſhe was capable to hold her tongue, and therefore worthy that her huſband ſhould impart his ſecret to her [B]: he did it, and by that means ſhe came to know that the preparations were making to kill Cæſar. If on that occaſion ſhe raiſed herſelf far above her own ſex, ſhe found herſelf on a level with the other women on the day on which the deſign was executed. The uneaſineſs of her mind was ſo ſtrong, and diſturbed her to ſuch a degree, that it threw her into fainting fits, and it was thought ſhe was dead [C]. We are not told

of Brutus, and ſuffered herſelf to be debauched by Julius Cæſar (1). She was the talk of the whole town (2): The other was married to Lucullus, and abandoned herſelf to diſſoluteneſs with ſo little diſcretion, that her huſband put her out of doors. Being thus ruined in her reputation ſhe retired to her brother's houſe, who was ſo kind as to receive her, and carry her along with him in his journeys. It was no great honour to him thus to keep in his houſe an object of infamy, and it was an inconvenient taſk for him to prevent her from continuing to lead a diſſolute life. *She leſſened* very much *the bad reputation ſhe had before, when it was obſerved, that ſhe had of her own accord ſubmitted to be watched by Cato, and to lead the ſame auſtere life with him, following him in his flight. And yet notwithſtanding this Cæſar upbraided him with that ſiſter of his* (3). Attilia Cato's wife was ſo diſſolute, that he was obliged to divorce her after he had got two children by her (4). He married her to his ſecond wife a woman, whom he yielded afterwards to Hortenſius by way of Loan; he married again when ſhe was a widow, and had inherited Hortenſius's eſtate (5). This afforded Cæſar a large ſcope to cenſure Cato's life (6). Add to this, that Cato finding himſelf of age to marry pitched upon a maiden, who had been contracted to Metellus Scipio. Her name was Lepida: the contract was broke off; and ſhe being at liberty conſented to Cato's addreſſes, and was betrothed to him. But Metellus Scipio, repenting afterwards that he had broken the match, did all that lay in his power to regain Lepida, and ſucceeded in his deſign (7). "At which Cato was "very much incenſed, and was reſolved to go to "law about it, but his friends diſſuaded him from "it. However, he was ſo moved by the heat of "youth and paſſion, that he wrote Iambicks againſt "Scipio, which had all the wit and ſatyr of Ar"chilochus, without the obſcenity and bitterneſs. "After this he married Attilia, the daughter of "Soranus, who was the firſt, but not the only wo"man he ever knew: much leſs happy in this than "Lælius, the friend of Scipio, who never knew but "one woman, namely, her whom he married firſt "(8)." The latter part of this paſſage is ſurperfluous with regard to the text I was to comment upon; but it contains ſo remarkable a particular, that I thought the reader would be obliged to me for not omitting it. Where are now a-days the perſons of Lælius's quality, and intimately acquainted with the General of an Army; where are, I ſay, the perſons who like him, during a long life, never enjoyed a woman but their own wife? Nay, where are the young men of Cato's quality, who enter *maidens* into the nuptial beds? Theſe are ſuch ſingular particulars, as will appear moſt extraordinary, and for the ſake of which it was proper to continue a quotation a little farther.

[B] *She cut herſelf with a knife in order to ſhew ... that ſhe was capable to hold her tongue, and ... worthy that her huſband ſhould impart his ſecret to her.*] If you deſign to have a complete notion of the great action ſhe performed on that occaſion, you muſt read this whole account from Plutarch. "Porcia ..... "being well ſkilled in Philoſophy, having a tender "love for her huſband, and being full of courage, "and adorned with a great deal of good ſenſe and "prudence, reſolved not to aſk her huſband's ſecrets, "till ſhe had made a trial of herſelf. She took a "little knife, with which the barbers uſe to cut "nails, and having turned all her ſervants and at"tendants out of her chamber, ſhe cut herſelf a "great gaſh in the thigh, upon which followed im"mediately a great flux of blood, and ſoon after "violent pains, and a dangerous fever, occaſioned "by the anguiſh of the wound. Brutus being in "great affliction upon her account, ſhe in the height "of all her pains ſpoke thus to him. *I* Brutus, "*being the daughter of Cato, was given in marriage to* "*you, not like a concubine, to partake only in the common* "*civilities of bed and board, but to bear a part in all* "*your good, and in all your bad fortunes: and for my* "*part, when I look upon you, I find no reaſon to re*"*pent the match: but what evidence of my love, what* "*ſatisfaction can you receive from me, if I may not* "*ſhare with you in bearing your moſt hidden griefs, nor* "*be admitted to any of your councils, which require ſe*"*crecy and truſt? I know very well, that women ſeem* "*to be of too weak a nature to be truſted with ſecrets.* "*But certainly*, Brutus, *a virtuous birth and education,* "*and a converſation with the good and honourable, are* "*of ſome force as to the forming of our manners, and* "*ſtrengthening our natural weakneſs. And I can boaſt* "*that I am the daughter of* Cato, *and the wife of* "Brutus; *and though before, I put too little confidence* "*in theſe two great titles, yet now I have tried myſelf,* "*and find that even againſt grief and pain itſelf I* "*am invincible.* Having ſaid this, ſhe ſhewed him "her wound, and related to him the whole trial "ſhe had made of her own conſtancy. At which "*Brutus* being aſtoniſhed, lifted up his hands to "Heaven, and begged the aſſiſtance of the Gods in "his enterprize, that he might live to be a "huſband worthy of ſuch a wife as *Porcia*; ſo hav"ing comforted her he left her, (9)" Valerius Maximus (10) gives us a much ſhorter account, and ſuppoſes other circumſtances; for he aſſerts that Porcia was acquainted with her huſband's deſign before ſhe wounded herſelf; he adds that ſhe gave herſelf the wound on the very day that Cæſar was killed, and that ſhe did it in order to try, whether ſhe ſhould have courage enough to put an end to her life in caſe Brutus's undertaking were attended with ill ſucceſs. Take notice here how the accounts of the Hiſtorians differ, even with regard to the moſt remarkable events.

[C] *The uneaſineſs of her mind .... diſturbed her to ſuch a degree, that it threw her into fainting fits, and it was thought ſhe was dead.*] Plutarch, in relating this particular, had no other view, but to give an inſtance of Brutus's intrepidity. Here follow his words. "In "the mean while there came one in all haſte from "Brutus's houſe, and brought news that his wife "was dying. For Porcia being extremely uneaſy a"bout the iſſue of the undertaking, and not able to "bear the greatneſs of her cares, could ſcarce keep "herſelf within doors; and at every little noiſe or "voice ſhe heard, leaping forth and ſtarting ſudden"ly, like one of the mad Prieſteſſes of Bacchus, aſk"ed every one that came from the *Forum*, what "Brutus was doing? and ſent continually one meſ"ſenger after another to enquire after him. At laſt, "after long expectation, the ſtrength of her body "could hold out no longer, but being overcome with "her doubts and fears, ſhe fainted away. She had "not time to betake herſelf to her chamber; for as "ſhe was ſitting among her women, a ſudden want "of ſpirits ſeized her, her colour changed, and her "ſpeech was quite loſt. At this ſight her women "made a great and lamentable out-cry, and many of "the neighbours running to Brutus's houſe, the re"port was ſoon ſpread abroad that Porcia was dead, "though ſhe recovered in a little while, and came to "herſelf again by the aſſiſtance of her women. "When Brutus received this news, he was extremely "troubled, not without reaſon: yet he was not ſo

(1) She proſtituted alſo her daughter to him. See above, quot. (1) of the art. CASSIUS LONGINUS (Cajus).

(2) Οὕτω μὲν ἦν ὁ πρὸς Καισαρα Σερβιλίας ἔρως περιῤῥύτος. So much was Servilia's love for Cæſar publiſhed abroad. Plutarch. *in* Bruto, p. 986.

(3) Idem, *in Catone minore*, p. 785 of Amiot's tranſlation.

(4) A ſon and our Porcia.

(5) See above the rem. [O] of the art. of the 1ſt HORTENSIUS (Quintus).

(6) Extracted from Plutarch. *in Catone minore*, p. 707, 784.

(7) Plut. ibidem, p. 726.

(8) Idem, ibid. Mr. Bayle gives here Amiot's tranſlation.

(9) Plut. *in* Bruto, p. 989. Mr. Bayle follows Amiot's tranſlation.

(10) Valerius Maximus, lib. 3. cap. 2. num. 15. p. m. 254.

told what she did, nor what she said, when she heard the success of the attempt, nor during the war, which her husband was obliged to carry on against Cæsar's friends; but we know that having accompanied him to the sea-shore with the greatest proofs of constancy, she could not forbear shedding tears at the sight of a certain picture [*D*], and that she killed herself with a great deal of courage, when she heard Brutus had done the same [*E*]. Observe that when she married him she was the Relict of Bibulus, by whom she had got children (*a*). If the President du Vair had known this, he would not have ascribed to her the answer, which he pretends she made [*F*], and which belongs probably to another PORCIA, who was Cato of Utica's sister, and the wife of one

(*a*) See the rem. [*D*] towards the end.

" carried away by his private grief, as to neglect " the publick concern; he did not so much as go " home to see how his wife was (11)." Cæsar was killed soon after.

(11) Plut. *in* Bruto, p. 990. Mr. Bayle follows Amiot's translation.

[*D*] *Having accompanied her husband to the sea-shore . . . . she could not forbear shedding tears at the sight of a certain picture.*] Plutarch's account of this contains some particulars, which are much to Porcia's honour; it is therefore proper to transcribe it here. " Brutus despairing of any good success, resolved to " leave Italy: he went by land through Leucania, " and came to Elea, situated by the sea side. From " hence it was thought convenient that Porcia should " return to Rome: she was overcome with grief to " part from Brutus, but strove, as much as was possible, " to conceal it; but in spight of all her manly reso- " lutions, a picture, which she saw there accidentally, " betrayed it. The story of it was the parting of " Hector and Andromache, when he went to engage " the Greeks, giving his young son Astyanax into " her arms, and she fixing her eyes upon him with " an earnest and affectionate look. As soon as she " espied this piece, the resemblance it bore to her " own concern, made her burst out into tears, and " several times a day she walked where that picture " hung, to gaze at it, and weep before it. Upon " which occasion *Acilius*, one of Brutus's friends, re- " peated out of Homer these lines, wherein Andro- " mache speaks to Hector.

" *Be careful, Hector, for with thee my all,*
" *My father, mother, brother, husband fall.*

" To which Brutus replied with a smile; but I must " not answer Porcia as Hector did Andromache,

" *Mind you your wheel, and to your maids give law.*

" For though the natural weakness of her body hin- " ders her from acting what only the strength of men " can perform, yet she has a mind as valiant and as " active for the good of her country, as the best of " us. This relation is in the memoirs of Bibulus, " Porcia's son (12)." This Bibulus, who was Porcia's son by her first husband, wrote a little book *of the actions and deeds of Brutus* (13). She had at least one child more by that husband (14).

(12) Plut. *in* Bruto, p. 994. Mr. Bayle follows Amiot's translation.

(13) Idem, ibid. p. 989.

(14) Idem, *in Vita Catonis minoris*, p. 771, *A*.

[*E*] *She killed herself with a great deal of courage when she heard Brutus had done the same.*] They, who do not understand Latin, will see hereunder, in the passage from Plutarch, the sense of this Apostrophe of Valerius Maximus. *Tuos quoque castissimos ignes, Portia, M. Catonis filia, cuncta sæcula debita admiratione prosequuntur: quæ cum apud Philippos victum & interemptum virum tuum Brutum cognosceres, quia ferrum non dabatur, ardentes ore carbones haurire non dubitasti, muliebri spiritu virilem patris exitum imitata. Sed nescio an hoc fortius, quòd ille usitato, tu novo genere mortis absumpta es* (15). i. e. " All future ages will also re- " vere as they ought your most chaste remains, O " Porcia, M. Cato's daughter; for when you knew " that your husband Brutus was vanquished and killed " at the battle of Philippi, as you could not meet " with any sword to kill yourself, you did not scruple " to swallow burning coals; imitating thus the brave " death of your father, with a woman's spirit. But " I question whether there was more courage in him " who died a common death, than in you who died " after a new and unusual manner." Plutarch relates the same particular, and quotes Valerius Maximus, and another Author. But then he observes, that there was a letter dispersed abroad under the name of Brutus, from which one might learn, that Porcia died because she was not well waited upon in her distemper.

(15) Valer. Max. lib. 4. cap. 6. p. m. 394, 395.

" As for Porcia . . . Nicolaus the Philosopher, and " Valerius Maximus write, that being desirous to " die, but being hindered by her friends who conti- " nually watched her, from killing herself, she snatch- " ed some burning coals out of the fire, and shutting " them close in her mouth, stifled herself and died. " Though there is yet extant a letter of Brutus to his " friends, in which he laments the death of Porcia, " and accuses them for neglecting her so, that she " chose to die rather than languish with her disease. " So that it seems Nicolaus was mistaken in the time; " for this epistle, if indeed it be authentick, and tru- " ly Brutus's, gives us to understand the disease and " the love of this Lady, and the manner of her death " (16)."

(16) Plut. *in* Bruto, *in fine*, p. 1009. Amiot's translation.

[*F*] *The President du Vair . . . . would not have ascribed to her an answer, which he pretends she made.*] One of the decrees, given in a solemn manner (in a red gown) by that President, relates to a cause which was tried in the Parliament of Provence, between a woman who married again nine months after her first husband's death, and the first husband's relation. By that decree she was deprived *of all that had been left her by* her husband's *last will*, and *of all the matrimonial advantages, because she married within the year of her mourning* (17). Monsieur du Vair quotes many beautiful sentences from the heathen Writers, and from the antient Fathers, against second marriages (18), and he asserts that our Porcia declared, that an honest woman marries but once. *Æneas's Dido being pressed to marry again, wishes rather to die. . . . And yet being at last persuaded to it, she laments her fate, and cries out*, & quo solo sidera adibam extinctus pudor. *i. e.* " That modesty is now gone, by which alone I " could be exalted to the skies," *as judging very justly, that women who marry a second time, have neither shame nor happiness left: for which reason, as Tertullian tells us*, fortunæ muliebri coronam non imponebat nisi univira, i. e. " no woman could put a crown on the " Goddess Fortune's head, but she who had been " married to one husband only." *Which is pretty much to the same purpose with what the celebrated Porcia, Brutus's wife, said*; fœlix & pudica matrona non nubit nisi semel (19). i. e. " A happy and mo- " dest matron marries but once." This Porcia could not speak thus without condemning herself; since Brutus was her second husband. I imagine that Monsieur du Vair was misled, because he did not sufficiently consider St. Jerom's words. They are not accurate; they do even contain a falsity, so that they propose to lead us into error. But after all, they do not ascribe the answer in question to Porcia the wife of Brutus. St. Jerom having mentioned Martia, Cato's youngest daughter (20), who would never marry again, adds, that Brutus married Porcia, who was a maiden (21), and that Cato married Martia who was not a maiden (22), and that accordingly, experience shewed that Martia was capable to forsake Cato and marry Hortensius, and that Porcia would not live without Brutus. St. Jerom mentions afterwards one Porcia the younger, who made the answer which you have seen in the passage from Mr. du Vair. *Martia Catonis filia minor, cum quæreretur ab ea, cur post amissum maritum denuo non nuberet, respondit, non se invenire virum, qui se magis vellet, quàm sua. Quo dicto ostendit divitias magis in uxoribus eligi solere, quàm pudicitiam, & multos non oculis, sed digitis uxores ducere. Optima sanè res, quàm avaritia conciliat. Eadem cum lugeret virum, & matronæ ab ea quærerent, quem diem haberet luctus ultimum: ait, quem & vitæ. Arbitror, quæ ita virum quærebat absentem, de secundo matrimonio non cogitabat. Brutus Portiam virginem duxit uxorem, Martiam Cato non virginem: sed Martia inter Hortensium Catonemque discurrit, & sine Catone vivere Martia potuit,*

(17) *Oeuvres du Sieur du Vair*, p. 859, edit. of Geneva, 1617, 8vo.

(18) Compare this with what is observed above, rem. [*E*] of the art. GONZAGA (Lucretia de).

(19) *Oeuvres du Sieur du Vair*, p. 820.

(20) We do not find such a daughter of Cato mentioned by the Heathen Authors.

(21) This is false, for she was the relict of Bibulus.

(22) Plutarch does not say this.

one Domitius Ænobarbus (*b*), and who was unqueſtionably adorned with very noble qualities, ſince Cicero (*c*), Lollius, and Varro, wrote her elogium. She died before Cæſar was killed.

(*b*) Plutarch. *in Catone Utic.* p. 778. F.

(*c*) See Cicero, *Epiſt. ad Atticum*, 37 and 48. lib. 13.

tuit, Portia ſine Bruto non potuit. Magis enim ſe unicis viris applicant fœminæ, & nihil aliud noſſe, magnum arctioris indulgentiæ vinculum eſt. . . . . Portia minor, cum laudaretur apud eam quædam bene morata, quæ ſecundum habebat maritum, reſpondit: Felix & pudica matrona, nunquam præterquam ſemel nubit (23). i. e. "Martia, Cato's youngeſt daughter, being aſked "why ſhe did not marry again after her huſband's "death, anſwered, that ſhe could not meet with a "man, who liked her better than her money. By "which ſaying ſhe ſhewed, that men loved riches, "rather than modeſty, in a woman; and choſe a "wife by their fingers, rather than by their eyes. "They like that beſt, which gratifies their covetouſ-"neſs. The ſame Martia mourning for her huſ-"band, and being aſked by ſome matrons, which "would be the laſt day of her grief, replied, the "ſame with that of my life. I am apt to believe, "that ſhe who lamented her abſent huſband, had "no thoughts of taking another. Brutus married "Porcia, when ſhe was ſtill a virgin; Cato mar-"ried Martia, who was not a virgin. But Martia "went from Cato to Hortenſius, and from Hortenſi-"us again to Cato: Martia could live without Cato, "Porcia could not live without Brutus. Women are "generally more fond of one ſingle huſband; and "the not knowing of any other man ties the knot "of friendſhip much faſter. . . . . As they were "commending before Porcia the younger a virtuous "woman, who was married to a ſecond huſband, "Porcia anſwered, a happy and modeſt matron ne-"ver marries but once." One cannot well underſtand what he means by this Porcia the younger, *Porcia minor*; for antient hiſtory does not mention two daughters of Cato of Utica; and if it ſpeaks of two Porcia's, it is to acquaint us that Cato was the brother of the one, and the father of the other. At that rate the latter muſt have been Porcia the younger, *Porcia minor*; but ſhe could not have declared herſelf againſt ſecond marriages, with that ſeverity, which St. Jerom mentions. Some pretend, that he means the other Porcia, Cato's ſiſter, who was married to Domitius. *Meminit Hieronymus* (Porciæ Domitio nuptæ) *adverſus Jovinianum, qui tale ejus dictum celebrat:* cum apud eam, &c (24). But for what reaſon ſhould he call her *Porcia minor?* It is very probable that he meant a Porcia, who was the youngeſt ſiſter of Brutus's wife, and that his notions being perhaps ſomewhat confuſed, he called the ſame perſon *Porcia minor*, whom he had named Martia a little before. It muſt be remembered that Martia, Cato of Utica's wife, was big with child, when her huſband yielded her up to Hortenſius (25). Nothing can prevent us from thinking ſhe was pregnant of a girl, who is indifferently called *Porcia minor*, or *Martia* (26), though it was not the cuſtom for daughters to be called by their mother's name. St. Jerom, who was not perhaps attentive enough, made two perſons out of the two names of one ſingle woman. However it be, it is certain, that the anſwer he aſcribes to Martia, is of the ſame nature with that which he aſcribes to Porcia the younger. It was of ſome purpoſe to him to diſtinguiſh them, for his deſign was only to enlarge the number of ſuch inſtances. He quotes that of Annia, that of Marcella, and that of Valeria. The firſt anſwered, that ſhe would not marry again, becauſe, ſaid ſhe, if I met with a good huſband, I ſhould be in a continual fear to loſe him (27); and if he proved a bad one, it would be a very hard caſe for me to live in that miſerable condition, after the kind uſage I received from my former huſband. As for Marcella, ſhe anſwered, I am ſo well ſatisfied with having been once married, that I do not want to have any more of it. Valeria anſwered only, that her firſt huſband was ſtill living for her (28). *Anniam cum propinquus moneret, ut alteri viro nuberet; eſſe enim ei & ætatem integram, & faciem bonam: nequaquam, inquit, hoc faciam. Si enim virum bonum invenero, nolo timere, ne perdam: ſi malum, quid neceſſe eſt poſt bonum peſſimum ſuſtinere? . . . . . Marcella major rogata à matre ſua, gauderet-ne ſe nupſiſſe, reſpondit: ita valde, ut amplius nolim. Valeria Meſſalarum ſoror, amiſſo Servio viro, nulli volebat nubere. Quæ interrogata cur hoc faceret, ait ſibi ſemper maritum Servium vivere* (29).

(23) *Hieronym.* lib. 1. *adverſ. Jovinianum*, p. m. 36.

(24) Glandorp. *Onomaſt.* p. 716.

(25) Plut. *in Catone minore*, p. 771.

(26) The Author of the *Scholia on St. Jerom, ad locum ſupra relatum*, thinks that this Martia was called thus on the account of her mother.

(27) See above, rem. [*A*] of the article GONZAGA (Julia de).

(28) *Hieronymus*, lib. 1. *adverſ. Jovian.* p. m. 36.

(29) An antient Author ſaid accordingly, that *viduæ luctus pro marito erat.* (Grief is a widow's husband;) which Lucian has ſince applied to Pompey's wife, in his encomium upon her. *Perfruitur lachrymis, & habet pro conjuge luctum.* (She feeds on her tears, and her grief is inſtead of a huſband to her.) Du Vair, *Oeuvres*, p. 820.

Obſerve that thoſe maxims afforded a moſt noble field to the Counſellors, who pleaded againſt the widow, who is meant in Monſieur du Vair's decree. She gave them another large ſcope to expatiate upon by her impatience to marry a ſecond huſband in the ninth month of her widowhood, and without waiting till Lent was over. *She does not only violate that private and domeſtic mourning*, ſaid they (30), *ſhe does not only forget the reſpect ſhe owes to her late huſband, ſhe does not only ſlight the memory of the benefactor, but ſhe does even profane the time of publick mortification, ſhe breaks through the laws of the Church, and gives offence to all the world. The mettle of youth has perhaps carried you too far, and as Tertullian obſerves*, deſpumare illis nuptiis ſanguinis fervorem oportuit, *it was proper to allay the heat of your blood by that marriage. But that excuſe would hardly be allowed a young maiden in the prime of her age. Though, as St. Jerom obſerves*, Libido majorem in virginibus patiatur famem, dum dulcius putat omne quod neſcit; *the appetite of luſt is ſtronger in virgins, becauſe they imagine that the ſweeteſt, which they have not yet experienced. And ſhall an old woman dare to urge that excuſe, after ſhe had lived and lain twenty five years with a man, who was threeſcore and ten when he died? How then have you contained yourſelf during your huſband's life, when the name of a wife, and the cover of marriage afforded you more liberty, and the ſight of an old man could but the more provoke your luſt?* They ſtruck her dumb with civil laws: but ſhe oppoſed againſt them the canon law, and the indulgence of the Pope's decrees (31). It is a ſcandalous thing, that there ſhould be civil laws, which the canon law enervates, in order to ſupport the abuſes in matrimonial affairs (32).

(30) Ibid. p. 818.

(31) Ib. p. 826, 854.

(32) See above, quotat. (42), of the art. PIENNE.

PORCIUS (MARCUS), one of the greateſt men among the Antients, known commonly under the title of CATO THE CENSOR, was born in the year 519 after the building of Rome [*A*], in the town of Tuſculum (*a*). He began to ſerve in the armies at the age of ſeventeen, and ſhewed not only great courage, but alſo a great contempt

(*a*) Cornel. Nepos, *in Fragmento* Vitæ Catonis, Plut. *in Catone Majore, init.* p. 336.

[*A*] *He was born in the year* 519 *after the building of Rome.*] Here follows the proof it. *Anno poſt Conſul primum fuerat* (Q. Maximus) *quam ego natus ſum* (1). i. e. "I was born the year after Q. Fabius "Maximus had been Conſul the firſt time." Thus ſpeaks Cato in a book of Cicero. Now the *Faſti Conſulares* place the firſt Conſulſhip of Fabius Maximus under the year of Rome 520. All the dates ſet down in the ſame books prove that we muſt read thus the Latin paſſage I have quoted. See Grævius's edition; you will meet there with a note of Vincent Contarin, and with another of Charles Langius which clear up this matter. Let us infer from that date of Cato's birth, that Livy and Plutarch were miſtaken, when they aſſerted, that Cato pleaded his own cauſe at the age of fourſcore and ſix, and that he impeached Sergius Galba four years after (2). He died at the age of fourſcore and five; for it was in the year of Rome 604, under the Conſulſhip of Lucius Marcius, and Manius Manilius, which was fourſcore and ſix years before Cicero's Conſulſhip, as he himſelf obſerves (3). Corradus has been ſomewhat inaccurate on this paſſage. According to him (4) Cato was born ſeven years after the Conſulſhip of Claudius Cento and Sempronius Tuditanus, which happened in the year of Rome 513, and he was in his thirtieth

(1) Cicero, *de Senect.* cap. 4. p. m. 392.

(2) Titus Livius, lib. 39. p. m. 762. Plut. *in Catone Majore*, p. 344, 345.

(3) Cicero *in* Bruto, p. m. 109.

(4) Corradus, *in Brutum Ciceronis*, p. 109.

contempt for the pleaſures, and even for what is called the comforts of life [*B*]. He was a man of an uncommon ſobriety, and there was no bodily exerciſe which he thought beneath him; for on his return from the army he uſed to apply himſelf to the tilling of his own lands, but yet without neglecting the improvement of his mind, eſpecially with regard to the art of ſpeaking, ſince he employed his time very much in the pleading of cauſes in the neighbouring cities, and he did it with ſo much generoſity, that he would never receive any reward for it. The diſcourſes of a Pythagorean Philoſopher (*b*), whom he heard at Tarentum, when that town was retaken by Fabius Maximus, in whoſe Army he ſerved, ſtrengthened very much his natural inclination for temperance. Valerius Flaccus, who had an eſtate near Cato's, was curious to ſee that young man, of whom they told him ſuch remarkable particulars; and as he found it was a good plant, which wanted only to be a little cultivated, and to be tranſplanted into a better ſoil, he perſuaded him to come to Rome. Cato was ſoon eſteemed there, and as this Valerius Flaccus proved a very kind patron to him, he was ſoon preferred. He was firſt choſen a Military Tribune by the people's votes: he was afterwards appointed Queſtor, and then from one degree to another he arrived at laſt at the Conſulſhip (*c*), and at the Cenſorſhip (*d*). No man was more proper than him to perform the functions of a Cenſor, nor did ever acquit himſelf better of the duties of that office. He exerted all his ſeverity, all the ſtrength of his eloquence, and the whole weight of his regular life, to repreſs the luxury and the other vices of the Romans (*e*); for which reaſon it was ſaid that he was not leſs uſeful to the Roman Commonwealth by the war he waged againſt the depravation of manners, than Scipio by his victories over the enemies (*f*). It was well known before hand that he would acquit himſelf of the Cenſorſhip with the utmoſt ſeverity, and this was one of the reaſons which determined the Patricians to oppoſe him, when he declared himſelf a Candidate for that employment; but that ſame reaſon determined the people to prefer him before all his competitors. This particular has been admirably well deſcribed together with his elogium by the beſt of the Latin Hiſtorians [*C*]. The inſcription on this ſtatue

(*b*) His name was *Nearchus*.

(*c*) In the year of Rome 558.

(*d*) In the year of Rome 569.

(*e*) Extracted from Plut. *in Vita Catonis Majoris.*

(*f*) See Seneca's words in the remark [*B*].

tieth year under the Conſulſhip of Cornelius Cethegus, and Sempronius Tuditanus, that is to ſay in the year of Rome 549. This calculation is not accurate: every one may ſee that there are but 29 years after the year of Rome of 502, to the year 549. A little lower Corradus obſerves (5), that Cato was born in the year 521, and that as he died in the year 604, he muſt have lived at leaſt fourſcore and five years. This is an erroneous computation. Some pages lower (6) he aſſerts that Cato died in the year 605, aged fourſcore and five years, being born in the year 521. This does not ſet his reckoning right. Let us obſerve however that Cato lived till that age; Cicero aſſerts it expreſsly. *Annos quinque & LXXX. natus exceſſit è vita cum quidem eo ipſo anno contra Ser. Galbam ad populum ſumma contentione dixiſſet, quam etiam orationem ſcriptam reliquit* (7). i. e. "He died at the age "of fourſcore and five, having that ſame year ha- "rangued the people againſt Sergius Galba with "great vehemency, which ſpeech he has alſo left "behind him in writing." Cato did not only write down his plea againſt Galba, but inſerted it alſo in his book of *Origines* (8), a few days or a few months before he died. Pliny ſets down the time of Cato's death in too general a manner. *Circa captas*, ſays he (9), *Carthaginem et Corinthum . . . . . ſupremum is diem obiit.* i. e. "He died about the time when Car- "thage and Corinth were taken." Theſe two cities were conquered in the year 608. I do not find that he aſſerts in his 15th book, as Glandorp pretends (10), that Cato died at the age of fourſcore and five; I find only there that he died after he had made the Senate reſolve to begin the third Punic War (11): the 29th book ought to have been quoted where we read theſe words, *hic Cato DCV. anno urbis noſtræ obiit, LXXXV. ſuo* (12). i. e. "Cato died in the year "of Rome 605, in the eighty fifth of his age." Velleius Paterculus's account agrees with this as to the year of Rome, ſince he obſerves that Cato died 5 years after the deſtruction of Carthage (13). Let us not cenſure Moreri for placing Cato's death under the year 606 after the building of Rome. But we may think it ſomewhat ſtrange that he ſhould not yet (14) have corrected the blunder he committed, when he ſaid it was *during the ſecond Punic War.*

(5) Corradus, *in Brutum Cicer*, p. 110.

(6) Ibid. p. 150.

(7) Cicero *in* Bruto, p. 149.

(8) *Quam orationem in Origines ſuas retulit paucis antequam mortuus eſt an diebus an menſibus.* Idem, ibid. p. 165.

(9) Plin. lib. 14. cap. 4. p. m. 124.

(10) Glandorp. *in Onomaſt.* p. 714.

(11) Plin. lib. 15. cap. 18. p. 197.

(12) Idem, lib. 29. cap. 1. p. 668.

(13) Paterculi. lib. 1. cap. 13.

(14) I write this in March 1701.

[*B*] *He ſhewed . . . . . a great contempt . . . . . for the pleaſures, and . . . . comforts of this life.*] I ſhould be too long if I were to tranſcribe all the particulars, which books acquaint us with upon that ſubject. I ſhall only quote a paſſage from Seneca, in which he tells us that Cato was content with one horſe for himſelf and his baggage, and uſed to look after it himſelf. *M. Cato Cenſorius (quem tam reip. hercule profuit naſci quam Scipionem: alter enim hoſtibus noſtris bellum, alter cum moribus geſſit) canterio vehebatur, & hippoperis quidem impoſitis, ut ſecum utilia portaret. . . . . O quantum erat ſæculi decus, imperatorem triumphalem, cenſorium (& quod ſuper omnia hæc eſt) Catonem, uno caballo eſſe contentum, & ne toto quidem! Partem enim ſarcinæ, ab utroque latere dependentes, occupabant. Ita non omnibus obeſis mannis, et aſturconibus, et tollutariis præferres unicum illum equum ab ipſo Catone defrictum* (15). i. e. "M. Cato, who had been a Cenſor (a "man born indeed for the happineſs of the Common- "wealth no leſs than Scipio, for if the latter fought "our enemies, the former made war againſt our "wicked morals;) Cato, I ſay, uſed to ride on a "gelding, on which he put a cloak-bag to carry "with him the things he wanted. O! what a "glory was it for that age, to ſee a General who "had triumphed, who had been a Cenſor, and (what "is more than all this) to ſee Cato content with one "horſe, and which was not even entirely for him! "for his cloak-bag hanging down on each ſide of "the horſe, occupied part of it. Would you not "prefer that ſingle horſe, which Cato himſelf uſed "to rub, before all your plump nags, Spaniſh hor- "ſes, and ambling mares?" He did not want for ſlaves, who might have ſpared him that trouble, but he choſe rather to ſpare it them. It was his inclination; he was ſeen tilling the ground, dreſſed like them, and afterwards ſetting himſelf down at table with them, eating of the ſame bread, and drinking of the ſame wine with them (16). Seneca might have related a particular more curious ſtill, than that which he has recorded. *When Cato entered upon the Government of Sardinia, though his predeceſſors there uſed to require tents, bedding, and cloaths upon the publick account, and to charge the people with heavy taxes, for furniſhing them with proviſions and entertainments for a great train of ſervants and attendants; he, on the contrary, by his frugality ſhewed an incredible difference; for in nothing he wanted the contributions of the publick; nay, he went on foot to viſit the cities without horſe or litter, and with only one of the town officers, who carried his gown and a cap to offer ſacrifices in to the Gods* (17).

(15) Seneca, *Epiſt.* 87. p. m. 353.

(16) Plut. *in Marco Catone*, p. 337. See alſo Valerius Maximus, lib. 4. cap. 3. num. 12.

(17) Idem, Plut. p. 339. Mr. Bayle makes uſe of Amiot's French Tranſlat.

[*C*] *This particular has been admirably well deſcribed, together with his eloguim, by the beſt of the Latin Hiſtorians.*] That paſſage of Livy is ſo beautiful, that I cannot

(g) Plut. *in Vita Catonis Majoris*, p. 347.

(h) Idem, ibid. and p. 134, *B.*

ſtatue which was erected to him contained a moſt glorious teſtimony of his reforming virtue [*D*]. He ſhewed a great indifference both with regard to the erecting of ſtatues [*E*], and with regard to commendations (*g*) : but yet he commended himſelf in the moſt lofty manner (*h*), and was not ſorry that the elogiums he beſtowed on himſelf ſhould be read in his books. He harangued very often, and inſerted ſome of his own ſpeeches into

cannot forbear tranſcribing it entirely without omitting one word, and yet I dare not be ſo bold as to attempt a tranſlation of it. *In hoc viro* (M. Porcio) *tanta vis animi ingeniique fuit, ut quocunque loco natus eſſet, fortunam ſibi ipſe facturus fuiſſe videretur, nulla ars neque privatæ, neque publicæ rei gerendæ ei defuit. Urbanas ruſticaſque res pariter callebat. ad ſummos honores alios ſcientia juris, alios eloquentia, alios gloria militaris provexit. huic verſatile ingenium ſic pariter ad omnia fuit, ut natum ad id unum diceres, quodcunque ageret. in bello manu fortiſſimus, multiſque inſignibus clarus pugnis : idem poſteaquam ad magnos honores pervenit, ſummus imperator idem in pace ; ſi jus conſuleres, peritiſſimus : ſi cauſa oranda eſſet, eloquentiſſimus : nec is tantùm, cujus lingua vivo eo viguerit, monumentum eloquentiæ nullum extitit. vivit imò, vigetque eloquentia ejus, ſacrata ſcriptis omnis generis. Orationes & pro ſe multæ, & pro aliis, & in alios. Nam non ſolùm accuſando, ſed etiam cauſam dicendo fatigavit inimicos. ſimultates nimio plures & exercuerunt eum, & ipſe exercuit eas. nec facilè dixeris, utrum magis preſſerit eum nobilitas, an ille agitaverit nobilitatem. Aſperi proculdubio animi, & linguæ acerbæ, & immodicè liberæ fuit, ſed invicti cupiditatibus animi, & rigidæ innocentiæ, contemptor gratiæ, divitiarum : in parſimonia, in patientia laboris periculique ferrei propè corporis, animique, quem ne ſenectus quidem, quæ ſolvit omnia, fregerit : qui ſextum & octogeſimum annum agens cauſam dixerit, ipſe pro ſe oraverit, ſcripſeritque, nonageſimo anno Sergium Galbam ad populi adduxerit judicium. Hunc, ſicut omni vita, ita tum* (cenſuram) *petentem premebat nobilitas : conſenſerantque, præter L. Flaccum, qui collega in conſulatu fuerat, candidati omnes, ad dejiciendum honore eum, non ſolùm ut ipſi potius adipiſcerentur : nec quia indignabantur novum hominem cenſorem videre, ſed etiam quòd triſtem cenſuram, periculoſamque multorum famæ, & ab læſo à pleriſque, & lædendi cupido expectabant. etenim tum quoque minitabundus petebat, refragari ſibi qui liberam & fortem cenſuram timerent, criminando & ſimul L. Valerio ſuffragabatur : illo uno collega caſtigare ſe nova flagitia, & priſcos mores revocare poſſe. His accenſi homines, adverſa nobilitate non M. Porcium modò cenſorem fecerunt, ſed etiam collegam ei L. Valerium Flaccum adjecerunt* (18). [Though Mr. Bayle's modeſty would not ſuffer him to tranſlate that paſſage, yet for the ſake of thoſe of our readers, who do not underſtand Latin, we think it proper to attempt to give the ſenſe of it here ; though without hopes of coming up to the beauty of the original. The ſenſe is as follows. " There was ſuch a ſtrength of mind and " ſo great a genius in that man (M. Porcius) that in " what place ſoever he had happened to be born, " he would have raiſed himſelf in the world. He " wanted none of thoſe talents, whic hare neceſſary to " manage either private or publick affairs. He underſtood the buſineſs of the city and of the country " equally well : ſome arrive at the higheſt dignities " by their political learning ; others by their elo- " quence, and others by their reputation as warriors. " But his pliable genius was equally proper for all " theſe various things ; ſo that one would have " thought he was born for every particular deſign he " attempted. In the war he was moſt active and " brave, and gained a glorious reputation by many " and remarkable battles : being raiſed to high dig- " nities he proved one of the greateſt Generals. In " time of peace, if a matter of law offered, he ap- " peared a perfect Civilian ; if he was to plead, a " moſt eloquent Orator. Nor did he appear ſuch " only in his life time, as a man who left no monu- " ments of his eloquence behind him. His elo- " quence is ſtill living and in its full force, being con- " ſecrated in his writings on all kinds of ſubjects. " There are many ſpeeches of his, which he deli- " vered in his own defenſe, in the defenſe of others, " and againſt ſome. For he wearied his enemies, " not only by impeaching them, but even by plead- " ing his own cauſe. There were but too many " perſons who had a ſecret hatred againſt him, but " he knew how to be even with them. Nor is it " an eaſy matter to determine, whether the Nobility " perſecuted him moſt, or whether he vexed the " Nobility moſt. He was unqueſtionably of a ſe- " vere temper, and of a bitter tongue too immode- " rately free : but then his mind was proof againſt " all the paſſions incident to man, of a ſtrict inno- " cence, ſlighting favour and riches : ſo temperate, " and ſo patient under many labours, and in the " greateſt dangers, that one would have thought " his body and even his mind were made of ſteel, " which age itſelf, which deſtroys all, could not " alter ; for being fourſcore and ſix years old, he " pleaded his own cauſe, ſpoke and wrote in his own " vindication : and being fourſcore and ten he im- " peached Sergius Galba before the people. As the " Patricians had endeavoured to vex him all his " life time, ſo they did it particularly when he de- " clared himſelf a Candidate for the Cenſorſhip. " All the other Candidates, except L. Flaccus, who " had been his Collegue in the Conſulſhip, had " agreed together to prevent him from being pro- " moted to that dignity, not only that they might " the eaſier get it themſelves, nor yet, only becauſe " they could not bear to ſee one choſen Cenſor, who " was the firſt of his family that came to any dignity, " but alſo becauſe they expected he would be a very " ſevere Cenſor, dangerous to the reputation of ma- " ny, ſince moſt of them had offended him, and he " was but too much inclined to ſpare none. Nay, " even when he was making intereſt for the Cen- " ſorſhip, it was with threatnings, declaring that " they only oppoſed him, who dreaded a free and " ſtout Cenſor, at the ſame time he gave his vote " to L. Valerius, aſſerting that it was only with ſuch " a Collegue he ſhould be able to puniſh the new " diſſoluteneſs, and reſtore the antient manners. " Such a diſcourſe having animated the people, " they did not only appoint M. Porcius Cenſor, a- " gainſt the inclination of the Nobility, but gave " him alſo M. Valerius Flaccus for a Collegue."

(18) Livius, lib. 39. cap. 40, 41.

[*D*] *The inſcription on the ſtatue which was erected to him contained a . . . teſtimony of his reforming virtue.*] " The people were very well pleaſed with what he " had done during his Cenſorſhip : for they erected a " ſtatue to him in the Temple of the Goddeſs of " Health, on which they put an inſcription not of " his warlike deeds and triumphs, but ſuch as ſig- " nified, that this was Cato the Cenſor, who by his " good diſcipline and regulations reclaimed the Ro- " man Commonwealth when it was declining, and " ſupinely falling into vice (19)." Cornelius Nepos obſerves, that Cato's ſeverity repreſſed the luxury, which had already crept into the Commonwealth. *Cato Cenſor cum eodem Flacco factus, ſeverè præfuit ei poteſtati, Nam & in complures nobiles animadvertit, & multas res novas in edictum addidit, qua re luxuria reprimeretur, quæ jam tum incipiebat pullulare* (20). i. e. " Cato being choſen Cenſor with the ſame Flaccus " exerted his power with ſeverity ; for he puniſhed " many noblemen, and made ſeveral regulations by " his decree, in order to reſtrain the luxury, which " began already to prevail."

(19) Plut. *in Marco Catone*, p. 347. Mr. Bayle quotes Amiot's French Tranſlat.

(20) Cornelius Nepos, *in Fragmento* Vitæ Catonis, p. m. 384.

[*E*] *He ſhewed a great indifference . . . with regard to the erecting of ſtatues.*] Immediately after the words of Plutarch, which I have tranſcribed in the remark [*D*], we meet with this paſſage. " Before " this ſtatue was ſet up to him, he uſed to laugh " at thoſe who loved ſuch kind of things, ſay- " ing, they were not ſenſible, that they boaſted " chiefly in the workmanſhip of engravers and paint- " ers, and not in their own virtue ; but as for him- " ſelf, he could boaſt, that the citizens bore his moſt " noble image in their breaſts ; meaning thereby the " memory of his life and actions. When any " ſeemed to wonder that he ſhould have never a " ſtatue, when many ordinary perſons had one

into his Roman Hiſtory [*F*]. That Hiſtory has not been tranſmitted down to us, any more than the work he wrote on the Art of War (*i*). He compoſed ſome books of Huſbandry (*k*), and valued himſelf very much on his particular ſkill in that art (*l*). He wrote alſo ſomething on rhetorick, and was probably the firſt Roman who wrote on that ſubject (*m*). He was ſeveral times impeached, and defended himſelf always with a great deal of ſtrength: he was ſo conſcious of his own innocence, that in one of the actions which were brought againſt him he offered to ſubmit to the judgment of one of his enemies [*G*]. He declared againſt the Phyſicians, and againſt thoſe ſtudies which were

(*i*) Plinius, *in Præfat.* Vegetius, lib. 1. cap. 8.

(*k*) They are extant.

(*l*) Plut. *in Vita Catonis majoris*, p. 351.

(*m*) See Quintilian, *Inſt. Orat.* lib. 3. cap. 1.

" erected to them, I would much rather, ſaid he, " be aſked why I have none, than why I have one." Ammianus Marcellinus mentions that noble anſwer (21). Obſerve, that Plutarch ought not to have ſaid in another paſſage of his works (22), that Cato would not ſuffer they ſhould ſet up a ſtatue to him.

(21) *Cenſorius Cato . . . interrogatus quamobrem inter multos nobiles ſtatuam non haberet, malo, inquit, ambigere bonos, quamobrem id non meruerim, quam, quod eſt gravius, cur impetraverim muſitare.* Amm. Marcel. lib. 11. cap. 6. p. m. 21.

(22) Plut. *in Præcept. Reip. ger.* p. 820, *B.*

[*F*] *He inſerted ſome of his own ſpeeches into his Roman Hiſtory.*] He compoſed it in his old age, and divided it into ſeven books. The firſt contained the actions of the Kings of Rome: the ſecond and third an account of the riſe and foundation of every city in Italy; for which reaſon it is thought he entitled the whole *Origines*. In the fourth book he treated of the firſt Punic War, and in the fifth of the ſecond: he gave ſummary accounts of them, referring every thing to particular heads. He wrote after the ſame manner of the following wars, to the Prætorſhip of Sergius Galba who vanquiſhed the Luſitanians *. He ſpoke of the actions, without naming thoſe who had performed them. He mentioned the curioſities, which were to be met with in Spain and in Italy. He ſhewed a great deal of learning and accuracy in that work (23). Take particular notice of theſe words of Cornelius Nepos; *ab adoleſcentia confecit orationes: Senex hiſtorias ſcribere inſtituit* (24). i. e. " From his youth he compoſed ora- " tions, and in his old age he began to write Hiſto- " ries." Remember alſo that Cicero aſſerts Cato was applying himſelf to that work the ſame year he died (25). This affords us a well grounded reaſon to cenſure Livy, who ſuppoſes that Lucius Valerius a Tribune of the people haranguing againſt Cato in the year 558, quoted his book of Origines againſt him (26). Cato was then but thirty nine years old; whence it muſt be inferred, that at that time he had not yet compoſed that work, and that Livy, who is no doubt the father and the creator of the ſpeeches he gives us, forgot on this occaſion to make his ſuppoſitions agree with true chronology. One may refute him by his own words, ſince he obſerves in another place (27), that the ſpeech which Cato made for the Rhodians in the year 587, had been inſerted in the fifth book of the *Origines*. Is not this a proof, that theſe *Origines* were not yet publiſhed when the Tribune Valerius harangued againſt Cato? It were to no purpoſe to ſuppoſe, that there were ſeveral editions of that work, ſome containing more than the others, ſince nothing like it is hinted by any antient Author whatſoever; and after all the firſt edition could not have been publiſhed, but when the Author was already well ſtricken in years (28). Father Noris (29) has cenſured Livy upon this account. Voſſius (30) had already ſhewn, that he thought Livy was miſtaken, which he ſuppoſes the Tribune of the people (31) borrowed from Cato's *Origines*. Obſerve that in the Epitome of Livy's 49th book we read, that Cato's ſpeech againſt Galba was to be met with in the book of the *Origines*. Now he made it the laſt year of his life. See what I have quoted above from Cicero (32). He had publiſhed above one hundred and fifty orations, which Cicero has very much commended, though not without obſerving that no man read them (33). They were uſed, no doubt, an hundred years after Cato's death, as we uſe now adays the orations that were made before the States of the Kingdom, or at the openings of the Seſſions in the 16th Century. A freed-man of Cicero made ſome ſmart criticiſm on Cato's oration for the Rhodians; but ſee in Aulus Gellius how that Critick was anſwered (34).

* Now the Portugueze.

(23) Extracted from Cornelius Nepos, *in Fragmento* Vitæ Catonis.

(24) Idem, ibid.

(25) See the rem. [*A*] quot. (7).

(26) Livius, lib. 34. p. m. 623.

(27) Livius, lib. 45. p. 880.

(28) Cornelius Nepos, *in Fragmento*, Vitæ Catonis.

(29) Noris, *Cenotaph. Piſan.* p. 4.

(30) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* lib. 1. cap. 5. p. 21.

(31) His name was not *Oppius*, as Voſſius aſſerts.

(32) In the rem. [*A*], quot. (7).

(33) Cicero *in* Bruto, p. m. 114.

(34) Aulus Gellius, lib. 7. cap. 3.

Let us conſider a little theſe words of Cornelius Nepos; *atque horum bellorum duces non nominavit, ſed ſine nominibus res notavit.* i. e. " He has not named " the General who commanded in thoſe wars, relating only what paſt, without mentioning the " names of thoſe who acted." The Commentators on Pliny, without excepting Father Hardouin himſelf, were unacquainted with that paſſage. Here follows my proof. Pliny obſerves, that Cato, who in his Annals concealed the names of the Generals, related how a certain elephant was called. *Certe Cato, cum Imperatorum nomina Annalibus detraxerit, eum* (elephantum) *qui fortiſſime præliatus eſſet in Punica acie, Surum tradidit vocatum* (35). i. e. " Cato obſerved " that the elephant who fought moſt bravely in the " army of the Carthaginians, was called Surus." Read this note of Father Hardouin (36). *Auctoris mentem aſſequi cum minime poſſent Plinii editores, hanc poſtremam vocem corruptam rati ſcripſere*, cum Imperatorum nomina annalibus deſcriberet, *contra fidem codicum Reg.* 1, 2. *ceterorumque melioris notæ, à ſcriptoris mente longiſſime aberrantes, cujus hæc ſententia eſt: Cato, inquit, Imperatorum Punicorum nomina annalibus ſuis apponere neglexit: idem tamen, quod nomen elephanti eſſet, qui tunc fortiſſime præliatus, referre operæ pretium duxit.* i. e. " The Editors of Pliny not be- " ing able to find out his meaning, have imagined " that the word *detraxerit (left out)* was corrupted, " and have changed it into *deſcriberet (related)* in- " conſiſtently with the firſt and ſecond manuſcript of " the King's Library, and with all the other good " manuſcripts; miſtaking widely the Author's ſenſe, " whoſe meaning is, that Cato omitted in his An- " nals the names of the Carthaginian Generals, and " yet thought it worth while to tell the readers, how " an elephant was called, who fought moſt bravely " in the Carthaginian army." Father Hardouin imagined, you ſee, that Cato omitted only the names of the Carthaginian Generals. He would not have thought ſo, if he had called to mind Cornelius Nepos's words.

(35) Plin. lib. 8. cap. 5. p. m. 142.

(36) Hardouin. *in* Plin. Tom. 2. p. 253.

Obſerve that the fragments of Cato's *Origines*, publiſhed by Annius of Viterbo, paſs for a ſpurious work; but thoſe, which Riccoboni has collected, and which have been printed at the end of his treatiſe concerning hiſtory, are genuine. Auſonius Popma has made additions to them, and has added them with ſome notes to Cato's other works (37).

(37) At Leyden 1598, in 8vo.

[*G*] *He was ſeveral times impeached, and defended himſelf . . . . . and offered to ſubmit to the judgment of one of his enemies.*] " As he worried the others very " much, ſo neither was he himſelf always out of " danger in the adminiſtration of publick affairs; " for if he gave his enemies but the leaſt handle, he " was immediately impeached by thoſe who wiſhed " him no good: he was accuſed near fifty times, the " laſt of which was when he was fourſcore and 6 years " old; on which occaſion he ſpoke a word, which " has been much taken notice of and well remem- " bered: that it was hard for him, who had lived " contemporary with others a great while ago, to " plead now before a new race of men. Nor was " this the laſt cauſe, in which he was engaged; for " four years after, when he was fourſcore and ten, " he impeached Sergius Galba; ſo that, like Neſtor, " he lived near three ages of a man, and that in a " continual action (38)." Theſe words of Plutarch want to be corrected in ſome places: for Cato did not live ſo long; and it had been better to ſay like Pliny, that he was impeached forty four times. *Cato primus Porciæ gentis*, ſays he (39), *tres ſummas in homine res præſtitiſſe exiſtimatus, ut eſſet optimus Orator, optimus Imperator, optimus Senator: quæ mihi omnia, etiamſi non prius, attamen clarius fulſiſſe in Scipione Æmiliano videntur, dempto præterea plurimorum odio, quo Cato laboravit. Itaque ſit proprium Catonis, quater & quadragies cauſam dixiſſe, nec quenquam ſæpius poſtulatum, & ſemper abſolutum.* i. e. " Cato, the firſt of " the

(38) Plut. *in Marco Catone*, p. 345. Mr. Bayle quotes Amiot's French Tranſlation.

(39) Plin. lib. 7. cap. 27. p. 47.

were most in fashion among the Greeks [*H*]. However, he studied the Greek tongue, but

" the family of the Porcii, being raiſed to high dig-
" nities, is thought to have excelled in three things,
" ſo as to have been the beſt Orator, the beſt Gene-
" ral, and the beſt Senator: in all which Scipio
" Æmilianus ſhone, I think, though not the firſt,
" yet with a brighter luſtre; and what is more, he
" was not hated by moſt of his fellow-citizens, as
" Cato was. This then was peculiar to Cato, that
" he defended himſelf forty times, and that he was
" oftener impeached than any one elſe and always
" acquitted." Aurelius Victor has uſed the ſame number forty four (40), wherein he has been more accurate, than in what he alſo obſerves, namely, that Cato being fourſcore years old impeached Galba; he ſhould have ſaid *being fourſcore and five years old.* See the remark [*A*]. Moreri has committed a moſt egregious blunder, when he ſaid, *that Cato's enemies impeached him above four hundred times.* Let us not omit theſe words of an antient Author. *Cato ſextum & octogeſimum annum agens, dum in rep. tuenda juvenili animo perſtat, ab inimicis capitali crimine accuſatus, ſuam cauſam egit. Neque aut memoriam ejus quiſpiam tardiorem, aut firmitatem lateris ulla ex parte quaſſatam, aut os hæſitatione impeditum animadvertit. Quia omnia iſta in ſtatu ſuo æquali ac perpetua induſtria continebat. Quin etiam in ipſo diutiſſimè actæ vitæ fine diſertiſſimi oratoris Galbæ accuſationi defenſionem ſuam pro Hiſpania oppoſuit* (41). i. e. " Cato being fourſcore and ſix years
" old, and continuing to exert himſelf for the de-
" fenſe of his country with a youthful and lively
" mind, was accuſed by his enemies of a capital
" crime, and pleaded his own cauſe. Nor could
" any one perceive that his memory was leſs ſtrong,
" or his conſtitution weaker, or that there was any
" impediment in his ſpeech. For by an even and
" continual care he kept all theſe things in a good
" condition. Nay, towards the end of his moſt
" long life he defended himſelf by his oration for
" Spain againſt the accuſation of that eloquent Ora-
" tor Galba." There are two errors in that paſſage: for Cato was not fourſcore and ſix, when he pleaded the firſt of the two cauſes mentioned by Valerius Maximus: and it was he who impeached Galba in the ſecond of thoſe cauſes, and not he who was obliged to defend himſelf againſt Galba's accuſations. Nay, the latter was like to be brought in guilty, and would have been condemned, had he not moved the people's compaſſion (42).

(40) *Galbam octogenarius accuſavit, ipſe quadragies quater accuſatus, glorioſe abſolutus.* Aurel. Victor. *de Vir. illuſtr.*

(41) Valer. Maximus, lib. 8. cap. 7. num. 1. p. m. 677, 678.

(42) Cicero *in* Bruto, p. m. 165.

To conclude this Commentary on my text, it will be ſufficient to quote Valerius Maximus, who ſpeaks thus. *Cato ſuperior ſæpenumero ab inimicis ad cauſæ dictionem vocatus, nec ullo unquam crimine convictus: ad ultimum tantum fiduciæ in ſua innocentia repoſuit, ut ab his in quæſtionem publicam deductus, Ti. Gracchum, à quo in adminiſtratione reip. ad multum odium diſſidebat, judicem depoſceret. Qua quidem animi præſtantia pertinaciam eorum inſectandi ſe inhibuit* (43). i. e. " Cato
" the elder was often impeached by his enemies,
" but never found guilty of any crime. At laſt he
" truſted ſo much to his own innocence, that being
" again accuſed by them, he deſired Tiberius Grac-
" chus might be his judge, who hated him exceed-
" ingly on account of their different notions about
" the manner of governing the Commonwealth.
" By this greatneſs of his ſoul he ſet bounds to the
" obſtinacy, with which his enemies perſecuted him."

(43) Valer. Maximus, lib. 3. cap. 7. num. 7. p. 309.

[*H*] *He declared againſt the Phyſicians, and againſt thoſe ſtudies which are moſt in faſhion among the Greeks.*] Let us quote Plutarch, who having obſerved, that Cato was not well pleaſed, that the three Philoſophers, who were ſent Embaſſadors from Athens, ſhould be ſo well liked at Rome, and that he adviſed to ſend them back immediately (44), continues thus.
" Yet he did not do this, out of any hatred againſt
" Carneades, as ſome imagined, but becauſe he de-
" ſpiſed all Philoſophy in general, and out of a
" kind of pride, laughed at the Greek Muſes and
" their Literature: nay, he uſed to ſay, that old
" Socrates was only a prating ſeditious fellow. . . . . .
" And to deter his ſon from ſtudying Greek Litera-
" ture, he uſed a much rougher voice than his old
" age ſeemed to allow, pronouncing, as it were, with
" the voice of an oracle, that the Romans would be
" ruined, when they began once to be infected with
" the ſciences of the Greek. Though time ſhewed
" the vanity and falſity of his ſlanderous ſaying;
" for the city of Rome grew never greater, and
" flouriſhed never more, than when the learning and
" ſcience of Greek was in eſteem there: but Cato
" hated not only the Greek Philoſophers, but alſo
" the Phyſicians; for he was acquainted with the
" anſwer which Hippocrates made when the King of
" Perſia ſent for him, and offered him a large ſum
" of gold and ſilver, if he would go and live at his
" Court; which anſwer was, that he ſwore he
" would never aſſiſt the Barbarians, becauſe they
" were enemies to the Greeks: which Cato aſſerted
" was an oath, now to be taken by all the Phyſicians:
" and therefore he commanded his ſon moſt ex-
" preſsly to avoid them; for he himſelf had written
" a treatiſe of preſcriptions, by which he uſed to
" cure thoſe of his own family when they were ſick,
" and to keep them in health (45)." If you have a mind to ſee Cato's own words, read the following paſſage from Pliny. *Mox à ſævitia ſecandi urendique tranſiſſe nomen in carnificem, & in tædium artem omneſque Medicos: quod clariſſimè intelligi poteſt ex M. Catone, cujus auctoritati triumphus atque Cenſura minimum conferunt: tanto plus in ipſo eſt. Quamobrem verba ejus ipſa ponemus. Dicam de iſtis Græcis ſuo loco, Marce fili: quid Athenis exquiſitum habeam, & quod bonum ſit illorum litteras inſpicere, non perdiſcere, vincam. Nequiſſimum & indocile genus illorum: & hoc puta vatem dixiſſe: Quandocunque iſta gens ſuas litteras dabit, omnia corrumpet. Tum etiam magis, ſi Medicos ſuos huc mittet. Jurarunt inter ſe barbaros necare omnes Medicina. Et hoc ipſum mercede faciunt, ut fides iis ſit, & facile diſperdant. Nos quoque dictitant barbaros, & ſpurcius nos, quam alios opicos, appellatione fœdant. Interdixi tibi de medicis* (46). i. e. " From that Phyſician's (*Archa-
" gathus's*) cruelty in cutting, and burning, the name
" of *Vulnerarius* (a curer of wounds) was afterwards
" applied to the hangman, and the art of Phyſick it-
" ſelf, with all the Phyſicians, were become the ſub-
" ject of men's averſion, as appears moſt plainly
" from Cato, whoſe triumph and Cenſorſhip add
" very little weight to his authority, which of itſelf
" is very great. Wherefore we ſhall tranſcribe his
" own words. *I ſhall ſpeak of theſe Greeks in a proper*
" *place*, my ſon Mark, *and ſhew what is uſeful at Athens,*
" *and that we may get ſome notion of their learning, but*
" *muſt not get horoughly acquainted with it.* They are
" a moſt wicked and ſtubborn kind of people; believe
" this as though a Prophet had ſpoken it. When-
" ever that nation ſhall introduce her literature a-
" mong us, ſhe will ſpoil all. The more if ſhe ſends
" her Phyſicians thither. They have ſworn among
" themſelves to deſtroy all the Barbarians by the
" means of phyſick: and this they do for a fee, that
" people may truſt to them, and they have an oppor-
" tunity to deſtroy men the eaſier. They ſtyle us
" alſo Barbarians, and uſing us in a more vile man-
" ner than they do the others, they diſgrace us by
" the name of clowns. I have forbidden you to con-
" verſe with Phyſicians." This may ſerve to refute thoſe, who ſhould pretend, that Carneades's ſpeech againſt juſtice was the chief reaſon why Cato adviſed the Senate to get rid immediately of thoſe pratling Embaſſadors. I have known a very able man, who imagined that Cato's chief reaſon was, that Carneades had attacked the very foundations of the politicks of Rome, and diſcovered a myſtery, which was the ground of the power and glory of that ambitious Commonwealth. They who were at the head of the ſtate acted in ſuch a manner, as to make the world believe that reaſon and equity were the rules of all their actions. But Carneades, in his refutation of juſtice, urged this argument among others, that the Romans ſhould be obliged to return to their cottages, if they would act juſtly, that is to ſay, if they would reſtore the eſtates they had ſeized upon (47). I am apt to think, that Cato was not well pleaſed with that obſervation, and that he perceived the conſequences of it: but I am perſuaded that there were much ſtronger reaſons ſtill, which exaſperated him againſt theſe Embaſſadors of Athens, &c.

(44) See above, the art. CARNEADES, rem. [*F*], at the break.

(45) Plut. *in Catone Majore*, p. 350. Amiot's French Tranſlat.

(46) Plin. lib. 29. cap. 1. p. 667, 668.

(47) *Omnibus populis qui florerent imperio & Romanis quoque ipſis qui totius orbis potirentur, ſi juſti velint eſſe, hoc eſt ſi aliena reſtituant ad caſas eſſe redeundum, & in neceſſitate ac miſeriis jacendum.* Carneades, *apud* Lactant. lib. 5. cap. 16. p. 341.

I must

(n) See the rem. [A].

but only, as it is ſaid, when he was very old [I]. He lived a long time (n), and enjoyed to the end of his life a great ſtrength both of body and mind. His conſtitution was ſo healthy, that he wanted women even in his old age; and as his keeping a concubine could not be kept ſo ſecret as he wiſhed, he married again [K]. The wife he took was a maiden of a lower condition than his own. We ſhall ſee hereunder (o), what he anſwered on that occaſion to his ſon's complaint. It is pretended that he did not meet in that

(o) In the rem. [K].

I muſt ſpeak in this place of a falſity told by Agrippa and by Montagne, and learnedly refuted by Monſieur Drelincourt, Profeſſor of Phyſick. *Romani quondam ſub Catone Cenſorio Medicos omnes & urbe tota, & tota Italia populerunt, eorum funeſta mendacia crudelitatemque averſati* (48). i. e. "The Romans under "Cato the Cenſor had formerly baniſhed all the "Phyſicians from the city and from all Italy, hating "their dangerous lies, and their cruelty." Theſe are Agrippa's words: here follow Montagne's (49). *The Romans had lived* 600 *years, before they admitted* the Art of Phyſick *into their city; but after they had tried it, they baniſhed it again, by Cato the Cenſor's authority.* One might quote an infinite number of moderns, who have aſſerted the ſame: John Langius, a German Phyſician, pretends that Cato the Cenſor cauſed the Greek Phyſicians to be baniſhed from Rome (50). Gaſpar à Reies, a Spaniſh Phyſician, relates, that Cato's advice, that all the Greeks and Egyptians ſhould be baniſhed, paſſed without any oppoſition; and that as all the Phyſicians at Rome were come either from Greece, or from Egypt, they were all involved in the ſame ſentence which the Senate pronounced according to that ſevere Cenſor's wiſh (51). He adds (52), that this baniſhment happened in the year of Rome 590, and continued till the time of the firſt Emperors. But all this is ſaid at random; there is not one proof, either that Cato practiſed upon the Senate or upon the People to obtain ſuch a ſentence of baniſhment, or that there ever was ſuch a ſentence in his time. On the contrary, we read in Pliny, who, of all the antient Authors, is the moſt proper to be quoted to the diſadvantage of the Phyſicians, that the Senate baniſhed them a long time after Cato's death. *Et cum Græcos* (antiqui) *Italia pellerent*, ſays he, DIU POST CATONEM, *excepiſſe Medicos* (53). This paſſage ſeems to ſignify, that all the Greeks were baniſhed from Italy, *except the Phyſicians.* In this ſenſe the learned Monſieur Drelincourt underſtands thoſe words (54); but it is certain that they muſt be underſtood in another ſenſe: they ſignify, that the Phyſicians were compriſed by name in the ſentence of baniſhment: for if they had been excepted, Pliny would have had no occaſion to urge the reaſons, which he has explained with ſo much accuracy, in order to vindicate both Cato's prepoſſeſſion, and the ſeverity of the Roman Senate. *Non deſeram Catonem*, thus he ſpeaks in the following page, *tam ambitioſæ artis invidiæ à me objectum, aut Senatum illum qui ita cenſebat.* i. e. "I ſhall not abandon Cato, whom I "have expoſed to the hatred of that haughty pro-"feſſion, nor the Senate, who was of that opinion." It appears from the Law-dictionaries (55), that the word *excipere* ſignifies pretty often, not *to except*, or *exclude*; but *to comprehend or compriſe by name, and expreſsly.* Obſerve, that Pliny was not in the right to aſſert, that the city of Rome continued ſix centuries without any Phyſicians; Monſieur Drelincourt has proved the contrary, in an oration which he delivered (56) in July 1671. It is a very good apology for the Art of Phyſick, and has been printed three times. See alſo Gaſpar à Reies (57).

[I] *He ſtudied the Greek tongue . . . . only, as it is ſaid, when he was very old.*] I have made uſe here of an *as it is ſaid*, becauſe we meet with authorities for and againſt that particular. Cato, one of Tully's dialogiſts, in his Dialogue on old Age (*de Senectute*), declares, that he was very much advanced in years, when he began to ſtudy the Greek tongue. *Quid, quod etiam addiſcunt* (Senes) *aliquid? ut Solonem veſtibus gloriantem videmus, qui ſe quotidie aliquid addiſcentem ſenem fieri dicit: ut ego feci, qui Græcas litteras ſenex didici. Quas quidem ſic avide arripui, quaſi diuturnam ſitim explere cupiens* (58). i. e. "What, if even old "men can learn ſomething? As we ſee Solon boaſting "in verſe, that though well ſtricken in years, he "was daily learning ſomething; and as I have done, "who in my old age have learnt the Greek tongue; "to which I applied myſelf ſo eagerly, as though it "was to quench a thirſt, which I had laboured under "a long while." Let us conſider the following paſſage from Plutarch. "It is ſaid, that he applied "himſelf very late to the Greek tongue, and when he "was already pretty old; and that by reading Thu-"cydides, and much more by Demoſthenes, he im-"proved his ſtyle, and formed his eloquence; as ap-"pears from his works, which are mixed with Greek "ſayings, maxims, and hiſtories, many of them "tranſlated word for word, and interwoven with "his own apophthegms and ſentences (59)." This does not prove much in Cicero's behalf, and ſeems proper enough to ſhew, that Cato did not ſtay ſo long, before he learnt the Greek tongue. What I ſhall now obſerve, is more ſtrong ſtill to convince us, that he ſtudied it much ſooner than is generally imagined. Plutarch refutes thoſe, who aſſerted, that there was ſtill an oration of Cato extant, which he had delivered in Greek before the Athenians. *This is falſe*, ſays Plutarch (60), *for he ſpoke to them by an Interpreter, though he might have harangued in Greek if he had had a mind to do it.* Cato was not yet forty five years old at that time. Some Hiſtorians aſſert, that whilſt he was Prætor in Sardinia, he was inſtructed there in the Greek tongue by Ennius. *In Prætura Sardiniam ſubegit, ubi ab Ennio Græcis literis inſtitutus* (61). Victor ſays, he conquered Sardinia; *ſubegit*; but this is a miſtake, which Moreri was not aware of: Sardinia was already conquered, when Cato was ſent thither as a Prætor. Moreri pretends that he conquered it in the year 556. Mademoiſelle le Fevre (62) [afterwards Madam Dacier] has placed that Prætorſhip under the year 555. Cato was therefore but thirty ſix years at that time; ſo that we muſt not ſay that he learnt the Greek tongue in his old age; otherwiſe we muſt explode Aurelius Victor's authority. I ſhall tranſcribe hereunder (63) a paſſage from Cicero, in which it is aſſerted, that Cato was unacquainted with the learning of Greece.

[K] *His keeping a concubine could not be kept ſecret . . . . . he married again.*] What I ſhall now tranſcribe from Amiot's Plutarch is a noble piece of hiſtory. Cato (64) "having loſt his firſt wife . . . "married his ſon to the daughter of Paulus Æmilius, "who was ſiſter to Scipio Africanus; and being now "a widower himſelf, he made uſe of a young girl, "a maid-ſervant, who uſed to go and meet him pri-"vately in his chamber. Yet ſhe could not go ſo "ſecretly, eſpecially in a ſmall houſe, where there "was his daughter-in-law, a young married woman, "but the intrigue was ſoon diſcovered: for the young "wench, paſſing by too boldly to Cato's bed-cham-"ber, the youth, his ſon, ſaid nothing; but his fa-"ther perceived that he was aſhamed of it, and "that he had looked a little angry upon her. Ca-"to finding that the new married couple were diſ-"pleaſed at his behaviour, without finding fault "with them, or ſaying a word, away he goes, as "his cuſtom was, with his uſual company to the mar-"ket; among the reſt he calls aloud to one Salonius, "a Clerk of his, and aſked him whether he had "married his daughter." The concluſion was, that Cato told him he deſired his daughter for himſelf; *the match was quickly ſtruck up . . . . Whilſt they were making preparations for the wedding, Cato's ſon, taking ſome of his friends along with him, went and aſkt his father for what offence he brought in a mother-in-law upon him. But the father cried out preſently, Do not ſpeak ſo, my ſon; I am well pleaſed with all that you do, nor do I find any fault with it; I only deſire to have many children, and leave the Commonwealth more ſuch citizens as you are. . . . . He had by this ſecond wife a ſon, to whom, from his mother, he gave the ſirname of Salonius;*

(48) Agrippa, *de Vanit. Scientiar.* cap. 83. p. m. 196.

(49) Montagne, *Eſſais*, liv. 2. cap. 36. p. m. 788.

(50) Langius, *Epiſt. Medic.* 2. lib. 2. p. 482.

(51) Gaſpar à Reies, *in Elyſio jucund. Quæſt. Campo*, quæſt. 1. num. 13. p. m. 11.

(52) Idem, ibid. p. 12, 13.

(53) Plin. lib. 29. cap. 1. p. 668, 669.

(54) Drelincurtius, *Apologia Medica*, p. 47. edit. 1693.

(55) See Father Hardouin, on that paſſage of Pliny.

(56) In the Univerſity of Leyden.

(57) *In Elyſio jucund. Queſtion. Campo*, Quæſt. 1. num. 17.

(58) Cicero, *de Senectute*, cap. 8. p. m. 406. See alſo cap. 1. p. 386. And Valerius Maximus, lib. 8. cap. 7. num. 1.

(59) Plut. *in Catone Majore*, p. 337. Amiot's French Tranſlat.

(60) Plut. *ubi ſupra*, p. 343.

(61) Aurel. Vict. *de Viris illuſt.* p. m. 70.

(62) *Anna Tanaquilli Fabri filia, in* Aurel. Victor. ibid.

(63) In the rem. [U], quotat. (113).

(64) Plut. *in Catone Majore*, p. 350.

that unequal match with all the advantages he expected [L]. He was a kind huſband, and a tender father (p), and was as exact in keeping a ſtrict diſcipline in his own family, as he was in reforming the diſorders of the city. There are very eminent ſtateſmen, who notwithſtanding all their endeavours, cannot put their domeſtick affairs into a good order, and who meet with leſs trouble and better ſucceſs in the cares of the Government, than in the management of their own families. Cato did not reſemble them, he was not leſs capable to govern a family, than a ſtate: he knew ſo well how to regulate the conduct of his footmen, that they kept their tongues within the ſtricteſt rules of diſcretion [M]. It ſeems one might blame the liberty he gave them to lye with his maid-ſervants, provided they paid a certain ſum of money, to which he taxed them (q): but he had his reaſons for it. He deſerved to be cenſured on another account, I mean his great application to improve his eſtate, and to encreaſe his income: for he was guilty of the moſt

(p) See the rem. [N] towards the end.

(q) See the rem. [M].

nius: This was the father of Marcus Cato, who was the father of Cato of Utica. This laſt was not therefore the grand-nephew of Cato the Cenſor, as is aſſerted in Moreri (65), but his great-grand-ſon.

(65) They have corrected that miſtake in the Paris edit. of 1699.

[L] *It is pretended, that he did not meet in that unequal match with all the advantages he expected.*] St. Jerom, in order to prove that they, who marry a poor woman, in hopes to live peaceably at home, are often diſappointed, urges the inſtance of Cato. The ſeverity of this Cenſor was not capable to preſerve him from the ill effects of his wife's proud temper, whom yet he had choſen from a family of mean extraction. *M. Cato Cenſorius habuit uxorem Actoriam Paulam, humili loco natam, vinolentam, impotentem, & (quod nemo poſſet credere) Catoni ſuperbam. Hoc ideo dico: ne quis putet ſi pauperem duxerit, ſatis ſe concordiæ proviſſe* (66). We do not find that Cato was married above twice. Now this paſſage of St. Jerom cannot be underſtood of the Cenſor's firſt wife: we muſt therefore underſtand it of the ſecond, though Plutarch does not call her *Actoria Paula*, and though he ſuppoſes ſhe was the daughter of one Salonius. Here follows what he tells us of Cato's firſt marriage. " He married to his firſt wife a woman more noble " than rich, being nevertheleſs of opinion, that a " noble and a rich woman are both uſually haughty " and proud: but yet he thought that thoſe of noble " blood would be more aſhamed of baſe things, and " conſequently more obedient to their huſbands, in " all that was fit and decent (67)." We may therefore infer from thence, that he ſubmitted to bear with the pride of his wife, whether ſhe were noble or rich, but that he hoped he would have leſs to ſuffer from a woman of a good family, than from a rich wife. He took other meaſures in his ſecond marriage; he would have neither riches nor nobility in a wife, and yet he met in that ſecond marriage with all the inconveniencies of a proud and paſſionate temper; ſo eaſy it is to be diſappointed, and to gueſs wrong in an affair of that kind. See the remark [G] of the article AVENTINE. A famous Author has made uſe of that paſſage from St. Jerom, in one of his books, where he condemns the cuſtom of requiring from the Candidates or Miniſters, that they ſhould marry the widow, or the daughter of the late Paſtor whoſe church is offered to them. He pretends that theſe conditions are a little tyrannical, and that it were better to leave them at liberty to chooſe a wife with a pretty good fortune (68). *Ut non probo*, ſays he (69), *illius patris inſtitutum, (videatur Plutarch. in Demetr.) qui ut perſuadere poſſet filio, vetulam locupletem uxorem ducere, ex Euripidis Phœniſſis occinebat* (70): ubi lucrum ſuadet, reluctetur licet natura uxorem ducatis: *ita neque conſultum paſtori, ut reſpectu unius miſericordiæ, pauperem uxorem domum ducat. Nam licet poeta Græcus exiſtimet*, ſponſam ſine dote non habere loquendi libertatem: *talis tamen ſæpe deprehenditur procaciſſima eſſe, atque marito ſuo quam immorigera; imo nec abſimilis Actoriæ Paulæ, quam (teſtis eſt Hieronym. lib. 1. in Jovin.) cum Cenſorius Cato*, &c. i. e. " I " do not like the maxim of that Father, who to per- " ſuade his ſon to marry an old but rich woman, re- " peated to him this line from Euripides, *When a wo- " man has money, you muſt marry her, though never ſo " much againſt your inclination.* Nor is it proper for " a Miniſter, out of pity for one perſon only, to " marry a poor woman. For though it be the opini- " on of a Greek Poet, that *a wife who brings no " fortune has not the liberty to ſpeak*, yet it happens often that ſhe is very inſolent, and very diſobedient to " her huſband, and not much unlike Actoria Paula, " whom, according to St. Jerom, Cato the Cenſor, " &c." He was not, perhaps, quite in the wrong.

(66) Hieronym. *adv. Jovinianum*, lib. 1. p. m. 37. He obſerves here, that this wife of Cato was paſſionate, and given to drinking.

(67) Plut. *in Catone Majore*, p. 347. Amiot's Tranſlation.

(68) *Optandum Patroni non injicerent compedes iis, quos ad miniſterium promovere laborant, obtrudendo illis, aut demortuorum Paſtorum viduas, aut filias. Quod tamen pro dolor! nimis quam frequenter in hoc ipſo Fœderato Belgio contingit.* Schoockius, *ubi infra.*

(69) Martinus Schoockius, *Exercitat.* p. 259. edit in 4to.

(70) See above, quot. (4) of the art. PHILLA.

[M] *He knew ſo well how to regulate the conduct of his footmen, that they kept their tongues within the ſtricteſt rules of diſcretion.*] Let us relate here all that he uſed to practiſe with regard to his ſlaves. " He " purchaſed a great many ſlaves out of the captives " taken in war, but chiefly he brought up the young " ones, who were capable of being (as it were) broken " and taught like little whelps and colts. But none " of theſe ever went into another man's houſe, unleſs " they were ſent either by Cato himſelf, or by his " wife. If they were aſked, what Cato did, they " anſwered, they did not know. When a ſervant " was at home, he was obliged, either to do ſome " work or to ſleep: for indeed Cato loved thoſe " moſt, who uſed to lye down often and take a nap; " accounting them more docile than thoſe who were " naturally briſk and lively, and more fit for any " thing, when they were refreſhed with a little ſlum- " ber. Being alſo of opinion, that his ſervants " would take the greateſt pains imaginable to ſatiſ- " fy their venery, he ſet a certain price to be paid " by thoſe who converſed with his bond-women, but " would ſuffer none to be concerned with any others " abroad. At firſt, when he was but a poor ſoldier, " he would not be difficult in any thing, which re- " lated to his diet; but looked upon it as a pitiful " mean thing, to quarrel with a ſervant for the ſake " of his own belly: but afterwards, when he grew " richer, and made any feaſts for his friends and " comrades, preſently when ſupper was done, he would " with a leathern thong ſcourge thoſe who had not " waited well, or been careleſs in dreſſing the meat. " He always contrived too, that his ſervants ſhould " have ſome difference one among another, always " ſuſpecting and fearing ſomething, when there was " a good underſtanding between them. And if any " one of them had committed ſomething, which de- " ſerved to be puniſhed capitally, he tried him in the " preſence of all the reſt, and then, if he were found " guilty, he put him to death before their eyes (17)." Here are ſome particulars, which ſhew that Cato was a moſt judicious man; it was an action, much greater than one can imagine, to have been capable to prevent his ſervants from making an ill uſe of their tongue, by divulging what paſt at his houſe. This was not much more difficult, than the finding of the Philoſopher's ſtone; but then it was of a very great advantage: for what greater ſlavery can there be, than to fear continually the chattering of one's ſervants? This is being a ſlave under one's own roof. Juvenal is admirable upon this topic.

(71) Plut. *in Catone Majore*, p. 548.

Taceant illi, ſed prodere malunt
Arcanum, quam ſubrepti potare Falerni,
Pro populo faciens quantum Laufella bibebat.
Vivendum recte cum propter plurima, tunc his
Præcipue cauſſis, ut linguas mancipiorum
Contemnas: nam lingua mali pars peſſima ſervi.
Deterior tamen hic, qui liber non erit, illis
Quorum animas & farre ſuo cuſtodit, & ære (72).

(72) Juven. Sat. 9. ver. 115.

" Art thou ſo ſtupid grown
" To think a rich man's faults can be unknown?
" Has he not ſlaves about him? Wou'd not they
" Rejoice, and laugh ſuch ſecrets to betray?

" What

(r) In the rem. [B] of the artic. PRÆTEXTATUS.

most odious usury [N]. I have mentioned in another place (r) the speech he made to keep up the law by which the women were prohibited to adorn themselves. I have also hinted in the same place at a speech of his, by which it appears, that he knew how to enliven sometimes the majesty and gravity of his discourses. We should have a false notion of him, if we imagined that nothing but a sad austerity appeared in his speeches and in his conversations; he knew how to set them off with humour and ralleries; he was a man capable of witty sayings [O]; even young people would take a pleasure in his conversations: he grew sociable with his friends at table, and intermixed the conversation with lively discourses: he loved they should often speak at table of the merit of illustrious men; but he would not suffer them to say either good or ill of the wicked. We must not omit the judgment he passed on Kings, and the lesser degree of merit he allowed

" What more effectual to revenge their wrongs,
" Than the unbounded freedom of their tongues?
. . . . . .
" Let us live well, were it alone for this,
" The baneful tongues of servants to despise,
" Slander (the worst of poison) ever finds,
" An easy entrance to ignoble minds.
" And they, whose vicious lives such abject foes
" must fear,
" More mean and wretched far than their own
" slaves appear. *Dryden.*

Cato had less to fear, than a thousand other Romans, the indiscretion of his slaves; but after all, he looked upon their silence as something necessary for the good order in a well disciplined family. He is not to blame for hating their livelineſs; for generally speaking, the more a footman is brisk and ingenious, the greater rogue he is. When the Ministers of a Prince do not love one another, they watch each other's actions, they dread one another, so that the Master is better served, and less betrayed. We may say the same, proportionably, of private families, where there are many servants; whence you must infer, that Cato acted according to his usual prudence, when he kept his servants at variance among themselves. One cannot vindicate him so easily with regard to his giving his men-slaves leave to enjoy his bond-women, upon paying a certain price. This was a natural consequence of his prohibiting them severely to divert themselves out of doors: but at this time his regulations would be condemned; there is no honest family in which such sport would be suffered; and any maid-servant would be turned out of doors, if she did not keep within the bounds of continency, whether she diverted herself at home or abroad. And as for the men-servants, it is expected that they be continent, at least, within doors.

[N] *His great application to improve his estate .... He was guilty of the most odious usury.*] " At last he " was too much given to an extravagant desire of " gain, and looked upon Agriculture rather as a " pleasure than as a profit; resolving therefore to " lay out his money in lasting and solid things, he " purchased ponds, hot baths, grounds full of Fuller's " earth, pastures, and woods, whereby a great revenue flowed to him, and such, he used to say, as " Jupiter himself could not hurt. He was also given " to a most blameable usury in his traffick by sea; " and that thus: he required, that those, whom he " put out his money to, should have many partners: " now when the number of them and their ships " came to fifty, he himself would put in but one " share: for which Quintio, whom he had made " free, and who traded and sailed along with these " Adventurers, was to be his Factor; so that thus " there was no danger of losing his whole stock, but " only a little part, and that with a prospect of a " great profit. He likewise lent money to those of " his slaves who would borrow any, with which they " bought also other young slaves, whom, when they " had taught and bred up at his charges, they would " sell again at the year's end; but some of them " Cato would keep for himself, giving just as much for " them, as another had offered. And to incline his " son to be of this kind of temper, he used to say to " him, that to suffer one's estate to decay, was not " acting like a man of spirit, but rather like a weak " widow. But a farther proof of Cato's avaritious " temper, was his daring to say, that he was a God-" like man, and worthy of immortal praise, who by " his skillful management encreased his estate so, that " what he added to it, amounted to more, than what " he had inherited from his parents (73)." These are very wicked maxims; this was not giving a good education to his son; his advice and his example in that respect were good for nothing, and did but ill suit with the care he had taken in other respects to educate him as a kind father. He himself taught him Literature, though he had a slave who taught it to many other persons. *He would not have his son reprimanded by a servant, or pulled, it may be, by the ears, when he happened not to learn his task well. Nor would he have him owe to a servant the obligation of so noble and great a thing as his learning: wherefore he himself taught him his grammar, law and fencing: nor did he only shew him how to throw a dart, to fight with other arms, and to ride, but even to play at fisty cuffs, to endure both heat and cold, and to swim over the most rapid and rough rivers. He says also, that he wrote his histories in large characters with his own hand, that so his son, without stirring out of the house, might be acquainted with the great men of antiquity, and learn their noble actions, whose example he might endeavour to follow, in order to become himself an eminent man. Nor did he less abstain from speaking any thing obscene before his son, than if it had been in the presence of those sacred virgins called vestals.* See the margin (75).

(73) Plut. *in Catone Majore*, p. 149.

(74) Plut. ibid. p. 148.

(75) This was following a very noble maxim, which Juvenal expresses thus.
Nil dictu fœdum visuque hæc limina tangat,
Intra quæ puer est.
Procul hinc, procul inde puellæ
Lenonum, & cantus pernoctantis parasiti.
Maxima debetur puero reverentia: si quid
Turpe paras, nec tu pueri contemseris annos,
Sed peccaturo obsistat tibi filius infans.
Juven. Sat. 14. ver. 44. See also Plato, *de Legibus*, lib. 5.

[O] *He was a man capable of witty sayings.*] Plutarch has collected a pretty large number of them (76); I shall relate but one, and make use of Balzac's paraphrase, and the Preface with which he introduces it. " Even the Censors themselves, MADAM, " though one would think that sadness was one of " the duties of their office, did not absolutely renounce all kind of raillery. They were not obstinately determined to be eternally severe: and " that peevish unsufferable honest man, I mean, the " first Cato, ceased sometimes to be peevish and unsufferable. He had some sparks of mirth, some " intervals of good humour. He dropt some sayings " which do not want wit: and if you please, MADAM, you may judge of all the rest by this. He " had married a very handsome woman; and it is " recorded in history, that that woman was extremely afraid of thunder, and loved also her husband extremely. As these two passions prompted " her to the same thing, she always chose her husband as an asylum against thunder, and threw herself into his arms at the first noise she imagined to " have heard from Heaven. Cato, who liked the " stormy weather, and who was not sorry to be caressed more than ordinary, could not keep his " joy within his own breast; he discovered that family " secret to his friends, and talking one day of his " wife, he told them, that she had found means to " make him wish for bad weather, and he was never " more happy than when Jupiter was angry. It is " severity itself which has joked thus, it is excessive " rigour, and supreme justice (77)."

(76) Plut. *in Catone Majore*, p. 340, and in *Apophth.* p. 198.

(77) Balzac, *Discours à Madame la Marquise de Rambouillet*, p. m. 49, 50. of his *Oeuvres diverses*.

It will not be improper to observe on what occasion Cato said this; it was during his Censorship, when he degraded the Senator Manilius, who would probably have been Consul the next year, and who was degraded for no other crime but for a kiss which he gave his wife at noon day, in the presence of his daughter (78). There are some persons who think, that at Rome, and in some other countries, it is neither decent nor prudent for a husband to shew his love to his

(78) Plut. *in Catone Majore*, p. 346.

allowed to them, with compariſon to the great men who flouriſhed in a Commonwealth [P]. Nor muſt we forget to mention what he judged of thoſe women, who commit adultery; he thought they were all poiſoners [Q]. This was very ſevere, but not ſo much as the puniſhment he inflicted on a Roman Senator, for giving his wife a kiſs in the preſence of his daughter (5). He ſtruck him out of the catalogue of the Senators for that ſingle fact only. They who ſuppoſe that he would not have become young again [R], aſcribe to him a thought very becoming his good ſenſe. What he ſaid to a Nobleman, whom he ſaw coming out of a bawdy-houſe, ſavours of a looſe morality; but yet he might have excuſed it by this axiom, that of two evils we ought to avoid the greateſt [S]. They are miſtaken, who pretend he was the Author of that cuſtom, which prevailed

(5) See the rem. [O] towards the end.

wife in the ſight of his children: but they judge nevertheleſs that Cato was too ſevere, and ſtretched the maxims of the education of children too far. They think it unjuſt, that the Senator Manilius ſhould have paid ſo dear for ſuch a kiſs. Let us ſee Plutarch's judgment, He finds Cato's conduct too ſevere; but yet he blames Manilius. *Cato deprived a Roman Senator of his dignity, becauſe he had kiſſed his wife in his daughter's preſence. This was indeed a little too hard. But if it be indecent, (as it really is) to kiſs, hug, and embrace one another in the ſight of others* (79), *how much more indecent and baſe is it, to ſcold and abuſe one another? To toy and ſport with his wife in private, and then to chide, blame, and abuſe her with ſharp and bitter words before the world* (80).

(79) Εἰ δὲ αἰσχρόν ἐστιν ὡς ὄντως ἐστὶν) ἑτέρων παρόντων ἀσπάζεσθαι καὶ φιλεῖν καὶ περιέλκειν ἀλλήλους. *Sed tamen ſi eſt (ut profectò eſt) turpe conjuges in præſentia aliorum blandiri, oſculari, & amplecti ſeſe invicem.* Idem, ibid. See hereunder the quotations (109) and (110).

(80) Plut. *in Præceptis Conjugalibus*, p. 139, *D. E.*

[P] *The judgment he paſt on Kings, and the leſſer degree of merit he allowed them with compariſon to the great men . . . . . in a Commonwealth*] "King Eumenes being once come to Rome, the Senate received him with a great deal of ſplendor, and the chief citizens ſtrove who ſhould ſhew him moſt kindneſs and reſpect. Cato on the contrary ſhewed, that he did not like all that kindneſs, and would not viſit him: upon which ſome of his familiar friends ſaid to him, I wonder you ſhould thus ſhun King Eumenes's company, ſince he is ſo good a Prince, and ſo great a lover of the Romans. It may be ſo, replied Cato, but yet a King is always of his own nature a ravenous beaſt, that lives by prey. Nor was there ever a King, though never ſo much commended or eſteemed, who deſerved to be compared with an Epaminondas, a Pericles, a Themiſtocles, a Manius Curius, or an Amilcar ſirnamed Barcas (81)." This calls to my mind what I have heard ſome Engliſhmen ſay, that monarchy is of a very great expence, and that the money, neceſſary to keep up a King's ſtate, would be ſufficient to maintain a numerous army and a large fleet for the defenſe of the country. It is certain, that the expences, which Kings make for their own houſhold only, are prodigious. How many ſorts of guards, how many kinds of officers do they not pay? A whole volume would not be ſufficient to explain all the employments in the Emperor of Conſtantinople's houſhold. When a man reads *l'Etat de la France*, the preſent State of France (82), and finds there ſo many uſeleſs officers and ſervants, the twentieth part of which would be ſufficient to dreſs a Prince's meat, and to wait of him, the reſt being only a vain and ſuperfluous oſtentation, one cannot forbear obſerving that this alone muſt be a heavy burden to the people. The ſame ſuperfluity is to be ſeen proportionably, and with the difference only of more or leſs, in all thoſe places where the ſovereign power is in the hands of one perſon only: if it were urged, that all this is deſigned to ſtrike the inferiors with reſpect, and to give ſtrangers a high notion of the Prince's power, Cato would have anſwered, that even this ſhewed evidently that Kings are what he pretended.

(81) Plut. *in Catone Majore*, p. 340.

(82) It is a book, which they reprint very often. *Codinus*, (thus ſpeaks Vigneul Marville, p. 70. of the 3d vol. of his *Melanges*, edit. of Roan 1701) *in the account he gives of the ceremonies that were uſed at the Emperor of Conſtantinople's table, makes me ſweat at the ſight of ſo many ceremonies.*

[Q] *What he judged of thoſe women, who commit adultery; he thought they were all poiſoners.*] Quintilian obſerves, that this judgment of Cato is an authority proper to be urged by a Counſellor who ſhould plead againſt a diſſolute woman, charged with poiſoning her huſband. *Si cauſſam veneficii dicat adultera, non Marci Catonis judicio damnata videatur, qui nullam adulteram non eandem eſſe veneficam dixit* (83)? Quintilian is in the right to think that this ſentence of Cato would have great weight in the cauſes he mentions; but generally ſpeaking it is not to be admitted. If it be certain that a man died of poiſon, and that his wife committed adultery, they, who think her guilty of her huſband's death, have very ſtrong preſumptions on their ſide, and they may urge her adultery as a moſt probable argument againſt her. But if one ſhould argue without any exception, that ſince a woman is not true to her huſband, ſhe will poiſon him, the concluſion will not be well drawn. There are many ſuch women, who are kind to their huſbands, who take a great deal of care of them when they are ſick; and who, in a word, would by no means poiſon them, although they were a little ill humoured. So that Cato's maxim is carried too far.

(83) Quintil. *Inſt. Orat.* lib. 5. cap. 11. p. m. 244.

[R] *It is ſuppoſed that he would not have become young again.*] The words which Cicero makes him ſpeak upon that ſubject are admirable (84). *Quo quidem me proficiſcentem* (85) *haud ſane quis facile retraxerit, neque tanquam Peliam recoxerit* (86); *& ſi quis deus mihi largiatur, ut ex hac ætate repueriſcam, & in cunis vagiam, valde recuſem: nec vero velim, quaſi decurſo ſpatio, ad carceres a calce revocari. Quid enim habet vita commodi? quod non potius laboris? ſed habeat ſane, habet certe tamen aut ſatietatem, aut modum; non lubet enim mihi deplorare vitam, quod multi & ii docti ſæpe fecerunt, neque me vixiſſe pœnitet: quoniam ita vixi, ut non fruſtra me natum exiſtimem: & ex vita ita diſcedo, tanquam ex hoſpitio, non tanquam ex domo. commorandi enim natura diverſorium nobis, non habitandi dedit.* i. e. "As I am now going to the place of departed ſouls, no man could eaſily call me back, "nor would I be boiled young again, as Pelias was: "and if ſome God would grant me now to become "a child again, and to cry again in a cradle, I "would refuſe it from my heart: and now being "come to the end of life I would not go back to "the ſtarting-place. What comfort is there in this "life? Or rather how many troubles and vexations "are there not? But ſuppoſe this life as comfortable "as you pleaſe, yet we muſt be once ſatiated with "it; we muſt ſet bounds to our love of it. I have "no mind to lament the fate of man in this life, as "many, and even learned men have often done: "nor do I repent that I have lived; ſince I have "lived ſo as to have reaſon to think, I was not "born to no purpoſe; and I depart from this life as "from an inn, and not as from my own houſe. For "nature has given us a tranſitory lodging, but not a "dwelling-place." Take notice here, how that great man's maxims are connected together. He was not ſorry to have lived; he thought that the character he had acted on the ſtage of this world was glorious; and yet he would not begin his life again, if ſome God was to offer it him (87), and he does not inſiſt on the reaſon which he thought it very true; namely, that in this life we are liable to a great many inconveniencies, and enjoy but few comforts.

(84) Cicero, *de Senect.* cap. ult. p. m. 452.

(85) That is to ſay, to the place whither the ſouls go, when they leave the body.

(86) Concerning the miſtake that is here, ſee the rem. [C] of the art. PELIAS.

(87) Compare this with what ſhall be obſerved in the article TULLIA, rem. [R] towards the end.

[S] *What he ſaid to a Nobleman, whom he ſaw coming out of a bawdy-houſe, ſavours of a looſe morality; but then he might have excuſed it by this axiom, that of two evils we ought to avoid the greateſt.*] Horace is, I think, the only Author who acquaints us with this particular.

Nil medium eſt. Sunt, qui nolint tetigiſſe, niſi illas,
Quarum ſubſutâ talos tegat inſtita veſte:
Contrà, alius nullam, niſi olenti in fornice, ſtantem,
Quidam notus homo cùm exirct fornice, Macte
Virtute eſto, inquit ſententia diva Catonis.
Nam ſimul ac venas inflavit tetra libido,
Huc juvenes æquum eſt deſcendere, non alienas
Permolere uxores (88).

(88) Horat. Sat. 2. lib. 1. ver. 23.

prevailed among the Romans of kiſſing their women relations, in order to know whether they had drank any wine [T]. To conclude, he was at once both a great Orator, and a pro-

" Men keep no mean. One, when his blood boils o'er,
" Will take a matron only for his whore.
" While others all but common jades refuſe,
" They fly to ſober whores, and rake the ſtews.
" A certain noted bully of the town,
" When he did leave the ſtews, was often known
" To uſe old Cato's words; *Go bravely on:*
" *Here our hot youths ſhould come to cool their flame;*
" *And never uſe the married city dame.*"

CREECH.

Let us ſee Monſieur Dacier's note on the *Macte virtute eſto* (89). " This is a ſaying of Cato the Cenſor, " who ſeeing an honeſt man coming out of a bawdy-" houſe, commended him, and exhorted him to do " always the ſame. But taking notice afterwards, " that he never ſtirred from it; *Friend*, ſaid he, *I* " *commended you for coming here ſometimes, but not* " *for making it your uſual dwelling-place. Adoleſcens,* " *ego te laudavi quod interdum huc venires; non quòd* " *hic habitares.*"

[T] *They are miſtaken who pretend he was the Author of that cuſtom, which prevailed among the Romans of kiſſing their women relations, in order to know whether they had drank any wine.*] It is unqueſtionably certain, that the Romans made a law, by which the women were forbid to drink wine; and to prevent them from drinking any privately, they introduced the cuſtom for the men to kiſs their kinſwomen (90): but it is falſe that our Cato enacted that Law, and that he publiſhed that cuſtom. We read in Pliny (91), that one Egnatius Mecenius, having killed his wife becauſe ſhe had drank wine, was acquitted by Romulus. We meet with the ſame particular in Servius's Commentary on the 737th verſe of the firſt Æneis. That man's being acquitted ought not to be looked upon as a ſingular caſe; ſince by the laws of Romulus, the puniſhment of women's crimes was left to the diſcretion of their huſbands and relations, and the two greateſt crimes they could be guilty of, were to commit adultery, and to drink wine. When Romulus made that law, he was perſuaded, that after a woman had committed adultery, ſhe was capable of any other wicked attempt, and that the drinking of wine was the firſt ſtep to adultery. You may read all this in Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus (92). We muſt alſo think that this firſt King of Rome had the antient laws of Italy in view, and there were few of an older date, than that by which the women were prohibited to drink wine; for we find that King Faunus whipped his wife to death. becauſe ſhe had drank ſome againſt the cuſtom. *Sex. Clodius in eo libro quem Græcè ſcripſit, refert Fauni hanc uxorem fuiſſe: quæ quia* CONTRA MOREM, *decuſque regium, clam vini ollam ebiberat, & ebria facta erat, virgis myrteis à viro uſque ad mortem cæſa* (93). i. e. " Sextus Clodius in " that book which he wrote in Greek, relates, that " this was Faunus's wife; who having againſt the " cuſtom, and againſt the King's dignity, drank a " quantity of wine, and got drunk, was by her huſ-" band whipped to death with a rod made of myrtle " branches." Plutarch has mentioned this, as you will ſee hereunder, where I correct an error, which the Criticks have not obſerved, that I know of.

Infer from all this that our Cato the Cenſor did not make the law we have been ſpeaking of. There is therefore a groſs blunder in the following paſſage from Mr. Lomeier: *Apud Romanos mulieres paſſim oſculo ſalutabantur à propinquis, quo explorarent, an contra legem temetum olerent. Inſtitutum hoc erat Catonis teſte Plinio*, lib. 14. cap 13. (94). i. e. " It was the cuſ-" tom among the Romans for the men to ſalute their " kinſwomen with a kiſs, in order to know whether " they ſmelled of wine, which was againſt the law. " This cuſtom was eſtabliſhed by Cato, according to " Pliny." This is what Lomeier aſſerts in a diſſertation he wrote upon kiſſes. He has quoted Pliny without giving himſelf the trouble to conſult him: if he had conſulted him, he would have found that Cato was quoted there, not as the Author of thoſe cuſtoms of the Romans, but only as a Writer who had mentioned them. *Cato* (ſcripſit) *ideo propinquos feminis oſculum dare, ut ſcirent an temetum olerent. Hoc tum nomen vino erat, unde & temulentia appellatur* (95). *i. e.* " Cato (wrote), that the men uſed to kiſs their " kinſwomen, on purpoſe to know whether they " ſmelled of wine, which was antiently called *teme-* " *tum*, whence the word *temulentia* is derived, which " ſignifies *drunkenneſs*." I imagine that Lomeier had no other ground for what he ſaid, but what he met with in Kempius; but he did not conſider it with due attention. He has told a falſity, for want of underſtanding that Writer's words, and another, becauſe he underſtood them. Kempius aſſerts, that the women were forbidden to drink wine by Cato's authority, and that, as a conſequence of that prohibition, the men began to uſe themſelves to kiſs their kinſwomen, with a deſign to know whether they had tranſgreſſed that law. *Poſtmodum ſucceſſu temporis* (96), *cum ex auctoritate M. Catonis vinum mulieribus interdictum eſſet, primùm viri cognatarum os cæperunt oſculari, ut odor indicium faceret, ſi bibiſſent.* Affinibus & propinquis oſculari eas jus eſt, ut ſobrias comprobent, *inquit* Arnobius lib. 2. adverſus Gentes. *Vinum enim mulierem bibiſſe perinde erat, ac ſi in adulterio ac gravi crimine deprehenſa, capitali ſupplicio plectenda eſſet, ceu* Plinius *habet* Lib. 14. *Hiſt. Nat. cap.* 13 (97). [Mr. Bayle having given the ſenſe of the former part of this paſſage, we ſhall tranſlate only the laſt ſentence of it, which is to this purpoſe.] " When " a woman had drank any wine, it was the ſame " as though ſhe had been guilty of adultery, or of " ſome other great crime, and ſhe was capitally " puniſhed, as Pliny obſerves." It is plain that the quotation from Pliny, which concludes that paſſage, does not relate to the beginning of it; and yet Lomeier has employed it, in order to prove what he tranſcribed from Kempius in the beginning of theſe Latin words, which I have ſet down here.

Here follows the error, which I have ſaid was not obſerved in the text of Plutarch. This Hiſtorian, having aſked why the Roman Ladies cauſed no Myrtle to be carried into the chapel of the *Bona Dea*, or kind Goddeſſes, though they took a delight in putting all kinds of green boughs there, anſwers, it was becauſe that Goddeſs had been married to a man, who had whipped her with a rod of Myrtle, when he had found out that ſhe had been drinking wine. Πότερον (ὡς οἱ μυθολογοῦντες ἱστοροῦσι) Φαυλίᾳ μὲν ἦν γυνὴ τῷ μάντεως, οἴνῳ δὲ χρησαμένη κρύφα, καὶ μὴ λαθοῦσα, ῥάβδοις ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐκολάσθη μυρσίναις (98). That is to ſay, according to Xylander's tranſlation, *An credendum eſt fabulæ, quæ perhibet Faulii cujuſdam aruſpicis uxorem cùm clàm poto vino non fefelliſſet, à marito virgis myrteis fuiſſe caſtigatam.* The Greek word Φαυλίᾳ, muſt be eraſed here, and Φαύνῳ put in its ſtead: for not only the Author quoted by Lactantius aſſerts that the *Bona Dea* had been married with Faunus, &c (99); but even Plutarch obſerves in the Life of Cæſar (100). The Latin Tranſlator might have boldly corrected that error; but inſtead of ſetting that paſſage right, he ſpoils it, and tranſlates it erroneouſly. He ſuppoſes, that Plutarch anſwers, that the Myrtle was not admitted, becauſe the wife of a certain Phaulius, a fortune-teller, had been whipped, &c. This is not following the original. Plutarch does not hint at a perſon, whom one may call with contempt, *cujuſdem, one*. He obſerves, that the woman who was whipped, was the ſame, whom they worſhipped at Rome under the name of *Bona Dea*. Amyot has very well avoided that laſt miſtake, which was the moſt conſiderable. He tranſlates the paſſage thus. *It was becauſe ſome relate fabulouſly, that ſhe was the wife of Flavius a Diviner; and having drank wine ſecretly, ſhe was found out by her huſband, and whipped by him with a rod of Myrtle.* Boxhornius (101) had made no remarks on Xylander's tranſlation.

What I have obſerved concerning the cuſtom of the Romans to kiſs their kinſwomen, muſt be a little better cleared up. Plutarch has explained it very well, and it appears from the account he gives of it, that the women uſed to go and kiſs their kinſmen when

(89) Dacier on this paſſage of Horace, Tom. 6. p. 130, 131. of the Dutch edit.

(90) See the paſſage from Valerius Maximus, above, quotat. (49) of the art. ERMITA; and Aulus Gellius, lib. 10. cap. 23; and Tertullian. *in Apologet*, cap. 6.

(91) Plin. lib. 14. cap. 13.

(92) In the 2d book of his *Antiquities of Rome*, chap. 26. p. m. 93.

(93) Lactant. lib. 1. cap. 22. See alſo Arnobius, lib. 5. p. 165, and Plut. *in Quæſt. Romanis*, p. 268, D.

(94) Lomeier, *Genial. Dierum*, part. 1. p. 357.

(95) Plin. lib. 14. cap. 13.

(96) The Author had juſt been quoting the Canon Law, and mentioning ſeveral things poſterior to Cato. Judge then, whether his *poſtmodum*, &c. is judiciouſly placed.

(97) Martinus Kempius, *Diſſert. 16. de Oſculis*, p. m. 637.

(98) Plut. *in Quæſt. Romanis*, p. 268, D.

(99) See above quotat. (99).

(100) Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ νύμφην δρυάδα Φαύνῳ συνοικήσασαν. *Romani nympham Dryada Fauno nuptam.* Plut. *in Cæſare*, p. 711.

(101) He publiſhed with notes Plutarch's treatiſe *de Quæſt. Romanis*, in Greek and Latin, in the year 1637, in 4to.

(t) See the rem. [U].

(u) See the rem. [K], towards the end.

a profound Civilian [U], two qualities which ſeldom meet together, any more than thoſe of an eloquent Preacher, and a learned Divine (t). You will ſee in one of our remarks (u), how Cato of Utica was deſcended from him. I have obſerved ſeveral errors in the Hiſtorical Dictionaries, and in ſome others Writers. I ſhall ſet them down in my Supplement,

when they met them. Theſe are remarkable particulars, which the other Writers have not mentioned. *What is the reaſon*, aſks he (102), *why they kiſs their kinſmen on the mouth? Is it, as moſt perſons think, becauſe the women being prohibited to drink wine, the cuſtom was introduced, that when they met their kinſmen, they ſhould go and kiſs them on the mouth, that they, who had drank wine, might be thereby found out and convinced? Or is it for the reaſon, which the Philoſopher Ariſtotle mentions* (103) . . . . *or rather becauſe that privilege was granted to the Ladies, as ſomething glorious and creditable to them, if it appeared thereby that they had many and virtuous relations: or becauſe it was forbidden to marry one's relations, ſo that the only token of kindneſs they could give them was a kiſs: whence that only proof of kindred has been kept up among them. For they did not formerly marry their kinſwomen, as even at this time they do not marry their aunts, nor their ſiſters; and it was a long while before they were allowed to marry their couſins.* It is not much to the purpoſe, to examine whether theſe reaſons of Plutarch be well grounded or not: it is enough to have mentioned the facts he relates; they deſerve to be known. His account hints plainly enough to us this circumſtance, namely, that theſe kiſſes were given to the men by the women publickly, as they happened to meet with them, either in the ſtreet, or in any other place. It had not been polite for the men to make the firſt ſteps: for this would have looked as though they ſuſpected their kinſwomen had drank wine. It was the women's buſineſs to offer their lips; this alone was a proof that they were conſcious of their own innocence. They had brought it into queſtion, if they had not offered the kiſs boldly, and immediately upon their meeting with their kinſmen. At this time ſuch a cuſtom would occaſion a thouſand railleries; and afford an inexhauſtible ſpring of ingenious pieces of gallantry, as alſo of ſilly jokes; for couſins are apt to look very kindly on their kinſwomen. A prudent mother would not be very well pleaſed that her daughter's couſins had the right to try whether they ſmell of wine or not. Obſerve, that Propertius charges his faithleſs miſtreſs (104) with pretending falſely that many men were her relations, that ſhe might never want kiſſes.

(102) Plut. *in Quæſt. Romanis*, p. 265. Amiot's Tranſlation.

(103) That reaſon is, that the Trojan Ladies having burnt the Ships of Æneas, pacified their husbands by embracing and kiſſing them.

(104) *Cynthia*, and not *Phryne*, as Kempius, *de Oſculis*, p. 636. falſely ſuppoſes.

Quin etiam falſos fingis tibi ſæpe propinquos,
Oſcula ne deſint (105) *qui tibi jure ferant* (106).

(105) There is *nec deſunt*, in the editions; I have followed Gebhard's correction.

(106) Propert. *Eleg.* 6. lib. 2.

I ſhall cloſe this remark as I have begun it; that is to ſay, with cenſuring a blunder, which relates to Cato. Kempius aſcribes to him the publiſhing of a decree, by which married perſons were forbidden to kiſs each other in their daughters preſence; for which he quotes Plutarch. But it is certain that Plutarch ſays no ſuch thing. We have ſeen above (107), all that he relates upon this ſubject. *Nihilominus tamen parcè inter veteres maritale oſculum, & non niſi admodum circumſpectè, ac remotis arbitris, ne liberi ſcilicet inde furtivis amorum illecebris ſtimularentur, M. Catonem Cenſorinum* (108) *Stoicæ diſciplinæ addictum, edicto prohibuiſſe, ne Maritus conjugem deoſcularetur in præſentiâ filiæ, Manliumque quem omnium opinio Conſulem deſignabat, Senatu ejeciſſe, quod uxorem coram filia nubili exoſculatus eſſet, Auctor eſt* Plutarchus in Catonis vitâ, p. 346 (109). *i. e.* " However, the antient married " people uſed to kiſs each other ſparingly, with " great circumſpection, and never before witneſſes, leſt it ſhould intice their children to indulge " themſelves in the ſecret pleaſures of love: and " Cato the Cenſor, who was addicted to the Stoick " Philoſophy, enacted by a decree, that an huſband " ſhould not kiſs his wife in his daughter's preſence, " and expelled Manlius out of the Senate, (though " in all the people's opinion he was to be choſen " Conſul the next year) becauſe he had kiſſed his " wife before his daughter whow as marriageable, as " Plutarch relates in Cato's Life." It is not true that Cato made any law, or cauſed any to be made upon that ſubject; he puniſhed Manlius by the bare authority of his office; but this was not to be a precedent for the future: the Cenſors, who ſucceeded him, were not obliged to follow his example; we meet with no other inſtance of ſuch a puniſhment, and it is very probable that many perſons indulged themſelves the ſame liberty, which Manlius had taken. The laws cannot well extend ſo far as to prohibit ſuch things; all that can be done, is to give men advice, and make them fear to fall under the cenſure of a Magiſtrate. I think that Clemens of Alexandria did not condemn Cato's ſeverity. See how he adviſes married people not to kiſs one another before their ſervants (110).

(107) In the rem. [O].

(108) He ought to have ſaid *Cenſorium*. It is not true that Cato was of the Stoick ſect; he is miſtaken here, for his great-grandſon Cato of Utica.

(109) Kempius, *de Oſculis*, Diſſ. 15. p. 615.

(110) Clemens Alexandr. *Pædagog.* lib. 3. cap. 12. p. m. 258.

[U] *He was at once both a great Orator, and a profound Civilian.*] See Valerius Maximus (111), and Quintilian (112), or rather this beautiful paſſage from Tully, which ſhews us ſo well how much Cato excelled in many things. *Quid Marco Catoni præter hanc politiſſimam doctrinam tranſmarinam, atque adventitiam defuit? num quia jus civile didicerat, cauſas non dicebat? aut quia poterat dicere, juris ſcientiam negligebat? at utroque in genere & laboravit, & præſtitit: num propter hanc ex privatorum negotiis collectam gratiam tardior in republica capeſſenda fuit? nemo apud populum fortior, nemo melior ſenator, idem facile optimus imperator: denique nihil in hac civitate temporibus illis ſciri, diſcive potuit, quod ille non tum inveſtigarit, & ſcierit, tum etiam conſcripſerit* (113). i. e. " What did M. Cato " want beſides that moſt polite indeed, but foreign " learning, which comes from beyond ſea? Was it " becauſe he had ſtudied the Civil Law, that he did " not plead at the bar? Or becauſe he could plead, " did he therefore neglect the ſtudy of the law? Indeed he ſtudied both the Law and the Art of Eloquence, and excelled in both. Or was he more unqualified to take upon him the Government of the " Commonwealth, becauſe his ſkill in the management of private affairs had won him the people's " favour? No man had more credit with the people, " no man was a better Senator than he was, who was " at the ſame time the greateſt General. Nor was " there at that time any thing that could be learnt or " known, but he learnt it, knew it, and even wrote " about it." The number of thoſe who have been adorned at once with the moſt noble gifts of Rhetorick, and a moſt deep knowledge of the Law, has always been ſo ſmall, that we may ſay, that the enjoying theſe together, was one of the moſt eminent and moſt uncommon qualities of our Cato. I know that Cicero (114) has laboured to prove, that a man cannot be a greater Orator, unleſs he be poſſeſſed at the ſame time with all the riches of an univerſal learning. *Illud eſt*, ſays he (115), *hujus inſtitutæ ſcriptionis, ac temporis, neminem eloquentia, non modo ſine dicendi doctrina, ſed ne ſine omni quidem ſapientia florere unquam, & præſtare potuiſſe. Etenim cæteræ ferè artes ſe ipſæ per ſe tuentur ſingulæ: bene dicere autem, quod eſt ſcienter, & perite, & ornate dicere, non habet definitam aliquam regionem, cujus terminis ſepta teneatur. Omnia quæcunque in hominum diſceptationem cadere poſſunt, bene ſunt ei dicenda, qui hoc ſe poſſe profitetur, aut eloquentiæ nomen relinquendum eſt.* i. e. " Such is the na- " ture of that ſcience and of this time, that no man " can be eminent and excel in eloquence, not only if " he be not ſkilled in the art of ſpeaking, but even " if he be not adorned with an univerſal learning: " every one of the other ſciences can ſubſiſt by themſelves, without the aſſiſtance of any other ſcience: " but the art of ſpeaking well, that is to ſay, to the " purpoſe, ſkilfully and eloquently, is not confined " within certain limits. A man who pretends to be an " Orator, muſt be able to ſpeak well of every thing " that can be debated, or he muſt give up his claim to " eloquence." I know alſo that Tully has aſſerted, that Lucius Craſſus, and Mark Anthony the Orator, two of the moſt eloquent men of their time, were not ſo ignorant, as it was imagined, and that on the contrary they were both very learned (116): but he confeſſes

(111) Valerius Maximus, lib. 8. cap. 7. num. 1.

(112) Quint. *Orat. Inſt.* lib. 12. cap. 3. p. m. 565.

(113) Cicero, *de Orat.* lib. 3. folio m. 95, *B.* He had obſerved in the 1ſt book, folio 66, *A. Quid vero ille M. Cato? nonne & eloquentia tanta fuit, quantam illa tempora, atque illa ætas in hac civitate ferre maximam potuit, & juris civilis omnium peritiſſimus?*

(114) *In Libris de Oratore.*

(115) Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. 2. *init.* folio m. 71, *B.*

(116) Idem, ibid.

Supplement, where I ſhall give the articles of the other illuſtrious Cato's.

confeſſes himſelf, that experience is againſt him (117), and if he had not confeſſed it, would not he have been eaſily convicted of his miſtake by many inſtances? Would he have dared to aſſert that Demoſthenes could paſs for a learned man, if compared to Ariſtotle? Would he have dared to maintain, that Ariſtotle was capable of compoſing as good orations as Demoſthenes? Let us ſpeak the truth: the talents of eloquence ſeldom meet with an immenſe learning. This may be obſerved at this time, as well as formerly: the moſt celebrated Preachers are, generally ſpeaking, unacquainted with the Oriental languages, and with the Art of Criticiſm, and they are not very deeply ſkilled in Theological ſubjects: conſult the *Nouvelles Lettres contre l'Hiſtoire du Calviniſme de Monſieur Maimbourg* (118); you will ſee there what ſkillful Judges have declared upon this topic; you may, if you pleaſe, add to it the teſtimony of the Abbot of St. Cyran. *You have made me ſenſible by experience*, ſays he to a Jeſuit (119), *of what I had heard ſometime before, namely, that it is very difficult to be at once an eloquent Preacher, and a very learned man.* Doctor Huarte aſſerts, that learning and eloquence do not belong to the ſame faculty of the ſoul, the former belonging to the underſtanding, and the latter to the imagination. See the ninth and tenth chapters of his *Examen des Eſprits*. Imperialis refutes him as well as he can (120), but proves his own Theſis very indifferently. It is certain that Providence beſtows its gifts after ſuch a manner, that they are generally divided: ſome fall to the ſhare of one ſoul, and others to another's ſhare. They who have the gift of gaining victories, have not received the gift of improving their victory. They, who might know how to make an advantage of it, do not know how to conquer (121). They who excel in the languages, and in the knowledge of matters of fact, are not adorned with a great talent for reaſoning. See what Monſieur Simon obſerves concerning Father Morin, and concerning Petavius (122). It is very certain, that as much as Bochart excelled Monſieur Claude in learning, ſo much below him was he in what is called urging an argument home, ſolving an objection, and fitting a Philoſophical or a Theological queſtion to the bottom. Balzac was a little ſurprized when he read a judicious diſcourſe, which Father Faure, an eminent Preacher, had publiſhed (123).

(117) *Et in noſtra civitate, & in ipſa Græcia quæ ſemper hæc ſumma duxit, multos & ingeniis, & magna laude dicendi ſine ſumma rerum omnium ſcientia fuiſſe fateor.* Idem, ibid. C.

(118) Page 624, &c.

(119) Saint Cyran, in his *Cenſure de la Somme Theologique du Pere Garaſſe*, p. 8. of the *Avis au Pere Garaſſe*.

(120) Joh. Imperialis, *in Muſæo Phyſico*, lib. 2. cap. 7.

(121) See above, quotat. (7), of the article CÆSAR.

(122) Above, quotat. (12), of the art. PETAVIUS.

(123) See the *Diſſertation* printed at the end of his *Socrate Chrétien*, p. m. 12, &c.

PORSENA (CHRISTOPHER). See PERSONA.

PORTUGAL (ALFONSUS VI. OF THAT NAME, KING OF) was born the 28th of Auguſt, 1643. He was hardly ſeven years old, when it was obſerved that he had ſome beginnings of madneſs. That diſorder of his brains did by no means leſſen his ambition; it made him only ſhew it more openly; for his eldeſt brother, Prince Don Theodoſius, dying May the 15th, 1653, Alfonſus did not conceal his joy. He ſhewed that he ſpoke ſincerely, when the very firſt day of his brother's illneſs, he ſaid, he ſhould not be ſorry if it proved mortal, ſince he ſhould get a Crown by it. He came to that Crown, under his mother's regency, the 15th of November, 1656 (*a*). His bad qualities appeared more and more; he made no account of his Governor's counſels; he uſed to draw his ſword againſt the firſt perſons he met with, and if he did not kill them, it was not for want of good will; he ran about the ſtreets in the night-time with ſome wicked fellows, and committed a thouſand outrages, and a thouſand villainous actions in the bawdy-houſes [*A*], and boaſted of them the next morning, as though he had performed the moſt glorious actions. All the means that were tried to remedy theſe diſorders proving ineffectual, it was at laſt reſolved to remove from him the perſons who completed his ruin, and they were accordingly carried off with main force from his own apartment. This exaſperated him very much, ſo that he retired from Liſbon, and went to Alcantara. In order to prevent the dangerous conſequences of his evaſion, the Queen was obliged to reſign to him the adminiſtration of the Kingdom. This was done at Liſbon, with the neceſſary ceremonies, June the 23d, 1662. After that time, three or four great Lords, who had engroſſed the whole favour of that young Prince, laboured as much as lay in their power to procure the Queen's diſgrace [*B*], and

(*a*) Her name was Louiſa Frances de Guſman. Her husband, who from being Duke of Braganza, was made King of Portugal in the year 1640, died November the 6th, 1656. About that revolution conſult an anonymous book, which was publiſhed at Paris in the year 1689, with this title, *Hiſtoire de la Conjuration de Portugal.* It was written by the Abbé Vertot, and was not leſs eſteemed than his *Hiſtory of the Revolutions of Sweden*, which he publiſhed in the year 1695.

[*A*] *He committed a thouſand outrages, and a thouſand villainous actions in the bawdy-houſes.*] In the relation (1), from which I borrow this article, it is obſerved (2), that he uſed to run about the ſtreets with theſe people, that he entered into ſcandalous houſes, where he uſed the women in the moſt outrageous manner; that he never went out in the night with them, but there were an hundred tragical ſtories told the next morning: in a word, that he was dreaded every where as a wild and cruel beaſt: that though he viſited the Proſtitutes at their own houſes, yet he uſed to have lewd women brought to him in his own palace: that he even boaſted of ſuch immodeſt actions with them, that as they were by no means probable, ſo they were not credited. After the Queen Dowager was retired from Court, he form'd two companies, the one of foot, the other of horſe, *which he uſed to call his low and high patrole, and which he compoſed of the moſt profligate men in the kingdom* (3). He uſed to go out every night with theſe two troops, and attacked indifferently all thoſe he met with. *They, who accompanied him, had generally their ſwords by their ſide without ſcabbards, that they might be the readier to execute his commands. And the better to deceive the people, they uſed to blacken their ſwords, that the brightneſs of the ſteel might not betray their deſigns. They who brought theirs back tainted with blood were highly commended by the King.* "His diſſoluteneſs "kept pace with his paſſions; he either went him-"ſelf to the lewd women, or they brought them to "him, at a country-ſeat near Alcantara, where his "favourites kept up that wicked inclination in his "mind, in order to ſilence, if it were poſſible, the "report that was ſpread of his frigidity (4)."

[*B*] *Three or four Lords . . . . laboured . . . to procure the Queen's diſgrace.*] They had good ground to think, that ſhe endeavoured to raiſe her ſecond ſon to the throne: for in the arguments urged for the nullity of that marriage, printed at the end of the *Relation*, they have not omitted to obſerve, *that conſidering King Alfonſus's incapacity and frigidity, the Queen, who was fully perſuaded of it, having ſecretly conſulted the Phyſicians about it . . . . was reſolved, during his regency, to procure the ſceptre to the Infante her ſecond ſon.* Alfonſus revenged himſelf of her: *he was pleaſed that people ſhould talk diſreſpectfully of all* the Queen's *actions before him.* Some perſons uſed to meet in the night time under the Queen's windows, *at the time when ſhe locked herſelf up to ſay her prayers; theſe perſons broke her windows, and gave her ſuch horrid language, that it would be a ſhame to write it* (5). Once on a Lady-day, the King, in the preſence of

(1) I have given the title of it in the margin of the text of this article, quotat. (*b*).

(2) Page 19.

(3) Ibidem, p. 92.

(4) Ibidem, p. 95.

(5) Ibid. p. 85.

and ſucceeded ſo well in that attempt, that in March 1663, ſhe was obliged to execute a deſign, which was not perhaps ſo deeply rooted in her heart, as ſhe would make the world believe; I mean, the deſign of forſaking the world, to mind nothing but her ſalvation. After ſhe was retired into a country-ſeat, the King gave himſelf over more than ever to his wicked inclinations, even ſo far as not to make the leaſt account of the outſide of religion [C]; which ſhews that his very favourites were not capable to manage him [D]. There were three or four of them for ſome time; but at laſt Count de Caſtelmelhor ſupplanted all the reſt, and found means to ſtrengthen himſelf in the King's favour, by pretending he had diſcovered a moſt horrid conſpiracy [E]. The Infante Don Pedro (b) was ſuſpected of a deſign to make himſelf King, and was ſo ill uſed, that he retired from Court, after the King had made his publick entry into Liſbon with his new wife, the 29th of Auguſt, 1666. The Queen Dowager had departed this life the 28th of February of the ſame year. The new Queen was a French Princeſs, but of the Houſe of Savoy (c). By her entreaties, ſhe perſuaded the Infante to return to Liſbon, where he ſuffered a thouſand vexations. She experienced alſo the King's ill-temper on many occaſions. There was nothing but quarrels and complaints. The removal of Count de Caſtelmelhor, at the Infante's repeated inſtances, did not mend the King's affairs. And as Anthony de Souſa de Macedo, Secretary of State, was called back to Court, it proved ſuch a terrible ſhock to the Queen, that ſhe would no longer ſee any company but the King, *who uſed to ſay nothing to her but what was uncivil and unkind.* That Secretary of State having exaſperated the Queen very much, ſhe had at laſt obtained that he ſhould be removed from his place; but he got again into it in the moſt inſulting manner. The Infante was determined to drive him out again at any rate; he went to the palace (d) with ſuch a numerous attendance, that the Secretary retired, not daring to truſt any longer to the King's protection. They obliged afterwards the King to ſummon the States of the Kingdom, to meet the firſt of January 1668; but before that time was come, the Queen made uſe of a terrible device: ſhe retired into a Convent November the 21ſt 1667, ſent word to the King that ſhe was determined to return into France, and declared to the Ladies who attended her, that her marriage was never conſummated. She hinted ſomething of it in the letter ſhe wrote to her reputed huſband. Here

(b) He was the King's only brother.

(c) Her name was Frances Mary Elizabeth; ſhe was born the 21ſt of June, 1646, and was the daughter of Charles Amedée of Savoy, Duke of Nemours, by his wife Iſabella of Vendôme, the daughter of the Duke of that name, who was King Henry the Fourth's natural ſon.

(d) In October 1667.

of his whole Court, paſſed before the Queen, who was ſeated in the gallery, without paying the cuſtomary compliment (6). The day ſhe retired from Court, the King ſeemed perfectly pleaſed; and having accompanied her to the country-ſeat ſhe had choſen, he left her at the door of the firſt room, without paying her the leaſt compliment in the world. *He returned at night on horſe-back, in a very good humour, going to all the litters or coaches he met on the road, to ſay ſome lewd and ſmutty words to the ladies* (7). A little before the Queen died, ſhe let her two ſons know the condition ſhe was in. The Infante wept at it. *But the King was ſo far from being moved in the leaſt, that he ridiculed his brother for his tender heart, and would not ſuffer him to ſet out immediately to go and ſee his mother* (8). It is certain that this Queen had a thouſand vexations to ſuffer from her ſon Alfonſus. This is the fate of moſt of the ſovereign Princes; nor is this the leaſt misfortune that attends their condition. There are no perſons who want more to have children, and none who receive more diſpleaſure from them. When they have no children, they are witneſſes, either to the intrigues which are carried on for their ſucceſſion, to the exceſſive homage which is paid before hand to another family: and when they have children what jealouſies and ſuſpicions muſt they not entertain within their breaſt at the ſight of thoſe, who worſhip a riſing ſun? Happy are they yet, if men will ſuffer them to govern, till they die a natural death. It is chiefly of them one ought to have ſaid, *filius ante diem patrios inquirit in annos* (9). i. e. "The ſon wiſhes for his father's death before his time is come."

(6) Ibid. p. 86.

(7) Ibid. p. 90.

(8) Ibid. p. 110.

(9) Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 1.

[C] *So far as not to make the leaſt account of the outſide of religion.*] The Author, who is my original, ſpeaks thus. "He had ſo little regard for religion, "that without any reaſon, he cauſed maſs to be ſaid "on his ordinary days in his chamber, whilſt he was "in bed, and at an unſeaſonable hours. On Holy-"days he never went to Chapel till after he had "dined, ſo that maſs was ſaid in his Chapel, when "they were ſinging the evening Prayers in the other "Churches. As he could not refuſe abſolutely to "hear ſermons, he ordered the preachers to ſhorten "their diſcourſes; ſo that ſome were baniſhed for "not obeying that order, and others abſtained from "preaching. However, there were ſome bold enough "to exclaim againſt thoſe diſorders, but to no pur-"poſe, becauſe there were others, who by the flat-"teries, with which they intermixed their ſermons, "rendered that zeal ineffectual (10)."

(10) *Relation*, p. 97.

[D] *His very favourites were not capable to manage him.*] They had, no doubt, wit enough to underſtand, that on the one hand nothing could expoſe his Crown to more danger, than the contempt for the holy Ceremonies; and that on the other hand nothing was more proper to conceal his diſſoluteneſs, than an outward ſhew of devotion. It was therefore their own intereſt to inſpire him with that kind of policy: and ſince they did not perſuade him to aſſiſt with aſſiduity at the publick exerciſes of religion, ſince they did not teach him to put on an air of devotion on thoſe occaſions at leaſt, for devotion, much more than charity, *covers a multitude of his ſins*, we ought to think, that they could not do it. Of what ſtupidity would they not be ſuſpected, if they had ſuffered a young Prince, whom they could manage as they pleaſed, to draw upon himſelf the reſentment of the preachers, by ſo diſagreeable and mortifying an order as that to preach ſhort? Was not that wounding to the quick? There were ſome, who choſe rather to be baniſhed or not to preach, than to obey ſuch an order (11). Another thing, wherein that Prince ſhewed little regard for the preachers, was his laughing at the Comets, and even in the moſt fooliſh manner. Here follows what we meet with in the *Relation*. "There appeared at that time a Comet; "the King being told that it preſaged the death of "Kings, or that their dominions would be poſſeſſed "by others, abuſed it with the moſt opprobrious lan-"guage from his terraſs, gave a thouſand ſhameful "names, and ſhot even at it with a piſtol." It was an eaſy matter to draw his horoſcope, conſidering what perſons he exaſperated, and what follies he committed.

(11) See the foregoing remark.

[E] *Count de Caſtelmelhor ..... found means to ſtrengthen himſelf in the King's favour, by pretending he had diſcovered a moſt horrid conſpiracy.*] It is an artifice, which men are often obliged to make uſe of either to prevent conſpiracies, or to get rid of ſuſpected perſons; it is, I ſay, an artifice often neceſſary, to publiſh that a moſt deſperate plot has been diſcovered. It is no matter, if after all no man be found guilty: in the mean time, you have alarmed the world, and

Here then there was an action of impotency brought againſt Don Alfonſus [*F*], a Prince who had ſo much boaſted of his great exploits with the women (*e*). The moment he knew what the Queen wrote to him, he went to the Convent into which ſhe was retired, and would have had the gates of it broke open, had not the Infante prevented it. The next day he told his brother *in a great paſſion, and with very indecent words, that he was more a man than people imagined.* The Queen declared before ſeveral Counſellors of State, and before ſeveral Officers of the Crown, the reaſons for which ſhe retired from Court, and the deſign ſhe had to have her marriage declared void. She wrote to the Chapter of the Cathedral Church of Liſbon (*f*), deſiring them to take cognizance of that cauſe, without any delay. They talked immediately of marrying her to the Infante: nor was it long before the diſpenſation came. In a word, there was ſuch a diligent ſearch made in every reſpect, that Don Pedro took poſſeſſion of the Royal Palace on the 23d of November 1667, and on the 2d of April following he married Mademoiſelle d'Aumale, ſince Alfonſus's reputed wife was now to be called thus. The Chapter had declared the marriage

(*e*) See the rem. [*A*].

(*f*) The See was vacant at that time.

taken meaſures to keep men in awe. Count de Caſtelmelhor *made the King believe that there was a deſign to deprive him of his Crown; and at the ſame time he ſpread a report abroad, that he had diſcovered that conſpiracy by a divine revelation. He charged the Queen,* the Duke of Cadaval, and ſeveral other perſons who were out of favour. *It was therefore reſolved, that an enquiry ſhould be made about that pretended conſpiracy . . . . . That enquiry continued a great while, either becauſe it was not carried on in earneſt, or with a deſign to encreaſe the fear of thoſe who were accuſed, by exaggerating the diſcoveries, which were pretended to be made daily. Though nothing was found by thoſe enquiries againſt the perſons accuſed, yet ſome body would hint that they were nevertheleſs guilty. But the honeſty of the judges was not to be ſhaken; they all declared the accuſed not guilty. The accuſed aſked often that they would let them know of what they were accuſed; but they could never get a copy of their impeachment. And that information, which ought to have been annulled, ſince it contained no proofs againſt the accuſed, was yet preſerved by the credit of the favourites, as an armed hand, ready to cruſh the accuſed if any opportunity offered* (12). This was an artful piece of policy.

(12) *Relation*, p. 100.

[*F*] *An action of impotency brought againſt Don Alfonſus.*] It was already ſome months ſince the Queen's Confeſſor had began an intrigue with Monſieur de Schomberg, and ſince he had owned to him to what perplexity that Princeſs was reduced. The King's impotency was one of the firſt articles that were declared. "The Queen not being able to live any "longer under that ſevere reſtraint, to which the "King's brutality, and his favourite's inhumanity re"duced her, diſcovered to Father de Ville, her "Confeſſor, the extreme deſire ſhe had, to declare "ſecretly all her grievances to Count de Schomberg, "and to let him know the well grounded fear ſhe "was under of ſuffering ſomething worſe ſtill: that "the Duke of Beaufort, and the Biſhop of Laon re"commended nothing more ſtrongly to her, than to "truſt entirely to him: ſo that ſhe was perſuaded, "he alone was able to mitigate her grief, and to "afford her the means to extricate herſelf out of the "difficulties in which ſhe was entangled. This Father "Jeſuit, who has been very faithful to his miſtreſs, "and who has behaved himſelf with a great deal of "wiſdom and prudence in thoſe ſtorms, and in the midſt "of all the rocks of that ſea, approved the Queen's "deſign, and communicated it to Count de Schom"berg: and as they had already a reciprocal eſteem "for each other, he gave him a particular account "of that Princeſs's misfortunes, according to the or"ders ſhe had given him, and from his own inclina"tion; he even confirmed to him that the report "which had been ſpread of the King's impotency "was but too true, and that it was to be feared leſt it "ſhould be attended with very bad conſequences; that "they had lately made a ſecret door in the Queen's "bed-chamber, and placed the bed ſo that one might "get into it through the door, without being ſeen "by any perſon in the room: that it was to be fear"ed leſt ſome man ſhould be let into the Queen's "bed that way, in order to conceal the King's diſ"grace and his weakneſs (13)." This is what we meet with in Monſieur Fremont d'Ablancourt's memoirs (14), and he was very well acquainted with the affairs of the Court of Portugal. This Confeſſor of the Queen, and the Infante Don Pedro's Confeſſor (15), contributed very much to the revolutions which happened in that country (16).

(13) *Mémoires de Mr. Fremont d'Ablancourt*, p. 319, 320.

(14) They were printed in the year 1701.

(15) He was alſo a Jeſuit.

(16) See the ſame *Memoires*, p. 322, &c.

One cannot forbear obſerving, that there were but few perſons, whoſe condition has been more lamentable than this Queen's before the revolution: for (17) *after the firſt day* of her marriage with *King Don Alfonſus . . . it was perceived, that things did not paſs between them with ſuch a mutual ſatisfaction, as might have been hoped and expected from perſons of their age. This was obſerved at firſt by thoſe only who came neareſt their perſons: but it ſpread farther inſenſibly, and began to lay the foundation of a third party in that Court; ſo that the two weakeſt parties uniting together, as it generally happens, againſt the ſtrongeſt, conquered it at laſt . .* (18). *The King was not in the leaſt more good natured than before his marriage: he continued his wicked courſes, and gave daily new vexations to the Queen, ſo far that he pretended to be in love with the firſt of her waiting-women . . . . Count de Caſtel Melior,* his favourite having (19), *bribed one of the Queen's women, in whom ſhe put her greateſt confidence; he ſhewed no more than ſome outward civility to that Princeſs: ſo that the King and his favourite excepting a kind of regard they ſhewed her ſtill before the world, made her ſenſible when they were in private with her, that they cared very little for her. Such ſtrange uſage from thoſe who were in the wrong, gave the Queen at laſt an occaſion to miſtruſt them very much, and to ſuſpect that they were contriving ſome moſt pernicious deſign againſt her: but the more reaſons they gave her to complain, the more careful and wary ſhe was how to ſhew her reſentment, not knowing well whom ſhe could truſt to . . . . France, which ſhe had but lately left, was ſtill preſent to her mind, and being entirely taken up with a deſire to anſwer the expectations that were conceived of her, ſhe conſidered much leſs how ſhe could remedy her misfortunes, than how ſhe might conceal them. Now though ſhe was ſo unfortunate herſelf as not to want to grieve upon the account of others, yet ſhe could not behold without uneaſineſs the bad uſage, which the Infante met with, and when occaſion offered ſhe ſhewed that ſhe laboured to reſtore him to the King's favour.* How many misfortunes heaped upon one another was ſhe made to ſuffer? To be married, and to be ſtill a maid; to have an huſband both impotent, and moſt brutiſh at the ſame time; to fear his wicked deſigns, without daring to complain; to ſuſpect and miſtruſt all the world; to ſee a Prince perſecuted, for whom ſhe had a great eſteem and friendſhip, and who was in love with her (20); are not theſe misfortunes accumulated together to an exceſs? The King of Portugal had particular reaſons for being civil and complaiſant to his Queen: he ought to have done like an inſolvent debtor, who by his humility and fine compliments endeavours to mitigate the ill humour of his creditors; *qui nummos non geſtat in burſa, mel ſaltem habeat in bucca.* i. e. "He who has no "money in his purſe, ought at leaſt to have honey "in his mouth." He ſhould have paid her at leaſt in good words; but inſtead of that he railed at her, and abuſed her, without remembring that he could not make her amends by ſubſtantial effects, for the opprobrious language he gave her. Moſt other huſbands are humble and complaiſant in ſuch a caſe; they endeavour to refute the proverb, which ſays, that

(17) Fremont d'Ablancourt, *Memoires*, p. 294.

(18) Ibid. p. 295.

(19) Fremont d'Ablancourt, *Memoires*, p. 296, 297.

(20) The Infante conſidered, that if the Queen Dowager's project had been executed, he would now be in poſſeſſion of an object, which he valued more than the Crown, and would not have the grief to ſee ſo beautiful a Princeſs (the Queen married to Don Alfonſus) ſo undecently uſed. *Memoires de Fremont d'Ablancourt*, p. 294.

marriage void the 28th of March immediately preceding [G]. I forgot to obſerve, that when Don Pedro took poſſeſſion of the palace, he made himſelf maſter of the King's perſon, who that ſame day ſigned a writing, in which he declared, that of his own accord he reſigned the Kingdom to his brother the Prince. The States of the Kingdom acknowledged Don Pedro as Prince Regent: if he had been willing, he might have been proclaimed King, and have added to the Royal Authority, with which he was already inveſted, a title which is of ſome uſe even to thoſe who enjoy the full power of a King. Spain made artfully an advantage of that revolution to conclude a treaty of peace (g), which the alliance concluded in 1667 between France and Portugal might have prevented, if peace had not become neceſſary to a Kingdom, which had changed its maſter by ſuch proceedings. This is what I have extracted from a book (b) printed at Amſterdam. I do not pretend to anſwer for what it contains [H]; and if I had by me ſome authentick and ſecret memoirs of the other party, I would give them here without any partiality either for or againſt Don Alfonſus, that the reader might be able to paſs a better judgment on that whole affair. That Prince, far from appealing from the ſentence, by which he was declared impotent, ſubmitted to it both by word of mouth, and in writing. The new married couple, after they had lived ſome time together, thought it fit, for their great ſecurity, to aſk for a new diſpenſation from the Pope, confirming that, which Cardinal de Vendome, Legate *à Latere* in France, had ſent them before they married. The Pope granted them all they could wiſh. It is certain that the Queen had urged ſtrong motives of conſcience to have her firſt marriag declared void (i) [I], and they would be very unreaſonable,

(g) It was concluded the 13th of February, 1668. See Wicquefort, *de l'Ambaſſadeur*, Tom. 1. p. 367.

(b) Intitled *Relation des Troubles arrivez dans la Cour de Portugal, en l'année* 1667 & 1668.

(i) Extracted from the ſame *Relation*, &c.

that a misfortune never comes alone. This is alſo generally the conduct of your coquet women: by their cajolings and ſubmiſſions they make their huſbands ſwallow that tough bit, a pair of horns.

[G] *The chapter had declared the marriage void the 28th of March immediately preceding.*] It is obſerved in the ſentence that both parties had done reſpectively what lay in their power for the conſummation of the marriage, without being able to ſucceed, the whole blame of which ought to be laid on the male. Here follow ſomewhat at length the expreſſions, which were uſed on that occaſion. "It appears that during "that time (21) they could not compaſs their deſign, "though they endeavoured it with all the care and "diligence that is requiſite; but it was occaſioned by "the Prince's incapacity, occaſioned by an infirmity, "under which he has laboured from his infancy, "and which is at preſent abſolutely incurable. "Which is more than ſufficiently proved by ſuch "arguments as the law admits: ſo that the impediment is reckoned to be at leaſt morally certain; after which there is no longer any occaſion for an inſpection of the parts, nor for any greater trial, as "of three years, for inſtance, or of any other arbitrary term. All this being examined together with "the reſt of the acts, according to the laws, the "marriage between the ſaid moſt ſerene Prince and "Princeſs is judged to contract *de facto* only, and "not *de jure*, and is declared null and void, ſo that "the ſaid Prince and Princeſs may diſpoſe of their "own perſons as they ſhall think proper, and part "their goods between them according to their marriage articles (22)."

(21) That is to ſay, during the ſpace of 16 months.

(22) *Relation*, p. 218.

[H] *I do not pretend to anſwer for what it contains.*] Whoever hears but one ſide of the queſtion hears nothing. I ſhould be very glad to read ſome anſwer from Count de Caſtelmelhor to the Author of the *Relation*. There is one thing that puzzles me. If Don Alfonſus's mad actions were ſuch, as that Author repreſents them, they could not be unknown to the moſt Chriſtian King's Embaſſadors or Envoys; and if they were acquainted with them, they could not but know that that Prince was in the condition, in which private perſons are not ſuffered to diſpoſe of their eſtate. They who labour under ſuch a madneſs are ſhut up, or at leaſt put under the guardianſhip of their relations. Why then did not the Miniſters of France give notice to the King their maſter, when Don Alfonſus's marriage was negotiating, that he was a madman, whom they ſhould be obliged to chain down, or at leaſt to watch continually very ſoon, and who beſides was thought to be impotent? Somebody has obſerved that Princeſſes are victims, who are ſacrificed to the intereſt of the State. This was never more true than with regard to Mademoiſelle d'Aumale. Don Alfonſus's favourites bribed a woman, to make her declare that the King had got her with child (23). She ſwore afterwards that it was falſe. The Author of the *Relation* (24) inſiſts very much on that woman's oath; but he is in the wrong: one ought to lay no ſtreſs on what ſhe declared: for if ſhe was capable to tell a lie at a favourite's requeſt, ſhe was alſo capable to tell a lie againſt a Prince, who was a priſoner, and like to be dethroned very ſoon. To act juſtly one ſhould never urge ſuch a recantation as a convincing proof: for whoever ſuffers himſelf to be bribed to ſay a thing, may as eaſily be bribed to unſay it again (25).

(23) Ibid. p. 96.

(24) Page 248.

[I] *The Queen urged ſtrong motives of conſcience to have her marriage declared void.*] This wants a Commentary; for otherwiſe the readers might imagine, that the Queen miſtruſting the effects of her conſtitution, and not thinking herſelf ſtrong enough againſt the inclinations of nature, was determined to have recourſe to the remedy eſtabliſhed by God, which ſhe did not meet with in Don Alfonſus's perſon: in a word, one might think that ſhe had not the gift of continency, and that ſhe wanted an huſband, in order to acquit herſelf of her duty towards God with regard to Chaſtity. But this would be putting a very wrong conſtruction on the motives of conſcience, which ſhe urged. It is therefore neceſſary to explain here what theſe motives were, in order to prevent the Reader's raſh judgment.

(25) Compare this with what is obſerved above, in the rem. [T] of the article CALVIN.

In the firſt place, Don Alfonſus, notwithſtanding his real impotency, was nevertheleſs extremely diſſolute, laſcivious and obſcene: he ſinned therefore unavoidably in that reſpect, and made the Queen ſin: for the moſt remiſs Caſuiſts agree, that without ſome conditions, which were wanting in Don Alfonſus's idle ſports, and ineffectual endeavours, a man who comes near his wife is guilty of the ſin of unchaſtneſs, and the woman alſo, who ſuffers her huſband's company in ſuch a caſe. Good manners do not ſuffer us to explain the matter more plainly; and even this is a prejudice in that Queen's favour: for it is by no means probable, that, unleſs in a caſe of the utmoſt neceſſity, a perſon of her rank, whoſe actions and proceedings are expoſed to publick view, ſhould have been willing to engage in a law-ſuit, in which a thouſand things were to be mentioned, which ſhame and chaſtity would conceal.

In the ſecond place, the Queen knew, that the King and his Favourite would never conſent that Don Pedro ſhould marry: ſince therefore the King was uncapable to get children, ſhe could no longer conceal it, without expoſing the Kingdom of Portugal to the moſt fatal revolutions: which was not only inconſiſtent with her affection for that kingdom, but even againſt her conſcience.

In the third place, when the King had a mind to divert himſelf with a girl, he uſed to employ a forerunner; it was always ſome of his favourites who broke the ice, after which the King did all he could to enter the breach, whilſt it was ſtill freſh. Now he had once a deſign to uſe the ſame artifice with re-

unreaſonable, who ſhould put a malicious conſtruction on the great melancholy, which appeared in her countenance [*K*], as ſoon as ſhe was convinced of her Conſort's natural defect. The abdicated King Don Alfonſus was ſent into the Iſland of Tercera, where he continued ſeveral years: but as there were reaſons to fear leſt the enemies of the Kingdom ſhould take him from thence, in order to raiſe diſturbances in the State, he was tranſported into a more ſecure place. It was into the Caſtle of Cintra ſeven leagues diſtant from Liſbon. He died in that Caſtle of an apoplectick fit, September the 12th 1683 (*k*).

(*k*) Extracted from the *Mercure Galant*, for October 1683.

The Queen of Portugal, once his wife, followed him ſoon after; for ſhe died at Palhavam the 27th of December 1683 (*l*), in the thirty eighth year of her age. Her only daughter the Infanta of Portugal was born the 6th of June 1669, and had been married to the Duke of Savoy in 1679. This marriage was declared in the Council of State of Portugal the 5th of September; the States of the Kingdom were convened in order to ratify it, and to abrogate a law, by which the Princeſſes of the Royal Family

(*l*) *Mercure Galant*, for February 1684, p. 123.

gard to the Queen; ſo that both that Princeſs's honour and her conſcience obliged her to get out of the power of ſuch an huſband.

Theſe three particulars want to be proved. Here follows what we meet with in the *Reaſons for annulling* (26) that marriage.

(26) *Relation*, p. 251.

On the firſt head we read then what follows. "Her "Majeſty's conſcience was continually prompting "her, and perſuaded her, that after an experience of "ſixteen months, long enough indeed, and but too "tedious, ſhe was obliged to part from the King, "without making a longer trial, ſince ſhe had "found ſufficiently that his impotency was incurable; "and as ſhe had ſeveral times conſulted her Father "Confeſſor about it, that ſhe might behave with a "ſafe conſcience in ſo weighty an affair, her Confeſ- "ſor, having conſidered it maturely, and examined "what he was to determine, in order to acquit him- "ſelf of his duty, declared before God, that he did "not think that her Majeſty, ſeeing what was the "caſe, could ſafely act any longer againſt her con- "ſcience, by continuing to live with the King."

As for the ſecond head, I refer to page 252 of *the Relation*.

What follows relates to the third head. The Queen ſaw her honour, *which was always infinitely more dear to her than her Crown, and even than her life* (27), "expoſed to the greateſt dangers, her fears "in that reſpect being too well grounded: whatſo- "ever neceſſity there be to ſpeak of thoſe dangers, "yet modeſty and ſhame will ſuffer us to mention only "ſo much of them, as cannot be abſolutely omit- "ted, and muſt be known to be able to judge of the "whole affair. One of theſe dangers is, that the King, "being ſenſible that he could never get children, "wiſhed yet moſt paſſionately to have ſome, in order "to reſtore himſelf (28) to the throne, by creating a "good opinion of himſelf in that reſpect, and re- "futing the contrary opinion, namely, that which "he knew all the world had of his impotency, which "grieved him more, than his impotency itſelf: "wherefore, the more impotent the felt himſelf, the "more he laboured to ſhew the contrary, abandoning "himſelf to all ſorts of women, and thinking by "that means to keep the Crown on his head, and "to make his brother the Prince die with grief, for "he hated him mortally, becauſe the Prince knew "for certain, and uſed to ſay, that his Majeſty would "never have any children, becauſe of his impotency. "The other danger was, that the Queen was not ig- "norant of what was then a ſecret, and what the "Judges came afterwards to know by the declaration "of the perſons concerned: namely, that when the "King had a mind to enjoy a girl, which he could "not do becauſe of his impotency, he made her lye "in his chamber with ſome of his favourites, and "in his own preſence, that he might the eaſier in- "dulge his inclination, after another had paved the "way for him, though in reality he could not do "more afterwards, than before, as appears by the "depoſitions of the perſons to whom that has happen- "ed, and who have ſworn it upon the holy goſpel. "Now what made the Queen fear more ſtill, that the "King, who had no other rule of his conduct, but "his great diſſoluteneſs, and the vain opinion of his "pretended ability, without any regard for this re- "putation, or for his conſcience; what made her "fear, I ſay, that the King deſigned to attempt the "ſame upon herſelf, was, that towards the end of "April 1667, he had her continually entreated by his "moſt intimate favourites, Enrigo Enriguez de Mi- "randa, Count de Caſtelmeglior, and his mother the "Marchioneſs, Lady of Honour to her Majeſty, to "paſs from her own apartment, where the King ne- "ver ſcrupled to go and meet her till that time, "into the King's, in order to lye with him (29), a- "gainſt all the antient formalities, and the common "cuſtoms of the Palace, and without any apparent "neceſſity: the Queen deſired ſeveral times to be "excuſed, though as civilly as ſhe could, urging, "not indeed the reaſons which cauſed her greateſt "fear inwardly (30): for ſhe had been willing to "make a ſacrifice for that new grievance to the "King's will, through an effect of that great ſub- "miſſion and regard which this Princeſs had for "her; but (urging) the baſhfulneſs and modeſty, "which are capable to prevent any woman of ho- "nour, and much more a Princeſs and a Queen as "ſhe was, from making, without any neceſſity, ſo ex- "traordinary an alteration, which would unqueſtion- "ably have expoſed her reputation, as well as the "King's: whereupon his Majeſty fell into ſuch a "paſſion, that the very night which followed that "day, he would by main force make her riſe out of "her bed, and follow him into his own apartment; "but after many threatnings and pretty hard words, "holding a dagger in his hand, he told her, that he "gave her but twenty-four hours to take her reſo- "lution; and if after that ſpace of time, ſhe did not "do the next night what he required of her, he "ſwore he would drag her by main force, or have "her dragged by four of his footmen; this grieved "and vexed the Queen moſt terribly: ſo that the ve- "ry next day ſhe made her complaint to the Count "by the mouth of her Confeſſor, deſiring him to "find ſome remedy to her misfortune, and pro- "teſting that ſhe would die, rather than do what "the King required, or any thing unbecoming her "dignity. This, together with the fear which was "deeply rooted in the Queen's mind, was the reaſon "why after that time ſhe did not judge herſelf ſafe, "and did not think ſhe ſhould ever be ſecure, as "long as ſhe continued to be expoſed, as ſhe would "be ſtill more for the future, to a danger, from "which it would be difficult for her to extricate her- "ſelf again another time, as ſhe had happily done "once: eſpecially, ſince the perſon to whom her "Majeſty could truſt moſt on ſuch occaſions, namely, "her Lady of honour, was the very perſon whom "ſhe had the greateſt reaſon to ſuſpect, becauſe "ſhe was the mother of the Count, who was the "King's favourite, and that ſhe ſhewed moſt openly "how paſſionately ſhe wiſhed that the Queen might "have children, in order to ſecure, by that means, "her own, and her ſon's fortune; for in the confe- "rence ſhe had with the Queen's Confeſſor upon this "ſubject, in order to find means to perſuade her in "the King's name, and in her own, to change her "bed and apartment, ſhe told him poſitively, it "would be only for five or ſix nights, after which "ſhe promiſed the Confeſſor to make the King go to "the Queen as he uſed to do."

(27) Ibid. p. 253.

(28) That expreſſion is very improper; for King Alfonſus had not been dethroned yet.

(29) Compare this with the rem. [*F*], towards the end, where you will meet with another device, which made the Queen uneaſy.

(30) I put here a *Nota bene*, becauſe the Author expreſſes himſelf with ſo much confuſion, that one cannot underſtand his meaning, unleſs one be extremely attentive.

[*K*] *The great melancholy which appeared in her countenance.*] If it be aſked how I know that the Queen

Family, who marry with foreign Princes, are excluded from the ſucceſſion to the Crown (*m*) [*L*]. Notwithſtanding all this the marriage was broke off, before the King of Savoy had ſeen the Infante. She died a maid October the 21th 1690. The Queen her mother had taken great care of her education: *ſhe had written down, with her own hand, counſels for* this Infanta, *which were found after her death* (*n*), and are very judicious; they are to be met with at length in the Mercure Galant for May 1684 (*o*). In the year 1687 King Don Pedro married a daughter of the Elector Palatine; ſhe died in the year 1699, at the age of thirty ſix years (*p*). We meet in Monſieur Fremont d'Ablancourt's Memoirs, printed in the year 1701, with ſeveral particulars concerning Don Alfonſus's reign, the annulling of his marriage, his being dethroned, *&c.*

(*m*) Extracted from the *Paris Gazette.*

(*n*) *Mercure Galant*, for May 1614, p. 21, 24.

(*o*) Page 25, &c.

(*p*) See *l'Eſprit des Cours de l'Europe*, for Sept. 1699, p. 480.

Since I have mentioned the Duke of Savoy's marriage with the Infanta of Portugal, it will not be beſide the purpoſe to obſerve, that the Court of France was thought to have had a great influence in that whole affair. The dablers in politicks were ſure to reaſon very much upon that ſubject, and to alledge ſeveral motives with as much boldneſs, as though they had been admitted into the ſecrets of the Cabinet Council. I ſhall not examine their reaſonings; I ſhall only refer to a book, in which one of their falſities has been refuted (*q*).

(*q*) See the 5th vol. of the *Reponſe aux Queſtions d'un Provincial*, chap. 6. *N.B.* This work was written by Mr. Bayle himſelf.

Queen appeared ſad, I ſhall quote my authority immediately. I find it in *the Reaſons for annulling the marriage.* Read and conſider what follows. "The "firſt time the King lay with the Queen, which was "three or four days after ſhe arrived in Portugal, "this Princeſs was ſoon ſo well acquainted with his "impotency, notwithſtanding her innocence, and "though ſhe was quite ignorant of thoſe matters, "that her Confeſſor found her very melancholy, and "as he had but too much reaſon to fear the common "report was true, he took the liberty to aſk her, "not as a Father Confeſſor, but with all the modeſty, "decency and confidence which his office would allow him, whether there was any foundation or appearance of truth, in what had been reported, or "whether ſhe had any hopes to ſee very ſoon ſome "fruits of her marriage; ſhe anſwered him, as "may be ſeen in the proceedings, but in ſuch a manner, as gave him ſufficiently to underſtand that ſhe "had already formed a true judgment of the con"dition of her marriage, and of the King's incapaci"ty to get children (31)." I long to ſee a book which has been juſt publiſhed (32).

(31) *Relation*, p. 250.

(32) I have been told juſt now, that the Hiſtory of this Queen, written by F. d'Orleans the Jeſuit, was publiſhed at Paris ſince May 1696. Thus I ſpoke in the 1ſt edit. of this work. I muſt add now, that that Hiſtory has been reprinted at Amſterd. and yet I have been ſo ill ſerved, that I have not yet been able to ſee it, tho' this article is now reprinting.

[*L*] *And to abrogate a law by which the Princeſſes . . . . . who marry with foreign Princes, are excluded from the ſucceſſion to the crown.*] It is called the law of Lamego. It was made by Don Alfonſus Henriquez, firſt King of Portugal, in the Aſſembly of the States-General, which he called together at Lamego, after the Victory he gained over five Kings of the Moors, at the battle of Urica, in the year 1139. It is enacted by that law, that the Princeſſes of the Royal Blood, who marry ſtrangers, are uncapable to ſucceed to the Throne. It is in conſequence of that law, that the Dukes of Parma were excluded from the Crown of Portugal, though they be deſcended from Princeſs Mary, eldeſt ſiſter of Catharine, Don Pedro's grand-mother (33).

(33) I have extracted this from the Paris *Gazette*, for the year 1679.

☞ POTTER (CHRISTOPHER), a learned Engliſh Divine in the 17th Century, was nephew of Dr. Barnabas Potter, Biſhop of Carliſle [*A*], and was born within the Barony of Kendal in Weſtmorland (*a*) about the year 1591 (*b*), and became Clerk of Queen's College in Oxford in the beginning of the year 1606 (*c*). April 30th 1610 he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts (*d*), and July the 8th 1613 that of Maſter (*e*); and the ſame year was choſen Chaplain of the College, and afterwards Fellow of it. He was then a great admirer of Dr. Henry Ayay, Provoſt of that College, ſome of whoſe works he publiſhed, and who was a zealous puritanical Lecturer at Abingdon in Berks, where he was much reſorted to for his preaching (*f*). March the 9th 1620 he took the Degree of Bachelor of Divinity (*g*), and February 17 1626-7 that of Doctor (*h*), having ſucceeded his uncle Dr. Barnabas Potter in the Provoſtſhip of his College on the 17th of June 1626 (*i*). "Soon after, ſays Mr. Wood (*k*), when Dr. Laud became a riſing "favourite at Court, he, after a great deal of ſeeking, was made his creature, and "therefore by the preciſe party he was eſteemed an *Arminian.*" March the 15th 1628 he preached a Sermon on *John* xxi. 17. at the Conſecration of his Uncle to the Biſhoprick of Carliſle at Ely-houſe in Holborn; which was printed at London 1629 in 8vo. [*B*]. In 1633 he publiſhed his *Anſwer to a late Popiſh Pamphlet, entitled*, Charity miſtaken

(*a*) Lloyd's *Memoirs*, p. 544. edit. 1668, in folio. Fuller's *Worthies in Weſtmorland*, and Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 85. 2d edit.

(*b*) Wood ſays, that he was 15 years of age in 1606.

(*c*) Idem, ibid.

(*d*) Idem, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 285.

(*e*) Idem, ibid. col. 194.

(*f*) Idem, *Athen. Oxon.* ubi ſupra.

(*g*) Idem, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 216.

(*h*) Idem, ibid. col. 234.

(*i*) Idem, *Hiſt. & Antiq. Univ. Oxon.* lib. 2. p. 116.

(*k*) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 85.

[*A*] *Dr.* Barnabas Potter, *Biſhop of Carliſle.*] He was born within the Barony of Kendal, in the County of Weſtmorland, and became a Student of Queen's College in Oxford, in the beginning of the year 1594, aged 15 years; where after he had taken the Degree of Maſter of Arts, he was elected Fellow of that College, and entering into Holy Orders, *became*, ſays Mr. Wood (1), *not only a puritanical Preacher in theſe parts, but at Totneſs in Devonſhire, where he was much followed by the preciſe party.* In 1615, he took the Degree of Doctor of Divinity, and the year following was choſen Provoſt of his College; which place he held about ten years, and then reſigned it, (being at that time one of the King's Chaplains,) and his intereſt, got his Nephew, Dr. Chriſtopher Potter, to ſucceed him. In 1628, he, *though a thorough-paced Calviniſt*, ſays Mr. Wood (2), was made Biſhop of Carliſle, by the endeavours of Biſhop Laud; to which See he was conſecrated at Ely houſe in Holbourn, on the 15th of March. He died at his lodgings in the Pariſh of St. Paul's Covent-Garden, London, in the beginning of January 1641, and was interred in the Church of that Pariſh, on the 6th of that month. He left a widow named Elizabeth. He wrote *Lectures on the 16th chapter of Geneſis. Lectures on the 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 17th, 18th chapters of Geneſis.* Mr. Wood cannot inform us, whether theſe lectures were ever printed. He wrote likewiſe *lectures* on the plagues of Egypt from Exodus, and on the Beatitudes from part of St. Luke; but theſe Mr. Wood thinks not to be extant. He publiſhed ſeveral ſermons, viz. 1. The Baronet's Burial: Or, a *Funeral Sermon at the Solemnities of that honourable Baronet, Sir* Edward Seymour's *Burial*, on Deut. xxxiv. ver. 5. Oxford 1613, in 4to. 2. *A Sermon on Eaſter Tueſday at the Spittal, &c.*

(1) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 12. 2d edit.

(2) Ibid.

[*B*] *Printed at London* 1629, *in* 8*vo.*] Mr. Vicars, a friend of our Author, having peruſed this ſermon, diſliked ſome paſſages in it, and therefore wrote a letter to him, in which he expoſtulated with him concerning his change of opinion, as he conceived. Upon this Dr. Potter wrote a vindication of himſelf,

by way of letter to Mr. Vicars, touching the points of God's free grace and man's free will, printed at the end of Mr. John Playfere's *Appello Evangelium for the true doctrine of the divine predeſtination concorded with the orthodox doctrine of God's free grace and man's free will.* London 1651, in 8vo. The paſſages in Dr. *Potter's* Sermon, which Mr. *Vicars* excepted againſt, were as follow: " For our controverſies, firſt " let mee profeſſe, I favour not (I rather ſuſpect) " any new inventions; for *ab antiquitate non recedo* " *niſi invitus*; eſpecially renouncing all ſuch as any " way favour or flatter the depraved nature and will " of man, which I conſtantly believe to be free " only to evill, and of itſelfe to have no power at " all, merely none, to any act or thing ſpiritually " good; moſt heartily embracing that doctrine, " which moſt amply commends the riches of God's " free grace, which I acknowledge to be the whole " and ſole cauſe of our predeſtination, converſion, " and ſalvation, abhorring all damned doctrines of " the Pelagians, Semipelagians, Jeſuites, Socinians, " and of their ragges and reliques, which helpe onely " to pride and prick up corrupt nature, humbly con- " feſſing in the words of S. * *Cyprian*, ſo often re- " peated by that worthy champion of grace S. † " *Auguſtine, in nullo gloriandum eſt, quandoquidem noſ-* " *trum nihil eſt. It is God that worketh in us both the* " *will and the deed*; and therefore let him *that glo-* " *rieth, glory in the Lord.* But for the points in queſ- " tion, they might ſure be debated with leſſe edge " and ſtomach, as they are at this day in the very ** " Church of *Rome*; and it were happy, if we could " ſuffer charity to moderate in all our diſputations. " If it be truth wee ſeeke, and not victory, " why take we not the counſell of St. Paul, ἀλη- " θεύειν ἐν ἀγάπῃ, *to ſeeke and ſpeake truth in love.* " Since the matters queſtioned are clogged and per- " plexed with ſo many inſuperable difficulties, that " the greateſt wits and ſpirits of all ages have here " found themſelves entangled in a maze, and at " length after all vexing diſquiſitions ſeeing no eva- " ſion, no iſſue out of this labyrinth, no banke or " bottome in this ocean, were forced to checke their " reſtleſſe repining underſtandings with St. Paul's, " *O Altitudo!* ſince on all hands they (3) confeſſed " to be not *fundamentall*, not eſſential to the faith; " ſince our own Church (as the (4) *primitive*) in great " wiſdome hath thought mene here to walke in a " latitude, and to be ſparing in her definitions; why " ſhould wee not all be *wiſe* unto *ſobriety*, and let " God alone with his ſecrets? Why may not our (5) " hearts be united, though our heads doe differ? " Why doe wee not deſire rather ſafely and ſweetly " to compoſe theſe differences, than raſhly and with " (6) danger to define them, and forbeare all *capi-* " *tall* cenſures either way, which muſt needs involve " many holy ſoules now at reſt with God, many (7) " Catholique Biſhops of the antient Church, many " learned and godly Doctors of our owne, nay, en- " tire *Reformed Churches*, all which have varied in " theſe opinions, though moſt neerly linked in their " affections? The faire and moderate carriage of " theſe controverſies between theſe reverend men, " (whoſe memoryes wee juſtly honour) †† *John Cal-* " *vin* and *Philip Melanchon*, eaſily perſwades mee, " that their violent followers at this day are not " more learned, but more uncharitable. And it ap- " pears by that, which maſter ** *Fox* hath recorded, " that our bleſſed Martyrs in the days of Queen *Mary*, " in their very priſons, freely diſputed and diſſented " in theſe opinions. And Biſhop *Hooper* hath left " his judgment to poſterity in the *Preface* to his " *Expoſition* of the *Decalogue*, which haply hee learnt " at Zurich of *H. Bullinger*, his intimate friend and " familiar." Dr. *Potter's* letter to Mr. *Vicars* in vindication of himſelf againſt the exceptions to theſe paſſages is dated July 7 1629; and in it he writes thus (8): *In divine truths my conſcience cannot ſerve men, or any other maſter beſides him, who hath his chaire in Heaven. I love* Calvin *very well; and I muſt tell you, I cannot hate* Arminius; *and for my part I am verily perſuaded, that theſe two are now where they agree well, in the Kingdome of Heaven; whilſt ſome of their paſſionate Diſciples are ſo eagerly brawling here on earth. I ſhould honour truth, if I heard it out of the Pope's mouth or the Devil's; nor can I believe a falſity, though publiſhed by an Angell. I prize my ſoule ſo dearly, that I dare not venture it upon any man's credit, or take upon truſt any opinion, which may endanger it; nor can the worth of all this world perſwade me, in matters of faith, to maintaine or believe any concluſion, which I finde not to iſſue from premiſſes of ſcripture and reaſon. But moſt eſpecially I tremble to think or ſpeak any thing of God Almighty, which hath not expreſſe warrant in his owne word; and ſo much the more, if it ſeeme injurious or diſhonourable to that moſt glorious and gratious Deity. For my life I cannot obtaine of my conſcience to declame, and revile, and cry downe an opinion, when I cannot ſee any ſolid ſatisfying anſwer to many contrary ſcriptures and reaſons. It is a very eaſie way, which many people walke, and if it were as ſafe, I would be content to walke it with them. Blind-folded they follow their leaders, and ſparing their own eyes, they preſume their guides ſo learned, ſo holy, ſee clearly enough. Therefore they beleeve all their dictates, as if they were divinely inſpired and ſpake oracles, without examining, which eaſes them of much trouble and difficulty in ſifting and judging. For my part, I ever thought a thing unworthy of a Chriſtian, and yet more of a Miniſter and full of danger, to invaſſal his underſtanding to any man or any men; or to embrace and eſpouſe opinions in religion, without judgment, out of fantaſie and prejudice, becauſe they are recommended by ſome great names, which we have in admiration.* He then ſhews the pains, which he had taken in examining controverſies about grace and free will, and obſerves (9), that " finding upon this (9) Page 423. " ſerious ſearch, that all doubts are not clearly de- " cided by ſcripture; that in the antient Church, " after the age of S. *Auguſtine*, who was preſently " contradicted by many Catholiques (as you may ſee " in the epiſtles of *Proſper* and *Fulgentius* to him " upon that very occaſion) they have ever beene " friendly debated, and never determined in any " Councill; that in our age whole Churches are here " divided, either one from another, as the *Lutherans* " from us, or amongſt themſelves, as the *Romaniſts*, " amongſt whom the *Dominican* family is wholly for " the *Remonſtrants*; that in all theſe ſeveral Churches " ſome particular Doctors vary in theſe opinions; " out of all this I collect for my part, that the points " are no neceſſary Catholique verities, not eſſential " to the faith, but meerely matters of opinion, pro- " blematical, of inferior moment, wherein a man " may erre or be ignorant without any danger to his " ſoul; yet ſo ſtill, that the glory of God's juſtice, " mercy, truth, ſincerity, and divine grace, be not " any ways blemiſhed, nor any evil to God's decree " or providence. Wherein I can aſſure you, I doe " not depart from my antient judgment, but doe well " remember what I affirmed in my queſtions at the " act, and have confirmed it, I ſuppoſe, in my ſer- " mon:

An { " *Efficacia Gratiæ pendeat à libro influxu arbitrii?* Negat. " *Chriſtus divinæ juſtitiæ, vice noſtrâ, propriæ & integrè ſatisfecerit?* Aff. " *Ipſe actus fidei (τὸ credere) imputetur nobis in juſtitiam ſenſu proprio?* Negat."

Quæſtiones Inceptoris Chriſtophori Potteri, 1627.

With reſpect to the objection, that the *Arminians* agree with the *Romaniſts*, he remarks (10), that *the Church of* Rome *makes more againſt the* Arminians *than for them. The prime controverſie (on which all the others are but appendices) is that touching the* abſolute irreſpective degree; *in which point, if you collect and number the ſuffrages, ten for one againſt the* Arminians. Tho. Aquine, *you know, was a great ſchool-maſter, and had many ſcholars. Obſerve and ſee, whether they all (and many more) doe not ſtrongly ſwim in the ſtreame after* Auſtine. *And the truth is, our firſt Reformers did herein but ſay over againe theſe leſſons, which they had learned in the* Roman *ſchooles, and the hardeſt paſſages, that have fallen from* Calvin *or* Piſcator, *may eaſily be parallelled with others as rigorous in many* Romiſh *Doctours. Eſpecially of late yeares the whole* Dominican *familie have been zealous and voluminous in theſe queſtions, which they call* de Auxiliis; *wherein though they ſweat to ſever their opinions from the* Calviniſts *(as they call us) yet ſome* Jeſuites *tell them (and very truly) that their labour is very vaine and ridiculous. Among the* Jeſuites *themſelves, the more antient,* Tolet, Bellarmine, Valentia, Suarez, *doe not in effect diſſent from the* Dominicans; *onely ſome few new ones,* Molina, Leſſius, *take up the bucklers againſt them, and bid them battell, but in very faire and friendly manner; for they in*

(10) Page 431.

* *Teſt. ad Quir.* lib. 3. cap. 4.

† *Contra duas Epiſt. Pelag.* lib. 4. cap. 6.

** *Inter aliquot Jeſuitas & Dominicanos.*

Epheſ. iv. 15.

(3) Pareus *in* iren. *Frid.* 3. *Palat. in Confeſſ. ad fin. Admont. Neuſtad.*

(4) *Cœleſt. in Ep. R. ad Epiſco Gall.* cap. *ult.*

(5) Rom. xiv. 1. Phil. ii. 3. —— iii. 15. 2 Tim. ii. 22. 1 Cor. xiii. 47. See Perkins *in* Gal. i. 2. and Gal. iii. 15.

Vide inſignem S. Cypr. erga diſſentientes a ſe modeſtiam Epiſt. 73. *ad Jubaian. in fine, & in præf. Concil. Carthag. laudat. ſæpe ab Aug. de Bap. contra Donat.* lib. 2. cap. *ult.* & lib. 3. cap. 3. & lib. 4. cap. 84, &c.

(6) Aug. *Enchir. ad Laurent.* cap. 59.

(7) Bez. *Annot. major. in* Rom. ii. 35. and Calv. *Inſt.* lib. 3. cap. 22. ſect. 1. and ſect. 8. P. Melanc. *in* Rom. ix. *Sixt. Sen.* lib. 6. ann. 251.

†† *Vide eum in præf. ad Loc. Com. Melanc. Gallice à ſe verſos, & Epiſtolas à μειλαίας.*

** *Exam. of John Careles.*

(8) Page 413.

miſtaken [C], which he wrote by ſpecial order of King Charles I. whoſe Chaplain he was. In 1635 he was promoted to the Deanery of Worceſter (*l*), having before had a promiſe of a Canonry of Windſor, which he never enjoyed. In 1640 he was Vice-Chancellor of the Univerſity of Oxford, in the execution of which office he met with ſome trouble from the Members of the Long Parliament. Upon breaking out of the Civil Wars,

(*l*) Le Neve, *Faſti Eccleſ. Anglican.* p. 301.

in a manner conflict, not as we doe, with paſſionate and mutual revilings, but with reaſons and arguments, and ſalvâ ſemper charitate, *for ſo they are commanded by their great Dictator at Rome, who indeed dares not otherwiſe decide the doubts, leſt the grieved partie raiſe another more dangerous queſtion,* Whether his judgment be infallible? *In like manner the Council of* Trente, *if you marke it, cunningly here declines the deciſion, and lurks in ſuch generall terms (like him that was called* Δοξίας *in the old Oracle) that both ſides confidently avow the ſentence to be given for them, when indeed it is given for neither.*

[C] *In* 1633, *he publiſhed* his anſwer to a late Popiſh pamphlet, entitled, *Charity miſtaken.*] A Jeſuit, who went by the name of *Edward Knott*, but whoſe true name was *Matthias Wilſon* (11), had publiſhed in 1630, a little book in 8vo, called, *Charity miſtaken, with the want whereof Catholickes are unjuſtly charged, for affirming, as they do with grief, that Proteſtancy unrepented deſtroies Salvation.* Dr. Potter publiſhed an anſwer to this at Oxford 1633, in 8vo, with this title: *Want of Charitie juſtly charged on all ſuch Romaniſts as dare (without truth or modeſty) affirme, that* Proteſtancie deſtroyeth Salvation: *Or, an Anſwer to a late Popiſh pamphlet, intituled,* Charity miſtaken, &c. The *ſecond edition reviſed and enlarged,* was printed at London 1634, in 8vo. Prynne obſerves (12), that Biſhop Laud having peruſed the *firſt* edition, cauſed ſome things to be omitted in the *ſecond.* It is dedicated to King Charles I. and in the dedication Dr. Potter obſerves, that it was *undertaken in obedience to his Majeſty's particular commandment.* In the preface he tells us, that "this Anſwer had been publique ſome "moneths agoe, if it had not been delayed, partly by "ſickneſſe, and the indiſpoſition of my body, (and "of my minde alſo, which was ever averſe from con-"tentions in Divinity, and now rather deſirous to "ſpend in devotion the few and evil days of my "life that remaine,) and partly of the hope I had to "ſee a ſecond edition of the *Miſtaker*'s work, which "the ſtrong report of that part promiſed, or rather "threatened. But that hope failing, and being loath "to ſeeme to faile in my obſervance, I now com-"mend it, ſuch as it is, to the bleſſing of God, and "to the uſe and judgement of the Church. My An-"ſwers, without further affectation, are true and mo-"deſt. I ſpeake to the cauſe, not to the perſon. "Whoſoever the *Miſtaker* be, he hath my pitty and "my prayers. He thinkes unworthily of truth, that "believes it to have need of our paſſions." In the *firſt ſection* our Author ſhews, that ſome Roman Catholics judge charitably of the Reformed. That the Jeſuits are furious and deſtructive in their cenſures againſt all, who are not of their faction. That this faction, which is infamous for its cruelties, is charged with want of charity, and not the Catholic Church. That the Catholic Church and the Roman Church are ignorantly or cunningly confounded. That the Catholic Church is truly and really charitable; and ſo the Engliſh, but not ſo the Roman, not even to her own children, eſpecially not to Proteſtants; of whom the *Miſtaker* and others ſpeak and think no better than of Infidels, *though we,* ſays the Doctor, *intirely profeſs and embrace the Catholic faith in all the parts of it.* In the *ſecond ſection* he treats of the Unity of the Church, and ſhews wherein it conſiſts, and obſerves (13), that *it is nothing hindered by diverſity of opinions in doubtfull matters. It is a great vanity to hope or expect, that all learned men in this life ſhould abſolutely conſent in all the pieces and particles of divine truth. The light, whereby we ſee in this ſtate of mortality, is very feeble and very different, in regard of the good ſpirit's illumination, the capacities of men, and their diligencies in ſtudy, prayer, and other means of knowledge. So long as the* (14) faith once delivered to the ſaints *is earneſtly contended for and kept intire, that is, the* (15) common faith *of Chriſtians, containing all Catholique and neceſſary verities; ſo long as men* (16) walk according to this rule *charitably, though in other things they be otherwiſe minded, the Church is but* one, *her unity no way violated. For this unity conſiſts in the unity of* faith, *not of opinions; and in an union of men's hearts and affections by true charity, which will eaſily compound or tolerate all unneceſſary differences. Factions and fiery ſpirits kindle and fly aſunder on ſmall occaſions; but among wiſe men, each diſcord in religion diſſolves not the unity of faith or charity. Points of religion are well diſtinguiſhed by* (17) Thomas *and* (18) Stapleton. Some, *ſay they,* are primitive articles, of the ſubſtance of religion, eſſential in the object of faith. *Diſſention in theſe is pernicious, and deſtroys unity.* Others are ſecondary, probable, accidental, or obſcure points; *wherein the oppoſitions and diſputations of learned men proceeding modeſtly are tolerable, and ſometime profitable for finding out the truth. Unity in theſe matters is very contingent and variable in the Church, now greater, now leſſer, never abſolute in all particles of truth. And therefore thoſe antient Worthies, the Fathers of the Church, as they were the moſt zealous to defend, even with their blood, to the leaſt jot or title, the* rule of faith *(as they called it)* or the Creed *of Chriſtians, or (as the ſcripture calls it) the* (19) form of wholeſom words, *the* (20) principles of the oracles of God, *or of the doctrine of Chriſt; ſo againe, they were moſt charitable to allow in other things (beſides or without the faith) a great latitude and liberty. As in a muſical conſort, a diſcord now and then (ſo it be in the deſcant, and depart not from the ground) ſweetens the harmony; ſo the variety of opinions, or of* (21) *rites in parts of the Church, doth rather commend then prejudice the unity of the whole.*

He then ſhews how far the communion of the Church is neceſſary. In the *third ſection,* he ſtates the true difference between the Roman and Reformed parts of the Church; and obſerves, that Proteſtants have rejected nothing but Popery, that is, corrupt ſuper-additions to the faith, confeſſed by learned Romaniſts to be doubtful and unneceſſary novelties; and that they have reformed the errors and abuſes of Rome without ſchiſm. He ſhews likewiſe how and to whom thoſe errors are damnable. "For though, "*ſays he* (22), in themſelves they be not damnable, "to them, which beleeve as they profeſſe; yet for "us to profeſſe (and to avow by oath, as the Church "of Rome injoynes) what we believe not, were "without queſtion damnable. And they with their "errours, by the grace of God, might go to hea-"ven, when we for our hypocriſy and diſſimulation, "without repentance, ſhould certainly be condemned "to hell. It is the doctrine of the Roman ſchoole, "that *veniall* ſinnes to him that commits them, not "of ſubreption or a ſuddain motion, but of preſump-"tion that the matter is not of moment, change "their kinde and become *mortall.* The like may be "ſaid of errours. To him, who in ſimplicity of "heart beleeves and profeſſeth them, and withall "*feareth God and worketh righteouſneſs,* to him they "ſhall prove veniall. Such an one ſhall, by the "mercy of God, either be delivered from them, or "ſaved with them. But he that againſt faith and "conſcience, ſhall go along with the ſtreame to pro-"feſſe and practiſe them, becauſe they are but little "ones; his caſe is dangerous; and without repen-"tance deſperate. We hope and thinke very well "of all thoſe holy and devout ſoules, which in for-"mer ages lived and died in the Church of Rome. "For though they died in many ſinfull errours, "yet becauſe they *did it ignorantly through unbelief* "(23), not knowing them to bee either errors or "ſins, and repenting in generall for all their un-"knowne treſpaſſes; we doubt not but they obtained "pardon of all their ignorances. For it were an "unreaſonable incongruity to imagine, that the God "of Mercy ſhould not be as ready to pardon errours "of underſtanding, as wilfull impieties. Nay, our "charity reaches further to all thoſe at this day, who "in

(11) See Southwell's *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jeſu,* p. 185. edit. Romæ 1676.

(12) Canterbury's *Doom,* p. 251, 252.

(13) p. 38, 39.

(14) Jud. 3.

(15) Tit. i. 4.

(16) Phil. iii. 15, 16.

(17) Aquin. 2. 2. q. 2. art. 5. q. 2. 9. art. 3. ad. 2.

(18) Staplet. *Dupl.* lib. 3. c. 12. n. 3. & *Rel.* cap. 1. q. 3. art. 6. notab. 3. *Licet, & utile eſt de rebus difficilibus in Eccleſia aliter putare; neque hoc unitatem violat, ſed veritatem illuſtrat.*

(19) 2 Tim. i. 13.

(20) Heb. vi. 1. and v. 12.

(21) Firmilianus *apud* Cyprian. *Epiſt.* 75. num. 5. Auguſt. *Epiſt.* 86. Socrat. *Hiſt.* lib. 5. cap. 21.

(22) p. 77, 78.

(23) Cypr. *Epiſt.* 63. *Pam. num.* 13. *Si quis de Anteceſſoribus noſtris vel ignoranter vel ſimpliciter non hoc obſervavit & tenuit, quod nos Dominus facere exemplo & magiſterio ſuo docuit, poteſt ſimplicitati ejus de indulgentia Domini venia concedi; nobis vero non poterit in ſec. qui nunc a [illegible] admoniti [illegible] ſtructi [illegible]*

Wars, he ſent all his plate to the King, and declared, that he would rather, like Diogenes, drink in the hollow of his hand, than that his Majeſty ſhould want; and he afterwards ſuffered much for the Royal Cauſe (*m*). In conſideration of this, upon the death of Dr. Walter Balcanqual, he was nominated to the Deanery of Durham in January 1645-6; but was prevented from being inſtalled by his death, which happened at his College March the 3d following. He was interred about the middle of the Chapel there; and over his grave was a marble monument faſtened to the North wall, at the expence of his widow Elizabeth, daughter of Dr. Charles Sonibanke, ſome time Canon of Windſor, afterwards wife of Dr. Gerard Langbaine, who ſucceeded Dr. Potter in the Provoſtſhip of Queen's College (*n*). He was a perſon eſteemed by all that knew him to be learned and religious; exemplary in his behaviour and diſcourſe, courteous in his carriage, and of a ſweet and obliging nature, and comely preſence. But he was more eſpecially remarkable for his charity to the poor; for though he had a wife and many children, and expected daily to be ſequeſtered, yet he continued his uſual liberality

(*m*) Lloyd, *ubi ſupra.*

(*n*) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 86, 87.

" in ſimplicity of heart beleeve the Roman religion, " and profeſſe it; but we underſtand onely thoſe, " who either have not ſufficient meanes to finde the " truth, or elſe ſuch as after the uſe of the beſt " meanes they can have, all things conſidered, finde " not ſufficient motives to convince their conſcience, " that they are in errour. But they that have *un-* " *derſtanding* and *meanes* to diſcover their errour, and " neglect to uſe them, wee dare not flatter them " with ſo eaſy a cenſure; and much leſſe them, that " dare profeſſe the religion of the Church of Rome, " when they do not beleeve it; or onely beleeve it, " becauſe ſome carnal or worldly reſpect doth blinde " or miſleade their underſtanding." He afterwards treats of the diſſentions of Proteſtants among themſelves; and proves, that they do not differ in any point fundamental. In the *fourth ſection* he treats of the nature of Hereſy, and obſerves, that the Church may declare an hereſy, but cannot make any doctrine heretical properly, unleſs it be ſuch in the matter of it. *All neceſſary truth*, ſays he (24), *is contained in ſcripture, which is the rule, according to which the Church is to judge* (25) *of truth and errour. Her declaration is only to fetch out that truth, which is in the ſcripture; her expoſition of the text muſt not be an addition to it: it is a faulty and erroneous declaration, which inſtead of declaring, gives another and a contrary ſenſe. Neither is any doctrine neceſſary or true, becauſe the Church declares it ſuch, but becauſe it is ſuch in itſelfe by warrant of ſcripture.* He then obſerves, that the words *Hereſy* and *Heretick* are very ambiguous, and ſhews how they were commonly uſed by the antient Fathers; and makes ſome remarks on their catalogues of Hereticks. He tells us what conſtitutes a Church, and obſerves (26), that " it ſeemeth to " ſome (27) men of great learning and judgment " (but herein I had rather leave the Reader to his " judgment, than interpoſe mine own) that all, who " profeſſe to love and honour Jeſus Chriſt, (though " it be in much weakeneſs and with many errours, " yet) are in the viſible Chriſtian Church, and by " Catholiques to be reputed brethren. Or to the " ſame purpoſe; whereſoever (ſay they) a company " of men do joyntly and publiquely profeſſe the ſub- " ſtance of Chriſtian religion, which is, *Faith in* " *Jeſus Chriſt the ſonne of God, and Saviour of the* " *world, with ſubmiſſion to his doctrine in minde and* " *will*; there is a Church, wherein ſalvation may " bee had, notwithſtanding any corruption of judg- " ment or practice; yea, although it be of that na- " ture, that it may ſeeme to fight with the very " foundation, and ſo hainous, as that in reſpect there- " of, the people ſtained with this corruption, are " worthy to be abhorred of all men, and unworthy " to be called the Church of God." He adds ſeveral illuſtrations and proofs, which are brought by thoſe learned men, to aſſert the ſaid poſition, viz. *that to beleeve in Jeſus Chriſt the ſonne of God and Saviour of the world, with ſubmiſſion to his doctrine in minde and will, is ſufficient to conſtitute a Church, wherein ſalvation may be had.* In the *fifth ſection* he ſhews, that divine revelation is the principal motive and laſt object, into which faith ſupernatural is reſolved; and that the teſtimony and miniſtry of the Church is of great uſe for the begetting of faith; but that the Church hath not an authority unlimited and abſolutely infallible in all her doctrines, as ſome Romaniſts pretend, though others of them reaſonably and fairly limit the Church's infallibility. That the Church Univerſal is infallible in fundamental doctrines, but not ſo in points of leſs moment. That general Councils *are not abſolutely freed from all error. Such a Councell*, ſays he (28), *is but an aſſembly of men, and thoſe ſometimes not of the moſt able and ſufficient. The Church Univerſall may have many more able members out of the Councell, then ſhe hath in it. For though that repreſenting body have all the legall power or binding ſtrength of the whole; yet it hath not all the natural power or wiſdom, which is in the whole. The Catholique Church cannot poſſibly communicate her ſtrength or power in that kinde to any Councell. Yet ſuppoſe the beſt men to be in that meeting, even they are but men, when all is done; neither all of them equall in the endowments of nature or grace, nor any of them perfect, being every one ſubject to all the infirmities and paſſions, which attend our nature. Their meeting then cannot make them infallible in all things, though the act, that is hammered out by ſo many heats, muſt needs in reaſon be perfecter, then that which is the iſſue of one man's ſufficiency. But happily they are infallibly aſſiſted! No doubt the holy infallible ſpirit aſſiſts at all ſuch holy meetings; but how far, or in what manner, is all the doubt. The good ſpirit ever aſſiſts the endeavours of the devout and diligent, ſo far as is neceſſarie, and is ready to guide them that are deſirous to be guided by him. But his guidance is not a violent rapture, or a wilde enthuſiaſme; but in ſearches of truth he ever directs to the infallible rule of truth, the ſcripture. And it is poſſible, that a general Councell may miſapply, or miſunderſtand, or neglect that rule weakly or wilfully, and ſo erre, notwithſtanding the ſpirit's aſſiſtance.* He then treats of the Pope, whom the Romaniſts call the *Church virtuall*; and obſerves how his flatterers ſpeak of his authority; and ſhews, that no Roman Catholick can be aſſured of his infallibility, which is, at the moſt and beſt, but problematical by their own principles. In the *ſixth Section* he remarks, that the diſſentions in the Church of Rome are of greater importance than any among the Reformed. That the Roman Catholicks differ not only in opinion, but in matters of their faith, as about the Pope's authority; and that the Popes themſelves differ about their vulgar Latin bibles. That the diſcords among them are uncharitably purſued. That implicit faith in ſome points and in ſome men is admitted; and what it is which Proteſtants diſlike in that reſpect in the doctrine of the Romaniſts. " We will yeild, ſays he (29), that in " matters of great difficulty, and not of ſuch abſolute " neceſſity, a general, infolded, or virtuall beleefe " may ſuffice to ſome perſons, who either want capa- " city or means of better inſtruction, ſo as they dili- " gently and conſcionably endeavour to encreaſe " their knowledge, not affecting ignorance, and " withall carry an humble preparation of minde to " beleeve diſtinctly and particularly any truth, when " it is cleered unto them out of the word of God. . . " The things we diſlike in the doctrine of implicite " faith, as it is delivered by ſome Roman Doctors, " are ſpecially two. 1. They teach, that implicite " faith *alone* and *of itſelfe* may ſuffice to ſalvation, " without any diſtinct knowledge, or explicite faith, " of any article in the Creed. . . . 2. They make " this implicite faith to reſt itſelfe, not on the *Scrip-* " *ture*, the onely foundation and rule of faith, but

(24) p. 99.

(25) Κριτὴν ἁμαρτοῦν ὁ Κανὼν, Ariſt. lib. 1. *de Anim.* See the learned *Anſwer to Fiſher's Relation of his three Confer.* p. 9.

(26) p. 113.

(27) Mr. Hooker, lib. 3. § 1. Thomas Morton, *Of the Church*, cap. 1. § 4. & cap. 7. § 10.

(28) p. 165, 166, 167.

Matt. xviii. 20.

(29) p. 198, & *ſeq.*

lity to them; having on hearing Dr. Hammond's ſermon at St. Paul's, experimented the truth of the Doctor's aſſertion, that charity to the poor was the way to grow rich (o). He tranſlated into Engliſh from the Italian, Father Paul's *Hiſtory of the Quarrels of Pope Paul V. with the State of Venice*, printed at London 1626 in 4to; and he had lying by him at his death ſeveral manuſcripts fit to be printed; among which was one entitled, *A Survey of the Platform of Predeſtination*; which coming into the hands of Dr. William Twiſſe of Newbury, was anſwered by him, as alſo *three Letters* of our Author concerning that ſubject.

(o) Lloyd, *ubi ſupra.*

" on the *Church*, ſtill meaning by the Church, (not " the Church Catholique, or any ſound member of " it, but) onely to the Church of Rome, that is, the " Pope aſſiſted with ſome few of his Cardinals and " Prelats." In the *ſeventh* and laſt *Section* he ſhews, that the diſtinction between doctrines fundamental and not fundamental is moſt neceſſary, and is grounded in reaſon and ſcripture. *By* fundamental doctrines, ſays he (30), *we meane ſuch Catholique Verities, as principally and eſſentially pertaine to the faith; ſuch as principally conſtitute a Church, and are neceſſary in ordinary courſe to be diſtinctly beleeved by every Chriſtian, that will be ſaved. Other points of truth are called* not fundamental, *becauſe they are not of ſuch abſolute neceſſity, and doe not primarily belong to the* Unity of Faith, *or to the eſſence of a Church, or to the ſalvation of a Chriſtian. Such as, for their ſubtilty and profoundneſſe, are very diſputable in themſelves, and happily by plaine ſcripture indeterminable; ſuch finally as may admit an* ἐπίχω, *or a* non liquet; *both ignorance, if it be not affected, and errour, if it proceed not from negligence or wilfulneſſe, without perill.* He then obſerves, that the Creed of the Apoſtles, as it is explained in the latter Creeds of the Catholic Church, is eſteemed a ſufficient ſummary or catalogue of fundamentals by the beſt learned Romaniſts and by antiquity. " For " how can it be neceſſary, ſays he (31), for any " Chriſtian to have more in his *Creed*, than the " Apoſtles had, and the Church of their times? " May the Church of after-ages make the narrow " way to Heaven narrower than our Saviour left it? " Shall it be a fault to ſtreiten and encomber the " King's highway with publique nuiſances; and is " it lawfull, by adding new articles to the faith, " to retrench any thing from the latitude of the " King of Heaven's highway to eternall happineſſe? " The *Yoke* of Chriſt, which he ſaid was *eaſie*, may " it juſtly be made heavier by the Governours of the " Church in after-ages? The Apoſtles profeſſe, they " revealed to the Church the (32) *whole Councell of* " *God, keeping back nothing* needful for our Salvation: " what tyranny then to impoſe any new unneceſſary " matters in the faith of Chriſtians, eſpecially (as " the late Popes have done) under that high com- " manding forme, *Qui non crediderit, damnabitur?* . . " All that can be replyed to this diſcourſe is this, " that the whole faith of thoſe times is not contained " in the Apoſtle's Creed; which is all one, as if a " man ſhould ſay, *This is not the Apoſtle's Creed, but a* " *part of it.* For the Apoſtles and the Church of " their times in giving it this name, doe they not " plainly tell us, that the ſumme and ſubſtance of " their *Credenda* is comprized in it? For to call it a " Creed, and to leave out of it any neceſſary article " of faith, what had it been but to deceive the world? " The antient Church appointing her infants to be " inſtructed (for matter of beleefe) (33) onely in the " *Creed*; and admitting her Catechumens, upon " their profeſſion of the Creed, to Baptiſme, and into " the number of the Faithfull; and exacting of " ſtrangers the ſame profeſſion, before they could be re- " ceived into the communion of the Catholiques; did " ſhe not by all this evidently declare her judgment, " that the profeſſion of this Creed, and theſe articles " alone, was an abſolute profeſſion of the Catholique " faith?" He next anſwers the exceptions of his antagoniſt againſt the confeſſion of the Church of England. This book of our Author was replied to by Mr. Knott in 1634, in a treatiſe intitled, *Mercy and Truth. Or Charity maintayned by Catholiques. By way of reply upon an anſwer lately framed by D.* Potter *to a treatiſe, which had formerly proved, that charity was* miſtaken *by Proteſtants: with the want whereof Catholiques are unjuſtly charged, for affirming, that Proteſtancy unrepented deſtroyes* Salvation. *Divided into two parts.* Mr. Chillingworth undertook to anſwer that reply, which he did in 1637 in his celebrated book, entitled, *The Religion of Proteſtants, a ſafe Way to Salvation: Or an Anſwer to a* Booke, entitled, Mercy and Truth; or Charity maintained by Catholiques, *which pretends to prove the contrary.* T.

(30) p. 211, 212.

(31) p. 221.

(32) Acts xx. 27.

(33) *De conſecr. diſt. can. Ante viginti, & Symbolum, & Baptizandos, &, Non liceat.*

☞ POTTER (FRANCIS), a learned Engliſh Divine, ſon of Mr. Richard Potter, a native of Oxfordſhire, and Vicar of Meyre in Wiltſhire, was born in the Vicarage-houſe there on Trinity Sunday 1594, and educated in grammar learning in the King's ſchool at Worceſter under Mr. Henry Bright. He became a Commoner of Trinity College in Oxford under his elder brother Hannibal Potter in the latter end of the year 1609 (a). July the 8th 1613 he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts (b), June the 26th 1615 that of Maſter (c); and July the 8th 1625 that of Bachelor of Divinity (d). He continued a cloſe ſtudent in his College till the death of his father in 1637; and then ſucceeding him in the Rectory of Kilmington, left the Univerſity, and retired to his living, where he lived in a very retired manner till his death (e). In 1642 he publiſhed at Oxford in 4to, a treatiſe entitled, *An Interpretation of the number* 666. *Wherein not onely the manner how this number ought to be interpreted is clearly proved and demonſtrated; but it is alſo ſhewed, that this number is an exquiſite and perfect character truly, exactly, and eſſentially aeſcribing that State of Government, to which all other Notes of Antichriſt do agree. With all knowne objections ſolidly and fully anſweared, that can be materially made againſt it* [A]. It was afterwards tranſlated into French, Dutch, and Latin; and the Latin Verſion was done by ſeveral hands. One copy was all or moſtly

(a) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 612, 613. 2d edit.

(b) Idem, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 394.

(c) Id. col. 202.

(d) Id. col. 232.

(e) Idem, *Athen. Oxon.* ubi ſupra.

[A] *In* 1642 *he publiſhed at Oxford in* 4*to, a treatiſe, entitled,* An Interpretation of the Number 666, *&c.*]

There is prefixed to it the following judgment of Mr. *Joſeph Mede* upon the treatiſe: " This diſcourſe " or tract of the number of the beaſt is the happieſt, " that ever yet came into the world, and ſuch as " cannot be read (ſave of thoſe that perhaps will not " beleeve it) without much admiration. The ground " hath been harped on before, namely, that that " number was to be explicated by ſome ἀντιστοιχίαι " to the number of the Virgin-company and new " Hieruſalem, which type the true and Apoſtolical " Church, whoſe number is always derived from XII. " But never did any worke this principal to ſuch a " wonderfull diſcovery, as this Author hath done, " namely, to make this number not onely to ſhew " the manner and property of that ſtate, which was

moſtly performed by Mr. Tho. Gilbert, of Edmund Hall in Oxford, and printed at Amſterdam 1677, in 8vo; part of the Latin tranſlation is inſerted in the ſecond part of the fourth volume of Poole's *Synopſis Criticorum*. Our Author's treatiſe was attacked by Mr. Lambert Morehouſe, Miniſter of Preſtwood, about ſix miles from Kilmington, who aſſerts, that 25 is not the true, but propinque root of 666. Mr. Potter wrote a Reply to him. Mr. Morehouſe gave a manuſcript copy of this diſpute to Dr. Seth Ward, Biſhop of Sarum, in 1668. Our Author, while he was very young, had a good talent at drawing and painting, and the Founder's picture in the Refectory of Trinity College is of his copying. He had likewiſe an excellent genius for Mechanicks, and made ſeveral inventions for raiſing of water, and water-engines; which being communicated to the Royal Society, about the time of its firſt eſtabliſhment, were highly approved of, and he was admitted a Member of that Society. Mr. Wood likewiſe obſerves (*f*), that about the year 1640, "he entertained the notion of curing diſeaſes by "transfuſion of blood out of one man into another; the hint whereof came into his head "from Ovid's ſtory of *Medea* and *Jaſon*. Which matter he communicating to "the Royal Society about the time of its firſt erection, it was entered into their books. "But this way of transfuſion having (as it is ſaid) been mentioned long before by *Andr.* "*Libavius*, our Author *Potter* (who I dare ſay never ſaw that Writer) is not to be "eſteemed

(*f*) *Athen. Oxon.* ubi ſupra.

"to be that beaſt, but to deſigne the city, wherein "he ſhould reigne; the figure and compaſſe thereof; "the number of gates, Cardinall titles or Churches, "St. Peter's Altar, and I know not how many more "the like. I read the book at firſt with as much "prejudice againſt the numerical ſpeculation as might "be, and almoſt againſt my will, having met with "ſo much vanitie formerly in that kinde. But by the "time I had done, it left me poſſeſt with as much "admiration, as I came to it with prejudice." In the *Epiſt. to the Reader* dated at Kilmington Mar. 27 1642, our author obſerves that he had not publiſhed this treatiſe haſtily, and unadviſedly, but upon mature, or at leaſt upon long deliberation; *and divers yeares*, ſays he, *have now paſſed, ſince ſome chiefe ſubſtantial points of it were publiquely declared and defended in the divinity ſchoole at Oxford; and neither then nor at any time ſince, could I ever heare or learne any reaſon, that could be brought againſt it, which might cauſe me to doubt of the probability or truth of it..... Concerning the interpretation itſelfe, it ſuppoſeth this number* 666 *to be an image and typicall repreſentation of the whole body of* Antichriſt, *that is, of the whole body of his Kingdome, State, and Hierarchy; and thus much is generally acknowledged by many writers, and eſpecially by* Cotterius, *who layeth this as a certaine ground, by which the true interpretation of this number ought to be tried and examined. Now if this number be an image and type of the whole body of* Antichriſt, *then no man ought to imagine, that the whole image of* Antichriſt *is like unto any one particular member or part of the body of Antichriſt; for as the whole image of Cæſar is not like unto the hand of Cæſar, nor like unto the head of Cæſar; ſo neither is this number, being conſidered wholly, applicable to any particular times, names, perſons, places, or other individuall things or circumſtances belonging unto* Antichriſt, *as divers interpreters have endeavoured to apply it. But he that deſireth to know Cæſar by his image, muſt compare head to head, face to face, eye to eye, hand to hand, and foot to foot; and ſo conclude a likeneſſe in generall from an induction of particulars. In like manner he that deſires to know* Antichriſt *by this number, muſt firſt finde in this number, being conſidered as an abſolute number, ſuch things as are moſt eſſential and remarkable in it, and ſuch things, by which this number is diſtinguiſhed from all other numbers; and theſe being found out, muſt be compared with thoſe things, that are moſt eſſentiall and remarkable in that State or Government, which is* Antichriſt, *and with thoſe things, by which* Antichriſt *is diſtinguiſhed from all other States and Governments whatſoever. Now the root and figure of every number are thoſe things, which are moſt eſſential and remarkable in it; and by one or both of theſe every number is diſtinguiſhed from all other numbers. In theſe doe the eſſentiall properties of all numbers conſiſt; and upon theſe chiefly doe all the myſteries depend, which* S. Auguſtine, *and divers other ſacred and profane Writers have obſerved to be in numbers.* "And concerning thoſe things, which are moſt eſ- "ſential and remarkable in the Kingdome of *An-* "*tichriſt*, to and with which the root and figure of "this number being found out, is to be applied and "compared; the ſcriptures themſelves doe infalli- "bly guide and direct unto them by an actuall appli- "cation of the root and figure of an oppoſite number "unto ſuch particulars, as are moſt remarkably an- "ſwerable and oppoſite to them. As for the find- "ing out of the root and figure of the number 666, "this cannot be done but by a kinde of calculation "or computation of the number itſelfe; wherefore it "is ſaid in the text, ὁ ἔχων τὸν νοῦν ψηφισάτω τὸν ἀριθμὸν "τοῦ θηρίου, *Let him that hath underſtanding, count the "number of the beaſt*, that ſo he may finde out the "root and figure of it, by which the root and "foundation of *Antichriſt*'s Hierarchie, his originall, "his city, ſtate, doctrine, and many other particulars "are manifeſtly revealed. And this is the effect of "the following interpretation, which dependeth "chiefly of the extraction of the root of the number "666, as the words of the text doe neceſſarily im- "ply, that the right interpretation ſhould doe." This work contains the following particulars. 1. The probability of the following interpretation, briefly and generally propoſed; the opinion of numeral letters being almoſt wholly rejected. 2. That the myſtery of the number 144, which is the number oppoſed to 666, conſiſts in the ſquare root of it, which is 12; and that therefore the myſtery of 666 muſt be in the ſquare root of it alſo. 3. The manner of the interpretation more clearly yet curſorily propoſed; with an introduction to the true interpretation of the number 144, and the meaſures of the new Jeruſalem. 4. A diſquiſition concerning the interpretation of the 16th and 17th verſes of the 21ſt chapter of the Revelations, and a new expoſition of the meaſures of the new Jeruſalem. 5. A farther confirmation of the preceding interpretation of the new meaſures of the new Jeruſalem. 6. The interpretation of the meaſure of the wall of the new Jeruſalem, or of the 144 cubits. 7. A farther confirmation of the ſolid and ſquare meaſures abovenamed, ſhewing that the like meaſures are uſed in other places of ſcriptures. 8. The reaſon why the new Jeruſalem is meaſured by the ſolid and ſquare meaſures only. That the meaſure and ſtructure of the wall, and the number, by which it is expreſſed, both typically repreſent the Hierarchy of the Church of Chriſt. The concluſion of this digreſſion concerning the meaſures and numbers of the new Jeruſalem. 9. That thoſe Writers, who make the myſtery of the number 144 to conſiſt in the root of it, ought alſo to have extracted the ſquare root of the number 666. That the extraction of the ſquare root is an antient and uſeful invention, by which many famous myſteries have been found out. 10. What the counting of the number is. What is meant by the firſt beaſt, the ſecond beaſt, and the image of the beaſt mentioned Revel. chap. xiii. That by counting the beaſt's number, ſome other number ought to be found out beſides the number 666. 11. What it is to extract the ſquare root of a number. That 25 is the number, that is the root of 666, and remarkably oppoſed to 12. Some objections concerning the fractions of the root of

"esteemed the first Inventor of that notion, nor Dr. *Richard Lower*, but rather an Ad-"vancer." He fell blind before his death, and died at Kilmington about April 1678, and was buried in the chancel of the church there. His memory is preserved in Trinity College by a dial, which he made and set up on the north side of the old quadrangle.

of 666. 12. That the number 25 hath been conceived to be a fatal and unfortunate number by such as knew no relation that it had to *Antichrist*, or to the number 666. 13. Of the nature and quality of those particulars, in which the root and the figure of the beast's number is to be applied to the Papacy. 14. That Rome is answerable to Jerusalem, and the Pope's Cardinals to Christ's Apostles. 15. That the first number of Cardinals, according to their first institution and foundation, is chiefly to be considered as that, which most remarkably characterizes *Antichrist* in his original. 16. A disquisition concerning other particulars, to which the number 12 is applied in the description of the new Jerusalem, and particularly of the 12 gates, 12 tribes, and 12 angels. 17. Of such particulars in the mystical Babylon as are ἀντιστοίχα to the gates, tribes, angels, and foundations of the new Jerusalem. 18. Of such things as are answerable to the measure of 12000 furlongs, and the 12 kinds of fruits growing on the tree of life. The conclusion of all, that hath been said concerning the antithesis of things in general, as it is distinguished from that antithesis of numbers, which is next to be proved. 19. That the first decreed and limited number of Cardinals and Parish Priests in Rome was 25; and that the first number of churches for baptism, and parishes, was 25 also. 20. That the number of the gates of Rome was 25. 21. That as 12000 furlongs are the solid measure of a cube, whose perimeter is equal to the compass of the new Jerusalem; so 25000 furlongs are the solid measure of a cube, whose perimeter is equal in compass to the city of Rome. 22. That the Popish creed consists of 25 articles, as the Apostles creed doth of 12. 23. The conclusion, which follows upon the chief part of the application above proved, and some necessary and remarkable observations concerning it. 24. A brief and cursory recital of some other less remarkable particulars, in which the number 25 is remarkably applicable to the city and Church of Rome. 25. That the number 25 is remarkable in divers things pertaining to St. Peter's Church in Rome. Of the measures of St. Peter's altar, and the characters imprinted upon it and other Popish altars. 26. That the number 25 is an affected symbolical device among the Papists. Of the mass of Christ's five wounds five times multiplied and repeated. Of their jubilees, and affectation of the twenty-fifth day of the month. 27. Objections answered concerning the fractions of the root 666. That the root of 666 is more exactly applicable to the Papacy, than the root of any square number could have been. 28. A farther and full answer to all objections about the root of 666, drawn from the consideration of the figure of that number, by which the figure of the city of Rome is exactly expressed. 29. Objections answered, and difficulties cleared, (even to such as have no knowledge of Arithmetick) concerning those solid figures and numbers, by which the several measures of the compass of Rome and the new Jerusalem may be found out. Some other objections also briefly answered. T.

(a) Euseb. *in* Chron.

(b) And by contraction *Dicarchia*. The Latin Poets have called it by that name, even after it was called *Puteoli*.

(c) Strabo, lib. 5.

(d) Livius, lib. 24.

(e) Livius, lib. 33. and 34. See also the *Inscription* transcribed by Andrew Schot *in Itinerario Italiæ*, part. 3.

POZZUOLO, in Latin *Puteoli*, a city of the Kingdom of Naples, has nothing left of its antient splendor, but a few inconsiderable remains. It was built by the Samians in the 4th year of the 64th Olympiad, which was the 232d year after the building of Rome (*a*). It was called *Dicæarchia* (*b*). It belonged for some time to those of Cumæ, who made their port of it (*c*). The Romans conquered it during the second Punick war, in the year of Rome 538, and put a strong garrison there (*d*). Twenty years after they erected it into a colony, and changed its name into that of *Puteoli* (*e*) [*A*]. It was one of the best ports they had on that sea [*B*]. It became very considerable by the beauty of the publick buildings, that were raised there (*f*), I mean, by its temples, by its rings, by its theatres, and by its amphitheatres. The country-seats, which the richest citizens of Rome, and Cicero among others, built in the neighbourhood of that city, contributed more still to raise its fame (*g*). Some assert, that its people were more esteemed than those of Tyre [*C*]. I say nothing of its baths; all the world knows that they were very much celebrated [*D*]; and so they are still. Augustus (*b*) and Nero (*i*) sent new colonies thither. That city was burnt to ashes by Alaric, in the year 410 of the Christian Æra,

(f) See the *Antiquities of Pozzuolo*, written by Scipio Mazzella.

(g) Idem, ibid.

(b) Frontinus, *de Colon.*

(i) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 14.

[*A*] *Into that of* Puteoli.] Either because of the great number of wells, or on account of the bad smell of the hot waters (1).

(1) Strabo, lib. 5.

[*B*] *It was one of the best ports the Romans had on that sea.*] This was the staple town of the ships that came from Alexandria. Read these words from Seneca. *Subito hodie nobis Alexandrinæ naves apparuerunt, quæ præmitti solent & nunciare secuturæ classis adventum: tabellarias vocant. Gratus illorum Campaniæ adspectus est: omnis in pilis Puteolorum turba consistit. . . . . In hoc omnium discursu properantium ad littus, magnam ex pigritia mea sensi voluptatem* (2). i. e. "The ships "from Alexandria have appeared to us to day all on "a sudden, they are sent before to bring advice of "the fleet's coming. They call them advice-boats. "Their sight is very acceptable to the inhabitants of "Campania. The whole mob of *Puteoli* is got to-"gether. . . . . In that great concourse of people "who run to the sea-shore, I am very well pleased "with my laziness, which keeps me at home."

(2) Seneca, *Ep.* 77. *init.* Compare this with what Suetonius observes, *in* Augusto, cap. 98.

[*C*] *Some assert that its purple was more esteemed than that of Tyre.*] Scipio Mazzella pretends it, and quotes Pliny for it; and yet it is certain that Pliny does not speak of this purple, but of a kind of vermilion, in which purple was one of the ingredients. Here follow Mazzella's words. *Fù da gli antichi tenuta in gran stima la purpura, che si faceva in Pozzuolo, che per la bontà & eccellenza sua avanzava quelle di Tirio, de Getulico, e del Laconico, ch'erano purpure pretiosissime. Di che Plin. nel* 35. *lib. al.* 6. *capo della purpura parlando così scrive.* Quare Puteolanum potius laudatur, quàm Tyrium aut Getulicum, unde preciosissimæ purpuræ (3). He ought to have considered, that the word *Puteolanum* must be referred to *purpurissimum à creta argentaria*, which Pliny had been just mentioning. The women used it to paint their fans with (4).

(3) Scipione Mazzella, *Anticbita di Pozzuolo*, p. 6 and 7. edit. Napol. 1606, in 8vo.

[*D*] *Its baths . . . . . were very much celebrated.*] See John Elisius the Physician's treatise *de Balneis Puteolanis*, corrected and improved by Scipio Mazzella: it is printed at the end of the Antiquities of Pozzuolo. We meet there with some Latin verses written by Alcadinus, in praise of those baths. This Alcadinus was born at Siracusa, and was sent by his father to Salerno to study there. He made such a progress in Philosophy and in Physick, that from a scholar he was soon raised to the condition of a Professor of these two sciences. The reputation he gained in physick made several Princes wish to have him at their Court. He cured the Emperor Henry IV. who was fallen dangerously ill in the Kingdom of Naples. From that time he was very much beloved by that Emperor, who loaded him with presents. After Henry's death he applied himself to the Emperor Frederic II. and at his request he composed the verses I have men-

(4) *Quiaque istas buccas tam belle purpurissatas habes.* Plautus, *in* Trucul. Act. 2. scen. 2. ver. 35. See the same also in Mostell. act. 1. sc. 3. ver. 101.

Æra, and by Genſeric in the year 455 (*k*): fourſcore and ten years after, or thereabout, it was taken by Totila, who cauſed the walls of it to be pulled down, and who ſacked and plundered it in ſo furious a manner, that it continued ſixteen years uninhabited. The Greeks having rebuilt it, it began to be peopled again by degrees, ſo that it was a pretty good Town, when Romauld II. of that name, Duke of Benevento, took it in the year 715, and laid it waſte with fire and ſword. It was plundered by the Hungarians in the tenth century. After having often changed its maſter, it fell at laſt under the dominion of Alfonſus of Aragon, King of Naples, in the 15th century. Earthquakes have made a ſtrange havock in that city at ſeveral times, and eſpecially in the year 1538 (*l*). The paſſage, in which Gaſſendi has mentioned it, gives me an opportunity to take notice of a miſtake of his Epitomizer [*E*]. I ſhall alſo ſpeak of a blunder of Benjamin of Tudela [*F*]. There is a reference in Moreri, which ought to have been corrected (*m*).

(*k*) Scip. Mazzella, *Antiquit. de Pozzuolo.*

(*l*) Extracted from the ſame Scipione Mazzella.

(*m*) *Puzzole*, ſee *Puzzole*. It ſhould have been, See *Ponzol*, or *Puzzuolo*.

tioned. He flouriſhed in the year 1191, and lived fifty two years (5). Thomas Bartholin has omitted him in his liſt of the Phyſicians who were Peots at the ſame time.

(5) Extracted from Scipione Mazzella, *de Balneis Puteolani*, p. 260.

[*E*] *A miſtake of his Epitomizer.*] Gaſſendi relates, that earthquakes produce ſometimes mountains in the continent and iſlands in the ſea. With regard to the mountains he relates what happened near Pozzuolo in the year 1538. *Mirabilius videri poteſt*, ſays he (6), *enaſci ex oppoſito non modo in Continentibus montes, ſed etiam in medio mari inſulas. Nam de Montibus quidem facit fidem Puteolanus ille, quem Simon Portius * ita deſcribit, ut fuerit una nocte ad pluſquam M. paſſuum altitudinem, ex pumicibus, cineribuſque congeſtus; id nempe ſub finem Septembris anni* M.D.XXXVIII. Though Monſieur Bernier was a learned man, yet he miſtook in this paſſage a thing which is very plain: he did not obſerve, that *Puteolanus* muſt be referred to *terræ motus*, and made an Author of it. *What is not leſs ſurprizing*, ſays he (7), *is to ſee mountains ariſe in one night, which are made up of Pumice ſtones and aſhes, in the midſt of the continent, as Puteolanus relates.* This puts me in mind of the *Hexameron ruſtique*, in which it is obſerved that *Du Pinet . . . . . made two Roman Gentlemen out of two kinds of marbles* (8), and that Coeffeteau (9) wrote *the Captain Corſinius* inſtead of the city of Corſinium.

(6) Gaſſendus, *Phyſicæ ſect.* 3. membro 1. lib. 1. cap. 6. p. 50. *Oper.* Tom. 2.

* *Epiſt. de conſt. agri Put.*

(7) Bernier, *Abrege de la Philoſophie de Gaſſendi*, Tom. 5. p. 227. Edit. of Lyons 1684.

(8) See above, quot. (26) of the art. PINEL.

(9) In chap. 18. of the 3d book of his tranſlation of *Florus*.

[*F*] *I ſhall . . . . ſpeak of a blunder of Benjamin of Tudela.*] He aſſerts, not only that the city of *Puteoli* was antiently called *Surrentum*, but alſo that it was built by Tſintſan Hadar-Ezer, who dreading King David, had made his eſcape. *Ulterius profectus fui Puteolos quondam Surentum dictam, urbem magnam, quam olim condidit Tſintſan Hadar-Ezer, quum metu Davidis regis (in pace quieſcentis) aufugiſſet* (10). Theſe two falſities had already been obſerved by Mazzella (11), and by Conſtantine l'Empereur (12), and afterwards again by Pinedo (13), who obſerves that this Tſintſan Hadar-Ezer is mentioned in the third verſe of the eighth chapter of the ſecond book of Samuel, and that the ſpurious Joſephus ſon of Gorion relates the ſame ſtory in the third chapter of his firſt book. You ſee there the genius of the Jewiſh nation, and even of all others. Every nation imagines, that their great men have been the cauſe of numberleſs events in the remoteſt countries. David, whoſe name was unknown in Italy till the Romans read Joſephus, and who lived about three centuries before the building of Rome, ſtruck Romulus with ſuch a terror, if we may believe Benjamin, that this founder of Rome dug a road fifteen miles long under the mountains of Pozzuolo, in order to hide himſelf. *Hinc per milliaria quindecim ſub montibus iter conficiter. Operis author eſt Romulus, qui Romam condidit, atque hæc omnia fecit, cum ſibi à Davide Iſraëlitarum rege & Joabo exercitus duce metueret. Alia etiam cum ſupra, tum infra montes urbis Neapolis exſtruxit* (14). Here follows Conſtantine l'Empereur's note: it contains an exclamation, which is not too ſtrong conſidering that Rabbi's impertinence. " Who would " not be angry at this, ſays he, and how would the " Jews abuſe us if we were guilty of ſuch miſtakes!" *Quis ad tantum ſtuporem non obſtupeſcat? coætaneos facit Davidem & Romulum, quum trecentis circiter annis poſt Davidem regnare cæperit. Quod in dubium vocari non poteſt; ſed ex diverſis hiſtoricis conſtat, & paſſim à Chronologis obſervatum, quorum verba repetere neceſſe non eſt in tanta luce. Huic parallelum eſt, quum Romulum talparum more in terram ac longiſſimas ſpecus ſe recepiſſe fingit, ſive eas metu Davidis, qui ante aliquot ſecula mortem obierat, excavaſſe ſcribit. Quis ad hujuſmodi non ſtomachetur? ſi nos ita aberraremus, quàm ſuperbe nobis Judæi inſultarent* (15).

(10) Benjam. *Itiner.* p. 14. edit. Lugd. Bat. 1633.

(11) Mazzella, *Antichita di Pozzuolo*, p. 4, 5.

(12) L'Empereur, *Notis in* Benjam. *Itiner.* p. 159.

(13) Pinedo, *in* Stephanum Byzantium, *Voce* Δικαιάρχεια, p. 236.

(14) Benjam. *Itiner.* p. 15.

(15) L'Empereur, *Notis in* Benjam. *Itiner.* p. 159.

PRADILLHON (JOHN BAPTIST), born in the Limouſin, " retired very " young into the ſolitude of Feuillans, an Abbey, ſituated in the dioceſe of Rieux, and " on which ſeveral others depend. The Monks were ſoon acquainted with his merit; " he was but twenty-five, when he had already a ſhare in the Government of the con- " vent, and at the age of forty he became the Arbiter and Head of it. He was four " times choſen for that poſt; and the eſteem and inclination the Monks had for him, " would have continued him always in that employment, had it not been inconſiſtent " with their laws (*a*). . . . He died at Paris in his monaſtery in the ſtreet of St. Ho- " noré, September the 25th, 1701 (*b*)." I ſhall obſerve ſomething concerning the works he has publiſhed [*A*].

(*a*) *Mercure Galant*, for October 1701, p. 253.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 263.

PRÆPOSITUS

[*A*] *I ſhall obſerve ſomething concerning the works he has publiſhed.*] " The intimate and free corre- " ſpondence he had at Rome with the learned Fag- " nanus, when he was Attorney General at that " Court, has procured us a book of the practice of " the Canon Law, which not only the Monks, but " even the other Clergymen often conſult, to deter- " mine the queſtions which relate to the diſcipline " of the Church. It is no eaſy matter to collect in- " to a large volume ſo many important ſubjects, with " ſo much order and clearneſs, as this ſmall volume " contains. The Nuns of the Order of St. Bernard at " Toulouſe are obligated to him for the diſcovery of " the ſecret and almoſt incredible auſterities of their " firſt Abbeſſes. The publick has approved his re- " lations (1)." He is the Author of a book entitled, *La Conduite de Dom Jean de la Barriere, Premier Abbé de Feuillans, durant les troubles de la Ligue & ſon attachement au ſervice du Roy Henry III.* i. e. " The " conduct of John de la Barriere, firſt Abbot of the " *Feuillans*, during the troubles of the league, and " his zeal for King Henry the Third's ſervice." This work was printed in the year 1699. The Journal des Savans for the 13th of September 1700 contains an account of it. Don Pradillhon took ſeveral journies *for the ſervice of his congregation*, which gave him acceſs *to the moſt celebrated Records of the ſeveral Provinces of the Kingdom. As he was a very good judge of antient writings, and ſo honeſt as to be proof againſt any private intereſt whatſoever, the learned depended entirely on his bare extracts. The character, which the illuſtrious Monſieur Baluze gives him in his Popes of Avignon, is worth an whole elogium. The Nobles were willing to truſt him with the examination of their titles; which he had made his ſtudy during his leiſure hours: he was ſo modeſt, that he would never conſent that his manuſcripts on that ſubject ſhould be printed* (2).

(1) *Mercure Galant*, for Octob. 1701. p. 255, 256.

(2) *Mercure Galant*, for Octob. 1701. p. 259, &c.

[*A*] *He*

PRÆPOSITUS (NICHOLAS), was a Physician of Tours, and wrote a dispensary, which is nothing but a downright Plagiarism, if we may credit the Author I shall quote hereunder [*A*]. Konig (*a*) styles him a Physician of Salerno, which is a mistake.

(*a*) In *Bibliotb. vet. & nova*, p. 661.

[*A*] *He wrote a dispensary, which is nothing but a downright Plagiarism, if we may credit the Author whom I shall quote hereunder.*] That Author's name is John de Renou; I have given his article. He tells us (1), that there have been four Physicians named Nicholas, and who wrote each of them a dispensary; that one of them named Præpositus, formerly a Physician at Tours, "did not scruple to rob "the other three of their reputation and labour, "by transcribing word for word, and pretending to "be the Author of the *Antidotary* of a certain antient Pharmacographer, named James des Parties (2), which was first compiled and transcribed by "Nicholas Myrepsus, and by other Antidotariographers, and has besides maliciously concealed the firname of the said Nicholas's, the better to hide "his manifest Plagiarism, prefixing only to the prescriptions he robbed from them the name of Nicholas, without mentioning the firnames of Nicholas Alexandrinus, Nicholas Florentinus, or Nicholas of Salerno, from whom he has extracted "(as they extracted from James des Parties) what he "falsely ascribes to himself." He has imposed upon many persons; *for most of the Apothecaries* look upon him *as the true and genuine Author of all the barbarous and course physical compositions, which are contained in a certain common and trivial dispensary, to which he has prefixed his name and firname. But he has been so wicked as to prefix his own name only to one composition, to make the world believe that he is the Author of it, though the contrary be very well known.* This may be of use to those writers, who will undertake to continue the catalogue of Plagiaries which Thomasius has begun.

(1) John de Renou, in the 6th book of the *Antidotaire*, ch. 5. p. 741. edit. de Lyons 1637. See also his *Introduction à la Pharmacie*, chap. 17. p. 489, and in his Preface, and in the 38 chap. of the 5th book of the *Antidotaire*, and in sundry other places.

(2) The Author of the *Lindenius renovatus* observes, p. 490, that Jacobus de Partibus, a Novice of Tournai, was Physician to Charles VII. K. of France, and to Philip Duke of Burgundy, and died, being a Canon of Tournai, about the year 1465. See the art. PARTS.

The Author of the *Lindenius Renovatus* (3) gives, from the Chronology of the Physicians written by Wolfgang Justus, that Nicholas Præpositus seems to be the same with Nicholas Myrepsus firnamed Alexandrinus, and that it is said he practised physick at Lyons towards the year 1364. Now this Wolfgang Justus said (4), that *Nicolaus Myrepsus Alexandrinus, Præpositus alias dictus*, lived among the modern Greeks about the year 1198, and (5) that *Nicolaus Alexandrinus* lived before Ægineta, that is to say, before the year 420 (6). Judge therefore whether that Author considered with attention what he wrote. We find in the *Lindenius Renovatus* (7), that the *Dispensatorium Nicolai Præpositi ad Aromatarios, sive Introductiones in Artem Apothecariatus*, was printed at Lyons in the year 1505, and in the year 1536 in 4to, and at Paris in the year 1582 in 4to.

(3) p. 842.

(4) Apud *Lindenium renovatum*, p. 840.

(5) Ibid. p. 820.

(6) Ibid. p. 865.

(7) p. 842.

PRAT (ANTHONY DU) Chancellor of France, and afterwards Cardinal, in the reign of Francis I. was born at Issoire in Auvergne. It is agreed, that he was a man of great abilities, but not that he was an honest man. He is blamed, among other things, for the concordate, made between Leo X. and Francis I. anno 1516. It is said that he thereby introduced into the Kingdom a pernicious custom [*A*], whereby the

[*A*] *It is said that he . . . introduced by the concordate . . . . . a pernicious custom.*] It being my design to collect some testimonies on this subject, I shall begin with the following words of a Jansenist (1). "The Chancellor Anthony du Prat, Cardinal, Archbishop of Sens, Bishop of Alby, Valence, Die and "Gap, and Abbot of Fleury, assembled (2), in the "convent of the great Austin Friers in Paris, the "Bishops of his province who attended the Court, and "there caused some ordinances to be read, made by "him for the explication of the Christian doctrine, "and for the discipline of the church, in opposition "to the errors of Luther, which at that time made a "great noise in Europe. . . . (3). This Prelate never "resided in any of his dioceses; nor ever performed "any of his episcopal functions, but that ordinance "against Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, Oecolampadius, Zuinglius; for Calvin and Beza did "not make any noise yet. To this good Prelate is "ascribed the abolishing of the pragmatic sanction, "that is, the exact observation of the antient Canons in the Church of France; and of making "the concordate between Francis I. and Leo X. "which has destroyed all the apostolical discipline "in France; abolished the canonical elections, and "reduced the Church of France to a deplorable state "of captivity." The Archbishop of Ambrun sided with this Chancellor, and endeavoured to make the Jansenists odious at Court, as though, by disapproving the concordate, they envied his Majesty the advantages which accrued to him from it. *They endeavoured*, says he (4), *to deprive the Crown of a singular advantage: they inveigh* (p. 10.) *of the first libel, against the concordate which was made between King Francis* I. *and Pope Leo* X. To this good Prelate, *say they, speaking of Chancellor du Prat, Cardinal and Archbishop of Sens*, is ascribed the taking away of the pragmatick sanction, that is, the exact observation of the antient canons, &c. . . . . *They bear an ill will to that great man, because that he, in a council held by him in his province of Sens, anno* 1528, *forbid the translation of the Bible into the vulgar tongue.* These words were censured by one who was surprized (5) *to hear him speak of the concordate in a manner so unworthy of his character.* "He ought to have learned "from the most celebrated Historians, and the enquiries of the Clergy of France, with what eye "the Bishops, the Parliaments, and all persons of "probity have ever looked upon that treaty. He "ought not to have been ignorant, that, for a long "time, publick prayers have been long offered up "in several Churches, to beseech God that they "might be abolished, and the canonical elections "restored (6); as appears by various rituals, such as "that of Vannes, printed at Lyons, and by another "of Clermont, printed in 1608, by order of the late "Cardinal of Rochefoucaut. Lastly, since he, doubtless sets a great value upon the authority of the "Archbishop of Paris, he ought, at least, to have "spoke of him in the same terms as this Prelate "does in the life of Henry IV. where he relates, "page 229, that the general assembly of the Clergy, "held at Paris in 1599, *made a strong remonstrance to "the King, whereby the Prelates entreated him not to "burthen his conscience with the nomination to Bishopricks, Abbies, and other benefices, with cure of souls.* "And he should not have appeared less knowing than "such a Prince as Henry IV. who, though educated "in heretical principles, and in the field, did nevertheless answer this remonstrance of the Clergy, as "the Archbishop of Paris relates afterwards, *viz.* "that *he was sensible, that the particulars they had observed to him, with regard to the nomination to "Bishopricks, were true, but that he was not the Author of that abuse.*" Let us also add the following passage (7). *It is false to assert*, that the Gentlemen of Port-Royal *had reason to be disgusted at Chancellor du Prat, as though* he had forbid translations in the vulgar tongue, in the Council of Sens anno 1528, "because he never made any such prohibition; he "only forbidding the printing of the sacred books "without leave first obtained from the ordinary; "which does not concern, in any manner, the translation of Mons, that being approved of by the ordinary of the place where it was printed. It is "also false to assert, that Cardinal du Prat ought to "be called *a great man*; and that the Author of the "Dialogues is to blame for speaking of him in the "manner he does; since that person must be altogether unacquainted with our History, who should "not know that no man was more inveighed against "by the Authors, his Contemporaries. Belcarius,

(1) *Dialogue entre deux Parroissiens de St. Hilaire du Mont, sur les Ordonnances contre la Traduction de Mons*, p. 37 of Tom. 1. of the pieces relating to that Translation.

(2) In 1528.

(3) Ibid. p. 38.

(4) *Requete presentee au Roi par l'Archeveque d'Ambrun*, p. 270, of the abovementioned volume.

(5) Remarks on the *Requete* of the Archbishop of Ambrun, p. 271, of the same volume.

(6) Quintin, making a speech for the Clergy, in the General Estates of the Kingdom, anno 1561, spoke in very strong terms for the restoring of elections. See *President de la Place, Hist. de l'etat de la Religion & Repub.* folio m. 143 *verso & seq.*

(7) *Remarques sur la Requete de l'Archeveque d'Ambrun*, p. 271.

the choice of Biſhops was transferred to the Court, which was the ready way for mitre to be beſtowed on perſons who were more of a worldly diſpoſition, than adorned with the knowledge and virtue requiſite in thoſe who are to have the care of ſouls: but to this it may be anſwered, that in the time when Biſhops came into the Church by election, the Church had as bad Paſtors as under the Concordate [*B*]. I can ſcarce prevail upon myſelf

" Biſhop of Mets, calls him *the worſt* of men: *Bi*
" *pedum nequiſſimus*; and charges him with cauſing
" the Sieur de Semblance to be ſentenced to die, by
" corrupt judges. In all probability, it is of him
* Lib. 3. " that Budæus makes the ſtrange elogium, * in the
" beginning of his book entitled, *Forenſia*."

It is certain that moſt abominable abuſes were introduced into the collation to benefices, by means of the concordate; and hence it is, that, on the complaints of the three Eſtates of the Kingdom, aſſembled at Orleans in 1560, an ordinance was made, which, had it been obſerved, might have again ſettled things upon a very good foot. It runs thus. " All Arch-
" biſhops and Biſhops ſhall henceforward, immedi-
" ately upon the vacancy of a See, be elected and no-
" minated, viz. the Archbiſhops by the Biſhops of
" the Province, and the Chapter of the Epiſcopal
" Church: the Biſhops by the Archbiſhop, and the
" Biſhops of the Province, and the Canons of the E-
" piſcopal Church; together with twelve conſidera-
" ble Gentlemen, who ſhall be elected by the Nobi-
" lity of the dioceſe, and twelve conſiderable Citizens,
" who alſo ſhall be elected in the Town-houſe of the
" Anti-epiſcopal or Epiſcopal City. Who being all
" convened, on a certain day, by the Chapter of the
" vacant See, aſſembled, in manner aforeſaid, ſhall
" pitch upon three perſons, duly qualified according
" to the holy Canons and Councils, and thirty years
" of age, at leaſt, whom they ſhall preſent to us; in
" order for us to promote, to the vacant Archbiſhop-
" rick or Biſhoprick, one of the three, at our plea-
" ſure." In order that my Readers may know the evils, which it was thought would be remedied by this ordinance, I ſhall cite the words of a Commentator (8). " If the laws, both divine and human,
" had been obſerved by thoſe who profeſs them, or
" whoſe buſineſs it is to ſee them put in execution,
" this article might juſtly be conſidered as ſuperflu-
" ous; for the particulars mentioned in it, were regu-
" lated by holy ordinances, in the ſame manner as they
" are here; but the calamity of the times, the bold-
" neſs of mankind, avarice, the credit of great men,
" had changed and depraved all things, which were
" growing worſe and worſe, had not the good and
" ripe judgment of our Monarch, or his Council,
" prevented it. Ignorant and ſtupid wretches, by fa-
" vour, friendſhip, or money, got poſſeſſion of rich
" benefices, of the moſt exalted dignities in the
" Church, and the richeſt Sees. And as theſe had
" not the capacity nor experience to diſcern good
" from evil, but, ſo far from it, not to diſtinguiſh
" vice from virtue, they acted according to their lit-
" tle knowledge; nay, generally, ſome were choſen
" Biſhops, before they were completely formed in their
" mother's womb, the ſad effects of which have been
" felt throughout every part of Chriſtendom. The
" poor afflicted people could not refrain from heavy
" murmurs, to ſee themſelves governed by ſuch men,
" their Vicars, or Suffragans, of the ſame ſtamp
" with themſelves; who raſhly laid upon God's
" people intollerable burthens, which they them-
" ſelves would not touch with the top of their fin-
" gers; until the Lord opened the eyes, hearts and
" mouths of the poor people, to ſee, ſpeak and
" complain, of the Princes to hear, and of the King
" to judge with juſtice and uprightneſs. Methinks
" we may juſtly form the ſame expectations of
" Charles IX. our King, as the Augurs or Sooth-
" ſayers did of Auguſtus; under whom the Monar-
" chy was ſo well governed, was ſo happy, and its
" limits ſo greatly extended. It is manifeſt, from
" this article, that perſons of virtue, integrity, and
" learning, will receive the reward of their labours;
" the ignorant will be rejected, and young people ex-
" cited to ſtrive to raiſe themſelves to the noble
" ſtage of virtue. Children ſucking at the breaſt
" will no longer be raiſed, as formerly, to the high-
" eſt dignities in the Church, which are too heavy
" for their weak ſhoulders; and are too heavy a
" digeſtion for their Stomachs, eſpecially in matters
" relating to religion, which requires that none
" ſhould be made choice of but perſons of the great-
" eſt worth, probity, chaſtity and piety, and whoſe
" fleſhly luſts are mortified and extinguiſhed either
" through age, or the love of God; for to commit
" the Government of the Church to ignorant per-
" ſons and children who are not able to govern
" even themſelves, is a ſtrange and extraordinary
" circumſtance; and no leſs contrary to laws both
" divine and human, than the appointing one pupil
" to be guardian of another, or for the blind to lead
" the blind. . . . . This good King Lewis XIII. ob-
" ſerving this fault to prevail among the Clergy in
" his time, ſaid that aſſes were happier than horſes;
" for horſes (ſaid he) are obliged to ride poſt for be-
" nefices, whilſt many aſſes are preſented to them
" without having the leaſt trouble. For this reaſon
" people could not forbear rebuking them in a thou-
" ſand paſquinades and libels; and the following ver-
" ſes were writ on account of the loſs of the electi-
" ons, againſt thoſe who uſurped them, and ſuch as
" unworthily poſſeſſed church preferments.

" *Au temps paſſé l'Eſprit Saint eliſoit*
" *Ceux, dont ſouloit l'Egliſe eſtre ſervie.*
" *En ce temps-là, vertu fruit produiſoit:*
" *Car les eleuz eſtoyent de ſainte vie.*
" *Mais maintenant les mondains par envie*
" *Ont uſurpé la ſainte election,*
" *Dont s'en enſuy humaine affection:*
" *Et par ainſi tous vices procedez*
" *Sont des Paſteurs: qui nous ſont concedez*
" *Par les chevaux, par la poſte, & par dons.*
" *Trop mieux vauldroit les elire à trois dez:*
" *Car à l'hazard ils pourroyent eſtre bons.*"

(8) Joachin du Chalard, Advocate in the grand Council. *Sommaire Expoſition des Ordonnances du Roi Charles IX.* folio 7 *verſo*, Paris edit. of 1568.

In antient times, the holy ſpirit choſe
Such Paſtors as might edify mankind:
In thoſe bleſt ages virtue ſhone conſpicuous,
And none elected but whoſe life was pure.
But now the worldlings baſely have uſurped
The choice in all elections, whence proceeds
Endleſs injuſtice, and a round of woes,
Since only worthleſs men may wear the gown.
The perſons, now, to benefices raiſed
Owe all to bribery, and naught to virtue.
Henceforward, then, let box and dice decide;
Thus fickle chance may, haply, give ſome good ones.

If I ever write the article of Genebrard, as I hope to do, I ſhall not omit ſpeaking of the book he publiſhed, to ſhew the neceſſity of reviving canonical elections (9). He uſed to call the concordate a myſtery of iniquity.

[*B*] *In the time when Biſhops came into the church by election, the church had as bad Paſtors as under the concordate.*] We have ſeen, in the preceding remarks, the joke which Lewis XIII. paſt on that occaſion; which ſhews that many abuſes were committed under the pragmatick ſanction, and before the concordate. The Archbiſhop of Ambrun aſſerts (10), that the *concordate has put an end to the abuſes, the ſimonies, and intrigues which formerly prevailed in elections*: but an Abbot Commendatory expatiates very much on theſe diſorders. " I have been told by a Lady of great
" quality, that ſhe heard the great King Francis ſay,
" that the circumſtance, which chiefly prompted him
" to make the concordate with Pope Leo, for aboliſh-
" ing the elections of Biſhops, Abbots, and ſome
" Priors, and to have the nomination of them, was,
" becauſe of the great abuſes found among the
" Monks, in thoſe elections; for without having
" any regard to abilities, and learning, which were
" ſeldom found in monaſteries . . . . they general-
" ly elected the merrieſt fellow; who was moſt fond
" of

(9) It was burn by the hangman See the 11th Diſſertation of Natalis Alexander, *in Selecta Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiaſticæ capita*. Seculi 15 and 16.

(10) In his petition to the King, againſt the tranſlation of Mons, p. 272, 273. Tom. 1. of the tracts relating to that verſion.

myſelf to believe what is related by ſome Hiſtorians, viz. that Cardinal du Prat ſhewed a ſtrong deſire to be raiſed to the Pontificate [C]. Some Authors relate, that he pretended

" of whores, dogs and hawks; who was the beſt to-
" per; in a word, the greateſt debauchee, in order
" that he, when created their Abbot or Prior, might
" afterwards indulge them, in like manner, in all
" their debauches, and licentious pleaſures; they
" firſt engaged them, for this purpoſe, by an oath,
" and obliged them, either by ſelf-love or force, to
" obſerve it. The worſt circumſtance was, when they
" happened not to agree in their choice, they uſed to
" fight, box, and wound one another; nay, murther
" was often committed on thoſe occaſions; in ſhort,
" there uſed to be more tumults, intrigues and ca-
" bals, than there is in the creation of the Rector or
" Principal of the Univerſity of Paris, which I have
" ſeen formerly, but do not know whether it is ſo
" ſtill. Beſides, ſome would elect ſome ſilly Monk,
" who durſt not ſay his ſoul was his own, conſequent-
" ly not order any thing but what was pleaſing to
" them, and menaced him whenever he pretended to
" ſeverity. Others elected, out of mere pity, ſome
" poor creature of a Monk, who uſed privately to
" rob them, make up a purſe, and ſtarve his Friers,
" which occaſioned great complaints, and at the ſame
" time impoveriſhed the Abbey. . . . In a word, a
" numberleſs multitude of abuſes uſed to be commit-
" ted in theſe elections and creations, which I ſhall
" now omit. Farther, the great Monarch in queſtion,
" conſidering the good ſervices which his Noblemen
" generally did him, and not being able to reward
" them from the revenues of his own demeſnes, and
" the monies ariſing from his taxes, (he being obli-
" ged to employ the whole, to defray the great ex-
" pences of his long and mighty wars,) he thought
" it more prudent to recompence thoſe who had ſerved
" him faithfully, with ſome abbies, and other church
" preferments, than to leave them to cloiſtered Monks,
" a ſort of men (would he ſay) fit for nothing but
" eating and drinking, gaming, making bow-ſtrings
" and ferret-bags; catching rabbits, and whiſtling to
" linnets; ſuch were their exerciſes, and the diſſo-
" lute manner in which they ſpent their idle hours;
" and indeed it was then a proverbial expreſſion, he
" is as idle as a Prieſt or Monk; and likewiſe, as
" covetous and lecherous as a Prieſt and a Monk; or
" as the Italians ſay, *Pretri fratri, Monachi & pulli,*
" *mai non ſon ſatulli* (11). i. e. " Prieſts, Friers,
" Monks, and chickens, are never ſatisfied." Now
" it is to be obſerved, that as there were abuſes in
" the elections of Friers, thoſe of Biſhops were as ir-
" regular; for the Biſhops, in order to procure the
" votes of the Canons, and ſuch as poſſeſſed the chief
" dignities, uſed to win them over, and bribe them
" with money; and corrupt the reſt by preſents, and
" the promiſe of future favours: ſo that this was
" called a real Simony, rather than a juſt and holy
" election; in imitation of many Popes in that age,
" who procured, in this manner, the votes of the
" Cardinals. There alſo were frequently tumults,
" mutinies, intrigues and cabals in their chapters, on
" which occaſion they would fight, wound and kill
" one another, as formerly happened in Germany, as
" I have been told; for the Canons were a bluſter-
" ing, quarrelſome ſet of people, as they are at this
" time; and employed the ſword no leſs than the
" breviary. The Biſhops having attained, in this
" manner, the moſt exalted dignities, uſed to lead
" ſtrange lives. They indeed were much more reſi-
" dent in their dioceſes than they are now, for they
" never ſtirred from them; but then, what did they
" do there? They only led the moſt diſſolute lives,
" being for ever a hunting, hawking, feaſting at
" weddings, carouzing and whoring, they having
" ſeraglios of ſuch creatures. I was told that one
" of theſe uſed to go in queſt of little beautiful girls
" of ten years old; and that they diſperſed and ſet-
" tled them up and down their pariſhes and villages,
" as Gentlemen do puppies, to make uſe of them
" when they ſhould be grown up. Such was their
" conduct, for no perſon durſt cenſure them, ſo
" much they were dreaded. I could ſay more, but will
" not give any farther ſcandal. Our preſent Biſhops,
" ſaid a great man to me, are more prudent, or at
" leaſt wiſer hypocrites, and have a better knack at
" concealing their dark vices. God forbid that
" what I have related both of antient and modern
" Biſhops, and the abuſes committed by them, ſhould
" be applied to all; for there have been antiently, a
" great many worthy ones, both regular and ſecular,
" who led very holy lives; as there are now, and
" will be afterwards, great numbers, with God's
" bleſſing, who loves and never abandons his people
" (12)."

(11) Brantome, *Memoires*, Tom. 1. in his *Diſcourſe on Francis I.* p. 251 *& ſeq.*

(12) Idem, ibid. p. 255.

[C] *Cardinal du Prat ſhewed a ſtrong deſire to be raiſed to the Pontificate.*] The Gentlemen of Port Royal did not fail to repreſent to the Archbiſhop of Ambrun, the particulars which Laurence Capelloni relates concerning Anthony du Prat's death. " Cle-
" ment VII. ſays that Author, being dead, Cardinal
" du Prat had ſuch an extravagant deſire to be Pope,
" that he preſumed to wait upon the King, to tell
" him, that it was then in his power to raiſe him
" to the Holy See. The King being willing to hear
" what lengths he would go in his ambition, let him
" go on. The Cardinal then added, that if his
" Majeſty would employ his credit and authority
" with the College of Cardinals, in order to raiſe
" him to the Pontificate, he himſelf would be only
" nominally Pope, but that the King ſhould be ſo in
" effect. The King perceiving the extravagant am-
" bition with which this man was fired, and reflect-
" ing on the extreme difficulties of ſuch a deſign,
" which could not be completed without employing
" large ſums, anſwered: in good faith, Mr. Chan-
" cellor, the Cardinals are ſo extremely greedy, that
" I have no manner of inclination to ſatiate it. The
" Cardinal replied, that if the King entertained any
" ſuch deſign, he would find four hundred thouſand
" crowns to put it in execution. The King anſwer-
" ed, you very probably (Sir) may have the ſum you
" ſpeak of; but as for myſelf, I have no mind to
" engage in that deſign. This anſwer of the King
" brought the Cardinal to himſelf, and made him
" ſenſible of the fault he had committed; not ſo
" much for ſhewing his ambition, as for diſcovering
" his wealth. This afflicted him to ſuch a degree,
" that he fell ſick upon it; and his indiſpoſition,
" which was ſlight at firſt, encreaſed prodigiouſly
" upon his being told that the King, knowing he
" was confined to his bed, had given orders for the
" ſeizing his moveables and money; adding to
" thoſe who complained to him about it in the
" Cardinal's name, that he dealt with him as he had
" adviſed him to deal with others: ſo that (ſays this
" Hiſtorian) the Cardinal died, God knows how,
" *(Dio ſa come)* extremely diſſatisfied and uneaſy
" on that account (13)." I will not omit, that the Gentlemen of Port Royal obſerved to this Prelate, that he could not doubt the truth of this ſtory, ſince he had given his approbation to the book in which it is related. *In this manner*, ſay they (14), *this great man died, of whom one cannot give an ill character without offending the Biſhop of Ambrun. And yet it is obſervable, that this Hiſtory is related in Auberi's lives of the Cardinals, printed by Soli in* 1645; *together with an authentick approbation of* MESSIRE GEORGE D'AUBUSSON, *wherein he declares*, that the Author has written with the truth required in an Hiſtorian; *and therefore it is pretty ſurprizing, that the high preferments to which he is raiſed ſhould have made him ſo ſoon forget his firſt ſtudies.*

(13) *Remarques ſur la Requete de l'Archeveque d'Ambrun*, p. 272.

(14) Ibid.

Varillas (15) gives us Capelloni's relation, but without citing him; and obſerves that *du Prat grew ſo corpulent, that a hollow was cut in his table, to make room for his belly.* He adds (16), that this Cardinal, " after lying in a languiſhing condition ſix months,
" died the ninth of July 1535 (17); and, in order
" to make ſome ſort of ſatisfaction to his Cathedral
" at Sens, which he had never gone into once, tho'
" he had been a long time Archbiſhop, he deſired
" to be buried there, though he had neglected it
" his whole life time." Another ſtory is related much more injurious to the memory of Francis I. than Capelloni's relation. I ſhall cite it, to ſhew the little credit that ought to be given to ſuch accounts; for

(15) *Hiſtory of Francis I.* lib. 7. p. 241. 2d edit. (Dutch).

(16) Ibid. p. 242, 43.

(17) The Author of *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for Auguſt 1684, art. 8. p. 629. mentions the year 1534, on the authority of the 1ſt edit. (Dutch) of Varillas's *Francis I.* It appears from this Chancellor's epitaph, mentioned by Frizon, p. 574, 575, of *Gallia purpurata*, that he died the 9th of July 1535, aged 72 years.

ed to have the ſtrangury, in order to extricate himſelf from a dangerous affair [*D*]. It is not probable that he was ſo very ignorant of the Latin tongue as Jonſton affirms [*E*]. It has

for there are ſcarce any more ſure marks of certain ſtories being falſe, than the different ways in which they are told, being ſometimes ſaid to happen at ſuch a time, and to ſuch perſons, and ſometimes to others. " It was a peccadillo of the Court, like to " that which Francis I. employed, in order to poſſeſs " himſelf of Cardinal Marcellus's wealth (*a*). The " King was in want of money. Melanchthon, who " ſays that he knew the Cardinal intimately, relates " it thus. *The King ſpread a report, by the diſpatches " which his Courier brought him from Rome, that Pope " Paul was dead there. He then ſent for this Cardinal, " whom he knew to be ambitious, and that he wanted " to be raiſed to the Pontificate, and informed him of " this falſe report.* The reſult of it was this. *He re- " preſented to the King, how greatly it concerned him " and his Kingdom, to have a perſon elected who was " his firm friend. You ſay very true, ſays the King. " Now ſuppoſe we ſhould get you elected?* The Cardinal " was exceedingly pleaſed with the motion. *But, " ſays the King, money will be wanted to do this, and " I have none now.* The Cardinal then preſented " him with *two tuns of gold. There is enough, ſaid the " King, I will put ſome of my own money to it.* By " the next letters which came from Rome, it ap- " peared that the Pope was ſtill living, and had not " even been ſick. The Cardinal informed the King " of this, and deſired to have his money back again. " The King anſwered, *I will reprimand my Embaſſa- " dor for writing falſe news:* with regard to the " money, he ſaid, if the *Pope is not dead, he will die. " This repartee ended this affair, which was ſo melancholy " for the Cardinal* (18)." The Author, from whom I borrowed theſe particulars, quotes a book of Melanchthon which I have not by me (19). I therefore cannot anſwer for its accuracy; but I have found, in another work of Melanchthon's, an incident that ſeems to be a medium between this and that of Capelloni. Here follows the whole paſſage: *Rex Galliæ, pater Franciſci, indigebat ſubitò pecunia. Itaque per alium quendam ad ſuum Cancellarium ex Roma, & per poſtam mittit ei literas, ſignificans Papam eſſe mortuum. Lectis literis, mox properat Cancellarius ad Regem, ei nunciaturus tanquam aliquid novi. Rex legit literas, ſimulans ſe neſcire, & interrogat quid ſibi ſit faciendum? Reſpondit Cancellarius, conſultiſſimum eſſe mittere Romam Legatum, & aliquem conſtituere Papam, qui ſit à partibus regis Galliæ. At Rex: ad eam rem opus eſt pecunia, ſicut dicitur: Nulla pecunia eſt ſatis magna, aſpiranti ad Pontificatum. Cancellarius dicit, ſe adhuc habere duas thonnas auri; utrum ſufficerent? Reſpondit Rex: Bene eſt, & ego aliquid pecuniæ addam. Cura igitur unam thonnam auri perferri ad me. Poſtquam eam Rex acceperat, ſubornat alium nuntium afferentem ei literas, Papam adhuc vivere, & non eſſe mortuum. Egregium ſanè inventum, quo quaſi cornicum oculos confixit, & avarum per ſuam avaritiam decepit* (20). i. e. " The King of France, father to Francis, " was in immediate want of money. He thereupon " cauſed a letter to be ſent, by another hand, from " Rome, to his Chancellor, by which he informed " him that the Pope was dead. The Chancellor " having read the letter, waited immediately upon " him, to inform him of the news. The King " having read over the letter, pretended ignorance, " and aſked what he could do in that affair? The " Chancellor replied, that the moſt prudent courſe " would be to ſend an Embaſſador to Rome; and " raiſe ſome perſon, who was a friend to his Gallic " Majeſty, to the Papal Throne. Said the King, " before this can be done, money muſt be procured; " but no ſum of money is conſiderable enough, with " regard to one who aſpires to the Pontificate. Says " the Chancellor, I have two tuns of gold; is that " ſufficient? The King replied, very well: I myſelf " will add ſome money to it, and therefore ſend one " of the tuns of gold to me. His Majeſty having " received this money, he got another meſſenger to " bring him a letter, informing him that the Roman " Pontiff was ſtill living. This was a moſt admira- " ble device, to deceive a covetous man merely by " his own covetouſneſs." In this paſſage it is not Francis I. who tricked his Chancellor out of money, but another King, father to Francis. Now, as the father of Francis I. was not a King, we muſt ſuppoſe that Melanchthon ſpeaks of Henry II. father of Francis II. but can Francis I. be denoted by the name of Francis, without any other numerical diſtinction? Manlius did not do honour to his maſter, to publiſh a relation in which the names of perſons are ſo imperfectly expreſſed. I leave it to the reader to conſider, how variouſly the three ſtories abovementioned have been told.

§ (*a*) In the margin (19) is cited Dom. p. fol. 171. an Author or book, which Bayle ſays he had not. The ſame ſtory is found in Alexander's *Joco-ſeria*, n. 34. Tom. I. of the Francfort edition 1615. It is there quoted from D. Pezelius, *Poſtill. Mel.* Part III. pag. 170. In all probability Cardinal Marcellus mentioned above is du Prat himſelf, of whom much the ſame ſtory is told; and whoſe Latin name *Pratellus*, perhaps in Melanchthon, was changed into Marcellus by the German bookſellers. REM. CRIT.

[*D*] *Some Authors relate, that he pretended to have the ſtrangury, in order to extricate himſelf from a dangerous affair.*] " On the other ſide, how many might " we name, whoſe lives were ſaved merely by their " being ſick, as antiently happened to Auguſtus? " And how many have eſcaped death, merely from " a ſuppoſition that, becauſe of their extreme infir- " mity they were very near it *? *Multorum mortem " diſtulit morbus, & ſaluti illis fuit videri perire.* Car- " dinal du Prat got releaſed out of priſon, in the " reign of Francis I. from the fear ſome perſons " were under leſt he ſhould die of a pretended " ſtrangury, by which he impoſed on his Phyſicians, " he drinking privately the urine he made. And " we ſaw a favourite of Henry III. act ſo well the " dying man, in order to keep off ſome impending " danger under Henry IV. that he ſince lived thirty " years under the late King, in perfect health (21)." I am almoſt of opinion, that La Mothe le Vayer miſtook one man for another. No Author, I believe, relates that our du Prat was impriſoned; but it is related *that Cardinal de la Balue drank his own urine, in order that Lewis XI. upon the ſuppoſition that he had the ſtrangury, might ſet him at liberty* (22). Theſe are La Mothe le Vayer's words. He quotes the life of Lewis XI. written by Peter Matthieu, which quotation is exact (23). And though it may happen, that two Miniſters of State may employ, at different times, the ſame ſtratagem to ward off an impending evil; I yet am of opinion that the two ſtories related by that Author are not true: it is much more probable, that he confounded times and perſons. Many other writers have done this, and will do it hereafter.

[*E*] *It is not probable, that he was ſo very ignorant of the Latin tongue as Jonſton affirms.*] This Author wrote a little piece, entitled, *Naturæ conſtantia*, wherein he endeavours to prove that the world does not grow worſe. Among other inſtances of the ignorance of paſt ages, he mentions our du Prat, who imagined that *moloſſus* ſignified a mule; and that a mule, in Latin was *muletus*. *Placet hic adjicere*, ſays he (24), *& exemplum* du Prat *Epiſcopi & Cancellarii Galliæ; qui cum in literis ab Henrico VIII. Angliæ Rege ad Franciſcum I. Galliarum Regem ſcriptis, iſta verba*, Mitto tibi duodecim moloſſos, *offendiſſet, mulos per moloſſos intelligi exiſtimabit; & poſt animadverſo errore, moloſſos ſe pro* muletis *accepiſſe, duplicata inſcitia ſubjunxit.* I am to obſerve, that Jonſton quotes no perſon, though, on other occaſions, when he ſpeaks of the moſt trifling particulars, he cites with great accuracy the book whence he borrows. Some perſons aſcribe this ſlander to Beza. Read what follows. " The ſame may perhaps happen with reſpect to " Cardinal de Birague's ignorance, as of that of " Cardinal du Prat, who as Beza relates, when King " Francis I. had received from Henry VIII. a dozen " of Engliſh maſtiffs (it being *duodecim moloſſos* in the " letter) he aſked him for one of the *mules* which " he had received from that country; and the King " himſelf telling him that they were maſtiffs, he " excuſed

* *Sen. Epiſt.* 79.

(18) Jeremie de Pours, *Divine Melodie du Saint Pſalmiſte*, lib. 5. p. 1090.

(19) He quotes *Dom.* p. 3. folio 171.

(20) Joannes Manlius, *in Locorum communium Collectanies ex Lectionibus Philippi Melanchthonis excerptis*, p. 175. edit. Franc. 1568. This book might, in ſome meaſure, be intitled *Melanchthoniana.*

(21) La Mothe le Vayer, *Diſcours de la Sante & de la Maladie*, in Tom. 8. of his works, p. 185, 186.

(22) La Mothe le Vayer, *Lettre* 42. Tom. 10. of his works, p. 319.

(23) Here follow the words of Peter Matthieu, book 10. num. 3. p. m. 524. *He uſed to piſs, and then drank his urine ſo ſecretly, that it was thought he would die of the Strangury. The King gives order for the Phyſicians to viſit him, and they give him over, &c.*

(24) Jo. Jonſtonus, *de Naturæ conſtantia*, p. 73. edit. Amſtel. 1632.

has been obſerved, that he was a great lover of the fleſh of young aſſes [*F*], and made others love it.

He was a violent perſecutor of the Proteſtants, ſome of whom declare, that, as a puniſhment from God, he died mad [*G*]. A famous Hiſtoriographer ſuppoſes, that he was dreadfully tortured by remorſe, from a conſciouſneſs of his having introduced innovations whereby the people were grievouſly oppreſſed (*a*). Here follows the epitaph that Beza made upon him, the wit of which turns upon his corpulence. *Antonio Pratenſi, Cancellario Galliarum, inter obeſos obeſiſſimo. Ampliſſimus vir hic jacet* (*b*). [" Where " Bayle obſerves, that *it is agreed* that Chancellor du Prat *was a man of great abilities, " but not that he was an honeſt man*, he ſhould have called to mind the law-maxim which " he himſelf admits, (*Politian, n.* 11.) *Quilibet preſumitur bonus, donec probetur malus.* " (Every man is ſuppoſed to be honeſt till he is proved otherwiſe.) Bayle, in the note " [*A*], quotes ſeveral paſſages from an obſcure Janſeniſt, *&c.* But is even one of thoſe " Writers juſtly unexceptionable? Might we not oppoſe to theſe teſtimonies thoſe of " ſeveral Writers, who declare Chancellor du Prat to have been a man of great probity. " The Calviniſts inveighed againſt him, becauſe he was ſo zealous a Catholic. The " advocates for Janſenius have written with great virulence againſt him, becauſe he had, " anticipately (if I may uſe that expreſſion) condemned their doctrine: and the enemies " to the Concordate acted in the ſame manner merely out of animoſity, *&c.* *"] The Proteſtant Reader will obſerve, that this paſſage, copied from the remarks added to the Paris Edition of Bayle's Dictionary, is written by a Roman Catholic, who does not enforce his criticiſms by one ſingle authority. Rem. by the Tranſl.

(*a*) Mezerai, *Abrege Chronol.* Tom. 4. p. m. 584. ad ann. 1535.

(*b*) Beza, *Poem.* p. 94. edit. *tert.*

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 978. col. 1.

" As " excuſed himſelf with ſaying that he imagined he " had heard it read *duodecim muletos*. But after all, " Mr. Auberi, who has writ a very faithful and ac- " curate hiſtory of the Cardinals *, ſhews, that this " ignorance, which Beza aſcribes to du Prat, is a di- " rect calumny; and proves it very clearly by the " teſtimony of Feron, who calls him a very learned " and famous Civilian; of Sadoletus, who made " choice of him to be the cenſor of his Latin works; " and of Auton, who applauds the very eloquent La- " tin ſpeech he made to the Emperor Maximilian " (25)."

* Tom. 3. p. 355.

(25) Naudé, *Dialogue de Maſcurat*, p. 426. See alſo Father Garaſſe, p. 641, of *la Doctrine Curieuſe*.

I do not know whether Beza ſpeaks of this in ſome of his works; but am ſure that this ſtory is related at length in a book of Henry Stephens (26).

[*F*] *It has been obſerved, that he was a great lover of the fleſh of young aſſes.*] In this he reſembled Mecænas, who firſt brought that kind of food into vogue. *Pullos earum* (aſinarum) *epulari primus Mecænas inſtituit, multum eo tempore prælatos onagris: poſt eum interiit auctoritas ſaporis* (27). But after Mecænas's death, people no longer reliſhed the fleſh of young aſſes, ſo that it fell to its former price. Meibomius obſerves, that the ſame riſing and falling happened in the time of Anthony du Prat (28). *Simile quid de* Antonio Pratenſe, *Galliæ Cancellario refert Johannes Bruyerinus. lib.* XXIII. *de re cibaria, cap.* XX. *Ætate noſtra, inquit*, Antonius Pratenſis, Galliæ Cancellarius, imitator exſtitit Mecænatis in eo genere eſcæ *(carnis nempe aſininæ)* quàm avidiſſimus; verum & cum ipſo gratia quoque illius carnis ſepulta eſt (29). As the work in queſtion of Meibomius is pretty ſcarce, I flatter myſelf that it will not be taken amiſs, if I obſerve, that there are, in that book, ſeveral examples of the ſlavery to which men reduce themſelves, with regard to their palates. Many will alſo be very well pleaſed to read the incident themſelves here, which ſhews, that men, out of flattery, bring their palates into ſlavery; and that a favourite has credit enough, not only to bring into faſhion ſuch dreſſes as they themſelves are pleaſed with, but alſo ſuch aliments as they reliſh (30). *Potuit vero* (Mecænas) *& gulæ tantum aut peculiaris ſibi appetitus gratia cibo iſto veſci cœpiſſe familiarius: quem deinde ob ipſius auctoritatem alii, quaſi aſſentatione quadam, cariorem & in pretio habuere, donec ab obitu Mecænatis rurſum vileſceret, quod uſu venire in ejuſmodi rebus fere ſolet. Sic* acipenſerem *Plinius refert, lib.* IX. *cap.* XVII. *nullo in honore fuiſſe ſuo, id eſt, Trajani tempore: quem tamen Serenus Sammonicus apud Macrobium Saturn. lib.* III. *cap.* XVI. *docet, tum apud antiquos fuiſſe in pretio, tum poſt Plinium ſuo ævo gratiam ejus ad epulas quaſi poſtliminio rediiſſe. Sic Horatius* rhombum & ciconiam *nullo in cibis uſu fuiſſe ſcribit, antequam id docuiſſet vir prætorius, ſive is fuerit, dubitantibus Acrone & Porphyrione, Aſellius, ſive Rufus, aut Sempronius. Et addit*, mergos, *vile alias cibi genus, ſi quis aſſos dixerit futuros ſuaves, juventutem Romanam pravi docilem id facile crediturum. Verſus ſunt Serm. lib.* II. *Sat.* II.

Tutus erat rhombus, tutoque ciconia nido,
Donec vos auctor docuit prætorius. Ergo
Si quis nunc mergos ſuaveis edixerit aſſos,
Parebit pravi docilis Romana juventus.

Nec diſſimile quid contigit ſuperiori ſeculo Romæ. De Hadriano VI. *enim Pontif. Max. narrat Paulus Jovius* (31), &c. i. e. " Poſſibly Mecænas might eat often of " that diſh, becauſe he had a particular gout for it; " and that others might ſeem to diſcover a fondneſs " for it, out of flattery to him; till at laſt, after " Mecænas's death, it again ſunk to no value, as com- " monly happens to things of this kind. Thus Pliny, " book 9. chap. 17. relates, that in his time (under " the Emperor Trajan) ſturgeons were not eſteemed; " which nevertheleſs Serenius Sammonicus, book 3. " cap. 16. of Macrobius, informs us was greatly " reliſhed by the antients, and in his time, (which " was after that of Pliny) it regained as it were its " place in entertainments. Thus Horace relates, that " the turbot and ſtork were never introduced in them, " till a perſon of diſtinction brought them into vogue, " whether this was Aſinius, Rufus, or Sempronius; " Acron and Porphyry being in doubt about that " circumſtance. He adds that, ſhould any perſon " ſay that coots, though ſo inſipid a diſh, would be " a tid-bit when roaſted; the Roman youth are ſo " credulous that they would eaſily believe ſo. Ho- " race's verſes, in Satyr II. Book II. are as follow:

" Safe ſwam the turbot, ſafe the ſtork could reſt,
" Unclaim'd by nicer palates, in her neſt,
" Till a rich glutton ſerv'd them at his feaſt.
" Nay, were it ſaid, a cormorant when ſtew'd,
" Becomes, by dreſſing, moſt delicious food,
" The youth of Rome their taſte would thence re-
" fine,
" And each young Lord upon a cormorant dine.

" ſomething like this was ſeen at Rome in the laſt " age: Paulus Jovius relating as follows of Hadrian " VI. &c."

(30) Meibomius, *in Vita Mecænatis*, cap. 26. p. 165, 166.

(31) Meibomius relates, in this place, what I cited in the rem. [*R*] of the art. HADRIAN VI.

[*G*] *Some . . . . declare that, as a puniſhment from God, he died mad.*] Henry Stephens, ſpeaking of a Lieutenant Criminal, who *died diſtracted, after having ſeveral times denied and blaſphemed* God, adds (32). " Chancellor du Prat (the Legate) met with the like " ſad fate, notwithſtanding his noble hoſpital, *(Hotel " Dieu)* of which Francis I. uſed to ſay, that it was " not large enough to lodge all thoſe whom du Prat " had reduced to a ſtate of poverty. He died at his " country-ſeat at Nantouillet; his ſtomach being " eaten by worms, during which he vented blaſphe- " mies againſt God, being extremely impatient,

(32) Henry Stephens, *Apologie d'Herodote*, chap. 26. p. 310.

" As to Bayle's ſaying, that Chancellor du Prat . . *is blamed among other things, for the* " *Concordate*, &c. What proof has he that this Chancellor cauſed this Concordate to be " made, and that it was in his power to get it made, or to prevent it. Were we to " reckon up thoſe who are for and againſt the Concordate, I am perſuaded that many " more will be found who approve, than cenſure it : and therefore when Bayle ſays that " du Prat *is blamed for it*, &c. he alſo might as juſtly have ſaid that *he is applauded for* " *it*, &c. The Concordate, with regard to the nomination to Biſhopricks and Abbies, " is one of thoſe particulars about which many things are ſaid pro and con, *&c.* If we " conſider it only with reſpect to abuſes, I believe it cannot poſſibly be denied, but that " elections occaſioned many more intrigues, greater ſimony, and other abuſes, than are " found in nominations, as ſettled by the Concordate *."

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. *ubi ſupra.*

" cauſed by the grievous pain he felt ; and likewiſe " (as ſome relate) from the vexation he felt, to ſee " his coffers ſealing up, which extorted the following " words from him ; Behold what it is to ſerve a " King both with body and ſoul ! This du Prat was " the firſt who thought it requiſite that the Parlia- " ment ſhould take cognizance of hereſies, becauſe " (as he ſaid) they are intermixed with blaſphemy. " He alſo iſſued out the firſt commiſſions for putting " to death all ſuch as oppoſed the Romiſh Church, " after being quite tired out with the dilatorineſs of " Berquin's trial." [*It is ſurprizing Bayle did not obſerve, that Henry Stephens is greatly miſtaken, in applying to Chancellor du Prat, what was ſaid of Rollin or Roulin, Chancellor of Burgundy, concerning the Hoſpital of Beaune which he cauſed to be built in* 1443 *.

* From the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 978. col. 1.

PRÆTEXTATUS (PAPYRIUS), made himſelf famous at Rome in his childhood, by his keeping a ſecret which his mother would fain have extorted from him. This is mentioned in the Supplement to Moreri, but the Author of that ſtory has left out all the wit of it, for which reaſon I think it incumbent on me to relate it more faithfully [*A*]. I ſhall even point out the Author of that ſtory a little better than the Writer of that Supplement has done ; a circumſtance that is of ſome importance on the preſent occaſion [*B*].

PRICE

[*A*] *To relate it more faithfully.*] The Senate not having an opportunity to conclude an affair of great importance, which had been under debate, put it off till next day, and ordered it to be kept ſecret till ſuch time as the decree ſhould be paſt. Young Papyrius, who, according to the cuſtom of thoſe times, had followed his father into the Senate, was aſked by his mother what matters had been tranſacted in the Senate. The youth anſwered, that he was ſtrongly exhorted not to reveal it, and conſequently that he ought to be ſilent on that head. This anſwer excited the Lady's curioſity the more, which prompted her to importune her ſon ſtill more ; ſo that he was forced to tell an untruth, in order that he might be no longer teazed, and not diſobey the order of the Senate. He told his mother, that the following queſtion had been debated in the Senate, whether it would be more important to the ſtate, for one huſband to have two wives, or one wife two huſbands. The Lady being ſurprized at what ſhe heard, flew out of the houſe in order to alarm the reſt of the married women ; ſo that, the next day, a great crowd of them came to the door of the Senate, and with tears in their eyes, humbly begged that the decree might paſs for one woman to have two huſbands, rather than one man two wives. The Senators could not gueſs the reaſon, why the women in queſtion were crowding together and making ſuch an uproar ; but young Papyrius explained the affair to them, by informing them how he had been reduced to the neceſſity of eluding his mother's curioſity. The Senate admired him for it ; and it was ordered, that thenceforwards, no other youth but he ſhould be admitted into the Senate. Such is the origin of the word *Prætextatus* (1). We are obliged to Aulus Gellius for this relation, whoſe words I only borrow : *Secretum rei & ſilentium deberi puer affirmans animum ejus ad inquirendum everberat. Quærit igitur compreſſius violentiuſque. Tum puer, matre urgente, lepidi atque feſtivi mendacii conſilium capit. Actum in ſenatu dixit, utrum videretur utilius magiſque è republica eſſe, unuſne ut duas uxores haberet, an ut una apud duos nupta eſſet. Hoc illa ut audivit, animo compaveſcit : domo trepidans egreditur : ad cæteras matronas defert quod audierat. Perveniunt ad ſenatum poſtera die matrumfamilias caterva, lacrymantes atque obſecrantes orant una potius ut duobus nupta fieret, quàm ut uni duæ. Senatores ingredientes in curiam, quæ illa mulierum intemperies & quid ſibi poſtulatio iſthæc vellet, mirabantur. Puer Papirius in medium curiæ progreſſus, quid mater audire inſtitiſſet, quid ipſe matri dixiſſet, rem, ſicuti fuerat, denarrat. Senatus fidem atque ingenium pueri deoſculatus conſultum facit, ut poſthac pueri cum patribus in curiam ne introeant, niſi ille unus Papirius* (2). Macrobius has copied theſe particulars almoſt verbatim, but has added one circumſtance, which is not inſerted in Aulus Gellius. He relates that the Senators looked upon this bare-faced impudence of theſe women, as an ill-boding prodigy, which ſurprized them greatly (3).

(1) *Ei puero poſtea cognomentum honoris gratia inditum prætextatus, ob loquendi tacendique in ætate prætextata prudentiam.* Aulus Gellius, lib. 1. cap. 23.

(2) Idem, ibid.

(3) *Ut non parvæ rei prodigium illam verecundæ ſexus impudicam inſaniam paveſcebant.* Macrob. Saturn. lib. 1. cap. 6. p. m. 211.

The Author of the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary has made two miſtakes here. 1ſt, He ſuppoſes (4) that Papyrius told his mother, that the Senate had decreed that every man ſhould have two wives. But that Author ſhould have ſaid, that Papyrius pretended the Senate had debated, whether this would be more advantageous to the Commonwealth, than to decree that every wife ſhould have two huſbands. 2d, He ſuppoſes that the Roman Ladies in queſtion beſought *the Senate, that women might have the ſame prerogative, which had been granted the day before to men, and that every one of them might be permitted to marry two huſbands.* But this way of telling the ſtory makes it quite flat, and deprives it of all its beauty : nay, it makes theſe Ladies quite blind to their own intereſt; for what advantage could they reap by making ſuch a requeſt ? Is it not plain, that all things duly conſidered, ſhe would have been in a worſe condition than before, had every huſband had two wives, and every wife two huſbands ? The beſt thing they could have hoped for, would have been, to be upon the ſame terms as before ; for if every woman could ſay, *I have two huſbands*, ſhe alſo might ſay, *I ſhare them with another.* Are two halves more than a whole ? I am ſenſible that we may ſuppoſe ſeveral caſes, in which it would be advantageous to them ; but upon other accounts, and in ſeveral other caſes, which may eaſily be ſuppoſed, the diſadvantage would equal, and perhaps exceed the advantage.

(4) Under the word *Papyrius.*

[*B*] *I ſhall even point out the Author of that ſtory . . . a circumſtance that is of ſome importance on the preſent occaſion.*] Notwithſtanding the authority of Aulus Gellius, I yet ſhould think this ſtory a mere fiction ; but I cannot think ſo, when I reflect that it was ſpoke in an oration by grave Cato the Cenſor. In order, therefore, that the Reader may be the better enabled to form a judgment of this matter, it is not enough to inform him, that it is related by Macrobius (5). Such a Compiler as he is of ſmart ſayings and tales, does not deſerve much credit. Smart ſayings and pretty ſtories are frequently invented in an Author's ſtudy. The Inventors of them, not being willing to loſe their labour, ſpread them abroad ; and to make themſelves the merrier with them, and give them the

(5) In the Supplement to Moreri, Macrobius only is quoted.

PRICE (JOHN), called in Latin *Pricæus*, flouriſhed in the 17th Century. *He was born in England, and a man of vaſt learning and great judgment. After having travelled many years, he retired to Florence, and there turned Roman Catholic* (a). . . . *He died at Rome in* 1676 (b). He had publiſhed ſeveral books, in which he diſplayed a vaſt fund of erudition [*A*]. *He left behind him a Commentary on Pliny's Epiſtles, which will ſoon be*

(a) Colomiés, *Bibl. Choiſie*, p. 142. Amſt. edit. 1699.

(b) Ibid. p. 143.

the greater currency, they aſcribe them to certain places and perſons, accompanying them with all ſuch circumſtances as may make them appear moſt credible. When ſtories thus invented are of a diverting caſt, and give a handle for laughter, they take root in the memory, and are eaſily ſpread. Collections are made of theſe, which are frequently printed; but perſons of taſte and judgment content themſelves with applauding the wit (if any) in them, without taking them for matter of fact. Such is the judgment we are to form of ſeveral ſtories and witty conceits read in Macrobius. His authority therefore is not to be much depended upon with regard to the tumultuous aſſembly of the Roman Ladies. Aulus Gellius, whom he copied, deſerves more credit. He lived pretty near the time when this particular happened; but all thoſe, who content themſelves with quoting him on that occaſion, do not ſhew much judgment. Cato ought to be cited, that Author having borrowed this ſtory from Cato. He does not quote the very words of that Cenſor, he not having the original at that time, but then he gives the ſenſe of it. *Hiſtoria*, ſays he (6), *de Papirio Prætextato dicta ſcriptaque eſt à M. Catone in oratione, qua uſus eſt ad milites contra Galbam, cum multa quidem venuſtate atque luce atque munditia verborum. Ea Catonis verba huic prorſus commentario indidiſſem, ſi libri copia fuiſſet id temporis, quum hæc dictavi. Quòd ſi non virtutes dignitateſque verborum, ſed rem ipſam ſcire quæris, fermè ad hunc modum eſt.* i. e. " This ſtory, relating to Papyrius Prætextatus, is told " by M. Cato, in a clear and elegant ſpeech made by " him againſt Galba. I ſhould have copied Cato's " words in this Commentary, had I poſſeſſed the " original at the time when I wrote it. But if you " are deſirous of reading the ſtory itſelf, abſtracted " from all the graces of diction, it is as follows." It is ſomewhat probable that this adventure is true, ſince a man of ſo much dignity as Cato (that is ſaying all in one word) told it in an oration that was publiſhed. I am not inſenſible that the Cenſor in queſtion uſed to joke now and then (7); but at ſuch a time, and on ſuch an occaſion, a perſon of his character would not have joked. It may perhaps be objected to me that Livy, who does not omit another tumult raiſed by the Roman Ladies, takes no notice of this; but this objection may be eaſily anſwered, by ſaying that it perhaps was mentioned in thoſe books of his hiſtory which are loſt. I ſhall obſerve, by the way, that the other tumult was raiſed on occaſion of the law which forbid women the uſe of ornaments in their apparel. There was a deſign to ſuppreſs it. Some Tribunes were for having it continue in force, whilſt others required it to be annulled. Our Cato, who was Conſul that year (8), made a ſtrong ſpeech (9) in defenſe of that law; and againſt the liberty which the women had taken of crowding together, and making an uproar in every ſtreet: nevertheleſs the law was annulled. The Tribunes who oppoſed this were obliged to ſubmit, upon ſeeing their houſes beſieged by theſe female mutineers (10). *Capitolium turba hominum faventium adverſantiumque legi complebatur. Matronæ, nulla nec auctoritate, nec vetecundia, nec imperio virorum, contineri limine poterant: omnes vias urbis, adituſque in forum obſidebant: viros deſcendentes ad forum orantes, ut florente republica, creſcente indies privata omnium fortuna, matronis quoque priſtinum ornatum reddi paterentur. Augebatur hæc frequentia mulierum indies; nam etiam ex oppidis conciliabuliſque convenerant. Jam & conſules prætoreſque, & alios magiſtratus adire & rogare audebant. Cæterum minime exorabilem alterum utique conſulem M. Porcium Catonem habebant; qui pro lege, quæ abrogabatur, ita diſſeruit. . . . . (11). Hæc quum contra legem proque lege dicta eſſent, aliquanto major frequentia mulierum poſtero die ſeſe in publicum effudit, unoque agmine omnes tribunorum* (12) *januas obſederunt, qui collegarum rogationi intercedebant: nec ante abſtiterunt, quam remiſſa interceſſio ab tribunis eſſet. Nulla deinde dubitatio fuit, quin omnes tribus legem abrogarent, anno vigeſimo poſt abrogata eſt, quam lata.* i. e. " The capi- " tol was quite filled with people who favoured and " oppoſed the law. The married women could not " be kept at home, either by authority, by modeſ- " ty, or the power of their huſbands. They crowded " every ſtreet, and thoſe which led to the Forum; " beſeeching all ſuch Senators as paſſed that way, " that as the Commonwealth was in ſo rich and daily- " flouriſhing a condition, they would pleaſe to " permit the married women to be adorned as for- " merly. Theſe crowds of women increaſed per- " petually by the great numbers who flocked to them " from towns and factious places. They now were " ſo bold as to go and petition the Conſuls, Prætors, " and other Magiſtrates. However, M. Porcius Ca- " to, the other Conſul, was no ways to be moved in " their favour; but ſpoke as follows for the law " which was going to be annulled. . . . . Theſe " things being ſaid in favour of, and againſt the " law, a ſtill greater concourſe of women was ſeen " in the ſtreets; and they beſieged, in a body, the " doors of all ſuch Tribunes as oppoſed the motion " of their Collegues; nor could be prevailed upon to " depart, till thoſe Tribunes had given their words " to ceaſe their oppoſition. Upon this the law, twen- " ty years after its being enacted, was annulled by all " the tribes."

(6) Aulus Gellius, lib. 1. cap. 23.

(7) See Balzac, *Oeuvres diverſes*, in the *Diſcours de la Converſation des Romains*, p. m. 49. I quoted his words in citat. (77) of the article PORCIUS.

(8) This was the year of Rome 558.

(9) See his ſpeech in the beginning of Livy's 34th book.

(10) Livy, lib. 34. *init.* p. m. 621.

(11) Idem, Ibid.

(12) *i. e.* of Marcus and Publius Brutus, Tribunes of the people, who oppoſed the motion made by their Collegues, viz. of having the law *Oppia* repealed.

I alſo will obſerve by the way, that ſo many errors are committed in the way of citing Authors, that it would be proper to lay down ſome rules on that head. The moſt inconſiderable things may be brought into a method or art; and if this was done with regard to the citing of Authors, it would put a ſtop to ſome abuſes. In laying down theſe rules, I wiſh notice was taken how far Authors might extend the liberty of adding ſome particulars of their own, to the particulars related by them. The Reader has ſeen in what manner Macrobius enlarges a litte the ſtory told by Aulus Gellius. A Spaniſh Jeſuit has enlarged it much more; he affirming, that on the day in queſtion, the Senators came later than uſual from the Aſſembly, and that this was the reaſon why Papyrius's mother aſked what affair had employed the Senate ſo long. *Como el negocio era peſado, y los votos no ſe concertavan, ſalieron aquel dia los Senadores algo mas tarde de ſu conſejo de lo que ſolian: lo qual fue occaſion para que la madre del Papyrio le preguntaſſe, porque cauſa ſe havian detenido tanto en el Senado* (13). He ſuppoſes that young Papyrius anſwered his mother, that the affair which had been debated upon was to be kept in the deepeſt ſecrecy, till it ſhould be determined another day. Now theſe circumſtances are not mentioned either by Aulus Gellius or Macrobius. However, I believe, that if there is any fault in advancing them, it is very inconſiderable; and I take the Spaniſh Author to be more inexcuſable, for quoting, not only the two antient Authors abovementioned, but likewiſe Alexander ab Alexandro, Volaterranus, and Charles Stephens.

A REMARK with reſpect to the manner of quoting Authors.

(13) Juan de Torres, *primera Parte de la Philoſophia Moral de Principes*, lib. 1. p. 59. Barcelona edit. 1598.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books, in which he diſplayed a vaſt fund of erudition.*] He publiſhed at Paris in 1635, A defenſe for or apology of Apuleius, with notes in 4to. and in 1646 *Annotationes in Evangelium Matthæi*, in 4to. & *Annotationes ad Epiſtolam Jacobi*, in 8vo. and in 1647 *Acta Apoſtolorum ex Scriptura, Patribus, Græciſque ac Latinis Scriptoribus illuſtrata*, in 8vo. His notes *in Pſalmos & in pleroſque alios Libros Novi Teſtamenti*, were printed at London in 1660. folio. His Commentary on Apuleius's Metamorphoſes was printed at Tergou in 1650, 8vo. " He deſigned " to reprint his apology for Apuleius, with the ad- " dition of a great number of notes; to publiſh Au- " lus Gellius, on whom he had writ many remarks; " Avienus *de oris maritimis*, and ſome corrections upon " Heſychius, the index of which he had annexed " to the Metamorphoſes of Apuleius; I mean the " index of the Authors mentioned by Heſychius: but " his

be ſent to preſs (*c*). He had been applauded by perſons of very great learning [*B*]. He reſided ſome years in Paris, and even publiſhed ſome books there; but did not leave it till the year 1646, when he returned to England (*d*). Sarrau (Sarravius) declares, that he had reaſon to leave France in anger (*e*). This Author ſays alſo, that he deſerved juſtly to be admired on account of his learning, and the patience and conſtancy with which he ſuſtained adverſe fortune (*f*).

(*c*) Colomiés, &c. ibid.

(*d*) Sarravius, *Epiſt.* 169. p. 173.

(*e*) *Ille in Angliam heri repatriavit erga Galliam noſtram peſſime, nec immerito, animatus.* Idem, ib.

(*f*) Idem, *Epiſt.* 157. p. 162.

" his ſight growing very weak, he ſays ſomewhere in " his notes, that he did not think he ſhould be able " to finiſh his pieces (1)." This Author's notes on the golden aſs, or Apuleius's Metamorphoſes, are ſo copious, that the text takes up only 262 pages, whereas the notes fill 734 pages, and are in a ſmaller letter than the text. The Author declares, that he intended to introduce ſome exact and new particulars into his notes, which was no very eaſy matter, as ſo many Commentators had writ before him (2). He adds, that he therein obſerves what Apuleius had borrowed from Tacitus, Suetonius, Saluſt, from Virgil chiefly, and from other Writers; and thoſe particulars which Ammianus Marcellinus, Sidonius, St. Jerom, and St. Auſtin, had borrowed from him; that he had been particularly careful to publiſh the text as near the original as he could poſſibly; and had endeavoured, in near 300 places, to reſtore the true reading merely by conjecture. He informs us, that he had made uſe of but one manuſcript, which was that he had preſented to the Archbiſhop of Canterbury, and which this Prelate had beſtowed on the Bodleian library. He had had Colvius's edition with Caſaubon's notes, written in his own hand, and the edition of Vicenza printed in 1488. He looks upon it as the moſt antient edition next to that of Rome of 1472; and he often chooſes to follow it rather than the later editions. There are two antient editions of Apuleius not taken notice of by Fabricius (3). The oldeſt taken notice of by him is that of Venice 1493.

(1) Colomiés, *Bibl. Choiſie*, p. 142. Amſt. edit. 1699.

(2) *Dedimus operam ut & appoſita & nova afferemus: rem poſt tot alios haud adeo in proclivi ſitam.* Jo. Pricæus, *in Præfat.*

(3) John Alberto Fabricius, *in Bibl. Lat.* p. 137.

[*B*] *He has been applauded by perſons of very great learning.*] " Price is praiſed by Sarravius, in his let- " ters; by Archbiſhop Uſher on St. Ignatius's epiſ- " tles; by Heinſius, in an epiſtle to Carlo Dati; " by Selden more than once, in the ſecond book *de* " *Synedriis Ebræorum*; by Voſſius, in his *Harmonia* " *Evangelica*; by Morus, in his notes on the New " Teſtament; by Redi, in his treatiſe on the Genera- " tion of Inſects; but eſpecially by Axenius on Phœ- " drus (4)." Sarravius obſerves, that Price complained of his having been treated with contempt by Salmaſius; but, to pacify him, Sarravius gave him a copy of one of Salmaſius's works: *Unicum quod ſupererat* (exemplar) *donavi doctiſſimo viro tuique ſtudioſiſſimo Jo. Priceo, ut eum placarem aliquo modo conquerentem, quod in Miſcellis Defenſionibus contemptim a te eſſet habitus* (5).

(4) Colomiés, *Bibl. Choiſie*, p. 143, 144.

(5) Sarravius, *Epiſt.* 144. p. 150.

PRIDEAUX (JOHN), Biſhop of Wincheſter, and a very great Divine, was born in 1578, at Stafford, a town in Devonſhire. In 1596 he was admitted into Exeter College in Oxford, were he improved greatly in his ſtudies in a very ſhort time. His vigorous conſtitution enabled him to apply himſelf very intenſely to his ſtudies, and his happy memory made him reap ſpeedily the fruit of his labours. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his ſubtlety in diſputing, and was choſen Fellow of the above-mentioned College in 1602. He ſucceeded Dr. Holland in the maſterſhip of that College, and took his Degree of Doctor of Divinity. He was appointed Regius Profeſſor of Divinity upon Dr. Abbot's being promoted to the See of Saliſbury. He behaved in his maſterſhip with ſo much prudence, and his carriage was ſo engaging, that he drew a very great number of ſtudents to his College; and they made ſo great an improvement by his wiſe counſels and his judicious choice of tutors, that many of them were able to ſerve both the Church and State, and were the ornament of them. He exerciſed his employment thirty two years or thereabouts. He was no leſs careful to diſcharge the duties of his other employment, I mean, his Profeſſorſhip of Divinity. He therein gained great reputation by his learning; and his inviolable attachment to the King and the Church of England. He continued in that Profeſſorſhip a little above twenty ſeven years. He was five times Vice-Chancellor of the Univerſity of Oxford, and was nominated Biſhop of Wincheſter in 1641. He died the 29th of July 1650, aged ſeventy two years (*a*). He publiſhed ſeveral works [*A*]. It may not be neceſſary to inform my readers, that he muſt not be miſtaken for another PRIDEAUX [*B*] who publiſhed a ſecond edition

(*a*) Extracted from Paul Freherus, *Theatre* p. 550. He quotes Wood's *Antiq. Univerſit. Oxon.*

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral works.*] He publiſhed an apology for Caſaubon, *contra Andream Eudæmon-Johannem*, printed at Oxford in 1614, 8vo. His *Hypomnemata Logica, Rhetorica, Phyſica, tyrocinium ad ſyllogiſmum legitimum contexendum, &c. Heptades Logicæ, &c.* were printed in the ſame city, as likewiſe *Lectiones decem in totidem Religionis capita: Lectiones* 22, *Orationes* 13, *Conciones* 6, *& Oratio ad Jacobum Regem: Orationes* 9, *in inaugurales in promotione Doctorum: Faſciculus Controverſiarum Theologicarum: Theologiæ Scholaſticæ Syntagma, & Conciliorum Synopſis: Manuductio ad Theologiam Polemicam: Iſagoge ad omnigenæ Hiſtoriæ lectionem*, and ſeveral more. I take no notice of his Engliſh works.

[*B*] *Another* PRIDEAUX . . . *publiſhed a ſecond edition of* the Marmora Arundelliana.] His Chriſtian name is Humphrey, and he ſtyles himſelf *ædis Chriſti alumnus*. He has ſhewn a great deal of learning in the work publiſhed by him at Oxford in 1676, folio, under the title of *Marmora Oxonienſia ex Arundellianis, Seldenianis, aliiſque conflata*. He has inſerted in this work in queſtion that which Selden publiſhed in London in 1628, and which under the title of *Marmora Arundelliana*, contained an explication of part of the marbles which the Earl of Arundel ſent for from the Levant. Prideaux likewiſe inſerted ſome of the notes which Lydyat had writ on ſome of thoſe marbles; but what he wrote of his own forms the moſt conſiderable part of the work; he having reviſed and illuſtrated with notes, *recenſuit & perpetuo Commentario explicavit*, not only the inſcriptions of the Earl of Arundel's marbles, but alſo thoſe of ſeveral other monuments of the ſame kind which have been given to the Univerſity of Oxford. It muſt be obſerved, that Selden had explained the inſcriptions of only twenty nine Greek marbles, and ten Latin ones. He ſelected ſuch of them as he thought the principal, from among a very great number; I ſay, a very great number; there being 250 Arundelian marbles. They were carried to London in 1627, placed in the gardens of Arundel Houſe. Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, had been at great pains and expence to procure them, he having ſent Mr. William Petty, a very learned Gentleman, into the Levant for that purpoſe. *Ea* (marmora) *illuſtriſſimus Comes, dum in Italia degerat, (quæ ei altera patria erat) ex antiquarum Aſiæ, Græciæ, & Italiæ urbium ruinis, operâ Doctiſſimi viri Gulielmi Pettæi in hac re uſus, ſummis impenſis conquiſivit. Græcorum pleraque è Smyrna habuit, ei ibi* * *Gaſſendus (ſi fides ipſi*

* *In Vita* Peireſkii, lib. 4. ad ann. 1629.

edition of the *Marmora Arundelliana.*

ipſi hac in re habenda ſit) narrat operâ Peireſkii ſui primo detecta erutaque fuiſſe, perſolutis quinquaginta Aureis per Sampſonem quendam illius negotia Smyrnæ procurantem ; ſed cum inde convehenda eſſent, Turcarum fraude Sampſone in carcerem conjecto, ibi detenta erant, donec ea illuſtriſſimus Arundelliæ Comes majori pretio per Pettæum redempta cum aliis, quæ per eundem procuratorem collegerat, Londinum in hortos Palatii Arundelliani, anno Dom. noſtri 1627 *curavit tranferenda* (1). i. e. " The moſt illuſtrious Earl, during his abode in " Italy, which he was extremely fond of, procured " thoſe marbles, at a vaſt expence, taken out of the " ruins of the antient cities of Aſia, Greece, and " Italy ; on which occaſion he was aſſiſted by the " very learned Mr. William Petty. He got the " greateſt part of the Greek marbles from Smyrna ; " Gaſſendus, (if he may be credited) informs us, " that they were firſt diſcovered there, and dug up, " by the care of his friend Peireſk, who got one " Sampſon (a perſon that managed his affairs in the " above-mentioned city, to pay fifty piſtoles for them. " But when they were to be conveyed from thence, " Samſon being impriſoned by the treachery of the " Turks, the marbles in queſtion were detained " there, till the illuſtrious Earl of Arundel having " redeemed them, with ſome others, which the " ſame perſon had procured him at a higher price ; " ſent them to the gardens of Arundel Houſe in " 1627." The Lord Henry Howard, his grandſon, gave them to the Univerſity of Oxford, which prompted ſuch perſons as poſſeſſed the ſame kind of marbles to devote them to the ſame place. *Quæcunque Vir immortalitate digniſſimus Thomas Arundelliæ Comes, legatione quaſi ſolenni eam ob rem inſtitutâ, infinitis impenſis, & repetito ſæpius capitis periculo eruditiſſimi Viri Gulielmi Pettæi, cui procuratio ea demandabatur, Europâ Aſiâque excuſſis, in Britannias noſtras deduxerat, Nepos ejuſdem tanto Avo non inficiandus, æternitati & Muſis hic loci demum conſecrabat : reliquiſque quotquot fuere eruditæ antiquitatis Patronis autor extitit, ut ad tanti Auſpicis morem, quæcunque apud ſe laterent ex temporum naufragio Tabulæ, ibidem appenderent* (2). i. e. " The grandſon of the immortal Thomas Earl of " Arundel, a man highly deſerving ſuch an uncle, " gave to this ſeat of the muſes (our Univerſity) all " the marbles the Earl had procured of this kind. " He had collected them, at an infinite expence, and " at the frequent hazard of the life of the moſt " learned Mr. William Petty, who got them from " all parts of Europe and Aſia, and brought them " into England. The noble Donor was imitated in " this particular, by all the patrons of antient learn- " ing ; they depoſiting in the ſame Muſæum all the " like monuments they poſſeſſed which had eſcaped " the dire ſhipwreck of time." The reader muſt not be miſled by the firſt word of this paſſage, which implies, that the grandſon beſtowed on the Univerſity of Oxford all the marbles which his grandfather had brought to London ; but this is not true, he not beſtowing ſcarce above half of them ; the reſt being unhappily loſt, after that Arundel Houſe had been abandoned by the owners, in the time of the Civil Wars, during which they were forced to go into baniſhment. Dr. Prideaux informs us of this in his preface ; ſo that his miſtake may be corrected by his own words (3). *Arundelliana* (marmora) *plura quam centum & triginta numerantur ; hæc tamen vix ultra dimidiam partem eorum conficiunt, quæ inſigniſſimus Arundelliæ Comes collegerat ; cætera, cùm tempore nuperrimi belli civilis incendii in hortis Arundellianis Londini, pulſis inde dominis, diu neglecta jacuerint, aut furtim ſurrepta, aut ſervorum negligentiâ corrupta, aut à Lapicidis* (4) *ad reficiendas ædes adhibita in magnum rei literariæ damnum amittuntur.* i. e. " There are upwards of one " hundred and thirty Arundelian marbles ; which " nevertheleſs are ſcarce above half of thoſe which " the moſt noble Earl had procured ; the reſt, during " the late Civil Wars, having lain long neglected, " in the gardens of Arundel Houſe at London, at " the time when the owners of it were driven away ; " were either ſtole, or defaced by the careleſsneſs of " ſervants, or employed by maſons in the repairing " of houſes, and ſo are loſt, to the great detriment " of learning." This ſhews that Vigneul Marville does not go upon a falſe report, when, after mentioning theſe Arundelian marbles, he adds ; " A de- " plorable circumſtance is, that during the troubles " in England, moſt of thoſe marbles were employed " in mending doors and repairing chimnies. This is " fine encouragement for the curious to put them- " ſelves to ſo much expence (5)." I could have expatiated ſtill more on the importance of theſe marbles, had I not called to mind that they form an article in the ſupplement to Moreri's Dictionary, and the *Journal des Sçavans*, of the 25th of April 1678. Humphrey Prideaux is alſo the Author of a Latin tranſlation of a tract of Maimonides, *De jure pauperis & peregrini apud Judæos*, printed with notes by him in Oxford, anno 1672, 4to. He alſo is Author of the life of Mahomet, cited by me ſo often in the article MECCA. I am told that he is a Canon of Norwich.

(1) Humphridus Prideaux, *Præf. ad Marmora Oxonienſia.*

(2) Idem, *Epiſt. Dedicator. init.*

(3) Idem, *in Præf.*

(4) The Author ſays, two pages after, that he had read all the inſcriptions of theſe marbles except one. This is a marble of which only the half is now remaining, and the letters of which are defaced ; the other half was employed by a maſon. *Altera à Lapicida quodam ad reficiendum focum in Palatio Arundelliano adhibita.*

(5) Vigneul Marville, *Melanges*, Tom. 2. p. 301, 302. Dutch edit. This Author has committed ſome errors in the titles of the Earl of Arundel, and his grandſon.

☞ PRIDEAUX (JOHN), a learned Engliſh Biſhop in the 17th Century, was born at Stowford in the Pariſh of Harford near Ivy-bridge in Devonſhire, on the 17th of Sept. 1578, and was the fourth of ſeven ſons of his father (*a*), who being in mean circumſtances, and having a great family, our Author, after he had learned to write and read, having a good voice, ſtood Candidate for the place of Pariſh Clerk of the Church of Ugborow near Harford [*A*] ; but being diſappointed, a Gentlewoman of the Pariſh, mother of Sir Edmund Towel, maintained him at ſchool till he had gained ſome knowledge of the Latin tongue, when he travelled to Oxford, and at firſt lived in a very mean ſtation in Exeter College, doing ſervile offices in the kitchen, and proſecuting his ſtudies at his leiſure hours, till at laſt he was taken notice of in the College, and admitted a Member of it in Act-Term 1596, under the tuition of Mr. Will. Helme, B. D. (*b*). January the 31ſt 1599 he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts (*c*), and in 1602 was choſen Probationer Fellow of his College (*d*). May the 11th 1603 he proceeded Maſter of Arts (*e*) ; and ſoon after entered into Holy Orders (*f*). May the 6th 1611 he took the Degree of Bachelor of Divinity (*g*) ; and the year following was elected Rector of his College in the room of Dr. Holland (*h*) ; and June the 10th the ſame year proceeded Doctor of Divinity (*i*). In 1615, upon the advancement of Dr. Robert Abbot to the Biſhoprick of Sarum, he was made Regius Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of Oxford ; by virtue of which place he became Canon of Chriſt Church, and Rector of Ewelme in Oxfordſhire (*k*) ; and afterwards diſcharged the Office of Vice-

(*a*) Prince's *Worthies of Devon*, p. 510.

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

(*c*) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 156. 2d edit.

(*d*) Prince, *ubi ſupra.*

(*e*) Wood, *ubi ſupra*, col. 165.

(*f*) Prince, *ubi ſupra.*

(*g*) Wood, *ubi ſupra*, col. 189.

(*h*) Prince, *ubi ſupra.*

(*i*) Wood, *ubi ſupra*, col. 192.

(*k*) Idem, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 130.

[*A*] *Stood Candidate for the place of Pariſh-Clerk of the Church of Ugborow near Harford.*] Mr. Prince tells us (1), that " he had a Competitor for the Office, " who had made great intereſt in the pariſh for him- " ſelf, and was likely to carry the place from him. " The Pariſhioners being divided in the matter, did " at length agree in this, being unwilling to diſ- " oblige either party, that the Lord's day following " ſhould

(1) *Worthies of Devon*, p. 510.

Vice Chancellor of the Univerſity for ſeveral years. He publiſhed ſeveral works [*B*]. In the Rectorſhip of his College he behaved himſelf in ſuch a manner, that it flouriſhed more than any other in the Univerſity, many foreigners coming thither for the benefit of his inſtruction. And in his Profeſſorſhip he exerted himſelf with great zeal againſt the Doctrines of the Socinians and Arminians. November the 22d 1641 he was elected to the Biſhoprick of Worceſter, to which he was conſecrated December the 19th following; but the troubles were at that time ſo far advanced, that he received little or no profit from it, to his great impoveriſhment. For adhering ſtedfaſtly to his Majeſty's cauſe, and pronouncing all thoſe of his Dioceſe, who took up arms againſt him, excommunicate, he was plundered, and reduced to ſuch ſtraights, that he was obliged to ſell his excellent library (*l*). He died of a fever at Bredon in Worceſterſhire, at the houſe of his ſon-in-law Dr. Henry Sutton, July the 20th 1650, leaving to his children no legacy but *pious poverty, God's bleſſing, and a father's prayers*, as appears from his laſt will and teſtament. His body was attended to the grave by perſons of all ranks and degrees, and was interred in the Chancel of the Church of Bredon (*m*). He was a man of very extenſive learning; and Nath. Carpenter (*n*) tells us, that "in him the heroical wits of "*Jewel*, *Rainolds*, and *Hooker*, as united into one, ſeemed to triumph anew, and to "have threatened a fatal blow to the Babyloniſh Hierarchy." He was extremely humble, and kept thoſe leathern breeches, in which he came to Oxford, in the ſame wardrobe, where he lodged his Rochet, in which he left that Univerſity (*o*). He was exemplary in his charity, and very agreeable in converſation. By his firſt wife, Mary, daughter of Dr. Taylor, burnt for the Proteſtant Religion in the reign of Queen Mary, he had ſeveral children, *viz.* *William*, a Colonel in the ſervice of King Charles I. and ſlain at the battle of Marſton-Moor in 1644; *Matthias*, a Captain in the army of that King, who died at London 1646; and three other ſons, who died in their infancy, and were buried in Exeter College; and two daughters, *viz.* *Sarah*, married to William Hodges, Archdeacon of Worceſter, and Rector of Ripple in Worceſterſhire; and *Elizabeth*, married to Dr. Henry Sutton, Rector of Bredon in Worceſterſhire. Our Author had for his ſecond wife, Mary, daughter of Sir Tho. Reynel of Weſt Ogwell in Devonſhire, Knight (*p*). Cleaveland the Poet wrote an Elogy upon his death.

(*l*) Idem, ibid. and Walker's *Attempt*, part 2. p. 78.

(*m*) Prince, p. 515.

(*n*) *Geography delineated*, lib. 2. c. 15.

(*o*) Lloyd's *Memoirs*, p. 536.

(*p*) Prince, p. 514, 515.

"ſhould be the day of trial; the one ſhould tune "the Pſalm in the forenoon, the other in the after-"noon; and he that did beſt pleaſe the people, "ſhould have the place. Which accordingly was "done, and *Prideaux* loſt it, to his very great grief "and trouble. Upon which, after he became ad-"vanced to one of the firſt dignities of the church, "he would frequently make this reflection, ſaying, "*If I could have been Clerk of* Ugborow, *I had never* "*been Biſhop of* Worceſter."

[*B*] *He publiſhed ſeveral works.*] 1. *Tabulæ ad Grammaticam Græcam introductoriæ.* Oxford 1608, in 4to. 2. *Tyrocinium ad Syllogiſmum contexendum.* 3. *Heptades Logicæ, ſive Monita ad ampliores Tractatus introductoria.* Theſe two laſt pieces were printed with the *Tabulæ ad Grammaticam Græcam*, &c. Mr. David Lloyd obſerves (2), that our Author's Greek Grammar and Logick were both but a fortnight's work. 4. *Caſtigatio cujuſdam Circulatoris, qui R. P. Andream Eudæmon-Johannem Cydonium ſoc. Jeſu ſeipſum nuncupat, oppoſita ipſius calumniis, in Epiſtola Iſaaci Caſauboni ad Frontonem Ducæum.* Oxford 1614, in 8vo. 5. *Alloquium ſereniſſ. Reg. Jacobo Woodſtochio habitum*, 24 *Aug.* 1624. In one ſheet in 4to. 6. *Orationes novem inaugurales de totidem Theologiæ apicibus, prout in promotione Doctorum Oxoniæ publicè proponebantur in Comitiis.* Oxford 1626, in 4to. 7. *Lectiones decem de totidem Religionis Capitibus, præcipuè hoc tempore controverſis, prout publicè habebantur Oxoniæ in Veſperiis.* Oxford 1625, in 4to. 8. *Lectiones* 22, *Orationes* 13, *Conciones* 6, & *Oratio ad Jacobum Regem.* Oxford 1648, in folio. Among which are contained the preceding lectures, orations, and ſpeeches to King James at Woodſtock. 9. *Concio ad Artium Baccalaureos pro more habita in Eccleſiâ B. Mariæ Oxon. in die Cinerum in Act.* ii. 22. *Ann.* 1616. 10. *Faſciculus Controverſiarum ad Juniorum aut occupatorum captum colligatus*, &c. Oxford 1649, 1651, in 4to. 11. *Theologiæ Scholaſticæ Syntagma Mnemonicum.* Oxford 1651. 12. *Conciliorum Synopſis*, printed with the *Faſciculus*. 13. *Epiſtola de Epiſcopatu*, in folio. 14. *Manuductio ad Theologiam Polemicam.* Oxford 1657, in 8vo. publiſhed by Mr. *Tho. Barlow*, afterwards Biſhop of Lincoln, with a Latin Epiſtle before it in the name of the Printer. 15. *Hypomnemata Logica, Rhetorica, Phyſica, Metaphyſica, &c.* Oxford, in 8vo. 16. Several Sermons, as 1. *A Sermon at the Conſecration of Exeter College Chapel*, on Luke xix. 46. Oxford 1625, in 4to. 2d. Perez Uzzah: *A Sermon before the King at Woodſtock*, on 1 Samuel vi. 6, 7. Oxford 1625, in 4to. Both theſe Sermons are printed with another volume, entitled, 17. *Twenty Sermons.* Oxford 1636, in 4to. The two firſt are entitled, *Chriſt's Counſel for ending Law-caſes*, dedicated to his kinſman *Edmund Prideaux*, Eſq; 18. *Nine Sermons on ſeveral Occaſions.* Oxford 1641, in 4to. 19. *A Synopſis of the Councils*, ſubjoined to *an eaſy and compendious Introduction to Hiſtory*, publiſhed in the name of his ſon *Matthias Prideaux*, but ſuppoſed to be written by the Doctor, or at leaſt for the moſt part. 20. *Hiſtories of Succeſſions in States, Countries, or Families*, &c. Oxford 1653. 21. *Euchologia:* Or, *The Doctrines of practical praying; being a Legacy left to his daughters in private, directing them to ſuch manifold uſes of our common prayer book, as may ſatisfy upon all occaſions, without looking after new lights from extemporal flaſhes.* Dedicated to his daughters, *Sarah Hodges*, and *Elizabeth Sutton.* London 1655, in 8vo. 22. *The Doctrine of Conſcience, framed according to the form in the Common Prayer*; left as a legacy to his wife, containing many caſes of conſcience, and dedicated to Mrs. Mary Prideaux, *Relict of the Right Reverend Father in God* John, *late Lord Biſhop of Worceſter*, by *T. N.* London 1656, in 8vo. 23. *Sacred Eloquence:* Or, *The Art of Rhetoric, as it is laid down in Scripture.* London 1659, in 8vo. T.

(2) *Memoirs*, p. 536.

☞ PRIDEAUX (HUMPHREY) (*a*), was third ſon of Edmund Prideaux of Padſtow in Cornwall, Eſq; by Bridget daughter of John Moyle of Bake in the ſaid County, and ſiſter to Sir Walter Moyle, father of the late learned and ingenious Walter Moyle, Eſq; He was by both parents deſcended from ancient and honourable families; that of his father having flouriſhed in many places in Devonſhire and Cornwall, as at Prideaux, Orcherton, Addeſton, Thuborough, Tolden, Netherton, Ford Abbey, Padſtow, Gurland, and Nutwell, and being mentioned with great honour by many Writers (*b*). Our Author was

(*a*) For the particulars of this article, we are obliged to our Author's ſon, Edmund Prideaux, of Padſtow in Cornwall, Eſq;

(*b*) Leland, Camden, Carew's *Survey of Cornwall*, Fuller's *Worthies of Devon*, Riſdon's *Devon.*

was born at Padſtow May the 3d 1648, and being a younger brother, was by his parents intended for the Church, and ſent to ſchool, firſt at Leſchard, afterwards to Bodmyn in Cornwall, and from thence to Weſtminſter under Dr. Buſby, where he continued three years. He was then removed to Chriſt Church in Oxford, and entered a Commoner December the 5th 1668, and on the 26th following admitted ſtudent by Dr. Fell, Dean of that College. June the 22d 1672 he commenced Bachelor of Arts; and as ſoon as he had taken that Degree, he was employed by Dean Fell in publiſhing an edition of *Lucius Florus*, the notes, which he was ordered to put to it, containing only references to the other Hiſtorians, who treat at large of what Florus mentions only in Epitome. After this he had a deſign of publiſhing *Johannes Antiochenus Malela*, from a manuſcript in the Bodleian library; but as he was ſoon after engaged in publiſhing the *Marmora*, this work was upon that, as well as other accounts, laid aſide by him, but afterwards publiſhed by Dr. Hody, Profeſſor of Greek in the Univerſity of Oxford. The Lord Henry Howard, then Earl of Norwich, having given to that Univerſity the Arundell marbles, which were the collection of his grandfather, Thomas Earl of Arundell, it was thought proper to have them publiſhed with a comment to explain them; and Mr. Prideaux, though then only Bachelor of Arts, was appointed to it, who publiſhed this work at Oxford in folio under the title of *Marmora Oxonienſia ex Arundellianis, Seldenianis, aliiſque conflata, cum perpetuo Commentario* [*A*], in May 1676, he being then one year Maſter of Arts, having taken that degree April 29. 1675. Having been ordered to preſent one of the copies to the then Lord Chancellor Finch, afterwards Earl of Nottingham, this introduced him to the Patronage of his Lordſhip, who in the beginning of the year 1679 preſented him to the Rectory of St. Clement's near Oxford. In the ſame year he publiſhed at Oxford in 4to. two tracts out of *Maimonides* in Hebrew, with a Latin Verſion and Annotations, under the title of *De Jure Pauperis & Peregrini apud Judæos*. As he was appointed Hebrew Lecturer of Chriſt Church, he publiſhed this book for the ſervice of that Lecture. About Midſummer 1681, Dr. Aſtley, Dean of Norwich dying, Dr. John Sharp, afterwards Archbiſhop of York, was appointed Dean in his room; and his Prebend in that Church being void, and in the gift of the Lord Chancellor, his Lordſhip wrote a very kind letter to Mr. Prideaux, then at Oxford, to let him know, that he beſtowed it upon him; and accordingly he was inſtalled in it Auguſt the 15th following. On the 15th of November 1682 he was admitted to the Degree of Bachelor of Divinity; and on the 17th of February 1682-3 inſtituted into the Rectory of Bladen *cum Capella de Woodſtock* in Oxfordſhire [*B*], on the reſignation of Dr. Marſhal Rector of Lincoln College, and Dean of Glouceſter. In the year 1686 at the public act in Oxford Mr. Prideaux proceeded Doctor of Divinity; and having exchanged his living of Bladen for that of Saham-Tony in Norfolk, as ſoon as the act was over, he left Oxford [*C*], and ſettled upon his Prebend of Norwich. Soon after this he was engaged in a controverſy with the Papiſts at Norwich concerning the validity of the orders of the Church of England, which produced his book upon that ſubject printed in 1688 in 4to [*D*]. December the 21ſt 1688 he was inſtalled in the Archdeaconry of Suffolk, to which he was collated by Dr. Lloyd, then Biſhop of Norwich. In the Winter of the year 1689, a convocation being called, he publiſhed his thoughts concerning the matters then in diſpute there in a pamphlet printed in 4to without his name, and entitled, *A Letter to a Friend relating to the preſent Convocation.* In 1691 upon the death of Dr. Edward Pococke, the Hebrew Profeſſorſhip at Oxford being vacant, it was offered to Dr. Prideaux, but he refuſed it, though he afterwards regretted his refuſal. After the act of toleration many people imagining themſelves at full liberty either to go to Church, or ſtay at home, as they thought proper, by which means the Churches were much deſerted, the Doctor drew up a circular letter directed to the Miniſters of his Archdeaconry, to inform them how that affair ſtood, and that thoſe, who did not ſerve God in ſome place of religious worſhip then tolerated, were liable to the penalties of former ſtatutes. He diſperſed this letter in print through his Archdeaconry, and afterwards publiſhed it at the end of his directions to Church-wardens in 1701. In Eaſter-Term 1697 he publiſhed his *Life of Mahomet* [*E*]; and June the 8th 1702 was inſtalled

[*A*] *Publiſhed this work at Oxford in folio under the title of* Marmora Oxonienſia, &c.] This book ſuffered by reaſon of the many typographical errors, through the neglect of Mr. Bennet, the public corrector of the preſs; ſo that it was publiſhed with all the faults as it came from the preſs; as likewiſe on account of the Author's being obliged to furniſh a ſheet every week, whether he was ſufficiently prepared or not.

[*B*] *Inſtituted into the Rectory of* Bladen cum Capella de Woodſtock *in Oxfordſhire.*] This living was in the gift of the Lord Keeper Guildford. Mr. Prideaux held it with his place of ſtudent of Chriſt Church, by virtue of his being library keeper, to which there being no other ſalary, except forty ſhillings *per ann.* to a deputy, the library keeper has the privilege to hold a living with his ſtudent's place.

[*C*] *As ſoon as the act was over he left Oxford.*] The laſt thing he did there was to attend the funeral of his great maſter Biſhop Fell, who died on the Saturday of the act, and was buried on the Tueſday following. As ſoon as the Doctor ſaw him put into the ground, he left Oxford, and never went thither more.

[*D*] *Which produced his book upon that ſubject, printed in* 1688, *in* 8vo.] It was entitled, *The Validity of the Orders of the Church of England made out againſt the Objections of the Papiſts; in ſeveral Letters to a Gentleman of Norwich, who deſired ſatisfaction therein.* It was reprinted in 1715.

[*E*] *His* Life of Mahomet.] There were three editions of this printed in the firſt year. Our Author

inſtalled Dean of Norwich, on the death of Dr. Henry Fairfax; and on the 3d of December following he preached a Thanſgiving Sermon for the ſucceſs of the expedition to Vigo [*F*]. In Eaſter Term 1703 he publiſhed his Tract for the vindicating of the juſtice of the preſent eſtabliſhed Law, which gives the ſucceſſor in any Eccleſiaſtical Benefice or Preferment all the profits from the day of avoidance. He wrote this on occaſion of an Act of Parliament, then intended to have altered the preſent Law. It was afterwards reprinted in 1716. About the ſame time he publiſhed an award made by King Charles I. and paſſed under the Great Seal, for ſettling two ſhillings in the pound out of the rents of all grounds, buildings, and edifices, within the city of Norwich, for the ſettled maintenance of the Parochial Clergy; to which he annexed a diſcourſe in vindication of it. This he publiſhed at a time, when an attempt was made to procure an Act of Parliament for that purpoſe; and it was reprinted in 1716. In 1709 he publiſhed his Treatiſe of *the original Right of Tythes* [*G*]. In the ſpring of the year 1710 he was cut for the ſtone; which was attended with ſuch circumſtances as interrupted his ſtudies for more than a year; but as ſoon as he returned from London, he reſumed them, and reviſed his book of directions to Church-wardens, the bookſeller having ſignified to him his intentions of publiſhing another edition. He afterwards proceeded with his *Connection of the Hiſtory of the Old and New Teſtament* [*H*]; which he had begun, when he laid aſide the deſign of writing the Hiſtory of Appropriations: but by the time that he had finiſhed the firſt book, his diſtemper came upon him. He finiſhed the firſt part in 1715, and it was publiſhed in Michaelmas Term that year; and in Hillary Term 1717-18, he publiſhed the ſecond part; both which went through eight editions at London, beſides two or three at Dublin, before the end of the year 1720. The Author of *Cato's Letters* printed in the *London Journal* (*c*) ſtyles this work "a "body of univerſal Hiſtory, written with ſuch capacity, accuracy, induſtry, and honeſty, "as

(*c*) See that *Journal*, No. 121. for Nov. 18. 1721.

intended to have written an Hiſtory of the Saracen Empire, and with it the decay and fall of the Chriſtian Religion in the Eaſt. He deſigned to have begun it from the death of *Mauritius*, the Greek Emperor, *A. D.* 602. The reaſons of his deſiſting from purſuing this deſign are repreſented in the Preface to the *Life of Mahomet*; and therefore he publiſhed only that part, which contained the Life of that Impoſtor.

[*F*] *Preached a thankſgiving ſermon for the ſucceſs of the expedition to Vigo.*] He preached it at the Cathedral of Norwich, and publiſhed it at the requeſt of the Mayor and Aldermen of that City. This was the only ſermon which he ever publiſhed; and could he have followed his own inclinations, it would have been one of the laſt, which he would have choſen for that purpoſe, it containing, according to the nature of ſuch ſermons, little more than an harangue upon the occaſion of the day.

[*G*] *His treatiſe of* the Original Right of Tythes.] His firſt intention was to give the Hiſtory of Appropriations; and this book was to have been only an introduction; but it growing too large, he reſolved to publiſh it by itſelf as the firſt part of the work. He had for many years made collections of the Common-Law and Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; notwithſtanding which, he was at a loſs for many things, which he could not have recourſe to without going to London, and conſulting the publick Records there. Beſides, he was about this time ſeized with the calamitous diſtemper of the ſtone; ſo that he was forced to lay aſide that deſign. At the end of this book he publiſhed likewiſe the bill, which he had drawn up for the remedying of the inconveniency, which the Church ſuffers from the holding pluralities; the occaſion whereof is repreſented at the beginning of the treatiſe.

[*H*] *His* Connection of the Hiſtory of the Old and New Teſtament.] In the preface dated at Norwich Auguſt the 1ſt, 1715, he writes thus: *The calamitous diſtemper of the ſtone, and the unfortunate management I fell under being cut for it, having been driven out of the pulpit, in wholly diſabling me from that duty of my profeſſion; that I might not be altogether uſeleſs, I undertook this work, hoping that the clearing of the Sacred Hiſtory by the Profane, the connecting of the Old Teſtament with the New by an account of the times intervening, and the explaining of the Prophecies that were fulfilled in them, might be of great uſe to many.* He obſerves afterwards, that *ſo little mention having been made of* Zoroaſtres *by the Weſtern Writers, whether Greek or Latin, the Reader may perchance be ſurprized to find ſo much ſaid of him in this Hiſtory, and his time placed ſo much later, than is vulgarly reckoned. But how ſparing ſoever the Greeks and Latins may have been in ſpeaking of him, what hath been wanting in them, hath been ſufficiently ſupplied by the Perſians and Arabs, who have given us large accounts of him, and have placed his time where truly it was, that is, in the time of* Darius Hyſtaſpes *King of Perſia. For it was not till after the time of* Mahomet, *that the Arabs had any literature among them; but the Perſians had it long before. For we find in ſcripture* (1), *that the Perſians had books and regiſters, in which the actions of their Kings, and the Hiſtories of their reigns were carefully recorded; and* Cteſias (2) *tells us the ſame, and that it was out of thoſe books and regiſters, that he extracted his Hiſtory, which he wrote of the Aſſyrian and Perſian affairs* (3), *in twenty-three books. And Perſia being the country which was the ſcene of all* Zoroaſter's *doings, there it is, that we may moſt likely expect the beſt account of him. And ſince he was there the Founder and great Patriarch of the religion, which was received, and reigned in that country from the time of* Darius Hyſtaſpes *to the death of* Yazdeyerd, *for near eleven hundred and fifty years, and conſequently was among them (as he ſtill is among the remainder of that Sect) in the ſame eſteem and veneration, that* Mahomet *is among the* Mahometans, *no wonder that much hath been ſaid of him by their Writers. And if thoſe Writers have been as antient, as thoſe of the Greeks and other Nations, I know not why they ſhould not have the ſame authority. I acknowledge many fabulous things have crept into their writings concerning him, as there have into the Roman Legends of their Saints, and for the ſame reaſon, that is, to create in vulgar minds the greater veneration for him.* "What "I have out of the latter, I am beholden for to Dr. "Hyde's book *De Religione Veterum Perſarum*; for I "underſtand not the Perſian language. All that "could be got out of both theſe ſorts of Writers, "concerning him or his religion, that carry with it "any air of truth, is here carefully laid together, as "alſo every thing elſe, that is ſaid of either of them "by the Greeks, or any other authentic Writers. "And out of all this put together, is made up that "account, which I have given of this famous Im-"poſtor. And if *the Life of Mahomet*, which I have "formerly publiſhed, be compared herewith, it will "appear hereby, how much of the way, which this "latter Impoſtor took for the propagating of his "fraud, had been chalked out to him by the other. "Both of them were very crafty knaves; but *Zoroaſ-"tres* being a perſon of the greateſt learning of his "time, and the other ſo wholly ignorant of it, that "he could neither write nor read, he was by much "the more eminent of the two, though the other "hath had the greater ſucceſs in the propagation of "his

(1) Ezra, iv. 15, 19. v. 17. vi. 1, 2. Eſther vi. 1.

(2) *Apud Diodorum Siculum*, lib. 2.

(3) Photius, *in Excerptis.*

" as make it one of the beſt books that ever came into the world, and ſhews him to be " one of the greateſt men in it: no book was ever more univerſally read and approved. " It is indeed a great publick ſervice done to mankind, and entitles the Author to the " higheſt publick gratitude and honour. But though I never ſaw any great work to " which I found fewer objections; yet as a memorable proof how inſeparably miſtakes " and prejudices cleave to the mind of man, the great and candid Dr. Prideaux is not " without them. I therefore do not upbraid him with them, but rather admire him " for having ſo few. There are however ſome of his theological obſervations, which " ſeem to me not only ill grounded, but to have a tendency to create in his readers wrong " notions of the Deity, and to encourage them to miſtake the common accidents of life, " and the common events of nature, for judgments of God, and to apply them ſuper- " ſtitiouſly as ſuch." There are ſome letters between the Dean and Mr. Walter Moyle relating to ſome paſſages in this work publiſhed in the Miſcellaneous Works of the latter. He died on Sunday November the 1ſt 1724, in the 77th year of his age, after an illneſs of ten days; and was interred, according to his own direction, in the body of the Cathedral

" his Sect, the *Magians* ſcarce having ever inlarged " themſelves beyond the preſent bounds of the King- " dom of Perſia, and ſome parts of Meſopotamia, A- " rabia, and India; whereas the Mahometans have " overſpread a great part of the world; for which " they have been beholden to the prevailing power " of two mighty Empires erected by them; that is, " that of the Saracens firſt, and next that of the " Turks, who having extended their conqueſts over " many Countries and Kingdoms, have by the power " of the ſword ſubjugated the inhabitants to their " religion, as well as to their Empire." We ſhall ſubjoin here a letter of our Author relating to ſome obſervations upon his book communicated to him.

To John Chamberlayne, Eſq; at Petty-France.

" SIR,

" I have received the favour of yours. I am ſor- " ry to find by your Letter from Carolina, that that " Plantation is under ſo great difficulties, eſpecially " when our difficulties at home will not give us leiſure " to help them. As to what is wrote therein about cir- " cumciſion uſed by ſome in that country, it can in- " fer nothing. They that would have the ten Tribes " of the Kingdom of Samaria to have gone into Tar- " tary, and America to have been planted from that " country, may ſerve themſelves from this particular. " But that conceit will not hold. Thoſe of the ten " Tribes, that continued in their religion, came under " the name of Jews; and thoſe that did not, were ab- " ſorbed among the nations, to whom they joined them- " ſelves. And ſince now the names of the Moabites, Am- " monites, Edomites, and Midianites are utterly loſt, " why ſhould we think the ten Tribes may not in " the ſame manner be loſt alſo? Time wears off all " things in this world, men, families, and alſo na- " tions; and new ones come up in their ſtead. " Sometimes there are diſeaſes that require circum- " ciſion. There is what the Phyſicians call the " Philbert-Prepuce, that is ſo long as to hinder ma- " king water. And we are told, that it was upon " this occaſion that firſt circumciſion came among " the Arabians; that is, their Prepuces were ſo long, " that they were forced to cut off ſome part of them, " that they might conveniently make water.

" As to the obſervations made upon my book by " that Gentleman you mention; I am glad ſo learn- " ed and diſcerning a perſon can find no more than " four particulars, to except againſt in ſo large a " work. As to the firſt of them, it is impoſſible No " Amon could have been Alexandria. Till Alexan- " der built that city, there was nothing there but a " very ſmall village. If we ſuppoſe ſo great a city " ſtood there till deſtroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, there " muſt neceſſarily have been ſome ruins of it left, " when Alexander built his city upon that place; " and if there had, ſome notice muſt have been ta- " ken of them. But none of thoſe Writers, that tell " us of the founding of this city by Alexander, give " the leaſt intimation of any ſuch, but ſome of " them write of it what plainly infers the contrary. " The Prophet Nahum ſpeaks of No Amon to be a " city of better note than Niniveh; but no city in " Egypt could pretend to this, but Thebes, which " had 100 gates, had 700000 inhabitants, and was " 50 miles in compaſs. The place where Alexandria " ſtood, being ſurrounded by the ſea on one ſide, " and by the Lake Maraotis on the other, could not " afford room enough for ſo large a city to ſtand on " it; and yet it muſt be of ſo large extent, if equal " to Ninive. The extent of that city is deſcribed in " my book. The Prophet Nahum deſcribes No A- " mon to be ſituated among the rivers. That Thebes " was, for it was ſurrounded on both ſides by branches " of the Nile. But Alexandria had no river near it. " That which was neareſt, was the branch of the " Nile, that diſcharged itſelf into the Mediterrane- " an at Canopus, which was at the diſtance of 25 " miles from Alexandria. A canal was indeed after- " ward drawn thither from that branch; but this " was the work of the Ptolomies. But that which " makes it moſt probable, that No Amon was The- " bes, is the name, for No Amon in the Coptic " languague ſignifieth the ſame with Dioſpolis, " which is the Greek name of the Egyptian Thebes. " The authorities, which your friend brings, are built " only upon conjecture, and therefore can be valid " no further than the reaſons on which they are " founded. As to the interpolations, it cannot be " ſaid, but *Proverbs* xxv. 1. there is an interpolation. " And if it may be admitted in one part of ſcripture, " why not in another? Nothing, that has been ſaid " againſt it, carries weight enough to overthrow the " neceſſity of allowing thoſe other interpolations, " which I have mentioned. What is argued for the " antiquity of the points from *Matth.* v. 18. is the " weakeſt argument that is brought for it. For " what we render *tittle*, is the Greek original κεραία, " i. e. *one corner*; and means no more than that, " whereas ſome letters differ only by corners, one ha- " ving a round corner, and another a ſharp corner, as " *Daleth* and *Reſh*, theſe ſhall not be changed the " one for the other. As to what he quotes Bux- " torf for, that doth not evince what is ſaid to the " contrary. However, I follow neither party; only " I recite as fairly as I can the arguments on both " ſides; and I declare my opinion different from " both, with which both what he argues from Buxtorf, " and what from Jerom, may well conſiſt. I write " this with a ſick hand, having been confined to my " chamber above a month by a fever, which I can- " not get thoroughly free from. I am, Sir,

July 16th, 1716. " Your moſt obliged humble ſervant,

" H. Prideaux.

This letter being communicated by Mr. Chamberlayne to the late Dr. John King, Rector of Chelſea, near London, the latter wrote to him the following letter (4).

" SIR, Decemb. 21. 1716.

" I thank you for communicating to me the learn- " ed Dean of Norwich his letter concerning circum- " ciſion uſed by the Americans in Carolina. And " give me leave to add my ſudden thoughts upon the " matter. Circumciſion was uſed, not as a religious " rite, among the Egyptians in Africa, Arabians, and " divers other people of Aſia, in old time, and ſince " by

(4) Communicated by his ſon-in-law, John Martyn, F.R.S. and Profeſſor of Botany in the Univerſity of Cambridge.

Cathedral of Norwich. He was taken ill about a year before his death, ſo as to be wholly confined to his chamber: he had for ſome time before been very feeble, with paralytic ſhakings in his hands, and rheumatic pains, which were occaſioned by his loſs of blood, in being cut for the ſtone, and the ill management which he fell under afterwards, complained of in the Preface to the firſt volume of his *Connection*. He was tall of ſtature, and of a ſtrong conſtitution, very regular in his manner of life, ſeldom being out of bed after ten at night, and uſually in his ſtudy by four in the morning.

" by the Saracens, Turks, and Mahometans through-
" out their dominions upon a religious account. This
" Mahomet took from the Jews. Now we know the
" Saracens poſſeſſed Barbary, and a conſiderable part
" of Spain, for many ages before the diſcovery of
" America. Wherefore if it be neceſſary to think,
" that the Americans muſt have this uſage from
" ſome other people, it is a more probable conjecture
" to think, that ſhips from thence might be driven
" upon the coaſt of America, and ſo have brought
" this cuſtom among them, than by the ambageous
" way of Tartary, where circumciſion is not practi-
" ſed, and which (for ought we know) is not joined
" to any part of America. But it cannot be inferred
" from the uſe of circumciſion, that thoſe parts
" were planted by the ten Tribes, or any of them,
" in that round-about way; nor is it neceſſary to con-
" ceive it, becauſe circumciſion was uſed (as the
" Dean obſerves) for removing a natural impediment.
" Herodotus (in *Euterpe*) obſerves, that the Egyptians
" uſed circumciſion, in order to keep themſelves
" clean; which is exactly the Dean's reaſon. For
" it was a difficult matter for thoſe Eaſtern people to
" diſcharge nature freely, who had prepuces (accord-
" ing to ſome Anatomiſts) ſix times as big as the
" Europeans. Beſides, the length of theſe prepuces
" was looked upon as an impediment to the ſeminal
" emiſſion, and ſo an hindrance to generation, which
" all nations were fond of removing. The Egyptians
" very probably to this end uſed circumciſion to their
" male children, and ſomething like it to their females.
" Strabo (Lib. 17.) delivers it as a laudable cuſtom
" among them. Τὰ παιδία περιτέμνειν, καὶ τὰ θήλεα
" ἐκ τέμνειν.
" As to thoſe remarks I made, I am not willing
" to inſiſt any farther on them, or give that excellent
" perſon any interruption in his learned labours. I
" muſt own I value and admire his book, and I
" look upon it as written with great knowledge and
" ſound judgment; and it is (I preſume to ſay) one
" of the learneſt pieces this age has produced. I
" impatiently expect the ſecond part, which I hope
" will not be long before it be made publick. In
" the mean time I deeply lament the ill health of
" that learned Dean; I heartily pray for the better
" ſtate thereof, and wiſh him a long life for the
" benefit of the learned world." T.

PRIERIAS, or DE PRIERIO (SILVESTER), a Frier of the Order of St. Dominic, was ſo called from his being born in a village of Prierio in Italy (*a*). He flouriſhed in the beginning of the 16th Century; was looked upon as a learned Divine, an eloquent Preacher, and publiſhed a great many books. He was maſter of the ſacred Palace under Pope Leo X. and ſome ſay that he was promoted, from this employment, to that of General of the Dominicans; but then they do not take notice of the time when he was raiſed to the laſt mentioned dignity. The circumſtance, which makes me think they are miſtaken, is [*A*], that an Author, who has beſtowed prodigious applauſes on him, takes notice, that he was appointed Vicar-general of the Order of the Dominicans; and would have been promoted ſtill farther, had not envious death prevented him (*b*). The Senate of Venice had honoured him with a Profeſſorſhip in the Univerſity of Padua (*c*), whence he had been invited to Rome to the like employment, with a publick ſtipend; and was afterwards appointed maſter of the ſacred Palace (*d*). He was no ways ſucceſsful in writing againſt Luther [*B*]. It is ſaid he was the firſt who took up the pen againſt him. Onuphrius Panvinius (*e*), and many other Writers are of this opinion; nevertheleſs, ſome aſſert that the Divines of Louvain, and certain others have diſputed this priority with him (*f*). I have read in Antonius Senenſis, that the firſt book he wrote againſt Luther was printed at Rome in 1520, and entitled, *Errata & Argumenta Martini*

(*a*) In the territory of Monferrat, according to ſome, or the Aſtezan, according to others; but to point out juſtly the ſituation of this place, I muſt obſerve that it is in the Montferrat of Savoy; between the Marquiſate of Ceve and that of Final, and very near the city of Ceve.

(*b*) Ghilini, *Teatro*, Tom. 1. p. 209.

(*c*) Du Pin, Tom. 14. p. 115, affirms, that he was a long time Profeſſor of Divinity in Bologna.

(*d*) Ghilini, *Teatro*, Tom. 1. p. 209.

(*e*) Onuph. *in Chron. Eccleſ.* ad ann. 1521. *apud* Anton. Senenſem, *in Bibl. Prædicat.* p. m. 223.

(*f*) Labbe, *Diſſert. de Script. Eccleſ.* Tom. 2. p. 374.

[*A*] *The circumſtance which makes me think they are miſtaken.*] Beſides the reaſon given by me in the text, I ſhall obſerve here, that *Auguſtin ab Eccleſia*, who wrote the hiſtory of the Prelates of Piedmont, has joined to it a long liſt of all the Eccleſiaſticks of the Dominions of the Duke of Savoy, on both ſides the Alps, who were Generals of the Order; but he makes no mention of Silveſter Prierias (1). He nevertheleſs had heard of him; for he obſerves, in his *Corona Regia Sabaudica*, that Prierias was born in Prierio, a village of weſtern Liguria, in the Marquiſate of Ceve (2).

(1) This rem. was communicated to me by Mr. Minutoli.

(2) See Oldoini, *in Athenæo Liguſtico.*

[*B*] *He was no ways ſucceſsful in writing againſt Luther.*] The firſt thing which this Reformer combatted was the Doctrine of Indulgences. He oppoſed them with arguments drawn from reaſon; but Eckius and Prierias who anſwered him, *not being able to ſuſtain the attack, had recourſe to common anſwers, and laid down as the foundation or principle, ... the authority of the Popes, and the authority of the Schoolmen; concluding, that indulgences ought to be conſidered as an article of faith, ſince they proceeded from the Pope, who could not err in any manner in matters of faith, and had approved the Doctrine of the Schoolmen* (3). Here follows Father Maimbourg's judgment on this method of anſwering. " Silveſter Prierias, inſtead of refuting
" ſolidly, as he might have done, the anſwer which
" Luther had made to his piece, drew up another, in
" which he amplified in a prodigious degree, the Pa-
" pal power and authority, which he raiſes infinitely
" higher than that of all Councils, of which he ſpeaks
" in ſuch expreſſions, as even the Court of Rome
" would not approve; a circumſtance that gave Lu-
" ther an opportunity of rendering this authority
" odious to the Germans; and of making a diver-
" ſion, by ſticking cloſe to ſo nice a point, which
" then was not the matter in diſpute. So very ne-
" ceſſary it is, in combating Hereticks, not to deviate
" ever ſo little from the maxims of the faith, with-
" out medling unſeaſonably, and with a prejudiced
" mind, with litigious queſtions; in which a perſon
" gives his opponent the advantage of being able to
" maintain his opinion, with as much right as he
" has to combat it (4)." No circumſtance can better ſhew the ill ſucceſs of Prierias's writings, than his being ordered by the Pope, not to write any more on thoſe controverſial ſubjects. *Reſpondit* Sylveſter Prierias *tam feliciter, ut ipſe pontifex indixerit illi ſilentium* (5).

(3) Fra. Paolo, *Hiſt. of the Council of Trent*, lib. 1. p. 6. See alſo Pallavicino's Hiſtory of the ſame Council, lib. 1. chap. 6. num. 3.

(4) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. de Lutheran.* lib. 1. p. 30, 31. Dutch edit.

(5) Eraſm. *Epiſt.* 71. lib. 19. p. m. 887.

[*C*] *The*

tini Lutheri recitata, detecta, & repulsa, &c. (b); but this is a false assertion [C]. The reader may see in the answer to *Questions d'un Provincial* (b) an error of Moreri copied by Du Pin. Prierias, in his answer to Luther, boasts his having refused a Bishoprick (i). He was very loose in point of morality; he affirming *that it is not even necessary, in order to be justified in the sacrament of penance, to have attrition; and that it is sufficient, if a person is sorry for not having it, or even desirous to be sorry for it* (k). His doctrine against equivocations is not much better [D].

(g) Anton. Senensis, *in Bibl. Prædicat.* p. 223.

(b) Page 619. Tom. 1.

(i) Seckend. *Hist. Lutheran.* lib. 1. n. 39. col. 1.

(k) *Journal de Trevoux*, Sept. 1703. p. 1623. French edit.

[Prierias was named *Mozolini*. He was born about the year of our Lord 1460; had published a book in 1496; and was carried off by the plague at Rome in 1523 *.]

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 978. col. 2.

[C] *The first book he wrote against Luther . . . . . was not printed in* 1520.] Luther, as early as the year 1518, published a treatise or answer to a dialogue which Prierias had writ against him (6). Prierias answered him, by a work entitled, *de juridica & irrefragabili veritate Romanæ Ecclesiæ Romanique Pontificis, Liber tertius, index quidem longissimus, sed brevissimum Epitoma* (7). Luther refuted this answer the same year 1518. I do not pretend to assert, that Prierias's first book against Luther was not printed at Rome in 1520, as Antonius Sinenses and du Pin (8) affirm: all I assert is, that it had been printed before that year. By the way, I am of opinion, that John Eckius, a learned Divine, wrote his Obelisks, in opposition to Luther's Theses on Indulgences, before Prierias took the pen in hand; but he did not intend to publish that piece; and I am of opinion, that it was Luther who published it jointly with his refutation. He had procured a manuscript copy of this little work of John Eckius (9). Let it be observed, that John Tezel, a Dominican Frier, and Inquisitor in Germany, and the first Commissioner for the promulgating of Indulgences, first began to write against Luther; for, in a publick disputation at Franckfort on the Oder, he offered a Theses, in which he attacked that of Luther; and had before published a little piece, in the German tongue, in opposition to a sermon preached by Luther against Indulgences (10).

(6) See Seckendorf, *Hist. Lutheran.* lib. 1. p. 31. col. 1.

(7) Seckend. ib. p. 39. col. 1.

(8) Du Pin, *Bibl.* Tom. 14. p. 115. Dutch edit.

(9) See Seckend. *Hist. Lutheran.* lib. 1. p. 30. ad ann. 1518.

(10) Seckend. ibid. p. 25 and 26. See also Du Pin, Tom. 13. p. 33.

[D] *His doctrine concerning equivocations is not much better.*] I shall quote this particular, as we find it in the Anti-Coton. "This Andrew Eudemonojohannes "Cydonius, page 40, builds on the authority of Sylvester, in the 5th accusation or charge, question "13, where he says, *When the Judge does not proceed "judicially, because the party accused is not simply subject "to him, or for some other reason; in this case, though a "lie be unlawful it yet is not a mortal sin; because "it is not contrary to the dictates of justice, nor given in "just judgment, but usurped. A lie will not even be a "venial sin, if, in answering craftily, and, as we say, "sophistically, he advances something which is false, "as the Judge understands it, but true, according to "him: because in this case, not being his subject, he is "not obliged to speak the truth* *. We must understand, "that by this judgment which is not truly so, but "usurped over those who are not subject to him, he "means the authority which Civil Magistrates have "over the Clergy, and chiefly over the Jesuits, who "even are not subject to Bishops (11)." Eudæmon Johannes, the Jesuit, had quoted these words of Prierias, in his apology for Garnet. His answer to the Author of the Anti-Coton is as follows. *Sylvestri verba profers non infideliter . . . . . sed Gallice pervertis potius quam vertis: quero enim ex te ubi illa legeris in verbis Sylvestri,* Voire le mensonge ne sera pas meme peché veniel? *Imo, inquit ille, non erit etiam veniale si respondendo, &c. Tu ut mendaciis totus scates, de tuo verbis ejus mendacium addidisti, cum ita verteris mendacium non erit peccatum veniale. Nunquam somniavit vir ille mendacium ullum esse posse, quod peccatum minimum veniale non sit; sed negavit peccatum esse veniale cum injusto judice æquivocationibus agere, quod ipsum S. Gregorius docuit* (12) i. e. "You cite Sylvester's words "faithfully, but then you pervert, rather than translate them into French; for I would ask where "you read the following words in his book, *Voire le "mensonge ne sera pas meme peché veniel* (a lie will "not even be a venial sin). What he says, *it will "not even be a venial sin, if in answering, &c.* You, "(as you utter nothing but lies) have added to his "words a lie of your own, in your translating it "thus; *a lie will not be a venial sin.* That Author "never imagined, that there could be such a thing "as a lie, which is not a venial sin; but he declared "that it was not a venial sin, to employ equivoca-"tions, in presence of an incompetent Judge, which "very thing was taught even by St. Gregory." It is very probable, that by these words he *means the authority of Magistrates*; the Author of the Anti-Coton hints at our Sylvester, and not Eudæmon Johannes. In this case he is guilty of a blunder; for the book whence the passage was taken, quoted in Garnet's Apology, was writ long before the Society of Jesus appeared in the world. It was dedicated to Pope Leo X, who died in 1521. Eudæmon Johannes (13) did not forget to criticise the Author of the Anti-Coton upon that head. He censures him (14) also for not understanding that *V. Accusat.* signifies, *Voce Accusatio* (under the word accusation,) and not *the fifth accusation or charge.*

* *Quando juridice non procedit, vel quia accusatus ei non est subjectus simpliciter, vel in hoc casu, aut quacunque alia de causa, tunc licet mendacium sit illicitum, non tamen est mortale, quia nec contra debitum justitiæ, nec est in judicio vero, sed in usurpato. Immo non erit etiam veniale, si respondendo cautelose & ut aiunt sophistice dicat aliquid falsum apud sensum judicis & apud suum verum.*

(11) *Anti-Coton*, p. 24.

(12) Eudæmon Joannes, *Anti-Coton. Confutat.* cap. 3. p. 113.

(13) Idem, ibid. p. 114.

(14) Ibid. p. 112.

PRIEZAC (DANIEL DE), *Counsellor of State in Ordinary, born in the Castle of Priezac in Limosin* (a), *was chosen in* 1639 *to fill the only seat that was vacant, to complete the number forty* in the French Academy (b). He wrote several books [A], and died in 1662.

(a) Pellisson, *Hist. de l'Acad. Franc.* p. 229.

(b) Idem, ibid.

[A] *He wrote several books.*] Pellisson's words shall serve as a Commentary on this (1). "His printed "works are, *Observations against Melrose's books, intituled,* Philip the Prudent. *Vindiciæ Gallicæ. Three "volumes concerning the Privileges of the Virgin. Disceptatio legitima, in controversia mota inter Apostolicæ "Cameræ cognitorem, Actorem: & Eminentissimos Cardinales Barberinos, excellentissimumque urbis Romæ "Præfectum; Defensores. A volume, in 4to, of Political Discourses.* He is now (2) writing *a second* vo-"lume." I am to observe, that the *Vindiciæ Gallicæ* is an answer to the *Mars Gallicus* of Jansenius.

(1) Pellisson, *Hist. de l'Acad. Franc.* p.m. 354.

(2) Pellisson wrote this in 1652.

PRIOLO (BENJAMIN), in Latin *Priolus*, Author of an History of France from the death of Lewis XIII. to the year 1664, was born at St. John d'Angeli the 1st of January 1602. He descended from the *Priuli*, or *Prioli*, an illustrious family, some of which were Doges of Venice [A]. He was but fifteen when his father and mother died; a circumstance that no doubt increased the difficulties he had to struggle with in the course of

[A] *He descended from the* Priuli *or* Prioli, *an illustrious family, some of whom were Doges of Venice.*] ANTHONY PRIOLI, nephew of LAURENCE and JEROM PRIOLI, brothers, and successively Doges of Venice, came very young into France, in the reign of Henry II. with an Embassador of the Loredano family, his uncle by the mother's side. He fell in love with the daughter of a Gentleman of Saintonge, who was come to Paris about a considerable law-suit. He married the young Lady; and taking her to Venice, met with so ill a reception there from the Republick and his relations, that a resolution was taken to annul their

of his ſtudies, and which nevertheleſs did not abate the paſſion he had for learning; a paſſion ſo ſtrong, that he frequently uſed to paſs whole days and nights in ſtudy (*a*). He ſtudied at Orthez, next at Montaubon, and afterwards at Leyden. He profited by the Lectures of Heinſius and Voſſius, in the laſt mentioned city; and during three years application he got perfectly well acquainted with the Greek and Latin Poets and Hiſtorians. He went to Paris, prompted ſolely by the deſire of ſeeing and conſulting Grotius; and went afterwards to Padua, invited by the exalted reputation of Cremoninus and Licetus, under whom he completely learnt the opinions of Ariſtotle, and thoſe of the other Philoſophers of antiquity. He returned to France, whence he went again into Italy, there to get himſelf recognized by the houſe of Prioli, as one of their relations [*B*]. He

(*a*) *Tanta fuit in illo diſcendi intemperies, ut noctes diebus continuaret evolvendo quidquid volumi-num edidit Romana aut Graia vetuſtas.* Johannes Rhodius, *de Vita* Benjamini Prioli, p. 3.

their marriage. It would have been annulled accordingly, purſuant to the laws, if the Embaſſador, who repreſented in France the whole republick, had not ſigned the marriage contract, for which he was cenſured by a decree in 1554; and it was reſolved, that Anthony and his poſterity ſhould be excluded from all the poſts and employments of the Senate. Upon this ill ſucceſs he left Venice; and having ſecured his effects, he returned to France, and ſettled in his wife's native place, at St. John d'Angeli. He had a great many children: the eldeſt ſon, named MARK, was the father of JULIAN, who was the father of BENJAMIN, whoſe article I am now writing. Julian ruined himſelf by his four marriages, and by the great ſums he expended in war, being the firſt Officer of the regiment *de la Force*. Benjamin was brought him by his fourth wife. He put his father's name under the copper-plate engraved by the famous Pitau, prefixed to his Hiſtory of France, and ſtill ſold at the Print-ſellers. The inſcription runs thus, *Benjaminus Priolus Santo. Juliani F. Eques Venetus, Rerum Gallicarum Scriptor florentiſſimus.* This ſhews Sorbiere's miſtakes with reſpect to the father of Benjamin Priolo.

This family increaſed conſiderably, and was naturalized under Charles IX. as foreign Nobility; and, under Henry IV. they all turned Proteſtants. Several eminent Proteſtant Miniſters ſprung from them (1). They were ſolicited, by a letter (2) written by Leonardo Donato, the Doge, to return to Venice; but did not care to accept of the invitation, they being well ſettled in France. They did not trouble themſelves any more about Venice; but it may be proved, that they always pretended to have come originally from that city; this, I ſay, may be proved, by a paſſage in the *Recherches de la Nobleſſe*, printed at Montaubon in 1616. The Author, one Mr. de Roque, a Gentleman of Bearne, affirms, that the Prioleau (for thus he ſpells it) (3) of Saintonge and *le Pais Rochelois*, did not come originally from Venice, as ſome of them pretended, in a great number of records in the reign of Henry III; but that they are Gentlemen deſcended from remote anceſtors, who were deſirous of deriving their pedigree from the Venetians, from the ſimilitude of their names to that of the family of the noble Prioli, from whom two Princes ſprung. This paſſage, though it contains a falſity, refutes palpably the *Sorberiana*. The falſity I ſpeak of appears evidently by the good ſucceſs of Benjamin Priolo, in proving his extraction from the Prioli of Venice. The genealogical memorial preſented by him having been examined, the Republick decreed that a patent ſhould be iſſued, which he received accordingly from the hands of Mr. Grimani, Embaſſador of France in 1660, with a gold chain, and a gold medal of three hundred piſtoles value. By that patent the Senate recognized him as a noble Venetian Knight. The arms of the family of Prioli are blazoned, and added to the ſeal, and round about, *Non data, non conceſſa, ſed adnata, ſenatus decreto.* The title is alſo in Latin, but the reſt in Italian. At the ſame time Priolo received a congratulatory letter from Laurence Prioli, Proveditor of the ſea, and who, at that time, was the head of the family.

It muſt be obſerved, that the Commonwealth of Venice is the country where the baſtards of the Nobility are moſt rejected, and have the leaſt notice taken of them. Their fathers even won't own them, and utterly abandon them; it not being the cuſtom of the noble Venetians to have, reſpectively, private miſtreſſes; but go to proſtitutes, and join for the maintaining one of them between them. By this means they avoid being jealous of one another; but if their miſtreſs proves with child, they all diſown it (4).

(1) A nephew of Benjamin was the Proteſtant Paſtor of the Church of Niort.

(2) Dated the 15th of April, 1608.

(3) I know from perſons of credit, that ſome Miniſters of that country wrote their name *Prioleau*. But the Reader muſt obſerve, that as there is little difference in the pronunciation throughout all parts of France, whether we write *Priolo*, or *Prioleau*, and the French not being very accurate, it is no wonder the pronunciation ſhould have varied in that family.

[*B*] *He went again into Italy, where he got himſelf recognized by the houſe of Prioli, as one of their relations.*] In this manner I paraphraſe the following Latin words of John Rhodius, *In Italiam reverſus eſt, quærendis apud Venetos originis ſuæ primordiis* (5). It is added, that the Senate of Venice gave Benjamin Priolo a very gracious reception, and knighted him, but without admitting him to the prerogatives of his family; this not being allowed by the laws of the Republick, becauſe he deſcended from Anthony Prioli, who had married a foreign woman, out of the Venetian territories. *Blande acceptus à Senatu, factus eques, ſed excluſus generis ſui prærogativa, quoniam Antonius Priolus ejus avus paternus, qui Princeps fuit Reip. Venetorum, non potuit legitimum matrimonium extra urbem & cum extera contraxiſſe ſalvis patriæ legibus* (6). This Author ſhould not have ſaid that Anthony Prioli was Doge; and he ought to have called him Benjamin's great-grandfather, not his grandfather. He likewiſe is miſtaken with reſpect to the time; the patent iſſued by the Senate, by which Benjamin was acknowledged to be of the Prioli family, being dated in 1660. As to what he ſays at the end of his Elogium (7), that Priolo turned Eccleſiaſtick after his wife's death; this is an arrant falſity.

(4) Extracted from a manuſcript.

(5) Johannes Rhodius, *de Vitæ Benjamini Prioli*, p. 4.

(6) Idem, ibid.

(7) *Ipſe pater ſe ſacris addixit, rerum humanarum & ſæculi pertæſus, pervicacis, ingrati.* Idem, ibid. p. 7.

Here follows two paſſages, which will confirm the particulars I advanced in the preceding remark. Priolo, ſpeaking of the town of St. John d'Angeli, makes the following ſhort digreſſion: *Ibi mea infantia vagiit, hic aerem primum hauſi. Hæc terra, mihi atavis Venetis, iiſque illuſtribus, neſcio quo caſu, primum tacta. Si decora meæ gentis à me intermiſſa ſunt, forſan nepotibus inſtaurabuntur; & Sant Angelium olim me alumno gaudebit* (8). "It was there I firſt drew breath, and "my infant cries were heard. It was there, by I "know not what chance, that I was brought into "the world, my anceſtors being illuſtrious Venetians. "If the honours of my family are loſt with regard to "me, they perhaps may be reſtored to my poſterity; "and St. Angeli may one day boaſt of having educated "me." It is plain that he glories publickly in being deſcended from a noble family of Venice. He does the ſame in the dedication of his work to the Commonwealth of Venice. *O patria!* ſays he, *ô vaſti pelagi dominatrix! agnoſce tuum civem, vel ſolo nomine Prioli tibi dilectum.* i. e. "My native country! thou So-"vereign of the boundleſs ocean! acknowledge thy "Citizen, dear to thee by the ſingle name of Prioli."

(8) Priolus, *de Rebus Gallicis*, lib. 6. num. 38. p. m. 283.

ADVERTISEMENT to the Reader once for all.

By the way I muſt intreat my Readers to be very attentive to what follows. There is a ſingle difference between other hiſtorical dictionaries, and this. I do not, like the Authors of thoſe dictionaries, barely draw the out-lines, as it were, of perſons lives; but collect, as far as the few books I have will permit me, the moſt ſingular and remarkable paſſages; the judgments which have been formed of the perſons I write upon, and the errors which have been committed concerning them. I examine, diſcuſs, prove, and refute, as occaſion may offer. But when I have not any proofs to refute a falſity, I am obliged to leave it unrefuted; and my ſilence in that reſpect is not a ſign that I warrant the truth of the facts mentioned by me. Thoſe whoſe words I quote, and whoſe works I cite, muſt be anſwerable for what they advance. It is ſufficient for me to refute the falſities, which I know to be ſuch; and to be always ready to refute thoſe which may be pointed out to me, or ſuch as my own reſearches may diſcover daily to me. This I am ever extremely ready to do; and no perſon can do me a greater pleaſure, than to communicate to me proofs and illuſtra-

He devoted himſelf to Duke de Rohan [C], then in the Venetian ſervice; and inſinuated himſelf ſo much into his favour, that he become one of his moſt intimate confidents during the remainder of his days. He ſent him twice to Spain on important negotiations, and left to him the management of all particular affairs, all the time that he commanded the troops of France in the Valteline, and the territory of the Griſons. Priolo was in all the engagements, and fought both on foot and on horſeback (*b*). Uncertain of what his fate would be after this Duke's death, he retired to Geneva, having married, three months before, Elizabeth Michaeli, a Lady of a very noble family (*c*). He purchaſed a country-ſeat at Saconnet, near Geneva, and there repoſed himſelf after all the toils and fatigues he had before gone through. The Duke de Longueville drew him from this retirement, upon his being appointed Plenipotentiary from the Court of France, for the treaty of Munſter; for that Nobleman being deſirous of taking him thither, as a perſon whoſe genius and counſels might be of great advantage to him, our Priolo reſolved to leave Geneva and ſettle in Paris [D]. He ſtaid ſix months in Lyons, and there had frequent conferences with Cardinal Francis Barberini, on controverted doctrines. The effect of theſe conferences was, that himſelf, his wife, his children and ſervants, abjured the Proteſtant religion, and immediately received the communion from the hands of that Cardinal. However, he was not long eaſy at Paris; for the civil war breaking out ſoon after, he joined with the Malecontents, which proved the ruin of his fortune (*d*). All theſe particulars I extracted from a Latin piece written by John Rhodius, and printed at Padua in 1662. The following particulars come from another hand. Dazzled with the glory of the Prince, with whom he had ſided, he could not be prevailed upon to pay a due regard to the favours which the Queen-mother beſtowed upon him, nor liſten to the mighty promiſes made him by Cardinal Mazarine. This plunged him into ill fortune, he being obliged to retire to Flanders, upon which his eſtate was confiſcated, and his family baniſhed. Being afterwards reſtored to the favour of his Sovereign, he was reſolved to lead a retired life; to devote himſelf to ſtudy; and to ſupport himſelf on the wrecks of

(*b*) *In Rhætia & Tellina valle, cum Gallicis armis præeſſet Rohanius, Priolus omnia pro nutu verſavit. Prœliis variis illic cum Germanis & Iberis certatum: ubique interfuit: pugnavit eques, & pedes.* Johannes Rhodius, *de Vita Benjamini Prioli*, p. 4.

(*c*) *Cum ante trimeſtre uxorem duxiſſet Elizabetham Michaeliam, illuſtri genere, ſcilicet atavis editam principibus Lucenſis Reip. & Michaeliis patriciis Venetis, unde Principes non pauci.* Idem, ib.

(*d*) Extracted from Rhodius, *de Vita Benjamini Prioli.*

illuſtrations neceſſary for the rectifying of errors (9) of other Authors, inſerted in this work on their credit and authority. I ſhall ever be ready to do every thing that juſtice and truth require. I can be poſitive on this article; having ſounded my own mind, and can give proofs of it. For inſtance, I was extremely well pleaſed at having an opportunity to prove the Author of the *Sorberiana* guilty of fraud, or a miſtake, with reſpect to Benjamin Priolo's father, &c. I have another obſervation to offer. A falſity reflecting on an honourable family would be deſpiſed, were it publiſhed only in ſome pamphlet, or ſuch like piece, that ſoon ſinks into oblivion; but if it be inſerted in a voluminous work, and particularly in thoſe folio volumes called Dictionaries, it gives greater pain. For this kind of works ſhorten ſo much, by their being writ in an alphabetical order, the reſearches of the curious, that men will have them, in ſmall as well as large libraries, even when they are ill digeſted. Hence there is reaſon to fear, that the particulars they contain may ſpread univerſally, and laſt to lateſt poſterity. But it ought to be conſidered, at leaſt as to my work, that my bare relating of any incident does not increaſe the number of authorities. Did I cite them without quoting any perſon, I ſhould ſet up myſelf as a new authority or evidence; but as I quote the expreſs words of the ſeveral Authors, whoſe names I ſet down in the margin, what I ſay is grounded wholly on their authority. A looſe ſheet or pamphlet, one of the *ana* volumes, a heap of ſeveral incoherent collections, found in Sorbiere's ſtudy, and containing random diſcourſes that happened in converſation, do not become more weighty and conſiderable becauſe they are cited in a large work. They are the individual things they were, and nothing more. And it may be obſerved, that of all particulars which form the ſubject of converſation, none are leſs to be depended upon than ſuch as relate to the origin of families. For the inſtant any man riſes in the world, envy on one hand, or flattery on the other, ſoon invent falſities advantageous or diſadvantageous to him. Theſe are ſoon ſpread, but with this difference, that ſatyrical falſities ſpread faſter, and are ſooner believed, than flattering falſhoods.

(9) This ought alſo to be underſtood of ſuch errors as I myſelf commit.

[C] *He devoted himſelf to Duke de Rohan.*] The expreſſion of John Rhodius, *incidit illic in infelicem Rohanii Ducem* (10), ought to be corrected. It ſeems to imply, that chance firſt brought Priolo acquainted with the Duke de Rohan. The firſt is, that Priolo's family had devoted itſelf to the houſe of Rohan, and that he was godſon to the Duke de Soubiſe, brother to the Duke of Rohan. It is to be obſerved, that he did not enter into that Duke's family in quality of Phyſician, nor was afterwards his Secretary (11), as is affirmed in the *Sorberiana*. I have been informed, that he lived under no other character with the Duke, but that of being his *Fac totum*; and that he had no more ſkill in phyſic than what may be attained by a general ſtudy of philoſophy.

(10) Johannes Rhodius, *de Vit. Benjamini Prioli*, p. 4.

(11) Patin declares he was. See citation (17) hereunder.

[D] *Our Priolo reſolved to leave Geneva, and ſettle in Paris.*] All ſuch as read this narrative with attention, will find it incoherent; and be no ways ſatisfied with a relation, where there are ſo many chaſms, and ſo little connexion. They might cenſure me on that account, did I not take care to point out Rhodius's error, and correct it. This Author has ſhewn on this occaſion, that it is eaſier to write in good Latin the compendious hiſtory of a famous man, than to prevent great chaſms aud omiſſions in the relation of an affair. Is it not a very incoherent way of relating a ſtory, to ſay, that a man went and ſettled in Paris, becauſe the Duke de Longueville would take him to Munſter, and not mention whether he accepted that Duke's propoſals? *Longavillanus Dux ad conventum Monaſterienſem cum ſumma poteſtate de pace Legatus iturus, eò Priolum invitavit, ejus operâ & conſilio uſurus in tam arduo negotio. Hinc illi decretum Geneva relicta irrevocabilem pedem Lutetiæ figere, quò totam familiam. . . . . deduxit. Lugduni ſex menſes remanſit. . . . . Non diu tranquillè Lutetiæ egit, cum derepentè ſtudia partium exarſere, & bella civilia cœpta* (12). i. e. "The Duke de Longueville being ſent to "the congreſs at Munſter, with full powers to treat "of a peace, invited Prioli to that city, being deſirous "of making uſe of his counſel and aſſiſtance in ſo "difficult a negotiation. Upon this Prioli, leaving "Geneva, went to Paris, with his whole family, "fully determined to ſettle there for life. He re"ſided ſix months in Lyons. . . . But did not enjoy "much quiet at Paris; party rage ſoon breaking out, "and the horrors of Civil War." To fill up the chaſm left by this Author, I muſt inform the reader, that Priolo left Geneva, and ſet out for Munſter, in compliance with the Duke de Longueville's requeſt. He ſtaid there about a year, and afterwards returned to Geneva, whence he went to France in order to ſettle in Paris. In Munſter he contracted a very intimate friendſhip with Chigi the Nuncio, who was afterwards Pope Alexander VII. He wrote him a congratulatory letter in Latin, as ſoon as he heard of his being raiſed to the Pontificate; and received a very devout anſwer from the Pontiff, with ſome medals, &c. The

(12) Rhodius, *de Vit. Benjamini Prioli*, p. 4 and 5.

of the Storm by which he had been buffetted. It was at this time, and to divert his melancholy, that he wrote [*E*], without the leaſt flattery or partiality, a Hiſtory [*F*], which has borne ſeveral impreſſions, and the beſt edition whereof is that of Leipſick, printed in 1686 [*G*]. However, he was again employed in negotiations; ſince, in 1667, he was appointed to go to Venice, upon a ſecret affair. This circumſtance was known by the credentials found among his papers, and drawn up by Mr. Lionne. He did not go to the end of his journey, being ſeized with an apoplectick fit, of which he died, in the Archbiſhop's palace in Lyons. I had declared in the firſt edition merely upon hearſay, that he died in the Hoſpital; but I now correct this error; and proteſt ſincerely, that I related this upon the authority of thoſe who told me this particular in Geneva; people whom I had reaſon to believe were well acquainted with this particular, and who, having a great eſteem for this Author, mentioned this circumſtance only as an inſtance of the ill fate of men of letters. It was in pity to him, and to ſhew the caprice and injuſtice of the age in which he lived, that they mentioned this, on occaſion of Prierius Valerianus's work *De Infelicitate Litteratorum*, which ſome of the company had mentioned. I alſo ſtrike out the paſſage I had cited from the *Sorberiana*; I having been informed, by perſons

Duke de Longueville was ſo well ſatisfied with his ſervices, that he aſſigned him a penſion of twelve hundred Livres on the principality of Neufchâtel (13); and a little before his death, he made him a preſent of twelve hundred crowns, as the laſt token of his affection (14).

(13) It was paid till that Prince died.

(14) Extracted from the above-mentioned *Memoir*.

[*E*] *It was . . . . to divert his melancholy, that he wrote a Hiſtory of* France.] He repreſents himſelf as a man who had met with great misfortunes; and declares, that the only motive of his attempting to write hiſtory was, to divert his melancholy, he being oppreſſed with ill fortune. *Inter maximas ærumnas natus eſt hic fœtus, quem lincturus eram, ſi licuiſſet. Paſſim notabuntur veſtigia minus alacris animi. Quid reſpondeam, non habeo. Humanæ imbecillitatis ingens patrocinium neceſſitas. Non fama, ſed requies mihi quæſita: fallendis innumeris tædiis, ipſe me damnavi in hanc arenam* (15). i. e. "This embrio was brought "forth in the midſt of calamities; and had it been "in my power, I would have ſhaped it into ſome "form. The reader will perceive, every now and "then, ſtrokes which denote a mind no ways at eaſe. "I know not what anſwer to make on this occaſion. "The grand plea for human weakneſs is neceſſity. I "did not thirſt after fame, eaſe being the only "thing I ſought for; and I ſet myſelf this taſk, "to divert the numberleſs gloomy reflections which "brood over my mind." We ſhould have had a particular account of his troubles, were his life, written by himſelf, publiſhed. This is one of the books he promiſed to the publick, as the reader will find hereunder (16).

(15) Benjam. Priolus, *Lectori ad calcem* Hiſtoriæ.

(16) In the rem. [*I*].

[*F*] *He wrote . . . . without the leaſt flattery or partiality a hiſtory.*] The particulars I related from it in the article of Marſhal de GUEBRIANT's Lady, plainly ſhew, that the Author was not afraid of publiſhing things, which might diſpleaſe the Great. What he has told concerning the Ducheſs of Longueville proves his great boldneſs in that particular. Patin went upon a fallacious probability, when he wrote as follows. *Mr. Priolo, formerly Secretary to the late Duke de Rohan, wrote the Hiſtory of France in Latin, from the death of the late King,* in gratiam Mazarini. *His work is entitled,* Conatus Hiſtorici. *There muſt be a great deal of flattery in it; but that is eſſential to the age for which God was pleaſed to reſerve us* (17).

(17) Patin, *Letter* 200. p. 190. Tom. 2. It is dated the 14th of Sept. 1660.

Sorel did not form ſuch a judgment, but rather was of a contrary opinion (18). The Author was ſo far from baſe flattery, that having obtained the King's licence, he thought it would be proper, before he made uſe of it for printing his whole work, to ſee what the principal Courtiers would ſay of the liberty he took. Accordingly he firſt publiſhed (19) an epitome of his hiſtory in one book, in which he ſoftened his pen; and yet ſome Miniſters thought him too bold, and let him know, that they would not ſuffer it to be printed, unleſs his book ſhould be caſtrated by ſuch examiners as they might appoint. Priolo made his remonſtrances to the King, who gave him leave to print his hiſtory in Charleville (20), which was accordingly done in 1665, and the work was allowed to be ſold publickly in France (21). This edition is in quarto, and is not entitled *Conatus Hiſtorici*, but *Benjamini Prioli ab exceſſu Ludovici XIII. de Rebus Gallicis Hiſtoriarum libri XII.* It was thrice reprinted in foreign countries; once in Utrecht (22), and twice at Leipſic.

(18) See Sorel's *Bibl. Franc.* p. 366, 367. Paris edit. 1667.

(19) Paris, by Cramoiſi, 1662.

(20) A city belonging to the Duke of Mantua, and ſtanding on the Meuſe, between Sedan and Charlemont.

(21) From the above-mentioned *Memoir*.

(22) In 1669, 12mo.

I muſt not omit, that this work of Priolo is cited in Auberi's life of Cardinal Mazarine; in the Prince of Conde's life, and in ſome other books. I am certain that, had it been written in French, with all the fire and vivacity that is ſeen in the Latin, it would have borne above ten impreſſions. It would be infinitely pleaſing to thoſe who are fond of the modern taſte, which took place ſince our Author's death; it being filled with thoſe characters and pictures, which are now ſo much in vogue. Tacitus's phraſeology is ſeen in almoſt every part of it, and is introduced very happily and naturally. I take no notice of ſeveral ſecret intrigues our Author reveals, and which he had from the firſt hand. We find, by the works of Count Galeazzo Gualdo Priorato, and by the particular memoirs of the Regency, that he was employed in negotiations.

[*G*] *The beſt edition is that of Leipſick, printed in* 1686 (23).] It contains ſome letters, which the Author had ſuppreſſed in the edition of Charleville; ſome very good alphabetical tables or indexes, and likewiſe ſome curious and very inſtructive notes (24). It alſo includes a Latin verſion of the particulars mentioned, concerning this work, in the *Journal des Savans* (25). Mr. Gallois gave ſo ingenious a turn to the opinion he entertained of it, that the Author had reaſon to be diſſatisfied, and at the ſame time had no good pretence to complain; ſo true it is, that ſome jokes are offenſive, and yet the perſon levelled at by them does not dare to ſhew his reſentment: ſuch jokes are very perplexing (26). The Latin Tranſlator has not preſerved all the delicacy of the rallery: I will even be ſo bold as to ſay, that he has not only enervated the laſt period, but alſo altered the ſenſe of it, of which the Reader may judge. The Journaliſts words are as follow: *Had I not propoſed to forbear giving my opinion of the books mentioned in this Journal, the ſtyle of this Hiſtory is, perhaps, the circumſtance I ſhould leaſt cenſure* (27). Now compare this with this Latin: *Ita ut niſi omnino propoſitum eſſet abſtinere à librorum judicio, de quibus in his Ephemeridibus nonnullæ* (28) *ſolent proferri, diceretur fortaſſe, ſtylum hujus hiſtoriæ ejus eſſe generis, in quo vix quicquam occurrat quod correctionem mereatur.* This Tranſlator ſuppoſes, that Mr. Gallois had ſaid, that Mr. Priolo's ſtyle is ſo good, that it ſcarce wants any correction. But he is far from having ſaid this. His thought is, that the Hiſtory he ſpeaks of does not deſerve to be cenſured ſo much with regard to the ſtyle, as for other particulars. He therefore ought to have tranſlated it thus: *In ſtylo hujus hiſtoriæ pauciora quam in cæteris omnibus fortaſſe reprehenderem.* I am to obſerve, that the Author was not ſurprized to find that the ſpecimen of his work gave offence to ſome perſons of a ſevere turn of mind, and even to thoſe of a devout caſt; he looking on this as a mark of the merit of his work: *Procul tetrici & moroſi,* ſays he (29), *immo devoti. Tales me carpſerunt lecto primo meo libro. Eorum flagello patientiam indulſi, Boni argumentum talibus diſplicere.* i. e. "Avaunt ye ſevere and moroſe, "and even ye devotees. Theſe cenſured my firſt "book, and I ſubmitted with patience to their rod, "as it is an argument of merit to diſguſt perſons of "that

(23) It is in 8vo, and the 2d edit. printed in that town.

(24) See rem. [*I*], of the art. GUEBRIANT.

(25) Of Feb. 22, 1666.

(26) *Heu quam miſerum eſt, ab eo lædi de quo non poſſis queri!* Publ. Syrus.

(27) *Journal des Savans*, 22 Feb. 1666. p. m. 159, 160.

(28) We don't know what this adjective refers to; and what ſenſe ſoever he gives it, it cannot be that of the original.

(29) In his advertiſement to the Reader, at the end of the work.

perſons of undoubted credit, that Sorbiere was groſly miſtaken, as is manifeſt from the remarks I point out (*e*). I would have refuted him, in the firſt edition (*f*), had I then known the particulars requiſite for that purpoſe. Priolo left ſeven children, who, by their father's death, loſt the penſions ſettled on him; but his name ſupported them, and they ſupported it in their turn; and have been in very flouriſhing circumſtances for theſe many years [*H*]. I know not whether the books he intended for the preſs will be publiſhed [*I*]. It is pity they were not printed. I ſhall cite ſome of his maxims [*K*], and the judgment he formed of Cicero, Livy, and the moſt celebrated Authors of ancient Rome [*L*].

(*e*) The remarks [*A*] and [*B*] of this article.

(*f*) See the cloſe of the rem. [*B*].

PRIOR

" that ſtamp." He confeſſes that he never was at any ſchool or univerſity (30). Wherefore then (will it be aſked) does he acknowledge in his dedication to the Doge and Senate of Venice, that he is obliged, for his beſt inſtructions, to the univerſity of Padua? *Illa veſtra Antenorea altrix mei, dulcis Artium parens . . . me ſuis præceptis imbuit . . . . hæc me docuit à celſa mentis arce deſpicere errantes, & ex veris cauſis ſcire, ſub quantis tenebris jaceret mortalium dies.* i. e. " In " your univerſity of Padua which nouriſhed me, " (the fond mother of arts,) I imbibed my firſt inſtruc- " tions. . . . It was ſhe taught me to ſurvey, from " the lofty ſummit of the mind, mortals wandering " below; and to diſcover the true cauſes, why their " ſteps are overſpread with ſo deep a gloom." I anſwer, that he does not contradict himſelf; his meaning is, that he had taught himſelf the Latin tongue, without the aſſiſtance of a maſter; but he does not ſay the ſame of the ſciences; he owning that he had been taught by the Profeſſors at Padua.

(30) *Etſi nullas ſcholas nec Academias unquam viderim, & nullo niſi me præceptore uſus ſim, nemo tamen me temere debet arbitrari niſi Latini ſermonis bene peritus.* Ibid.

There ſeems to be a more real contradiction between him and Rhodius: and yet they may be reconciled, by ſuppoſing (31) that Priolo was indeed ſent to Orthez and Montauban to learn the Claſſicks; but that he could not be prevailed upon to follow his maſter's rules, and learned the Latin tongue by a method different from theirs.

(31) I have been aſſured that it was ſo.

[*H*] *Priolo left ſeven children, who . . . . loſt the penſions ſettled on him . . . . but they have been in very flouriſhing circumſtances for theſe many years.*] Cardinal Mazarin had left him, by his will (32), a penſion of fifteen hundred livres, aſſigned on the entire legacy of Duke de Mazarin; and the King, when he gave him a licence for printing his Hiſtory, in 1661, ſettled a yearly penſion of two thouſand livres. This appears from the then *preſent State of France*, in the liſt of the Literati. Though his family loſt this glorious income by his death, they found other helps, the Court taking care of them. Mr. Colbert placed the eldeſt ſon in the Finances, and he has raiſed himſelf conſiderably. The younger ſon, though under twenty, was admitted into the Life-guard. He is now Exempt in the firſt troop (33). Three of his five daughters are Nuns; and the two others hold the chief rank among the Gentlewomen belonging to two of the moſt conſiderable Ducheſſes of the Court. The eldeſt of the Nuns was Prioreſs in the royal monaſtery of Chaillot; and, in 1692, was appointed, by his Majeſty, to go and eſtabliſh the rule now obſerved by the Ladies of the royal houſe of St. Cyr, near Verſailles. She is the ſpiritual Foundreſs of it (34).

(32) It is in print.

(33) I writ this in April 1701.

(34) Extracted from the above-ſaid *Memoir*.

[*I*] *I know not whether the books he intended for the preſs will be publiſhed.*] The following words are found in the laſt page of his Hiſtory: *Opera Benjamini Prioli brevi edenda. Vitanda in vita, ſeu de ſtultitia humanæ gentis, Lib.* 4. *Quæſtionum naturalium, ſeu de re plantaria veterum & recentiorum, Lib.* 3. *Opus Emunctum, triginta annorum Meditatio, quod jam celebratur ſub apertiori titulo, & falsò nonnulli ſibi aſſcripſerunt. De Vita & Geſtis Henrici Rohannii Ducis. De Vita & Moribus Cæſaris Cremonini. Vita Benjamini Prioli. Judicium de Scriptoribus Græcis & Latinis. Epiſtolarum Senilium ad Maximos Europæ Proceres Centuria ſingularis.*

It is very probable, that the Life of this Author will be publiſhed, prefixed to a work (35) drawn up from the maxims found among his papers, and which form a natural image of the heart of man, according to the various events of life.

(35) By his ſon.

[*K*] *I ſhall cite ſome of his maxims.*] Man, did he uſe to ſay, poſſeſſes but three things, the ſoul, the body, and wealth. Theſe are expoſed continually to three ſorts of ambuſcades or enſnaring attacks; the ſoul to that of Divines, the body to that of Phyſicians, and wealth to that of Counſellors and Lawyers. Rhodius expreſſes this as follows: *Cùm tribus tantùm homo conſtet, anima, corpore, & bonis: tres inſidiatores illis perpetuò imminere: adulterinos Theologos animæ per laqueos conſcientiæ injectos, nihil ad bonos mores, & ſolidam pietatem: medicos corpori, per pharmaca noxia, cùm ruſticatio, diæta, & mens hilaris, ſola morbis opitulentur: bonis rabulas forenſes, per litium articulos & formulas, cùm per arbitros idoneos amputandæ ſint radices, creſcentibus ſine fine familiarum malis* (36). " Divines " enſnare the ſoul by lulling aſleep the conſcience, " and uttering things which are far from promoting " true piety and virtue: Phyſicians enſnare the body, " by their hurtful medicines; whereas a country " life, proper food, and a chearful mind, beſt cure " diſeaſes. Lawyers enſnare our wealth, by their " quirks and chicane; whereas the only way to put " an end to conteſts is to chooſe proper arbiters." A wiſe man ought not to be too forward, if he is deſirous of ſucceeding at Court; the only way to obtain one's deſires, is to uſe patience, judgment, and ſubmiſſion. A man muſt not be over familiar with any perſon; *i. e.* ſuch a man muſt reveal no more than what he is willing ſhould be made publick; for what can be more abſurd than to expect that others will be more faithful to you, than you have been to yourſelf (37)? A man muſt eſpecially ſhun, in Courts, the ſnares laid by the fair ſex. *Cavendum præſertim in aulâ à fallacibus fœminarum vinclis: omnes nugaces eſſe, infidas, & judicii modicas, nunquam eodem tenore mentis & animi* (38). Lewdneſs is the completion of all evils; it wounding the ſoul, the body, the reputation; and, what moſt affects debauchees, it empties their purſe. It is a folly to marry, unleſs a man be particularly obliged to take a wife, to prevent his family from being extinct. A man is ſcarce able to conduct himſelf; and therefore ought not to undertake to conduct that, which of all things is moſt ungovernable. Rhodius expreſſes theſe ſeveral particulars much better than I. *Scortationem ultimum malorum, indecoram, noxiam, probroſam; animum, corpus, famam, & quod magis diſſolutum hominem afficit, crumenam lædentem. Quæcunque uni venditat ſui corporis jura, cuilibet ſine diſcrimine ſui copiam facit. Uxorem ducere, inſanum; ſi eos excipias, qui propagando ſanguini hoc debent ſuis penatibus; vix potens humana vis ſe regere, adſciſcit difficillimum quod regat, ut qui remigiis vix lembum ſubigit, remulcum adjungit* (39). He had ſo ſtrong an averſion to a lie, that he could not hear lying ſpoken of without falling into a violent paſſion; and there was not any thing he recommended with greater earneſtneſs to his children, than to ſhun that fault, and to lead a pious life. Every Chriſtian (did he uſe to ſay) ought to keep clear from lying; and every Gentleman, though not a Chriſtian, ought to ſhun that vice. He bore a mortal hatred to thoſe who ridiculed the ſcriptures. *Mendacium ita averſabatur, ut ad ſolam mentionem excandeſceret, nihil prius veritate & pietate in Deum, liberis commendans. Omnem Chriſtianum à mendacio alienum eſſe debere; nobilem autem, etiamſi Chriſtianus non ſit. In deriſores Scripturæ Sacræ, quorum hoc ſeculum feraciſſimum, inexpiabili odio flagrabat* (40). He was a very ſtrict obſerver of juſtice, but paid little regard to the exterior of religion (41). This re-calls to my memory that Montagne, though not very devout, proteſts that he had a natural averſion to lying (42).

(36) Jo. Rhodius, *de Vita Benjam. Prioli*, p. 6. See Caſtiglione's *Cortigiano*, lib. 2. p. m. 295.

(37) *Nulli ſe facere nimis ſodalem oportere, id eſt, nihil revelare, niſi quod publici juris eſſe velis. Nam quid ineptius quam putare aliquem tibi magis fidum, quam tibi ipſe fuiſti?* Idem, ibid.

(38) Idem, ibid.

(39) Idem, ibid.

(40) Idem, ibid. p. 7.

(41) *Juſti & æqui ſervantiſſimus, religionis parum, quæ quidem in externis actibus verſatur,* Idem, ib. p. 5.

[*L*] *I ſhall cite . . . the judgment he formed of Cicero, Livy, and the moſt celebrated Writers of ancient Rome.*] He was no great admirer of Cicero. He admired Livy, and thought him inimitable; for which reaſon, believing it would be impoſſible for him ever to come up to that model, he reſolved to imitate Tacitus. He

(42) See chap. 17. book 2. of Montagne's *Eſſays*, p. m. 579, 580.

☞ PRIOR (MATTHEW), an eminent Engliſh Poet, was ſon of Mr. George Prior, Citizen of London, and joiner, and was born in that city in 1664 (*a*). His father dying while he was very young, left him to the care of an uncle, a Vintner near Charing-Croſs, who diſcharged the truſt repoſed in him with a tenderneſs truly paternal, as our Author always acknowledged with the higheſt gratitude. He received part of his education at Weſtminſter-ſchool, where he diſtinguiſhed himſelf to great advantage; but was afterwards taken home by his uncle, in order to be bred up to his trade. However, at his leiſure hours he proſecuted his ſtudy of the Claſſics, and eſpecially of his favourite Horace; by which means he was ſoon taken notice of by the polite company, who reſorted to his uncle's houſe. It happened one day, that the Earl of Dorſet being at this tavern, which he frequented, with ſeveral Gentlemen of Rank, the diſcourſe turned upon the Odes of Horace; and the company being divided in their ſentiments about a paſſage in that Poet, one of the Gentlemen ſaid, *I find we are not like to agree in our criticiſms; but if I am not miſtaken, there is a young fellow in the houſe, who is able to ſet us all right:* upon

(a) *Memoirs of the Life of Mr.* Prior, *by* Samuel Humphreys, *Eſq;* p. 1. prefixed to the 3d volume of Prior's *Poems on ſeveral Occaſions*, 3d edit. London 1733.

was ſo paſſionately fond of Seneca, that no man could be more ſo. He preferred Lucan to Virgil, and the tenderneſs of Catullus to the majeſty of Horace. But Rhodius, his good friend and panegyriſt, thinks this taſte a little odd. *Senecam deperibat: neſcio quo malo genio M. Tullium ingentem virum, Romanæ eloquentiæ patrem, non admiratus eſt: cæteros ad unguem tenebat. Tit. Livium inimitabilem prædicabat, ideoque deſperans, nobis poſteriſque Tacitum repræſentavit. Lucanum præferebat Virgilio: quis hoc credat? & teneras Catulli amationes Horatianæ majeſtati* (43). The judgments he gives are certainly not regular and juſt; for a man, who admires Livy more than Tacitus, ſhould naturally place Tully far above Seneca, and Virgil far above Lucan. The eloquence of Cicero, of Livy, and Virgil, their character and genius are pretty much of the ſame kind (44). Theſe are Authors who do not pretend to ſhine; they diffuſing, without affectation, a light that embelliſhes the whole work, as every part naturally requires it; a light that is not intended to dazzle, like that of ſome Writers, who, inſtead of letting every reaſon through its proper medium, have recourſe to a kind of Dioptricks, to collect together a numberleſs multitude of rays, in order to caſt the greater light. This is their chief aim and ſtudy. Thus Seneca, the two Plinys, and Tacitus, have done. Lucan, in like manner, toils and tortures himſelf, to hit upon expreſſions of an extraordinary kind, and to give himſelf airs of grandeur. Theſe, it muſt be confeſſed, were very great genius's; and they, perhaps, would have writ more naturally, had they lived in the ſame age with Cicero, Livy, and Virgil; but they began to ſtudy at the time when the Romans were beginning to have a depraved taſte. The ſame happened to the Romans, as to thoſe who are too much uſed to drinking excellent wines: their taſte palls, and they cannot raiſe it but by drinking brandy, or the ſtrongeſt liquors that the art of man can poſſibly invent. A majeſtic, natural and uniform eloquence began to be flat and inſipid, as ſoon as they had been accuſtomed to it; they required witty ſtrokes and bright ſallies; they were deſirous of walking, not by the light of the ſun, this not being ſtrong or piercing enough, but by the flaſhes of lightning. The French began to be infected with the ſame diſeaſe. Seneca and Tacitus gave into that taſte, and were afraid of not being eſteemed, in caſe they wrote like the Authors of the golden age. However this be, their ſtyle is directly oppoſite to that of Livy. How then could Priolo be charmed with that great Hiſtorian and Seneca at the ſame time? How came he to admire Lucan more than Virgil, and Seneca more than Tully? Such a taſte is no ways regular. But no perſon can give a reaſon why his taſte differs from others, and it is a ſubject that will hardly admit of controverſy. Let us therefore reſt ſatisfied with the fact; and confirm, from the teſtimony of Priolo, that of his panegyriſt. Here follows what he himſelf ſays with regard to his taſte for Livy (45): *De me equidem dixero, ſi quis ævi priſci inflexit ſenſus, fuit ille Livius, quem unicum ſcriptorem Romanum imperium tulit majeſtate ſuâ dignum. Ita ſpiritus & quaſi voces repræſentabat, ut & agere eadem & loqui credas dicendi genere non anxio, ſed limpido, & quod me torquet, non imitabili. . . . . Ego deſperatione Livianæ imitationis* (46) *nulli me addicere decrevi.* Priolo declares it here as his opinion, that Livy was a Writer worthy the Majeſty of the Roman Empire. That he repreſents ſo ſtrongly the very ſpirit and words of perſons, that one would imagine they were ſpeaking and acting. That he does this, not in a laboured, but a clear ſtyle, and which (to his great grief) was inimitable. That deſpairing to imitate Livy, he was determined not to imitate any one. The following paſſage relates to Priolo's admiration of Seneca. *Ego M. Tullium magni ſemper feci; ſed ſi hodie viveret, ſtylum immutaret. Seneca, qui eum ingenio & judicio longiſſime ſuperavit, uſus eſt dicendi genere auribus ſui temporis accommodato, nec de imitatione Tulliana unquam cogitavit, jactatæ puritati arenam ſuam ſine calce præferens. Certè mirari ſatis non poſſum eorum ingenia, qui quicquid altum ſpirat, inflatum & tumidum appellant. Tales Lucanum, tales Statium ſuæ cenſuræ ſubjiciunt* (47). i. e. "I always had the higheſt regard for Tully; but were he now living, he "would change his ſtyle. Seneca, who far exceeded "him in genius and judgment, writ in a ſtyle ſuited "to the ears of his Contemporaries; nor ever thought "of imitating that of Cicero, preferring his own "ſand without chalk or lime, to that Author's boaſted purity. I indeed cannot enough wonder at the "genius of thoſe people, who give the name of "inflated and fuſtian to every thing lofty. Theſe "perſons cenſure Lucan and Statius." Here alſo follows what he confeſſes with regard to his imitation of Tacitus: *Profiteor me furem eſſe notæ rapacitatis, habeo piceatas manus, omnia rapio. Taciti & aliorum audax prædo, crudas ejus paginas in opus meum propello. Poteram adſcito fuco diſſimulare, non curavi. Niſi centonibus ſtylum animes in deſita lingua, quid niſi languidum & emortuum expectandum* (48). i. e. "I confeſs my "ſelf to be a moſt rapacious thief; my hands are "pitchy, and ſnatch at every thing. I am a bold "plunderer of Tacitus and other Authors; and I take "whole indigeſted pages from him, and inſert them "in my work. I might have diſſembled my thefts, "but would not. If we don't animate a dead tongue "with paſſages from the ancients, what can be expected but a flat and lifeleſs work?" Coſſard the Jeſuit criticized his ſtyle; and to him, if I miſtake not, the following ſharp reply is directed (49). *Meum ſtylum abruptum, inæqualem, immo, (ut verbis ejuſdem ſcioli utar) nullum; ſcatere paginam centonibus & furtis. Scias, ô blenne, quiſquis es, familiares mihi à puero antiquos ſcriptores, in aula & in caſtris aliquando lectos, nunc ſeſe offerre non vocatos, & ab hinc quadraginta annis nequidem eos libaſſe, & dictaſſe totam hanc Hiſtoriam inter ambulandum, ne litura quidem imperata: tantum abeſt, ut bis aliquid unquam ſcripſerim.* i. e. "That my ſtyle is disjointed, unequal, and (to uſe this "Sciolift's words) no ſtyle at all, and crowded with "borrowed paſſages. But know, thou dunce, whoſoever thou art, that I have been converſant with "the ancients from my childhood; that I ſtudied "them formerly both in the Court and Camp; and that "they now preſent themſelves uninvoked. That I "have not looked into them for theſe forty years, "and dictated all this enſuing Hiſtory as I walked "up and down, without making the leaſt raſure; "ſo far am I from having writ any thing twice." The cloſe of this paſſage ſhews us the manner in which this Hiſtory of France was writ, the Author having dictated it as he walked, without blotting out one word; a circumſtance that is very extraordinary.

(43) Jo. Rhodius, *de Vita Benjam. Priuli*, p. 7.

(44) Setting aſide the difference which depends, 1ſt, on the character of the ſubjects treated by ſome; 2d, between proſe and verſe.

(45) Priolus, *ad Lectorem, in limine* Hiſtoriæ, folio, m. c. 3 *verſo.*

(46) He ſays, that Buchanan endeavoured, but in vain, to write in Livy's manner. *Buchananus Titum Livium præſtare nobis conatus eſt; certè vigeſies à capite ad calcem antequam ad ſuum opus ſe accingeret, eum lectitaſſe perhibetur. . . . . Buchananus, illius equidem ſimia eſt, tantum ab eo diſtans, quantum ſimia ab homine.* Idem, bid.

(47) Idem, ibid. folio, c. 4.

(48) Idem, folio c. 5.

(49) Idem, ibid. *in fine libri* C c. 4 *verſo.*

[*A*] *Brought*

upon which he named Mr. Prior, who was immediately ſent for and deſired to give his opinion of Horace's meaning in the Ode under debate. This he did with great modeſty, and ſo much to the ſatisfaction of the company, that the Earl of Dorſet from that moment determined to remove him from the ſtation which he was in, to one more agreeable to his genius; and accordingly procured him to be ſent to St. John's College in Cambridge (*b*), where he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1686 (*c*), and afterwards became Fellow of that College. During his reſidence in the Univerſity he contracted an intimate friendſhip with Charles Montague, afterwards Earl of Halifax; in conjunction with whom he wrote a very humorous piece, entitled, *The Hind and the Panther, tranſverſed to the Story of the Country-Mouſe and the City-Mouſe*, printed in 1687 in 4to. in anſwer to Mr. Dryden's Poem called *The Hind and the Panther*, publiſhed the year before. Upon the Revolution Mr. Prior was brought to Court by his great Patron, the Earl of Dorſet [*A*], by whoſe intereſt he was introduced into the ſcene of publick employment, and in 1690 was made Secretary to the Earl of Berkely, Plenipotentiary for King William and Queen Mary at the Congreſs at the Hague (*d*). In this ſtation he acquitted himſelf ſo well, that he was afterwards appointed Secretary to the Earls of Pembroke and Jerſey, and Sir Joſeph Williamſon, Embaſſadors and Plenipotentiaries at the Treaty of Ryſwick in 1697; as he was likewiſe in 1698 to the Earl of Portland, Embaſſador to the Court of France. While he was in France, one of the Officers of the French King's Houſhold ſhewing him the Royal Apartments and curioſities at Verſailles, eſpecially the paintings of Le Brun, wherein the victories of Lewis XIV. are deſcribed, aſked him, whether King William's actions were alſo to be ſeen in his palace? *No, Sir*, anſwered Mr. Prior; *the monuments of my Maſter's actions are to be ſeen every where but in his own houſe* (*e*). He was likewiſe in 1697 made Secretary of State for Ireland (*f*), and in 1700 was created Maſter of Arts by *Mandamus*, and appointed one of the Lords Commiſſioners of Trade and Plantations, upon the reſignation of Mr. Locke (*g*), and was Member of Parliament for Eaſt Grinſtead in Suſſex. In 1710 he was ſuppoſed to have had a ſhare in writing *The Examiner*, and particularly a criticiſm in it upon a Poem of Dr. Gaſth to the Earl of Godolphin [*B*]; which criticiſm occaſioned Mr. Addiſon to

(*b*) Ibid. p. 2, 3.

(*c*) From the *College Regiſter.*

(*d*) Oldmixon's *Hiſtory of England, during the Reigns of King William and Q. Mary, Q. Anne, and K. George I.* p. 150. edit. Lond. 1735. in folio.

(*e*) Ibid. p. 178.

(*f*) See his *Epitaph.*

(*g*) Oldmixon, *ubi ſupra*, p. 210.

[*A*] *Brought to Court by his great patron, the Earl of Dorſet.*] In 1689 he wrote the following epiſtle to Fleetwood Shephard, Eſq; publiſhed in the *third volume* of his Poems, which will inform us of ſome circumſtances relating to him.

" When crowding folks, with ſtrange ill faces,
" When making legs, and begging places,
" And ſome with patents, ſome with merit,
" Tir'd out my good Lord Dorſet's ſpirit;
" Sneaking I ſtood among the crew,
" Deſiring much to ſpeak with you.
" I waited while the clock ſtruck thrice,
" And footman brought out fifty lies;
" Till patience vext, and legs grown weary,
" I thought it was in vain to tarry;
" But did opine it might be better
" By penny-poſt to ſend a letter.
" Now if you miſs of this epiſtle,
" I'm baulk'd again, and may go whiſtle.
" My buſineſs, Sir, you'll quickly gueſs,
" Is to deſire ſome little place;
" And fair pretenſions I have for't,
" Much need and very ſmall deſert.
" Whene'er I writ to you, I wanted;
" I always begg'd, you always granted.
" Now, as you took me up when little,
" Gave me my learning and my vittle;
" Aſk'd for me from my Lord (1) things fitting,
" Kind as I'd been of your begetting;
" Confirm what formerly you've given,
" Nor leave me now at ſix and ſevens
" As *Sunderland* has left *Mun Stephens.*
" No family, that takes a whelp,
" When firſt he laps, and ſcarce can yelp,
" Neglects, or turns him out of gate,
" When he's grown up to Dog's eſtate:
" Nor periſh, if they once adopt
" The ſpurious brats by ſtrollers dropt,
" Leave them, when grown up luſty fellows,
" To the wide world, that is the gallows:
" No thank them for their love, that's worſe,
" Than if they'd throttl'd them at nurſe.
" My uncle, reſt his ſoul, when living,
" Might have contriv'd me ways of thriving;
" Taught me with cider to repleniſh
" My vats or ebbing tide of rheniſh;
" So when for hock I drew prickt white wine,
" Swear't had the flavour, and was right wine;
" Or ſent me with ten pounds to Furni-
" Val's Inn, to ſome good rogue-attorney;
" Where now by forging deeds, and cheating,
" I'ad found ſome handſome ways of getting.
" All this you made me quit to follow
" That ſneaking whey-fac'd God Apollo;
" Sent me among a fiddling crew
" Of folks, I'ad never ſeen nor knew;
" Calliope, and God knows who.
" To add no more invectives to it,
" You ſpoil'd a youth to make a poet.
" In common juſtice, Sir, there's no man,
" That makes the whore, but keeps the woman.
" Among all honeſt Chriſtian people,
" Whoe'er breaks limbs, maintains the cripple.
" The ſum of all I have to ſay,
" Is that you'd put me in ſome way,
" And your petitioner ſhall pray.
" There's one thing more I had almoſt ſlipt,
" But that may do as well in poſtſcript:
" My friend Charles Montague's preferr'd,
" Nor would I have it long obſerv'd,
" That *one mouſe* (2) eats, while *t'other's* ſtarv'd."

(1) Dorſet.

(2) Alluding to the *City Mouſe and Country Mouſe*, written by Mr. Montague and himſelf.

[*B*] *Suppoſed to have had a ſhare in writing* The Examiner, *and particularly a criticiſm in it upon a Poem of Dr.* Garth's *to the Earl of* Godolphin.] That Poem was as follows:

Whilſt weeping Europe bends beneath her ills,
And where the ſword deſtroys not, famine kills,
Our iſle enjoys by your ſucceſsful care
The pomp of peace amidſt the woes of war.
So much the public to your prudence owes,
You think no labours long for our repoſe.
Such conduct, ſuch integrity are ſhown,
There are no coffers empty but your own.
From mean dependence merit you retrieve,
Unaſk'd you offer, and unſeen you give.
Your favour like the Nile increaſe beſtows,
And yet conceals the ſource from whence it flows.
So poiz'd your paſſions are, we find no frown,
If funds oppreſt not, and if commerce run.
Taxes diminiſh'd, liberty entire,
Thoſe are the grants your ſervices require.
Thus far the ſtate-machine wants no repair;
But moves in matchleſs order by your care;
Free from confuſion, ſettled, and ſerene,
And like the univerſe by ſprings unſeen.

But

to attack our Author with great ſeverity in his *Whig Examiner* [C]. In 1711 Mr. Prior was made one of the Commiſſioners of the Cuſtoms, and was ſent Miniſter Plenipotentiary to France for the negotiating a peace with that Kingdom. Soon after the acceſſion

But now ſome ſtar, ſiniſter to our prayers,
Contrives new ſchemes, and calls you from affairs.
No anguiſh in your looks, nor cares appear,
But how to teach th' unpractis'd crew to ſteer.
Thus like ſome victim, no conſtraint you need,
To expiate their offence, by whom you bleed.
Ingratitude's a weed in ev'ry clime;
It thrives too faſt at firſt, but fades in time.
The God of day and your own lot's the ſame,
The vapours you have rais'd obſcure your flame;
But tho' you ſuffer, and a while retreat,
Your globe of light looks larger as you ſet.

The criticiſm upon this Poem was publiſhed in a letter to the *Examiner*, Numb. VI. for Thurſday September the 7th 1710. and the Author of it obſerves, that there does not appear *either Poetry, Grammar, or deſign in the compoſition of* that Poem. " The " whole, ſays he, ſeems to be, as the ſixth edition " of the *Diſpenſary* happily expreſſes it, *A ſtrong un-* " *laboured Impotence of thought*. If we examine it " by the new teſt of good poetry, which the Doctor " himſelf has eſtabliſhed, *pleaſing at firſt bluſh*, has " this piece the leaſt title even to that? Or if " we compare it with the only pattern, as he thinks, " of juſt writing in this kind, *Ovid*, is there any " thing in *De Triſtibus* ſo wild, ſo childiſh, ſo flat? " What can the ingenious Doctor mean? Or at what " time could he write theſe verſes? Half of the " Poem is a panegyric on a Lord Treaſurer in being; " and the reſt a compliment of condolance to an " Earl that has loſt the ſtaff. In thirty lines his pa- " tron is a *River*, the *primum mobile*, a *pilot*, a *vic-* " *tim*, the *ſun*, any thing, and nothing. He *beſtows* " *increaſe, conceals his ſource, makes the machine move,* " *teaches to ſteer, expiates our offences, raiſes vapours,* " and *looks larger as he ſets*. Nor is the choice of " his expreſſions leſs exquiſite than that of his ſimi- lies. For *Commerce to run, paſſions* to be *poiz'd,* " *merit* to be *retriev'd from dependence*, and a *machine* " to be *ſerene*, is perfectly new. The Doctor has a " happy talent at invention, and has had the glory of " enriching our language by his phraſes, as much as " he has improved medicine by his bills.

" But to be more particular:

" *And where th' ſword deſtroys not* (ſays our Pane- " gyriſt) *famine kills.*

" I could wiſh the verſe would have allowed of " the word *plague* or *peſtilence*, for I ſuppoſe that is " what the Author means. I have heard of the " plague at Dantzick; but what part of Europe fa- " mine rages in, I know not. Why won't *phyſic* " ſtand here? It is better ſenſe, and runs as well. " What the *Pomp of Peace* is, I as little compre- " hend, as how it can be enjoyed *amidſt the woes of* " *War*.

" *Such conduct, ſuch integrity, are ſhown,*
" *There are no coffers empty but your own.*

" Since there is little poetry in this couplet, I wiſh " there were more truth in it. Some coffers I have " heard were empty three weeks ago; and if they " are not ſo ſtill, the notion is more obliged to the " Doctor's *unpractiſed crew* than to the *experienced* " *pilot*.

" *Unaſk'd you offer.*

" A great diſcovery! I always thought till now, " he that was aſked might be ſaid to *give*, but not " properly to *offer*. The malicious part of the " world will, I doubt, be apt to obſerve, that this " ſentence, as it ſtands here, is as true in fact, as " it is exact in language.

" *Your favour, like the Nile, increaſe beſtows.*

" If the beauty of the ſimile is to be judged of by " the frequent uſe, which the Poets of all ages have " made of it, ſcarce any can come in competition " with the Doctor's *River*. The *Nile* on theſe occa- " ſions is as trite as the ſtories of *Icarus* and *Phaeton*. " I remember I uſed it when I was about twelve, " in a new-year's-gift to my uncle, and was heartily " aſhamed of it a year after. A ſchool-boy can no " more miſs the Nile, than a French Author, when " he dedicates to the *Grand Monarch*, can live with- " out the ſun, that other ſimile, in which the Doc- " tor rejoices.

" *——Some ſtar ſiniſter to our prayers*
" *Contrives new ſchemes.*

" Alii legunt *five ſtars*, which makes this paſſage " intelligible. I have often heard Aſtrologers talk " of a ſort of influence, that ſtars have upon human " affairs; but I know of no ſtars but thoſe in Mr. " *Bickerſtaff*'s conſtellation, that ever *contrived ſchemes*, " and thoſe too were erected under no very benign " aſpect.

" My Lord's care, he tells us, is to teach the *un-* " *practiſed crew to ſteer*. By *crew* we are to under- " ſtand the Lords of the Treaſury. A very civil " expreſſion! but as to the ſenſe of it, what affinity " is there between *crew* and *ſteering*? Is *ſteering* the " buſineſs of the whole ſhip's *crew*? This is a true " image of the Whig-ſcheme, where every man is " his own pilot."

If we read the next two lines, we ſhall find theſe people have wounded him, and yet like the beſt natured victim *imaginable*, he needs no conſtraint to expatiate their offences. *All this is what the French call* Gallimatias, *and what the Engliſh Critics term* nonſenſe. *But what follows?* For whom you bleed. Bleed? *What is the Devil in the Doctor to mention ſuch a word, and give ſo unlucky a hint? I hoped that this point had been ſo well guarded, that here could be no farther need of an* act of ſecurity.

The God of day, and your own lot's the ſame.

A hundred pound for a genitive caſe, as old Buſby uſed to cry out upon ſuch an occaſion.

But to go on from Grammar to decency. Of this happineſs of Great Britain is any part aſcribed to the Queen? To this machine, which moves ſo like the univerſe, does the Royal Hand give any turn? Methinks he might at leaſt allow her Majeſty as much as his friends did in the Coronation Medal, VICEM GERIT ILLA. *But, as the Poet obſerves,*

Ingratitude's a weed of every clime.

He will give me leave in my own turn to obſerve, that in Don Sebaſtian *it is,*

Ingratitude's the *growth* of ev'ry clime.

What occaſion was there of altering a verſe he thought fit to ſteal? This is being a mere Banditti in poetry, to rob and murder too. But who is to be charged with this ingratitude? The whole body of the nation did indeed wiſh the treaſurer out, but it was her Majeſty only that could diſplace him. Such are the compliments, which the Crown receives from this Anti-monarchicl Academy. Excellent Poets, dutiful Subjects!

I could give you many more obſervations upon the beauties of this ſublime panegyric, if I had my Longinus *by me. It has been corrected, I find, twice or thrice already; and if the Author corrects it once more, I am ſo well acquainted with his lucky performances that way, that I do not doubt but I ſhall be tempted to write to you again upon the ſame ſubject. He will not be like himſelf, if he does not ſhift his patron as well as his phraſes, and it will not ſurprize me at all, if the next edition the poem ſhould come out inſcribed to the late Treaſurer of Ireland.*

[C] *Which criticiſm occaſioned Mr. Addiſon to attack our Author with great ſeverity in his* Whig-Examiner.] In

acceſſion of King George I. to the Throne, October the 23d 1714 he preſented a memorial to the Court of France, requiring, that the canal and new works at Mardyke ſhould be demoliſhed. The year following he was recalled from France; and upon his arrival was taken up by a warrant from the Houſe of Commons, and ſoon after ſtrictly examined by a Committee of the Privy Council. On the 10th of June Robert Walpole, Eſq; moved the Houſe of Commons for an impeachment againſt him; and on the 17th Mr. Prior was ordered into cloſe cuſtody, and that no perſon ſhould be admitted to ſee him, without leave from the Speaker. In 1717 an Act of Grace paſſed, but he was one of the perſons excepted out of it; however, at the cloſe of that year he was diſcharged from his confinement. After the fatigues of a length of years ſpent in various ſcenes of action, he was deſirous of enjoying the remainder of his days in tranquillity and retirement, which he did partly at an eſtate of his at Down-Hall in Eſſex. He died at Wimpole in Cambridgeſhire, the ſeat of the Earl of Oxford, September the 18th 1721, and was interred, according to his deſire, in Weſtminſter-Abbey, where a beautiful monument is erected to him, the inſcription upon it [*D*] being written by Dr. Robert Freind, late Maſter of Weſtminſter-ſchool. His Poems which are juſtly admired, were collected

In the firſt number of that paper for Thurſday September the 14th 1710, he obſerves, that "the deſign "of this work is to cenſure the writings of others, "and to give all perſons a rehearing, who have ſuffered under any unjuſt ſentence of the *Examiner*. "As that Author has hitherto proceeded, his paper "would have been more properly entitled the *Exe-* "*cutioner:* at leaſt his examination is like that, which "is made by the rack and wheel. I have always "admired a critic, that has diſcovered the beauties "of an Author, and never knew one, who made it "his buſineſs to laſh the faults of other Writers, that "was not guilty of greater himſelf; as the hangman "is generally a worſe malefactor than the criminal "that ſuffers by his hand. To prove what I ſay, "there needs no more than to read the annotations, "which this Author has made upon Dr. *Garth*'s "Poem, with the Preface in the front, and a riddle "at the end of them." Mr. Addiſon concludes that paper with theſe words. "Before I take my fare-"well of this ſubject, I ſhall adviſe the Author for "the future to ſpeak his meaning more plainly. I "allow, he has a happy talent at doggrel, when he "writes upon a known ſubject. Where he tells us in "plain intelligible language how *Syriſcas*'s ladle was "loſt in one hole, and *Hans Carvel*'s finger in ano-"ther, he is very jocular and diverting; but when "he wraps a lampoon in a riddle, he muſt conſider, "that his jeſt is loſt to every one but the few merry "wags that are in the ſecret. This is making "darker ſatires than ever *Perſius* did. After this "curſory view of the Examiner's performance, let us "conſider his remarks upon the Doctor's. This "general piece of raillery, which he paſſes upon "the Doctor's conſidering the treaſurer in ſeve-"ral different views, is that which might fall upon "any Poem in *Waller*, or any other Writer, who has "diverſity of thoughts and alluſions; and though it "may appear a pleaſant ridicule to an ignorant rea-"der, is wholly groundleſs and unjuſt. I do likewiſe "diſſent from the *Examiner* upon the phraſes of "*paſſions being poized*, and of the *retrieving merit from* "*dependence*, which are beautiful and poetical. It is "the ſame cavilling ſpirit, that finds fault with that "expreſſion of *the pomp of peace among woes of war*, "as well as of *offering unaſk'd*. As for the *Nile*, how "*Icarus* and *Phaeton* came to be joined with it, I "cannot conceive. I muſt confeſs, they have been "formerly uſed to repreſent the fate of raſh ambitious "men; and I cannot imagine why the Author ſhould "deprive us of thoſe particular ſimiles for the fu-"ture. The next criticiſm upon the *Stars* ſeems "introduced for no other reaſon but to mention Mr. "*Bickerſtaff*, whom the Author every where endea-"vours to imitate and abuſe. But I ſhall refer the "*Examiner* to the frog's advice to her little one, that "was blowing itſelf up to the ſize of an ox:

——Non ſi te ruperis, inquit,
Par eris——

"The alluſion to a *Victim* may be a Gallimatia in French "politicks, but is an apt and noble alluſion to a true "Engliſh ſpirit. And as for the *Examiner*'s remarks "on the word *bleed* (though a man would laugh to "ſee impotent malice ſo little able to contain itſelf) "one cannot but obſerve in them the temper of the "Banditti, whom he mentions in the ſame paper, "who always murder where they rob. The laſt ob-"ſervation is upon the line, *Ingratitude's a weed of* "*every clime*. Here he is very much out of humour "with the Doctor for having called that the *Weed*, "which *Dryden* only terms the *Growth* of every "clime. But, for God's ſake, why ſo much tender-"neſs for ingratitude? But I ſhall ſay no more. "We are now in an age, wherein impudent aſſertions "muſt paſs for arguments; and I do not queſtion "but the ſame, who has endeavoured here to prove "that he, who wrote the *Diſpenſary*, was no Poet, "will very ſuddenly undertake to ſhew, that he, who "gained the battle of *Blenheim*, was no General."

[*D*] *The inſcription upon it.*] It is as follows.

Sui temporis Hiſtoriam meditanti
Paulatim obrepens Febris
Operis ſimul & Vitæ filum abrupit,
Sept. 18. *An. Dom. MDCCXXI.*
Ætat. 57.
H. S. E.
MATTHÆUS PRIOR *Armiger*
Vir Eximius,
Sereniſſimis
Regi Gulielmo *Reginæq;* Mariæ
In congreſſione Fœderatorum
Hagæ anno 1690 *celebrata,*
Deinde Magnæ Britanniæ Legatis,
Tum iis
Qui anno 1697, *pacem Reſwicki confecerunt,*
Tum iis
Qui apud Gallos annis proximis Legationem obierunt.
Eodem etiam anno 1697 *in Hibernia*
Secretarius,
Nec non in utroq; honorabili conſeſſu
Eorum,
Qui anno 1700 *ordinandis Commercii negotiis,*
Quique anno 1711 *dirigendis Portorii rebus*
Præfidebant,
Commiſſionarius;
Poſtremo
Ab ANNA;
Feliciſſimæ memoriæ Reginâ,
Ad Ludovicum XIV. Galliæ Regem
Miſſus anno 1711
De pace ſtabiliendâ,
(Pace etiamnum durante,
Diuque ut boni jam omnes ſperant duraturâ)
Cum ſumma poteſtate Legatus.
Qui,
Hos omnes, quibus cumulatus eſt, titulos
Humanitatis, ingenii, eruditionis laude
Superavit.
Cui etiam naſcenti faciles arriſerant Muſæ,
Hunc puerum ſchola hic Regia perpolivit,
Juvenem in Collegio Sancti Johannis
Cantabrigiæ optimis ſcientiis inſtruxit;
Virum denique auxit & perfecit
Multa cum viris principibus conſuetudo;
Ita natus, ita inſtitutus,
A Vatum choro avelli nunquam potuit,
Sed ſolebat ſæpe rerum civilium gravitatem
Amœniorum Literarum ſtudiis condire;
Et cum omne adeo poetices genus

collected by him, and published together in one volume in folio, with an elegant dedication to the present Duke of Dorset. Since his death some more of his Poems have been published under the title of *Poems on several Occasions, by the late* Matthew Prior, *Esq*; Several manuscript works of his are in the possession of the present Earl of Oxford. His *Solomon, on the Vanity of the World*, has been translated into Latin by Mr. William Dobson, of New College in Oxford, with so much elegance and spirit [*E*], that we may expect from that Gentleman a very masterly Latin Version of *Milton*'s *Paradise Lost*, in which he is now engaged. His translation of *Solomon* was printed at Oxford in 4to.

Haud infeliciter tentaret,
Tum in fabellis concinnè lepideque texendis
Mirus artifex
Neminem habuit parem.
Hæc liberalis animi oblectamenta,
Quam nullo illi labore constiterint,
Facile ii perspexere, quibus usus est, Amici;
Apud quos Urbanitatum & Leporum plenus,
Cum ad rem, quæcunque forte inciderit,
Aptè copioseque alluderet,
Interea nihil quæsitum, nihil vi expressum
Videbatur,
Sed omnia ultrò effluere,
Et quasi jugi è fonte affatim exuberare
Ita suos tandem dubios reliquit,
Essetne in scriptis poeta elegantior,
An in convictu Comes jucundior.

[*E*] *His* Solomon, on the Vanity of the World, *has been translated into Latin by Mr.* William Dobson, *of New College in Oxford, with so much elegance and spirit, &c.*] We shall give a specimen of his translation in that of the following lines in the second book.

" I drank, I lik'd it not; 'twas rage, 'twas noise,
" An airy scene of transitory joys.
" In vain I trusted, that the flowing bowl
" Would banish sorrow, and enlarge the soul.
" To the late revel, and protracted feast,
" Wild dreams succeeded and disorder'd rest;
" And as at the dawn of morn, fair reason's light,
" Broke thro' the fumes and phantoms of the night,
" What had been said, I ask'd my soul, what done;
" How flow'd our mirth, and whence the source
" begun.
" Perhaps the jest, that charm'd the sprightly crowd,
" And made the jovial table laugh so loud,
" To some false notion ow'd its poor pretence,
" To an ambiguous word's perverted sense,
" To a wild sonnet, or a wanton air,
" Offence and torture to the sober ear.
" Perhaps, alas! the pleasing stream was brought
" From this man's error, from another's fault;
" From topicks which good-nature would forget,
" And prudence mention with the last regret.
" Add yet unnumber'd ills, that lie unseen
" In the pernicious draught; the word obscene,
" Or harsh, which once elanc'd must ever fly
" Irrevocable; the too prompt reply,
" Seed of severe distrust, and fierce debate;
" What we should shun, and what we ought to
" hate.
" Add too the blood impoverish'd, and the course
" Of health suppress'd by wine's continued force.
" Unhappy man! whom sorrow thus and rage
" To diff'rent ills alternately engage.
" Who drinks, alas! but to forget; nor sees,
" That melancholy sloth, severe disease,
" Mem'ry confus'd, and interrupted thought,
" Death's harbingers, lie latent in the draught;
" And in the flowers, that wreath the sparkling
" bowl;
" Fell adders hiss, and pois'nous serpents roll."

Indulsi Cyathis; Rabies mera; clamor ineptus,
Vanaque lætitiæ raptim fugientis Imago.
Credulus ah nimium! speravi pocula mœstum
Posse animum lenire, atrasque avertere Curas.
Post ludos sera jam nocte licentius actos
Incertus sopor, interruptaque somnia turbant.
Jamque ubi mane novo radiis victricibus alma
Dispulerat Ratio simulacra fugacia noctis,
Quid facere & fari suaserunt pocula, mecum
Volvi animo; quales & quo de fonte lepores
Fluxerunt, reputans. Risus, jocus ille, solutos
Qui movit, lætâ circum plaudente coronâ,
Forsitan ingenii nugis ab inanibus ortum
Duxerat, ambiguo lusu vel imagine falsa,
Improbulisve Lyræ numeris cantuve protervo,
Casta quibus metuat violari sordibus auris.
Forsitan heu! nimium lepidos movere cachinnos
Infelix Vitium, incauti levis error Amici,
Quæque palam fari sapiens & candidus ultro
Parceret, & densa velaret honestius umbra.
Quinetiam infidis Cyathis conferta malorum
Agmina cæca latent; hinc linguæ effusa Venena
Præcipitis, vanis nunquam revocanda querelis
Sæpius incauto pronum devolvier Ore
Responsum torquetur atrox, spargitque vicissim
Insanas lites, alienaque jurgia siccis.
Adde etiam exhaustas vini quod largior usus
Sanguinis attenuat vires, carpitque salutem.
Ah miserum! rabies quem cæca atrique Dolores
Diversis hinc inde malis involvere certant!
Heu! sperat curarum haurire oblivia; nescit
Interea sævo confidere funditus haustu
Morborum omne Genus; lentæ intolerabile pondus
Desidiæ, Errores Animi, Cerebrique natantis
Somnia, quæ passu sequitur mors tarda silenti.
Nec videt innexis circum cratera Corollis
Lethiferosque Angues, atrasque latere colubras. T.

PRISCILLIAN, a Spanish Heresiarch, lived in the fourth Century. He possessed very fine qualities [*A*], being a ready genius, very eloquent and learned. He was laborious, sober, and no ways avaricious. A too eager thirst after knowledge prompted him, in his youth, to learn magick (*a*). This thirst, I say, inclined him to listen to Helpidius the Rhetorician, and to a Lady who had imbibed some errors of the Gnosticks (*b*). He was infected with them, and employed all his abilities to spread them. He

(*a*) *Idem vanissimus & plus justo inflatior profanarum rerum scientia, quin & Magicas artes ab adolescentia eum exercuisse creditum est.* Sulpicius Severus, *Sacræ Hist.* lib. 2. p. m. 163. (*b*) This Rhetorician and that Lady were taught by one Mark, an Egyptian. It is falsely asserted in Moreri, that this Mark taught Priscillian.

[*A*] *He possessed very fine qualities.*] Sulpicius Severus speaks of him as follows. *Ab his* (Agape quadam non ignobili muliere, & rhetore Helpidio) *Priscillianus est institutus, familia nobilis, prædives opibus, acer, inquietus, facundus, multa lectione eruditus, disserendi ac disputandi promptissimus: felix profecto, si non pravo studio corrupisset optimum ingenium, prorsus multa in eo animi & corporis bona cerneres. Vigilare multum, famem, sitim ferre poterat, habendi minime cupidus, utendi parcissimus* (1). i. e. " By these (Agape, a Lady of some note, and Helpidius the Rhetorician) " Priscillian was instructed. He was born of a noble " family, vastly rich, of a violent and restless disposition; eloquent, very learned and extremely " quick and ready in disputation. Thrice happy " would it have been for him, had he not depraved " his admirable genius by the ill use he made of it; " he possessing many good qualities both of mind " and body. He could endure long watchings, hunger and thirst; was not greedy of amassing, and " very moderate in the use of riches."

(1) Sulpicius Severus, *Sacræ Hist.* lib. 2. p. 162, 163.

[*B*] *He*

He won over great numbers of people, and was followed particularly by the women [B]. Some Biſhops alſo became his ſectariſts. This poiſon having already ſpread itſelf into a great many cities, the ſtrongeſt endeavours were uſed to ſtop it. A Synod was accordingly aſſembled in Saragoſſa (c), whither the Biſhops of Aquitain came (d). Priſcillian, and all his adherents, were there condemned for refuſing to appear; and the Magiſtrates were ordered to drive them out of all cities. This ſentence was ſo far from intimidating the Hereticks in queſtion, that they choſe Priſcillian their Biſhop. He left Spain with Inſtantius and Salvianus, two Prelates of his ſect, and ſet out for Rome, to juſtify himſelf to the Pope. They brought over many Diſciples, in their way through Aquitain. Euchrocia, wife to Delphidius the Rhetorician (e), received them at her country-ſeat; and was ſo charmed with Priſcillian, that ſhe followed him every where. Several other women were ſeduced by theſe people, and abandoned all things to follow them in their journey [C]. The Pope refuſed to hear them, as alſo Saint Ambroſe; but the Papal Court ſhewed them greater indulgence, it favouring them with a Reſcript, commanding them to be reſtored to their ſeveral churches. They returned to Spain, and had ſo much intereſt, that Ithacius their accuſer, being cited to give an account of his conduct, as a diſturber of the church, fled into Gaul. He there inflamed to ſuch a degree Maximus the Tyrant againſt thoſe ſectariſts, that they were commanded to come to the Council at Bourdeaux. Inſtantius was there condemned, which Priſcillian ſeeing, he deſired to appear before Maximus, and his requeſt was granted. His accuſers followed him to that Court, and carried on the proſecution with ſo much vigour, that

(c) In 381.

(d) Among others, Delphinius Biſhop of Bourdeaux. *Vide Alteſerram, Rerum Aquitanicarum*, lib. 5. cap. 5. p. 323.

(e) *De quo vide* Alteſerram. ibid. cap. 3. p. 116, 317. & Auſonium *in* Profeſſor. num. 5.

[B] *He employed all his abilities to ſpread them . . . . was followed particularly by the women . . . . ſome Biſhops alſo became his ſectariſts.*] I ſhall again quote Sulpicius Severus. *Is ubi doctrinam exitiabilem aggreſſus eſt, multos nobilium, pluresque populares authoritate perſuadendi & arte blandiendi allicuit in ſocietatem. Ad hoc mulieres novarum rerum cupidæ, fluxa fide, & ad omnia curioſo ingenio, catervatim ad eum confluebant. Quippe humilitatis ſpeciem ore & habitu prætendens, honorem ſui & reverentiam cunctis injecerat. Jamque paulatim perfidiæ iſtius tabes, pleraque Hiſpaniæ pervaſerat: quin & nonnulli Epiſcoporum depravati, inter quos Inſtantius & Salvianus, Priſcillianum non ſolum conſenſione, ſed ſub quadam etiam conjuratione ſuſceperant* (2). Here follows father Maimbourg's copious paraphraſe on this Latin paſſage. " As this Hereſiarch ſaw on " one hand, and knew by his own experience, that " mankind are naturally very prone to ſenſuality, " which corrupted the whole world before the flood; " and knowing, on the other hand, the weak ſide of " people, and particularly of the female ſex, who " are eaſily impoſed upon by a ſpecious outſide of " piety; he acted ſo well the Saint, that there never " was a greater hypocrite than this Impoſtor. And " indeed, no man ever diſcovered leſs fondneſs for " the world; he ſtudiouſly affecting the higheſt con- " tempt of all ſublunary things, by the meanneſs and " poverty of his dreſs, his behaviour and converſati- " on; by his modeſt, humble and mortified air; by " the great auſterity of his life, and the alms he beſtow- " ed with a moſt liberal hand; talking of nothing but " penitence, faſting, watchings, prayer, and the con- " tempt of all worldly things, in order to be united " perfectly to God. By this means he ſoon acquired, " throughout all Spain, the character of a moſt zealous " ſervant of God; a man of wonderful holineſs, " on which account he was admired univerſally. The " women eſpecially, who are more eaſily impoſed " upon by theſe fallacious appearances, and whoſe " curioſity, (ſo natural to them) makes them fond of " novelty, the marvellous and ſhew, eſpecially in re- " ligious matters, flocked after him, in order to be " directed by him, when but a Lay-man. Being, " moreover, learned; having a ſmooth tongue, and " admirably well verſed in the arts of perſuaſion; " and knowing how to inſinuate himſelf artfully into " the minds of men, by flattering them in a de- " licate and witty manner; he ſoon became the " head of a very great party (in moſt of the provin- " ces of Spain,) conſiſting, not only of women and " the common people, but alſo of perſons of Quali- " ty and Eccleſiaſticks, among whom were even " ſome Biſhops, who, like all the reſt, looked upon, " and followed him, as a great Saint (3)."

(2) Sulpic. Sever. *Sacræ Hiſt.* lib. 2. p. 163.

(3) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. du Pontificat. de St. Leon*, lib. 1. p. 44, 45. Dutch edit. He quotes Sulpicius Severus's words in the margin.

[C] *Euchrocia, wife to Delphidius the Rhetorician . . . . . ſeveral other women were ſeduced by theſe people, and abandoned all things to follow them in their journey.*] If we may credit what ſome ſharp Satyriſts ſay, the people in queſtion began with the ſpirit and ended in the fleſh. Euchrocia was charmed at firſt, by the outward devotion and pious diſcourſes of this Heretick; but he charmed her inſenſibly with ſomething of a very different nature, he lying with that Lady, and getting her with child. If any perſon ſhould object to me, that the Latin words I ſhall cite hereunder, ſignify, that this incident relates to Procula, daughter of Euchrocia, I will not deny it obſtinately; but will own, that this is, perhaps, the beſt ſenſe that can be given to the original. The exteriour devotion, which Priſcillian had long affected, had not made him forget that young Procula was preferable to her mother. Here follows the Latin: *Iter eis præter interiorem Aquitaniam fuit: ubi tum ab imperitis magnifice ſuſcepti, ſparſere perfidiæ ſemina, maximeque Eluſanam plebem, ſane tum bonam & religioni ſtudentem, pravis prædicationibus pervertere: à Burdigala per Delphinum repulſi, tamen in agro Euchrociæ aliquantiſper morati, infecere nonnullos ſuis erroribus. Inde iter cœptum ingreſſi, turpi ſane pudibundoque comitatu, cum uxoribus atque alienis etiam fœminis, in quis erat Euchrocia, ac filia ejus Procula: de qua fuit in ſermone hominum, Priſcilliani ſtupro gravidam, partum ſibi graminibus abegiſſe* (4). i. e. " They journied through A- " quitain, where meeting with a ſplendid reception " from the ignorant, they ſcattered abroad the ſeeds " of perfidiouſneſs; and perverted particularly, by " their wicked diſcourſes, the Gaſcoons, a worthy, " religious people. The Dauphin driving them " from Bourdeaux, they made ſome ſtay at the man- " ſion-houſe of Euchrocia, and infected ſome per- " ſons with their erroneous doctrines. They ſet out " from thence with a ſcandalous train, with their " wives and other women, among whom were Eu- " chrocia, and her daughter Procula, of whom it is " related, that ſhe was got with child by Priſcillian, " and miſcarried in the fields." It was happy for Delphidius that he died young; as it prevented his having the grief to hear of his daughter's incontinence, and his wife's execution (5). It is well known that Euchrocia was put to death with Priſcillian (6). An applauder of Theodoſius declaimed, with great eloquence, againſt this cruelty; and could not forgive Maximus for having put to death the wife of an illuſtrious Poet, becauſe ſhe was accuſed of being over devout. *De virorum mortibus loquor, cum deſcenſum recorder ad ſanguinem fœminarum, & in ſexum cui bella parcunt non parcè ſævitum? Sed nimirum graves ſuberant invidioſæque cauſæ, ut unco ad pœnam clari vatis matrona raperetur. Objiciebatur enim, atque etiam exprobrabatur mulieri viduæ nimia religio, & diligentius culta divinitas* (7). i. e. " Do I ſpeak of the death " of men, when I recollect, that he was ſo mean as " to ſpill the blood of women, and behaved with cruel- " ty towards that ſex, whom even war ſpares? But " there were reaſons why the widow of an illuſtrious " Poet was put to death: for it was objected to her, " and

(4) Sulp. Severus, *Sacræ Hiſt.* lib. 2. p. 165.

(5) *Minus malorum munere expertus Dei, Medio quod ævi raptus es. Errore quod non deviantis filiæ, Pœnaque læjus conjugis.* Auſonius, *in Profeſſ.* num. 5. p. m. 160.

(6) Sulp. Severus, *Hiſt. Sacræ*, lib. 2. p. 170.

(7) Latinus Pacatus, *in Panegyrico Theodoſio dicto*, cap. 29. p. m. 509.

(f) In 385. that they cauſed him to be ſentenced (*f*) to die (*g*). Hereunder is the character of Ithacius, the chief inſtrument of Priſcillian's death [*D*], and the conſequence of the ſeverity

(g) Extracted from Sulp. Severus, *Hiſt. Sacræ*, lib. 2.

" and ſhe was even reproached, with being over re-
" ligious, and too zealous a worſhipper of the Deity."
Some people are ſurprized, how it was poſſible for Priſcillian to win over ſo many females, ſince his mock devotion was blended with ſuch ſhocking lewdneſs. He confeſſed at his trial, that he had held nocturnal and lewd aſſemblies with women, and that he uſed to ſtrip himſelf ſtark naked when he prayed (8). But other Writers ſay, that it was this very thing made his flock increaſe, and drew over the women to him. This is Father Maimbourg's opinion. I will again quote his paraphraſe, which is a little too much extended, of Sulpicius Severus's words.
" When people are ſo much prepoſſeſſed in a man's
" favour as to believe him a Saint, they obey implicitly
" all his commands; and they admit, without the
" leaſt reluctance, all his deciſions as ſo many ora-
" cles, particularly when they favour the impulſes of
" corrupt nature. Hence this wretch found it no
" difficult taſk to perſuade his followers, that if the
" ſpirit which comes from God was perfectly united
" to them, by a certain form of prayer he taught
" them, they then might, and ought to give the
" luſts of the fleſh their full ſwing, without God's
" taking any concern in, or being offended at it;
" ſince the fleſh does not proceed from him, but
" from the wicked principle, no leſs than marriage.
" It was owing to this deteſtable doctrine, that all
" ſuch women as did not love their huſbands, left
" them, in ſpite of their teeth *, as huſbands did
" their wives, of whom they were grown tired; and
" all of them in general, as did every one of his
" diſciples, prayed together as he did, as though they
" had been in a ſtate of innocence, and afterwards
" defiled themſelves with pollutions of every kind.
" Such is uſually the reſult or end of theſe new
" doctrines, enthuſiaſms, and new forms of prayer,
" (more mad than myſterious) of certain mock-en-
" lightened, and pretendedly ſpiritual men, who
" beginning by the ſpirit in order to impoſe upon
" the world, commonly end with the fleſh (9)."

(8) *Nec diffitentem obſcœnis ſe ſtuduiſſe doctrinis, nocturnos etiam turpium fœminarum cœtus iſſe conventus, nudumque orare ſolitum, nocentem pronunciavit.* Sulp. Severus, *Hiſt. Sacræ*, lib. 2. p. 170.

* Sever. lib. 2.

(9) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. du Pontific. de St. Leon*, liv. 1. p. 45, 46.

[*D*] *Hereunder is the character of Ithacius, the chief inſtrument of Priſcillian's death.*] Ithacius was a Spaniſh Biſhop, of an impudent, debauched character, who ſacrificed all things to his paſſions. He plainly ſhewed, that he was not actuated by the love of truth; and that he perſecuted thoſe hereticks with ſo much violence, merely through a principle of vanity. The firſt ſteps he had taken obliged him to ſtake every thing; he thirſted after the honours of the victory, and would ſhew his great power, and his authority in cabals. He could not bear to think of its being obſerved that he did not win his cauſe; he left nothing unattempted with the tyrant Maximus, in order to obtain the victory by the aid of the ſecular arm; and as he was afraid of being traverſed in his deſigns by wiſe and judicious perſons, he was ſo impudent and politically malicious, as to accuſe all he did not like, as Priſcillian-Hereticks. Whenever any perſon uſed to apply himſelf to reading or faſting, ſuch a one was immediately branded, by this violent perſecutor, as an accomplice of that ſect. Was he not ſo bold as to accuſe (of favouring them) St. Martin, who beſought him not to act the part of a ſtate-proſecutor; and entreated Maximus not to ſhed the blood of the hereticks in queſtion? Such are the abominable artifices of moſt of thoſe who impeach others of hereſy: they are revived every age, and the world ſuffers itſelf to be as much impoſed upon, as though they were but juſt ſtarted up. The Hiſtorian I am going to quote deſerves the greateſt encomiums, for ſaying that the Priſcillianiſts were not more diſagreeable to him than their accuſers. *Secuti etiam accuſatores Idacius & Ithacius Epiſcopi: quorum ſtudium in expugnandis hæreticis non reprehenderem, ſi non ſtudio vincendi plus quam oportuit certaſſent. Ac mea quidem ſententia eſt, mihi tam reos quam accuſatores diſplicere. Certe Ithacium nihil penſi, nihil ſancti habuiſſe definio. Fuit enim audax, loquax, impudens, ſumptuoſus, ventri & gulæ plurimum impertiens. Hic ſtultitiæ eo uſque proceſſerat, ut omnes etiam ſanctos viros, quibus aut ſtudium inerat lectionis, aut propoſitum erat certare jeju-niis, tanquam Priſcilliani ſocios aut diſcipulos, in crimen arceſſeret. Auſus etiam miſer eſt, ea tempeſtate Martino epiſcopo, viro plane Apoſtolis conferendo, palam objectare hæreſis infamiam. Namque tum Martinus apud Treveros conſtitutus, non deſinebat increpare Ithacium, ut ab accuſatione deſiſteret: Maximum orare, ut ſanguine infelicium abſtineret: ſatis ſuperque ſufficere, ut epiſcopali ſententia hæretici judicati eccleſiis pellerentur* (10). St. Martin's interceſſion was ſo powerful, that the unhappy perſons in queſtion were not proſecuted, ſo long as he continued at Triers; but as ſoon as he had left that city, ſome Biſhops won over Maximus, and prompted him to break his word with him (11). Priſcillian was ſentenced to die; and then Ithacius, fully gratified in all his wiſhes, diſcontinued the impeachment, that is, he did not appear before the judges, when the ſentence was to be confirmed; a groſs artifice, which was juſtly ridiculed by Sulpicius Severus. *Cæterum Ithacius videns quam invidioſum ſibi apud epiſcopos foret, ſi accuſato, etiam poſtremis rerum capitalium judiciis aſtitiſſet (etenim iterari judicium neceſſe erat) ſubtrahit ſe cognitioni fruſtra calido jam ſcelere perfecto* (12). Latinus Pacatus treats theſe bloody minded Biſhops as they deſerved; and expatiates in a proper manner on the ſcandal they cauſed, by laying their polluted and bloody hands on the moſt ſacred things; and enveighed againſt the iniquity of the tyrant Maximus, for careſſing and protecting ſuch Prelates (13). *Quid hoc majus poterat intendere accuſator ſacerdos? fuit enim, fuit & hoc delatorum genus, qui nominibus antiſtites, revera autem ſatellites, atque adeò carnifices, non contenti miſeros avitis evolviſſe patrimoniis, calumniabantur in ſanguinem, & vitas premebant reorum jam pauperum. Quinetiam cùm judiciis capitalibus aſtitiſſent, cùm gemitus & tormenta miſerorum auribus ac luminibus hauſiſſent, cùm lictorum arma, cùm damnatorum fræna tractaſſent, pollutas pœnali manus contactu ad ſacra referebant, & cærimonias quas inceſtaverant mentibus, etiam corporibus impiabant. Hos ille* (14) *Phalaris in amicis habebat, hi in oculis ejus, atque etiam in oculis erant: nec injuria, à quibus tot ſimul votiva veniebant, avaro divitum bona; cruento innocentium pœna; impio religionis injuria.* i. e.
" Could an accuſer, who was a Miniſter, have gone
" greater lengths? For there was a ſet of informers,
" who being Biſhops nominally, but in reality ſol-
" diers, and therefore executioners, not content with
" turning unhappy perſons out of their paternal
" eſtates, proſecuted them till they were ſentenced to
" die; and took away the lives of thoſe whom
" they had reduced to beggary. Farther, after ſit-
" ting in judgment in criminal matters; beholding
" and hearing the groans and tortures of the unhap-
" py criminals; after handling the Lictor's rods and
" the ſcourges of condemned wretches; they then
" would ſolemnize the holy Rites of Religion with
" hands defiled with blood, and pollute its ceremo-
" nies. Theſe were the tyrant Maximus's friends, the
" men he doated on; which indeed was natural
" enough for him to do, ſince they ſatiated his ava-
" rice with the wealth of the rich; his cruelty, by
" puniſhing the innocent; and his impiety, by pro-
" faning religion."

(10) Sulp. Severus, *Hiſt. Sacræ*, lib. 2. p. 168, 169.

(11) *Quoad uſque Martinus Treveris fuit, dilata cognitio eſt: & mox diſceſſurus egregia authoritate à Maximo elicuit ſponſionem, nihil cruentum in reos conſtituendum. Sed poſtea Imperator per Magnum & Rufum epiſcopos depravatus, & à mitioribus conſiliis deflexus, cuique præfecto Evodio permiſit, viro acri & ſevero.* Idem, p. 169.

(12) Idem, ibid. p. 170.

(13) Latinus Pacatus, *in Panegyrico Theodoſio dicto*, cap. 29. p. m. 509.

(14) That is, the Tyrant Maximus overcome by Theodoſius.

We may take notice in Ithacius of another circumſtance, in which ſuch as impeach with the greateſt violence reſemble him. No Biſhop would have found it a more difficult matter, than he, to account for his own conduct, and yet he was the moſt eager in ſlandering and proſecuting others. This wicked behaviour is unaccountable, as the Heathens have obſerved, they declaring, that innocence is the moſt eſſential quality in an accuſer (15). But thoſe who ſet up for accuſers, commonly have very little regard to this. There is a certain Writer, whoſe works, tho' filled with abſurdities, contradictions, profanations, novelties, very dangerous paradoxes and hereſies, he yet has charged a great many people with advancing falſe doctrines; and could he have had a Maximus, we ſhould have heard of nothing but perſons removed from their employments, out-lawed, fulminated with an anathema, not to ſay worſe. In all probability theſe irregular and unjuſt proceedings will laſt as long as the world.

(15) *Cognoſce quam multa eſſe oporteat in eo qui alterum accuſet. . Primum integritatem atque innocentiam ſingularem. Nihil eſt enim quod minus ferendum ſit, quam rationem ab altero vitæ repoſcere eum, qui non poſſit ſuæ reddere.* Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. 1. folio 22, *B*.

[*E*] . . *and*

ſeverity [E]. Saint Martin, Biſhop of Tours, refuſed to communicate with ſuch Biſhops as had prompted Maximus to that cruelty; and it being at laſt extorted from him to communicate with them, he was greatly afflicted upon that account all his life after; and imagined that this was the reaſon, why the gift of miracles, with which he was endued, was ſo much weakened with regard to him. Some other Biſhops imitated him [F], with a reſolution not to admit Ithacius and his adherents to their communion. He was not uneaſy at this ſo long as the tyrant Maximus, his protector, and the object of his adulation lived; but as ſoon as he had loſt him, he was puniſhed for his crime. Pope Leo was not ſo ſcrupulous as St. Martin, he approving of Priſcillian's execution [G]. Maimbourg makes a diſtinction that is almoſt ridiculous (*b*). I ſhall not enquire whether thoſe Hereticks believed and ſaid all that is aſcribed to them (*i*); I only ſay, that one of their opinions,

(*b*) See the rem. [G].

(*i*) See Moreri's Dictionary, Dutch edit. in the addition to the art. PRISCILLIAN.

[E] . . . *and the conſequences of that ſeverity.*] The words of Mr. Flechier, one of the fineſt Writers of his age, are ſo beautiful, that I am perſuaded all my Readers will be pleaſed to ſee them here. "This "execution was attended with many ill conſequences; "the putting this Hereſiarch to death, ſerved only "to add new ſtrength to his hereſy. His followers "interred him with great magnificence, and ho-"noured him as a Martyr; and thoſe who were the "inſtruments of his condemnation, abuſing their "credit, and the great intereſt they had at Court, "perſecuted good men with impunity *. Any per-"ſon who faſted, and loved ſolitude and retirement, "was immediately ſuſpected by them; and it was a "crime to behave with greater ſobriety and regula-"rity than they. Thoſe who were moſt obnoxious "to them, were immediately called Priſcillianiſts, "eſpecially when they were victims, whoſe death "might pleaſe the Prince, or increaſe his treaſures, "by the confiſcation of their eſtates †; for they "took away perſons lives, and deprived them of their "eſtates, at pleaſure; and preſerved the Tyrant's "friendſhip by calumnies, cruelties, and other acti-"ons like his (16)."

* *Sulp. Sever. de vita S. Mart.*

† *Pacat. in Panegyric.*

(16) Flechier, *Hiſt. de Theodoſe*, liv. 3. ad ann. 385. p. m. 303. Paris edit. 12mo. 1680.

[F] *Some other Biſhops imitated St.* Martin.] Continuing to ſhew the ill conſequences, which attended the putting to death Priſcillian, I ſhall make uſe of Father Maimbourg's words, they being better than any tranſlation I can make. "The moſt lamentable "circumſtance on this occaſion is, that this impeach-"ment carried on by Ithacius, cauſed, for ſome "time, a dangerous kind of ſchiſm in Gaul. For, "on one hand, Theognoſtus, a Biſhop of great au-"thority, having greatly condemned it, and even af-"terwards withdrawn from his communion, was imi-"tated in this particular by moſt of the Biſhops, who "imagined, as he did, that theycould not in conſcience "communicate with a man who had diſhonoured both "his character and the church, by polluting him-"ſelf with the blood of thoſe whoſe death he had "occaſioned. But on the other hand, ſeveral Bi-"ſhops, won over by Ithacius, whoſe accomplices "they were, or whoſe proceedings they applauded, "ſided with him; and ſeeing themſelves ſtrongly "ſupported by the favour of the Prince who pro-"tected Ithacius, they held a kind of a council or "conventicle in Triers, where he was cleared, and "declared legally innocent, by the ſentence pro-"nounced by them (17)." He afterwards relates how St. Martin refuſed to communicate with them, till he was informed that, by complying, he ſhould prevail with Maximus to repeal *the decree, whereby all the Priſcillianiſts that could be found ſhould be put to death* (18). St. Martin *did not approve of the putting Hereticks to death; and he was afraid that many of the worthieſt Catholicks would ſuffer in that ſlaughter; becauſe they looked upon as Priſcillianiſts, thoſe who, by their modeſt and mortified look ſeemed to lead a more regular life than others; thoſe hypocritical Priſcillianiſts not being diſtinguiſhed from ſuch as were truly devout men* (19). Thinking therefore that, of two evils, the leaſt ought to be choſen (20), he ſubmitted for a little time to the violence that was done to him; and aſſiſted with thoſe Biſhops at the *ceremony of the ordination of Felix Biſhop of Triers. . . . . The next day he returned very ſorrowful, and deeply repenting what he had done; and perceiving that this gift of miracles, with which* * *God had endued him, did not exert itſelf ſo frequently in him as before, he endeavoured to compenſate the loſs he had ſuſtained by his penitence. As for Ithacius's ſchiſm, it was not long lived; for Maximus his protector having been defeated ſome time after by Theodoſius the Great* †; *and killed by the ſoldiers in Aquileia, he was abandoned by all the Biſhops his adherents, and ſent into baniſhment, in which he died.*

(17) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. du Pontific. de St. Leon*, lib. 1. p. 57, 58.

(18) Ibid. p. 59.

(19) Ibid.

(20) Ibid. p. 60. where he cites the following words of Sulp. Severus, Dial. 3. *Satius æſtimans ad horam cedere, quam his non conſulere quorum cervicibus gladius imminebat.*

* *Sever. ibid.*

† *Iſid. de vir. ill. c. 2.*

[G] *Pope Leo . . . approved of Priſcillian's execution.*] Maimbourg (21) acknowledges, that till then Hereticks had not been puniſhed in that manner; but he aſſerts, *that they may very juſtly be treated with that ſeverity, as has frequently been practiſed ſince.* And not to ſpeak, ſays he, "of thoſe, who have proved in "their writings, that it was not only lawful, but like-"wiſe very proper to act in this manner, we need "but read what St. Leo has writ on this head, when "iſſuing, as will ſoon be obſerved, the neceſſary or-"ders for proſecuting in Spain the Priſcillian Here-"ticks he applauds Maximus for this action, and "ſays as follows *: That *the rigour and ſeverity of "his juſtice againſt that Hereſiarch and his diſciples "whom that Prince put to death, was of great ſervice "to the clemency of the church. For though ſhe is con-"tented with the mildneſs of the judgment which the "Biſhops pronounce, according to the canons, againſt ob-"ſtinate Hereticks, and is not for bloody executions* (α*), "*ſhe nevertheleſs is greatly aſſiſted and well ſupported, "by the ſevere conſtitutions of the Emperors, ſince "ſometimes Hereticks, through the dread of ſo rigorous "a puniſhment, have recourſe to the ſpiritual remedy, in "order to cure the deadly diſeaſe of their hereſy, by a "true and ſincere converſion.*" Maimbourg aſſerts (22), that Ithacius's chief fault was, his *applying himſelf to a ſecular tribunal, in a cauſe that was wholly eccleſiaſtical*, and doing all that lay in his power to take away the lives of thoſe Hereticks, *which is contrary to the laws of the church. For which reaſon*, ſays he, *when the Clergy implore the aſſiſtance of Princes and Magiſtrates againſt them, they always proteſt that they ſo earneſtly wiſh for their amendment, that they do not deſire to have them put to death, but rather that they ſhould find mercy; leaving, however, the Judges at liberty to act according to the laws, for the good of the Church and State.* This is a fallacious diſtinction, and mere grimace; it is, at leaſt, a conduct ſo oppoſite to the ſolemnity of a ſerious tribunal, that it is no wonder the Inquiſition ſhould be ridiculed on that account. The perſons hinted at, intreat Princes to enact laws againſt Hereticks, and laviſh the higheſt applauſes on them, when they make hereſy death; they deliver up to them thoſe whom they have declared Hereticks; conſequently ſuch perſons are the cauſe of their death. When they tell the Civil Magiſtrate, that they do not deſire them to be put to death, it is acting a mere farce (23). And by the way, why do not they requeſt the ſame indulgence with reſpect to aſſaſſins? for, according to theſe perſons, a Heretick is worſe than a poiſoner and a murderer. Ariſtotle's maxim, *poſito uno abſurdo multa ſequuntur*, was never truer than in this matter. The abſurdity of ſubjecting opinions to the ſword of the Civil Magiſtrate is attended with a thouſand abſurdities; and ſuch as maintain it fall into numberleſs contradictions. Obſerve that the Inquiſition ſentences people to die, and is not contented with declaring them Hereticks (24).

(21) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. du Pontific. de St. Leon*, lib. 1. p. 56.

* *Profuit diu iſta diſtrictio Eccleſiaſticæ lenitati, quæ etſi ſacerdotali contenta judicio cruentas refugit ultiones: ſeverit tamen Chriſtianorum Principum Conſtitutionibus adjuvatur, dum ad ſpirituale nonnunquam recurrunt remedium, qui timent corporale ſupplicium.* St. Leo, *Ep.* 95. *ad Turi b.*

(22) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. du Pontific. de St. Leon*, lib. 1. p. 57.

(23) See Jurieu, *Apologie pour la Reformation*, Tom. 2. p. 241, 257. 4to. edit.

(24) See Jurieu, ibid.

α* In thoſe countries where the Inquiſition prevails Hereticks are always ſentenced to be burnt. Now, as in ſuch executions there are neither bones broke, nor *blood ſpilt*, the query is, whether the maxim *Eccleſia non novit ſanguinem*, expreſſed here in equivalent terms by St. Leo, is obſerved in this reſpect, or only eluded. REM. CRIT.]

opinions, which was approved in St. Auſtin [*H*], ſeems to have been condemned in them.

(25) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. du Pontific. de St. Leon*, lib. 1. p. 65.

(26) We cannot poſſibly ſuppoſe, that any Heretick ever deprived men of that faculty.

** *Quod ſi id credi liceat, & doceri, nec virtutibus præmium, nec vitiis pœna debebitur. Omniaque non ſolum humanarum Legum, ſed etiam divinarum Conſtitutionum decreta ſolventur. Quia neque de bonis, neque de malis actibus ullum poterit eſſe judicium, ſi in utramque partem fatalis neceſſitas motum mentis impellit.* St. Leo, *Epiſt.* 93.

(27) Maimb. *Hiſt. du Pontific. de St. Leon*, lib. 1. p. 66.

(28) I make uſe of his tranſlat. of the paſſage from S. Leo. ibid. p. 65, 66.

[*H*] *One of their opinions, which was approved in St. Auſtin, ſeems to have been condemned in the* Priſcillianiſts.] The three following things are certain. 1. St. Auſtin believes, that man is impelled invincibly, either to evil by the corrupt ſtate of his nature, or to good by the Holy Ghoſt. 2. This doctrine deprives man of free-will, taking this word for the liberty of indifference. 3. St. Auſtin's doctrine has been ſolemnly approved by the church. Now the Reader will preſently ſee, that the Priſcillianiſts were condemned for deſtroying free-will, *by ſubjecting man's will to a fatal neceſſity, which it cannot oppoſe* (25). That is, that they were condemned becauſe they deſtroyed free-will, taking that word, not for the faculty of acting freely (26), and with a moſt agreeable propenſion, but for the power of chooſing between two contraries. They therefore were condemned for a doctrine which was approved in St. Auſtin. Let us conſider the manner in which they are refuted by Saint Leo **. " If it be lawful to believe and teach " this doctrine, virtue ought to be no longer rewarded, nor vice puniſhed; and all laws, not only human but alſo divine, are no longer binding, and " may be violated with impunity; becauſe it will be " no longer poſſible to give judgment, either in favour of good actions, or againſt evil ones, if a fatal neceſſity impells and overcomes the will (27). *Now can it be doubted after this,* (I ſtill uſe Father Maimbourg's expreſſions (28), without acquieſcing with all he ſays,) *if Saint Leo believed what faith obliges us to believe, viz. that grace does ſo influence our minds, that it does not lay any neceſſity upon us; but that it leaves us our free-will entire, on the liberty of indifference, by which we may chooſe one of two contrary things; and do good by grace, or evil of ourſelves.* I can eaſily ſuppoſe, that they differed from Saint Auſtin, in the explication of the cauſes which determine the will; but they muſt neceſſarily have agreed with him in this point, viz. that the principle, which moves it, does not permit it to ſtop, to go back, or turn aſide. Now it is on this very thing, that Pope Leo's arguments are grounded, when he refutes the Hereticks in queſtion. It is therefore certain, that when he condemns their doctrine, he refutes Saint Auſtin; and that he could not approve the doctrine of that Father, without admitting what he had rejected in the Priſcillianiſts. I do not enquire whether he argues juſtly; I only ſay, that all the proofs he builds on rewards and puniſhments, on laws and judgments, would be wrong againſt this ſect, if they were not good againſt Saint Auſtin's ſyſtem. It is to be obſerved, that Saint Leo argues from the conſequences, with which the doctrine of a fatal neceſſity might be attended; and does not ſay that theſe Hereticks taught theſe conſequences. This ſhews that he argued againſt the doctrine itſelf, independently of the principle on which they grounded it, and of the conſequences they actually drew from it. It was proper for me to add this obſervation, becauſe it confirms my text.

PRODICUS, a native of Iulis (*a*) in the iſland of Cea [*A*], one of the Cyclades, contemporary with Democritus Gorgias Leontinus, and Diſciple of Protagoras, was one of the moſt famous Sophiſts of Greece. He flouriſhed in the 86th Olympiad (*b*), and had, among other Diſciples, Euripides, Socrates (*c*), Theramenes (*d*), and Iſocrates (*e*). He was not aſhamed to teach privately in Athens, though he was come to that city with the character of Embaſſador, from his countrymen, who had before raiſed him to ſeveral other publick employments (*f*); and though one would have concluded that the high applauſes, which his ſpeech obtained him from the Athenians, the day he was admitted publickly to audience, would have made him employ his talent only on ſuch occaſions. Plato, who makes pretty frequent mention of him, and even with applauſe, but not without ſometimes employing irony (*g*), the darling figure of Socrates his great interlocutor, inſinuates, that a deſire of getting money prompted Prodicus to keep ſchool, and indeed he got a great deal of money that way. Philoſtratus (*h*) ſeems to be much of the ſame opinion with Plato; he declaring that Prodicus was fond of money, and loved to ſpend it in diverting himſelf. He uſed to go from one city to another, diſplaying his eloquence; and though he did it in a mercenary way [*B*], he nevertheleſs had great honours

(a) Suidas.

(b) Euſeb. *in Chron.*

(c) Plato, *in Menone*, p. 425.

(d) Suidas.

(e) Plutarch, and Dion. Hal. in the *Life of Iſocrates.*

(f) Plato, *in Hippia Maj.* p. 1246.

(g) Dion. Halicarnaſſeus, in his *Letter to Pompey*, blames Plato for ſlandering Prodicus and ſeveral others.

(h) *In Vita Sophiſt.* lib. 1. p. 500.

[*A*] *In the iſland of Cea.*] Suidas declares expreſsly, that Prodicus was a native of that iſland, ἀπὸ Κέω τῆς νήσου, and he calls him Κεῖον, as he had been called by Plato (1), Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus (2), Plutarch (3), Diogenes Laertius (4), &c. From Κέως comes Κεῖος, and by contraction Κῖος, which the Latins have expreſſed *Ceus*, or *Ceius*, or *Cius* (5). Menage (6) juſtly cenſures Marcilius Ficinus, for tranſlating Πρόδικος Κεῖος in Plato, *Prodicus Chius*; as Amyot has likewiſe done in his verſion of the life of Iſocrates. The Latin tranſlator of Philoſtratus has committed the like error; he tranſlating Πρόδικον Κῖον, in Philoſtratus, *Prodicum Chium* (7). The French tranſlator was doubtleſs more careful in conſulting Philoſtratus's Latin verſion, than in examining the Greek text, ſince he rendered it thus, *Prodicus, a native of Chios.* Caſeneuve, who cenſures him for this and ſome other miſtakes (8), overlooks two that deſerve to be criticized. The Greek paſſage is as follows: Προδίκῳ δὲ τῷ Κίῳ ὄνομα τοσοῦτον ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ ἐγένετο ὡς καὶ τὸν Γρύλλου Ξενοφῶντα ἐν Βοιωτοῖς δεθέντα ἀκροᾶσθαι διαλεγομένου, καθιςάντα ἐγγυητὴν τῷ σώματι. The French Tranſlator has rendered theſe words to this purpoſe. *Prodicus, a native of Chios and ſon of Grillus, was in ſo much reputation, that being impriſoned in Bœotia, Xenophon was bail for him, in order that he might hear him.* 1. Xenophon, not Prodicus, ſhould be called Gryllus's ſon. Caſeneuve ſays this himſelf, page 43; and nevertheleſs, when he cenſures the tranſlation, page 42, he ſays the Tranſlator *ſhould have ſaid*, Prodicus, a native of Chios, and ſon of Gryllus, &c. 2. It was Xenophon who was impriſoned, not Prodicus; and nevertheleſs, there is no perſon who reads this tranſlation, but imagines that Xenophon was bail for Prodicus when impriſoned. Though Caſeneuve knew, that the Sophiſt in queſtion was not born in the iſland of Chios, he yet did not know what country-man he was; he ſaying, that he was a native of *the iſland of Cio, now called Standia.* But this is a miſtake, he being born in the iſland of Cea, or Ceos, now called Zea. Moreri, in ſuppoſing him a native of the iſland of Cos (9), has only followed the error of perſons who knew more than himſelf. Eraſmus calls him *Coum*, page 394, of his Adagia, as alſo Charles Stephens in his dictionary, which fault was not corrected either by Lloyd or Hofman. They likewiſe have not corrected what he aſcribes falſely to Suidas, viz. his having made Prodicus a native of the iſland of Chios. Menage (10) affirms, that an error has crept into the firſt chapter of the third book of Quintilian, where Prodicus is called *Chius*; but I have not found that miſtake in the editions I conſulted. Maucroix, in his verſion of the great Hippias, printed at Paris in 1685, makes Prodicus a native of the iſland of Cos. Father Goulu had committed the ſame miſtake, in his French tranſlation of the Apology for Socrates (11).

(1) *In* Protagora, *& paſſim alibi.* He ſays in *Hippia Majore*, p. m. 1246, that Prodicus came ἐκ Κέω *ex Cea Inſula.*

(2) *In Vita Iſocratis.*

(3) Ibid.

(4) *In Protagora.*

(5) See Wolfius, *in Iſocrat. Vitam, & Menage in Diog. Laert.* p. 419.

(6) Ibid.

(7) *In Vita Sophiſt.* p. 449.

(8) Caſeneuve, *Comment. ſur les Epiſt. de Philoſtr.* p. 42.

(9) In the Dutch edit. it is *Col*: but this is an error of the preſs.

(10) Menage, *in Laert.* p. 419.

(11) It is in part 2. of Phyllarchus's *Letters.* See p. 581.

[*B*] *In a mercenary way.*] See Philoſtratus (12) and Plato.

(12) *In Vita Sophiſt.* p. 488.

nours paid him in Thebes, and ſtill greater in Lacedæmonia. His declamation at fifty drachms has been very much talked of [C]. It was called πεντηκονταδραχμος, according to ſome learned men, becauſe every auditor was obliged to pay him fifty drachms (i), which amounted to more than four French Crowns. Prodicus's ſtyle muſt have been very eloquent [D], ſince people flocked prodigiouſly to hear him, though he had a diſagreeable voice (k). It is related that Xenophon, when a priſoner in Boeotia [E], being deſirous of hearing Prodicus (l), procured bail, and went and gratified his curioſity. Few orations have been oftener quoted, or occaſioned more applications, than that in which our Sophiſt feigned, that virtue [F] and pleaſure, in a female diſguiſe, preſent themſelves to Hercules, and each ſtrive to win him over (m). The Athenians put him to death as one who corrupted their youth. If this connexion was only that mentioned by Ariſtophanes, in one of his Comedies (n), when he ſays, *this man has been ſpoiled by books*,

(i) Hofman, in the art. PRODICUS, ſpeaks but of five drachms.

(k) Δυσήκοον καὶ βαρὺ φθεγγόμενος, *diſſone & injucunde loquens.* Philoſtr. p. 500. See alſo Plato in *Protag.* p. 220.

(l) Philoſtr. p. 499.

(m) Ἐν Ἀθήναις καίτοι πιεῖν αὐτῷ δοῦναι ὑπὲρ διαφθορᾶς τῶν νέων. *Athenis hauſta cicuta mortuus eſt quaſi juvenes corrumperet.* Suidas.

(n) Idem, Suidas.

Plato. The latter ſays, that young perſons of the richeſt and moſt noble families, drawn by Prodicus, Gorgias, Polus, and Hippias, who uſed to travel from town to town, gave them great ſums of money, and promiſed to be very grateful over and above this, and at the ſame time neglected to be taught by their fellow citizens, who would have inſtructed them gratis (13).

(13) Plato, *in Apol. Socr.* p. 15 and 16. and in *Theage*, p. 93.

[C] *His declamation at fifty drachms.*] I have employed the word declamation, but without depriving myſelf of the right to ſubſtitute another, in caſe it ſhould be neceſſary. In my opinion the word ἐπίδειξις, uſed by Plato and Suidas, ſignifies an harangue or ſpeech, in which an Author diſplays all his rhetoric; and intends to ſignalize himſelf, both on account of the importance of the ſubject, and the vaſt concourſe of auditors. Thoſe who tranſlate ἐπίδειξιν ποιεῖν, *ſpecimen edere*, to publiſh a ſpecimen, have not a wrong notion of the thing; for they give us to underſtand, that an orator exerts his utmoſt ſtrength, as though he had been deſired to produce a maſter piece. This I believe is the reaſon why the moſt ſhining ſpeeches, which are thoſe that form panegyricks or ſatyrs, have been aſcribed, by Rhetoricians, to the demonſtrative kind, ἐπιδεικτικὸν. However this be, there is ſome difficulty about the ἐπίδειξις πεντηκονταδραχμος of Prodicus. Suidas ſays that Prodicus firſt invented it; but ſays no farther, nor tells us what it is. Voſſius however makes him ſay, that all ſuch as deſired to hear that orator, uſed to pay him fifty drachms, that is, four French crowns and two Spaniſh rials (14). It is very plain, that Voſſius truſted to Creſollius (15), and looked no farther. He makes exactly the ſame valuation of money as the Jeſuit; but whereas, in the Jeſuit's book, this ſum of four crowns and two rials, which every auditor paid Prodicus, is but an explication of Suidas's words, or a conſequence drawn from them, it is ſet down in Voſſius as being Suidas's own words. Hence the reader may judge, how cautiouſly we ought to read common Authors in their quotations, ſince a man of Voſſius's character takes ſuch liberties. We will now ſee what he had ſaid in another book (16). He had related, as a circumſtance copied from Ariſtotle, that whenever Prodicus took notice that his auditors did not attend to him, he uſed to propoſe to them ſomething relating to his art, which he would not teach under the price of fifty drachms. The paſſage in Ariſtotle ſeems to bear two meanings; one, that Prodicus had a certain oration which abounded with ſuch lively ſtrokes, that whenever any of them was ſpoke before the audience, it immediately diſpelled the drowſineſs of the hearers; the other, that he had a treatiſe of rhetoric, containing ſeveral peculiar ſecrets, which would call up the attention of the hearers, though ever ſo abſent or weary (17). According to the firſt ſenſe, he had an oration which he kept for the grand days, that is, for his hearers who paid fifty drachms for it; and according to the ſecond ſenſe, he had a collection of good antidotes for his auditors, to keep them from ſleeping, and which he communicated to ſuch only as paid him handſomely for them. This puts me in mind of a Profeſſor of Philoſophy (18), famous among the Proteſtants of France, who would not teach certain ſophiſms, unleſs he was paid a certain tax or price he put upon them. Voſſius has followed the firſt of theſe two meanings in one of his books, and the laſt in the others. It would be no eaſy matter to determine which is the trueſt, conſidering the brevity which Ariſtotle and Suidas have affected, in ſpeaking of this matter; this, I ſay, would be pretty difficult, if Plato did not give us to underſtand, that the ἐπίδειξις πεντηκονταδραχμος of Prodicus's was rather a letter than a ſpeech. Socrates complains, in his bantering way, of his not being able to diſcourſe to purpoſe on the nature of names, becauſe he had not heard the ἐπίδειξις of fifty drachms, which Prodicus ſaid, taught that whole myſtery; he had heard only that of one drachm, τὴν δραχμιαῖα (19). Creſollius did not underſtand this laſt word; but falſely imagined, that it ought to be taken in Plato, for the ſame thing which had before been called πεντηκονταδραχμος. *Plato qui rem eandem memorat, ea cauſa δραχμιαίαν ἐπίδειξιν nominavit* (20). Madam Dacier, in her remarks on Ariſtophanes's clouds, p. 235. had a more juſt idea of the thing. *Prodicus*, ſays ſhe, *was the vaineſt man that ever lived; and entertained ſo advantageous an opinion of his own learning, that he never taught the moſt inconſiderable thing gratis. He had ſpeeches of all rates and prices ready, from an obolus to fifty drachms.*

(17) Τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶν, ὥσπερ ἔφη Πρόδικος ὅτε νυστάζοιεν οἱ ἀκροαταὶ παρεμβεβλῆσθαι τῆς πεντακοντάδραχμα αὐτοῖς. *Hoc autem eſt, ut dixit Prodicus, cum dormitant auditores, inferre aliquid demonſtrationis quinquaginta drachmarum ipſis* Ariſt. *Rhetor.* lib. 3. cap. 14.

(18) David Derodon.

(19) Νῦν δὲ οὐκ ἀκήκοα, ἀλλὰ τὴν δραχμιαίαν. Plato, *in Cratylo*, p. 265.

(20) Creſollius, *Theatr. Rhetor.* lib. 3. cap. 5. p. 178.

[D] *Prodicus's ſtyle muſt have been very eloquent.*] This may be proved by the teſtimony of ſeveral grave Authors. Maximus Tyrius (21) aſcribes to Prodicus the beauty of expreſſion, καλλιλογίαν, as his true characteriſtic. Marcellinus (22) ſays, he was very exact and accurate in the choice of his words. Themiſtius ſays, that his ſpeeches were full of ornaments and beauties, πολυτελεῖς τε καὶ γέμουσας ἡδονῆς. I am of opinion that Naudæus (23) ought not to have ranked him among thoſe Sophiſts, who uſed to declaim or ſpeek on any ſubject that was propoſed, without premeditation. But Philoſtratus would induce one to think the contrary; he ſaying, page 487, of his lives of the Sophiſts, that not only Gorgias was the firſt who underwent that trial; but alſo that he was prompted to it in order to eclipſe the glory which Prodicus gained by going from town to town, and delivering elaborate ſpeeches. Being deſirous of ſurpaſſing an Orator, whom he uſed to laugh at for often repeating the ſame words, he reſolved to exert his eloquence on unpremeditated ſubjects (24). There is no doubt, but that the thoughts in Prodicus's ſpeeches were as ſubtile as his ſtyle was beautiful; and that he contributed, as much at leaſt, as any body elſe, to cauſe the Athenians to forbid the Sophiſts to plead cauſes: this people could no longer bear to ſee the ſubtilties of thoſe Sophiſts make that to appear juſt which was unjuſt (25). See the Proverb Προδίκου σοφώτερος, more knowing than Prodicus. Eraſmus has committed an error there, in imagining that this Prodicus meant there was not the Sophiſt, but another. See how he is cenſured for it in Caſeneuve's notes on Philoſtratus's epiſtles, p. 42, 43. See alſo Ariſtophanes's clouds. But let the Poet ſneer as much as he pleaſes, we may infer from what he ſays, that our Sophiſt was conſidered as a man of great wit and learning.

(21) *Diſſert.* 7. *init.*

(22) In the *Life of Thucydides*, who ſays that he imitated τὴν τῶ Προδίκῳ ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἀκρίβειαν.

(23) Synt. *de Studio Liber*, p. 87. in the collection of Diſſertations *de Studiis inſtituendis*, printed in 1645, where we find *Prodichum Chium.* Doubtleſs the laſt miſtake is Naudæus's.

(24) Ἐπικόπτων τὸν Πρόδικον ὡς ἑωλά τε καὶ πολλάκις εἰρημένα ἀγορεύοντα ἐπαφῆκεν ἑαυτὸν τῷ καιρῷ. Philoſtr. p. 488.

(25) Idem, ibid.

[E] *Xenophon, when a priſoner in Boeotia.*] Charles Stephens did not underſtand any part of that paſſage of Philoſtratus. He explains it as though this Author had ſaid, that Prodicus was a man of ſo much authority, that Xenophon, having been taken Priſoner in Boeotia, was permitted to go home becauſe Prodicus was bail for him. Lloyd and Hofman have copied the errors of Charles Stephens word for word.

[F] *That in which Prodicus feigned, that virtue.*] I employed the word oration, not only becauſe Philoſtratus makes me have that idea of it, but alſo becauſe the profeſſion of Prodicus leads one naturally to it. It is not improbable but that a fiction of this kind

books, by Prodicus, or the converſation of great talkers, his puniſhment would have been a little too ſevere; but it is ſomewhat probable, that he was accuſed of inculcating profaneneſs or irreligion into his Diſciples [*G*]. I know not whether other Authors beſides Plutarch have obſerved, that he was of an infirm and very ſickly conſtitution [*H*].

(26) Lib. 2. *de memor. Socratis.*

(27) Cicero, *Officior.* lib. 1. cap. 32. *Epiſt.* 12. *ad Famil.* lib. 5.

(28) Quintil. lib. 9. cap. 2.

(29) Max. Tyr. *Orat.* 4. *init.*

(30) Lucian. *in Somnio.* I ſhall obſerve hereunder, in the rem. [*H*] of the art. ZOROASTER, that the words of Clemens Alexandrinus are ambiguous.

(31) Berchet, in his *Scholia* on this paſſage of Henry Stephens, declares Prodicus to be a native of the iſland of Cos, or of the iſland of Chios; and ſince he ſays that he was a man *ſummæ auctoritatis*, he ſhews that he fell into the miſtake of Charles Stephen's Dict.

(32) Sext. Emp. *adv. Mathem.*

ſerved him for the ſubject of a declamation. It is nevertheleſs true that Xenophon (26), who favours us with the ſubſtance of it, gives it as the extract of a work concerning Hercules, ἐν τῷ συγγράμματι τῷ περὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους. What Charpentier ſpeaks of is ſtill more particular, in his French tranſlation; *in the book*, ſays he, *which* the learned Prodicus *wrote concerning the Life of Hercules.* Suidas informs us that this was a book entitled ὧραι, *the hours*; but notwithſtanding this, we yet may call this compoſition of Prodicus an oration. I ſaid that this fiction had been often quoted and applied, and I had reaſon to ſay ſo. Cicero (27), Quintilian (28), and Maximus Tyrius (29), ſpeak of it; but Silius Italicus, mentioned by Moreri, makes no mention of it. He feigns ſomething like this in honour of Scipio Africanus. Lucian alſo imitated this fiction (30). Among the moderns, I ſhall cite only Henry Stephens, who ſpeaks of it in the exhortation prefixed to his Greek verſion of the Geneva Catechiſm (31).

[*G*] *He was accuſed of inculcating profaneneſs or irreligion into his Diſciples.*] Sextus Empiricus ranks him among the Atheiſts (32); as does likewiſe Cicero, tho' not ſo directly, he ſaying that he taught, that to human gratitude is owing the belief of the exiſtence of Gods. This claſhes as much with ſound divinity, as if we ſhould ſay, as others have done, *primus in orbe Deos fecit timor*, to fear is owing the invention of religion; or with others, that the wiſdom of politicians invented it, in order to keep the common people to their duty. Cicero ſhews, that Prodicus's opinion is really deſtructive to religion. *Quid? ii qui dixerunt totam de Diis immortalibus opinionem fictam eſſe ab hominibus ſapientibus Reipub. cauſa, ut quos ratio non poſſet, eos ad officium religio duceret, nonne omnem religionem funditus ſuſtulerunt? Quid Prodicus Chius? qui ea quæ prodeſſent hominum vitæ Deorum in numero habita eſſe dixit, quam tandem religionem reliquit* (33)? i. e. "Did not thoſe perſons entirely deſtroy all religion, "who declared that the doctrine or belief of the im- "mortal Gods was invented by Politicians, to keep "thoſe men virtuous, from principles of religion, "whom reaſon could not reſtrain? What religion did "Prodicus of Chios leave, when he ſaid, that thoſe "things which are of advantage to man's life, are "ranked in the number of the Gods?"

(33) Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*, lib. 1. *circa fin.* p. m. 170.

[*H*] *He was of an infirm and very ſickly conſtitution.*] Plutarch obſerves, that when men are to be raiſed to publick employments, regard ſhould be had to their ſtrength and vigour, and not to their age; and therefore, that a robuſt old man ought not to be excuſed from it, as it was juſt to diſpenſe with Prodicus in his youth. It was this gave him occaſion to inform us of Prodicus's infirmity. He joins him with ſo lean and feeble (34) a man, that this paſſage deſerves to be cited, which is tranſlated according to Amiot's verſion (35). *As therefore that man, who would adviſe Prodicus the Sophiſt, or Philetas the Poet, who were both young, but lean, feeble, ſickly* (36), *and commonly confined to their beds, to concern themſelves with publick affairs, would be ſtupid and ſenſeleſs; ſuch would thoſe be, who ſhould forbid ſuch old men as Phocion, Maſſiniſſa the African, and Cato the Roman, to exerciſe public employments.*

(34) See the art. PHILETAS.

(35) Plut. *an ſeni ſit gerenda Reſpublica*, p. 791. *E.*

(36) Νίκε μὲν, ἰσχνὸς δὲ καὶ νοσώδης καὶ τὰ πολλὰ κλινοπετὴς δ' ἀῤῥωστίαι ὄντας. *Integra quidem ætate verum graciles & ob infirmitatem valetudinis crebro decumbentes.* Idem, ib.

PRODICUS, a Heretic in the ſecond Century (*a*), Founder of the Sect of the Adamites, imbibed the deteſtable opinions of Carpocrates, and added to them the ſhameleſs one of the copulation of both ſexes in publick [*A*]; he commanding that women ſhould be in common. Hence, in their publick banquets, every man took the firſt woman who fell in his way, after the candles were taken away; and it was affirmed that this lewd practice was the myſtical ceremony of initiation (*b*). Perſons, who are ever ſo little of a pious diſpoſition, are ſtruck with horror in finding, that ſo ſoon after the death of the Apoſtles, the doctrine of the myſterial union that ought to be between Chriſtians, was interpreted as implying the carnal conjunction of man and woman; and that perſons dared to maintain, that the true participation in the myſteries conſiſted in this. But what could be expected from ſuch a man as Prodicus, who imagined that ſouls were lodged in bodies, not for their puniſhment, but to pay homage to Angels, who had created the world, by all kinds of ſenſuality (*c*)? Prodicus's followers boaſted of their poſſeſſing

(*a*) See the rem. [*A*] of the art. ADAMITES.

(*b*) Theod. Hæret. Fab. lib. 1. cap. 6. and lib. 5. cap. 27.

(*c*) Idem, lib. 5. cap. 10 and 20.

[*A*] *And added to them the ſhameleſs opinion of the copulation of both ſexes in publick.*] Here follows Theodoret's words: Οὗτος προφανῶς λαγνείαν τοῖς Καρποκράτους προσέθηκε δόγμασι. *Hic ad decreta Carpocratis adjecit palam & publicè ſcortari* (1). The only proof Theodoret alledges for this is, that Prodicus commanded women to be in common, that is to ſay, that in the meats called by the primitive Chriſtians *Agapæ* (ἀγάπαι) every man ſhould enjoy a woman as ſhe ſhould happen to fall in his way, when the lights were put out. This they uſed to call communicating, and being initiated into the myſtery. I do not ſee any reaſon Theodoret had to aſcribe this additional doctrine to Prodicus, ſince Clemens Alexandrinus, whoſe teſtimony he borrows, aſcribes (2) all this to Carpocrates; for after having related, not as a circumſtance mentioned in their writings, but merely as an hearſay, that infamous practice of taking away the lights, and copulating, he ſays that Carpocrates ſhould enact thoſe laws for dogs, ſwine, and goats. Clemens Alexandrinus therefore did not think, that Carpocrates had left the enacting of theſe ſtrange laws to any of his ſucceſſors, for inſtance, Prodicus. Theodoret therefore makes uſe of an Author who is againſt him. This Author obſerves that the men in queſtion, before they went to theſe feaſts, uſed to inform ſuch women as they were deſirous of enjoying, that they had made choice of them (3). This is probable enough. The paſſions are too ingenious not to be active on ſuch occaſions, and to refer the whole to chance. The Carpocratian women knew therefore pretty well who would be their partners; and were not wholly in the caſe mentioned by a Roman Poet.

(1) Theodoret. Hæret. Fab. lib. 1. cap. 6.

(2) Stromat. lib. 3. p. 430.

(3) Μελετήσαντας δὲ τὴν τοιαύτην ἀγάπην τὴν κοινωνίαν, μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ ἤδη παρ' ὧν ἂν ἐθελήσωσι γυναικῶν αἰτεῖν τὴν τῷ Καρποκράτει· ὃ γὰρ θέμις εἰπεῖν θεῖον· νόμεα ὑπαχοΐν. *Meditatos autem in ejuſmodi agape communionem, interdiu jam, à quibus velint mulieribus exigere Carpocrateæ (divinæ enim nefas eſt dicere) legis obedientiam.* Cl. Alex. *Stromat.* lib. 3. p. 430.

Mox juniores quærit adulteros
Inter mariti vina: neque eligit
Cui donet impermiſſa raptim
Gaudia luminibus remotis:
Sed juſſa coram non ſine conſcio
Surgit marito: ſeu vocat, inſtitor,
Seu navis Hiſpanæ magiſter,
Dedecorum pretioſus emtor (4).

(4) Horace, *Od.* 6. lib. 3.

"Marry'd, their leſſons ſhe improves,
"By practice of adult'rous loves,
"And ſcorns the common, mean deſign,
"To take advantage of her huſband's wine,
"Or ſnatch in ſome dark place,
"A haſty illegitimate embrace.

"No! the brib'd huſband knows of all,
"And bids her riſe when lovers call:
"Hither a Merchant from the *Streights*,
"Grown wealthy by forbidden freights,
"Or city Canibal repairs,
"Who feeds upon the fleſh of theirs:

"Convenient

poſſeſſing the ſecret books of Zoroaſter (*d*); and maintained that God ought not to be invoked (*e*), and that men ought not to run the hazard of martyrdom, by confeſſing the truth (*f*).

(*d*) Cl. Alex. *Strom.* lib. 1. p. 304.

(*e*) Ibid. lib. 7. p. 722.

(*f*) Tertull. *in Scorpiac.* cap. *ult.*

" Convenient brutes, whoſe tributary flame
" Pays the full price of luſt, and gilds the
ſlighted ſhame. ROSCOMMON.

I muſt add that Theodoret, in another circumſtance, has not been ſo accurate as he ought in the quotation of Clemens Alexandrinus. He makes him ſay of Prodicus, what is properly and directly ſaid of ſome others; and which cannot be applied to Prodicus but in general, and with ſeveral indirect arguments.

PRUDENTIUS, whoſe entire name is *Aurelius Prudentius Clemens*, a Chriſtian Poet, was born in 348 [*A*]: he was a Spaniard; but it is diſputed whether he was a native of Calahorra, or Saragoſſa, or ſome other city of that country [*B*]. Thoſe who declare that he was raiſed to the Conſulate, are groſly miſtaken [*C*]; and they ſhould only have ſaid, that he was honoured with a very conſiderable employment (*a*). He did not begin to employ his muſe on religious ſubjects, till he was ſeven and fifty. He had been a Lawyer, afterwards

(*a*) See the rem. [*D*].

[*A*] *He was born in* 348.] This is proved from the following words:

Hæc dum vita volans agit
Inrepſit ſubito canities ſeni,
Oblitum veteris me Saliæ Conſulis arguens
Sub quo prima dies mihi (1).

(1) Prudent. *in Prologo Operum.*

" Whilſt my too fleeting life is thus engag'd,
" Inſtant, old age comes on, and turns me gray,
" Hinting that I've old Salia's Conſulate
" Forgot, the year which gave Prudentius birth."

The meaning of this is, that he was born under the Conſulſhip of Salia: now we find that the Conſuls of the year 348 were Flavius Philippus and Flavius Sallia, or Sallea (2). I am to obſerve, that ſuch as ſuppoſe him to flouriſh in 380 (3) are almoſt as much miſtaken as thoſe who declare him to flouriſh in 430 (4).

(2) Onuphrius, in book 3 of the *Faſti*, proves, by an inſcription, that his name was Sallea.

(3) Sixtus Senenſis is cenſured for this by Father Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſ.* Tom. 2. p. 794.

(4) *Bibl. Hiſpan.* p. 205.

[*B*] . . . . *It is diſputed whether he was a native of Calahorra, or Saragoſſa or ſome other city of that country.*] Aldus Manutius, Sixtus Senenſis, Poſſevinus, and ſome other Writers, declare him to be a native of Saragoſſa; but Mariana aſſerts that he was born in Calahorra (5). They inſiſt, in favour of the firſt opinion, the hymn *in honorem ſanctorum decem & octo Martyrum Cæſarauguſtanorum* (6), which begins thus:

Bis novem NOSTER *populus ſub uni*
Martyrum ſervat cineres ſepulchro
Cæſarauguſtam vocitamus urbem
Res cui tanta eſt.

(5) Mariana, *Hiſt. Hiſpan.* lib. 4. cap. 17.

(6) It is the 4th of the book περὶ στεφάνων.

" Beneath one tomb, my countrymen have laid
" The ſacred, bleſt remains of twice nine martyrs?
" The only place, which can this honour boaſt,
" Cæſar Auguſta's called."

The following paſſage is found in the hymn in queſtion:

NOSTER *eſt quamvis procul hinc in urbe*
Paſſus ignota dederit ſepulchri
Gloriam victor, prope litus altæ
Forte Sagunti.
NOSTER, & NOSTRA *puer in palæſtra,*
Arte virtutis, fideique olivo
Unctus, horrendum didicit domare
Viribus hoſtem (7).

(7) Prudent. ib. *Hymn.* 4. ver. 97.

" He's ours, tho' martyr'd in a diſtant clime,
" The victor may indulge funereal honours,
" And let his aſhes lie near fam'd Saguntum.
" Our countrymen anointed with the oil
" Of faith, aroſe a mighty hero 'mong us,
" And learnt to triumph o'er the dreadful foe."

Prudentius ſpeaks of St. Vincentius, who was a native of Saragoſſa. A like proof is brought in favour of the ſecond opinion; for we find, the two following verſes in the hymn *in honorem ſanctorum Martyrum Hemiterii & Chelidonii Calagurritanorum* (8).

Hoc bonum ſalvator ipſe, quo fruamur, præſtitit
Martyrum cum membra NOSTRO *conſecravit oppido* (9).

(8) It is the 1ſt of the book περὶ στεφάνων.

(9) Prudent. ib. *Hymn.* 1. ver. 115.

" This good we owe to our bleſt Saviour's bounty,
" Who, loving us, made ſacred to our city,
" The blood of Martyrs."

And in the hymn for the martyrs of Saragoſſa, we read as follows.

NOSTRA *geſtabit Calagurris ambos*
Quos veneramur (10).

(10) Idem, ibid. *Hymn.* 4. ver. 31.

" Both, ſhall our Calahorra bear,
" Whom we with equal awe revere."

Mariana made uſe of theſe two paſſages; but the Author who criticiſed him ſhews (11), that if they afforded a good proof, they would be inſignificant for that very reaſon, becauſe they cannot be ſolid, unleſs the paſſages brought in favour of the contrary opinion are ſo likewiſe. In a word, they are reaſons which prove too much, and conſequently prove nothing. He invalidates the arguments of Mariana and Aldus Manutius reciprocally; and declares that Prudentius, though born neither in Saragoſſa nor Calahorra, might have called them *noſtra*, becauſe they were ſituated in Hiſpania Tarraconenſis, the country where he was born. He confirms his opinion by two remarks (12), one of which is taken from the following words concerning Tarragona:

(11) Pedro Mantuano, *Advertencias à la Hiſt. de Juan de Mariana*, p. 82 & *ſeq.*

(12) Idem, ibid. p. 85.

O triplex honor, o triforme cumen
Quo NOSTRÆ *caput excitatur urbis*
Cunctis urbibis eminens Hiberis (13).

(13) Prudent. *Hymn.* 6. ver. 142.

" O triple honour, triple glorious fame,
" Which raiſes thus our city 'bove all others"

The other proof is grounded on this, that though Prudentius ſays ſo many things of Merida, the native country of St. Eulalia, he does not call it *noſtra*; the reaſon of which, ſays he is, becauſe it was not in *Hiſpania Tarraconenſis*, but in *Hiſpania Luſitanica*. I muſt obſerve that he is miſtaken with regard to the following words, *noſtra puer in palæſtra*, he affirming (14) that they hinted at Valentia (15) where St. Vincentius ſuffered martyrdom; but it is plain they denote Saragoſſa, the place of his birth and education.

(14) Pedro Mantuano, *Advertencias à la Hiſt. de Mariana*, p. 84, 85.

(15) A town in Hiſpania Tarraconenſis.

The Author who cenſures Mariana is better at pulling down than building up; for when he endeavours to prove that Salia in Aſturia is the place of Prudentius's birth, he does not give one good reaſon, though he ſhews a great deal of ingenious learning. His principal argument is in the following words, *oblitum veteris me Saliæ Conſulis* (16). He pretends (17) that if *veteris* refers to *Conſulis*, there muſt have been two Salias ſucceſſively Conſuls; and that Prudentius muſt have been under the conſulate of the firſt. Now it is certain there was not a *Salia major* and *Salia minor*, as a *Scipio Africanus major*, and a *Scipio Africanus minor*. This objection would have ſome weight, was Prudentius an Author rigorouſly accurate in the choice of his terms. To conclude, if we were to refer, with Pedro Mantuano, the word *veteris* to a town, what will become of the word *conſulis*? His ſaying (18), that it ſignifies a year will not be any thing to the purpoſe.

(16) See the rem. [*A*].

(17) Pedro Mantuano, *Advertencias à la Hiſt. de Mariana*, p. 87.

(18) Idem, ibid. p. 90.

[*C*] *Thoſe who declare that he was raiſed to the Conſulate are groſly miſtaken.*] Aldus Manutius (19) calls him

(19) Aldus, *in Vita Prudentii.*

wards a judge, then a ſoldier, and laſtly, enjoyed a noble employment at Court [*D*]. He does not deny but that he was debauched in his younger years (*b*). His Poems ſhew more of religious zeal than imbeliſhments of art (*c*). He is often guilty of falſe quantity, not to mention that all his opinions are not orthodox [*E*]. The liberty he took in aſſerting that

(*b*) See the rem. [*D*].

(*c*) *Melior omnino Chriſtianus quam Poeta meo judicio.* Lilius Gregor.

Gyraldus, *Dialog.* 25. p. 906. Tom. 2. *Operum.* See alſo Gyrald. *in Poet. Hiſt.* p. 290.

him *vir conſularis & Maſſaliæ Conſul.* His miſtake proceeds from his not rightly underſtanding the letters V. C. added to Prudentius's names; and from reading *oblitum veteris Meſſaliæ conſulis arguens*, inſtead of which it ſhould be *me Saliæ*. The two letters V. C. ſignify *vir clariſſimus*, as Alciatus obſerves (20), and not *vir conſularis*, a title which was no longer uſed in that age (21). Here follows a paſſage from du Pin (22). "This paſſage has been underſtood by very "few Authors (23); and ſome, as Aldus, Sixtus Se- "nenſis, Poſſevinus, and even father Labbe imagined "that he had been Conſul of a city called Meſſalia, "which father Labbe (24) ſuppoſes to be Marſeilles; "but it is a blunder. They miſtook the name of "Salia the Conſul, who was Conſul with Philip in "348, for the name of a city; and gave Prudentius "the title of Conſul, which belongs to Salia, under "whoſe Conſulate Prudentius was born." The Author who criticiſes Mariana (25) refutes Antonius Nebriſſenſis, who ſuppoſes that Prudentius was born under the Conſulſhip of Meſſalia: he ſhews that there was no Conſul of this name from the beginning of the reign of Dioclefian till the reign of the Emperor Anaſtaſius. He refutes Aldus, who imagines, that Prudentius was Conſul of Meſſalia (26), ſhews that there is no ſuch Conſul in the *Faſti Conſulares*, that ancient Authors have never ſpoke of a city called Meſſalia. There indeed was a city named Maſſillia, now called Marſeilles: but (ſays he) ever ſince the diviſion of the Empire under Conſtantine, one Conſul uſed to be elected at Rome, and another at Conſtantinople; or both in Rome, and then both in Conſtantinople; and ſometimes two in Rome, and two in Conſtantinople at the ſame time; but it does not appear that any Weſtern Conſul ever reſided in Marſeilles. It is ſufficient to ſay, that had Prudentius been Conſul, he would have mentioned that circumſtance in the paſſage inſerted in the beginning of the following remark.

(20) See Father Chamillard, the Dauphin Scholiaſt, p. 1.

(21) Idem, ibid.

(22) Du Pin, *Bibl. des Auteurs Eccleſ.* Tom. 3. p. 6. Dutch edit.

(23) That is, *oblitum veteris me Saliæ, &c.*

(24) See his *Diſſertat. de Script. Eccleſ.* Tom. 2. p. 793.

(25) Pedro Mantuane, *Advertencias à la Hiſt. de Mariana*, p. 86, 87.

(26) It ſhould be *Maſſalia.*

[*D*] *He did not begin . . . . till he was ſeven and fifty. He had been a lawyer, afterwards a judge, then a ſoldier; and laſtly, enjoyed a noble employment at Court.*] He himſelf gives us a ſhort account of his life, and does not omit the lewdneſs he was guilty of in his younger years. Read the following lines.

Per quinquennia jam decem,
Ni fallor, fuimus; ſeptimus inſuper
Annum cardo rotat, dum fruimur ſole volubili.
Inſtat terminus, & diem
Vicinum ſenio jam Deus adplicat.
Quid nos utile tanti ſpatio temporis egimus?
Ætas prima crepantibus
Flevit ſub ferulis: mox docuit toga
Infectum vitiis falſa loqui, non ſine crimine:
Tum laſciva protervitas,
Et luxus petulans (heu pudet ac piget!)
Fœdavit juvenem nequitiæ ſordibus ac luto.
Exin jurgia turbidos
Armarunt animos, & male pertinax
Vincendi ſtudium ſubjacuit caſibus aſperis.
Bis legum moderamine
Frænos nobilium reximus urbium:
Jus civile bonis reddidimus, terruimus reos.
Tandem militiæ gradu
Evectum pietas Principis extulit,
Adſumptum proprius ſtare jubens ordine proximo (27).

(27) Prudent. *in Prologo Operum.*

"Five times ten years I've liv'd, and ſeven more,
"If I miſtake not: ſuch the time theſe eyes,
"Were favour'd firſt with ſol's inſpiring ray.
"But now, ſince life's dire limits I approach,
"And age begins to creep thro' every nerve,
"Let me examine what good acts I've done.
"Beneath the maſter's rod my youth I wept;
"My riper years the wrangling bar beheld,
"Where all its quirks and cavils I imbib'd.
"Next, wanton luxury and riot luſt,
"Their venom ſpread round my polluted ſoul,
"And prompted me to acts I now repent.
"Then, in fierce conteſts, thoughtleſs I engag'd;
"And the fell thirſt of conquering ſwell'd my mind,
"Which long expos'd me to unnumber'd perils.
"Twice, o'er the nobleſt cities I preſided,
"Whilſt juſtice and ſoft mercy ſway'd alternate;
"The bad reſtraining; making vertue happy.
"Laſtly, exalted in my Prince's favour,
"A military honour I receiv'd;
"Kindly commanded to be near his perſon."

He bethought himſelf a little late, but not too much ſo (28), of renouncing ſublunary vanities, and compoſing verſes in a pious ſtrain. It may be made a queſtion, whether Prudentius's publiſhing the debauched conduct of his youth may be of advantage to all his readers. A young debauchee, who ſhould anſwer thus to thoſe who ſhould cenſure his behaviour, *Prudentius, that very devout Poet, and ſo good a Chriſtian, behaved as I now do when he was young; I will conduct myſelf as he did afterwards, when I am ſeven and fifty*; ſuch a debauchee, I ſay, would make a wretched anſwer, and yet it appears juſt in his eye, and lulls him in his ſin.

(28) *Nam ſera nunquam eſt ad bonos mores via. Quem pœnitet peccaſſe pene eſt innocens.* Seneca, *in Agamemn.* act. 2. ver. 342. p. m. 262. *i. e.* It is never too late for a man to reform his conduct. He who repents of his fault is almoſt innocent.

[*E*] *All his opinions are not orthodox.*] He aſſerts as a truth, that the damned have annually a day of reſt or intermiſſion from their torments; and that this is the day on which Chriſt roſe from Hell. Who had let him into theſe anecdotes?

Sunt & ſpiritibus ſæpe nocentibus
Pœnarum celebres ſub Styge feriæ,
Illa nocte, ſacer qua rediit Deus
Stagnis ad ſuperos ex Acheronticis (29):
. . . . . .
Marcent ſuppliciis Tartara mitibus,
Exſultatque ſui carceris otio
Umbrarum populus liber ab ignibus:
Nec fervent ſolito flumina ſulphure (30).

(29) Prudent. *Hym.* 5. *Cathemer.* ver. 125. p. m. 21.

(30) Idem, ibid. ver. 133.

"The tortur'd ſouls below, have reſt from pain,
"And gaily wanton 'midſt feſtivities,
"On that all ſacred night, when God's great ſon
"Roſe from th' infernal ſhades and ſoar'd to hea- "ven.
. . . . . .
"The torments of dire Tartarus grew mild;
"Then flitting ſhades, releas'd from horrid woe,
"Exult for joy, nor feel the ſcorching fires;
"Nor floods are heated with their uſual ſulphur.

He affirms in another place, that God ſentences but very few to damnation.

Quæſitor ille ſolus
Animæque corporiſque,
Enſiſque bis timendus
Prima ac ſecunda mors eſt.
Idem tamen benignus
Ultor retundit iram,
Paucoſque non priorum
Patitur perire in ævum (31).

(31) Idem, ibid. *Hym.* 6. ver. 89. p. 24.

"He only ſearches out the heart and mind;
"He is the ſword that's to be doubly fear'd;
"The firſt and ſecond death.——
"Yet he in tenderneſs to poor mankind,
"His anger ſoftens, and permits but few
"Ungodly ſouls, eternally to periſh.

Some blame him exceedingly for having wiſhed, not to enjoy the glories of paradiſe, but a ſtate of moderately-violent ſuffering. He declares that he would be contented, provided that his ſoul was not lodged in the deepeſt dungeon of hell, and does not deſire a better fate after the reſurrection (32).

(32) See the *Bibl. Univerſelle*, Tom. 12. p. 186, 187.

Multa in theſauris Patris eſt habitatio, Chriſte,

that but few would be damned, would not now be received. This might be of ſome ſervice to him againſt the objections of the Marcionites, againſt whom he wrote a Poem ; but it is certain that he could not thereby ſolve the difficulties relating to the origin of evil [*F*]. There

Diſparibus diſcreta locis ; non poſco beatâ
In regione domum : ſint illic caſta virorum
Agmina, pulvereum quæ dedignantia cenſum
Divitias petiere tuas : ſit flore perenni
Candida virginitas, animum caſtrata reciſum.
At mihi Tartarei ſatis eſt ſi nulla miniſtri
Occurrat facies, avidæ nec flamma Gehennæ
Devoret hanc animam, merſam fornacibus imis.
Eſto : cavernoſo, quia ſic pro labe neceſſe eſt
Corporeâ, triſtis me ſorbeat ignis Averno :
Saltem mirificos incendia lenta vapores
Exhalent, æſtuque calor languente tepeſcat.
Lux immenſa alios, & tempora vincta coronis
Glorificent : me pœna levis clementer adurat (33).

(33) Prudent. *in Hamartigenia, ſub fin.* p. 227.

" O Chriſt ! in thy almighty father's houſe
" Are many manſions : I, too worthleſs mortal,
" Aſk not a place in thoſe celeſtial ſeats.
" There dwell the ſouls of men, of virtuous men,
" Who ſcorning the vain riches of this world,
" Sought only after thy eternal treaſures.
" There lives virginity in deathleſs bloom.
" Enough for me, if gracious Heaven preſerves
" From the dire aſpect of Hell's gloomy fiends,
" And keeps me from its ſwift, ſurrounding flames.
" But, as my blackening guilt requires purgation,
" O ! let the fire with gentle heat exhale,
" And mildly purge away my various ſins.
" Let others aim at light, and heavenly crowns,
" I only wiſh to burn in gentler flames.

Mr. Perkins, a Proteſtant divine, affirms that this is an impious prayer, and ought not to be aſcribed to Prudentius (34). He is not the only perſon who thinks that it is a piece added to the Hamartigenia. However this be, Victor Giſelinus, a Roman Catholick Author, has publickly condemned that prayer in a work (35), which Poſſevinus greatly applauds (36). I am to obſerve, that the moſt accurate editions (37) give it as genuine ; whereas ſome verſes that have been looked upon as ſuppoſititious, have been omitted. We do not find in Heinſius's edition, as in that of Sichard, the third ſtanza of the hymn falſely entitled, *ad incenſum cerei Paſchalis* (38). This title, as well as this ſtanza, are not in the beſt manuſcripts, but have been left out as ſuppoſititious pieces. The prayer annexed to the Hamartigenia would have been expunged alſo, had there been any reaſons to make it believed that it was not written by Prudentius. But here follows a hereſy, of which he cannot be cleared by denying the thing. He believed the materiality of the ſoul.

(34) *Dictum impium & non tribuendum Prudentio ait noſter Perkinſius.* Rivet. *Crit. Sacri*, lib. 3. cap. 26. p. 1123. Tom. 2. *Oper.*

(35) In his notes on Prudentius.

(36) See Rivet. *Oper.* Tom. 2. p. 1123.

(37) For inſtance, that of Nicholas Heinſius.

(38) It is the 5th of the *Cathemerinon.*

Reſciſſa ſed iſta (39) *ſeorſum*
Solvunt hominem perimuntque ;
Humus excipit arida corpus
Animæ rapit aura LIQUOREM (40).

(39) That is, the body and ſoul.

(40) Prudent. *Hym.* 10. *Cathemerinon*, ver. 9.

" When ſoul and body by Death's icy hand
" Are ſeparated ; ſoon to duſt the body
" Changes ; and the liquid ſoul to air.

That Prudentius meant, by *animæ liquorem*, a material ſubſtance, cannot be doubted, when we conſider what he ſays in another place :

Non occidet, inquit,
Interior qui ſpirat homo : luet ille perenne
Supplicium, quod ſubjectos male rexerit artus.
Nec mihi difficile eſt LIQUIDAM *circumdare flammis*
Naturam, quamvis PERFLABILIS *illa feratur*
Inſtar Noti : capiam tamen, & tormenta adhibebo (41).

(41) Idem, *contra Symmach.* lib. 2. ver. 184.

" Th' interior man (ſays he) will never die,
" But ſuffer endleſs puniſhment, becauſe
" It plung'd in wickedneſs the ſubject body.
" I eaſily can conceive a liquid nature,
" Tho' thin and open as the ſouthern wind,
" Suffering ſad tortures.

Le Clerc obſerves (42), that theſe words of Prudentius, *animæ rapit aura liquorem*, ſignify very naturally the mortality of the ſoul, and that *an Epicurean could not expreſs himſelf better*. It is certain that this verſe, and the three foregoing, explain a doctrine, which is found in the books of ſeveral Heathens, and relates to the characteriſticks of death (43). It is, ſaid theſe, a compound's reſolving itſelf into its firſt principles, each of which returns to the place from which it came ; the body to the earth, the ſoul to the air or æther. If we peruſe what Lucretius ſays on this head, it will appear that Prudentius might paſs for his epitomizer :

(42) Le Clerc, *Bibl. Univerſ.* Tom. 12. p. 166.

(43) See in the art. AMPHIARAUS, citat. (35), what I have cited from Epicharmus.

Denique cæleſti ſumus omnes ſemine oriundi
Omnibus ille idem Pater eſt, unde alma liquenteis
Humorum guttas Mater cum Terra recepit
Fœta parit nitidas fruges, arbuſtaque læta,
Et genus humanum (44).
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
Cedit item retro de Terra quod fuit ante,
In terras : & quod miſſum 'ſt ex Ætheris oris,
Id rurſum Cæli rellatum templa receptant :
Nec ſic interimit mors res, ut Materiai
Corpora conficiat, ſed cœtum diſſupat ollis (45).

(44) The Reader will find the ſequel of this citation (58) of the art. JUPITER.

(45) Lucret. lib. 2. ver. 990.

" Laſtly, we all from ſeed celeſtial riſe,
" Which Heav'n, our common parent, ſtill ſupplies.
" From him the earth receives enliv'ning rain,
" And ſtrait ſhe bears bird, tree, and beaſt, and man.
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
" And ſo each part returns, when bodies die,
" What came from earth to earth, what from the ſky
" Dropt down, aſcends again, and mounts on high.
" For death does not deſtroy, but diſunite
" The ſeeds, and change their order and their ſite. CREECH.

(46) See the rem. [*R*] of the art. LUCRETIUS the Philoſopher.

(47) And alſo in other books, See Le Clerc, *Bibl. Univerſ.* Tom. 12. p. 166.

But though theſe two Poets agree in their expreſſions, they yet are diametrically oppoſite in their ſentiments. This return of the ſoul to its principle, was a true death, according to Lucretius (46) ; but not according to all the reſt of the Heathens, and ſtill leſs ſo according to Prudentius the Poet, who expreſſes himſelf a little after (47) ſo poſitively on this head, that we cannot doubt his having taught the immortality of the ſoul.

Let me be allowed to ſay, that the judgment, which Mr. Perkins has paſſed, ſeems a little harſh to thoſe who have a due regard to equity and charity. Theſe are perſuaded, that the only reaſon why this Poet was willing to be deprived of Paradiſe, and to ſuffer a moderate puniſhment after this life, was, becauſe he thought himſelf too unworthy of the ſupreme beatitude, and but too deſerving of puniſhment. Now can this be called an impious humility ? Ought we not, in taking this matter in a favourable light, to call it a ſacrifice or offering of his perſon to God's juſtice ?

[*F*] *He could not thereby ſolve the difficulties relating to the origin of evil.*] I have propoſed them in ſeveral parts of this Dictionary (48) ; but, in order to ſhew that the Philoſophers are not the only ſet of men who ſpeak of them, I'll cite a long paſſage from an able Divine. " (49) The Manichees and Marcio-
" nites raiſed an objection to the orthodox, mention-
" ed by Prudentius (50) in its full ſtrength. This ob-
" jection is, that if the God who governs the world,
" was not pleaſed with vice, he would put a ſtop to
" it, ſince he is not ignorant of the corruption of
" mankind, and can ſtop it. They affirmed, that it
" is the ſame thing for a Being to commit evil and
" permit it, when he can hinder it. Prudentius an-
" ſwers, firſt, that it is plain that God is not de-
" lighted with vice, ſince he appoints a remedy for it,
" and ſaves thoſe who abſtain from it. In ſhort (re-
" ply the Hereticks) men cannot ſin in ſpite of God ;
" ſince he is the maſter of the heart of man and moulds
" it

(48) In the articles MARCION, MANICHEES, PAULICIANS.

(49) *Bibl. Univerſelle*, Tom. 12. p. 182 & *ſeq.*

(50) The words are as follow : *Si non vult Deus eſſe malum, cur non vetat ? inquit. Nil refert auctor fuerit factorque malorum. Anne opera in vitium ſceleris pulcherrima verti, Cum poſſit prohibere, ſinat ? quod ſi velit omnes Innocuos agere Omnipotens, nec ſancta voluntas. Degeneret, facto nec ſe manus inquinet ullo. Condidit ergo malum Dominus, quod ſpectat ab alto, Et patitur, fierique probat, tamquam ipſe crearit. Ipſe creavit enim, quod, cum diſcludere poſſit, Non abolet, longoque ſinit graſſarier uſu.* Prudent. *in Hamartig.* ver. 640. p. m. 217.

(d) Prudent. *in Symmach.* lib. 2. p. 695 *&* *ſeq.*

There are ſeveral editions of his works [G]. His books againſt Symmachus were writ before the victory gained over Radagaiſus in 405, and after that which Stilico won over Alaric, near Pollentia, in 402. He mentions the latter (*d*), but ſays nothing of the former,

" it as he pleaſes. Our Poet does not ſolve this difficulty any otherwiſe, than by returning to free-will, without which there could not be either vice or virtue. He expatiates very much on this, and proves it by the examples, not only of our firſt parents, but alſo of Lot and his wife, of Naomi's daughters-in-law, and of brothers, one of whom is daily ſeen to follow virtue, and the other vice, to which he adds this general maxim :

" *Omnibus una ſubeſt natura ; ſed exitus omnes*
" *Non unus peragit, placitorum ſegrege formâ.*

" All men are of the ſame nature, but all have not the ſame fate, becauſe they all have not the ſame will. It appears from what was ſaid above, that Prudentius ſuppoſed that mankind are born corrupt; but it is plain from what he ſays here, that he did not believe that this corruption determined them neceſſarily to evil. He adds, that the reaſon why God appointed rewards and puniſhments, is, becauſe men may be either good or bad as they pleaſe. If the Manichees had alſo objected to him, that it had been better there had been no liberty nor happineſs given as a reward; and if men had been neceſſarily happy, by their being neceſſarily determined to the love of virtue; than to make them ſo fatal a preſent as liberty, whereby moſt of them are plunged into eternal damnation : if (I ſay) the Manichees had ſtarted ſuch an objection to him, he perhaps would have made uſe of his principle mentioned above, *viz.* that few perſons are damned ; and who can ſay whether Prudentius did not ſtart ſuch a thought on account of this objection, which might naturally occur to his mind ?"

All the laſt part of this paſſage from le Clerc is extremely probable. I join in opinion with him, that had our Poet found himſelf hard preſſed, he would have anſwered that the number of the damned is very inconſiderable, and therefore that we ought not to exclaim ſo much againſt the ſeverity of divine juſtice, in expoſing mankind to miſery. But this anſwer would not have ſatisfied the Manichees, nor even have been looked upon as a palliative remedy, for they might have replied as follows. You own that our objection would be valid, were two thirds, or half of mankind to be damned eternally. You therefore own, that the good principle cannot make choice of a plan, in which the damnation of the greateſt part of mankind is included. You confeſs therefore that ſupreme goodneſs is inconſiſtent with the eternal infelicity of ſo many perſons. This confeſſion deſtroys their whole ſyſtem ; for you cannot admit that inconſiſtency, without acknowledging that the eternal unhappineſs of a very great number of creatures would be a mark of cruelty in the being who ſhould puniſh them. You are very ſenſible that infinite goodneſs cannot be blended with cruelty ; and if you could ſuppoſe that the Sovereign diſpoſer of all things might, without any mixture of this vice, ſentence to the flames two thirds or half of mankind, you would ceaſe to think ſupreme goodneſs inconſiſtent with this damnation. Here then is the foundation of that anſwer : the good principle would be cruel, were a great number of people to be damned ; but becauſe few perſons are damned, he is not cruel, and preſerves all the characteriſticks of infinite goodneſs. Conſider what it is you expoſe yourſelf to. You ought to own, that the damnation of mankind in general would be the effect of extreme cruelty, *actus ſævitiei ut octo*, as the ſchoolmen ſpeak, who meaſure the whole extent of a quality by eight degrees. Conſequently the damnation of half mankind would be the effect of a cruelty of four degrees ; whence it follows, that the damnation of a fourth part of mankind would ſhew God cruel two degrees. Though you ſuppoſe the number of the damned ever ſo ſmall, it will always ſhew, in God, a degree of cruelty, which, how ſmall ſoever it may be, cannot be conſiſtent with infinite goodneſs, ſince that goodneſs neceſſarily excludes the leaſt mixture of the contrary quality (51). In a word, if it be cruel to damn a thouſand millions of ſouls, it is alſo cruel to damn nine hundred millions, which proves that it is the ſame with regard to eight hundred millions, and ſo on ; for the difference would be only with regard to a greater or leſs number ; and this kind of ſubtraction will never lead from cruelty to infinite goodneſs ; but at moſt to a goodneſs leſs blended with the contrary vice; a goodneſs inconſiſtent with a principle, that is eternally and eſſentially good (52). On the other hand, if it is not cruel to damn an hundred thouſand perſons, why ſhould it be ſo to damn two hundred thouſand ? And if ſupreme goodneſs is not impeached by the damnation of two thouſand men, nor will it be ſo by the damnation of three hundred thouſand ; and you cannot aſſign any number that can leſſen its plenitude or fulneſs, ſince three hundred thouſand cannot hinder its continuing ſuch. Own therefore that your ſyſtem falls to the ground, if you pretend to anſwer our difficulty, by leſſening the number of the damned. We may here apply a thought of Horace (53) with all the ſubtleties of the *Sorites* (54). The true way of anſwering would be to aſſert, that the damnation of all men would be but an act of juſtice, without the leaſt mixture of cruelty. Our Author's method would therefore have been defective.

(51) Compare this with ſection 7, of the 3d treatiſe of *Janua Cœlorum reſerata.*

(52) See the art. ORIGEN, rem. [E], num. 4.

(53) *Eſt vetus atque probus centum qui perficit annos, &c.* Horat. *Epiſt.* 1. lib. 2. ver. 39. See this whole paſſage citat.

(54) See the rem. [O] of the art. CHRYSIPPUS.

I ſay nothing of another defect in his anſwer. The ſtrength of his adverſary's principle lyes in this, that a principle, who is able to prevent evil, and does not do it, wills it. This notion is evident. To what purpoſe is it to ſay, as our Poet does, that God has given man a full power of doing good ; and that man is the ſole cauſe of ſin, by his making an ill uſe of free will ? This does not weaken the objection ; it is giving one's theſis for a reply, it is *ignoratio elenchi*, and *petitio principii*, ſince the Manichees attack directly the hypotheſis of a free creature, whom a good principle will ſuffer to commit ſin.

[G] *There are ſeveral editions of his works.*] That of Aldus, printed at Venice in 1502, in 4to. is not the firſt, as has been affirmed, there having been one before in Deventer (55). Some ſay that he publiſhed two editions, but there ſeems to be no ground for ſuch an aſſertion (56). Du Pin (57) ſpeaks of *the Antwerp edition of* 1540, *in* 8vo. *with notes by Antonius Nebriſſenſis and Sichardus.* I am poſſeſſed of an Antwerp edition in 8vo. with notes by thoſe two Authors, but it was printed in 1546. The dedication by Sichardus is dated from Baſil in March 1537. Geſner, in his Bibliotheque (58), mentions an edition of Baſil by Cratander in 1527, with Sichardus's Scholia, and another edition in the ſame town, by Henricus Petri. Father Labbe (59) followed Plantin's Antwerp edition, printed in 1564, with notes and corrections, by Theodore Pulman (60), and a Commentary by Victor Giſelinus. The two books againſt Symmachus were printed at Paris in 1614, with *Grangæus's* notes, whom du Pin falſely calls *Gangræus.* He ſays that the laſt edition of Prudentius was that of Amſterdam in 1667, *with Heinſius's notes and corrections*; but he ought to have ſaid *Nicholas Heinſius*, to prevent the ſon's works from being aſcribed to the father. Methinks he ought to have mentioned that (omitted by him) *in uſum Delphini*, by Father Chamillard, printed at Paris in 1687. Moreri ſays, that there is an Amſterdam edition of Prudentius, in 1670, with notes by Nicholas Heinſius, and the Author's Life, but I have not yet been able to diſcover whether this is true. I have only the edition of Daniel Elzivir, printed in 1667, 12mo, but the Life of Prudentius is not inſerted in it, but it is (61) in Sichardus's edition. The *Variorum* edition, publiſhed by Weitzius, is of Frankfort or Hanaw, in 1613, and not of Hanover, as du Pin affirms.

(55) Nich. Heinſius, *in Præfat. Prudentii.*

(56) Idem, ibid.

(57) Du Pin, *Bibl. des Auteurs Eccleſ.* Tom. 3. p. 5.

(58) Folio 125.

(59) Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſ.* Tom. 2. p. 262.

(60) He calls him *Pulmaninus Cranenburgius.* Du Pin calls him *Pulman Graffembourg.* Both are errors ; for, beſides that he ſhould have ſaid *Cranenburg*, (a little town in the territory of Cleves, the native country of Theodore Pulman) he ſhould not have expreſſed himſelf in ſuch a manner, as to make the Readers imagine, that it is the name of this Author's family.

(61) Written by Aldus Manutius.

The Reader will not be diſpleaſed to ſee the judgment, which Father Chamillard forms of thoſe who have writ on this Author. *Giſelinus ſectatus eſt tantum ea, quæ omnium erant facillima & minime ſcitu neceſſaria,*

mer, though his ſubject required it.

neceſſaria, lapſus in multis etiam & hallucinatus. Nebriſſenſis hæret in Prudentio magis, ſed eſt brevior & ſingula delibare ſatis habet, quæ ad fabulam, hiſtoriam, & penitiorem ſcriptoris cognitionem requiruntur, omittit. Quid quod Apotheoſim, Hamartigeniam, duos contra Symmachum libros qui ſunt præ cæteris tamen digniſſimi qui legantur non attigit . . . . . Heinſii variæ lectiones in Prudentium *adſperſis interdum lectiſſimis notulis perquam eruditæ ſunt & accuratæ, ut ab Heinſio profectas facile noris . . . . Weitzius, qui cum editas hactenus in Prudentium notas collegiſſet, addidit etiam ſuas, eaſque minime contemnendas, hoc uni cæteris ſuperior quod veterum autorum locos indicet, ac eos præcipue ſacræ ſcripturæ quos Prudentius operi ſuo intexuit. Mitto Jacobum Spiegelium, qui commentariolum edidit in oden Prudentii inſcriptam* omnis hora, *ejus enim in illam notæ non ſolum ſunt propter nimiam prolixitatem moleſtæ, verum etiam minutis quibuſdam ac pene puerilibus nugis ab ipſa grammatica repetitis refertæ. Mitto etiam Adamum Siberum, Georgium Remum, Adamum Theodorum Siberum, Andream Wilkium: quorum alii verba ſex interdum aut ſeptem protulerunt, in hymnos tres aut quatuor totos, alii in unum duntaxat, ut merito ab interpretum Prudentii numero ſint expungendi. Aliter ſentiendum de Scholiis Iſonis, quæ quamvis admodum brevia ſint, quidquid eſt tamen gravioris modi ſolvunt* (62). He beſtows great applauſes on Fabricius's notes on five hymns of Prudentius, and thoſe of Eraſmus on the two laſt hymns of the CATHEMERINON.

(62) Stephanus Chamillard, *è Societate Jeſu, Præfat. ad* Prudent. *in uſum Delphini.*

I am to obſerve, that Walafridus Strabo has been made two Authors of, in Moreri, by a comma being put after Walafridus.

PRYNNE (WILLIAM), an Engliſh Lawyer, made a very great noiſe during the wars between King Charles I. and the Parliament. He was of a very inconſtant and fiery temper. He oppoſed the Epiſcopal Clergy with ſo much animoſity, that his conduct was looked upon as criminal, and he ſuffered an ignominious puniſhment, he being ſentenced to loſe his ears [*A*]. This ſentence was put in execution; but it afterwards proved of great advantage to him, when the war broke out between the King and Parliament. He then was conſidered as a glorious confeſſor of the good old cauſe, and a ſufferer for the purity of the Goſpel. He was choſen a Member of Parliament, and diſcovered a ſpirit of ſtrong animoſity againſt the Royaliſts: nevertheleſs, either from inconſtancy, or from ſome particular diſguſt, he grew more mild afterwards, and was thrown into priſon. He wrote a little book in his confinement [*B*], in which he repreſented, in the ſtrongeſt terms, to the adherents of the Parliament, that they ought not to bring the King to a trial; and that the army, which oppreſſed the liberties of the Parliament, was directed by the counſels of the Jeſuits. He, before that, had writ a book, in which he exhorted the Parliament to root out, by penal laws, all the Independents [*C*].

If

[*A*] *He being ſentenced to loſe his ears.*] A Proteſtant Miniſter of Baſil ſeems to ſay, that he was ſentenced to be baniſhed to ſome of the American iſlands; but it is more natural to ſuppoſe, that his meaning is, he was condemned to paſs the remainder of his life in a dungeon. His words are as follow. *Author noſter* Prynnus, Baſtwicus & Burtonus, *trium Facultatum Doctores, quod contra iſtam tyrannidem hiſcere auſi fuiſſent auribus mutilati, extra anni ſoliſque viam expulſi ſunt quo longa tabe perimerentur* (1). i. e. "Our "Author Prynne, Baſtwick and Burton, Doctors of "three Faculties, had their ears cut off; and were ſent "to baniſhment beyond the ſun's courſe, there to lan-"guiſh away their lives, for having preſumed to "exclaim againſt this tyranny." Here follows a paſſage from Baillet, which informs us of the time and place when William Prynne's ears were cut off. Some other incidents are likewiſe mentioned, for which reaſon I ſhall quote it entire (2). "William Prin, "or Prynne, indeed, wrote an *Anti-Arminianiſm*; "but this title does not ſo much attack the perſons of "the Arminians, as the nature and quality of their "doctrines. The only deſign of his book is to ſhew, "that the doctrine of abſolute predeſtination, as be-"lieved by the Calviniſts, had been held, without "interruption, by the Church of Chriſt. In all pro-"bability, this Mr. Prynne is that famous adverſary "of the Engliſh Biſhops; and particularly of the un-"fortunate William Laud, Archbiſhop of Canterbury "(3). It is he, whoſe ears were cut off by the hang-"man, in the Palace-yard of Weſtminſter, the 30th "of June 1637, for his tragedy concerning *the viola-"tion of the Sabbath, and the ſtate of the Biſhops*; and "who being ſentenced to pay five thouſand pounds, "with one Baſtwick a Phyſician, and Burton a Lon-"don Miniſter, was thrown into priſon, there to paſs "the remainder of his days. But the troubles in "England breaking out, he was ſet at liberty when "Charles I. was put to death, and even choſen a "Member of Parliament (4). He wrote a prodigious "number of books afterwards, moſt of them in Eng-"liſh, and was made Keeper of the Records in the "Tower of London. He died about eighteen or "nineteen years ſince."

(1) Wolfangus Meyerus, S. Th. D. & Verbi divini in Eccleſ. Baſil. Miniſt. Senior, *Epiſtola Dedicat.* Fulcimenti Gladii.

(2) Baillet, in his *Anti*, num. 88.

(3) See a paſſage from Dr. Smith, *in Vita Camdeni*, p. 56. *Illo* (Archiepiſcopo Laudo) *in carcerem detruſo, Gulielmus Prinnus, ob ſeditioſos libellos ſtigmate inuſtus, in D. Archiepiſcopi ſcrinia, tum ut ſi quicquam, quod fictis criminibus objectis aliqualem induceret colorem, occurriſſet, inde excerperet, tum ut quantum erat documentorum, quod Viro innocentiſſimo iiſdem diluendis, cum pro Tribunali ſiſtendus eſſet, de capite dicturus, uſui eſſe potuerit, quoque auferret, animo malevolo involavit.* See rem. [*M*] of the art. CAMDEN.

(4) He had been releaſed from his firſt confinement before this, and elected a Member of the Houſe of Commons.

[*B*] *He wrote a little book in his confinement.*] It is inſerted in a collection of various pieces, printed by a Royaliſt in 1649, and entitled, *Sylloge variorum Tractatuum, Anglico quidem idiomate & ab Auctoribus Anglis conſcriptorum, ſed in linguam Latinam tranſlatorum; quibus Caroli Magnæ Britan. Franciæ, & Hiberniæ Regis innocentia illuſtratur, & parricidium injuſtiſſimè & immaniſſimè in illum perpetratum, à Pſeudo-Parlamento & perduelli exercitu luce clarius declaratur. Acceſſit Reſponſum perneceſſarium ad declamationem ſeu provocationem M. Joannis Cooke. Auctore I. V. A. R.* William Prynne's tract is entitled, *Breve Memento ad præſens Non-Parlamentarium conventiculum, tangens ipſorum præſentes intentiones & proceſſus ad deponendum & ſupplicio afficiendum Carolum Stewardum legitimum ſuum Regem: per Guilielmum Prynnium, Armigerum, membrum Domus Communium, & captivum ſub exercitus Tyrannide: qui, ut apparet, arma fert contra Domos Parlamenti, ſuos quondam Dominos: quarum membra nunc violenter capit & detinet captiva, durante ipſorum illegali licentia.* The perſon, who tranſlated this piece into Latin, obſerves, that the Author of it was not well affected to the King (5).

(5) *Quam injuſte, perfide, perjure, crudeliter hæc geſta ſint in Unctum Domini, auctor hujus ſcripti quamquam omnium minime Regi obnoxius liberrime & fideliſſime exponit.*

[*C*] *To root out, by penal laws, all the Independents.*] He dedicated this book to the Houſe of Commons. I have the Latin tranſlation of it, printed in 1649. This verſion was one Wolfgang Meyer's, a Swiſs Proteſtant Miniſter. The title of the work is as follows. *Guilhelmi Prynn Angli Armigeri Aulæ Lincolnienſis, Fulcimentum Gladii Chriſtianorum Regum, Principum & Magiſtratuum: quo ipſorum Hæreticos, Idololatras, Schiſmaticos, Sectarum Authores, & Blaſphemos, pro criminis gravitate puniendi authoritas, jus ac poteſtas teſtimoniis Veteris ac Novi Teſtamenti, edictis & praxi Chriſtianorum Imperatorum, Regum, Statuum & Magiſtratuum, ſanctionibus item & ſtatutis Regni Angliæ: conſenſu denique optimorum tàm veteris, quàm recentioris Eccleſiæ Doctorum, & Politicorum, contra hodiernos Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ turbatores, veterum Donatiſtarum, & Monaſterienſium Anabaptiſtarum æmulos, ſolidiſſimè vindicatur.* Prynne has here taken notice of whatever may be ſaid for the power of the ſword againſt error; he brings in arguments, authorities, cuſtom, the deciſion of the Doctors or Fathers, that of the confeſſions of faith, &c. Father *de Sainte Marthe*, a French Benedictine, made no ſmall uſe of this book, to prove that the edict of Nantes had been juſtly repealed. See his anſwer to the complaints of the Proteſtants,

or

If the circumſtance aſcribed to him, concerning the perſon who ſet fire to the city of London [*D*], be true, he muſt have been a madman. He wrote a vaſt number of books, which ſhew him to be a man of prodigious reading [*E*]. He died the 24th of October, 1669, aged 69 years (*a*).

(*a*) Witte, *in Diario Biographic.*

or Mr. Coſins extract of it (6). Prynne, as early as 1643, oppoſed, with great vigour, the Independents, who were of opinion, that it would be to no purpoſe to aboliſh epiſcopacy, nay, that it would be prejudicial, if people, after that, were to be ſubject to the Synodical Government of the Puritans. Voſſius wrote to Grotius about this matter, in a letter dated in September 1643. *Unum eſt, in quo non ſatis conveniat illis, qui ſe Epiſcopis opponunt. Multi omnem regendæ Eccleſiæ poteſtatem penès preſbyterale collegium eſſe volunt. Alii vero ajunt hoc jugum gravius Epiſcopali. Quare contendunt, ſingulis id committendum Eccleſiaſtis, ut ſecundum Dei verbum, populum doceant, & gubernent. Atque ſic ab Epiſcopalibus & Preſbyteralibus (ſicut vocant) diſtincti, independentes nuncupantur. Pimius* (7), *cujus magna adeo in Parlamento eſt authoritas, prioris eſſe ſententiæ dicitur, ſed multi hac parte ei adverſantur, qui cætera convenire videntur. Eſtque plurimorum id judicium, utcunque infracta omni Regis poteſtate, & abolito Epiſcopatu, geminum agerent triumphum, eos inter ſeſe mox commiſſum iri ; quia multi non à Preſbyterii poteſtate minus, quam Epiſcoporum abhorreant* (8). i. e. " Thoſe who oppoſe Epiſcopacy, do not ſufficiently " agree in a certain particular. Many would have " the whole power of Church Government lodged " in the Preſbyteral Aſſembly ; whilſt others look " upon this as a more heavy yoke than Epiſcopacy. " They therefore would have every Paſtor or Eccle- " ſiaſtick teach and govern his reſpective flock, ac- " cording to God's word : and being, in this man- " ner, diſtinct or different from both Epiſcopalians " and Preſbyterians (the name theſe go by) they are " called Independents. We are told that Pym, who " has ſo much credit and authority in the Parliament, " is of the former opinion ; but ſeveral who ſeem " to agree with him in other particulars, oppoſe him " in this. Many think, that after having triumphed " over both the Regal Power, and aboliſhed Epiſco- " pacy, they will ſoon quarrel among themſelves ; " great numbers hating the power of the preſbytery " no leſs than that of the Biſhops." Here we have an inſtance of the propenſion, which mankind have to run into extremes. Part of the adverſaries of Epiſcopacy were for aboliſhing preſbyterian conferences and ſynods ; declaring that it was a more inſupportable yoke than that of the Hierarchy. Prynne ſtrongly oppoſed thoſe people, and was for inflicting a corporal puniſhment on them. See his *Fulcimentum gladii.*

(6) In *Journal des Savans*, for April 26, 1688. See alſo *Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Savans*, for May 1688, p. 384.

(7) This doubtleſs is an error of the preſs : read *Prynnius.* Voſſius's letters are full of ſuch errors, in the proper names. In p. 210, of the letters received, is *Theſtreſaito* for *Meſtrezatio.* This was Mr. Meſtrezat, a Proteſtant Clergyman of Paris.

(8) Voſſius, *Ep.* 462. p. m. 409. col. 1.

[*D*] *If the circumſtance aſcribed to him, concerning the perſon who ſet fire to the city of London, be true.*] If the thing I am going to relate had not been printed, I would not have cited it. " This thought puts me " in mind of the madneſs of William Prynne, an " Engliſhman. . . . . This Madman aſſerted to a " Gentleman who told it me again, that Pope Alex- " ander VII. ſet fire to the city of London in 1666 ; " and that he came over into England in the diſguiſe " of a Coleman (9)."

(9) Le Grand, *Hiſt. du Divorce de Henry VIII. Roi d'Angleterre*, p. 82. of the continuation of the ſecond part.

[*E*] *He wrote a vaſt number of books, which ſhew him to be a man of prodigious reading.*] Here follows what is told in De Witte's Diarium (10). GUIL. PRYNNE, Anglus, *Swainſwica-Somerſetenſis, Collegii Orielenſis Oxoniæ Commenſalis, Artium Baccalaureus. . . . Libri quos varii admodum, Theologici nimirum, Hiſtorici, Politici, & Polemici argumenti conſcripſit ad* 170. *adverſaria potius quam opera nuncupari merentur, adeoque* (11) *ipſum pene Toſtatum æquaſſe videtur. . . . . Libros à ſe conſcriptos moriens Hoſpitio Lincolnienſi, quod Londini eſt, legavit, qui voluminibus* 37. *in fol. & 4to continentur. i. e.* " William Prynne, born at Swainſwick in Somer- " ſetſhire, of Oriel College in Oxford, and Bachelor " of Arts. . . . . He wrote 170 books on various " ſubjects, viz. Divinity, Hiſtory, Politicks and " Controverſy ; which ought to be entitled *adverſa-* " *ria*, rather than *works* ; ſo that he ſeems to have " equalled Toſtatus himſelf. He bequeathed, at his " death, his books to Lincolns-Inn, in London, they " conſiſting of 37 volumes in folio and quarto." Here follows a paſſage from Schoockius, which ſhews that Prynne has been complimented as a man of vaſt reading ; and alſo prove that he was ſo rigid a Puritan, as even not to permit people to drink to one another's healths (12). *Is eſt qui auguſto elogio ab eodem* (D. Voetio) *condecoratur in diſput.* de ebrietate, *& quidem ſecundum hanc formulam :* Diffuſæ eruditionis Juriſconſultus Gul. Prynne, (13) cum generis nobilitate tum rara pietate conſpicuus, in tract. Anglico, adverſus *Salutes* conſcripto. *Liber hic Prynnii (de quo viro ante aliquot annos tam amplus rumor per Britanniam & Belgium fuit) ſi reſpondeat ejuſdem Tractatui de Spectaculis, (nam hunc ſolum vidi) dixerim, diffuſam eruditionem Authoris (licet hic ipſe à D. Voetio oſtentetur ut* nobilis) *reſpondere ſcopis diſſolutis, atque ſervire confirmando dicto vulgato, quod eam ſolam vim fortem eſſe agnoſcit, quæ fuerit* unita. *Fueritne vero Prynnius pius ſolus Deus novit, quum* D. Voetius *quando favet, nimis quam liberalis ſit in titulo illo concedendo. Certe, hoc non poſſum cognoſcere ex ejuſdem libro de Spectaculis, niſi pariter Phariſæi pii fuerint agnoſcendi, eo, quod* cuminum & anethum decimarent. i. e. " This is the man on whom " Voſſius beſtows ſo great an elogium in his diſputa- " tion on drunkenneſs, and his words are as follow : " *William Prynne, a very learned lawyer, a man con-* " *ſpicuous for the greatneſs of his birth and piety, in the* " *Engliſh tract written by him againſt healths.* In caſe " this book of Prynne, who, ſome years ſince, made " ſo much noiſe both in England and Holland, be " like the treatiſe he wrote againſt the ſtage, (for I " have ſeen only this piece) I will be ſo bold as to " affirm, that this Author's extenſive learning (tho' " Voetius applauds him for the nobility of his birth) " is mere idle, disjointed ſtuff ; and ſerves to confirm " the common ſaying, that no force is ſtrong but what " is united. Heaven only knows whether Prynn was a " pious man, ſince Voetius, when he likes an Author, " is too liberal in beſtowing that title. I certainly cannot " diſcover this from his book againſt the ſtage, unleſs, " at the ſame time, we allow the Phariſees to have " been pious, becauſe *they tithed cumin and anniſeed.*"

(10) Ad 24. October 1669.

(11) This *adeo* does not make a right concluſion, for Toſtat's works are not like *Adverſaria.*

(12) Martin Schoockius, *Exercitat. Variarum*, p. 302. edit. 1663. 4to.

(13) The edition of this diſpute *de Ebrietate* which I make uſe of (it is that of 1667, vol. 4. *Diſput. ſelect.* p. 503.) has only theſe words, *Diffuſæ lectionis Juriſconſult.* Gul. Prynne, *in tractatu, &c.*

☞ PRYNNE (WILLIAM). Mr. Bayle's article of this Writer being very defective, we ſhall give the following Supplement to it. He was born at Swainſwick near Bath in Somerſetſhire in the year 1600, (at which time his father was a tenant of Oriel College in Oxford) was educated in Grammar learning in the city of Bath, and became a Commoner of Oriel College under the tuition of Mr. Giles Widdowes in 1616 (*a*). January the 22d 1620 he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts (*b*). He removed afterwards to Lincoln's-Inn, where he ſtudied the common law, and was made ſucceſſively Barriſter, Bencher, and Reader. At his firſt coming to that Inn, he was a great follower and admirer of Dr. John Preſton, an eminent Puritan, who was Lecturer there ; and he publiſhed ſeveral books againſt what he thought the growing enormities of that age, in point of luxury, and concerning the doctrine and diſcipline of the Church [*A*]. His *Hiſtrio-*

(*a*) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 434. 2d edit.

(*b*) Idem, *Faſti, Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 215.

[*A*] *Publiſhed ſeveral books againſt what he thought the growing enormities of that age in point of luxury, and concerning the doctrine and diſcipline of the Church.*] They were as follow : *The perpetuity of a regenerate man's eſtate, againſt the Saints total and final Apoſtacy.* London 1627 in 4to. *Health's Sickneſs : Or, A compendious*

Hiſtrio-Maſtix, which he publiſhed about Chriſtmas in the year 1632, giving great offence to the Court, he was committed priſoner to the Tower of London on the 1ſt of February 1632-3 (*c*), and ſentenced by the Star-chamber on the 17th of February 1633-4, to be fined 5000*l.* to the King, expelled the Univerſity of Oxford and Lincoln's-Inn, degraded and diſenabled from his profeſſion of the law, to ſtand in the pillory, firſt in Palace-yard Weſtminſter, and three days after in Cheapſide, in each to loſe an ear, to have his book called *Hiſtrio-Maſtix*, publickly burnt before his face by the hand of the hangman, and remain priſoner during life (*d*). After this ſentence was executed, which was in May 1634, he was remitted to priſon; and on the 11th of June following, as ſoon as he could procure pen, ink, and paper, wrote a ſevere letter to Archbiſhop Laud concerning his ſentence in the Star-chamber, and that which the Archbiſhop in particular had declared againſt him; who acquainted the King with this letter, upon which his Majeſty commanded the Archbiſhop to refer it to Noy the Attorney General. Noy ſent for Prynne, and demanded whether the letter was of his hand-writing or not; who deſiring to ſee it, tore it to pieces, and threw the pieces out of the window; which prevented a farther proſecution of him (*e*). In 1635, 1636, and 1637, he publiſhed ſeveral books [*C*], particularly one, entitled, *News from Ipſwich*, in which he reflected very groſsly on the Archbiſhop and others of the Biſhops [*D*]; for which on the 14th of June

(*c*) Prynn's *New Diſcovery of the Prelates of Tyranny*, p. 7, 8, 9. edit. London 1641, in 4to.

(*d*) Ibid. p. 10, 11.

(*e*) Heylin's *Life of Archbiſhop Laud*, Part 1. lib. 4.

pendious and brief diſcourſe, proving the drinking and pledging of healths to be ſinful and utterly unlawful unto Chriſtians, &c. Lond. 1628 in 4to. *The unlovelineſs of love-locks: or, a ſummary diſcourſe, proving, the wearing and nouriſhing of locks or love-locks to be altogether unſeemly and unlawful unto Chriſtians; in which there are likewiſe ſome paſſages out of the Fathers*, &c. *againſt face-painting; the wearing of ſuppoſititious, powdered, or extraordinary long hair; and the women's manniſh, unnatural, impudent, unchriſtian cutting of the hair*, &c. London 1628 in 4to. *Brief ſurvey and cenſure of Mr.* Cozens *his couzening devotions*. London 1628 in 4to. This was written againſt the *Private Devotions*, publiſhed by Mr. *John Coſins*, afterwards Biſhop of Durham, which Mr. Prynne cenſures as containing Arminianiſm, and tells us (1), that this was one of the reaſons of Archbiſhop Laud's reſentment againſt him, and his calling into queſtion his *Hiſtrio-Maſtix*. *Anti-Arminianiſm: or, the Church of England's old Antitheſis to new Arminianiſm*, &c. London 1630 in 4to. There was a ſecond edition the ſame year. To this is added an *Appendix concerning bowing at the name of Jeſus*. This was anſwered by Mr. Giles Widdowes, formerly tutor to our Author, in a piece entitled, *The lawleſs, kneeleſs, ſchiſmatical Puritan: or, a confutation of the Author of an* Appendix concerning bowing at the name of Jeſus. Oxford 1631 in 4to. *God no Impoſtor or Deluder: or, an Anſwer to a Popiſh and Arminian Cavil in defenſe of Free-will and univerſal Grace*, &c. London 1630 in 4to. *Lame* Giles *his haltings; together with an Appendix concerning the Popiſh original and progreſs of bowing at the name of Jeſus*. London 1631 in 4to. Hiſtrio-Maſtix: *The Player's Scourge*, &c. *againſt the intolerable miſchief and abuſes of common Plays and Play-houſes*. London 1633 in 4to.

(1) *A new Diſcovery of the Prelates Tyranny*, p. 1.

[*B*] *His* Hiſtrio-Maſtix . . . *giving great offence to the Court, he was committed priſoner to the Tower of London on the 1ſt of February* 1632-3.] Mr. Whitelocke obſerves (2), that this book was licenſed by Archbiſhop Abbot's Chaplain, and "being againſt "plays, and a reference in the table of the book to "this effect, *Women-actors notorious whores*, relating "to ſome women-actors mentioned in his book, as "he affirmeth; it happened, that about ſix weeks "after this, the Queen acted a part in a Paſtoral at "Somerſet-houſe; and then Archbiſhop *Laud* and "other Prelates, whom *Prynne* had angered by ſome "books of his againſt Arminianiſm, and againſt the "juriſdiction of the Biſhops, and by ſome prohibi-"tions which he had moved, and got to the High-"commiſſion Court; theſe Prelates and their inſtru-"ments, the next day after the Queen had acted her "Paſtoral, ſhewed *Prynne*'s book againſt plays to the "King, and that place in it, *women-actors notorious* "*whores*, and they informed the King and Queen, "that *Prynne* had purpoſely written this book againſt "the Queen and her Paſtoral; whereas it was pub-"liſhed ſix weeks before that Paſtoral was acted. Yet "the King and Queen, though thus exaſperated, "did direct nothing againſt him, till *Laud* ſet Dr. "*Heylin* (who bore a great malice to *Prynne* for con-"futing ſome of his doctrines) to read *Prynne*'s books, "and to collect the ſcandalous points out of them; "which *Heylin* did, though (as *Prynne* affirms) not at "all warranted by the text of his book. But thoſe "two Gentlemen were well matched, and alike in "other things, though ſo much different in divinity "or ſhew of it. The Archbiſhop went with theſe "notes to Mr. Attorney *Noy*, on a Sabbath-day morn-"ing, and charged him to proſecute *Prynne* for this "book; which *Noy* afterwards did rigorouſly enough "in the Star-Chamber; and in the mean time the "Biſhops and Lords of the Star-Chamber ſent *Prynne* "cloſe priſoner to the Tower."

(2) *Memorials of the Engliſh affairs*, p. 18. edit. London 1732.

[*C*] *In* 1635, 1636, *and* 1637, *he publiſhed ſeveral books.*] *Appendix, Supplementum, & Epilogus, to the Flagellum Pontificis*, written by John Baſtwick, Doctor of Phyſic of Padua, ſome time of Emanuel College in Cambridge, afterwards a Practitioner of Phyſic at Colcheſter, where he was born. *A breviate of the Biſhops intolerable uſurpations and encroachments upon the King's prerogative and ſubject's liberties; with an Appendix to it:* 1635. *Certain queries propounded to the bowers at the name of Jeſus and the patrons thereof*, 1636. *The unbiſhoping of Timothy and Titus, proving them no Dioceſan Biſhops of Epheſus and Crete; and that Preſbyters have a divine right to ordain Miniſters as well as Biſhops, with a poſtſcript*, 1636. Reprinted with additions at London 1660 in 4to. *Looking-glaſs for all lordly Prelates*, 1636. *Certain queries propounded to Biſhops*, &c. 1636. *Inſtructions for Church-wardens concerning Viſitation-articles, fees, oaths*, &c. 1636. *News from* Ipſwich, *diſcovering certain late deteſtable practices of ſome domineering lordly Prelates to undermine the eſtabliſhed doctrine and diſcipline of our Church*, 1636 in 4to. publiſhed under the name of *Matthew White* three times in that year. Mr. Wood tells us (3), that he had a ſpecial hand in writing of a book, entitled, *A Divine Tragedy lately acted: or, a collection of ſundry memorable examples of God's judgment upon Sabbath-breakers*, &c. 1636 in 4to. At the end is an *Appendix* printed in another character, containing an account of the ſufferings of *Prynne* for his *Hiſtrio-Maſtix*, and the miſerable end, which is there ſaid to have befallen *Noy*, the Attorney General, and chief inſtrument of his ſufferings. *Catalogue of ſuch teſtimonies in all ages, as plainly evidence Biſhops and Preſbyters to be both one, equal, and the ſame in juriſdiction, office*, &c. *by divine law and inſtitution*, &c. 1637. reprinted in double columns in 1641. *A quench-coal, with an Appendix to it, in anſwer to* a Coal from the Altar, *and other pamphlets touching altars, and bowing to or towards them*, 1637. *An humble remonſtrance againſt the tax of ſhip-money lately impoſed, laying open the illegality, injuſtice, abuſes, and inconveniencies thereof.* Written in 1636; corruptly printed without the Author's knowledge at London 1641, and reprinted from a more correct copy at London 1643 in 4to. *Additions to the firſt part of a dialogue between* A *and* B *concerning the Sabbath's morality and the unlawfulneſs of paſtimes on the Lord's Day.* Printed twice in 1636.

(3) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 442.

[*D*] *In which he reflected very groſsly on the Archbiſhop and others of the Biſhops.*] He ſtyles the Biſhops

June 1637 he was ſentenced in the Star-chamber to be fined 5000 *l.* to the King, to loſe the remainder of his ears in the pillory, to be branded on both cheeks with the letters *S. L.* for a ſchiſmatical libeller, and to be perpetually impriſoned in Caernarvon Caſtle (*f*). On the 30th of the ſame month this ſentence was put in execution in the Palace-yard in Weſtminſter [*E*]; and on the 27th of July following he was removed from the Tower to the Fleet, and the ſame day began his journey towards Caernarvon-Caſtle, whence he was in January following removed to Mount-Orgueil Caſtle in the iſle of Jerſey, where he exerciſed his pen in writing ſeveral books [*F*]. November the 7th 1640 an order was iſſued out by the Houſe of Commons for his releaſement from priſon; and on the 28th of the ſame month he entered London triumphantly [*G*]. December the 3d following he preſented a petition repreſenting his ſufferings from Archbiſhop *Laud*, for which Mr. Wood tells us (*g*) that he had a recompence allowed him, though Mr. Prynne abſolutely denies that he *ever received one farthing recompence* (*h*). He was elected a Member of Parliament for Newport in Cornwall, and oppoſed the Biſhops, eſpecially the Archbiſhop, with great vigour, both by his ſpeeches and writings [*H*], and was the chief manager of the trial of that Prelate. In 1647 he was one of the parliamentary Viſitors

(*f*) L'Eſtrange's *Hiſtory of King Charles I.* p. 151.

(*g*) *Ubi ſupra*, col. 437.

(*h*) See *The Subſtance of a Speech made in the Houſe of Commons by W. Prynne, Eſq; Decemb.* 4. 1648. p. 4.

Biſhops in general *Luciferian Lord Biſhops, execrable traytors, devouring wolves*, &c. and "deſcants, ſays "Dr. Heylin (4), very trimly (as he conceived) on "the Archbiſhop himſelf, with his *arch-piety, arch-charity, arch-agent to the Devil*; that Beelzebub "*himſelf had been an Archbiſhop, and the like to thoſe, a moſt triumphant arch indeed to adorn his victories.*"

(4) *Life of Archbiſhop Laud*, part 2. lib. 4. p. 309.

[*E*] *On the 30th of the ſame month this ſentence was put in execution in the Palace-yard in Weſtminſter.*] He himſelf tells us (5), that he ſpoke at the execution of his ſentence among other things what follows: "The cauſe of my ſtanding here is for not putting "in my anſwer, under Council's hand, for which "the information was taken *pro confeſſo* againſt me. "What endeavours I uſed for the bringing in there-"of, God, my own conſcience, yea, and my Council "know, whoſe cowardice ſtands upon record to all "ages. For my own part, rather than I will have "my caſe a leading caſe, to deprive the ſubjects of "their liberty, which I ſeek to maintain, I will "joyfully expoſe my perſon to be a leading example "to bear this puniſhment." He bore the execution of his ſentence with more patience than either Mr. *Burton* or Dr. *Baſtwick*; and as he returned to the Tower by water, made this Diſtich upon his own ſtigmatizing:

(5) *New Diſcovery of the Prelates Tyranny*, p. 36.

S. L.
Stigmata *maxillis referens inſignia* Laudis,
Exultans remeo, Victima grata Deo.

[*F*] *Where he exerciſed his pen in writing ſeveral books.*] Mount-Orgueil: *or divine and profitable meditations raiſed from the contemplations of three leaves of nature's volumes, 1ſt, Rocks, 2. Seas, 3. Gardens.* London 1641 in 4to. *A poetical deſcription of* Mount-Orgueil *Caſtle in the iſle of Jerſey. The ſoul's complaint againſt the body's encroachment on her; and comfortable cordials againſt the diſcomforts of the impriſonments*, a Poem. *Pleaſant purge for a Roman Catholic to evacuate his ill humours, conſiſting of a century of polemical epigrams.* Theſe three laſt pieces were printed and bound up with *Mount-Orgueil: or divine and profitable meditations*, &c. During our Author's impriſonment there was publiſhed a book, entitled, *Woodſtreet-Compter's plea for its priſoner: or, the ſixteen reaſons which induce* Nathan Wickins, *late ſervant to Mr.* Will. Prynne, *but now priſoner in the ſaid Compter, to refuſe to take the oath* ex officio, &c. printed in 1638 in 4to. which book, though publiſhed under the name of *N. Wickins*, was generally ſuppoſed to be written by Mr. Prynne on account of the great number of quotations in it.

[*G*] *Entered London triumphantly.*] In the *diurnall occurrences or daily proceedings of both Houſes in this great and happy Parliament from the 3d of November 1640 to the 3d of November* 1641 (6), we find the following paſſage: "That afternoon [November "28th] maſter *Prynne* and maſter *Burton* came into "London, being met and accompanied with many "thouſands of horſe and foot, and rode with roſe-"mary and bays in their hands and hats; which is "generally eſteemed the greateſt affront, that ever "was given to the Courts of Juſtice in England." And Whitelocke obſerves (7), that *Prynne* and *Burton* *were conducted into London from their ſeveral priſons by many hundreds of horſe and foot in great pomp, and defiance of juſtice; and they petitioned the Houſe of Commons for damages againſt their proſecutors.*

(6) Page 8. edit. London 1641, in 4to.

(7) p. 39.

[*H*] *Oppoſed the Biſhops, eſpecially the Archbiſhop, with great vigour, both by his ſpeeches and writings.*] After his return from exile, he publiſhed the following books. *The antipathy of the Engliſh lordly prelacy both to legal monarchy and civil unity: or an hiſtorical collection of the ſeveral execrable treaſons, conſpiracies, rebellions, ſtate-ſchiſms, contumacies of antimonarchical Engliſh, Britiſh, French, Scotiſh, and Iriſh lordly Prelates, againſt our King, Kingdoms*, &c. *Enlarged and publiſhed by authority, ſince the Author's enlargement and return from exile.* London 1641 in 4to. in two parts. *New diſcovery of the Prelate's tyranny, in their late proſecutions of Mr.* Will. Prynne, *Dr.* John Baſtwick, *and Mr.* Hen. Burton, *Wherein the joint proceedings againſt them in the High-Commiſſion and Star-chamber*, &c. London 1641 in 4to. Mr. Wood obſerves (8), that in this book "he does Archbiſhop *Laud* a great deal "of injuſtice, eſpecially in this reſpect, that all the "things, that make againſt him, or ſound ill to his "name, he with great zeal ſcrapes together, whilſt "any thing that ſounds to his honour, or the leaſt "good that he hath done, he doth omit." The ſame Author tells us (9), that a Tract, entitled, *A terrible outcry againſt the loytering exalted Prelates; ſhewing the danger and unfitneſs of conferring them in any temporal office or dignity*, &c. London 1641 in 4to. is not Mr. Prynne's, nor like his ſtyle, nor mentioned in the catalogue of his books, though his name be to it, with his picture in a wooden cut. *A ſovereign antidote to prevent, appeaſe, and determine our unnatural and deſtructive civil wars and diſſenſions*, &c. London 1642 in 4to. *Vindication of Pſalm* cv. *ver.* 15. (Touch not mine anointed, and do my Prophets no harm) *from ſome falſe gloſſes lately obtruded on by Prieſts and Royaliſts.* London 1642 and 1644 in 4to. *The treachery and diſloyalty of Papiſts to their ſovereigns, in doctrine and practice. Together with an exact parallel of the juriſdiction, power, and privileges, claimed and exerciſed by our Popiſh Parliaments, Prelates, Lords and Commons, in former times, with theſe now claimed and practiſed by the preſent Parliament*, &c. London 1643 in a large quarto, in four parts, the *firſt* of which is in ſix ſheets under the title above mentioned. The *ſecond part* is entitled, *The ſovereign power of Parliaments and Kingdoms, wherein is vindicated their intereſt and power over the militia, poſts*, &c. *their right to nominate privy counſellors, ſtate-officers*, &c. *againſt the King's negative voice in the paſſing of bills.* The *third part* treats of the *lawfulneſs of the Parliaments neceſſary defenſive war againſt the King's malignant forces, both in law and conſcience.* The *fourth part* treats farther concerning *the ſovereign power of Parliaments and Kingdoms in ordering the militia, ſhips, magazines, great officers*, &c. with an *Appendix, manifeſting by ſundry hiſtories, that in the ancient Roman Kingdom and Empire*, &c. *the ſupreme ſovereignty of power reſided not in Emperors and Kings themſelves, but in their kingdoms*, &c. *Rome's maſterpiece: or the grand conſpiracy of the Pope and his jeſuitical inſtruments, to extirpate the Proteſtant religion, re-eſtabliſh popery*

(8) Col. 443.

(9) Ibid.

Viſitors of the Univerſity of Oxford. During his ſitting in the Long Parliament, he was very zealous for the Preſbyterian Cauſe; and when the Independents began to gain the aſcendant, ſhewed himſelf a warm oppoſer of them, and promoted the King's intereſt, eſpecially in his declenſion. December the 4th, 1648, he made a long ſpeech in the Houſe of Commons, concerning the ſatisfactorineſs of the King's anſwers to the propoſitions

popery, ſubvert laws, liberties, peace, parliaments, by kindling a civil war in Scotland, &c. Lond. 1643 and 1644 in 4to. Archbiſhop Laud wrote notes in the margin of this book as far as related to his own vindication from ſome aſperſions caſt on him in it. This book was reprinted with the Archbiſhop's notes by Mr. *Henry Wharton*, at the end of the *hiſtory of the troubles and trial of Archbiſhop* Laud. London 1695 in folio. *The opening of the great ſeal of England, containing certain brief hiſtorical and legal obſervations touching the original, antiquity, progreſs, uſe, neceſſity of the great zeal of the Kings and Kingdom of England in reſpect of charters*, &c. London 1643 in 4to. This book and his *ſovereign power of parliaments* were animadverted upon in a pamphlet printed at Oxford 1644 in 4to. entitled, *The fallacies of Mr.* William Prynne *diſcovered and confuted; in a ſhort view of his late books, entitled*, The ſovereignty of Parliaments, opening of the great ſeale, *&c. Wherein is laid open his falſe quotations, calumniating falſhoods, wreſting of the ſcriptures, points of Popery, groſſe abſurdities, mere contradictions, heinous treaſons, and plaine betraying of the cauſe. Written in anſwer to a letter ſent by* J. T. *to his friend. The doom of cowardice and treachery: or a looking-glaſs for cowardly and corrupt governors and ſoldiers, who through puſillanimity or bribery betray their truſts to publie prejudice*, &c. London 1643 in 4to. Written in relation to Nath. Fiennes's ſurrendering of Briſtol to the King's uſe, *Popiſh royal favourite: or, a full diſcovery of his Majeſty's extraordinary favour to and protection of notorious Papiſts, Prieſts, Jeſuits*, &c. *manifeſted by ſundry letters of grace, warrants*, &c. London 1643 in 4to. Anſwer'd by *N. D.* in a book entitled, Vindiciæ Caroli Regis: *or, a loyal Vindication of the King*, &c. printed in 1645 in 4to. *Moderate apology againſt a pretended calumny; in anſwer to ſome paſſages in* the Preheminence of Parliaments, *publiſhed by* James Howell, *&c.* London 1644 in one ſheet in 4to. *Check to* Britannicus *for his palpable flattery*, &c. London 1644. Written againſt *Marchamant Needham* concerning ſome paſſages in one or two of his *Mercurius Britannicus*, in vindication of *Nath. Fiennes.* Upon which there was publiſhed ſoon after, a pamphlet, entitled, *A Check to the Checker*, &c.. *The falſities and forgeries of the anonymous Author of a pamphlet, entitled, The Fallacies of Mr.* Willian Prynne *diſcovered in a ſhort view of his book, entitled, The Sovereignty of Parliaments, opening of the Great Seal, &c.* London 1644, in one ſheet in 4to. *Four ſerious Queſtions touching Excommunication and Suſpenſion from the Sacrament.* London 1644, in 4to. *Twelve conſiderable Queſtions touching Church-Government, ſadly propounded, out of a real deſire of Unity and Tranquillity in Church and State, to all ſober-minded Chriſtians, &c.* London 1644, in one ſheet in 4to. *Independency examined, unmaſked, refuted by twelve new particular interrogatories, &c.* London 1644, in two ſheets in 4to. This was anſwered by *Henry Burton*, his fellow-ſufferer, in a tract printed at London 1644, and by another, in a pamphlet intitled, *A Help to the right Underſtanding of a Diſcourſe concerning Independency, lately publiſhed by* Will. Prynne, 1644, in one ſheet in 4to. Mr. Prynne's book was twice printed the ſame year. *A full Reply to certain brief Obſervations and Anti-Queries on Mr.* Prynne's *twelve Queſtions about Church-Government, &c.* London 1644, in one ſheet in 4to. *True and full Relation of the Proſecution, Arraignment, Trial, and Condemnation of* Nath. Fiennes, *late Colonel and Governor of the City of Briſtol, &c.* London 1644, in 4to. *Clement Walker* had a ſhare in this piece. *Juſt Defence of* John Baſtwick, *Doctor of Phyſick, againſt the Calumnies of* John Lilbourne, *Lieutenant-Colonel, and his falſe Accuſations: written in way of Reply to a Letter of Mr.* Vicars, *&c.* London 1645, in 5 ſheets in 4to. *The Lyar confounded; or, a brief Refutation of* John Lilbourne's *miſerably miſ-ſtated Caſe, miſtaken, &c. againſt the High Court of Parliament, &c. the honourable Committee of Examinations, &c.* London 1645, in 7 ſheets in 4to. *Truth triumphing over Falſhood, Antiquity over Novelty: or, a ſeaſonable Vindication of the undoubted Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction, Right, Legiſlative and Coercive Power of Chriſtian Emperors, Kings, Magiſtrates, Parliaments, in matters of Religion, Church-Government, &c. in Refutation of* John Goodwin's Innocency's Triumph, *and his dear brother* Burton's Vindication of Churches, commonly called Independent, &c. London 1645, in 4to. *Hidden works of Darkneſs brought to publick Light: or, a neceſſary Introduction to the Hiſtory of the Archbiſhop of Canterbury's Trial, &c.* London 1645, in folio. *Suſpenſion ſuſpended: or, the Divines of Sion-College's late Claim of the Power of ſuſpending ſcandalous perſons from the Lord's Supper, &c. briefly examined, diſcuſſed, refuted, &c.* London 1646, in ſix ſheets in 4to. *Vindication of four ſerious Queſtions of grand Importance, concerning Excommunication and Suſpenſion from the Lord's Supper, &c. againſt a Reverend Brother* (10) *of Scotland, in a Sermon at St. Margaret's Weſtminſter, 5 Sept.* 1645. London 1646, in nine ſheets in 4to. anſwered by *John Saltmarſh*, in a pamphlet entitled, *The opening of Mr.* Prynne's *new Book, called a* Vindication: *or Light breaking out from a Cloud of Differences, or late Controverſies, wherein are Inferences upon the* Vindication, *&c.* London 1645-6, in 4to. *Freſh Diſcovery of ſome prodigious new wandering blazing Stars and Firebands, ſtiling themſelves* New Lights, *firing our Church and State into new Combuſtions.* London 1646, in 4to, 2d edition. To which are added of Mr. Prynne's Collection, *Letters, Papers, and a Petition lately ſent from the* Summer-Iſlands, *touching the ſchiſmatical, illegal, tyrannical proceedings of ſome Independents there, &c. Diotrephes catechiſed: or, ſixteen important Queſtions touching the Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction and Cenſures contradiſtinct to Civil, now challenged, as of divine right, by ſome rigid Preſbyterians and Independents, &c.* London 1646, in two ſheets in 4to. 3d edit. *Twelve Queſtions of publick Concernment touching the Regulation of ſome Abuſes in the Law and legal Proceedings.* London 1646, in 4to. Scotland's *ancient Obligation to* England, *and publick acknowledgment thereof for their brotherly aſſiſtance and deliverance of them.* London 1646, in 4to. Scotland's *publick Acknowledgment of God's juſt Judgments upon their Nation, for their frequent Breach of Faiths, Leagues, Oaths, &c.* London 1646, in 4to. Canterbury's *Doom: or, the firſt part of a complete Hiſtory of the Commitment, Charge, Trial, Condemnation, Execution of* William Laud, *Archbiſhop of* Canterbury, *&c.* London 1646, in folio. *Minors no Senators.* London 1646, in two ſheets in 4to, written againſt young men under age ſitting in the Houſe of Commons. *A Gag for long-haired Rattle-heads.* London 1646, in 4to. *Plain and ſhort Expedition to ſettle the Diſtractions of the Kingdom.* London 1647. *Counter-plea to the Cowards Apology.* London 1647. *Account of the King's Majeſty's Revenues and Debts.* London 1647. *Declaration of the Officers and Army's illegal injurious Proceedings and Practices againſt the eleven impeached Members.* London 1647. *Eight Queries upon the Declaration and late Lettsr to the Army.* London 1647. *Nine Queries upon the printed Charge of the Army, againſt the eleven Members.* London 1647. *The Hypocrites unmaſked.* London 1647. *New Preſbyterian Light ſpringing out of Independent Darkneſs.* London 1647. *The total and final Demands of the Army.* London 1647. *Brief Juſtification of the eleven accuſed Members from a ſcandalous Libel.* London 1647. *A Plea for the Lords: or, a ſhort and neceſſary Vindication of the Judiciary and Legiſlative Power of the Houſe of Peers, &c. againſt the late ſeditious Anti-parliamentary printed Petitions, Libels, &c. of Anabaptiſts, Levellers, Agitators*, Lilbourn, Overton, &c. London 1648, in four ſheets and half in 4to. *The Levellers levelled, &c.* London 1647. *The Sword of the Chriſtian Magiſtracy ſupported: or, a full Vindication of Chriſtian Kings and Magiſtrates Authority under the Goſpel to puniſh Idolatry, Apoſtaſy, Hereſy, Blaſphemy, and*

(10) George Gilleſpie.

ſitions of peace [*I*]; but on the 6th of that month, he, with ſeveral other Members of the Houſe of Commons, was refuſed entrance into the Houſe by the Army, and impriſoned, on account of their zeal for a peace and ſettlement with the King. Upon this he became a bitter enemy to the army and Cromwell their Leader, attacking them with great ſeverity in his writings [*K*]. Soon after he conveyed his eſtate to ſome of his relations, and denied the payment of taxes, and ſtood in open defiance of Cromwell; for which he was, on the 1ſt of July 1650, committed cloſe priſoner to Dunſter Caſtle in Somerſetſhire, by a warrant under Mr. John Bradſhaw's hand, expreſſing no particular cauſe, dated June the 25th, 1650. He then inſiſted ſtrongly upon *Magna Charta*, and the liberty of the ſubject. The year following, he was committed to Taunton Caſtle, and afterwards to Pendennis Caſtle. He afterwards wrote ſeveral books upon religious controverſies,

and obſtinate Schiſm with pecuniary, corporal, and in ſome Caſes capital Puniſhments. London 1647, in 4to. Tranſlated into Latin by *Wolfgangus Meyerus*, and printed in Germany in 1650. *Vindication of Sir* Will. Lewes, *from his Charge.* London 1647. This Sir *W. Lewes*, was one of the eleven accuſed Members. *Full Vindication and Anſwer of the eleven Members, viz.* Denzil Holles, &c. *to a late printed Pamphlet, entitled,* A particular Charge or Impeachment in the Name of Sir *Tho. Fairfax* and the Army, againſt the eleven Members. London 1647, in ſix ſheets in 4to. *The Lords and Commons firſt Love to, Zeal for, and Vindication of their injuriouſly accuſed and impeached Members, and violated Privileges, &c.* London 1647, in three ſheets in 4to. *The Univerſity of Oxford's Plea refuted: or, a full Anſwer to a late printed Paper, entitled,* The Privileges of the Univerſity of Oxford in point of Viſitation. &c. London 1647, in eight ſheets in 4to. Soon after came out a pamphlet of one ſheet, entitled, *An Account of Mr.* Prynne's *Refutation of the Univerſity of Oxford's Plea, &c.* written by Mr. *Robert Waring*; and another, in two ſheets, entitled, *A ſhort Cenſure of the Book of Mr.* William Prynne, *entitled,* The Univerſity of Oxford's Plea, &c. written by *Edward Bagſhaw. Nine Propoſals by way of Interrogation to the General, Officers, and Soldiers of the Army, concerning the Juſtice of their Proceedings in Law or Conſcience againſt the Parliament.* London 1647, in 4to. *Twelve Queries of publick Concernment.* London 1647, in half a ſheet in 4to. *Publick Declaration and ſolemn Proteſtation of the Freemen of England, againſt the illegal, intolerable, undoing Grievance of Free-quarter.* London 1648, in eight ſheets in 4to. *The Machiavellian Cromwelliſt.* London 1648. Irenarches redivivus: *or, a brief Collection of ſundry uſeful Statutes and Petitions in Parliament (not hitherto printed) concerning the Neceſſity, Inſtitution, Office, Oaths, &c. of Juſtices of the Peace.* Lond. 1648, in 8 ſheets, 4to. Ardua regni: *or, twelve arduous Doubts of great Concernment to the Kingdom.* London 1648. *The Caſe of the impeached Lords, Commons, and Citizens, truly ſtated.* London 1648; in three ſheets in 4to. *Practical Law, controuling, countermanding the Common Law, and the Sword of War the Sword of Juſtice.* Printed, as is ſaid in the title page, at Exeter 1648. *The Petition of Right of the Freeholders and Free-men of the Kingdom of England.* London 1648. *A new* Magna Charta, London 1648. *The County of Somerſet divided into ſeveral Claſſes.* London 1648. Mercurius Ruſticus, *containing News from ſeveral Counties of England, and their joint Addreſſes to the Parliament.* London 1648. *Juſt and ſolemn Proteſtation and Remonſtrance of the Lord Mayor, Common-Council-men, and Free-men of London.* London 1648.

[*I*] *Made a long ſpeech in the Houſe of Commons, concerning the ſatisfactorineſs of the King's anſwers to the propoſitions for the ſettlement of peace.*] He publiſhed it at London in 4to, under the following title, *The Subſtance of a Speech made in the Houſe of Commons by* Will. Prynn, *of Lincoln's-Inn, Eſq; on Monday the fourth of December* 1648, *touching the King's Anſwer to the Propoſitions of both Houſes upon the whole Treaty, Whether they were ſatisfactory or not ſatisfactory? Wherein the Satisfactorineſs of the King's Anſwers to the Propoſitions for Settlement of a firm laſting Peace and future Security of the Subjects againſt all feared legal Invaſions and Encroachments whatſoever, is clearly demonſtrated. As likewiſe, that there is no other probable or poſſible Way to ſettle a ſpeedy, firm and laſting Peace, but by the Houſes embracing and proceeding upon the large extraordinary Conceſſions of the King in this Treaty, for the Kingdom's preſent Weal and future Security. And that the Army's Remonſtrance, Nov. 20. is a way to ſpeedy and certain Ruine, and a meer Plot of the Jeſuites, to defame and deſtroy us. Put into writing, and publiſhed by him, at the importunate Requeſt of divers Members, for the ſatisfaction of the whole Kingdom, touching the Houſes Vote upon this Debate.* In this ſpeech, having mentioned his ſervices and ſufferings, he declares (11), that "he "had never yet received one farthing recompence "from the King, or any other, though I have wait- "ed, ſays he, above eight years at your doors for "juſtice and reparations, and neglecting my owne "private calling and affaires, imployed moſt of my "time, ſtudyes, and expended many hundred pounds "out of my purſe, ſince my inlargement, to maintain "your cauſe againſt the King, his Popiſh and Pre- "latical party. For all which coſt and labour, I never "yet demanded, nor received one farthing from the "Houſes, nor the leaſt Office or Preferment whatſo- "ever, though they have beſtowed divers places of "honour upon perſons of leſſe or no deſert. Nor did "I ever yet receive ſo much as your publike thanks "for any publike ſervice done you, (which every "Preacher uſually receives for every ſermon preached "before you, and moſt others have received for the "meaneſt ſervices) though I have brought you off "with honour in the caſes of *Canterbury* (12) and "*Macguire*, when you were at a loſſe in both; and "cleared the juſtneſſe of your cauſe, when it was at "the loweſt ebb, to moſt Reformed Churches abroad "(who received ſuch ſatisfaction from my books, that "they tranſlated them into ſeveral languages,) and "engaged many thouſands for you at home by my "writings, who were formerly dubious and unſatisfied." The preface is dated January the 22d, 1648. To the ſpeech is ſubjoined *An Appendix for the Kingdom's better Satisfaction of ſome Occurrences ſince this Speech,* in which he tells us, that "this ſpeech, uttered with "much pathetique ſerioufneſſe, and heard with great "attention, gave ſuch generall ſatisfaction to the "Houſe, that many Members, formerly of a contra- "ry opinion, profeſſed, they were both convinced "and converted; others, who were dubious in the "point of ſatisfaction, that they were now fully con- "firmed; moſt of different opinion put to a ſtand; "and the majority of the Houſe declared, both by "their chearefull countenances and ſpeeches (the "Speaker going into the withdrawing-roome to re- "freſh himſelfe, ſo ſoon as the ſpeech was ended) "that they were abundantly ſatisfied by what had "been thus ſpoken. After which the Speaker reſu- "ming the Chair, this ſpeech was ſeconded by many "able Gentlemen; and the debate continuing Sa- "turday, and all Munday and Munday night, till "about nine of the clock on Tueſday morning, and "244 Members ſtaying quite out to the end, though "the Houſe doores were not ſhut up (a thing never "ſeene nor knowne before in Parliament) the queſ- "tion was at laſt put: and notwithſtanding the Ge- "nerall's and whole Armie's march to Weſtminſter, "and menaces againſt the Members, in caſe they "voted for the Treaty, and did not utterly reject it "as unſatisfactory, carried it in the affirmative by "140 voices (with the foure Tellers) againſt 104, "that the queſtion ſhould be put; and then, with- "out any diviſion of the Houſe, it was reſolved on "the queſtion, *That the anſwers of the King to the "propoſitions of both Houſes are a ground for the Houſe "to proceed upon for the ſettlement of the peace of the "Kingdom.*"

(11) p. 4.

(12) Archbiſhop Laud; Connor Lord Macguire.

[*K*] *Became a bitter enemy to the army and Cromwell their Leader, attacking them with great ſeverity in his writings.*]

controverſies, and other points [*L*]. February the 1ſt 1659, he, as a ſecluded Member of the Houſe of Commons, being reſtored to ſit again, became inſtrumental in recalling King Charles II. in which he appeared with ſo much zeal, that he openly declared in the Houſe, when it was not ſeaſonable for ſuch expreſſions, that "if the King muſt come "in, it was ſafeſt for them, that he ſhould come in by the votes of thoſe, who "had made war againſt his father, *&c.*" Upon this he was ſent for by General Monk and his friends, and admoniſhed to be quiet, ſince ſuch declarations were unſeaſonable. In April 1660 he was choſen Burgeſs for the City of Bath to ſit in the *Healing Parliament*, which began at Weſtminſter the 25th of that month; and after the Reſtoration, he, inſtead of being made one of the Barons of the Exchequer, which place he is ſaid to have

writings.] He wrote the following books. *True and perfect Narrative of the Officers and Army's forcible ſeizing divers Members of the Commons-Houſe, Dec. 6 and 7.* London 1648. *Second Part of the Narrative concerning the Army's Force upon the Commons-Houſe and Members.* London 1648. *Proteſtation of the ſecured and ſecluded Members.* London 1648. *Vindication of the impriſoned and ſecluded Members of the Houſe of Commons, from the Aſperſions caſt upon them in the Majority of the Houſe, in a Paper lately printed and publiſhed, entitled, An humble Anſwer of the General Council of Officers of the Army under* Thomas *Lord* Fairfax, *&c.* London 1649, in five ſheets in 4to. *Demand of his Liberty to the General, 26th Decemb.* 1648, *with his Anſwer thereto, and his Anſwer and Declaration thereupon. Remonſtrance and Declaration of ſeveral Counties, Cities, and Boroughs, againſt the Unfaithfulneſs of ſome of their Knights, Citizens, and Burgeſſes.* London 1648. *Brief Memento to the preſent un-parliamentary Junto, touching their preſent Intentions and proceedings to depoſe and execute King Charles, Jan.* 1. ann. 1648. London 1649 in twelve ſheets in 4to. Reprinted at London 1660 in 4to. *Letter to the General, dated Jan.* 3. 1648, *demanding what kind of a priſoner he is? and whoſe priſoner? With an appearance to his action of falſe impriſonment.* With an *additional poſtſcript*, both printed on one ſide of a ſheet of paper. *Impeachment of High Treaſon againſt Lieutenant-General* Cromwell, *and other army officers,* January 1648. *Four conſiderable poſitions for the ſitting members, judges, and others to ruminate upon,* January 1648. *Declaration and proteſtation againſt the preſent proceedings of the general and general council of the army and their faction, now remaining and ſitting in the ſaid houſe*; dated the 19th of January 1648. *Six propoſitions of undoubted verity, fit to be conſidered of in our preſent exigency by all loyal ſubjects and conſcientious Chriſtians. Six ſerious queries concerning the King's trial by the new High Court of Juſtice.* London 1648. After the death of King Charles I. he wrote the following books. *Proclamation proclaiming* Charles *Prince of Wales, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, 1 Febr. in the firſt year of his reign,* 1648. *Declaration and proteſtation of the Peers, Lords, and Barons, againſt the uſurpations of ſome members of the Commons houſe, 8 Febr.* 1648. *Publick declaration and proteſtation of the ſecured and ſecluded Members of the Houſe of Commons againſt the treaſonable aud illegal late acts and proceedings of ſome few confederate members of that Houſe, ſince their forcible Excluſion,* 13 February 1648. *New Babel's Confuſion: or, ſeveral Votes of the Commons aſſembled in Parliament againſt certain Papers, entitled,* The Agreement of the People, *&c.* London 1649 in one ſheet in 4to. Prynne *the Member reconciled to* Prynne *the Barriſter: or, an Anſwer to a ſcandalous Pamphlet, entitled,* Prynne againſt Prynne; *wherein is demonſtrated that* William Prynne *Utter Barriſter of Lincoln's-Inn in his* Sovereign Power in Parliaments and Kingdoms *is of the ſame judgment with and no ways contradictory to* Will. Prynne, *Eſq; a Member of the Houſe of Commons in his* Memento, &c. London 1649 in four ſheets in 4to. *Firſt part of an Hiſtorical Collection of the ancient Councils and Parliaments of England, from the year* 673 *till ann.* 1216, &c. London 1649 in four ſheets in 4to. *Legal Vindication of the liberties of England againſt illegal taxes, and pretended Acts of Parliament lately enforced on the people: or, Reaſons aſſigned why he* [Prynne] *can neither in conſcience, law, or prudence, ſubmit to the new illegal Tax and Contribution of ninety thouſand Pounds the Month lately impoſed on the Kingdom by a pretended Act of* ſome Commons in *(or rather* out *of)* Parliament. London 1649 in eight ſheets in 4to. Reprinted with additions in 1660. *Arraignment, Conviction, and Condemnation of the Weſtmonaſterian Junto's* Engagement. London 1650. *Brief Apology for all Non-ſubſcribers, and looking-glaſs for all Apoſtate Preſcribers and Subſcribers of the new* Engagement, *&c.* London 1650 in two ſheets in 4to. *Summary Reaſons againſt the new* Oath *and* Engagement. *And an Admonition to all ſuch as have already ſubſcribed to it,* &c. 1649 in 4to. *The time-ſerving Proteus and ambi-dexter Divine uncaſed to the World.* London 1650 in 4to. Written againſt *John Dury*; in anſwer to which Mr. Dury wrote a piece publiſhed by *Samuel Hartlib,* Eſq; under the title of *The unchanged, conſtant, and ſingle-hearted Peace-maker drawn forth into the World: or, a Vindication of Mr.* John Dury, *from the aſperſions caſt upon him in a nameleſs pamphlet called,* The time-ſerving Proteus, *&c.* London 1650 in three ſheets in 4to. *Sad and ſerious Conſiderations touching the invaſive War againſt our Preſbyterian Brethren of Scotland.* Written in Dunſtar-Caſtle during his cloſe impriſonment there in September 1650. *A Goſpel Plea (interwoven with a rational and legal) for the ancient ſettled Maintenance and Tenths of the Miniſters of the Goſpel,* &c. London 1653. Reprinted with the ſecond part thereof in 1659. Jus Patronatus: *or, a brief, legal, and rational Plea for Advowſons and Patrons, ancient, lawful, juſt, and equitable rights and titles to preſent incumbents to Pariſh Churches or Vicarages upon vacancies,* &c. London 1654 in ſeven ſheets in 4to. *Declaration and Proteſtation againſt the illegal, deteſtable, and oft condemned Tax and Extortion of Exciſe in general,* &c. London 1654 in 4to. *Firſt part of a ſeaſonable, legal, and hiſtorical Vindication, and chronological Collection of the good old fundamental Liberties, Rights, Laws, Government of all Engliſh free Men.* London 1655 in 4to. The ſecond part was printed at London the ſame year. *A new diſcovery of Free-State Tyranny: containing four letters; together with a ſubſequent Remonſtrance of ſeveral Grievances and Demands of common Right; written and ſent by him* [Prynne] *to Mr.* John Bradſhaw *and his aſſociates at Whitehall (ſtyling themſelves* The Council of State) *after their two years and three months cloſe impriſonment of him,* &c. London 1655 in 4to.

[*L*] *He afterwards wrote ſeveral books upon religious controverſies and other points*] He wrote the following before the Reſtoration. *Brief polemical Diſſertation concerning the true time of the Inchoation and Determination of the Lord's Day Sabbath from Evening to Evening.* London 1655 in 4to. *The Quakers unmaſked, and clearly detected to be but the ſpawn of Romiſh Frogs, Jeſuits, and Franciſcan Friers, ſent from Rome to ſeduce the intoxicated giddy-headed Engliſh Nation,* &c. London 1655 in five ſheets in 4to. Reprinted at London in 1664. *An old Parliamentary Prognoſtication made at Weſtminſter for the preſent new Year and puny Members there aſſembled.* London 1655. *Seaſonable Vindication of free Admiſſion to and frequent Adminiſtration of the Holy Communion, to all viſible Church-Members, regenerate or unregenerate,* &c. London 1656 in 4to. *New diſcovery of ſome Romiſh Emiſſaries, Quakers; as likewiſe of ſome Popiſh errors, unadviſedly embraced, purſued by our Anti-communion Miniſters, diſcovering the dangerous Effects of their diſcontinuing the frequent Adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper.* London 1656 in eight ſheets in 4to. *Legal Vindication of two important Queries of preſent general Concernment, clearly diſcovering from our Statute, common, and canon Laws, the bounden Duty of Miniſters and Vicars of Pariſh Churches, to adminiſter the Sacraments, as well as preaching to their Pariſhioners, and the legal Remedies*

have ſolicited, was chief Keeper of his Majeſty's Records in the Tower of London, with a ſalary of 500 pound *per ann.* In Auguſt the ſame year, he was appointed one of the ſix Commiſſioners for Appeals and regulating the Exciſe. In April 1661, he was again elected Burgeſs for Bath, to ſit in the Parliament, which began May the 8th, the ſame year. In July following, being diſcontented at ſome proceedings in the Houſe, he publiſhed a paper, entitled, *Sundry Reaſons tendered to the moſt honourable Houſe of Peers, by ſome Citizens and Members of London, and other Cities, Boroughs, Corporations, and Ports, againſt the new intended Bill for governing and reforming Corporations*; of which he being diſcovered to be the Author, was obliged to beg pardon of the Houſe, in order

againſt them, in caſe of obſtinate refuſal. London 1656 in 4to. It was twice printed in that year. *Short Demurrer to the Jews long diſcontinued barred Remitter into England; compriſing an exact chronological Relation of their firſt admiſſion into England, their ill Deportment, Miſdemeanours, Condition, Sufferings,* &c. London 1656, ſecond edition in 4to. The ſecond part of his *Short Demurrer,* &c. was printed at London 1656 in 4to. *A ſummary Collection of the principal fundamental Rights, Liberties, Properties of all Engliſh free-Men.* London 1656 in 4to. Two editions, the ſecond of which was much enlarged. *Lord's Supper briefly vindicated, and clearly demonſtrated to be a Grace-begetting, Soul-converting (not a mere confirming) Ordinance.* London 1657. Anſwered by *S. S.* Miniſter of the Goſpel, in a book entitled, *Holy Things for holy Men: or, the Lawyer's Plea non-ſuited,* &c. London 1658 in 4to. *The Subjection of all Traytors, Rebels, as well Peers as Commons, in Ireland, to the Laws, Statutes, and Trials by Juries of good and lawful Men of England, in the King's Bench at Weſtminſter, for Treaſons perpetrated by them in Ireland, &c. Being an Argument at Law made in the Court of the King's Bench,* Term Hillar. 20 Car. Reg. *in the Caſe of* Connor Magwire, *an Iriſh Baron, &c.* London 1658 and 1681, in 4to. *Probable Expedient for future Peace and Settlement.* London 1658. *Twelve ſerious Queries propoſed to all conſcientious Electors of Knights, Citizens, and Burgeſſes, for the Aſſembly.* London 1658. *Twelve ſeveral Heads of publick Grievances, and uſeful neceſſary Propoſals of the Weſtern Counties, Cities, and Boroughs, to their Knights, Citizens, and Burgeſſes.* Ann. 1658. *Eight military Aphoriſms, demonſtrating the uſeleſneſs, unprofitableneſs, hurtfulneſs, and prodigal expenſiveneſs of all ſtanding Engliſh Forts and Garriſons, to all the People of England, &c.* London 1658, in three ſheets in 4to. *The firſt Part of a brief Regiſter, Kalendar, and Survey of ſeveral Kinds, Forms of all parliamentary Writs, &c.* London 1659. *Beheaded Dr.* John Hewyt's *Ghoſt, pleading, yea crying for exemplary Juſtice againſt the miſnamed High Court of Juſtice.* London 1659 4to. *The true good old Cauſe rightly ſtated, and the falſe uncaſed.* London 1659, two Edit. in one ſheet in 4to. Anſwered by an anonymous Writer, in three ſheets in 4to, entitled, *Mr.* Prynne's *good old Cauſe ſtated and ſtunted ten years ago, &c.* and by *Henry Stubbe,* in his *Commonwealth of Iſrael. The Republicans and others ſpurious good old Cauſe briefly and truly anatomized, to preſerve our native Country, Kingdom, legal Government, &c.* London 1659, three edit. in three ſheets in 4to. This was animadverted upon ſoon after by *John Rogers,* in his *Chriſtian Concertation with Mr.* Prynne, *Mr.* Baxter, *and Mr.* Ja. Harrington, *for the true Cauſe of the Commonwealth; being an Anſwer to Mr.* Prynne's Anatomy of the *Republicans, &c. and his* true and perfect Narrative. *To part of Mr.* Baxter's Holy Commonwealth, *with ſome Reflections on his* Catholick Key. *New Cheaters Forgeries detected, diſclaimed, &c.* London 1659. *True and perfect Narrative of what was done, ſpoken by and between Mr.* Prynne, *the old and newly forcibly late ſecluded Members, the Army-Officers, and thoſe now ſitting, both in the common Lobby-Houſe, and elſewhere, on the 7th and 9th of May, &c.* London 1659, in fourteen ſheets in 4to. Upon this was publiſhed, in one ſheet in 4to, a pamphlet, entitled, *The Character or Earmark of Mr.* Will. Prynne, *Author of a great many ſcandalous Paſquils, &c. Ten conſiderable Queries concerning Tithes, &c. againſt the Petitioners and Petitions, for their total Abolition, as Anti-chriſtian, Jewiſh, burthenſome, &c.* London 1659, in one ſheet in 4to. *Anſwer to a Propoſition, in order to the propoſing of a Commonwealth or Democracy.* London 1659. Concordia diſcors: *or, the diſſonant Harmony of ſacred publick Oaths, Proteſtations, Leagues, Covenants, Ingagements, lately taken by many time-ſerving Saints, Officers, without ſcruple of Conſcience, making a very unpleaſant Conſort, &c.* London 1659, in ſix ſheets in 4to. *The Remainder of* A Goſpel Plea, *for the Tithes and ſettled Maintenance of the Miniſters of the Goſpel.* London 1659. *A brief neceſſary Vindication of the old and new ſecluded Members from the falſe malicious Calumnies, and of the fundamental Rights, Liberties, Privileges, &c. from the late avowed Subverſions,* 1. *of* John Rogers, *in his* Chriſtian Concertation *with Mr.* Will. Prynne, *and others.* 2. *Of* Marchamont Needham, *in his* Intereſt will not lie, &c. London 1659, in eight ſheets in 4to. *Short, legal, medicinal, uſeful, fair, eaſy Preſcription to recover our Kingdom, Church, Nation, from their preſent dangerous, diſtractive, deſtructive Confuſion, and worſe than Bedlam madneſs, &c.* London 1659, in one ſheet and half in 4to. *Conſcientious, ſerious, theological, and legal Queries propounded to the twice diſſipated, ſelf-created, anti-parliamentary Weſtminſter Junto, and its Members. To convince them of, humble them for, &c.* London 1660, in ſix ſheets and half in 4to. It was printed in November 1659. *Seven additional Queries in Behalf of the ſecluded Members, propounded to the twice broken Rump now ſitting, the Cities of Weſtminſter, London, &c.* London 1660, in one ſheet in 4to. Publiſhed in December 1659. *Caſe of the old ſecured, ſecluded, and twice excluded Members, briefly and truly ſtated, for their own Vindication, &c.* London 1660, in one ſheet in 4to. Publiſhed in December 1659. *A full Declaration of the true State of the ſecluded Members Caſe. In Vindication of themſelves and their Privileges, and of the reſpective Counties, Cities, and Boroughs, for which they were elected to ſerve in Parliament, againſt the Vote of their Diſcharge, publiſhed in print January the 5th, 1659, by their Fellow-Members. Compiled and publiſhed by ſome of the ſecluded Members, who could not meet with ſafety and convenience, without danger of a forcible ſurprize by Red-coats.* London 1660, in ſeven ſheets and half in 4to. Publiſhed in January 1659-60. *Remonſtrance of the Noblemen, Knights, Gentlemen, Clergymen, Freeholders, Citizens, Burgeſſes, and Commons, of the late Eaſtern, Southern, Weſtern Aſſociation, who deſire to ſhew themſelves faithful and conſtant to the good old Cauſe, &c.* London 1659. *Ten Queries upon the ten new Commandments of the general Council of the Officers of the Army, 22d Decemb.* 1659. Printed in one ſheet in 4to. *Brief Narrative of the manner how divers Members of the Houſe of Commons that were illegally and unjuſtly impriſoned or ſecluded by the Army's Force in Decemb.* 1648, *and May 7, anno* 1659, *coming on the 27th of Decemb.* 1659 *to diſcharge their Truſt, were again ſhut out, by the pretended Order of the Members ſitting, &c.* London 1660, in one ſheet and half in 4to, publiſhed in the latter end of December 1659. *Six important Queries propoſed to the re-ſitting Rump of the Long-Parliament, fit to be ſatisfactorily reſolved, &c.* Printed in December 1659, on one ſide of a ſheet. *The Privileges of Parliament, which the Members, Army, and this Kingdom, have taken the Proteſtation and Covenant to maintain.* Re-printed in one ſheet in 4to, January the 5th, 1659-60, the day appointed to remember them. *Copy of the Preſentment and Indictment found and exhibited by the Grand Jury of Middleſex, on the laſt Day of Hilary Term* 1659, *againſt Col.* Matthew Alured, *Col.* John Okey, *and others, for aſſaulting and keeping Sir* Gilbert Gerard, *and other Members, by force of Arms out of the Commons Houſe of Parliament, on 27 Decemb.* 1659. London 1660. *Three ſeaſonable Queries propoſed to all thoſe Cities, Counties, and Boroughs, whoſe reſpective Citizens, &c. have been forcibly excluded,*

der to eſcape puniſhment (*i*). After the Reſtoration, he publiſhed ſeveral books [*M*]. He gave his works bound up together, in forty volumes in folio and quarto, to the Library of Lincoln's-Inn. Marchamont Needham (*k*) tells us, that *he was one of the greateſt Paper-worms, that ever crept into a cloſet or library.* In 1659, there was publiſhed a pretended petition of *the peaceable and well affected people of three nations*, ſhewing, that "whereas *Will. Prynne*, Bencher of Lincoln's-Inn, had for many years laſt paſt been "an indefatigable and impertinent Scribler, and had almoſt nauſeated the ſober part "of the ſaid Nations with the ſtench of his carion Paſquils and Pamphlets, for ſome "whereof he had ſuffered under the hierarchy in the time of the late King, *&c.* he might "have an Act of Amneſty and pardon for all his treaſons, ſeditions, jeſuitiſms, con-"tempts of Government, miſunderſtanding of the Scriptures, Law, and Reaſon, miſ-"quotations, and miſapplications of authorities to his Paſquils, *&c.*" Mr. Wood tells us (*l*), "that many perſons, eſpecially Royaliſts, judged his books to be worth little "or nothing, his proofs for no arguments, and affirmations for no teſtimonies, having "ſeveral forgeries made in them for his and the ends of his brethren. They are all in "the Engliſh tongue; and by the generality of ſcholars are looked upon to be rather "rhapſodical and confuſed, than any way polite or conciſe; yet for antiquaries, critics, "and

(*i*) Wood, col. 438, 439.

(*k*) *Mercur. Polit.* No. 7.

(*l*) Col. 439.

eluded, unjuſtly ejected and diſabled to ſit in the Commons Houſe, by thoſe now acting at Weſtminſter. London 1666, publiſhed about the latter end of December 1659, on one ſide of a ſheet of paper. *Humble Petition and Addreſs of the Sea-men and Water-men in and about the City of London, to the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Commons of the City of London, in Common-Council aſſembled, for a free and legal Parliament, &c.* London 1660. *Seaſonable and healing Inſtructions, humbly tendered to the Free-holders, Citizens, and Burgeſſes of England and Wales, to be ſeriouſly commended by them to their reſpective Knights, Citizens, Burgeſſes, elected, and to be elected, for the next Parliament, 25 April* 1660.

[*M*] *After the Reſtoration he publiſhed ſeveral books.*] *Second part of a brief Regiſter, Kalendar, and Survey of the ſeveral kinds of parliamentary Writs (relating to the Houſe of Commons), &c.* London 1660, in 4to. Bathonia rediviva: *the humble Addreſs of the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the City of Bath, to the King's moſt excellent Majeſty, preſented by Mr.* Prynne, 16 *June* 1660. London 1660. *The firſt part of the ſignal Loyalty of God's true Saints and pious Chriſtians (as likewiſe of Pagans) towards their King, both before and under the Law and Goſpel, expreſſed in and by their conſtant publick Prayers, Supplications, Interceſſions, Thankſgiving for them.* London 1660, in 4to. *The ſecond part of ſignal Loyalty; together with various Forms of Prayers, Supplications, Votes, Acclamations, Ceremonies, and Solemnities uſed at the Coronations of Emperors and Kings, eſpecially of the Kings of England.* London 1660, in 4to. *A ſeaſonable Vindication of the ſupreme Authority and Juriſdiction of Chriſtian Kings, Lords, and Parliaments, &c.* London 1660, in 4to, taken out of *John Hus. A ſupplemental Appendix to the premiſed Diſputation of* John Hus. *Sundry Reaſons humbly tendered to the moſt honourable Houſe of Peers, by ſome Citizens and Members of London, and other Cities, Boroughs, Corporations, and Ports, againſt the new intended Bill for governing and reforming Corporations.* Some few of theſe *Reaſons* were publiſhed, and the reſt ſuppreſſed. *A ſhort, ſober, pacifick Examination of ſome Exuberances in, and ceremonial Appurtenances to, the Common Prayer, &c.* London 1661, in 4to. Brevia Parliamentaria rediviva: *in 13 Sections, containing ſeveral Catalogues of the Numbers, Dates of all Bundles of original Writs of Summons and Elections, newly found, or formerly extant, in the Tower of London, &c.* London 1662, in 4to. *Apology for tender Conſciences, touching not bowing at the Name of Jeſus.* London 1662, in 4to. *The fourth part of a Regiſter and Survey of the ſeveral Kinds and Forms of parliamentary Writs, &c.* London 1664 4to. *The firſt tome of an exact chronological Vindication and hiſtorical Demonſtration of our Britiſh, Roman, Saxon, Daniſh, Norman, Engliſh Kings ſupreme Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction in over all ſpiritual and religious Affairs, Cauſes, Perſons, as well temporal, within their Realms of England, Scotland, Ireland, and other Dominions, from the original planting of Chriſtian Religion therein, and Reign of Lucius our firſt Chriſtian King, till the Death of King Richard I. A. D.* 1199, *&c.* London 1666, in folio. Dedicated to King Charles II. At the end of this volume is an advertiſement to the Reader, informing us, that the late dreadful fire having in three days turned 88 pariſhes and their Churches, with the Cathedral of London, into aſhes; and among other loſſes and miſchiefs to the ſeveral Companies of the City, moſt of all endamaged the Company of Printers and Stationers, moſt of whoſe habitations, ſtore-houſes, ſhops, ſtocks, and books, were not only conſumed, but their aſhes and ſcorched leaves conveyed aloft and diſperſed by the wind to places above ſixteen miles diſtant; among millions of other books thus deſtroyed, while our Author was buſy in ſecuring the publick *Records* of the Kingdom, his Printer's houſe, with moſt of the printed copies of this tome, then finiſhed at the preſs (except the tables to it) as likewiſe the ſecond tome formerly publiſhed, and of the firſt book and third tome, (wherein he had made ſome progreſs,) were then burnt together with it; not above 70 of them being reſcued from the fire, to the Author's damage near 2000 l. Upon this account he did not print his intended *Tables* for ſo few copies of this tome, till he ſhould be inabled to reprint it; eſpecially ſince the pages of the reprinted volume, by reaſon of ſome additions, would vary from thoſe already printed, and ſo make the tables unſuitable thereto. *The ſecond tome of an exact chronological Vindication and hiſtorical Demonſtration of our Kings ſupreme Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction, &c. from the firſt of King John* 1199, *to the Death of King Henry III.* 1273. London 1665, in folio. Dedicated to the Lord Chancellor Clarendon. Aurum Reginæ: *or concerning Queen-Gold, &c.* London 1668, in 4to. *Animadverſions on the fourth part of Sir* Edward Coke's *Inſtitutes of the Laws of England, &c.* London 1669, in folio. *The Hiſtory of King* John, *King* Henry III. *and the moſt illuſtrious King* Edward I. *wherein the ancient Sovereign Dominion of the Kings of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, over all Perſons and all Cauſes, is aſſerted and vindicated againſt all Incroachments and Innovations whatſoever. The miſtakes in ſome printed Statutes, Canoniſts, Law-books, Hiſtories, and other Matters of moment, are rectified and reſcued from Oblivion. Collected out of the ancient Records in the Tower of London, and now publiſhed for the better Advancement of Learning, Maintenance of the King's Supremacy, the Subjects Liberties, and the Laws of the Realm.* London 1670, in folio. The Dedication by the Author himſelf to the Earl of Angleſey, Sir Harbottle Grimſton, Sir Matthew Hale, Sir Edward Atkins, Sir Wadham Windham, Sir Richard Ramsford, Sir Robert Atkins, and the reſt of the worſhipful readers of Lincoln's-Inn, is dated from his ſtudy in Lincoln's-Inn, July 28 1688. This laſt volume was deſigned by the Author to have borne the ſame title with the two former, as appears from the book itſelf. But he dying juſt before it was publiſhed, "his executors, into whoſe "hands moſt of the impreſſion fell, put a new title to "the book, and called it *The Hiſtory of King John*, "&c. in hopes that appearing in the ſhape and diſ-"guiſe of an entire work, it would go off the more "readily (13)." Mr. Oldys obſerves (14), that "neither of the three volumes have been ſo ſufficiently "uſed by or known to ſucceeding writers of or upon "our Engliſh Hiſtory, as ſuch copious materials, ſo "carefully collected, do deſerve. One reaſon no "doubt is the ſcarcity of the two former volumes, "which are advanced to ſuch an extraordinary price, "that

(13) Nicholſon's *Engliſh Hiſtorical Library*, part 3. p. 203. edit. Lond. 1699.

(14) *Britiſh Librarian: exhibiting a compendious Review or Abſtract of our moſt ſcarce, uſeful, and valuable books in all Sciences, as well in Manuſcript as in print.* No. 1. for January 1737. p. 20.

" and ſometimes for Divines they are uſeful. In moſt of them he ſhews great induſtry, " but little judgment, eſpecially in his large folios againſt the Pope's uſurpations. He " may be well entitled, *Voluminous Prynne*, as *Toſtatus Albulenſis* was two hundred years " before his time called *Voluminous Toſtatus*; for I verily believe, that if rightly com-
(m) *Letter to Dr. Rogers*, ſect. 2. p. 28. edit. Lond. 1727. " puted, he wrote a ſheet for every day of his life, reckoning from the time, when he " came to the uſe of reaſon and the ſtate of man." Mr. Anthony Collins ſtyles him (*m*) *a little, factious, ſcribling fellow.* He died at his lodgings in Lincoln's-Inn, October the 24th 1669, and was interred in the walk under the Chapel there, which ſtands upon
(n) Wood, col. 453. pillars (*n*).

" that it is well known, the complete ſett has been " ſold for thirty pounds. Another reaſon for their " having lain ſo much in obſcurity, might be, ſome " publick puniſhment the Author once underwent for " writing another book, but in the former reign, and " long before he was Keeper of the Records, for " which yet he had a handſome recompenſe aſſigned " him by the Parliament, however it might leave " ſome diſtaſte to his name upon the minds of many, " as we may elſewhere obſerve. The laſt cauſe of " their neglect may be that artful diſregard, which " has been inſinuated of theſe collections, to abate " the curioſity of the Laity, and diſſuade their look-" ing into them. The Right Reverend Author laſt " quoted [Nicholſon] ſpeaking of thoſe two tomes
(15) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 202. " which periſhed in the fire of London, adds (15), " *No man has hitherto thought it worth his expence and* " *while to give us a new edition from any of the few* " *that eſcaped. His third has enough in all conſcience to* " *ſatisfy any reaſonable Reader, and ſuperſede his enquiry into* " *the ſtate of the caſe in either former or following ages.*" Beſides the works, of which we have already given a catalogue, he reviſed, rectified, and added a preface and marginal Notes, &c. to *An exact Abridgment of the Records of the Tower of London, from the Reign of King Edward II. unto King Richard III. of all the Parliaments holden in each King's Reign, and the ſeveral Acts in every Parliament, &c.* collected by Sir *Robert Cotton*, Bart. and printed at London 1657, in folio. He publiſhed likewiſe ſeveral treatiſes of other perſons, as, 1. *Truth gloriouſly appearing from under the ſad Cloud of Obloquy: or, a Vindication of the Practice of the Church of Chriſt in the Summer Iſlands, &c.* written by *Nath. White*, B. D. and Paſtor of the Church of Chriſt in the Summer Iſlands. 2. *A Diſcourſe of the Spaniſh Monarchy*, written by *Thomas Campanella*; which having been tranſlated into Engliſh by *Edm. Chilmead*, and publiſhed in 1654, had a new preface put to it by Mr. Prynne, with a title bearing the date of 1659. 3. *A Breviate of the Life of* William Laud, *Archbiſhop of Canterbury*, being extracts from the Archbiſhop's *Diary*. There are ſeveral pamphlets aſcribed to him, of which he was not the Author; particularly one intitled, Mola aſinaria: *or, the unreaſonableneſs and inſupportable Burthen now preſſed upon the Shoulders of this groaning Nation by the headleſs Head and unruly Rulers, &c. held forth in a Remonſtrance, &c.* London 1659, in one ſheet in 4to. T.

PSAMMITICHUS, King of Egypt 640 years before the birth of Chriſt, was the ſon of Nechus, whom Sabacus King of Ethiopia put to death, when he ſeized upon Egypt. The ſon would have met with the ſame fate, had he not fled to Syria. He was recalled after Sabacus was withdrawn, and he was one of the twelve great Lords who go-
(a) Herodot. lib. 2. cap. 152. verned Egypt (*a*). Every one of theſe had his diviſion or diſtrict, but then they acted
(b) Ibid. cap. 147. in concert, and rather like Partners or Collegues than neighbouring Princes (*b*). Pſam-
(c) Diodor. Siculus, lib. 1. cap. 66. mitichus was envied by the eleven others, either becauſe the wealth he had amaſſed by the impoſts he levied on goods (*c*) had enabled him to make alliances with foreigners; or becauſe they were afraid he would be Monarch over the whole Kingdom, as had been foretold by an Oracle [*A*]. They therefore baniſhed him to fenny places, where he perhaps would have lived all his life-time, had he not heard that ſome foreigners, who had made a deſcent into Egypt, laid waſte all the level country. Theſe were the Ionians and Carians. As advice was brought him that they were brazen men [*B*], he entertained great hopes, becauſe of an Oracle pronounced to him. He went to take a view of theſe people, and having engaged theſe foreigners to live with him, he made them inſtrumental in getting him poſſeſſion of all Egypt. He ſhewed himſelf very grateful, and gave
(d) Herod. lib. 2. cap. 154. them lands near the Nile, below the city Bubaſte (*d*). From that time he had always foreigners in his pay, and even gave them the precedency over the ſoldiers, his country-
(e) Diod. Sicul. lib. 1. cap. 67. men, in the war carried on by him in Syria (*e*). This exaſperated the Egyptians to ſuch a degree, that two hundred thouſand of them abandoned him. They went and ſettled in

[*A*] *They were afraid he would be Monarch over the whole Kingdom, as had been foretold by an oracle.*] The oracle had told them, that he among them, who ſhould perform his libations in a brazen cup, ſhould poſſeſs the Kingdom ſingly. It happened that on the laſt day of a ſolemn feſtival, as they were all in Vulcan's Temple, ready to perform the libations, the Prieſt who was to give them the golden cup they employed in that ceremony, miſtook in the number, and brought only eleven cups. What did Pſammitichus, who being the laſt of all had no cup? He took off his helmet, and employed it for the libation. The other Kings called to mind the oracle, and to prevent the effects of it, would have killed Pſammitichus, had they not known certainly that he had no hand in
(1) Herod. lib. 2. cap. 151. the Prieſt's miſtake (1). I know not how to bring off Athenæus, who makes Herodotus ſay, that the Egyptian Prieſts uſed to drink out of brazen cups; and that it does not appear that even the Kings, when they ſacrificed in publick, made uſe of a ſilver cup; ſo that Pſammitichus, who was the youngeſt King, performed his libations with a brazen cup, whilſt the reſt made them with ſilver cups (2). If the reader looks into the 151ſt chapter of the ſecond book of Herodotus, he will find that Athenæus relates this incident very unfaithfully. His tranſlator is almoſt as unfaithful. Here follows the Greek ψαμμήτιχον γῆν πάτρην ὄντα τῶν ἄλλων βασιλέων χαλκῆ φιάλῃ σπεῖσαι, τῶν ἄλλων ἀργύραις σπονδύλοις; and the Latin is as follows; *Itaque Pſammetichum aliis regibus poſteriorem libaſſe argentea phiala, ſuperiores autem ænea.*
(2) *Athen.* lib. 6. p. 231.

[*B*] *That they were brazen men.*] Pſammitichus, being reduced to a low condition by the jealouſy of the other Kings, conſulted an Oracle of Latona, which was in the city of Butis, and was looked upon as the beſt in all Egypt. He was anſwered, that revenge would come to him by ſea, when brazen men ſhould be ſeen. The pirates who were landed in Egypt were armed from head to foot, and as the people of that country had never ſeen men armed in that manner before, they imagined they were of braſs, and carried the news of it to Pſammitichus. From

in Ethiopia [C], and returned a very blunt reply to the arguments he cauſed to be made uſe of, in order to oblige them to return [D]. He did all that lay in his power to make up that loſs, and applied himſelf chiefly to make trade flouriſh. He was extremely fond of ſtrangers, and indulged them protection of every kind, putting a ſtop to the barbarity which had been exerciſed againſt them in the preceding reigns. He made an alliance with the Athenians and ſome other Greek Nations, and would have his children inſtructed by them (*f*). He alſo put ſeveral children, for inſtruction, under the Carians and Ionians, whom he had ſettled on the bank of the Nile; and this was the firſt time that men, ſpeaking a different language from the Egyptians, ſettled in their country (*g*). By this, as Herodotus (*h*) obſerves, curious perſons who afterwards travelled into that country, met with perſons who underſtood them, and interpreted and explained for them. I have enquired in another article (*i*), whether the city of Naucratis was built by the people of Miletus, in the reign of Pſammitichus. This Prince reigned fifty four years [E], and died the 3d of the 42th Olympiad (*k*), leaving his kingdom to his ſon Nechus (*l*). He was buried in Sais, the place of his birth, and the Capital of lower Egypt. He was buried (I ſay) there, in the Temple of Minerva (*m*); and it was there the Saïtes uſed to bury all their Kings (*n*). He was the firſt Egyptian Monarch who drank wine (*o*). He ſent perſons in ſearch of the ſpring or head of the Nile (*p*); and in order to diſcover who were the moſt ancient people in the world, he cauſed two children to be brought up in ſuch a manner, that they never heard any perſon ſpeak; and becauſe that, when they were two years of age, they ſpoke a word which ſignifies bread in the Phrygian language, the Egyptians were obliged to lay aſide their pretenſions of being the oldeſt people in the world, and yield it to the Phrygians (*q*). No ſiege ever laſted longer than that which Pſammitichus laid before the city of Azotus (*r*); it being twenty nine years before he took it. He did not gain ſo much glory by this enterprize, as by the art and dexterity with which he put a ſtop to a flood that was going to drown his whole kingdom. The Scythians, having defeated the Medes, ruled over all Aſia, and were marching directly into Egypt; but Pſammitichus met them in Paleſtine; and prevailed ſo far by his preſents and entreaties, that they marched back; and it was then that ſome of them plundered the Temple of Venus Urania in Aſcalon (*s*). Neither Moreri, nor the Authors of the Supplement to him, had much regard for the memory of this Monarch, ſince, inſtead of introducing, in his article, ſuch particulars as relate to him, and which, as the reader has ſeen, are neither few nor common, they have inſerted ſuch incidents only as relate to his ſucceſſors.

(*f*) Diod. Sicul. lib. 1. cap. 67.

(*g*) Herodot. lib. 2. cap. 154.

(*h*) Ibid.

(*i*) In the article NAUCRATIS.

(*k*) Calviſius, Helvicus, &c.

(*l*) Herod. lib. 2. cap. 158.

(*m*) Strabo, lib. 17. p. 551.

(*n*) Herod. lib. 2. cap. 169.

(*o*) Plut. *de Iſide*, p. 353.

(*p*) *Athen.* lib. 8. p. 345.

(*q*) Herod. lib. 2. cap. 2.

(*r*) Ibid. cap. 157.

(*s*) Idem, lib. 1. cap. 105.

From that time he entertained a very good opinion of the oracle, which, till then, he thought unworthy of the leaſt credit (3). What pity it is that Herodotus, whoſe relations are ſo delightful, did not live in another age, or did not know the difference there is between a hiſtory and a poem? In the latter, things muſt not be unravelled without a miracle, without ſomething in a ſupernatural way; the reader muſt be ſtruck with admiration at any rate: but the events related by an Hiſtorian muſt be ſimple and natural; a reader of good taſte may juſtly ſuppoſe, where theſe are not found, the Author forbore to write in that way, in order to make room for fictions, for machines, and the marvellous. I wonder that Herodotus ſhould leave any gleanings after him. He was ignorant of the Oracle mentioned by Polyænus (4). The God Ammon adviſes King Tementhes to beware of cocks. A Carian informed Pſammitichus, that the Carians were the firſt people who had ſet cock's-combs or creſts on their helmets; which was motive ſufficient to prompt Pſammitichus to levy a great number of Carians.

(3) Herod. lib. 2. cap. 152.

(4) Polyænus, *Stratag.* lib. 7. num. 3.

[C] *They went and ſettled in Æthiopia.*] According to Strabo (5), they were ſubject to a Queen who reigned over the iſland of Meroe; and that they poſſeſſed, near that iſland, the Province of Teneſis, and an iſland above that of Meroe. Pliny (6) quoting Ariſtocrean, ſpeaks of theſe fugitives, and of a city called Eſar, which they had inhabited three hundred years. The account he gives of its ſituation does not agree with Ptolemy, nor with what we juſt now heard from Strabo.

(5) Lib. 16. p. 530. lib. 17. p. 541.

(6) Lib. 6. cap. 30.

[D] . . . *and returned a very blunt reply, to the arguments he cauſed to be made uſe of in order to oblige them to return.*] Pſammitichus firſt got their Captains to exhort them, but afterwards he went in perſon. He beſought them to conſider, that they forſook their native country, their wives and children; to which they unanimouſly anſwered, ſtriking their bucklers with their lances, *We ſhall find countries enough, ſo long as we continue able to handle theſe weapons; and we ſhall never want wives and children, whilſt we ſhall be able to manage theſe other implements.* Saying theſe laſt words, they had the impudence to ſhew their pudenda. *Precibus ad ſententiæ mutationem eos ſolicitans, templa; patriam; uxores; liberos; recordari jubet. Tum univerſi haſtas clypeoſque pulſantes, contentâ voce reſpondent, quoad arma in poteſtate habeant, facilè ſibi patriam reperturos; reductis quoque tunicis genitalia oſtentant, nunquam ſibi uxores aut liberos defore, quamdiu his ſint inſtructi, dictitantes* (7).

(7) Diod. Sicul. lib. 1. cap. 67. p. m. 59.

[E] *He reigned fifty four years.*] Herodotus (8) declares this; Euſebius ſays he reigned but forty four years, and Moreri fifty eight years.

(8) Herod. lib. 1. cap. 157.

PTOLEMY, King of Egypt, XI of that name, was ſirnamed *Auletes*, becauſe of the prodigious fondneſs he had for playing on the flute. He ſucceeded his father (*a*) about the beginning of the 175th Olympiad, and the year of Rome 673 (*b*). He laid very heavy taxes on Egypt, in order to pay the immenſe ſums, which he wanted in order to gain and preſerve the friendſhip of the Romans. Upon this account his ſubjects hated him; and being beſides deſpiſed by them, by his ſo tamely ſuffering the Romans to win the iſland of Cyprus, he was expelled from his kingdom. He retired to Rome, where he long ſued for the protection and aid of the Commonwealth, in order to recover his kingdom: but his negotiation met with infinite oppoſition; and at laſt having loſt all hopes of being gratified in his wiſhes, he left Rome and went to Epheſus, where he obtained letters, commanding Gabinius to reſtore him to his kingdom, which order was accordingly happily executed by Gabinius (*c*). I have taken notice elſewhere (*d*) what

(*a*) His name was Ptolemy Lathurus.

(*b*) *Vide* Calviſium *ad hunc annum.*

(*c*) See the article BERENICE daughter of Ptolemy.

(*d*) Ibid.

became of Berenice, eldeſt daughter to this Monarch; and will obſerve here that Arſinoe, his youngeſt daughter, ſwayed the ſceptre ſome time [*A*]; but, properly ſpeaking, his other daughter, the famous Cleopatra, ſucceeded him.

Thoſe who deſire to have a more particular account of the life, manners, and fortune of this King, may peruſe his hiſtory publiſhed in Paris, anno 1698, by Baudelot de Dairval.

[*A*] *Arſinoe, his younger daughter, ſwayed the ſceptre ſome time.*] It is here I will diſcharge the promiſe I made (1), to compenſate for the too great brevity of Moreri. I ſay then, that ARSINOE ſtole away from the palace, whilſt the Egyptians were preparing to attack Julius Cæſar, who had the young King in his hands (2). She went to the Egyptian army, and commanded in it in conjunction with Achillas; but as a great quarrel aroſe between her and the laſt mentioned, each of them graſping at the ſole command, ſhe had him killed by Ganymede the eunuch (3). But Cæſar having given the young Prince his liberty, Arſinoe was obliged to reſign the throne to her brother. After Cæſar had gained the victory, and the death of young Ptolemy, Cæſar thought it expedient, for Cleopatra's ſafety, that Arſinoe ſhould leave Egypt (4). We learn from Appian, that Megabyzus, a Prieſt of Diana in Epheſus, received her in quality of a Queen (5); but he had like to have been put to death for this good office, when Mark Anthony, to pleaſe Cleopatra, would have killed Arſinoe in Miletus. He cauſed Magabyzus to be ſeized, becauſe of the kind reception he had given that Princeſs; but Cleopatra releaſed him at the requeſt of the Epheſians.

(1) In the art. ARSINOE.

(2) Cæſar, *de Bello Civ.* lib. 3. *ſub fin.* Lucan. lib. 10. *ſub fin.*

(3) Hirtius, *de Bello Alexandr. circa init.* p. m. 378.

(4) Hirtius, *de Bello Alexandr. circa init.* p. m. 396.

(5) Appian. *de Bello Civ.* lib. 5.

PUCCIUS (FRANCIS), born at Florence of an illuſtrious family, renounced the Roman Catholick Religion, as ſoon as he had examined the religious controverſies which aroſe in France in Calvin's time. He was at Lyons when he reſolved to change his religion. He went over to England, where he ſtudied Divinity firſt at Oxford, and then at London. He ſet out afterwards for Switzerland, where he had a diſputation with Socinus, concerning the ſtate of the firſt man. This ſeems to prove, that the Proteſtants looked upon him as an Orthodox man: but we ſhould be miſtaken if we thought ſo; for he held ſome opinions, for which the Magiſtrates of Baſil baniſhed him. He returned to London, where he was ſent to priſon, becauſe of the Doctrines which he diſperſed abroad. The moment he was ſet at liberty, he went over into the Low-Countries, and challenged Socinus to a verbal diſputation. They diſputed ſeveral times together in Poland, in preſence of the Church of Cracow, but could not agree. Wherefore Puccius, breaking off with the Sectaries of that country, got into the company of ſome perſons who were ſtudying Magick [*A*], and went with them to Prague, where he returned to his ancient profeſſion, I mean, that he returned again into the Pale of the Church of Rome (*a*). But notwithſtanding this, it is ſaid, that he was burnt at Rome [*B*]. He

(*a*) Extracted from Hoornbeeck, *Apparat. ad Controverſias Socinianas*, p. 52.

[*A*] *Who were ſtudying magick.*] The Author, whom I have quoted, uſes theſe words, *in comitatum ſe dedit aliquorum Magiæ ſtudioſorum, quibuſcum Pragam pervenit* (1). But it is better to conſult Socinus, who has given a more full account of this departure of Puccius. He obſerves (2) that that man, being condemned by the arbiters of the diſputation he had held with him at Cracow, would not confeſs himſelf vanquiſhed; but that they would not hear him any longer: the Synod of the Unitarians did not ſo much as vouchſafe to read his new book. Socinus adds, that he received from him an Italian book concerning the ſeal put to the ſcriptures (3). Puccius aſſerted that men could not underſtand one word in that divine book, and that we muſt wait for the arrival of the two men or witneſſes, who are mentioned in the eleventh chapter of St. John's Revelation, who would explain to us all the myſteries contained in the bible; which till that time could not be uſed as a rule to determine our controverſies about religious ſubjects. He imagined that theſe two men would appear very ſoon; for he took the 1260 of the beaſt's reign for ſo many years, and ſuppoſed that reign to have begun with the Council of Nice. He expected to be promoted to conſiderable preferments under the adminiſtration or miſſion of theſe two men (4); and whilſt he was flattering himſelf with theſe expectations, he got acquainted with two Engliſhmen, who attended the Palatine Laſci on his return from his Embaſſy to England. One of them was a Phyſician, the other had been a Magician, and they were both Roman Catholicks: but they promiſed the world a quick and general reformation, which God was to perform in Chriſtendom by their means. They boaſted of a familiar correſpondence with the Angels; the Phyſician had no viſions, and heard nothing extraordinary, but he wrote down very accurately all that his companion pretended to ſee and to hear. Socinus and ſeveral other perſons exhorted Puccius not to follow theſe two men; but they could not perſuade him: he went with them to Prague, and embraced again the Roman Catholick Religion; on which occaſion he wrote a long letter to Socinus, in which he aſſerted that the Angel, who ſhewed himſelf to theſe two Gentlemen, had alſo appeared to him, Puccius, in particular, and had moved him to abjure his errors. *Statim autem fere ut Pragam pervenit, factus eſt Papiſta, et miniſtros Pontificios adiens, ſuæ ab Eccleſia Romana olim defectionis veniam, conveniente ſatisfactione exhibita, impetravit. Ac mox huc ad amicos, et præſertim ad me, ad quem hac de re bene longas literas dedit, de ſuo, ut ipſe loquitur, ad Catholicæ, ſanctæque Dei Eccleſiæ gremium reditu diligenter ſcripſit, aſſerens ſe verbis unius ex illis Dei Angelis, qui ſociis illis ſuis reſponſa dare ſolent, ad ſe nominatim loquentis, monitum atque impulſum id feciſſe, diuturnumque errorem ſuum tandem agnoviſſe* (5). Socinus's letter, which contains that paſſage, was written in the beginning of the year 1586; it was not long before that Puccius had returned to Popery. Let us obſerve that he followed the profeſſion of a Merchant at Lyons, when he began to reliſh the doctrines of the Proteſtants. Though he was of a noble family, he could do it without degrading himſelf, according to the principles of the Italians: I ſay, of a noble family, for it is aſſerted, that he was really of the family of the Pucci's, of which there have been three Cardinals. *Scias eum ante plures annos, cum Lugduni, quamvis ex nobili admodum familia, quæ etiam tres Cardinales habuit, natus, ut patriæ ipſius adeoque totius noſtræ Etruriæ mos fert, mercaturam exerceret, exorientibus illis de religione in Gallia diſſidiis, quæ necdum ſopita ſunt, ſtatuit, mercatura relicta, ſe totum ſtudio Sacrarum Literarum tradere, ut quid ſentiendum in noſtra religione eſſet, dilucide cognoſcere poſſet* (6).

(1) Hoornbeeck, *Apparat. ad Controverſ. Socinianas*, p. 52.

(2) In his 3d *Letter* to Matthew Radecius.

(3) *Librum . . . cui titulum fecit de Bibliis occluſis, deque Elia qui ea aperturus eſt.* i. e. "A book . . "which he entitled, of the "Bible being "ſhut up, and of "Elijah who is "to open it." Socin. *Epiſt.* 3. p. 380. vol. 1. *Bibl. Fratrum Polonorum.*

(4) *Dum Puccius in hac venturi Eliæ expectatione totus eſt, dumque ſeipſum participem hujus divinæ legationis fore ſperat, quemadmodum ejus ipſe libellus non obſcure indicat.* Socin. ibid.

(5) Socin. *Epiſt.* 3. p. 380, vol. 1. *Bibl. Fratrum Polonorum.*

(6) Idem, ibid. p. 379.

[*B*] *Notwithſtanding this it is ſaid that he was burnt at Rome.*] The Archbiſhop of Saltſburg, they ſay (7), had him apprehended. and ſent him priſoner to Rome. That man deſerved ſome protection from the Inquiſitors, ſince he furniſhed them with a fair pretence to exclaim againſt the fundamental principle of the Proteſtants. Puccius returning into the Pale of the

(7) *Ab Archiepiſcopo Salisburgenſi captus tandem, & Romam miſſus, in rogo periit.* Micrælius, *Syntagm. Hiſt. Eccleſ.* p. m. 860.

He had no manner of learning, and was inclined to Fanaticiſm [C]. But the chief Doctrine with which he was infatuated was, that all honeſt men, even among the Heathens, would be ſaved [D]. Monſieur Baillet mentions him [E].

the Roman Catholick Church, after he had examined all the Sects who ſeparated from that Church, and tried whether he could meet with any thing ſatisfactory in France, Switzerland, England, Poland, Puccius, I ſay, returning after this into the Pale of the Church of Rome, is an evident proof, might the controverſial Writers ſay, that as ſoon as man go out of the road of authority, and follow that of a private examination, they cannot find any place where to reſt their foot upon; they ramble from one place to another, and if they have a mind to meet with firm ground, they muſt, like Noah's dove, return at laſt to the Ark. This is a noble common-place topic, which two moderns (8) have lately (9) urged when they went over to the Roman Religion. But it is after all nothing but a mere ſophiſm. The principle of authority does unavoidably lead private perſons to be Mahometans in Turkey, Heathens in China, and every where always of the national religion.

(1) The Sieurs Papin and de Verſé.

(9) I writ this in the year 1696.

[C] *He had no manner of learning, and was inclined to Fanaticiſm.*] Here follows the fine character which Voetius gives him. *Fr. Puccius natione Italus Filidinus* (10), *inſtar cotburni omnium aut nullius religionis, nullius eruditionis literariæ, philoſophicæ, ſcripturariæ, molitus eſt libellum Goudæ in Hollandia anno* 1592. *editum & Clementi VIII. dedicatum, quo aſſerit univerſalem reſtitutionem, & fidem naturalem in Deum, per quam omnes ſalvari poſſint. Fanatico illi errori (jactat enim revelationes* rat. 120. pag. 94.) *mox publica ſcripta oppoſuerunt, ex Reformatis* Franciſcus Junius, *ex Lutheranis* Lucas Oſiander, *ex Pontificiis* Nicolaus Serrarius. *De hominis iſtius univerſali* ἀπαιδευσία *ex ſcriptis, de ingenio & moribus ex* Epiſtolis Socini *judicare poteris,* Epiſt. 3. quæ eſt ad Matth. Radecum, *Secret. Gedanenſ. Puccius* prior *Socinum ſatis ſarcaſticè perſtrinxerat in collatione de Mortalitate, quæ poſtea typis edita fuit in* 4 (11). i. e. " Fr. Puccius an Italian, who like a " ſtage-player was of all religions, or of none at " all, a man ignorant of literature, of philoſophy, " and of divinity, wrote a book which was publiſhed " at Gouda in Holland, and dedicated to Pope Cle- " ment VIII. He aſſerts there is a general reſtora- " tion of all things, and maintains that all men can " be ſaved by their faith in God. That fanatical " error (for he pretends to revelations) was refuted " in printed books, by Francis Junius among the " Reformed, by Luke Oſiander among the Lutherans, " and by Nicholas Serrarius among the Roman Ca- " tholicks. You may judge of that man's univerſal " ignorance by his writings, and of his wit and " morals by Socinus's third letter, which he wrote " to Matthew Radſci. Puccius had firſt ridiculed " Socinus bitterly, in his diſſertation concerning mor- " tality, which was afterwards printed in 4to."

(10) See hereunder quotation (12).

(11) Gisb. Voetius, *Diſputat. Theolog.* Tom. 2. p. 234, 235.

[D] *That all honeſt men even among the Heathens would be ſaved.*] Tobias Pfannerus aſcribes that opinion to him on the credit of two Authors, whom he quotes. *Franciſcus Puccius Fedelinus, Romæ quidem poſtea neſcio quâ de causâ combuſtus, ignorationem & incredulitatem Evangelii, vel defectum Baptiſmi ad ſalutem nulli obeſſe* (ſtatuit) *modò ſtudeat vitæ inculpatæ, quoad externos mores, nec præfractè quicquam neget: ineſſe omnibus naturaliter hanc facultatem, ut poſſint & velint ſalvi fieri, etiam abſque ſcrutinio quæſtionum Theologicarum; ut Oſiander* *, *& poſt hunc Joh. Ludovicus Hartmannus* †, *teſtantur* (12). i. e. " Francis Puccius, " who was afterwards burnt at Rome, I know " not for what crime, aſſerted, that no man's igno- " rance or diſbelief of the goſpel, or want of bap- " tiſm, would be any obſtacle to his ſalvation, if he " did live an innocent life as to his morals, and " did not reject any doctrine out of obſtinacy: that " it is naturally in all men's power both to be able to " obtain ſalvation, and to will it, even without exa- " mining theological queſtions, as Oſiander, and J. " Lewis Hartman teſtify."

* *Oſiand. Cent.* 16. lib 4. cap. 46. citat. ib.

† *J. L. Hartmann. hiſt. Conc.* Tom. 4. Period. 6. Peric. 16. Exerc. 67. p. 701.

(12) Tob. Pfannerus, *Syſtemate Theolog. Gentilis,* p. 493.

[E] *Monſieur Baillet mentions him* (13)]. He tells us, that Luke Oſiander publiſhed a book in the year 1593 againſt our Francis Puccius, which book, adds he, is perhaps the ſame with that which is entitled, *Anti-Puccius.* " He has alſo the following paſſage. " Francis Puccius is, I think, no other but the Au- " thor of *Puccianiſm*, that is to ſay, of a new Sect, " which laſted but three days, and lay buried under " the ſtones, with which it was pelted by the Calvi- " niſts, the Lutherans, and the Catholicks. Tracing " the hiſtory of that man a little higher up, I find " that he is perhaps the ſame with Franciſco Pucci " of Florence, who retired to Baſil, who diſputed " with Socinus in the year 1577, about the ſtate of " the firſt man before the fall, and who held the im- " mortality of all the creatures, and conſequently of " man from the creation. But I will not aſſert, that " this Florentine is the ſame (14) with Franciſcus " Puccius Filidinus, who is mentioned in the firſt " claſs of the Index of condemned Authors and books, " under the name of the Council of Trent, where " it is obſerved, that that man did falſly call himſelf " Pucci." Obſerve that there is an *Anti-Puccius* quoted, which was wrote by Fauſtus Socinus; but that is not the title of the book, it is quoted thus only by abbreviation. That work contains four pieces: 1. A ſmall diſcourſe of Puccius concerning the immortality of all the creatures before *the fall.* That piece conſiſts of ten *Theſes* or poſitions, each of which contains one of the ten arguments on which he grounded his paradox. 2. Socinus's refutation of theſe ten Theſes. 3. Puccius's anſwer to that refutation. 4. Socinus's reply (15): it is very long and elaborate. All theſe pieces are inſerted in the ſecond volume of the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*, under this general title, *De ſtatu primi hominis ante lapſum Diſputatio.*

(13) In his *Anti*, num. 33. See alſo num. 69.

(14) He is certainly the ſame.

(15) Entitled, *Ad Defenſionem Franciſci Puccii Reſponſio.*

☞ PUCKERING (Sir JOHN), Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of England, in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, was born at Flamborough-head, in Yorkſhire, and ſecond ſon of a Gentleman, who left him a moderate eſtate (*a*). He applied himſelf to the ſtudy of the Common-law with ſuch ſucceſs, that he became the Queen's Serjeant, Speaker of the Houſe of Commons, and at laſt, Lord Keeper. Upon his being raiſed to the laſt poſt, he ſolicited her Majeſty, that he might have a leaſe of a large portion of the revenues of the Biſhoprick of Ely, then vacant [A], as it had been from the death of Biſhop

(a) Fuller's *Worthies in Yorkſhire,* and David Lloyd's *State-Worthies,* p. 607. 2d edit. Lond. 1670.

[A] *Solicited her Majeſty that he might have a leaſe of a large portion of the revenues of the Biſhoprick of Ely, then vacant.*] There are ſeveral original papers to this purpoſe among the manuſcripts belonging to the Biſhops of Ely. We ſhall give the Reader a copy of ſome of them.

" The moſt humble petition of your Majeſtie's moſt " bounden ſervant, the Keper of your Highnes " Great Seale.

" That it wolde pleaſe your moſt excellent Majeſ- " tie to receave from him, to be aſſured to you and " your heyres, mannors and lands of the cleere yeer- " ly valew of 4000 l. and to graunte to him and " his heyres, mannors and lands of the yeerlie valew " of 4000 l. in fee-ferme, with the advowſons be- " longinge or beinge in the pariſhes where the pre- " miſes lye.

" The ſame to be none of the aunciente reve- " news of the Crowne, or of the auncient revenewes " of the Dutchies of Lancaſter or Cornewall, or of " the Principalitie of Wales, nor lyinge within fower " miles of any of your Majeſtie's howſes of acceſſe, " but to be of the meane revenewe, which came to " your Majeſtie by attainder, or by exchainge duringe " your Heighnes reigne, and of parſonadges impro- " priate, tythes, and Chaunterei lands, and ſuch " like;

Biſhop Coxe, who died July 22, 1581, and not filled till the end of the year 1599. In 1588, he made a remarkable ſpeech in the Houſe of Lords concerning the Puritans [*B*]. He died in the year 1596. Camden (*b*) ſtyles him *Vir integer*, a man of integrity; but Lloyd tells us (*c*), that though he was "of good repute for his own carriage, he "was unhappy for that of his ſervants, who for diſpoſing of his Livings corruptly, left "themſelves an ill name in the Church, and him a dubious one in the State." The laſt of his male deſcendants was Sir Thomas Puckering, a Gentleman of three thouſand pounds a year in land, beſides money, who died in 1637, leaving one daughter not above ſix years old, as appears from a letter of the Reverend Mr. Charles Garrard, afterwards Maſter of the Charter-Houſe, in a letter to the Lord Viſcount Wentworth, Lord Deputy of Ireland, dated at London April 28, 1637 (*d*). Dr. Fuller likewiſe tells us (*e*), that the Lord Keeper's male iſſue failing, his eſtate deſcended to Sir Henry Newton, who aſſumed the name of Puckering.

(*b*) *Annales Reginæ Elizabethæ*, ad ann. 1596.

(*c*) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 609.

(*d*) See the *Letters and Diſpatches of Sir Thomas Wentworth, Bart. Earl of Straffford*, vol. 2. p. 72. edit. Lond. 1739. folio.

(*e*) *Ubi ſupra.*

PUFEN-

" like; and that no parcell thereof exceed fourtei " pounds by yeere.

" By which your Majeſtei ſhall preſently encreaſe " your revenews in poſſeſſion 400 l. yeerly contynew " for ever.

" Yf your Majeſtie ſhall not like to graunte ſo " much in fee-ferme; then it is moſt humbly deſired, " that your Heighnes wolde graunte 200 l. yeerlie in " fee-ferme after the rate aforeſaid, and other 200 l. " yeerlye by leaſe, to be aſſured from a Biſhop of " Elye of the lands of the Biſhoprike to your Majeſtie " for ſome reaſonable number of yeers, as Biſhops " have heretofore graunted in like caſes, not exceed- " ing 80 yeeres, yeeldinge the auntient and accuſ- " tomed rents to the Biſhop and his ſucceſſors; and " your Majeſtie to aſſigne the ſame leaſe over to your " ſaid ſervante.

" By which your Majeſtie ſhall encreaſe your reve- " new preſently in poſſeſſion 200 l. yeerly to conty- " new for ever."

" It may pleaſe your moſt excellent Majeſtie to " graunt me your moſt bounden ſervant your Princely " favour, that I may have a leaſe of parte of the " poſſeſſions of the Biſhoprike of Elye, not exceedinge " a thirde parte thereof in valew for ſuch reaſonable " terme of yeeres as the Biſhop may graunte unto " your Majeſtie, yeeldinge to the Biſhop and his ſuc- " ceſſors the beſt accuſtomed rents now or at any " tyme heartofore anſwered to the Biſhop for the " ſame, and performinge all ſervices and uſuall co- " venants for payment of rents, and doinge repara- " tions.

" For the accompliſhment whereof, yt may pleaſe " your Majeſtie to tranſlate one of the eldeſt Biſhopps, " whoe may make the ſame leaſe, by whoſe great " age it is lykeley the ſame Biſhoprike will not tarie " longe forrth of your Majeſtie's hands.

" Yt ſhall appeare unto your Majeſtie, that there- " by your Heighnes ſhall have as much profitt yeer- " ly in tenthes, ſubſidies, and firſt fruits out of thoſe " Biſhopriks, as your Majeſtie now hath clearly, the " See being voyde."

Reaſons that move the Lord Keper to aſke. " Sarge- " ant Puckeringe was taken to ſerve fower ſeſſions of " two Parliaments as Speaker, to his great expence " and chardge, and to the loſſe of his gaines in prac- " tize; wherby he coulde not make himſelf able, " as others (not ſervinge this courſe) have don.

" Being called to be Keper of the Great Seale, the " furniſhinge to ſo great a countenance (as this place " upon the ſodaine ſo enforced) was exceedinge " chardgeable.

" He hath no help of howſe (as ſondrie other Of- " ficers have appertaininge to their offices,) but pay- " eth 100 l. rente for his houſe at London, beſides " his houſe in the contrie.

" He hath no help of proviſion for horſe or howſe- " kepinge, by keeping of parks, or havinge other " offirs or leaſes of her Majeſtie.

" Other Chancellers have (for the moſt part) been " Biſhopps, and had therby great livings, beſides the " pore duteis of the Chanceller's office.

" The Lord Keper's profitts (ſithens his cominge to " the Seale) have been deminiſhed by cuttinge of " divers termes (by occaſion of ſickneſs) and the " chardge increaſed by ſeekinge habitation in the " contrei, where he hath no help of proviſion, but " all on the penny.

" Ther is detained from him the makinge of De- " niſons, which every Lord Keper and Chanceller " have had ſince her Majeſtie's tyme.

" He deſireth but to be made able to ſerve.

" He ſeketh not out of her Majeſtie's revenewes " and cofers.

" Yf he were a Civill Lawyer, he might ſue for " the Biſhoprike, but beinge a Common Lawyer, he " ſeeketh but to be the Biſhopp's Fermor, and that " only of ſuch a portion as the Biſhop can and wil be " willinge to ſpare, beinge no parte of his manſion " howſes or demeſnes, but that which others ſhall " have, yf the Lord Keper have it not.

" His Lordſhip (having this reaſonable ſuit) will " let to the tenants for reaſonable fynes, and thei " will be glad of certaine termes, and will beſtow " coſt upon their tenements."

[*B*] *In* 1588, *he made a remarkable ſpeech in the Houſe of Lords concerning the Puritans.*] He made this ſpeech by the ſpecial command of Queen Elizabeth. Mr. Tho. Pierce (1), afterwards Dean of Sarum, gives the following paſſage from it, tranſcribed from the Lord Keeper's own copy of the ſpeech. *And eſpecially you are commanded by her Majeſty to take heed, that no ear be given, nor time afforded to the wearifom ſollicitations of thoſe, that commonly be called Puritans, wherewithal the late Parliaments have been exceedingly importuned. Which ſort of men, whilſt in the giddineſs of their ſpirits they labour and ſtrive to advance a new Elderſhip, they do nothing elſe than but diſturb the good repoſe of the Church and the Commonwealth, which is as well grounded for the body of religion itſelf, and as well guided for the diſcipline, as any realm, that profeſſeth the truth. And the ſame thing is already made good to the world by many the writings of learned and godly men; neither anſwered nor anſwerable by any of theſe new-fangled refiners. And as the preſent caſe ſtandeth, it may be doubted, whether they or the Jeſuits do offer more danger, or be more ſpeedily to be repreſſed. For albeit the Jeſuits do empoiſon the hearts of her Majeſty's ſubjects, under a pretext of conſcience, to withdraw them from their obedience due to her Majeſty; yet do they the ſame but cloſely, and only in privy corners. But theſe men do both publiſh in their printed books, and teach in all their conventicles, ſundry opinions, not only dangerous to the well-ſettled eſtate and policy of the realm, by putting a pike between the Clergy and Laity, but alſo much derogatory to her ſacred Majeſty and her Crown, as well by the diminution of her ancient and lawful revenues, and by denying her Highneſs's prerogative and ſupremacy, as by offering peril to her Majeſty's ſafety in her own Kingdom. In all which things, (however in many other points they pretend to be at war with the Popiſh Jeſuits, yet) by the ſeparation of themſelves from the unity of their fellow-ſubjects, and by abuſing the ſacred Authority and Majeſty of their Prince, they do both join and concur with the Jeſuits in opening the door, and preparing the way to the Spaniſh Invaſion that is threatened againſt the Realm. And thus having, according to the weakneſs of my beſt underſtanding, delivered her Majeſty's moſt royal pleaſure and wiſe direction, I reſt here, with moſt humble ſuit for her Majeſty's a gracious pardon in ſupply of my defects, and recommend you to the Author of all good counſel.* T.

(1) *New Diſcoverer diſcovered, by way of Anſwer to Mr. Baxter his pretended* Diſcovery of the Grotian Religion, p. 109. edit. Lond. 1659, in 4to.

[*A*] *An*

☞ PUFENDORF (SAMUEL DE), an eminent Writer [*A*], was born in 1631, at Fleh, a little village near Chemnitz in Miſnia, a Provence in Upper Saxony (*a*), and was ſon of Elias Pufendorf, Miniſter of that place. His father having obſerved in him a very early inclination to learning, cultivated it with great care, and when he was of a proper age for the Univerſity, ſent him thither, by the aſſiſtance of a Saxon Nobleman, who being pleaſed with the excellent genius of the youth, was ſo generous as to maintain him there, the narrow circumſtances of our Author's father not enabling him to ſupport that expence. He went firſt to Grim, and having reſided there ſome time, removed to Leipſick, where, by his extraordinary application, he made a vaſt progreſs in his ſtudies. His father deſigning him for the Miniſtry, directed him to apply himſelf to the ſtudy of Divinity; but his inclination leading him another way, he turned his thoughts to that of the publick Law, which in Germany conſiſts of the knowledge of the Rights of the Empire over the Princes and States of which it is compoſed, and thoſe of the Princes and States, with reſpect to each other. He conſidered this ſtudy as a proper method of raiſing himſelf in time to ſome poſts in the Courts of Germany; for it is well known, that the ſeveral Princes, who compoſe the Germanick Body, have no other Miniſters of State, than men of learning, whom they ſtyle Counſellors, and whoſe principal ſtudy is the knowledge of the Publick Law of Germany. As theſe poſts are not venal, and no other recommendation is neceſſary to obtain them, but diſtinguiſhed merit, Mr. de Pufendorf reſolved to qualify himſelf for the honours, to which he aſpired. After he had reſided ſome time at Leipſick, he left that city, and went to Jena, where he joined to the ſtudy of Law that of the Mathematicks, to which he applied himſelf under Profeſſor Erhard Weigel, at whoſe houſe he lodged during the whole year 1657. His application to this ſcience, and to the Carteſian Philoſophy, for which he had an high eſteem, though without

(*a*) See his *Life* written in High Dutch, and prefixed to the High Dutch tranſlation of his book *de Statu Imperii Germanici*; and the *Preface* to the French tranſlation of his book *de Jure Naturæ & Gentium*; and the Preface to the French tranſlation of his *Introduction to Hiſtory*, edit. 1722, and *Bibl. Fabriciana*, Tom. 4. p. 133.

[*A*] *An eminent Writer.*] His works are as follow. I. *Elementorum Juriſprudentia Univerſalis Libri duo.* Hague 1660 in 8vo. *Cum Appendice de Sphærâ Morali*, Jena 1669 in 8vo. The *Appendix* printed in this ſecond edition was not written by our Author. In this work our Author has in ſome meaſure followed the method of the Geometricians, by laying down at firſt his definitions and axioms, which he then explains, and draws the concluſions contained in them. Though he was not afterwards ſatisfied with this treatiſe himſelf, and publickly owned the defects of it, as an haſty production of youth; yet it was very favourably received by the publick, and diſtinguiſhed him to great advantage. It was thought, that ſuch a performance promiſed ſomething very conſiderable in the future; and Baron Boinebourg, then Chancellor to the Elector of Mentz, who was extremely deſirous, that ſome perſon ſhould undertake to give a methodical body of the law of nature, and had in vain applied himſelf for this purpoſe to ſeveral learned men, particularly *Boecler*, *Conringius*, and *Rachelius*, thought him capable of ſo noble a work, and engaged him in it. This produced his famous book *De Jure Naturæ & Gentium*, of which we ſhall ſpeak below. II. *Joannis Meurſii Miſcellanea Laconica, ſive variarum Antiquitatum Laconicorum Libri IV. primum editi cura Samuelis Pufendorfii.* Amſterdam 1661 in 4to. III. *Joannis Laurembergii Græcia Antiqua, cum tabulis Geographicis, edente Samuele Pufendorf.* Amſterdam 1661 in 4to. IV. *Severini de Mozambano de Statu Imperii Germanici Liber unus.* Geneva 1667 in 12mo. Pufendorf dedicated this book to his brother, whom he ſtyles here *Lælio* Signor de *Trezolani*. It was reprinted with ſome remarks *Eleutheropoli* 1668 in 12mo. *Cum Notis & Stricturis Pacifici à Lapide* [Philippi Andreæ Oldenburgeri.] *Acceſſit Samuelis Pufendorfii Diſquiſitio de Republicâ irregulari ad Severini de Mozambano Caput IV. de formâ Imperii*, 1671 and 1682 in 8vo. *Auctior, & Exercitationum ſpecimine illuſtratus ab Ulrico Obrechto*, 1684 in 8vo. *Cum Præfatione Jacobi Pauli Gundlingii.* Berlin 1706 in 8vo. *Ex Autographo Auctoris recognitus, cum prioribus Editionibus collatus, ac ſetectis variorum Notis illuſtratus: curante D. Gottliel Gerhard Titio.* Leipſic 1708 in 8vo. It was tranſlated into High Dutch, and printed in 1715 in 8vo. An Engliſh tranſlation by Mr. Edmund Bohun was printed at London 1696 in 8vo. It was publiſhed in French at Amſterdam 1696 in 12mo. under this title: *L'Etat de l'Empire d'*Allemagne, *traduit da Latin de Mozambane, per François Savinien d'Alquié.* This tranſlation is a very bad one; to have ſucceeded in it, the tranſlator ought to have been better acquainted with the affairs of Germany. Pufendorf ſent in 1666 the manuſcript of this work to his brother, Iſaac Pufendorf, then Embaſſador from the Court of Sweden to that of France, in order that it might be printed in that Kingdom. The latter offered it for that purpoſe to a bookſeller, who gave it to Mezeray to peruſe. Mezeray thought it worth publiſhing, but refuſed to give his approbation, becauſe he found in it ſome paſſages oppoſite to the intereſts of France and others, in which the Prieſts and Monks were treated with great ſeverity. This engaged Iſaac Pufendorf to ſend the book to Geneva, where it was printed. The Author, who foreſaw, that it would make a great deal of noiſe, would not put his name to it, which did not appear except in the latter editions. It met with great oppoſition; it was condemned, prohibited, and ſeized in many parts of Germany; and ſeveral learned Civilians immediately wrote againſt it, either expreſsly, or occaſionally; as particularly the following. *Martin Schoockius* in his *Exercitationes XII. quibus Severini de Monzambano ad modum promulſidis, Tractatus de ſtatu Imperii Germanici diſcutitur, & quædam Chreſtino, plura obelo notantur. Cis Veronam* 1668 in 12mo. He deſigned to have written a larger work upon this ſubject, but was prevented by death. *Philip Andrew Oldenberger* in his *Notæ & Strictura*, publiſhed under the name of *Pacificus & Lapide. Utopia* 1668 in 8vo. and added to ſome editions of Pufendorf's books. *John Lewis Praſchius* in his *Literæ ſecretiores Monzambani ad Lælium Fratrem, de Germanâ Imperii Germanici formâ*, 1668 in 12mo. *Charles Scharſchmidius* in his book entitled, *Syſtema Juris Publici Romano Germanici, & Diſquiſitio de Republicâ Monſtruosâ, contra Severinum de Monzambano ejuſque Aſſeclas.* Francfort 1677 in 8vo. *John George Kulpis* in his *Commentationes Academicæ in Severinum de Monzambano de Statu Imperii Germanici.* Stutgard 1682 in 8vo. V. *De Jure Naturæ & Gentium Libri VIII. Lundini Scanorum* 1672 in 4to. This edition is the moſt correct. *Secunda Editio auctior & emendatior.* Francfort on the Mein 1684 in 4to. This edition is enlarged above a quarter. Reprinted at Amſterdam 1688 in 4to. *Cum Annotatis Johannis Nicolai Hertii Juriſconſulti.* Francfort on the Mein 1706 in 4to. Amſterdam 1715 in 4to. Francfort on the Mein 1716 in 4to. This edition is probably the ſame with that of 1706, with a new title page. *Hertius*'s notes are likewiſe inſerted in the edition of Amſterdam. Mr. *Barbeyrac* in his advertiſement before the ſecond edition of his French tranſlation of this work, tells us, that *Hertius* ſeems to have wrote theſe notes in haſte, in order to gratify the bookſeller, who was deſirous of recommending his edition by ſomething wanting in the former; and that they are very erroneous. The French tranſlation was publiſhed under this title: *Le Droit de la Nature & des Gens, ou Syſtême general des Principes les*

out a blind attachment to all its notions, contributed greatly to perfect his natural talents, and to give him a juſt and clear method of reaſoning. Though he uſed his utmoſt efforts to diſtinguiſh himſelf by his ſkill in the law, he neglected thoſe pompous titles, which are ſo much ſought for at the Univerſities, and are often a very equivocal characteriſtic of abilities and learning; and would never take the Degree of Doctor. He returned to Leipſic in 1658 with a view to ſeek for an employment fit for him. One of his brothers, whoſe name was Iſaiah, and who had been for ſome time in the ſervice of the King of Sweden, whoſe Chancellor he afterwards was in the Duchies of Bremen and Werden, and by whom he was employed in the management of his affairs at ſeveral of the principal Courts of Europe, wrote to him then, adviſing him to follow his example, and not to fix in his own country, but to ſeek his fortune elſewhere. Pufendorf reſolved to take this advice, and accepted the place of Governor to the ſon of Monſieur Coyet, a Swediſh Nobleman, who was then Embaſſador of the King of Sweden at the Court of Denmark. For this purpoſe he went to Copenhagen; but he did not continue long at eaſe there, for the war being renewed ſome time after between Denmark and Sweden, he was ſeized with the whole family of the Embaſſador, who a few days before had taken a tour into Sweden. During his confinement, which laſted for eight months, as he had no books, and was allowed to ſee no perſon, he amuſed himſelf by meditating upon

plus importans de la Morale, de Juriſprudence, & de la Politique traduit du Latin de M. le Baron de Pufendorf, *par* Jean Barbeyrac, *avec des Notes du Traducteur, & une Preface, qui ſert d'inſtruction à tout l'ouvrage.* Amſterdam 1706 in 4to. two tomes. *The ſecond Edition reviſed and conſiderably enlarged,* was printed at Amſterdam 1712 in 4to. two tomes This tranſlation is preferable to the original on account of the corrections, which the tranſlator has made in it, and the learned notes which he has added to it. It was tranſlated into High Dutch, and printed with the notes of *John Nicholas Hertius, John Barbeyrac,* and others, at Francfort on the Mein in 1711 in 4to. Mr. Barbeyrac ſays, that the editor of this tranſlation promiſes in the title page much more than he performs, ſince he has inſerted but a few of his notes, and thoſe the ſhorteſt, contenting himſelf with referring to the original French for thoſe, which are longer. It was tranſlated into Engliſh by Dr. *Baſil Kennet,* and others, and printed in 1708. This work has met with a very general approbation; it is indeed a body of the law of nature well digeſted, and preferable to *Grotius's* book *de Jure Belli & Pacis,* ſince the ſame ſubjects are treated with more extent and order. However, there has been a great number of critics, againſt whom Pufendorf was obliged to defend himſelf, which he did with ſucceſs. The firſt, who attacked him, was *Nicholas Beckman,* his Collegue in the Univerſity of Lunden. It is ſaid that he mixed a great deal of paſſion in his criticiſm, in which a Lutheran Profeſſor of the ſame Univerſity, named *Joſua Schwartz,* had likewiſe an hand.

This Writer, in order to give the greater weight to his objections, endeavours to draw the Divines into his party, by bringing religion into the diſpute, and accuſing our Author of Heterodoxy. He attempted by this means to exaſperate the Clergy of Sweden againſt *Pufendorf*; but the Senators of that Kingdom prevented this, and injoined his enemies ſilence, by ſuppreſſing by the King's authority, *Beckman*'s book, which notwithſtanding was afterwards printed at Gieſſen, under this title, *Index Novitatum quarundam, quas Dn.* Samuel Pufendorf, *Libro ſuo* de Jure Naturæ & Gentium, *contra orthodoxa fundamenta, Lundini edidit.* This piece being brought into Sweden, was burnt there in April 1675, by the hands of the common Executioner, and *Beckman,* the Author, baniſhed from all the Dominions of the King of Sweden, for having diſobeyed the orders given him, by publiſhing it. Jealouſy had occaſioned him to write this; but revenge made him write others, the very titles of which are ſufficient to ſhew his temper. He publiſhed at firſt under the fictitious name of *Veridicus Conſtantius,* a very ſatyrical piece, which was followed by ſome others, and among the reſt one under this long title: Nicolai Beckmanni *legitima Defenſio contra Magiſtri* Samuelis Pufendorfii *execrabiles fictitias calumnias, quibus illum contra omnem veritatem & juſtitiam ut carnatus diabolus, & ſingularis mendaciorum artifex per fictitia ſua entia moralia (Diabolica puto) toti honeſto ac erudito orbi malitioſè exponere voluit. Naturalis ſive Brutalis & Gentilis* Pufendorfii *ſpiritus uſq; adeo enormiter ſe exerit & perverſè opinatur, ut nec Diabolum nec infernum nec vitam æternam dari impiè credat; & dum omnem actionem humanam ſtatuat eſſe indifferentem, boni ac mali nec præmium nec pœnam futuram: hic tamen pro ſatyrico ſuo ingenio firmiter credit, ſi viris honeſtis & proximo ſuo audacter & malitioſè calumnietur, quod ſemper aliquid fœcis ſive mendacii in animis legentium hæreat. Impreſſum anno* 1677. He was not content with attacking *Pufendorf* with his pen, but he likewiſe challenged him to fight a duel, and wrote to him from Copenhagen for that purpoſe, threatening, that if he did not meet him at the place appointed, to purſue him wherever he ſhould go. *Pufendorf* took no notice of this letter, but without writing an anſwer, ſent it to the Conſiſtory of the Univerſity, which proceeded againſt Beckman. However he thought it neceſſary to publiſh ſomething in anſwer to the ſatyrical pieces of that Writer, which he did in the following books. VI. *Apologia pro ſe & ſuo Libro, adverſus Authorem Libelli famoſi, cui Titulus,* Index Novitatum, &c. 1674, in 8vo. VII. *Epiſtola ad amicos ſuos per Germaniam ſuper Libello famoſo, quem* Nicolaus Beckmannus *quondam Profeſſor in Academiâ Carolinâ, nunc verò cum infamiâ inde relegatus, mentito nomine* Veridici Conſtantii *ſuperiori anno diſſeminavit,* 1678, *in* 8vo. VIII. Petri Dunæi *in Academiâ Carolinâ Pedelli ſecundarii Epiſtola ad virum famoſiſſimum,* Nicolaum Beckmannum, *totius Germaniæ convitiatorem & calumniatorem longè impudentiſſimum, ſuper noviſſimis ipſius ſcriptis. Holmiæ* 1678, in 8vo. This piece, which was written by our Author, is intirely ſatyrical and perſonal. IX. Joannis Rolletti, *Palatini, diſcuſſio Calumniarum, quas abſurdiſſimas de illuſtri viro* Samuele Pufendorfio, *relegatus è Sueciâ nequam* Nicolaus Beckmannus *per cauſam defendendæ ſuæ famæ non ita pridem in vulgus ſparſit.* Manheim 1678, in 8vo. In this piece *Pufendorf* concealed himſelf under the name of *Rollettus.* Though *Joſua Schwartz* had an hand in the *Index Novitatum,* &c. publiſhed at firſt againſt *Pufendorf,* the King of Sweden pardoned him, after he had declared that he had no intention, that the book ſhould be printed, as it had been by *Beckman,* without his knowledge. But there happened afterwards an incident, which obliged him to leave the Dominions of that Prince. In the war between Sweden and Denmark, the Danes having made themſelves maſters of the city of Lunden, inſiſted upon the inhabitants taking an oath of fidelity to the King of Denmark. *Schwartz* not only ſubmitted to this, but likewiſe uſed his utmoſt efforts to perſuade others to follow his example. But when peace was ſettled between the two Crowns, and Lunden reſtored to the King of Sweden, he ſaw, that he could not continue any longer in ſafety in that country, and therefore retired into Denmark, where he was taken into the King's ſervice, and was appointed ſuper-intendant of the Duchy of Sleſwick. Being now at liberty to revenge himſelf upon *Pufendorf* for what he had ſaid of him in his *Apology,* he publiſhed againſt him, under the name of *Severin Wildſchutz,* his ſon-in-law, a violent piece, entitled, Severini Wildſchutz, *Malmogienſis Scani, Diſcuſſio Calumniarum à* Samuele Pufendorfio, *in*

upon what he had read in Grotius's Treatiſe *De Jure Belli & Pacis*, and the political writings of Hobbes. He drew up a ſhort ſyſtem of what he thought beſt in them; he turned and unravelled the ſubject in his own way; he treated of points, which had not been touched by theſe Authors; and added to the whole ſome new thoughts, which occurred to him. His deſign in this was only to divert himſelf in his ſolitude, but two years after he went to Holland, where a friend of his having read this eſſay adviſed him to reviſe it, and publiſh it; which he did at the Hague in 1660 under the title of *Elementa Juriſprudentiæ Univerſalis*. The Elector Palatine, Charles Lewis, to whom he had dedicated it, not only wrote him immediately a letter of thanks dated September the the 29th the ſame year, but invited him the year following to the Univerſity of Heidelberg, to which he was deſirous to reſtore its former luſtre, and founded in his favour a Profeſſorſhip of the Law of Nature and Nations, which was the firſt that was eſtabliſhed in Germany, though many ſince have been erected in imitation of it. Beſides this the Elector afterwards engaged him to beſtow ſome of his leiſure hours upon the inſtruction of the Electoral Prince, his ſon, who had likewiſe other maſters employed in his education. Pufendorf remained at Heidelberg till 1670, when the King of Sweden Charles XI. having founded an Univerſity at Lunden in the Province of Schonen, ſent for him to be Profeſſor there. The Elector Palatine was extremely ſorry to loſe him; but would not oblige him to continue with him, and conſented, that he ſhould accept of a more lucrative and advantageous poſt, which was offered him in Sweden. He went thither the ſame year, and was inſtalled in the place of Profeſſor of the Law of Nature and Nations, with a ſtipend

in Apologiâ Indicis Errorum ſuorum Venerabili univiro impoſitarum. Sleſwigæ 1687, in 4to. Pufendorf anſwered under the name of the ſame *Schwartz*, in the following letter. X. Joſuæ Schwartzii *Diſſertatio Epiſtolica ad eximium unum Juvenem* Severinum Wildſchyſſium, *privignum ſuum*. Hamburg 1688, in 4to. This piece is intirely ironical, and the ſtyle like that of the *Epiſtolæ obſcurorum virorum*; as is alſo that of the following, of which Pufendorf was likewiſe the Author. XI. *Juriſconſulti* Nicolai Beckmanni *ad V. C.* Severinum Wildſchutz *Malmogienſem Scanum, Epiſtola, in quâ ipſi cordicitus gratulatur de devicto & triumphato* Pufendorfio. Hamburg 1688. Our Author's book met likewiſe with oppoſition in Germany. The Univerſity of Germany condemned it in 1673, upon the mere repreſentation of *Beckman's Index*; and this condemnation engaged *Pufendorf* to write the following letter. XII. *Epiſtola ad plurimum Reverendum atque celeb. Virum Dn.* Johannem Adamum Scherzerum, *Theologum apud Lipſienſes primarium ſuper Cenſurâ quapiam in Librum ſuum iniquè latâ.* Harderwick 1673. This letter had not ſo great an effect as the book itſelf; for when it was brought to Leipſic, and examined with care, it was found immediately, that they had been impoſed upon by the accuſations of his adverſary, and the prejudices conceived againſt it vaniſhed by degrees. XIII. *Eris Scandica, quâ adverſus Libros de Jure naturali & Gentium objecta diluuntur.* Francfort on the Mein, 1686, in 4to. This is a collection of ſeveral pieces, ſome of which had been printed ſeparately. The principal, which is the ninth, is entitled, S. Pufendorfii *ſpecimen controverſirum circa Jus naturale ipſi motarum.* In this he anſwers the objections and difficulties, which ſeveral Proteſtant Divines had urged to him with relation to ſome paſſages of his book. There is prefixed to this collection, Julii Rondini *Diſſertatio Epiſtolica ſuper controverſiis, quæ* S. P. *cum quibuſdam aliis circa Jus naturale interceſſerunt.* This piece was written by *Pufendorf* himſelf, though diſguiſed under the name of *Rondinus*. XIV. *Joannis Rolleti Scharenſchmidus vapulans.* Stralſund 1678, in 8vo, pagg. 32. This piece, in which *Pufendorf* aſſumed the name of *Rolletus*, is deſigned to refute what *Scharenſchmid*, a Licentiate of Law at Leipſic, had written againſt his treatiſe *de ſtatu Imperii Germanici*, in his *Diſquiſitio de Republicâ Monſtroſâ contra Monzambanum.* XV. *Commentatio ſuper invenuſto Veneris Lipſicæ ovo*, Val. Alberti *calumniis & ineptiis oppoſita.* 1687. This was written againſt *Alberti*, whoſe ſyſtem of the foundation of the Law of Nature he had attacked in his *Eris Scandica*, and who had written an anſwer to him, entitled, *Eros Lipſicus, quo Eris Scandica* Samuelis Pufendorfii *cum convitiis & erroribus ſuis maſculè, modeſtè tamen repellitur; ſcriptus ad Ill. V.* Vitum-Ludovicum à Seckendorf, *adjectis prioribus Apologiis contra eundem* Pufendorfium, *& nonnullis Diſputationibus ejuſdem aut ſimilis argumenti.* Leipſic 1687.

Theſe are all the polemical Writings of *Pufendorf*, which do not deſerve the ſame regard with his other works, ſince they are full of perſonalities, and diſcuſſions of very little importance to the publick. XVI. *De officio Hominis & Civis juxta legem naturalem Libri duo.* Lunden 1673, in 8vo, Stockholm 1689, in 12mo. This edition is full of faults. Francfort on the Mein 1714, in 8vo. *Supplementis & Obſervationibus in Academiæ Juventutis uſum auxit & illuſtravit Gerſchovius*, Edinburg 1724, in 8vo. Tranſlated into French under this title: *Les Devoirs de l'Homme & du Citoyen, tels qu' ils lui ſont preſcrits par la Loy naturelle: traduits du Latin par* Jean Barbeyrac, *avec quelques Notes du Traducteur.* Amſterdam 1707, in 8vo. Luxembourg 1708, in 8vo. This edition is very incorrect, and printed on bad paper. The third edition was printed at Amſterdam 1715, in 8vo. The fourth edition reviſed, and enlarged, with a great number of notes, and ſome other pieces, was printed at Amſterdam 1718, in 8vo, two tomes. This is a very clear and methodical abridgment, made by our Author himſelf of the great work *De Jure Naturæ & Gentium. Andrew Adam Hochſtetter*, Profeſſor of Divinity at Tubing, has publiſhed notes upon this abridgment, under the title of *Collegium Pufendorfianum, ſuper Libris duobus* de Officio Hominis & Civis, *XII. Exercitationibus inſtitutum.* Tubing 1710, in 4to. Theſe notes are ſhort, and add but very little to the text; but there is a great multitude of quotations at the end of every article. There is another abridgment by an unknown Author of Pufendorf's large work, digeſted into queſtions and anſwers, and publiſhed under this title; *Compendium Juriſprudentiæ univerſalis ex* Sam. Pufendorfii *præcellenti Opere* de Jure Naturæ & Gentium, *in privatum uſum quorundam Juvenum excerptum.* Francfort 1694, in 12mo. XVII. *Diſſertationes Academicæ ſelectiores.* Lunden 1675, in 8vo. Upſal 1677, in 8vo. *Accedit Caroli Scharenſchmidii Diſquiſitio de Republicâ Monſtroſâ, ejuſque defenſio contra Monzambanum & Pufendorfium.* Francfort 1678, in 12mo. Reprinted under this title, *Analecta Politica, quibus multæ raræ graviſſimæque hujus Diſciplinæ Quæſtiones variis diſſertationibus explicantur & enodantur.* Amſterdam 1698 in 8vo. XVIII. *Hiſtorical and political deſcription of the ſpiritual Monarchy of the Pope*, in High Dutch. Hamburg 1679 in 12mo. pagg. 258. Tranſlated into Low Dutch with the remarks of *Chriſtian Thomaſius*, by *J. le Long.* Amſterdam 1724 in 8vo. Tranſlated into Latin, and printed at Francfort 1688 in 8vo. at the end of the Latin tranſlation of his *Introduction to Hiſtory.* Pufendorf publiſhed this book under the name of *Baſilius Hypereta*, and afterwards inſerted it with ſome alterations in his *Introduction to Hiſtory*, of which it makes the twelfth chapter of the firſt part. There was publiſhed ſome years after a Treatiſe of the ſame nature and in the ſame language, under the title of *Theodoſii Gibellini Cæſaro-Papa.* Francfort 1684 in 8vo, the Author of

ſtipend more conſiderable than thoſe of the other Profeſſors. His reputation greatly increaſed after that time, both by the fame and ſucceſs of his Lectures, and the works, which he publiſhed. Some years after the King of Sweden ſent for him to Stockholm, and made him his Hiſtoriographer, and one of his Counſellors. In 1688 the Elector of Brandenburg obtained the conſent of the King of Sweden, that he ſhould come to Berlin, in order to write the Hiſtory of the Elector William the Great, and granted him the ſame titles of Hiſtoriographer and Privy Counſellor, which he had in Sweden, with a conſiderable penſion. However, the King of Sweden ſtill continued to ſhew him marks of his eſteem, and in 1694 made him a Baron. But he did not long enjoy this title; for he died of an inflammation in one of his feet, occaſioned by cutting his nails, on the 26th of October the ſame year, aged ſixty three years.

PUTEANUS

of which is not known, though ſome aſcribe it to Iſaiah Pufendorf. XIX. *Introduction to the Hiſtory of the principal States, at preſent in Europe.* In High Dutch. Francfort on the Mein 1682 in 8vo. Pufendorf wrote this introduction for ſome Gentlemen, who ſtudied privately under him, without any deſign of publiſhing it. But finding it handed about in manuſcript, and that it was going to be printed, and was already tranſlated into the Swediſh language, he thought proper to publiſh it himſelf in High Dutch, juſt as it was, that is, not in ſo perfect a ſtate as he could have given it. The fourth edition of this book in High Dutch was made in 1699. XX. *Continuation of the Introduction to Hiſtory, &c. in which is an account of Sweden.* In High Dutch. Francfort on the Mein 1686 in 8vo. As our Author wrote in Sweden, and for the Swedes, he is more ample upon the Hiſtory of that Kingdom than upon that of others. XXI. *Addition to the Continuation of the Introduction to Hiſtory, &c. in Anſwer to* Varillas. In High Dutch. Francfort on the Mein 1687 in 8vo. Pufendorf in this addition, which is ſhort, attacks *Varillas* upon what he had ſaid in his *Revolutions* concerning the reformation in Sweden, and takes notice of 91 errors in his account. Our Author's *Introduction to Hiſtory* was tranſlated into French by *Claude Rouxel*, and printed in that language at Utrecht in 1687 and 1688 in four volumes in 16°. and afterwards at Amſterdam in 1710 in 16°. and at Leyden the ſame year in four volumes in 12mo. Though the title page aſſures us, that this tranſlation was made from the High Dutch original, it is certain, that it was done only from the Low Dutch verſion; but this did not prevent it, any more than the meanneſs of the tranſlator's ſtyle, and the puerilities, which he frequently makes his Author guilty of, from having a vaſt ſale. The title page of the Leyden edition of 1701 aſſures us, that it was corrected; but this whole correction conſiſts merely in the change of ſome words of no conſequence, without rectifying the groſs abſurdities. There has been ſince publiſhed a new edition more perfect, under this title: *Introduction à l'Hiſtoire generale & politique de l'Univers, où l'on voit l'origine, les revelations, l'Etat preſent & les interets des Souverains par M. le Baron de* Pufendorf. *Nouvelle edition, où l'on a continuè tous les anciens chapitres juſqu' à preſent, & ajoûtè l'Hiſtoire des principaux Souverains de l'Italie, de l'Allemange: &c. le tout dans un ordre plus naturel. Avec des Notes Hiſtoriques, Geographiques, & Critiques, & des Cartes.* Amſterdam, (*i. e.* Trevoux) 1722 in ſeven tomes in 12mo. The Editor not having leiſure to make a new tranſlation, only corrected that of *Rouxel*, comparing it with the High Dutch original, and mending the ſtyle. There is a Latin tranſlation of his work by Mr. *Cramer*, printed at Francfort 1688 in 8vo. and at Utrecht 1692 and 1703 in 8vo. In the two firſt editions there is no account of Sweden, but in the third of 1703 *Cramer* has given an abſtract of what Pufendorf wrote in the ſecond part of his work. There is likewiſe a Low Dutch tranſlation by *Simon de Vries*, printed in 1684, and an Engliſh one at London 1706. XXII. *Georgii Caſtriotæ, Schanderbegi vulgo dicti, Hiſtoria compendio tradita.* Stadæ 1684 in 12mo. Our Author wrote this Hiſtory at the command of Charles Lewis, Elector Palatine, and John Philip, Elector of Mentz. XXIII. *Commentariorum de rebus Suecicis Libri XXVI. ab Expeditione Guſtavi Adolphi Regis in Germaniam, ad abdicationem uſque Chriſtianæ.* Utrecht 1686 in folio.

Pufendorf having applied himſelf to read over the publick papers kept in the Archives of Sweden, with a deſign to write the Hiſtory of *Charles Guſtavus*, according to the orders, which he had received from *Charles* IX. thought proper to begin with that of *Guſtavus Adolphus*, and to continue it down to the abdication of Queen *Chriſtina*; and this he has executed in the preſent work, which is very curious and exact. XXIV. *De Habitu Religionis Chriſtianæ ad Vitam Civilem Liber ſingularis. Accedunt Animadverſiones ad aliqua loca è Politicâ Adriani Houtuyn Juriſconſulti Batavi.* Bremen 1687 in 4to. and 1692 in 12mo. In this book he endeavours to ſettle the juſt limits between the eccleſiaſtical and civil Powers. XXV. *Epiſtolæ duæ ſuper Cenſura in Ephemeridibus Eruditorum Pariſienſium, & Bibliothecâ Univerſali de quibuſdam ſuorum ſcriptorum locis lata, ad Vir. Cl. L. Andream Rechenbergium.* Leipſic 1688 in 4to. pag. 14. Pufendorf in this piece defends himſelf with great modeſty from the errors imputed to him in the *Journal des Savans* and the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle.* XXVI. *Epiſtola ad Fratrem Eſaiam Pufendorfium ſuper Theologiâ in formam demonſtrationis redigendâ.* This letter, which is dated February the 24th 1681. is printed in the ſecond volume of the Supplement to the *Acta Eruditorum* of Leipſic. XXVII. *Jus Feciale divinum, ſive de conſenſu & diſſenſu Proteſtantium Exercitatio poſthuma.* Lubeck 1695 in 8vo. pagg. 384. In this book our Author propoſes a ſcheme for a reunion of religions. It appears from the zeal, with which he recommended, before his death, the printing of it, that it was his favourite work. XXVIII. *De rebus geſtis Friderici Willelmi Magni, Electoris Brandenburgici, Commentariorum Libri XIX.* Berlin 1695 two volumes in folio. This Hiſtory, which is highly eſteemed, is extracted from the Archives of the Houſe of Brandenburg. The impreſſion was almoſt finiſhed, when it was thought proper to retrench ſeveral paſſages; and it is rare to meet with any copies, in which thoſe paſſages are preſerved. XXIX. *De Rebus à Carolo Guſtavo Sueciæ Rege geſtis Commentariorum Libri ſeptem.* Nuremberg 1696 in folio, in two volumes with cuts. A French tranſlation was printed at Nuremberg 1698 in two volumes in folio with cuts. Theſe cuts, which repreſent the ſieges and battles, are very numerous and well engraved, but defective in this reſpect, that they are the mere reſult of the imagination, and have no manner of relation to the Author's narration. XXX. *Epiſtolæ Amœbææ Sam. Pufendorfii & Joan. Groningii de Commerciis pacatorum ad Belligerantes.* Inſerted in the collection of *John Groningius*, entitled, *Bibliotheca univerſalis Librorum Juridicorum.* Hamburg 1703 in 8vo. XXXI. *Diſſertatio de Fœderibus inter Sueciam & Galliam.* Hague 1708 in 8vo. Tranſlated into French, and printed at the Hague 1709 in 8vo. XXXII. *Prodromus Juſtitiæ Palatinæ in causâ Wildfangiatus. Item Epiſtola ad Amicum in eadem cauſâ.* Inſerted in the *Diarum Europæum.* Some perſons have affirmed, that the notes printed under the name of *Athanaſius Vincentius*, on the *Polygamia Triumphatrix*, were written by *Pufendorf.* Perhaps the title of *Lunden* in *Schonen*, in that book, where he then was Profeſſor, gave occaſion to ſuſpect him for the Author. But theſe notes are full of a kind of learning ſo remote from the ſtudies, which he profeſſed, that he wants no apology in this point. Beſides, he was then too much employed in his great Hiſtory of Sweden, when that book was publiſhed, that is in 1682, to think of ſuch a work, which could not be done without very elaborate ſearches.

T.

PUTEANUS (ERYCIUS), Author of an immenſe number of books [*A*], was born at Venlo in Gelderland, November the 4th 1574. He began his ſtudies at Dort, whence he removed to Cologne, where he ſtudied rhetoric, and went through a courſe of philoſophy in the College of the Jeſuits. He went afterwards to ſtudy the Law at Louvain, and took his degree of Bachelor there in June 1597. He improved very much by Lipſius's Lectures, who conceived a great eſteem and friendſhip for him. In the year 1597 he went into Italy, and continued ſome time in the houſe of John Fernand de Velaſcos Governor of the Milaneze: from thence he removed to Padua and lodged at the celebrated Pinelli's (*a*). He left him in the year 1601 being choſen Profeſſor of eloquence at Milan. He gained a great reputation in that employment, ſo that he was promoted to the honourable poſt of Hiſtoriographer to his Catholick Majeſty, and in the year 1603 the city of Rome aggregated him and his poſterity among her patricians. He commenced Doctor of Law at Milan, *more rituque majorum* (*b*). He took alſo a wife (*c*) in the year 1604, and got many children by her. He commends her and his children very much in his letters [*B*]. In the year 1606 he removed to Louvain, being appointed to ſucceed to the Profeſſor's Chair which Juſtus Lipſius had filled with ſo much glory. He was very much conſidered in the Low Countries, and enjoyed the titles of Hiſtoriographer to the King of Spain, and Counſellor to the Arch-Duke Albert. He was even appointed Governor of the Caſtle of Louvain (*d*). He died in the year 1646 [*C*], and was buried in a Chapel, in which no man had yet been interred. It was the Chapel of St. Charles Borromeo in St. Peter's Church at Louvain (*e*). He was a man of merit and learning, and had a great literary correſpondence [*D*]. He affected

(*a*) Moreri ſuppoſes erroneouſly, that Pinelli lived at Milan.

(*b*) That is to ſay, with the ancient ceremonies.

(*c*) Her name was Mary Magdalen Catharine de la Tour, *Turriana*.

(*d*) Extracted from Valerius Andreas, *Bibl. Belgica*, p. 206, 207.

(*e*) *Vita Erycii Puteani*, in limine *Epiſtolar. Poſthumar.*

[*A*] *Author of an immenſe number of books.*] See the catalogue of them in Valerius Andreas's Bibliotheque, and in Ghilini's Theatre; but it is more complete in Witte's Memoirs (1). Moſt of them are ſmall works, and no man ſeemed ever more perſuaded than he of the maxim of a Greek Poet, *that a great book is always a great evil* (2). It is an eaſy matter for a man to multiply his publick productions, when he ſends to the preſs all that he writes. Our Puteanus laboured under that diſtemper: he has publiſhed even the very teſtimonials which he gave to his ſcholars (3). Monſieur Colomiés has mentioned a particular, which cannot be placed any where better than here. "Voſſius "has told me, that Moretus, a celebrated Printer at "Antwerp, blaming once Erycius Puteanus, who "had ſucceeded Lipſius, for publiſhing only ſmall "pamphlets, Puteanus anſwered that Plutarch, and "ſeveral other ancient Authors, had done the ſame. "To which Moretus replied, do you think, that "your books, which I cannot ſell, are as good as "Plutarch's? This put Puteanus into a paſſion, ſo "that he went out of Moretus's ſhop (4)." See Monſieur Baillet, in the 1ſt volume of his *Jugemens des Savans*, chap. 10. ſection *de la petiteſſe des Livres, (of the ſmallneſs of books.)* Read alſo theſe words from the 2d volume (5): *It is certain that this Puteanus paſſed for a Prattler, and for a great Writer of pamphlets: but he was otherwiſe a very learned man.*

(1) Witte, *Memoriæ Philoſophorum*, p. 567, & *ſeq.*

(2) See Monſ. le Fevre, in his *Vie des Poet. Grecs*, p. 141, 142. He aſcribes that thought to Callimachus. Here follow that Poet's words, as they are quoted by Athenæus, in the beginning of his 3d book. Τὸ μέγα βιβλίον ἴσον ἔλεγεν εἶναι τῷ μεγάλῳ κακῷ. *i. e.* "He uſed "to ſay, that a "great book "was like a "great evil."

(3) See the pamphlet, entitled, *Erycii Puteani Martyremata Academica, ſive doctrinæ & probitatis teſtimonia.* It was printed at Leiden, in the year 1618.

(4) Colomiés, *Opuſcules*, p. 124, 125. edit. of Utrecht, 1669.

(5) Art. 229 of the *Critiques Hiſtoriques.*

[*B*] *He commends her and his children very much.*] There is nothing more agreeable than a good wife, did he write to one of his friends; I ſpeak of it by experience, mine appears always young and beautiful to me, and though ſhe has often had children, yet ſhe has ſtill preſerved the charms of her face. *Illa mihi ſemper juvencula, ſemper pulchra; quia & ætatis florem, & formæ decus, toties jam puerpera ſervat. Imò illa mihi bona eſt, & qualem ex Apiculâ naſci Simonides voluit. Opportunè hic igitur illud Theognidis uſurpem:*

Οὐδὲν Κύρν' ἀγαθῆς γλυκιρώτιρόν ἰστι γυναικὸς.
Μάρτυς ἐγὼ, σὺ δέ μοι γίγνε ἀληθοσύνης.

Vin' & Latinè dicam?

Nil uxore bona, Cyrne, eſt jucundius: hujus
Cum tibi ſim teſtis, tu mihi teſtis eris (6).

(6) Eryc. Puteanus, *Epiſt. ſelectarum Apparatu*, Epiſt. 10. Cent. 4. p. m. 10.

This is what he wrote in the year 1626: but this did not come up to the whole wiſh of a Roman Poet. Puteanus's wife appeared ſtill young and beautiful to her huſband, but it was becauſe ſhe was ſtill really ſo. But the chief point for a woman is to appear young and handſome, even when ſhe is no longer ſo. Here follows the Poet's wiſh.

Candida perpetuo reſide, Concordia, lecto,
Tamque pari ſemper ſit Venus æqua jugo.
Diligat illa ſenem quondam: ſed & ipſa marito,
Tunc quoque cum fuerit, non videatur anus (7).

(7) Martial. *Epigr.* 13. lib. 4.

i. e. "Let concord always dwell in our bed; let pro-"pitious Venus keep up peace and union between us: "let my wife love me ſtill when I ſhall be old, and "let her when old ſtill be young in my eyes."

In another letter (8) written in the year 1617, Puteanus acquaints us, that his wife had born him four ſons and four daughters; and that he had loſt three boys. He ſeems very well pleaſed to have girls, and tells us the reaſons for it (9). He got other boys after that time. His ſon Fauſtus ſerved in the Armies (10), but he did not continue long there, for at the end of two years he entered among the bare-footed Carmelites, to follow in ſome manner the example of his brother John Stephen, who had taken the Jeſuit's habit (11). Puteanus mentions alſo two other ſons of his, the one of whom, named Juſtus, was Secretary to the Archbiſhop of Compſa, Apoſtolick Nuncio; and the other named Maximilian, was ſtudying under his father (12).

(8) It is the 64th of the 1ſt Century, p. 26.

(9) Ibid. p. 27, 28.

(10) See the 28th *Letter* of the 4th Century. It was wrote in the year 1626.

(11) See the 55th *Letter* of the ſame Century. It was wrote in the year 1628.

(12) See the ſame *Letter.*

[*C*] *He died in the year* 1646.] Monſieur Bullart does not ſuppoſe this; for he aſſerts, that Puteanus being born the fourth of November 1574, died at the age of threeſcore and ten years, after he had been near forty years Profeſſor of Hiſtory at Louvain (13). This is ſuppoſing plainly that he died in the year 1644. Lorenzo Craſſo (14) is widely miſtaken, when he aſſerts that Puteanus died in the year 1624. He has been miſled, for want of conſidering with due attention, theſe words of Ghilini, *L'anno* M.DC.XXIV. *ſù il Puteani da malattia oppreſſo, percio ſcriſſe queſto Epitaffio da metterſi ſopra la ſua ſepoltura* (15). i. e. "In the year "1624, Puteanus was taken ill, and therefore he "wrote this epitaph to be put upon his tomb." It is plain that this ſignifies only that he was ſick, and not that he died that year. Witte (16) places Puteanus's death under the year 1646, the 71ſt of his life, he ſhould have ſaid the 72d. He places it under that ſame year 1646 in the ſummary account he gives us of that Profeſſor's life (17). Valerius Andreas is the Author of that ſummary account, we may therefore depend upon it.

(13) Bullart, *Academie des Sciences*, tom. 2. p. 220.

(14) Lorenzo Craſſo, *Iſtoria di Poet. Greci*, p. 193.

(15) Ghilini, *Teatro d'huomini Letterati*, vol. 2. p. 73.

(16) In *Diario Biographico.*

(17) In *Memoriis Philoſoph.* p. 565. Konig, quoting the ſame book does nevertheleſs place *Puteanus*'s death under the year 1644.

Since the firſt edition of this Dictionary, I have conſulted the life of Puteanus, which is prefixed to his poſthumous letters publiſhed by his ſon-in-law, and I have found there that he died in the Caſtle of Louvain September the 17th 1646.

[*D*] *He had a great literary correſpondence.*] This appears from the letters he has publiſhed, and more ſtill from the following paſſage of Monſieur Bullart. *Laſtly, it was his learning which raiſed him ſo great a reputation in the moſt conſiderable Courts of Europe, and which made almoſt all the Princes, the learned men, the Embaſſadors of Kings, and the Generals of*

affected to interſperſe his writings with witty ſtrokes as they are called, and ſucceeded therein ſometimes pretty well; but on many occaſions his wit was not eaſy and natural enough, and conſiſted in quibbles and puns which are a little forced. He publiſhed a work, entitled, *Statera belli et pacis*, (The balance of peace and war) which made a great noiſe, and was like to have ruined him [*E*]. And yet it is a work, from which it appears that he was better acquainted with the true intereſt of his Catholick Majeſty than

Armies give him proofs of their friendſhip and eſteem in the letters they wrote him, of which above ſixteen thouſand were found in his library all placed in a regular order (18).

(18) Bullart, *Academie des Sciences*, Tom. 2. p. 220.

The catalogue (19) of all his works divided into five volumes ſhews, that the ſecond contains his letters, that is to ſay, *Epiſtolarum Atticarum apparatus, nimirum promulſis.* This contains about three hundred letters. *Miſſus ſecundi*; alſo three hundred. *Bellaria*, as many. *Deliciæ adoptivæ*, about a hundred. *Epiſtolarum Atticarum centuria ſingularis & nova. Epiſtolarum Atticarum apparatus novus*; it contains four hundred letters. *Apparatus poſthumus in quatuor centurias diſtributus*; four hundred. A collection of letters, which he wrote to Mr. de Zuylichem and to Daniel Heinſius, publiſhed at Leyden by Boxhornius in the year 1647. Add to this the 5th, the 6th, and the 7th century of his poſthumous letters publiſhed at Louvain in the year 1662 by the care of his ſon-in-law, Xiſtus Anthony Milſer (20), who had alſo cauſed the four former centuries to be printed in the ſame city and the ſame year. See Monſieur de Vigneul-Marville (21).

(19) Prefixed to his *Poſthumous Letters*, printed at Louvain, in the year 1662.

(20) He was Knight of the Order of Chriſt, and Governor of the Caſtle of Louvain.

(21) In the 2d vol. of his *Melanges*, p. 368, of the edit. printed at Rotterdam.

[*E*] *He publiſhed a work, entitled*, Statera belli & pacis, *which . . . . was like to have ruined him.*] That book was printed whilſt there was a truce negotiating between his Catholick Majeſty and the United Provinces in the year 1633. The Author adviſed to conclude a Peace, and ſhewed that the continuation of the war would be very detrimental to the Spaniſh Low Countries. He ſpoke with too much freedom of the advantages which the enemies had already got, and of the victories which they might ſtill expect to gain. Voſſius, his good friend, and the moſt peaceful man in the world, I mean, the moſt remote from the character of certain Writers, who in order to encourage the people to continue the war, lay before them the moſt artful deſcriptions of the people's own ſtrength, and of the enemy's weakneſs; Voſſius, I ſay, was very ſorry that Puteanus had brought himſelf into trouble by publiſhing a work of quite another kind (22). *His diebus haud lætus accepi, optimum, & diſertiſſimum virum Erycium Puteanum, in periculum, aut certè moleſtias aliquas incidiſſe. Scripſit ſtateram Belli, & Pacis, quo nonnullis de partium ſuarum impotentia prolatis, complures offendit. Noſti faſtum Hiſpanorum, & Principum aures, quorum nec hæ, neque illi veritatem accipere ſuſtinent. Itaque niſi noſſem multos ei in aula Bruxellenſi, quò vocatus eſt, amicos eſſe, niſi quoque ingenium, & eruditionem illius æſtimari ſcirem, ſiniſtri aliquid vererer. Nunc optima non omnino deſpero. Utinam non aliud audire cogatur, quam quod olim in ſimili ferè negotio, à Phalaride ajunt fuiſſe dictum Simonidi* (23), Μέλουν σοὶ Μουσῶν ἰυκλέϊς πόνος. i. e. "I have lately heard with grief, that "Erycius Puteanus, that beſt and moſt eloquent of "men, has brought himſelf into danger, or at leaſt "into ſome trouble. He has publiſhed the balance "of peace and war, wherein he has obſerved ſome"thing concerning the weakneſs of his own party, "which has given offence to many perſons. You "know the pride of the Spaniards, and the tickliſh "ears of Princes, neither of whom are able to bear "the truth. So that if I did not know that he has "many friends at the Court of Bruſſels, whither he "is ſummoned to appear, and if I were not ſenſible "that his wit and learning are very much eſteemed, "I ſhould fear the worſt; but now I hope the beſt. "Would to God! he were obliged to hear only "what Phalaris is reported to have ſaid to Steſichorus, "on an occaſion pretty much like this: *Mind only "the Muſes, your labours will be glorious enough.*" Voſſius acquainted a Phyſician of Dort with his uneaſineſs, who anſwered him that Puteanus had done imprudently, and that in Holland ſuch a fault would not be pardoned (24). *De Cl. Puteano quod ſcribis, valdè me percuſſit, quamvis tale quid metuerem, cùm legiſſem ſtateram, doctè magis, quam prudenter ſcriptam. Accepi ab eo literas, ſtatera jam edita, quam tamen præter morem ſuum non miſit. Eam Catzius Haga (ubi impreſſam* (25) *quoque noſti, nec hoc noſtro melius) ex conventu ordinum, ubi cum plauſu excepta, attulit, & mihi legendam tradidit. Deus bone! quàm bonus ille Belga, tam malus Politicus. Non hic ferremus, qui talia de nobis, quæ ille de Rege, de importuna Archid. legatione, & ſimilia. Ac niſi amici omnia pro illo, eſt quod metuamus vicem optimi, & elegantiſſimi ingenii.* i. e. "What "you wrote to me concerning the celebrated Putea"nus has made me very uneaſy, though I feared "ſomething like it, when I read his *Balance*, which "is wrote with more learning than prudence. I "have received a letter from him when his *Balance* "was publiſhed, which yet he has not ſent to me, "as he uſed to do his other works. Catz, coming "from the aſſembly of the States, where it was re"ceived with great applauſe, has brought it to me "from the Hague (where you know it was printed, "for which our friend will not fare the better) Catz, "I ſay, gave it me to read. Good God! how good "a Dutchman he is, but how bad a Politician? We "would not ſuffer here a man, who ſhould write "ſuch things of us, as he does of the King of Spain, "of the Arch-Duke's unſeaſonable Embaſſy, &c. "And if his friends do not exert themſelves for him, "we have juſt reaſons to dread that good and inge"nious man's fate." Beverwyck adds, that Puteanus was ſummoned to appear at Bruſſels, that they were to continue to examine him, that the Preſident Roſe had declared againſt him, but that other conſiderable perſons protected him, and that it was hoped their protection would ſave him. The Reader will no doubt be glad to find here the names of thoſe Protectors, for this is a part of our Puteanus's hiſtory. *Ob amicos quos plurimos habet, nihil illi periculi fore putabat. Sibi addictiſſimum habet, Varambonum Archiepiſcopum Ceſarienſem Infanti à ſacris, Chiffletium Medicum, qui plurimùm apud Ser. Inf. poſſunt, & alios, ſed infeſtum Roſam Præſidem Hiſpanis obnoxium, & paci ut dicitur, adverſum, qui etiam cauſa eſſe putatur, cur decem jam menſibus, nullæ ex Hiſp. literæ ad* ιρηνοποιὸς. *Infans quoque Cardinalis, qui jam in Burgundia, non minùs quàm Eugenia, illi benè volunt. Deum rogo, & benè faciant, neque ob* παῤῥησίαν *hanc gravius animadvertant, in virum candoris melle penitus imbutum.* i. e. "It is "thought he will be in no danger, conſidering the "many friends he has. Varambonus, Archbiſhop of "Saragoſſa, and Almoner to the Infante, is his Pro"tector, as well as Chifflet the Phyſician, and they "have both great credit with the Infante; he has "alſo ſome other Friends. But the Preſident Roſe, "who is attached to Spain, is his enemy: it is "thought he is againſt the peace, and that it is owing "to him that the Plenipotentiaries have received no "letters from Spain theſe ten months. Even the Cardi"nal Infante, who is now in Burgundy, and Eugenia, "are in Puteanus's intereſt. God grant that they "may ſerve him effectually, and that they do not "puniſh too ſeverely that moſt meek of all men for "his liberty of ſpeaking." This affair ended according to that Phyſician's wiſhes. We muſt not forget to obſerve, that an anonymous Author wrote againſt this work of Puteanus. His anſwer was entitled, *Anti-Puteanus, ſive Politico-Catholicus ſtateram Puteani inducias expendentis alia ſtatera expendens* (26). I have by me a little book (27), which contains the *Statera* of Puteanus, the Anſwer of the anonymous Writer, and two Letters, in which we meet with the opinion of a Dutchman, concerning that Anſwer. The Author of theſe Letters ſuſpects that the anonymous Writer is a Clergy-man (28), and even a Monk (29), and he ridicules him for aſſerting that there is neither courage nor prudence to be met with any where

(22) Voſſius, *Epiſt.* 199. p. m. 218. That Letter is dated in the month of July 1633.

(23) He ought to have ſaid *Steſichoro.*

(24) Joh. Beverwyckius, *Epiſt. ad Voſſium.* It is the 172d. p. m. 111, 112. It is dated July the 8th, 1633.

(25) This was not the firſt edit. for it was firſt printed in the Spaniſh Low-Countries, in 4to.

(26) See Monſ. Baillet's *Anti*, num. 158.

(27) Printed Coſmopoli, *apud Batavum patriæ libertatis & pacis amantiſſimum*, for a Dutchman, a great lover of peace, and of the liberty of his country.

(28) *Impenſe cavet, ne alius eſſe videatur quam ex ſacrorum ordine.* Barlæus, *Epiſt.* 214. p. 458. Tom. 1.

(29) *Videtur cucullus galeam induiſſe, aut galeæ cucullum, ita amice conjurant, & ex eodem ore jam Theologo jam milite digna audis.* Idem, *Epiſt.* 213. p. 451.

than they who applied themſelves only and entirely to ſtate affairs. They aſcribed falſely to him a ſatyr againſt King James [*F*]. It is aſſerted that he did the King of Poland a very great ſervice (*f*). They who have a mind to ſee the commendations, which many learned men have beſtowed upon him, and the honours which ſome Princes have done

(*f*) See the rem. [*H*].

where but in the Catholick Church (30); that the treaſury of Holland was almoſt exhauſted; that the States made the people groan under their high taxes; that their troops were cowards; that they received more prejudice than profit from their victories; that the King of Spain could very conveniently ſpare the towns he had loſt; that the Dutch owed their conqueſts to treaſon, and had bought them at a much higher price than they were worth. He will tell us very ſoon, ſays his Cenſurer to him, that it is for the King of Spain's intereſt, that our troops ſhould go and encamp in the very heart of Brabant, for the land will become more fruitful by the dung, which our horſes will leave there. *Nec minus ridiculus eſt, cum tributis & exactionibus ſupra quam fas eſt Batavos premi queritur, qui iſtos cenſus ſe Dominis ſuis debere, & felicitatis ſuæ ac fortunarum non niſi ſpicilegium eſſe credunt. . . . . Verum enimvero, quam lepide fatuus eſt hic ſcriptor, cum milites Federatorum* timidos lepores *vocat, cum Batavos* pugnam ſemper declinare *ſcribit:* victorias nobis magis nocuiſſe, quam profuiſſe. *Illane ſcribere non veretur poſt cladem Turnhautanam & Flandricam? An & tunc Henrici Belgii culpa terga vertit Hiſpanus? Et quando quæſo Regi Hiſpaniarum ac ſuis perſuadebit, Sylvam Ducis, Veſaliam, Venloam, Ruræmundam, Trajectum ad Moſam, expugnata ad Scaldim & alibi caſtella, victam Bercam nobis nocere? Regem vero ſuo commodo iis carere? quia non ſine magnis impenſis ea vicimus. Dicet propediem, utile eſſe Brabantis, exercitus noſtros in ipſo pene Brabantiæ meditullio ſtare & in hoſtico ali, ut ab equorum multitudine ſtercorati agri uberiorem ſegetem ferant* (31). The Author of this Cenſure is known long ago (32) to be Barlæus. I have got another little book (33), which beſide the *Stratera belli & pacis*, and the *Anti-Puteanus*, contains a political diſſertation of Puteanus *de Induciis Belgicis* (of the truce with Holland) and a Letter of Lipſius, with remarks on that Letter (34), and ſome other little pieces. Lipſius's Letter was wrote from Louvain, January the 3d, 1595, to a great Lord, who had aſked him, *Bellumne an potius Induciæ expediant Regi Hiſpaniarum cum Gallo, Anglo, Batavo.* i. e. "Whether it were better for the King of Spain to have "peace or war with the French, the Engliſh, and the "Dutch." It abounds with malice againſt Holland, and with political maxims, which are very ſubtle and refined. The Author of the Remarks refuted (35) effectually, and called himſelf *Juſtinus Bonæfidius Mont.* He abuſed Lipſius. See (36) the complaint the Jeſuit Petra Sancta makes of it..

The event has proved that Puteanus was in the right. For if the King of Spain had concluded either a peace or a truce with the United Provinces in the year 1633, he would have avoided many vexations and many loſſes, and Spain would be perhaps at this time in a more flouriſhing condition. I do not pretend to excuſe that Profeſſor; he had done much better to keep within the bounds of his profeſſion: prudence will not ſuffer us to publiſh all ſorts of truths: but we muſt not imagine, that the Dutch learnt any thing new from this book; they were perfectly well acquainted with the bad condition, in which the Spaniſh Low-Countries were. This is the firſt thing, which Politicians inquire into with regard to the enemy, and the people generally believe much more than there really is; they think the enemy in a worſe condition than he is. However it be, that Profeſſor did not ſufficiently conſider Salluſt's words, which he prefixed to his book, and which ſhewed him ſo evidently the reaſons why it is dangerous to give advice to Princes. They have other perſons enough to conſult; futurity is unknown even to the wiſeſt heads; and bad counſels are very often attended with good ſucceſs: ſo true it is, that fortune orders all things according to her own fancy. It is Salluſt who argues thus. *Scio ego,* ſays he (37), *quam difficile atque aſperum factu ſit, conſilium dare regi, aut imperatori; poſtremo cuiquam mortali, cuius opes in excelſo ſunt: quippe cum & illis conſultorum copiæ adſint; neque de futuro quiſquam ſatis callidus, ſatiſque prudens ſit. Quinetiam ſæpe prava magis, quam bona conſilia proſperè eveniunt: quia pleraſque res fortuna ex lubidine ſua agitat.* Men repent a thouſand times to have followed the advice of wiſe and prudent perſons, becauſe there happen many things, which make them judge, that if they had gone another way to work, they would have performed great matters. They with whom others have to deal, commit ſome faults, of which they were thought uncapable. A prudent Counſellor does not depend on ſuch faults: he diſſuades therefore from thoſe undertakings, which a raſh inconſiderate man adviſes: and it happens, that thoſe unforeſeen faults, or ſome other events, would have rendered the ſucceſs of the undertaking infallible if it had been attempted. The ſafeſt way is, not to ſet up for a Counſellor in publick affairs. Salluſt underſtood the reaſons of it perfectly well.

(30) *In Principe Auriaco nec fortitudinem, nec prudentiam agnoſcit, hac fretus ratione, quia Catholicus non eſt. Audi verba:* ad num. 90. *In ſola Eccleſia Catholica vera eſt fortitudo & prudentia.* Idem, ibid. p. 453.

(31) Idem, ibid. p. 454.

(32) Theſe two Letters are the 213th and the 214th of Barlæus's Letters.

(33) Printed at Leyden, *ex officina Elzeviriorum*, 1633, in 12mo.

(34) *Notæ ſeu Stricturæ Politicæ ad Juſti Lipſii Epiſtolam.*

(35) That Letter of Lipſius had already been refuted in the year 1618, by John Gael, an Advocate at the Hague.

(36) In the rem. [*C*] of the art. LIPSIUS.

(37) Salluſtius, *Orat. 2. ad Cæſarem de Republica ordinanda*, init. p. m. 527.

[*F*] *He aſcribed falſely to him a ſatyr againſt King James.*] Here follows the title of it. *Iſ. Caſauboni Corona Regia, id eſt, Panegyrici cujuſdam vere aurei, quem Jacobo I. Magnæ Britanniæ, &c. Regi, fidei defenſori, delinearat, Fragmenta ab Euphormione inter ſchedas τῦ μακαρίτυ inventa, collecta, et in lucem edita* 1615, *pro officina regia Jo. Bill Londini.* i. e. "Iſaac Caſau"bon's Royal Crown; that is to ſay, ſome frag"ments of a certain excellent panegyrick, which he "drew up for James I. of Great Britain, &c. "King, Defender of the Faith; which fragments "were found among the deceaſed's papers, collected "together and publiſhed by Euphormion in the year "1615, printed at London by Jo. Bill, at the King's "Printing-houſe." Mr. Almeloveen lent me that book (38) in the year 1693. It was then very ſcarce; but Monſieur Thomaſius has cauſed it to be reprinted ſince that time in his *Hiſtoria Sapientiæ et Stultitiæ humanæ*, (i. e. The Hiſtory of human Wiſdom and Folly.) There never was any thing more ſatyrical than that piece: the moſt wicked Princes were never more abuſed by the moſt ſlanderous Writers, than the good King James is by the terrible Scioppius, for it cannot be queſtioned but he is the Author of that outrageous piece. We ſhall now quote a Writer, who acquaints us that Puteanus cleared himſelf publickly from being the Author of it. *Non potuit ſatyricorum manus effugere Jacobus Britanniæ Rex, utut doctiſſimus & laudatiſſimus Princeps: cui ſub ſpecie Panegyrici Poſtumi à Caſaubono ſcripti, cujus quaſi fragmenta inter ſchedas ejus reperta, per inſignem nequitiam, continuo myſteriſmo horrenda flagitia objiciuntur. Lepide alioquin ſcriptus liber eſt; cui titulus,* Caſauboni Corona Regia, &c. . . . . *Refertur in Georgii Richteri vitâ Epiſtolis ejus præfixâ, pag.* 21. *è Colloquio cum Erycio Puteano accepiſſe Richterum, quod Puteanus ejus libelli autor habitus fuerit: cujus rei verò famam ille innixè declinans velut Apologiæ loco ſcriptum quoddam exhibuerit, cui nomen, Perjurium RUFFI & GIBBOSI, præfatus, quo delatorum ſuorum virulentiæ ac ſiniſteritati ſatis fuiſſe obviatum exiſtimaverit* (39). i. e. "James, King "of Great Britain, though a moſt learned and com"mendable Prince, could not eſcape the ſtrokes of "ſatyrical Writers. He is charged with the moſt "horrid crimes in a libel, publiſhed under the name "of Caſaubon, as though it were a panegyrick, the "fragments of which were found among that great "man's papers after his death: but it is a continual "and wicked irony, though wrote wittily enough; "it is entitled, *Caſaubon's Royal Crown, &c.* . . . . "It is related in George Richterus's life, prefixed "to his letters, that Erycius Puteanus told him in "converſation, that he (Puteanus) was thought to be "the Author of that libel; and as he was willing "to avoid that imputation as much as lay in his "power, he publiſhed a pamphlet by way of apology, "which is entitled the *Perjury of Ruffus and Gibbo*"*ſus*, (or of the red-haired and crump-ſhouldered fel"low) whereby he thought he had ſufficiently re"futed the virulency and malice of his accuſers." Theſe words of Morhof have not been well underſtood

(38) It is in 12mo, and contains 127 pages.

(39) Morhofius, *Polyhiſt.* lib. 1. cap. 8. p. 78.

done him, may read Pope Blount's *Cenſura, &c.* [G], and Bullart's Academy [H] (g). One of the moſt conſiderable friends he had at Milan was Secretary of the Council, and named John Baptiſt Saccus. I ſhall give ſome account of the manner in which Puteanus educated a young girl [I], for whom that friend was concerned. As ſhe was an Italian

(g) See alſo Baillet, *Jugement ſur les Critiques Gramm.* num. 503.

ſtood by the Author, who gave an extract from his book. " One may alſo put in the ſame rank thoſe " ſatyrs, which are levelled againſt the reputation " of the moſt virtuous men : ſuch is that, which is " entitled, *Caſauboni Corona Regia, &c.* which was " without any ground aſcribed to Monſieur du Puy, " and in which James I. King of England is charg- " ed with enormous crimes ; of which Monſieur du " Puy has cleared him ſufficiently in his *Perjurium* " *Ruffi et Gibboſi* (40)." There are two miſtakes in that paſſage. I. The Author of the extract imagined, no doubt, that Erycius Puteanus is the celebrated Peter du Puy, whoſe life Monſieur Rigault has written. When an Author, who is ſpeaking of books and of learned men, mentions Monſieur du Puy without any addition, he muſt be underſtood to mean Peter du Puy, the King of France's Library-keeper, that admirable man, who with his worthy brother afforded ſo much help to the men of letters, and who held ſo many learned conferences. II. It is not true, that the Author, whom Morhof mentions, cleared King James of the erroneous crimes which are imputed to him in that ſatyr ; he did only clear himſelf of being the Author of that wicked libel, and expoſed the malicious envy of his accuſers. Let us tranſcribe a very curious paſſage. *They aſcribe alſo to* John Barclay *a moſt bitter ſatyr againſt James I. King of Great Britain, entitled,* Corona Regia, *in which, under the ſpecious title of a Panegyriſt, he expoſes the adminiſtration of Henry VIII. the extraction and celibacy of Queen Elizabeth, and above all, the birth and actions of King James, whom he defames in a diſcourſe as witty as it is abuſive and outragious, All men being curious to read that libel, it was diſperſed throughout all Europe, and King James ſeeing himſelf repreſented therein in ſo odious a light, perſuaded his Allies to make ſtrict inquiries about the Author of it, that he might be puniſhed. Erycius Puteanus, Profeſſor of Eloquence in the Univerſity of Louvain, being ſuſpected, the Archduke Albert cauſed him to be examined, but he was found innocent* (41).

(40) *Bibl. Univerſelle*, Tom. 13. p. 23.

(41) Bullart, *Academie des Sciences*, Tom. 1. p. 198.

[G] *Pope Blount's* Cenſura.] But you muſt omit theſe words, *Inter præcipua Galliæ ornamenta, dum viveret, merito ſuo ſemper habitus eſt* Erycius Puteanus (42). *i. e.* " Erycius Puteanus had ſo much merit, that during " his life-time, he was always reckoned one of the " greateſt ornaments of France." Theſe words are quoted from Caſaubon's Preface to the Hiſtory of the Emperors : but in the firſt place, our Puteanus was not a French-man. Secondly, he was not much known, when Caſaubon publiſhed that book (43). Thirdly, he lived above forty years after that book was printed.

(42) Pope Blount, *Cenſura Authorum*, p. 689. edit. Londin. 1690.

(43) It was printed at Paris in the year 1603.

[H] . . . . . *and Bullart's Academy.*] Where you will meet with this paſſage. " (44) It was that " great learning, which having won the heart of Ur- " ban VIII. determined that great Pope to ſend him " his picture in a gold Medal which was very hea- " vy, with ſome copies of his works : it was that ſame " learning, which engaged Cardinal Frederick Borro- " meo to receive him into his Palace, when he re- " turned to Milan, and to preſent him with thoſe " precious relicks of his Uncle St. Charles Borromeo, " which that learned man has given to the Collegiate " Church of St. Peter at Louvain. It was alſo his " learning, which made him be tenderly beloved by " the Count de Fuentes, Governor of Milan, and " afterwards by the Archduke Albert, who having " promoted him to Juſtus Leipſius's Chair, admitted " him alſo moſt honourably into the number of his " Counſellors. Finally, it was that learning, which " made him be conſidered and eſteemed in the chief " Courts of Europe (45). . . . . He had the glory to " ſave the King of Poland's life, by explaining an " enigmatical writing, drawn up in unknown cha- " racters, which no man could read nor underſtand, " and which contained the ſcheme of an abominable " conſpiracy againſt that Prince."

(44) Bullart, *Academie des Sciences*, Tom. 2. p. 220.

(45) What I omit here is to be found in the rem. [D].

Concerning this laſt particular, we meet in his Life prefixed to his poſthumous Letters with the following paſſage ; *Ejus ingenio ac ſolertia conjurationem Polonicam detectam & ſic impeditam fuiſſe tanti momenti fuit, ut omne præmium ſuperarit. Verba Patris* HERMANNI HUGONIS *qui Marchioni* SPINOLÆ *à ſacris confeſſionibus erat, æſtimanda hic ſunt :* mea cautio erit, ut REX POLONIÆ ſciat, cui ſalutem debeat ſuam ut PHARAONIS liberalitatem imitetur in JOSEPHUM, aut ASSUERI gratitudinem in MARDOCHÆUM. POLONIA *quidem recepit hoc ab illo beneficium, ſed in univerſum orbem Chriſtianum extenſum eſt, quod quale quantumque ſit* BOHEMIA *& turbæ inde natæ ſatis declararunt* (46). *i. e.* " By his wit and penetration, the " conſpiracy in Poland was diſcovered, and diſap- " pointed ; and this was ſo conſiderable a ſervice, " that it could never be ſufficiently rewarded. Let " us conſider here the expreſſions of Father Herman " Hugo, Confeſſor to the Marquiſs of Spinola. *I " ſhall take care,* ſays he, *to let the King of Poland " know to whom he is indebted for his life, that he may " imitate Pharaoh's generoſity towards Joſeph, or Aha- " ſuerus's gratitude towards Mordecai.* Poland has " indeed received that benefit from him, but the ef- " fects of it extend over the whole Chriſtian world ; " what and how great it was, appears ſufficiently " from what happened in Bohemia, and from the " troubles which aroſe from thence."

(46) *Vita Erycii Puteani*, in limine, *Epiſt. poſthum.*

[I] *The manner, in which Puteanus educated a young girl.*] He wrote to his friend, that he did not ſuffer her to be kiſſed. This, ſaid he, is dangerous for Italian Ladies ; our Flemiſh Ladies may ſuffer it without any danger : they do not think there is any harm in it ; they do not find there is any amorous lecture in a young man's ogles, nor in the application of his lips to theirs : but the maidens of your country know the conſequences of all this : and therefore I have made this girl learn the language of our country, and our cuſtoms, excepting only that of kiſſing. If I ſhould not tranſcribe that Author's own words, the Reader might think that I add ſomething to them ; I ſhall therefore tranſcribe them, that it may appear I do rather weaken and enervate his thought. *De puella veſtra quid ſcribam ? valet, viget, jam matura viro, jam plenis nubilis annis. Mores & linguam quoque noſtram diſcit, tamen oſcula non libat. Sic eam habeo, uti educata eſt. Scis tu ; ut confringi vas citò Samium ſolet. Pudica quidem Belgarum oſcula, ſed tamen oſcula : & inſinuentur multò honeſtius, quam figantur. Abhorrere illa ab hoc ritu debet, & ſi pudicitiæ alumna eſſe velit, illæſum uſque quoque verecundiæ florem ſervare. Neſciunt noſtræ virgines ullum libidinis rudimentum oculis aut oſculis ineſſe, ideoque fruuntur. Veſtræ ſciunt. Si noſtra eſſe hæc quoque incipiet, particeps candoris noſtri erit, & caſtæ immunitatis capax* (47). i. e. " What ſhall I write " of your young maiden ? She is healthy, ſtrong, " ripe, fit to be married. She learnt our language " and our cuſtoms, but yet ſhe does not kiſs. I con- " tinue to educate her, as ſhe was educated at firſt. " You know, that a veſſel made at Samos is eaſily " broken. The Flemiſh women's kiſſes are modeſt " indeed, but yet they are kiſſes. It is more honeſt " juſt to touch the lips, than to preſs them cloſe. She " muſt abhor that cuſtom, if ſhe has a mind to keep " herſelf chaſte and modeſt. Our virgins do not " know that there is any inticement to luſt in the " eyes or in kiſſes ; but yours know it very well. If " ſhe begins once to be perfectly of the ſame tem- " per with our country-women, ſhe will then partake " of our plainneſs, and be capable to enjoy the " ſame honeſt liberty." Kempius quotes this whole paſſage in his learned and curious compilation *de Oſculis* (concerning kiſſes), and refers us to a Profeſſor of Philoſophy in the Univerſity of Leyden. That Profeſſor, treating of Temperance, one of the four Cardinal Virtues, propoſes this queſtion among others. *Is the cuſtom, which ſuffers ſtrangers in the Low-Countries, and in other places, to kiſs other men's wives, widows, and maidens, when they make them ceremonious viſits, agreeable to the rules of Chaſtity* (48) ? He anſwers, that that cuſtom is of very old ſtanding, but that

(47) Erycius Puteanus, *Epiſt. ad Joh. Baptiſtam Saccum*, apud *Martinum Kempium, Diſſertat.* 16. *de Oſculis*, num. 6. p. 626.

(48) *Quæritur tertio, An cum legibus caſtitatis, quæ temperantiæ eſt ſpecies, bene conveniat recepta illa apud noſtrates Belgas, aliaſque nationes, conſuetudo, qua peregrini oſcula figunt alienis uxoribus, viduis, ac virginibus, quando eas humanitatis cauſa ſalutant ?* Adrianus Heereboord, *Exercitat. Ethic.* 46. p. m. 173.

Italian, he would not ſuffer her to imitate ſome cuſtoms of the Flemiſh Ladies, which he

that ſeveral ancient ſages have condemned it, thinking it little conſiſtent with chaſtity. He quotes Socrates, who would have men abſtain from it abſolutely, nothing being more proper to ſtir up the fire of love than kiſſes. He quotes Seneca as aſſerting, that a virgin was charged with impudence becauſe ſhe had received a kiſs (49). He aſſerts that the ancients were perſuaded, that a kiſs caſts a blemiſh on a virgin's chaſtity (50), and proves it by the words of Ovid;

Oſcula qui ſumpſit, ſi non & cætera ſumpſit,
Hæc quoque quæ data ſunt perdere dignus erat.

i. e. "He who took a kiſs, and did not alſo take "the reſt, deſerved to loſe even that, which was "granted him." His concluſion or deciſion is, that kiſſes of compliment or ceremony are not inconſiſtent with chaſtity, ſince they may very well be given without any wicked deſire: and that we are not to imagine that all men or women are ſo eaſily inflamed, as not to be able to give or to receive a kiſs of men civilly without any detriment to their chaſtity. *Neque exiſtimandum eſt, omnium eſſe tam pronam & irritabilem ad libidines naturam, quin citra violationem coſtitatis, ac circa libidinem ullam, id genus mediorum, officii teſtandi cauſa, adhiberi poſſit* (51). This deciſion, and the reaſon on which it is grounded, are very judicious and unqueſtionable. But can there be any thing leſs judicious than the quotation from Ovid? For that Poet's words relate only to the kiſſes of lovers. That Profeſſor is very much to blame for quoting them upon ſuch a ſubject: he ought to have left out of his Theſis all that ſhew of learning, which he has ſtuffed it with, and ſhould have confined himſelf, like Puteanus, to the difference of the climates. The ſame liberties which are dangerous in Italy, are not ſo, or are leſs ſo in the Northern Countries; this was no doubt the meaning of the Profeſſor of Louvain. For we ought not to imagine that he meant a farewel-kiſs, or thoſe kiſſes that are given on the return from a long voyage. It is not at all probable, that in ſuch a caſe he would forbid his Italian virgin to follow the cuſtom. There were other occaſions enough in which he could preſcribe a particular behaviour to her, and in which ſhe might experience, according to the natural ſkill of the women of her own nation (52), what Horace obſerves (53).

The Profeſſor of Leyden has not exaggerated what he relates of Socrates. *Socrates apud Xenophontem abſtinendum eſſe in totum ab iſta oſculandi conſuetudine cenſet: quia nihil, inquit, ad amorem incendendum acrius eſt oſculo* (54): for that ancient Philoſopher has expreſſed himſelf upon that ſubject in the ſtrongeſt manner he could chooſe. Critobulus, ſaid he (55), *is more raſh, than if he were to throw himſelf headlong upon the points of naked ſwords, or to run into the fire, for he has been ſo bold as to kiſs a beautiful face.* Is there ſo great a raſhneſs in this, replied Xenophon. "Truly, "I could eaſily, I think, expoſe myſelf to the ſame "danger. Oh! thou wretched man, anſwered Socrates, doſt thou conſider what happens to thee after "thou haſt kiſſed a handſome face? Doſt not thou "loſe thy liberty? Doſt not thou become a mere "ſlave? Doſt not thou expoſe thyſelf to make exorbitant expences, in order to enjoy pernicious pleaſures? Doſt not thou put thyſelf under an incapacity to do good? Doſt not thou perceive ſomething that forces thee to apply thyſelf intirely to "the purſuit of ſuch things, as thou wouldſt deſpiſe "if thy reaſon were not corrupted? Good God, "ſaid Xenophon, this is aſcribing a ſtrange influence "to a mere kiſs! And doſt thou wonder at it, replied Seneca? Doſt not thou ſee ſmall ſpiders, "whoſe bite is ſo venomous, that it cauſes the greateſt anguiſh, and even turns men's brains? I know "it very well, ſaid Xenophon, but theſe little animals caſt a venom as they bite. And doſt thou "think, O fool, added Seneca, that amorous kiſſes "are not poiſon, becauſe thou doſt not ſee their poiſon? Let me tell thee, that a beautiful woman is "a more dangerous animal than even ſcorpions; "for theſe cannot hurt us, but when they touch us; "but beauty ſtrikes us, without coming near us; "from whatſoever diſtance we can behold it, it caſts "its poiſon upon us, and turns our brains. It is "perhaps for that reaſon, that Cupids are repreſented "with bows and arrows, becauſe a beautiful face "wounds from afar. I adviſe thee therefore, Xenophon, to fly away, without looking behind thee, "the moment thou perceiveſt an handſome woman. "And as for thee, Critobulus, I think it were proper thou ſhouldſt keep out of the way for an "whole year; that time will not be too long to cure "thy wound." Can there be a moral precept more becoming a great Philoſopher, than this is? Our honeſt Caſuiſts would not think it too ſevere, and would find no exaggeration in Socrates's compariſons (56). The maxims of an ancient Roman were not leſs ſevere. He had a freed-man, whom he loved very much, and a daughter who began to be marriageable. He came to know that his freed-man had kiſſed her, and puniſhed him ſeverely for it: though that fault were attended with ſome favourable circumſtances, which rendered it excuſable: but he did not mind this, nor the friendſhip he had for the guilty man; he conſidered only the conſequences of the puniſhment. We are not told whether or not he contented himſelf with the uſual puniſhment inflicted for a kiſs, and which was whipping (57): it is probable that the puniſhment he inflicted on his freed-man was more ſevere: but however it be, we know that his chief motive was to make his daughter ſenſible, that even with regard to mere kiſſes, ſhe was to preſerve herſelf a pure virgin for the huſband ſhe was to marry, and keep even in that reſpect her firſt bloom for him. Valerius Maximus had expreſſed himſelf very well upon that ſubject: let us hear him. *Quid P. Mænius? quam ſeverum pudicitiæ cuſtodem egit! In libertum namque gratum admodum ſibi animadvertit, quia eum nubilis jam ætatis filiæ ſuæ oſculum dediſſe cognoverat, cùm præſertim non libidine, ſed errore lapſus videri poſſet. Cæterùm amaritudine pœnæ, teneris adhuc puellæ ſenſibus, caſtitatis diſciplinam ingenerari magni æſtimavit. Eique tam triſti exemplo præcepit, ut non ſolum virginitatem illibatam, ſed etiam oſcula ad virum ſincera perferret* (58). Penelope would not have judged this a too ſevere morality. See the remark [*L*] of her article. We have mentioned (49) a Lady of Florence who acted from that principle, and according to a law which ſuppoſed the ſame maxim (60). That law is now out of date in France, but it has not yet been abrogated at Naples. One half of the bridegroom's ſettlement, who dies before the marriage be conſummated, goes to the bride, if ſhe has granted him a kiſs, but otherwiſe they allow her nothing. Is not this hinting that ſhe has no longer the ſame firſt favours to grant as ſhe had before (61), and that ſhe ought therefore to be indemnified? Theſe are maxims, which many other nations are entirely unacquainted with, who judge quite otherwiſe of things, and do not ſet ſo high a price on kiſſes. Let us quote the Author of the *Saint-Evremoniana*. *A kiſs, which in Turkey, Italy, and Spain, is the firſt ſtep to adultery, is nothing* at Paris *but a mere piece of civility: and if that pretty Perſian, who made ſo many myſterious journeys, in order to kiſs three times the handſome Cyrus, had lived at Paris, he would not have ſet ſo high a value on the pleaſure he had. Men make no viſits, but they give kiſſes; but theſe are like pieces of money, one makes them go for what one pleaſes: and as kiſſes are a commodity which coſts nothing, which does never wear out, and of which there is always a great plenty, none are ſparing of them, and few are fond to receive them* (62). What I ſhall now quote from Montaigne is of the ſame kind, for that Author conſidered only the kiſſes given out of mere civility; but as what he obſerves acquaints us with the cuſtom of his time, I may add it to the paſſage from the Saint-Evremoniana. "The ſcarcity of "any meat makes it palatable. See how the manner of ſaluting, which is peculiar to our nation, "leſſens the pleaſure of kiſſing, by making it too "common: whereas according to Socrates, kiſſes "are extremely powerful, and dangerous to ſteal away our

(49) *Apud ſapientiſſimum* Senecam, *Virginis Sacerdotem* (he ſhould have ſaid *Sacerdotium*) *petentis, inde arguitur impudentia* (it ſhould be *impudicitia*) *quod oſculo ſalutata fuiſſet.* Idem, ib. i. e. "In the "moſt wiſe Seneca, a virgin, "who had declared herſelf a "candidate for "the Prieſthood, was "taxed with "unchaſteneſs; "becauſe ſhe "had received a "kiſs." But this is not the ſtate of the queſtion. See Seneca, *Controv.* 2. lib. 1.

(50) *Oſculo pudicitiam virginis delibari cenſebant veteres, unde illud Ovidii.* Idem, ibid.

(51) Idem, ibid.

(52) *Neſciunt noſtræ virgines.. veſtræ ſciunt.* See above, quot. (47).

(53) *Oſcula quæ Venus quinta parte ſui Nectaris imbuit.* Horat. lib. 1. Od. 13. i. e. ".. A kiſs "Which Venus "doth in Nectar "ſteep." *Creech.*

(54) Heereboord, *Exercit. Ethic.* 44. p. 173. The ſenſe is given above, between the quotat. (48) and (49).

(55) Xenophon, lib. 1. *de Memorab.* Socratis. Mr. Bayle quotes Monſ. Charpentier's French tranſlation, p. 57. edit. of Paris 1657, in 12mo.

(56) *Confer quæ Achilles Tatius,* lib. 2. p. m. 79.

(57) *Si alienæ fœminæ oſculum infixum rationis ſit verbere vindicare, nonne qui illud puncto temporis fecerit, incomparabili horarum ſpatio verberatur, & ſuavitas voluptatis exiguæ diuturno dolore punitur?* Auguſt. *de Civit. Dei,* lib. 21. cap. 11.

(58) Val. Maximus, lib. 6. cap. 1. num. 4. p. m. 513.

(59) Above, quotation (1), of the article GUALDRADA.

(60) Above, quotation (1), of the art. MAMILLARIANS.

(61) *Quia ex oſculo vir capit gaudium, & ſponſa verecundiam, & quod Sponſus oſculando videtur quaſi cæpiſſe caſtrum. Alii eam aſſignant rationem, quia oſculum eſt actus carnis, & pro medietate eſt quaſi corrupta caro.* Kempius, *Diſſ.* 15. *de Oſculis,* p. 607.

(62) Saint-Evremoniana, p. 271, of the Dutch edit. 1701.

he thought would not have been dangerous, if ſhe had been born at Louvain.

" our hearts. It is a cuſtom unacceptable, and even " injurious to the Ladies, to be obliged to put out " their lips to any man who has three footmen be- " hind him, how diſagreeable ſoever he may be ;

" *Cujus* * *livida naribus caninis*
" *Dependet glacies, rigetque barba :*
" *Centum occurrere malo culilingis.*

* *Mart.* 7.

" Nor do we men get much by it : for as the world " ſtands divided, we muſt kiſs fifty old and ugly " women, if we have a mind to kiſs two or three " who are handſome. And to a weak ſtomach, as " thoſe of my age generally have, one diſagreeable " kiſs over-pays a delicious one (63)." We have ſeen above (64) in a paſſage from Eraſmus, what relates to the cuſtom of England. Let us ſee here what Kornmannus relates with regard to ſome cities in Germany (65). *Apud Germanos in multis locis uſitatum vidi Coloniæ Agrippinæ, Tubingæ* (66), *&c. ubi nefas grande creditur, ſi juvenis ad puellam veniens ipſam non oſculetur, & amplexetur : aſt in aliis locis contrarium obtinet : ſi enim quis apud nos in chorea puellam oſculetur indignata prorumperet. Quam me ? &c. aſt in occulto & ubi nemo videt benè patiuntur, imo per totam noctem non ſemel ferre recuſant : nam poſt factum oſculum nihil reliqui manet, quod cernatur : tantum de abſterſione agitur.* i. e. " I have ſeen many places in " Germany, as for inſtance, Cologne, Tubingen, " &c. where it would be looked upon as great " unpoliteneſs for a young man to meet with a " maiden without embracing and kiſſing her : but " a contrary cuſtom prevails in other places : for if " a young man offered with us to kiſs a maiden, ſhe " would fall into a paſſion, and tell him, whom do " you take me for ? &c. But in the dark, and when " nobody ſees them, they ſuffer it very patiently, " nay, they do not refuſe it many times for a whole " night ; for there is nothing to be perceived when " a girl has received a kiſs, and it is only wiping it " off."

(63) Montagne, *Eſſais*, liv. 3. chap. 5. p. m. 371.

(64) Quot. (57), of the article ERASMUS.

(65) Kornmannus, *de Linea Amoris*, p. m. 189, 190.

(66) Tho. Lanſius, *apud* Kempium, *Diſſert.* 16. 624. denies what Kornmannus aſſerts concerning Tubingen.

The obſervation of the Author of the *Saint Evremoniana*, namely, that in ſome countries a kiſs is looked upon as the firſt ſtep to adultery, would make ſome Commentators quote an hundred paſſages. They would not omit the words of Achilles Tatius, in which kiſſes are called agreeable forerunners, nor thoſe in which kiſſes are ſtyled ſuch powerful intices ments, that it is more to be wondered they were not followed with the whole ſport, than that all the other preludes proved ineffectual (67). Μέχρι τινος ἐπὶ τῶν φιλημάτων ἰσόμεθα, φιλίστη ; καλὰ τὰ προοίμια, προσθῶμεν ἤδη τὶ καὶ ἐρωτικόν. *How long, my dear Leucippa, ſhall we do nothing elſe but kiſs ? Theſe are indeed charming forerunners : but let us at laſt do ſomething of what lovers moſt paſſionately deſire* (68). Οὐδέν σε ἠρέθισεν εἰς ἀφροδίτην καὶν μίαν, ὁ δέησις, ὁ χρόνος, οὐχ ἡ τῶν σωμάτων συμπλοκή· ἀλλὰ, τὸ πάντων ὑβριστικώτατον, προσαπολόμενος, καταφιλῶν, ὅτως ἀνίεις ὡς ἄλλη γυνή. *Nothing could move you to make me taſte the pleaſures of love, not even ſo much as once, neither my prayers, nor the opportunities I gave you, nor my embraces : nay, what is moſt ſhameful ſtill, from my cloſeſt embraces, from my* WARMEST KISSES, *you part juſt as another woman would do.* Theſe words are a woman's complaints. But as to that other obſervation in the *Saint-Evremoniana*, that *kiſſes are a commodity, which never wears out* ; ſhall I be ſuffered to make the following Commentary upon it ? A man, who though he never ſtudied a courſe of philoſophy, was very much uſed to enquire into the reaſons of every thing, aſked a Phyſician once, why ſome ſtatues of braſs bore the marks of the kiſſes that had been given them (69), though nothing like it was ever obſerved on the face of the moſt famous Courtezans ? The Phyſician anſwered, that the ſtatues are expoſed for many ages together to the devotion of a prodigious crowd of people, and that beauty laſts but a very little time. That anſwer was not ſatisfactory ; it was replied to it, that the hardneſs of braſs making it laſt the longer was a full compenſation for the ſoftneſs of the ſkin, the rather becauſe reſpectful kiſſes, like thoſe that are given to idols, are very ſlight and ſuperficial, and do not come up to the cloſe and impetuous preſſing of the other kiſſes. The Phyſician was ſenſible of that difference, and alledged another reaſon, which was, that all that friction or preſſure could take away from a ſtatue was loſt for ever ; whereas living bodies do ſoon receive by nouriſhment what they loſe. This ſecond anſwer was judged to be perfectly to the purpoſe. Here are many trifles, will ſome ſevere readers ſay ; but muſt not there be ſome in large volumes like theſe ? Muſt not the reader meet here and there with a reſting-place ? I mean, with ſome things that are neither grave nor ſerious ?

(67) Achilles Tatius, lib. 2. p. 107.

(68) Idem, lib. 5. p. 347.

(69) See above, quotat. (17), of the art. GERGENTI. You may add to it this paſſage from Lucretius, lib. 1. ver. 517. *Tum portas propter ahena*
Signa manus dextras oſtendunt tenuari
Sæpe ſalutantes tactu, præterque meantum.

To conclude, I muſt obſerve that Puteanus was in the right to educate his young Italian maiden otherwiſe than he would have done a Flemiſh girl. In ſuch things we ought to follow cuſtom : this part of education does not belong to the law of nations, nor to the law of nature : the difference of climates and of prejudices is a better rule. We ſhall ſee in another place (70) what a Profeſſor of Groningen has obſerved in a work, in which he makes a parallel between ſome practices, which the Rigoriſts (71) condemned, and ſome other practices which they tolerated.

(70) In the rem. [M] of the art. SAINTE ALDEGONDE.

(71) Obſerve that this is not the name which is given them among the Proteſtants in Holland ; for they are called there *Preciſians*, in French *Preciſistes*.

PYGMALION, King of Cyprus, lived before the Trojan War, if we may credit thoſe who aſſert, that he was the father of Metharme the wife of Cinyras, by whom ſhe got Adonis (*a*) : for Cinyras reigned in Cyprus when the Greeks waged war againſt the Trojans (*b*). Some aſſert, that Pygmalion ſucceeded to his father Delus (*c*), and that he was a Phœnician by Nation (*d*). A Prieſt who had eat of the fleſh of a ſacrificed victim, and who had made his wife eat of it, was puniſhed for it, and thrown down from a precipice with her (*e*), by that Prince's command, who nevertheleſs did not ſhew himſelf a very devout man, ſince he loved a ſtatue of Venus criminally [*A*]. According

(*a*) Apollodor. lib. 3. p. m. 239.

(*b*) See the rem. [*B*] of the art. CINYRAS.

(*c*) Porphyr. *de Abſtin.* lib. 4. Hieronym. *in* Jovinian. lib. 2. cap. 9. *apud* Bochart. Geogr. Sacræ, parte 2. lib. 1. cap. 3. p. m. 370.

(*d*) Porphyr. ib. *apud* Meurſium *in* Cypro, p. 124.

(*e*) Porphyr. *de Abſtinentia*, lib. 4. *apud* Meurſium *in* Cypro, p. 126.

[*A*] *He loved a ſtatue of Venus criminally.*] Clemens of Alexandria urges this inſtance in order to ſhew to the Heathens the vanity of their Idols. Ὁ Κύπριος, ὁ Πυγμαλίων ἐκεῖνος, ἐλεφαντίνου ἠράσθη ἀγάλματος· τὸ ἄγαλμα Ἀφροδίτης ἦν, καὶ γυμνὴ ἦν, νικᾶται ὁ Κύπριος τῷ σχήματι, καὶ συνέρχεται τῷ ἀγάλματι· καὶ τοῦτο Φιλοστέφανος ἱστορεῖ. *Pygmalion the Cyprian was in love with an ivory ſtatue : it was the ſtatue of Venus repreſented quite naked. Pygmalion's heart is moved by the image, and he lyes with it, as Philoſtephanus relates* (1). Arnobius has quoted that ſtory to the ſame purpoſe. *Perdocent* (Dii) *aſpernari ſe illa* (ſimulacra) *in quibus ſpretos ſe ultione in aliqua ſignificare non curant. Philoſtephanus in Cypriacis auctor eſt, Pygmaleonem regem Cypri ſimulachrum Veneris, quod ſanctitatis apud Cyprios & religionis habebatur antiquæ, adamaſſe, ut fœminam, mente, animo, lumine rationis judiciique cæcatis : ſolitumque dementem, tanquam ſi uxoria res eſſet, ſublevato in lectulum numine copularier amplexibus atque ore, reſque alias gerere, libidinis vacuâ imaginatione fruſtrabiles* (2). i. e. " The Gods ſhew well enough how " much they deſpiſe thoſe images, ſince they do not " care to teſtify their anger by ſome puniſhment, " when any affront is done to their ſtatues. Phi- " loſtephanus relates in his account of Cyprus, that " Pygmalion, King of that iſland, fell in love with " a ſtatue of Venus, which from antiquity was held " ſacred and religious by the inhabitants of Cyprus : " Pygmalion, I ſay, loved that ſtatue as though it " had been a woman, ſo much was his mind, his " reaſon, and his judgment blinded. Like a mad " man he uſed to take the image into his bed, as if " it

(1) Clem. Alex. *Admonit. ad Gentes*, p. 38, C.

(2) Arnobius, lib. 6. p. 206.

According to Ovid, who does not ſuppoſe he was King of Cyprus [*B*], he was ſo ſcandalized to ſee the proſtitution of ſome women in that iſland, and beſides ſo much diſheartened by the defects which are natural to the fair ſex, that he reſolved to live in a perpetual celibacy [*C*]; but he made a ſtatue of ivory, with which he fell ſo paſſionately in love, that he practiſed towards it all the methods which men are uſed to practiſe in order to win a maiden's heart: he coaxed it, he praiſed it, he made it preſents, and loaded it with jewels: he went farther ſtill; he ſtroked it, he kiſſed it, and lay with it. The high Feſtival of Venus being come, he fell down before the altar of that Goddeſs, and with a trembling voice begged of her to give him a wife like the ſtatue he loved; his intention was to beg that that ſtatue might become his wife, but he did not dare to explain his mind. Venus gueſſed it, and granted him his heart's deſire. He was no ſooner got home, but beginning again to careſs that ivory ſtatue, he perceived it became ſenſible by degrees, and was at laſt a living maiden, who found herſelf in her lover's arms the very moment ſhe ſaw the light. At the end of nine months ſhe was delivered of a boy, who was named Paphus, and who was the father of that Cinyras, who lay with his own daughter, without being aware of it, and got the beautiful Adonis on her (*f*), as I have obſerved in another place (*g*). Some miſtake this Pygmalion for him, who is the ſubject of the next article [*D*].

(*f*) Extracted from Ovid, book 10. (and not 3, as we read in Charles Stephens, and in Lloyd) of the *Metam.* chap. 8. ver. 243, & *ſeq.*

(*g*) In the articles CINYRAS and MYRRHA.

" it had been his wife, he embraced it, kiſſed it, " and did other things, which could not but have " fruſtrated an imagination, which had been void " of luſt."

[*B*] *Ovid . . . . does not ſuppoſe he was King of Cyprus.*] I wonder he did not take more care, that his Readers might not miſtake Pygmalion for a mere Statuary, who got his livelihood by that trade. It is true that by ſtyling him *Paphius Heros* (3), the hero of Paphos, he hints plainly enough that he was no vulgar man; and it is certain that there are Princes, who know how to draw a picture, or to carve a ſtatue: but after all, it had been better to leave the Reader no room to doubt whether Pygmalion was a King or not. That he was a King, has been teſtified by Apollodorus, and by ſeveral other Authors (4). Add to this, that he was the Founder of the city of Carpaſia, in the iſland of Cyprus (5).

(3) Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 10. ver. 290.

(4) See the quotations in the text of this art.

(5) Steph. Byzant. *in* Καρπασια.

[*C*] *He was ſo ſcandalized at . . . . . the proſtitution of ſome women, and . . . . ſo much diſheartened by the defects which are natural to the fair ſex, that he reſolved to live in a perpetual celibacy.*] Here I only give the ſenſe of Ovid's words:

Quas quia Pygmalion ævum per crimina agentes
Viderat, offenſus vitiis, quæ plurima menti
Fœmineæ natura dedit, ſine conjuge cælebs
Vivebat, thalamique diu conſorte carebat (6).

(6) Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 10. ver. 243. p. m. 240.

" Pygmalion loathing their laſcivious life,
" Abhorr'd all woman-kind, but moſt a wife:
" So ſingle choſe to live, and ſhunn'd to wed,
" Well pleas'd to want a conſort of his bed.

DRYDEN.

The Poet had juſt been ſpeaking of the *Propætides*, whom Venus had prompted to proſtitute themſelves, becauſe they had refuſed to own her a Goddeſs (7).

(7) See the *Continuation* of my *Penſees diverſes*, p. 748.

[*D*] *Some miſtake this Pygmalion for him, who is the ſubject of the next article.*] Meſſieurs Lloyd, Hofman, and Moreri are of that number, as well as Meurſius; for he applies to Pygmalion King of Cyprus, ſeveral particulars, which belong only to Pygmalion King of Tyre, and brother of Dido. He quotes (8) Lutatius, who in his abridgment of Ovid's Metamorphoſes, has aſſerted, that Pygmalion King of Tyre being offended at the impudence of the Propætides, reſolved never to marry. Pygmalion, continues he, killed Sichæus, Dido's huſband, and being afterwards become King of Cyprus, he choſe Paphos for the ſeat of his Empire, which is the reaſon why Ovid ſtyles him *Paphius Heros*. He fell in love with the ſtatue of Venus; or, according to others, with a ſtatue he had made himſelf: he got a daughter by it, who was the wife of Cinyras; he puniſhed a Prieſt, who had eat of the fleſh of a victim; he reigned forty-ſeven years, and lived fifty-ſix, as Joſephus aſſerts. It was therefore with regard to his reign, rather than with regard to his life, that Venus preſerved him a long time. It appears from all this, that Meurſius knew but of one Pygmalion (9), and did not obſerve the difference of the times: for if he had done it, he would have ſeen that it was impoſſible the brother of Dido ſhould have been father-in-law to Cinyras, and the ſame with the perſon, to whom he has applied theſe lines of Nonnus,

(8) Meurſius, *de Cypro*, p. 124.

Οὐκ ἀπὸ Πυγμαλίωνος ἔχεις γένος, ᾧ ποτε Κύπρος
Μηκεδανὴν βιότοιο πολυχρονίοιο περείτην (10).

" You do not deſcend from Pygmalion, to whom " Venus granted a long term of life."

Nonnus ſpeaks there of a Pygmalion, who did not live after the expedition of Bacchus.

I ſhall obſerve occaſionally, that the ſame Meurſius applies to King Cinyras, the *Paphius Heros* (11), which in Ovid relates only to the Pygmalion, who was in love with a ſtatue, and who was grand-father to Cinyras by the father's ſide. He pretends alſo that he was in love with a ſtatue, which being changed into a maiden, he got by her a ſon called Paphus (12).

(9) Excepting his ſpeaking of a Pygmalion, one of the Kings of Cyprus, whom Ptolemy put to death, as we read in Diodorus Siculus, in his account of the war between the ſucceſſors of Alexander.

(10) Nonnus, Dionyſ. lib. 32. p. m. 813.

(11) Meurſius, *de Cypro*, p. 106.

(12) Idem, ibid. p. 107.

PYGMALION, King of Tyre, was by his father's laſt will to have reigned together with his wife; but the people beſtowed the ſovereign power upon him alone. His ſiſter, who was very beautiful, and whoſe name was Eliſa, is much better known under the name of Dido. She was married to Sicharbas (*a*) her uncle by the mother's ſide, who enjoyed the ſecond Dignity in the State, (for he was a Prieſt of Hercules) and was poſſeſſed of immenſe treaſures. Pygmalion, who thirſted after them, put him to death [*A*], and yet he did not get the prey he longed for: his brother-in-law's treaſures were buried in the ground, and the widow found means to make her eſcape with all thoſe riches, and went and built Carthage. Her brother had a mind to purſue her; but

(*a*) Virgil calls him *Sichæus*.

[*A*] *Pygmalion . . . . . put him to death.*] It was before the altar according to Virgil (1) and Ovid (2). But *Euſtathius, upon Dionyſius the Geographer, and Cedrenus, do not* ſpeak thus. *For Euſtathius aſſerts, that* Sichæus *was killed by Pygmalion, as he was gone to walk in the fields with him, and Cedrenus relates, that as they were both hunting, and Sichæus was purſuing a wild boar, Pygmalion ſtruck him in the back with a dart, and threw his corps from the top of a precipice; and being returned into his palace, he publiſhed, that Sichæus fell into a precipice, as he was purſuing a wild boar too eagerly* (3).

(1) See hereunder, quot. (31).

(2) *Occidit in terras conjux mactatus ad aras.* Ovid. *Epiſt. Didon.* Some Criticks will have us read inſtead of *in terras, Herculeas*, others again *infernas*. See Meziriac, *ſur les Epitres d'Ovide*, p. 743, 744.

(3) Meziriac, *ſur les Epitres d'Ovide*, p. 745.

[*B*] *He*

but he was diſſuaded from it by the entreaties of his mother, and by the threatenings that were made him from the Gods (*b*). He was then in the 7th year of his reign; he died at the age of fifty ſix years, of which he had reigned forty ſeven years (*c*). They, who are willing to know at what time he lived, may conſider, that according to Joſephus, the city of Carthage was built an hundred and twenty ſix years after the Temple of Solomon (*d*). We muſt not forget to obſerve that Pygmalion is ſaid to have had another ſiſter named Anna, whom he perſecuted after Dido's death [*B*]. There has been a controverſy occaſioned by ſome perſons cenſuring the celebrated Author of the Adventures of Telemachus, for repreſenting Pygmalion as a profligate man abandoned to all manner of vices, and particularly to an exceſſive incontinency [*C*]. It was pretended

(*b*) *Ex* Juſtino, lib. 18. cap. 4 and 5.

(*c*) Joſeph. *contra Apion.* lib. 1. p. 1043.

(*d*) Joſeph. *contra Apion.* lib. 1. p. 1043. But obſerve that in his text, which is followed by the Latin Tranſlator, and by Genebrard in his French Tranſlation, there is the number of 143 years and eight months, which does by no means follow from the number of years he aſſigns to the reign of each particular King.

[*B*] *He is ſaid to have had another ſiſter named Anna, whom he perſecuted after Dido's death.*] "There are "but few Authors, who mention that ſiſter of Dido. "Virgil, in his 4th Æneis relates, it was ſhe, who "ſeeing that Dido was uncertain whether or not ſhe "ſhould engage in a love intrigue with Æneas, ad-"viſed her to do it without the leaſt ſcruple, for "ſeveral reaſons which ſhe urged to her; and from "that time, ſhe was conſtantly the faithful meſſenger "between theſe two lovers. . . . . Servius obſerves, "that according to Varro . . . . *it was not Dido, "but Anna, who being in love with Æneas, killed her-"ſelf on the pile which ſhe had cauſed to be built.*" Ovid, in the 3d book of his *Faſti* relates, that *when Dido had killed herſelf out of deſpair, ſeeing that Æneas had forſaken her, Iarbas, King of Mauritania, took the city of Carthage by force of arms. Anna made her eſcape by ſea, with a great number of Tyrians, and retired at firſt into the iſle of Malta, where King Battus, who had been her gueſt, received her very kindly, and promiſed to aſſiſt her. But afterwards, dreading the power of Pygmalion, who threatened to make war againſt him, if he did not deliver his ſiſter into his hands, he deſired his gueſt to ſeek for another ſanctuary, if ſhe would not prove the cauſe of his ruin. Anna put to ſea again, dreading above all things her brother's fury, and fearing extremely to fall into his hands. Her ſhip met with a violent ſtorm, and was carried on the coaſt of Italy* (4), where Æneas received her very kindly. You may read the reſt of that account in Ovid; it is very curious, but probably a mere fiction of the Poet. And after all, his authority is not ſufficient to perſuade us, that Pygmalion would perſecute his ſiſter Anna.

(4) Idem, ibid. p. 760.

[*C*] *Some perſons have cenſured the celebrated Author of the Adventures of Telemachus, for repreſenting Pygmalion as a profligate man, abandoned to all manner of vice, and particularly to an exceſſive incontinency.*] "He re-"preſents him to us as a man paſſionately fond of "women, as doating upon the beautiful Aſtarbe, as "the moſt diſſolute man, who loved all ſenſual plea-"ſures to an exceſs, in a word, as a monſter of in-"continence. But that Prince was very far from be-"ing ſuch; he abhorred the women; he could not "bear them; he would never marry, nor admit by "his ſide a lawful wife, much leſs a concubine. Ve-"nus and her ſon Cupid had the vexation to ſee that "they could never make him ſubmit to their power. "The love of money was his predominant vice. "Covetouſneſs extinguiſhed in his breaſt all the other "paſſions, and made him proof againſt all the charms "of the beauties who were at his court. The Hiſto-"rians pretend, that the Gods put him to death, "with no other deſign, but to puniſh him for his con-"tempt, and want of love for the women. And "the Poets on the other hand aſſert, that Venus and "Cupid, in order to be revenged of him, becauſe "they could never ſubject him to their power, made "him fall in love with a ſtatue, and that to puniſh "him for his antipathy againſt living and animated "idols of fleſh, they inſpired him with an exceſſive "and mad fondneſs for an idol of ſtone. Upon this "ſubject, and the other particulars of the life and "character of Pygmalion, you may conſult the fol-"lowing Authors; Trogus Pompeius, or his Abbrevi-"ator Juſtinus, *l.* 18. *c.* 5. Velleius Paterculus, *l.* 1. "*c.* 2. Silius Italicus, in the 1ſt and 3d book of the "Punick war; Ariſtotle, in his treatiſe of *Wonder-"ful Things:* Joſephus, *contra Appion. l.* 1. Samuel "Bochart, in his *Canaan*, *l.* 1. *c.* 3. St. Theophilus "of Antioch, in his 3d book againſt *Antilochus*; the "Servius of Daniel, on the 1ſt Æneis; and laſtly, "the *Parallelle de l'Hiſtoire d'Eſpagne*, by John, Biſhop "of Girona. You will find by all theſe Authors, "that the Pygmalion of the Romance of Telema-"chus, is as much like the Pygmalion of the ancient "Hiſtorians and Poets, as a Wind-mill, or a Croco-"dile. The Author of the Romance deſcribes him to "us as a Tyrant, who was frighted by the ſenſe of his "horrid crimes, and who feared continually to be "murthered; he repreſents him as a man *whom every "thing troubles, diſquiets, and tortures, who fears his "own ſhadow, who cannot ſleep neither by day nor by "night*; as an Owl that ſhuns the light. . . . The "ancient Hiſtorians on the contrary, repreſent Pyg-"malion as a meek, peaceable, and quiet man. His "very name proves it; for, as the learned Bochart "obſerves, the word *Pygmalion* ſignifies in the Phœni-"cian language, *the Reſt of God.* There was never a "better brother. He would ſhare the Crown with "his ſiſter Eliſa or Dido, and having no wife, he did "all his endeavours to have her acknowledged and "declared Queen. After their father's death, he "had a mind to reſign the Kingdom to her, but the "people, not being willing to be governed by a "woman, oppoſed it, and conferred the whole au-"thority on Pygmalion alone, though he was ſtill "very young, and Dido had been inſtituted Heireſs "to the Crown, together with him, by their father, "whom ſome call Murgon, and others Agenor, the "ſon of Belus; and whereas the Author of the Ro-"mance ſuppoſes, that Pygmalion had always been "abhorred and deteſted by the people, he was on the "contrary their darling, and extremely beloved by "them. The people appointed him their only King, "by main force, againſt his father's laſt will, againſt "the laws of the Kingdom, and before he was of "age to reign. *Interim rex Tyri decedit, filio Pygma-"lione & Eliſſa filia inſignis formæ virgine hæredibus "inſtitutis. Sed populus Pygmalioni admodum puero reg-"num tradidit.* i. e. *In the mean time the King of "Tyre died, leaving by his laſt will the Crown to his ſon "Pygmalion, and to his daughter Eliſſa, a beautiful vir-"gin. But the people raiſed Pygmalion alone to the "throne; though ſtill very young*, ſays Juſtinus *. He "was always inſtead of a father to his ſiſter Dido; and "having married her to Acerbas, or Sicharbas, or "Sichæus, High-Prieſt of the Phœnicians, and High-"Prieſt of Hercules the God of the Tyrians, which "was the ſecond dignity in the Kingdom, that "Prieſt being the firſt perſon after the King, he ne-"ver called him otherwiſe but his ſon-in-law, though "he was only his brother-in-law, and at the ſame "time his uncle by the mother's ſide, being his mo-"ther's brother. *Avunculum ſuum, eundemque generum,* "ſays Juſtinus † (5)."

* *Juſtinus*, lib. 18. cap. 15.

† Idem, ibid.

The Cenſurer thinks it particularly ſtrange, that Pygmalion ſhould be ſtyled an impious man. *On the contrary*, replies he (6), he was *a moſt religious Prince, and ſo pious towards the Gods, that though he had the ſtrongeſt reaſons in the world to be exaſperated againſt his ſiſter, who had robbed him of all his treaſures, and was making her eſcape into Africa, and though he might eaſily have overtaken her, and cauſed her to be arreſted in the iſle of Cyprus, where ſhe landed firſt, before ſhe paſſed over into Africa; yet he would not make the leaſt attempt againſt her, becauſe having conſulted the Gods in a ſacrifice he offered to them, before he undertook any thing, the Diviners aſſured him, that the Gods would not ſuffer any perſon to prevent Dido from executing her deſigns, and that ſhe was to build a city, for which they were very much concerned.* Victus minis deorum quievit, cui cum inſpirati vates canerent, non impune laturum,

(5) L'Abbé Faidit, *Telemacomanie*, p. m. 126, & *ſeq.* I make uſe of an edit. in which the place where it was printed (in the year 1700) is called *Eleuteropole.*

(6) *Telemacomanie*, p. 129, 130.

tended that this was receding too much from the truth of hiſtorical facts. I ſhall give an account of the arguments urged on both ſides during that controverſy (*e*), and I ſhall make ſome obſervations upon them [*D*].

(*e*) See the rem. [*C*].

PYLADES,

turum, ſi incrementum urbis toto orbe auſpicatiſſimæ interpellaſſet, *ſays Juſtin* *. *And indeed we find that all the ill which the Poets and the Hiſtorians have ſaid of Pygmalion, conſiſts only in their charging him with coveteouſneſs.*

* *Juſtinus*, lib. 18. cap. 3.

Portantur avari
Pygmalionis opes pelago: dux fœmina facti †.

† Virgil, *Æn.* 1.

" Nor is Pygmalion's * treaſure left behind.
" The veſſels, heavy-laden, put to ſea
" With proſperous winds: a woman leads the way."

* Virgil ſays the covetous Pygmalion.

Avarice was his only vice, which certainly was but a ſlight foundation for the Author of the Romance, to repreſent him in ſo odious a light as he has done.

Here follows what an anonymous Writer anſwered to that cenſure. " The Author of the cenſure at-
" tempts here to prove, that Pygmalion King of
" Tyre was not a diſſolute man, becauſe about four
" hundred years before him there lived in the iſle
" of Cyprus a famous carver, of the ſame name,
" who was very chaſte. And indeed the Pygmalion he
" ſpeaks of, and whom he miſtakes for the King of
" Tyre, was a celebrated carver in the iſle of Cyprus,
" who had made a ſtatue with which he fell in love.
" Venus being moved with his paſſion, tranſ-
" formed the marble into a woman as beautiful as
" Pygmalion's work was. It was by that woman he
" got Paphos, who gave his own name to his native
" country. Paphos was the father of Cinyras; and
" Cinyras got by his own daughter Myrrha, a ſon
" called Adonis, who was Venus's darling. That
" ſtory is ſo well known, that one cannot ſufficiently
" wonder at that Author's ignorance, who pretends
" to ſo much learning, and yet has blundered in a
" ſubject which is as clear as the ſun at noon-day.
" That blunder is not the only one he has committed
" with regard to Pygmalion. He pretends that that
" Prince, whom the Archbiſhop of Cambray repre-
" ſents as an impious man, was moſt religious, and
" that his unſatiable avarice, and the murder he
" committed on the perſon of Sichæus, his ſiſter
" Dido's huſband, were mere trifles, and that he
" was nevertheleſs an honeſt man, and extremely be-
" loved by his ſubjects. Theſe are indeed noble
" ſentiments for a man, who blames us for writing a
" romance, which is deſigned only to promote the
" cauſe of virtue (7)."

(7) *Préface des Avantures de Telemaque*, of the laſt edit. printed at the Hague, p. m. 24.

Here follows the Cenſurer's reply (8). *The anonymous Apologiſt of the Romance of Telemachus, in his Preface to the new edition printed for Moetjens, charges me with miſtaking Pygmalion King of Tyre, and brother of Dido, whom Virgil ** mentions, for Pygmalion the ſtatuary, and carver of ivory ſtatues, who fell in love with one of his images, and with an ivory maiden he had made, and whom Ovid mentions ††. And for committing that pretended blunder in Literature, that honeſt man, as well as he, who wrote the new book, entitled,* les Caracteres des Auteurs anciens & modernes *, (the Characters of the ancient and modern Authors) *are of opinion that I ought to be ſhamefully driven out of Athens and Delphi, and confined in a* mad-houſe. . . *All I can ſay is, that their Apollo is a lying and ignorant fellow. I have never committed the blunder they charge me with. I am better acquainted with the two Pygmalions than they are. But I have made but one of them two as to their character and inclination. I have obſerved, with all the Ancients, that the two Pygmalions were ſo far from being amorous, and diſſolute with regard to the women, and deſerved ſo little to be quoted as inſtances of the diſorders, with which lewdneſs is attended (as the Author of the Romance of Telemachus does) that on the contrary, they did both extremely abhor and deteſt all women and maidens; they both lived unmarried, ſo that one could not chooſe in all antiquity an inſtance leſs proper to repreſent a diſſolute King, abandoned to the love of women, than the King of Tyre, who was never diſſolute, no more than the carver or turner Pygmalion, ſince the greateſt pleaſure of them both was to rail againſt the whole ſex* (9).

(8) L'Abbé Faydit, *Supplemens aux Eſſais de Litterature*, partic. 5. p. 124, & *ſeq.*

** *Æn.* 1.

†† *Metam.* lib. 10.

* p. 161.

(9) The Author quotes here theſe lines from the 24th book of Ovid's *Metam. Quas quia*, &c. which may be read above in the rem. [*C*] of the foregoing article.

[*D*] *And I ſhall make ſome obſervations upon them.*] It is very likely that I ſhall not make all the obſervations that could be made upon that ſubject: but no matter for that; let them, who pleaſe, come and glean after me.

I. I aſk, who are the ancient Authors, who have aſſerted that Pygmalion, Dido's brother, could not abide the women; and that this was the only reaſon why the Gods put him to death, or made him fall in love with a ſtatue. I conſult the Writers to whom I am referred, and find nothing in them of what I was made to expect. Juſtin, who is the firſt, does not ſay a word of it, and yet he is the Author who gives the largeſt account of Pygmalion. We meet with nothing concerning that Prince in Velleius Paterculus, who relates only in a few words, that the Tyrians built Utica (10), and that Dido built Carthage (11). Silius Italicus (12) mentions the unfortunate Dido ſeveral times, but without relating any of the particulars for which he is quoted. The paſſage from Ariſtotle (13) relates only to the building of Utica. Joſephus tells us only what you have ſeen above (14). Bochart's remarks conſiſt only in the etymological obſervation mentioned by the Cenſurer. St. Theophilus of Antioch tells us nothing but the name of Pygmalion's father, and how long Pygmalion lived, and how many years he reigned (15). The Servius of Daniel is not capable to ſatisfy my curioſity; and as for the pretended *Parallele de l'Hiſtoire d'Eſpagne*, by John Biſhop of Girona (16), what would it ſignify to meet with any particulars there? Since that Biſhop lived in the 15th Century, he deſerves no credit but ſo far as he quotes the Ancients.

(10) Val. Paterc. lib. 1. cap. 2.

(11) Idem, ibid. cap. 6.

(12) See him, lib. 1. p. m. 3, 11. lib. 2. p. 81.

(13) You will meet with it in the *Juſtinus Variorum*, p. 370. edit. Græviı 1683.

(14) In the text of this article.

(15) See Meurſius *in* Cypro, p. 126.

(16) The Latin title is *Paralipomena Hiſt. Hiſpanicæ.*

We have not therefore any authority, either for Pygmalion's chaſtity, or for the puniſhment he is ſaid to have ſuffered for it. Let us ſee whether the other good qualities, which are aſcribed to that Prince, be better grounded or not.

II. We are told, that he was *a meek, peaceful, and quiet man*, and that this is the character which the ancient Hiſtorians give him. His very name proves this, as the learned Bochart obſerves. But unfortunately for the cenſurer of Telemachus it happens, the Pygmalion of Bochart was the ſon of one Belus, who conquered the iſle of Cyprus at the time of the Trojan War (17): he was not therefore the brother of Dido who built Carthage. And beſides, who is there but knows, that the ſame name is given ſucceſſively to ſeveral perſons, who do not at all reſemble the firſt who bore it, and to whom it was perhaps given only to expreſs his character and morals? Laſtly, I cannot find thoſe ancient Hiſtorians, who have given our Pygmalion ſo fine a character. That tender friendſhip for his ſiſter, which is aſcribed to him; thoſe great endeavours to have her acknowledged Queen, are nothing but a paraphraſe of two or three words of Juſtin, who tells us that the people raiſed Pygmalion alone to the throne, though Dido by their father's will was appointed to inherit the Crown as well as he. By what means ſhall that paſſage be ſtretched or wire-drawn (18), in order to find in it the ſenſe, which our Cenſurer pretends to put upon it? May not we believe, with a great deal of probability, either that Pygmalion's faction laboured underhand to have that Princeſs excluded, or that the people were determined to exclude her, becauſe they thought this would pleaſe the Prince, and be an effectual method to prevent the ill effects of a diviſion, conſidering that Dido was married to the ſecond perſon in the State (19), that ſhe was very beautiful, and that, no doubt, ſhe was known to be capable of great deſigns (20). Laſtly, there never was a more ill grounded Commentary than that, by which Juſtin is made to ſay, that Pygmalion *had a mind to reſign the Kingdom* to his ſiſter . . *but that the people oppoſed it* . . . *and appointed him only King by main force.*

(17) See Bochart. *in* Geogr. Sacræ, part. 2. lib. 1. cap. 3. p. m. 369, 370.

(18) Obſerve that the Abbé Faydit quotes it as you have ſeen above.

(19) *Huic conjux Sichæus erat. . . . Cui* PATER *intactam dederat, primiſque jugarat Ominibus.* Virgil. *Æn.* lib. 1. ver. 343.

III. As Pygmalion was at that time but nine years old, one can hardly imagine that the Crown was given to him only and not to his ſiſter, for no other reaſon but becauſe *he was extremely beloved by the Tyrians, and their darling.* It is plain that he had not yet had time to become ſuch by his actions, but at moſt by

(20) She ſhewed it plainly enough by the building of Carthage.

the great hopes the people had conceived of what he would be one day. But this was an uncertain and deceitful hope; which does not afford a ſufficient ground to aſſert, that he governed juſtly: for how many lovely and promiſing children are there who are afterwards ſpoiled and corrupted to ſuch a degree, as to become the moſt wicked and profligate men?

IV. There was no great occaſion to obſerve, that Pygmalion *having no wife did all his endeavours to have* his ſiſter Dido *declared Queen*. It muſt almoſt always (21) be ſuppoſed, that a child, who is but nine years old, is not yet married, and it muſt never be ſuppoſed that he will regulate his conduct ſo, as though he deſigned never to marry: and after all it is not Pygmalion's celibacy, which makes Juſtin ſay that that Princeſs was deprived of a right which her father's laſt will had given her.

(21) I make uſe of that reſtriction, becauſe there are Princes who marry ſometimes their children, before they be of a ripe age.

V. Neither Juſtin, nor any other ancient Author, tells us, that *Pygmalion was always inſtead of a father to his ſiſter Dido*, nor that he married her to Sicharbas (22), nor that he ever called *the latter otherwiſe than his ſon-in-law*. The words of Juſtin quoted by the Cenſurer, *Avunculum ſuum eundemque generum*, are deſigned only to ſhew the odiouſneſs of Pygmalion's crime; for they ſignify that he killed Sicharbas who was at once his uncle by the mother's ſide, and his brother-in-law (23): the word *Gener* is taken indifferently by the ancient Writers to ſignify a father-in-law, a brother-in-law, and a ſon-in-law, though to ſpeak accurately it was at length taken only in the laſt ſenſe (24).

(22) You may have ſeen above, quotation (18), that it was Dido's father who married her to Sichæus.

(23) *Pygmalion oblitus juris humani avunculum ſuum eundemque generum ſine reſpectu pietatis occidit.* Juſtinus, lib. 18. cap. 4. p. m. 372.

(24) See Berneggerus's note on that paſſage of Juſtin.

VI. What the Cenſurer of Telemachus aſſerts (25), *viz.* that Pygmalion ſeized Sicharbas's riches, and that Dido robbed him of all his treaſures (26), is not accurate. Pygmalion could not make himſelf maſter of his brother-in-law's treaſures, which were buried in the ground: he was in hopes of coming at them, when Dido ſhould have taken ſanctuary in his own houſe: but inſtead of chooſing that ſanctuary, ſhe removed as far as ſhe could from Tyre, with all her huſband's treaſures. This is what Juſtin relates in the cleareſt manner in the world. Virgil's words, quoted by the Cenſurer (27), *Portantur avari Pygmalionis opes pelago, dux fœmina facti* (28), ſhould not have made him imagine, that Pygmalion's riches were carried away by his ſiſter. It appears evidently from what goes before, that ſhe took only her huſband's treaſures with her, which Virgil calls *Pygmalionis opes*, Pygmalion's treaſure, for no other reaſon but becauſe Pygmalion was in hopes to get them into his own hands: this is what the Commentators obſerve moſt expreſsly; and the thing is unqueſtionable.

(25) p. 128.

(26) p. 129.

(27) p. 130.

(28) Virg. *Æn.* lib. 1. ver. 363.

VII. The proof which is given us of Pygmalion's piety is very equivocal: the threatnings of the God's anger, which the Diviners explained to him, prevented him from purſuing Dido. This is no proof of love, or of filial fear for the Deity. Irreligious men being frighted by prodigies have ſometimes altered their wicked deſigns.

I ſhall make but two obſervations upon the diſcourſe of the Apologiſt.

VIII. The firſt is, that he ſuffered many blunders (29) of the Cenſurer to paſs unobſerved, which he might have taken notice of.

(29) Thoſe which I have been mentioning here.

IX. The ſecond is, that he neglected to take an advantage, which Virgil and Juſtin afforded him. He clears the Archbiſhop of Cambray very well with regard to the Anachroniſm he is ſuppoſed to have been guilty of in making Pygmalion King of Tyre, and brother of, Dido live at the time of the Siege of Troy. He clears him very well in that reſpect, I ſay; for he ſhews that the Archbiſhop was obliged to follow herein the *Diſpoſition of Virgil's Poem* (30): but for that ſame reaſon he was in the right to ſuppoſe, that that King of Tyre was a monſter of tyranny. That great Poet repreſents him as the moſt wicked of all men.

(30) *Preface des Avantures du Telemaque*, p. 26.

——Regna Tyri germanus habebat
Pygmalion, ſcelere ante alios immanior omnis,
Quos inter medius venit furor. Ille Sichæum
Impius ante aras, atque auricæcus amore,
Clam furo incautum ſuperat, ſecurus amorum
Germanæ; factumque diu celavit, et ægram
Multa malus ſimulans, vana ſpe luſit amantem (31).

(31) Virg. *Æn.* lib. 1. ver. 346.

"Pygmalion then the Tyrian Sceptre ſway'd;
"One who contemn'd divine and human laws.
"Then ſtrife enſu'd, and curſed gold the cauſe.
"The Monarch blinded with deſire of wealth;
"With ſteel invades his brother's life by ſtealth;
"Before the ſacred altar made him bleed,
"And long from her conceal'd the cruel deed.
"Some tale, ſome new pretence, he daily coin'd,
"To ſooth his ſiſter, and delude her mind."

DRYDEN.

He obſerves a little lower, that Dido was accompanied in her flight by thoſe perſons, who hated or feared that cruel tyrant (32). Juſtin aſſerts the ſame thing, with the addition of this particular, that they, who fled away, were perſons eminent by their quality; he even calls them Senators. *Eliſſa diu fratrem propter ſeclus averſata, ad poſtremum diſſimulato odio, mitigatoque interim vultu, fugam tacitè molitur; aſſumtiſque quibuſdam principibus in ſocietatem, quibus par odium in Regem eſſe, eandemque fugiendi cupiditatem arbitrabatur. . . . . Junguntur et Senatorum in eam noctem præparata agmina* (33). i. e. "Eliſſa (Dido) "hated her brother a long while for that crime; but "at laſt, diſſembling her reſentment, and ſhewing "in the mean time a chearful look, ſhe contrived ſe- "cretly to make her eſcape; and imparted her de- "ſign to ſome of the moſt conſiderable perſons, "whom ſhe thought had the ſame hatred againſt the "King, and longed like her to go out of his Do- "minions. . . . . Many Senators joined with her "the night ſhe went away."

(32) *Conveniunt quibus aut odium crudele tyranni Aut metus acer erat.* Idem, ibid. ver. 361.

(33) Juſtin. lib. 18. cap. 4. p. m. 372.

But here a little difficulty offers itſelf to us. Pygmalion reigned forty ſeven years, and lived fifty ſix years; and it was the ſeventh year of his reign that Dido went away, and built Carthage. This is what the Hiſtorians of Tyre, quoted by Joſephus, tell us; what he did during the laſt forty years of his reign is entirely unknown to us: the Writers who are extant ſay neither good nor ill of him during that time; and what we meet with in Ovid is nothing but a fiction (34). All that Virgil and Juſtin mention of his cruelty relates to the time before Dido's flight. Now he was but ſixteen when ſhe went away. Is it probable then that he had already governed in that barbarous and tyrannical manner? Ought we not to aſcribe ſo many cruelties to ſome Miniſter of State, rather than to that young King? The Cenſurer of Telemachus has hinted ſomething of this objection. *The murder of Sichæus*, ſays he (35), *happened when Pygmalion was but fifteen years old, ſince it happened a year before Dido's flight; and conſequently it was done by the advice of his council, rather than by his order, and from his own accord.* I add, that it had been a great prodigy, if his whole reign had been like the deſcription which Virgil makes of it, and had continued nevertheleſs forty years longer after Dido's flight, and for ought we know, ended by a natural death. Juvenal's ſaying (36) is well known.

(34) See the rem. [B].

(35) p. 130, 131.

(36) *Ad generum Cereris ſine cæde & vulnere pauci Deſcendunt reges & ſicca morte tyranni.* Juven. ſat. 10. ver. 112.

As for that Cenſurer's reply; here follows what I find to blame in it.

X. It will plainly appear to any one, who does but ſlightly examine what he has ſaid (37), that he ſpoke only of Pygmalion, the brother of Dido, and that he did not uſe the leaſt word or expreſſion that might hint he had Pygmalion of Cyprus in view. One cannot therefore well underſtand, why he aſſerts in his reply, that *he had obſerved, with all the ancients, that the* TWO PYGMALIONS *were ſo far from being . . . . diſſolute with regard to the women, . . . that on the contrary they did* BOTH *abhor and deteſt all women.* If a man can but read, he will eaſily perceive the falſity of that propoſition.

(37) See above, rem. [C], quotation (5).

XI. It is ſo falſe, that all the ancients tell us, that Pygmalion, Dido's brother, hated womankind, and that all his delight was to rail againſt the fair ſex, that we may fairly challenge the Cenſurer of Telemachus to quote one ſingle ancient Author, who has aſſerted this; or at leaſt who aſſerted it without ſuppoſing at the ſame time, that Pygmalion King of Tyre, and Pygmalion who fell in love with a ſtatue, were one and the ſame perſon.

XII. It is not true, that both the Pygmalions continued bachelors all their life time: the Pygmalion of the iſle of Cyprus was married to the maiden, into whom

PYLADES, a native of Cilicia, [*A*], was a very famous Pantomime at Rome under the reign of Auguſtus: he improved by new inventions the art of repreſenting theatrical pieces by dancing [*B*], as I have already obſerved in the article of BATHYLLUS. He wrote even ſome books upon that ſubject (*a*). One will be able to judge with how much ſkill he performed his part, if one conſiders that Auguſtus having called him back to Rome (*b*), from whence he had been baniſhed by a faction, the people were ſo well pleaſed at it, that this was one of the reaſons, why they were no longer offended at ſome burthenſome laws, which that Emperor had made. Others do not aſcribe Pylades's baniſhment to the credit of an oppoſite faction (*c*); they aſſert it was a puniſhment, which Auguſtus himſelf had inflicted upon him, becauſe he had pointed with his finger at

(*a*) *Athen.* lib. 1. cap. 17. Suidas *in* Πυλαδης.

(*b*) Dio, lib. 54.

(*c*) Sueton. *in* Auguſto, cap. 45.

whom Venus transformed the ſtatue with which he was in love, and he had a ſon by her (38). I confeſs that Joſephus does not tell us, that Pygmalion King of Tyre had any children: but as he wanted to continue the ſucceſſion of the Kings of Tyre only to that Prince, we cannot infer from his ſtopping there, that that Prince was never married, and did not leave his Kingdom to one of his ſons. The ſilence of Joſephus cannot therefore be urged as a good argument (39) againſt the Archbiſhop of Cambray's fiction, which is that one of Pygmalion's ſons ſucceeded to his Crown againſt his father's will. There is ſomething fallacious in the following words of the Cenſurer. *After Pygmalion we meet with no King of the Tyrians till the time of Ithobalus, under whoſe reign Tyre on the Continent was taken by Nebuchadnezzar. . . . So that it is probable, that after Pygmalion's death the Tyrians ceaſed to be governed by Kings, and that perpetual judges were appointed in their ſtead, like the Conſuls at Rome; and that old Tyre met after the death of Pygmalion with the ſame fate, which new or the inſular Tyre met with after the depoſition of Ithobalus. They put judges in his room, who were changed from time to time, and governed the people with a ſupreme authority. After which the Tyrians went to aſk for a King at Babylon, and got Merbalus, who reigned forty years; after his death the Babylonians appointed his brother Iromus to ſucceed him, who reigned many years over the Tyrians, at the time when Cyrus was King of Perſia* *. *All this is extracted word for word from Joſephus, or rather from Menander and Dius, whoſe words Joſephus tranſcribes* (40). Let it be ſo; but it ſhould have been obſerved, that Joſephus quotes from theſe Authors ſuch paſſages only as were neceſſary to confirm by the authority of ſtrangers, what the Jews aſſerted concerning the antiquity and deſtruction of their Temple, &c. He proves by the Annals of the Phœnicians, that Solomon traded with Hiram King of Tyre: and in order to ſhew that Solomon's Temple was an ancient building, he reckons how many years after Hiram's reign Carthage was built. He gives us therefore the ſucceſſion of the Kings of Tyre from Hiram down to Pygmalion, in whoſe time Carthage was built: the ſucceſſion of the following Kings of Tyre being nothing to his purpoſe, he does not mention them: can one infer from his ſilence that the ſucceſſion was interrupted at the death of Pygmalion, that Pygmalion died a bachelor, &c? In another place he had occaſion to confirm by the teſtimony of the Phœnician Hiſtorians what relates to the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, and the liberty granted the Jews to return into their own country. It was needleſs for him to go ſo far backwards as the time, which followed immediately the death of Pygmalion, and therefore he goes no farther back than the time of Ithobalus, under whoſe reign the city of Tyre was conquered by Nebuchadnezzar, and gives us the names of thoſe who governed ſucceſſively at Tyre, only from this Ithobalus down to Hirom who reigned there in the time of Cyrus.

(38) See Ovid, in the 10th book of his *Metam.*

(3) It is urged as ſuch in page 130 of the *Telemacomanie.*

* *Joſ. cont. Appi.* p. 1046.

(40) *Telemacomanie*, p. 131.

XIII. Obſerve that the judges did not ſucceed immediately to Ithobalus, as our Cenſurer pretends; they were not appointed till after the death of Baal, who ſucceeded to Ithobalus, and reigned ten years (41).

(41) Joſephus, *contra Appion.* lib. 1. p. 1043.

However it be, Joſephus is by no means proper to hinder us from believing, that a ſon of Pygmalion ſucceeded to the Crown at Tyre, and that that city was governed by Kings and not by Judges, ſince the time of that ſucceſſor of Pygmalion, to the time of that Ithobalus, who was contemporary with Nebuchadnezzar.

XIV. Since the Cenſurer refers us to Ovid for what relates to Pygmalion the carver, he ought to have retracted what he aſſerted; namely, that Venus had made him fall in love with a ſtatue, in order to puniſh his contempt for the women; for it is certain that Ovid mentions no ſuch thing: and that on the contrary he repreſents that Goddeſs ſo kind, that ſhe granted Pygmalion's requeſt immediately, by bringing to life that ſtatue, which was the object of his love (42).

(42) See the 10th book of the *Metam.* ver. 277, *& ſeq.*

XV. The beſt reply which the Cenſurer could have made was that, which did not come into his head. He might have urged the authority of ſome Writers, who make no difference beween the Pygmalion of Tyre, and the Pygmalion of the iſle of Cyprus, as we have obſerved above (43).

(43) In the rem. [*D*], of the foregoing article.

[*A*] *A native of Cilicia.*] This is plainly to be ſeen in Suidas; the following part of that paſſage, in which the place where he was born was perhaps mentioned, is dark and perplexed; nor have the Critics yet been able to clear it up. Boulenger (1) imagined that there is an inconſiſtency (which is merely chimerical) between thoſe who ſuppoſe Pylades was a Cicilian, and the anthology, which makes him come originally, ſays he, from Thebes in Egypt; whereupon he quotes theſe words;

Βάκχας
Ἐκ Θηβῶν ἰταλὴν ἤγαγε πρὸς θυμέλην
Ἀνθρώποις Πυλαάδης.

Id eſt quando Bacchas ex Thebis ad pulpitum Italicum hominibus Pylades adduxit. i. e. "When Pylades ſhewed the Theban Bacchæ on the ſtage in Italy." This ſignifies only that Pylades ſhewed to the Romans the repreſentation of ſomething which was performed at Thebes. But this was never intended to ſignify that he was of Thebes, or that he lived there before he came to Italy: and farther it is plain, that Thebes in Bœotia is only meant here, where Bacchus and his Feſtivals were chiefly ſolemnized. Let us obſerve that ἰταλὴν πρὸς θυμέλην is very well tranſlated, *ad pulpitum Italicum, on the ſtage or on the theatre of Italy:* but they who have tranſlated it *Italicum ad ſacrificium* (2), *for the ſacrifices of Italy*, have committed a very groſs blunder.

(1) Julius Cæſar Bulengerus, *de Theatro*, lib. 1. cap. 93. folio m. 115 and 117 *verſo.* You will ſee in the rem. [*E*], quot. (15), from whence theſe Greek lines are extracted.

(2) They have committed that blunder in Lubin's edit. of the *Anthology*, in 4to, p. 760.

[*B*] *He improved by new inventions the art of repreſenting theatrical pieces by dancing.*] In the article of Bathyllus I have given a general account of the alterations, that were made under Auguſtus in the dances of the Pantomimes. But to be a little more particular in this place I muſt obſerve, that if we may believe St. Jerom, Pylades is the firſt who danced at Rome by the ſound of flutes, and whilſt a band of muſicians was ſinging; and that before him the Pantomimes uſed to dance and ſing at the ſame time (3). Salmaſius does not grant all this (4): he ſhews, that as early as the time of Livius the Poet and Comedian, the dancer was exempted from the fatigue of ſinging himſelf, and that they gave him a boy, who ſung, whilſt another played on the flute (5): but he grants that Pylades is the firſt who took care that the muſicians ſhould ſing and others play on the flute whilſt he was dancing: *fiſtulas & chorum ſibi ſaltanti ut præcineret curaviſſe*, which agrees very well with the anſwer he made to Auguſtus, who aſked him what he had added to the dancing. Αὐλῶν συρίγγων τ' ἰυγῆς, ὁμαδόν τ' ἀνθρώπων: *the ſound of flagelets and flutes, and the ſymphony of men* (6): for before him there was but one flute deſigned for the uſe of the Pantomimes, whereas they uſed ſeveral when he performed. Lucian acquaints us that theſe people danced

(3) *Pylades Cilix Pantomimus, quum veteres ipſi canerent & ſaltarent, primus Romæ chorum ſibi & fiſtulas præcinere fecit.* Hieronymus, *in Chron. Euſeb.* ad ann. 1995.

(4) Salmaſ. *in Vopiſcum*, p. 836. edit. Lugd. Bat. in 8vo.

(5) Valer. Max. lib. 2. cap. 4. p. m. 161. See alſo Lucian. *de Saltatione*, p. m. 925. Tom. 1.

(6) It is the 13th line of the 10th book of Homer's *Iliad.*

at one of the ſpectators [C]. But it might be that Mecænas, who favoured Bathyllus Pylades's competitor, took hold of that opportunity in order to remove the latter. Pylades had another rival named Hylas [D], who had been his ſcholar. Macrobius acquaints us with ſeveral particulars upon this ſubject (*d*): he tells us that there was a popular inſurrection occaſioned by the competition (*e*); and that Hylas dancing one day a hymn which ended with theſe words, *the great Agamemnon*, expreſſed the thing by the action of a perſon, who ſhould be meaſuring the ſize of a tall man. Pylades, in order to find fault with him, cried out, *you make him tall, but not great*; whereupon the audience obliged him to dance the ſame hymn. He did it, and when he came to theſe words, *the great Agamemnon*, he put himſelf in the poſture of a man in a deep meditation (*f*). As he was once dancing the Tragedy of *Hercules*, ſome perſons pretended to find fault with his ſteps: whereupon he pulled off his maſk, and told the jeerers, *ye fools, do not you ſee that I act the part of a madman?* He threw ſome darts that day among the crowd of ſpectators: he threw ſome alſo when he performed the ſame part in Auguſtus's chamber. That Prince was not offended at his being uſed after the ſame manner as the Roman people. All theſe particulars are incomparably more agreeably related in the original (*g*): the curious readers will do well to conſult it. There are in the Anthology ſome Epigrams to the honour of our Pylades [E]. He left Diſciples behind him, who called themſelves ſucceſſively by his name. We find under Trajan's reign a dancer named Pylades, whom that Prince loved very much (*h*). We meet with another whom Didius Julianus ordered to dance in the palace, where Pertinax had juſt been murdered (*i*). Galen mentions a Pantomime, with whom he diſcovered that a certain woman was paſſionately in love, and who was no doubt a Diſciple of our Pylades (*k*). Gruterus's inſcriptions mention ſome Pantomimes who had the ſame name (*l*).

(*d*) Macrobius, *Saturn.* lib. 2. cap. 7.

(*e*) See the rem. [E] of the art. BATHYLLUS.

(*f*) *Nihil magis ratus magno duci convenire quam pro omnibus cogitare.* Macrob. *Saturn.* lib. 2. cap. 7.

(*g*) *Apud* Monobium, ibid.

(*h*) Xiphil. *in* Trajan.

(*i*) Xiphil. *in* Did. Juliano.

(*k*) See Voſſius, *Inſt. Poet.* lib. 2. p. 184. He refutes Brodæus, who in his notes on the *Anthology*, has aſſerted, that there were but two Pantomimes named *Pylades*.

(*l*) See Scaliger *in* Euſeb. p. 169. Salmaſ. *in* Vopiſcum, p. 234, edit. in 8vo.

danced by the ſound of ſeveral other inſtruments, *citharæ, cimbalorum*, of harps and cymbals, and of a certain ſtamping of the feet, which in Salmaſius's opinion was deſigned for the ſame purpoſe, as what is now called *beating time*. The ſame Author (Lucian) has alſo obſerved, it was chiefly under Auguſtus that the art of dancing was brought to ſuch a degree of perfection (7). It is an honour for Pylades, *qui ferebatur mutaſſe rudis illius ſaltationis ritum, quæ apud majores viguit, & venuſtam induxiſſe novitatem* (8). i. e. "Who is ſaid to have altered the ruſtic way of dancing, which was in uſe anciently, and to have introduced a new and agreeable method of performing."

(7) Οὐ παλαι ἀρχαμένη ἐς τοσοῦτον κάλλος ἐπιδιδόναι, ἀλλα καλὲ τὸν Σεβαςὸν μάλιςα. Lucianus, *de Saltatione*, p. 925. Tom. 1. *apud* Salmaſ. *in* Vopiſcum, p. 836.

(8) Macrob. *Saturn.* lib. 2. cap. 7.

[C] *He was baniſhed . . . . becauſe he had pointed with his finger at one of the ſpectators.*] Auguſtus muſt therefore have had a great indulgence for thoſe who hiſſed at the players, for that ſpectator was hiſſing at Pylades. *Pyladem urbe atque Italia ſummoverit quod ſpectatorem à quo exſibilabatur demonſtraſſet digito, conſpicuumque feciſſet* (9). If at this time a player at Paris ſhould revenge himſelf after the ſame manner as Pylades did, he would not be cenſured for it (10). We learn from the News-papers, that they have made very ſevere regulations in France againſt thoſe who pretend to hiſs at the players, and whoſe audacioufneſs was riſen to the higheſt degree. The petition, which a Poet preſented to the King, praying that their rage might be reſtrained, is a very pretty piece of poetry. It was firſt printed in the *Mercure Galant*, and afterwards in the collection of pieces, which is publiſhed monthly at the Hague. They have inſerted in the *Furetieriana* an Epigram upon the origin of hiſſing. That piece is aſcribed to an Author, who has gained a great reputation by his Tragedies. But the reputation of the wit who is abuſed in that Epigram, is ſo well eſtabliſhed, that it cannot hurt him in the leaſt (11). In the Dutch edition they have put *Hiſtorien* inſtead of *Hiſtrion* (12).

(9) Sueton. *in* Auguſto, cap. 45.

(10) I write this in the year 1696.

(11) See the *Lettres Hiſtoriques*, for March 1696. p. 288, 289.

(12) *Furetieriana*, p. 72.

[D] *Pylades had another rival named Hylas.*] Macrobius ſpeaks thus. *Hylam diſcipulum uſque ad æqualitatis contentionem eruditione provexit: populus deinde inter utriuſque ſuffragia diviſus eſt* (13). i. e. "He "taught his ſcholar Hylas ſo well, that at laſt he was "able to vie with him; and the people were afterwards divided in their opinions concerning theſe "two Pantomimes." Some learned men take this Hylas and Bathyllus to be the ſame perſon (14); they pretend that the former of theſe names was given him, becauſe he was as much beloved by his maſter Pylades, as Hylas was by Hercules. In a word, they imagine there was a criminal converſation between them. All this appears to me to be very far fetched, forced and ill grounded. No man ever ſaid that Bathyllus was Pylades's ſcholar, as Macrobius aſſerts of Hylas. Let us therefore obſerve only, that the one has probably been miſtaken for the other with regard to the reaſon, which made Auguſtus reprove Pylades, and for the reſt let us be perſuaded, that Hylas and Bathyllus were two different Pantomimes. See the remark [E] of the article BATHYLLUS.

(13) Macrob. *Saturn.* lib. 2. cap. 7.

(14) Iſaacus Pontanus, *in illum locum* Macrobii.

[E] *There are in the Anthology ſome Epigrams to the honour of our Pylades.*] That which Boulenger and Lubin have miſunderſtood, aſcribes to Pylades ſuch hands as can expreſs every thing, παμφώνους (15). One might make a very large collection, if one would attempt to tranſcribe all the paſſages, in which the Ancients have well repreſented the manual language of the Pantomimes: let us only give here theſe Latin words of Caſſiodorus (16): *His ſunt additæ Orcheſtarum loquaciſſimæ manus, linguoſi digiti, ſilentium clamoſum, expoſitio tacita.* i. e. "To theſe are added "the ſpeaking words of the Pantomimes, their talk"ing fingers, their loud ſilence, and dumb expoſi"tion:" and theſe Greek words of Nonnus (17), Νεύματα μῦθον ἔχων, παλάμην σόμα, δάκτυλα φωνήν, *Their very nod ſpeaks, their hands talk, their fingers have a voice.* Let us not quote any more paſſages, and omit St. Cyprian's ſaying, *cui ars ſit verba manibus expedire* (18). i. e. "Whoſe art conſiſts in expreſſing words "with his hands."

(15) Anthol. lib. 4. cap. 25. num. 8. p. m. 760.

(16) Caſſiod. lib. 4. *Variorum.*

(17) Nonnus, Dionyſ. lib. 7. ver. 18.

(18) Lib. *de Spectac.*

PYRRHO, a Greek Philoſopher, born at Elis in Peloponneſus, was the Diſciple of Anaxarchus, and accompanied him as far as India (*a*). He doubtleſs then followed Alexander the Great, whence the age in which he flouriſhed may be known. He had made painting his profeſſion (*b*), before he devoted himſelf to the ſtudy of Philoſophy. His opinions did not differ much from thoſe of Arceſilaus [A]; and he almoſt taught, as he did, the incomprehenſibility of all things: on all occaſions he found reaſons or arguments

(*a*) Diog. Laert. *in* Pyrrhone, lib. 9. *init.* num. 61.

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

[A] *His opinions did not differ much from thoſe of Arceſilaus.*] Were I to follow punctually Aſcanius Abderites, I ſhould ſay that theſe two Philoſophers did not differ in one ſingle reſpect. Γινωσκεται δοκει φιλοσοφῆσαι τὸ τῆς ἀκαταληψίας καὶ ἐποχῆς εἶδος. εἰσαγαγὼν, ὡς Ἀσκάνιος ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης φησί. *Nobiliſſime Philoſophiam tractaſſe videtur, commentus modum, quo de omnibus nihil decerneret, neque quicquam comprehendi poſſe diceret, ut Aſcanius*

arguments to affirm as well as to deny, for which reaſon he ſuſpended his aſſent after having examined the arguments *pro* and *con*; and reduced all his concluſions to a *non liquet*, *let the matter be farther enquired into.* Thus he was ſearching for truth all his life time; but he always ſo contrived matters, as never to grant that he had found it. Though he was not the inventor of that method of philoſophizing, it nevertheleſs goes by his name: the art of diſputing on all things, and always keeping one's judgment in ſuſpence, commonly being called *Pyrrhoniſm* or *Scepticiſm.* It is juſtly had in deteſtation in the ſchools of Divinity [*B*], where it endeavours to get new ſtrength, which, at the ſame time, is but

Aſcanius Abderites auctor eſt (1). This is aſſerting roundly, that the nature of things, according to Pyrrho, is incomprehenſible, this being Arceſilaus's doctrine. However, I had rather ſuppoſe ſome difference between them, becauſe ſepticiſm does not expreſsly imply incomprehenſibility. They have been called Scepticks, Zeteticks, Ephecticks, and Aphoreticks (2), that is, *examiners, reſearchers, men of doubt* and *ſuſpenſe*. All this ſhews that they ſuppoſed it was not impoſſible to find out truth, and did not affirm that it is incomprehenſible. It appears from Aulus Gellius, that they diſapproved of thoſe who aſſert that it is ſo; and in this, according to the Author in queſtion, the Scepticks and Academicks differed (3); they agreed together exactly in all other reſpects, and gave one another the abovementioned names (4). *Cum hæc autem conſimiliter tam Pyrrhonii dicant quam Academici; differre tamen inter ſeſe & propter alia quædam, & vel maxime propterea exiſtimati ſunt, quod Academici quidem ipſum illud nihil poſſe comprehendi, quaſi comprehendunt; & nihil poſſe diſcerni, quaſi diſcernunt: Pyrrhonii ne id quidem ullo pacto videri verum dicunt, quod nihil eſſe verum videtur* (5). Sextus Empericus has found out another thing in which they differ (6). Arceſilaus aſſerted, that the holding the mind in ſuſpenſe was naturally good, and affirmation naturally bad; however, they were only ſo in appearance, according to Pyrrho: οὐ καλὰ φύσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ φαινόμενον, *non ſecundum naturam ſed ſecundum id quod apparet.* After all, both were equally for doubting; and they might have been eaſily reconciled. They ſhould only have been deſired to expreſs themſelves more clearly and ſincerely (7).

(1) Diog. Laert. lib. 9. num. 61.

(2) See Gaſſendi *in Libro proœmiali de Philoſophia universè*, cap. 8. p. m. 24. See alſo Aulus Gellius, lib. 11. cap. 5.

(3) This muſt be underſtood of the ſecond Academy founded by Arceſilaus.

(4) Aulus Gellius, lib. 11. cap. 5.

(5) Idem, ibid.

(6) See Voſſius, *de Philoſophor. Sectis*, p. 107.

(7) See the paſſage of Ariſtocles, *apud Euſebium Præpar. Evang.* lib. 14. cited by Voſſius, ibid. p. 106.

[*B*] Scepticiſm *is juſtly had in deteſtation in the ſchools of Divinity.*] Scepticiſm is of dangerous conſequence with regard to that divine ſcience; for it does not ſeem to be much ſo with regard to Phyſicks or the State. There is little harm in ſaying, that the mind of man is too much bounded, to make any diſcoveries in natural truths; in the cauſes that produce heat, cold, the tides, &c. It is enough for us that we employ ourſelves in ſearching probable hypotheſes, and in making experiments: and I am very certain, that there are very few good Naturaliſts in our age, but will own that nature is an unfathomable abyſs; and that its ſprings are known only to him who made, and who directs them. Thus all theſe Philoſophers are, in that reſpect, Academicks and Scepticks. Society has no occaſion to be afraid of ſcepticiſm, for the followers of it do not ſay, that men ought not to conform to the cuſtoms of their country, practiſe the duties of morality, and reſolve upon thoſe things, on a probable reaſon, without waiting for certainty (8). They were at liberty to ſuſpend their judgments on this queſtion, whether ſuch and ſuch a duty be naturally and abſolutely lawful; but they did not ſuſpend it on this queſtion, whether it ought to be practiſed on ſuch and ſuch occaſions. Nothing therefore but religion can be afraid of ſcepticiſm; it ought to be grounded on certainty; its aim, its effects and uſuages fall to the ground, the inſtant that a firm perſuaſion of its truth is erazed from the mind. But on the other ſide, this need not give us any uneaſineſs; there never was, and there never will be but a ſmall number of people, who are capable of being impoſed upon by the reaſons of the Scepticks. The grace of God in the faithful, the force of education in other men; perhaps ignorance (9), and the natural inclination which men have to be peremptory; all theſe are a buckler impenetrable to the darts of the Scepticks, though the followers of this ſect imagine it to be more formidable than it was anciently. We ſhall now ſee on what grounds they build ſuch a ſtrange perſuaſion.

About two months ſince, a very able man gave me a full account of a conference at which he was preſent. Two Abbes, one of whom knew nothing but the common rote of learning, and the other was an able Philoſopher, diſputed with ſo much warmth, that they at laſt had like to have quarrelled in earneſt. The former had obſerved, (flatly enough) that he could pardon the Philoſophers of the heathen world, for having been wavering in the uncertainty of opinions; but, that he could not conceive how it was poſſible there ſhould be any Scepticks, under the light of the Goſpel. You are in the wrong, replied the other, to argue after that manner. Were Arceſilaus to return into the world, and combat our Divines, he would be a thouſand times more formidable than he was to the Dogmatiſts of ancient Greece: the Chriſtian theology would furniſh him with unanſwerable arguments. All the company were greatly ſurprized at theſe words, and deſired the Abbé to explain himſelf more plainly; not doubting but that he had advanced a paradox which would turn to his confuſion. Here follows the anſwer he made, which he directed to the firſt Abbé. I will give up the advantages, which the new philoſophy has given to the Scepticks. The name of Sextus Empiricus was ſcarce known in our ſchools. The method he propoſed with ſo much ſubtilty, concerning the ſuſpending of our judgments, was as little known as the *Terra Auſtralis* incognita, when Gaſſendi (10) gave us an epitome of it, which opened the eyes of the publick. The Carteſian Philoſophy has put the finiſhing ſtroke to the work; and none of the ſound Philoſophers are any longer in doubt, now, but that the Scepticks have reaſon to aſſert, that the qualities of bodies which ſtrike our ſenſes are mere appearances. Every one of us may juſtly ſay, *I feel heat when I am before a fire*, but not, *I know that fire is, in itſelf, ſuch as it appears to me.* In this form of ſpeech did the ancient Scepticks expreſs themſelves. But, in this age, the new Philoſophers ſpeak in a more poſitive ſtyle. Heat, ſmell, colours, *&c.* are not in the objects of our ſenſes: they are modifications of our ſouls: we know that bodies are not ſuch as they appear to us. They would willingly have excepted extenſion and motion, but could not do it; for if the objects of the ſenſes appear to us coloured, hot, cold, and emit an odour, though they really are not ſo, why might they not appear to have extenſion and figure; at reſt and in motion, though there ſhould really be no ſuch thing (11)? Farther; the objects of the ſenſes cannot be the cauſe of my ſenſations. I therefore might feel heat and cold; ſee colours, figures, extenſion and motion, though there were not one body in the univerſe. I therefore have not any good proof of the exiſtence of bodies (12). The only proof which could be given me of it is, that God would impoſe upon me, were he to imprint in my mind the ideas I have of body, at the ſame time that there ſhould be really no ſuch thing as bodies (13); but this proof would be a very weak one, it proving too much. Ever ſince the beginning of the world all mankind, except perhaps one out of two hundred millions, firmly believe that bodies are coloured, which at the ſame time is an error. I would aſk; does God deceive mankind with regard to thoſe colours? If he impoſes upon them in that reſpect, he may as well deceive them with regard to extenſion. This laſt fallacy or illuſion will not be leſs innocent, nor leſs conſiſtent than the former with the ſupremely perfect Being. If he does not impoſe on them with reſpect to colours, this doubtleſs will be becauſe he does not impel them irreſiſtibly to ſay, *thoſe colours exiſt out of my ſoul*, but only, *there ſeems to me to be colours there.* The ſame will be aſſerted with regard to extent: God does not impel us irreſiſtibly to ſay *they do exiſt*, but only to judge that we are ſenſible of them, and that there ſeems to us to be ſome. It is no leſs difficult for a Carteſian to ſuſpend his judgment with regard to the exiſtence of extenſion, than for a peaſant to

(8) See Diog. Laert. at the cloſe of Pyrrho's *Life.*

(9) This is a ſaying of Simonides, thoſe men are not cunning enough to be impoſed upon by ſuch a perſon as I. Balzac uſed to ſay the ſame of the young women in the village where he lived. Ageſilaus complained of his having to do with enemies who did not underſtand the military arts: that his ſtratagems were all employed to no purpoſe; and that he could not overreach unexperienced troops. See Plutarch, near the end of his *Life.*

(10) In his work *de ſine Logicæ*, cap. 3. p. 72 & *ſeq.* vol. 1. of his works, Lyons edit. of 1658.

(11) Abbé Foucher propoſed this objection, in his critique on the *Search after Truth.* Father Mallebranche made no reply to it, he well knowing the ſtrength of this objection. See the following citation.

(12) Father Mallebranche ſhews, in an explication of the *Search after Truth*, that it is extremely difficult to prove the exiſtence of bodies, and that faith only can convince us, that there are really ſuch things as bodies.

(13) See chap. 28 of Arnauld's *Traite des vrayes & des fauſſes idees*, where he confutes the above-hinted at explication of Father Mallebranche, from reaſons all taken from this principle.

but chimerical; but it may be of uſe to oblige man, by the conſciouſneſs of his ignorance, to

to forbear affirming that the ſun ſhines, ſnow is white &c. If therefore we deceive ourſelves in affirming the exiſtence of extenſion, God will not be the cauſe of it, ſince you acknowledge that he is not the cauſe of this peaſant's error. Such are the advantages, which theſe new Philoſophers would procure to the Scepticks, but I will not take advantage of them.

Immediately the philoſophical Abbot declared to the other, that if he were deſirous of triumphing over a Sceptick, he muſt begin to prove to him, that truth is certainly diſcoverable by ſome marks, and theſe are commonly called *criterium veritatis*. You may juſtly maintain to him, that evidence is the ſure characteriſtic of truth; for if evidence was not, nothing in the univerſe could be ſo. Be it ſo, will he ſay; I wanted to have you there. I will ſhew you ſome things which you reject as falſe, which yet are as evident as poſſible. I. It is evident that things which are not different from a third, do not differ one from the other (14): this is the baſis of all our arguments; hereon is grounded all our ſyllogiſms; and yet we are aſſured, by the revelation of the myſtery of the Trinity, that this axiom is falſe. Though you invent ever ſo many diſtinctions, you yet will never be able to ſhew, that this maxim is not contradicted by this great myſtery. II. It is evident that there is no difference between *individuum*, *nature*, and *perſon*; and yet the abovementioned myſtery convinces us, that perſons may be multiplied, and yet *individuums* and natures will not ceaſe to be one. III. It is evident, that, for a man to be really and perfectly a perſon, it is ſufficient to unite together a human body and a rational ſoul; and yet the myſtery of the Incarnation teaches us, that this is not ſufficient; whence it follows that neither you nor I can be certain whether we be perſons: for if it was eſſential to a human body and a rational ſoul, united together, to conſtitute a perſon, God could never cauſe, that thus united, they ſhould not conſtitute a perſon; it muſt therefore be ſaid, that perſonality is, with regard to them, merely accidental. Now every accident may be ſeparated from its ſubject after ſeveral ways; it is therefore poſſible to God to prevent us, ſeveral ways, from being perſons, though we conſiſt of ſoul and body; and who knows whether he does not employ ſome of thoſe ways to diveſt us of perſonality? Is he obliged to reveal to us the ſeveral ways he diſpoſes of us? IV. It is evident, that a human body cannot be in ſeveral places at the ſame time; and that its head cannot be penetrated, with all the reſt of its parts, under an indiviſible point; and yet we are taught, by the myſtery of the Euchariſt, that theſe two things happen daily (15): whence it follows, that neither you nor I can be certain whether we are diſtinct from other men; and whether we are not now in the Seraglio at Conſtantinople, in Canada, in Japan, and in every city of the world, under various conditions in every place. As God does nothing in vain, would he create a multitude of men, when only one, created in ſeveral places, and informed with various qualities, according to the places, would be ſufficient for his purpoſe? By this doctrine we loſe the truths, which we uſed to find in numbers; for we no longer know how many two and three make; we do not know what identity and diverſity are. If we ſuppoſe that John and Peter are two men, it is only becauſe we ſee them in different places, and becauſe one has not all the accidents of the other. But the foundation of this diſtinction is quite invalidated by the doctrine of the Euchariſt. There perhaps is but one creature, in the whole univerſe, multiplied, in ſeveral places, by production, and the diverſity of qualities; we make a long arithmetical calculation, as though there were a multitude of diſtinct beings (16); but this is only a vain imagination. We not only no longer know whether there are two bodies, but we are even ignorant whether there is a body and ſpirit: for if matter can be pervaded, it is plain that extenſion is no more than an accident of the body; and thus the body according to its eſſence, is an unextended ſubſtance: it therefore may receive all the attributes which we conceive in the mind, the underſtanding, the will, the paſſions, and ſenſations; there therefore is no longer a rule, to diſcern whether a ſubſtance is ſpiritual in its nature, or whether it be corporeal. V. It is evident that the modes of a ſubſtance cannot ſubſiſt without the ſubſtance which they modify; and nevertheleſs we know, by the myſtery of Tranſubſtantiation, that this is falſe (17). This confounds all our ideas; we can no longer define ſubſtance; for if the accident can ſubſiſt without any ſubject, then ſubſtance, in its turn, may ſubſiſt dependently of another ſubſtance, after the manner of accidents; a ſpirit may ſubſiſt after the manner of bodies, as, in the bleſſed Sacrament, matter exiſts after the manner of ſpirits: theſe may be impaſſible as matter is pervadable: now, if by coming from the darkneſs of Heatheniſm to the light of the Goſpel, we have learnt the falſity of ſo many evident notions, and ſo many certain definitions (18), what will it be, when we quit the darkneſs of this life, and riſe midſt all the glories of paradiſe? Shall we not, in all probability, learn the falſity of a thouſand things which now appear to us indiſputable? Let us take advantage by the temerity, with which thoſe who lived before the Goſpel diſpenſation, affirmed, that ſome certain evident doctrines were true, the falſity of which the myſteries of our theology has revealed to us.

Let us now proceed to morality. I. It is evident that we ought to prevent evil, whenever it is in our power, and that it is a crime in us to permit it, whenever it is in our power to prevent it. Nevertheleſs our theology ſhews us that this is falſe; it teaches us, that God does not do any thing unworthy of his perfections, when he permits all the wild diſorders which are in the world, though he might eaſily have prevented them. II. It is evident, that a creature which does not exiſt, cannot be an accomplice in an evil action. III. And that it is unjuſt to puniſh it, as being an accomplice in that action; nevertheleſs our doctrine of original ſin ſhews us the falſity of theſe evidences. IV. It is evident that we ought to prefer what is honeſt to what is profitable; and that the more holy a Being is, the leſs it is allowed to prefer what is profitable to what is honeſt. Nevertheleſs our Divines tell us, that it being at the option of God to chooſe, either a world that was perfectly regular, and adorned with virtues of every kind, and ſuch a world as ours, where ſin and irregularity are predominant; preferred the latter to the former, as ſuiting better the intereſt of his glory. It will be objected to me, that we muſt not meaſure and regulate the duties of the Creator by one of our duties; but if ſuch an objection is ſtarted, the objector will fall into one of the ſnares of his adverſaries. They only want to have you there; their grand aim is, to prove that the abſolute nature of things is unknown to us, and that we only know certain relations of it (19), We know not, ſay theſe, whether ſugar be ſweet in itſelf; all we know is, that it ſeems ſweet to us when we taſte it. We do not know whether a certain action be honeſt in itſelf, and naturally; we only believe that with regard to ſuch a perſon, with reſpect to certain circumſtances, it has the appearance or exteriour of honeſty. But it is another thing in other reſpects and in other relations. Behold then to what that man expoſes himſelf, who ſays that the ideas, which we have of juſtice and honeſty, admit of exception, and are relative. Conſider alſo, that the more we exalt the power or right of God to the privilege of acting contrary to our ideas, the more we ſhall deſtroy the only way we have of proving that there are bodies; this way is, that God does not deceive us; and that he would deceive us, in caſe the corporeal world did not exiſt. To ſhew a whole nation a ſight or ſpectacle, which does not exiſt out of their minds, would be an impoſition. *Diſtinguo*, (I diſtinguiſh) will it be anſwered; if a Monarch did this, *concedo* (I grant it;) if God did it, *nego* (I deny it;) for the rights of God are quite different from thoſe of Kings. Not to mention, that if the exceptions, you take to the principles of morality, are grounded on the incomprehenſible infinitude of God, I can never be certain of any thing; for I can never be able to comprehend the whole extent of the rights and privileges

(14) *Quæ ſunt idem uni tertio ſunt idem inter ſe.*

(15) I am to obſerve, that theſe are an Abbé's words. I am obliged to give this notice, in this ſecond edition, becauſe I have been told that ſeveral Proteſtants have been offended, to ſee the myſtery of the Trinity, and that of the Incarnation, put in parallel with the tenet of the real Preſence and Tranſubſtantiation.

(16) I am to obſerve, that if a body may be produced in ſeveral places, every other being, ſpirit, place, accident, &c. may be multiplied in the ſame manner; and thus there will not be a multitude of beings, but all will be reduced to one ſole created being.

(17) See the marginal note (15).

(18) Thoſe who hold tranſubſtantiation, place the eſſence of matter in the faculty of receiving extenſion, and ſo of the eſſence of all things: nothing is actual: every capacity is paſſive; now this capacity may conſiſt with ſpirit, &c. which confounds all definitions.

(19) The ſtrength of their Logick, conſiſted in a common place, which was that of relation, the eighth in the order of ten; and by which the Partizans of the Sect ſhew, that we judge of things only by compariſon, which they expreſs thus, *πάντα πρὸς τί, omnia ſunt ad aliquid.* La Mothe le Vayer, *on the Virtue of the Heathens*, Tom. 5. p. 217.

to implore the aſſiſtance of Heaven, and ſubmit to the authority of the faith [C]. As the particulars I relate (c) concerning a conference, in which two Abbes diſputed of Scepticiſm, may perplex many of my readers, I deſign to illuſtrate that matter, in a diſſertation at the concluſion of this work. We muſt conſider as ſo many trifling jeſts, or rather as impoſtures, the ſtories related by Antigonus Caryſtius (d), *viz.* that Pyrrho did not prefer one thing to another; and that neither a chariot nor a precipice could ever make him ſtep ever ſo little backward, or on one ſide; and that his friends who were in

(c) In the rem. [B].

(d) *Apud* Diogenem Laertium, lib. 9. num. 62.

leges of God. I concluded after this manner. If there was a mark or characteriſtic, by which truth could certainly be known, this would be evidence: now evidence is not ſuch a mark ſince it ſuits with falſities; therefore &c.

The Abbé, to whom this long diſcourſe was directed, could ſcarce forbear interrupting it. It was with prodigious pain he liſtned to it; and when he found that every one was ſilent, he flew into a violent paſſion againſt the Scepticks (20), and did not ſpare the other Abbé, for mentioning the objections or difficulties taken from the ſyſtems of Divinity. This Abbé replied modeſtly, that he knew very well that thoſe objections were very trifling, and mere Sophiſms; but then that it was but juſt that thoſe, who behave with ſo much haughtineſs towards the Scepticks, ſhould not be ignorant of the ſtate of matters. He went on thus: Till now you imagined that it would be impoſſible for a Sceptic to puzzle you; anſwer me therefore: you are forty five years old; you do not doubt of this; and if you are ſure of any thing, it is, that you are the ſame perſon to whom the Abbey of . . . was given, two years ſince. But I will now prove, that you have no good reaſon to be certain of this. I ſhall argue from the principles of our Divinity. Your ſoul was created: God muſt therefore renew its exiſtence every moment; or the preſervation of creatures is a perpetual creation. Who told you that God did not, this very morning, permit that ſoul to relapſe into non-entity; that ſoul which he had continued to create till then, from the firſt moment of your life? Who has told you that he did not create another ſoul modified like yours (21)? This new ſoul is that which you now have. Shew me the contrary, and let the company judge of my objection. A learned Divine, who was preſent, anſwered, and acknowledged, that creation being once ſuppoſed, God could as eaſily create every moment a new ſoul, as produce again the ſame ſoul; but that nevertheleſs the ideas of his wiſdom, and ſtill more the light which his word affords us, are ſufficient to aſſure us, that we have the identical numerical ſoul to day, which we had yeſterday, the day before &c. and we concluded that we ought not to amuſe ourſelves in diſputing with Scepticks, nor imagine that their Sophiſms can be eaſily eluded by the mere force of reaſon; that we ought, in the firſt place, to make them ſenſible of the infirmity of reaſon, in order that this may prompt them to have recourſe to a better guide which is faith. This is the ſubject of the following remark.

(20) Compare this with what La Mothe le Vayer relates in the ſecond part of his *Proſe chagrine*, Tom. 9. of his works.

(21) That is, with the reminiſcence or memory, which he would have reproduced, had he continued to create the Abbe's ſoul.

[C] *It may . . . oblige man . . . to implore the aſſiſtance of heaven, and ſubmit to the authority of faith.*] A modern author, who had ſtudied the ſect of the Scepticks more than any other, looks upon it as that which is leaſt oppoſite to the Chriſtian Religion, and *which may moſt eaſily admit the myſteries of our Religion* (22). He gives ſome reaſons to enforce his opinion, and then proceeds as follows (23). *We therefore have juſt reaſon to believe the ſyſtem of the Scepticks, grounded on an ingenuous acknowledgment of the ignorance of human nature, the leaſt repugnant to our belief, and the beſt adapted to receive the ſupernatural light of the faith. In this we advance nothing but what is conformable to the ſoundeſt Divinity, ſince that* (†) *of St. Deny does not inculcate any point more expreſsly than the weakneſs of the human underſtanding, and its ignorance, with reſpect to divine things in particular. It is thus that this great Doctor explains what God himſelf has pronounced by the mouth of his Prophets* (*), *who made darkneſs his retreat: for this being ſo, we cannot approach him without entring into that myſterious darkneſs, whence we learn this important leſſon, that he cannot be known any otherwiſe than in a dark manner, covered with ænigmas or clouds; and, as the ſchools ſay, by being ignorant of him. But as thoſe, who have always profeſſed humility and ignorance, will be much better ſatisfied than others with this ſpiritual darkneſs: the dogmatiſts, on the contrary, who never dreaded any thing more than to appear ignorant, are immediately loſt in it; and being ſo preſumptuous as to believe the light of their underſtanding was ſufficient to pierce through darkneſs of every kind, they thereby blind themſelves the more, as they imagine that they advance forward into an obſcurity which human nature cannot pierce. However this be, I think that Scepticiſm is of great benefit to a Chriſtian ſoul, when it prompts him to lay aſide all thoſe magiſterial opinions which St Paul has in ſo much abhorrence.* He expatiates more accurately and ſtrongly on this in another book (24).

(22) La Mothe le Vayer, *on the Virtue of the Heathens*, Tom. 5. of his works, p. 229. See alſo Abbé Foucher's *Diſſertations on the Philoſophy of the Academicks.*

(23) La Mothe le Vayer, ibid. p. 231.

† *Lib.* 1. *de myſt. pb. c.* 1 & 2.

* *Poſuit tenebras latibulum ſuum.*

(24) In part 2 of his *Proſe chagrine*, Tom. 9. of his works.

When a perſon is able to well comprehend all the ways of ſuſpending his judgment laid down by Sextus Empiricus, he perceives that this logick is the greateſt effort of ſubtlety, that the mind of man is capable of; but we ſee at the ſame time, that this ſubtlety is no ways ſatisfactory; it confounds itſelf; for were it ſolid, it would prove that it is certain we ought to doubt. There therefore would be ſome certainty; there would be a certain rule of truth. This would ruin that ſyſtem, but we need not be under any apprehenſions that things would come to that; the reaſons for our doubting are themſelves doubtful. How great a Chaos, and how great a torture is this for the human mind! One would therefore conclude, that the unhappineſs of this condition is beſt ſuited to convince us, that our reaſon is one of the miſleaders, ſince, when this faculty diſplays itſelf with the greateſt ſubtlety, it yet plunges us into ſuch an abyſs. The natural conſequence of this is, that we ought to renounce ſuch a guide, and to implore the cauſe of all things to give us a better. This is making a great ſtep towards the Chriſtian religion; it requiring us to expect, from God, the knowledge of thoſe things, which we ought to believe, and ought to do: it requires us to captivate our underſtandings to the obedience of faith. If a man is convinced, that nothing good is to be expected from his philoſophical enquiries, he will be the more prompted to offer up his prayers to God, in order that he would perſuade him of the belief of thoſe truths which we ought to believe, than if he flatters himſelf with the hopes of ſucceeding by reaſoning and diſputing. It is therefore a happy diſpoſition of a man towards faith, when he is ſenſible how defective reaſon is; and hence it is that Paſcal, and ſome other Writers, declared, that to convert Free-thinkers, reaſon ought to be degraded as much as poſſible, and repreſented as a faculty that ought not to be much relied on. Calvin writes admirably on this ſubject, he ſaying as follows in the Liturgy of Baptiſm (25); that is, he thus begins his inſtructions for thoſe, who are to be initiated in the Chriſtian religion. *In this* (26) *therefore* God *would have us be humble and diſpleaſed with ourſelves; and in this manner he prepares us to implore and require his Grace, in order that all the perverſity and curſe of our nature may be aboliſhed. For we are not qualified to receive it, till we have firſt diveſted ourſelves of all confidence in our own virtue, wiſdom and juſtice, and condemned every thing that is in us. However, after ſhewing us our unhappineſs, he comforts us in like manner by his mercy; he promiſing to regenerate us, by his holy ſpirit, in a new life, which may be to us as an entrance into his Kingdom. This regeneration conſiſts of two parts, viz.* DENYING *to follow* OUR OWN REASON, *our pleaſure and will; and* CAPTIVATING OUR UNDERSTANDING *and heart, to the wiſdom and juſtice of God, we mortify whatever belongs to ourſelves and the fleſh; and then that we* FOLLOW THE LIGHT OF GOD, *to comply with, and obey, his will, as he inſtructs us to do by his word, and leads us to it by his ſpirit.* Be this as it will, ſome perſons of

(25) It is to be obſerved, that this Liturgy is uſed in the churches of the Geneva confeſſion; and therefore the maxims contained in it ought to be conſidered as the general opinion of thoſe churches, and not as the particular opinion of John Calvin.

(26) *i. e.* By telling us that we muſt be regenerated.

in company with him very often ſaved his life. It can never be thought he was ſo mad as that comes to [D]: however, it cannot be doubted, but that he taught that the honour and infamy of actions, and the juſtice and injuſtice of them, depended only on human laws, and on cuſtom (e). How abominable ſoever this tenet may be, it follows naturally from the ſceptical principle following, that the abſolute and internal nature of objects is hid from us; and that we can be ſure only of what they appear to us in certain reſpects. The ſupineneſs and indifference of Pyrrho was aſtoniſhing [E]. He did not love any thing, nor was he ever angry upon any account (f); and no man in the world was

(e) Idem, ibid. num. 61.

(f) This muſt not be taken in a ſtrict ſenſe; he doubtleſs wiſhed to enjoy health rather than be ſick, &c.

of great abilities aſſert, that nothing can be more oppoſite to religion than ſcepticiſm. " (27). It is the " total extinction, not only of faith but of reaſon; " and nothing can be more impoſſible than to reclaim " ſuch as have carried their wild way of thinking to " ſuch an exceſs. The moſt ignorant perſons may be inſtructed, the moſt obſtinate maybe convinced, and the " moſt incredulous be perſuaded; but it is impoſſible, " I will not ſay, to convince a Sceptick, but to reaſon " juſtly againſt him; it not being poſſible to object " to him any proof, but what will be the groſſeſt of " all ſophiſms, I mean, a begging of the queſtion. " And indeed, no argument can be concluſive, but " by ſuppoſing, that whatever is evident is true, that " is, by ſuppoſing the thing in queſtion: for ſcep- " ticiſm, properly ſpeaking, conſiſts in not admit- " ting that fundamental maxim of the Dogmatiſts " (28)." See Voſſius, who having ſaid that Scepticiſm and Epicuriſm are very repugnant to the Chriſtian religion, confirms his opinion by a paſſage from Clemens Romanus (29). *Hinc Nicetas de ſe, & fratre Aquila in epitome Clementis Romani, de geſtis B. Petri p.* 56. *ed. Adr. Turnebi, in Latina Perionii tralatione ex Pariſienſi editione Sonnii fol.* 596. Ἠκριβώσαμεν δὲ καὶ τὰ φιλοσόφων, ἐξαιρέτως τὰ ἀθεώτατα. λέγω δὲ τὰ Ἐπικούρου καὶ Πύῤῥωνος, ἵνα καὶ μᾶλλον ἀνασκευάζειν δυνάμεθα. Accurate etiam ea inquiſivimus, quæ à Philoſophis traduntur: præcipue illa, quæ maxime repugnant pietati erga Deum: Illa, inquam, Epicuri ac Pyrrhonis, quo magis ea refellere poſſemus. *Nempe Nicetas quidem fuerat Epicurcus: Aquila vero Pyrrhonios erat ſecutus, ut apud ipſum eſt Clementem in octavo Recognitionum libro *, quod opus Græce non exſtat, ſed Latine ex tralatione Rufini Aquilejenſis* (30). i. e. " Hence Nice- " tas, in his epitome of Clemens Romanus, &c. " ſpeaking concerning himſelf and his brother Aqui- " la, ſays, *We have made a diligent enquiry into thoſe* " *things which are advanced by the Philoſophers, ſuch* " *particularly as are the moſt repugnant to religion; I* " *mean what Epicurus and Pyrrho have advanced, in* " *order that we might confute them the more eaſily.* For " Nicetas had been of the ſect of the Epicureans, and " Aquila a follower of Pyrrho, as appears from the " eighth book of Clemens Romanus's *Recognitions*, " which book is not extant in the Greek tongue, but " only Rufinus's Latin verſion of it."

I am to obſerve, that La Mothe le Vayer does not indulge the Scepticks the ſame favour as he did many ancient Philoſophers: the following particulars, copied from him, include ſeveral particulars which ſuit this article. " I deſpair of Pyrrho's ſalvation, " and that of all his Diſciples, who have entertained " the ſame opinion as he did of the Deity. How- " ever, they did not, as ſome perſons have believed, " profeſs Atheiſm. It appears from Sextus Empiri- " cus *, that they admitted the exiſtence of the Gods, " like the reſt of the Philoſophers; that they paid " them the cuſtomary worſhip, and did not deny their " providence. But beſides that, they never acknow- " ledged a firſt cauſe, which might have made them " deſpiſe the idolatry of the age in which they lived; " it is certain that they did not believe any parti- " cular, with regard to the divine nature, but with a " ſuſpenſion of mind, nor confeſſed any thing of " what was ſaid above, except in a doubtful way, " and merely in compliance with the laws and cuſ- " toms of the age and country in which they lived: " conſequently, ſince they have not had the ſmalleſt " ray of that implicit faith, on which we have " grounded the hopes of the ſalvation of ſome Hea- " thens, who have poſſeſſed it together with an ex- " traordinary Grace from Heaven; I cannot ſee there " is the leaſt room for our believing, that any Scep- " tick of that caſt can avoid going to hell (31)."

(27) La Placette, *Traite de la Conſcience*, p. 377.

(28) This maxim was formerly more powerful, when uſed, for inſtance, by the Stoicks, than it has been ſince, that one may aſſert *ad hominem* to Divines, that ſome evident propoſitions are falſe. See, in the rem. [B] above, the diſpute of the two Abbots.

(29) Voſſius, *de Philoſophorum Sectis*, p. 107, 108.

* Fol. 81. 6.

(30) Voſſius, *de Philoſophorum Sectis*, p. 108.

* *Lib.* 3. *Pyr. hyp. c.* 1.

(31) La Mothe le Vayer, *of the Virtue of the Heathens*, p. 226.

[D] *It can never be thought, he was ſo mad as that comes to.*] I will again cite la Mothe le Vayer (32). *I know it is aſſerted by Antigonus Caryſtius, that Pyrrho would not have ſtirred a ſtep out of his way, neither for a car, a precipice, nor a mad dog; and that he was preſerved from all thoſe diſaſters ſolely by his friends. But why ſhould we give credit to this Antigonus rather than to Ænefidemus, who wrote eight books of the ſect* † *of the Scepticks or Pyrrhonians, and who affirms that their founder was never guilty of any ſuch mad actions? They indeed are ſo improbable, and it is ſo difficult for a man to perſuade himſelf, that they might have been oppoſed by ſo great a number of Philoſophers, that I ſhould ſcruple to believe them, though they had not been contradicted by any perſon, and that the reſt of Pyrrho's life did not prove them to be falſe. And indeed it is agreed, that he lived till near ninety years of age, the greateſt part of which he ſpent in travelling; he having viſited the Magi of Perſia, and converſed with the Gymnoſophiſts of India. Is it probable, that a man who plunged himſelf into dangers of every kind, had lived to ſo advanced an age, and that he could meet, in all places, friends enough to free him from ſo many evils, which even thoſe who travel with the greateſt prudence and foreſight, find it very difficult to avoid? Be this as it will, he ought to be conſidered as the founder of a mighty ſect, and one who doubtleſs was conſiderable on many accounts. If there even was nothing to alledge in his favour, except what we read in his life, viz. of his being created* Pontifex Maximus *by his countrymen, this would be ſufficient to prove the calumny of his enemies, it not being probable to ſuppoſe that they would have beſtowed ſo important an office on a man of ſo fantaſtical a caſt . . .* (33). *He never wrote any thing, ſo that we cannot form a judgment of his capacity from his works. But abſtracted from what we may ſuppoſe from his exalted reputation, the ſole privilege of immunity which the city of Elis, the place of his birth, granted to all Philoſophers upon his account, and the honour he received from the Athenians, by their making him a deniſon of their city* (34), *an honour they granted to few, ſpeak his conſpicuous merit.*

(32) Ibid. p. 213, 214.

† *Diog. Laert. Photius in Bibl.*

(33) La Mothe le Vayer, *of the Virtue of the Heathens*, p. 227.

(34) We ſhall ſhew in the rem. [H], that this is falſe.

[E] *The ſupineneſs and indifference of Pyrrho was aſtoniſhing.*] I will give but one inſtance of it. Anaxarchus falling into a ditch, Pyrrho ſaw him there, and would not lend the leaſt helping hand to get him out, but went on. He was juſtly blamed on that account; for he ought to have helped, on ſuch an occaſion, a man, who was an entire ſtranger to him, much more a profeſſor. The reader will preſently ſee, that the maſter knew more than the diſciple on that head; for Anaxarchus not only made no complaint againſt Pyrrho, and did not approve that any perſon ſhould cenſure him for it, but alſo applauded him for that indolent temper, and his not loving any thing. Could any thing more ſurprizing than this be ſeen among the Friers of La Trape? Καί ποτε Ἀναξάρχου εἰς τέλμα ἐμπεσόντος, παρελθὼν οὐ βοηθήσας· τινῶν δὲ αἰτιωμένων, αὐτὸς Ἀνάξαρχος· ἐπῄνει τὸ ἀδιάφορον καὶ ἄοργον αὐτοῦ. *Et cùm aliquando Anaxarchus in ſcrobem incidiſſet, ille pertranſiit nihil ei opem ferens. Idque cùm plerique culparent, Anaxarchus ipſe laudabat, ut indifferenter & ſine affectu ſe habentem* (35). This puts me in mind of a repartee mentioned by Abbé de St. Real. *I could*, ſays he (36), *make the ſame reply as did one of the ancients, who being reproached for having very little regard to Philoſophy, though himſelf was a Philoſopher*; This very thing, *anſwered he*, I call philoſophizing. This anſwer was worthy both of Pyrrho and Anaxarchus.

(35) Diog. Laert. *in* Pyrrhone, lib. 9. num. 63.

(36) Ceſarion, *ou Entretiens Divers.* p. 31, 32. Hague edit.

Here follows another ſaying. Pyrrho maintained, that to live or die were things equally indifferent. Why do not you die then? (ſays one to him;) for that very reaſon, replied he; it is becauſe life and death are equally indifferent. This particular is not mentioned

was more perſuaded than he of the vanity of things [F]. Whenever he ſpoke, he did not much care whether he was, or was not, liſtened to; and though he perceived that his auditors went away, he nevertheleſs uſed to go on (g). He kept houſe with his ſiſter, and divided equally with her the ſmalleſt domeſtic concerns [G]. Thoſe who relate that he was made a deniſon of the city of Athens, for having killed a King of Thrace are greatly

(g) Diog. Laert. *ubi ſupra*, num. 62.

tioned by Diogenes Laertius, but Stobæus preſented it. Πύῤῥων ἔλεγε μηδὲν διαφέρειν ζῆν ἢ τεθνάναι· καί τις εἰπόντος πρὸς αὐτὸν, τί οὖν σὺ οὐκ ἀποθνήσκεις, ὁ δὲ, Ὅτι, εἶπεν, οὐδὲν διαφέρει. *Pyrrhon ajebat, nihil intereſſe inter vitam & mortem. Et cùm quidam ad eum diceret, cur igitur ipſe non moreris? Quia nihil intereſt, reſpondit* (37). Let it not be objected that he would have forgot his maxims, had he been in danger of preſent death. Let it not be ſaid,

(37) Stobæus, *Sermone* 118.

Era fuor de perigli un ſacripante,
Ma ne perigli havea cara la vita.

"When far from danger he was brave as Hector;
"But fearful as a hare when perils threatned."

He evinced the contrary, when in imminent danger of being ſhipwrecked. Pyrrho was the only perſon who was undiſmayed at the ſtorm; and obſerving that the reſt were ſeized with fear and the deepeſt melancholy, he deſired them, with an undiſturbed air, to look at a hog who was there, and who was feeding as uſual: Such, added he, ought to be the inſenſibility of the wiſe man (38). Τῶν γὰρ ἐμπλεόντων ἰσχυρῶς ταρασσομένων ὑπὸ χειμῶνος, αὐτὸς γαληνός ὢν ἀνέῤῥωσε τὴν ψυχὴν, δείξας ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ χοιρίδιον ἔσθιον, καὶ εἰπὼν, ὡς χρὴ τὸν σοφὸν ἐν τοιαύτῃ καθησύχαι ἀλαζαξίᾳ. *Navi aliquando vehebatur & cùm ſocii tempeſtate acti mœſtiores eſſent, ipſe tranquillo animo porcellum in navi edentem oſtendebat, dicens*, oportere ſapientem tali animi tranquillitate eſſe (39).

(38) Compare this with the doctrine of Diogenes the Cynic, mentioned by Du Rondel, rem. [C], of the art. PEREIRA.

(39) Diog. Laert. lib. 9. num. 68.

[F] *No man in the world was more perſuaded than he of the vanity of things.*] He eſpecially deſpiſed mankind, and was for ever repeating the line in which Homer compares men to leaves. Θαυμάζων αὐτὸν, καὶ συνεχὲς λέγων (40),

(40) Idem, ibid. num. 67.

Οἵηπερ φύλλων γενεὴ, τοιήδε καὶ ἀνδρῶν (41).

(41) It is the 146th ver. of *Iliad* 6.

Miratum eum (Homerum) *aſſidueque pronuntiare ſolitum ejus verſiculum*, tale quidem genus eſt hominum, quale eſt foliorum. Gaſſendi ſays that he was pleaſed with this compariſon, becauſe it expreſſed the mortality of mankind; and that fickleneſs of their opinions, whereby they are, like leaves, the ſport of every wind. *Quaſi exinde ſignificetur non hominum modo, perinde ac foliorum natura caduca, ſed opinio quoque inconſtans & perinde mutabilis ac minimo vento ſunt arborum folia mobilia* (42). He took a great delight in thoſe other paſſages of Homer, where men are compared to birds and flies; and in which their infirmities and childiſhneſs are deſcribed (43). Καὶ ὅσα συνεῖναι εἰς τὸ ἀβέβαιον, καὶ κενόσπουδον ἅμα καὶ παιδαριώδεις τῶν ἀνθρώπων. *Sicut & cætera illius, quibus infirmitas & inania ſtudia atque pueriles hominum motus indicantur* (44). I am ſurprized, it is not ſaid, that he was infinitely pleaſed with the following verſes of Homer;

(42) Gaſſendi, *de Logicæ fine*, cap. 2. p. m. 70.

(43) Diog. Laert. lib. 9. num. 68.

(44) Idem, ibid.

Τοῖος γὰρ νόος ἐστὶν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων,
Οἷον ἐπ' ἦμαρ ἄγῃσι πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε (45).

(45) Homer. *Odyſſ.* lib. 18. ver. 135. See St. Auguſt. *de Civit. Dei*, lib. 5. cap. 8.

"The mind of man is juſt as Heaven inſpires it."

It ſignifies, that the mind of man is unſtable; and that God gives them their proviſion of reaſon as a kind of daily bread, which he renews every morning. This agrees admirably well with the hypotheſis or doctrine of the Scepticks. They were for ever making enquiries; were never ſteady; and were ready every moment to argue after a new manner, according as the occurrences happened. A certain Divine does the ſame, if his adverſary may be credited; above all he cannot excuſe his varying, and his perpetual contradictions (46). He ſhews him, that he lays down principles according as he wants them; but that the moment they begin to incommode him, he ſubſtitutes oppoſite ones in their ſtead: and to uſe his words, he reproaches him with *reaſoning from hand to mouth*, and according to the paſſion *whoſe turn it* is to command in his ſoul. And yet this Divine is very peremptory; he denies; he affirms magiſterially and expeditiouſly. The Scepticks were not more reſerved on this occaſion than he is bold. A man ſhould not encroach upon their rights, but leave them the privilege of reaſoning from hand to mouth; a privilege they aſſume to themſelves in Cicero (47). By the way, opinions and paſſions are ſo prodigiouſly fickle, that one would conclude that man is a little commonwealth which frequently changes its magiſtrates.

(46) *Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Savans*, Oct. 1694. p. 72. In the extract of Saurin's book, entitled, *Examen de la Theologie de Mr. Jurieu.*

(47) Tuſcul. lib. 6. folio 273, *D.*

[G] *He divided . . . . the ſmalleſt domeſtic concerns.*] He uſed to carry chickens, hogs, milk, &c. to market to ſell; he uſed to ſweep the houſe and clean the furniture, as if he had been the ſervant maid of the houſe (48). The reaſon of this was, all things were indifferent to him, and he did not think that one thing was better than another. Τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας καθάρσια ἀδιαφόρως, *domique indifferenter munditiem curabat* (49). However, he was not always the ſame man, he being angry one day with his ſiſter; and when ſome one told him, that his anger did not ſuit with the indolence he profeſſed; do ye think, ſays he, that I will practiſe that virtue for the ſake of a woman; Χολήσας τι περὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς πρὸς τὸν λαβέμενον εἰπεῖν, ὡς οὐκ ἐν γυναικὶ ἡ ἐπίδειξις τῆς ἀδιαφορίας. *Cum ſorori quandoque ſuccenſuiſſet, argueretque illum quiſpiam ut immemorem inſtituti ſui, non, inquit, muliercula documentum erit noſtræ indifferentiæ.* The reader muſt not ſuppoſe his meaning to be, that he did not bid adieu to the paſſion of love; this was far from being his thought: he meant, that every ſubject or occaſion did not merit his putting in practice his doctrine, *viz.* of not being angry at any thing. The cauſe of his anger was highly unworthy a philoſopher, and particularly of ſuch a Philoſopher. He was angry with his ſiſter, becauſe he was forced to buy the things ſhe wanted, in order to offer a ſacrifice; a friend who had promiſed to provide them not having kept his word. This we are told by Euſebius. Φιλίστης δὲ τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτῷ θυούσης, ἔπειτα τῶν φίλων τινὸς ὑποσχομένου τὰ πρὸς τὴν θυσίαν, καὶ μὴ παραχομένου τῷ μέντοι Πύῤῥωνι θριαμβεύσαντος, καὶ ἀγανακτοῦντος, ἐπειδὴ ποτε ὁ φίλος ἔλεγεν, ὡς οὐ ποιήσαιτο σύμφωνα τοῖς λόγοις, οὐδ' ἄξια τῆς ἀπαθείας· εἶπεῖν αὐτὸν, ἐν γοῦν γυναικὶ οὐ δεῖ τὴν ἀπόδειξιν αὐτῆς ποιεῖσθαι· καίτοι δικαίως ἂν εἶπεν ὁ φίλος, ὅτι μαλαία καὶ ἐν γυναικὶ, καὶ κυνὶ, καὶ πᾶσιν (50). i. e. "Philiſta his ſiſter preparing a ſacrifice, "a friend of his promiſed to furniſh every thing "neceſſary on that occaſion, but failed to do it. "Pyrrho was then forced to provide thoſe things at "his own expence, and falling into a paſſion on that "account, his friend obſerved to him, that he was "far from following the maxims of his own philo-"ſophy, he not being free from all paſſion or per-"turbation of mind. To this Pyrrho replied, that "women were to be excepted on ſuch occaſions. "Says his friend (very juſtly) this kind of philoſophy "will be of no uſe with regard to women, dogs, "and all other things beſide." The Author, in theſe laſt words, alludes to the anſwer, which Pyrrho made when he was laughed at for running away, to ſave himſelf from a dog. He replied, it is a very difficult matter to put off the man. Ἀντίγονος ὁ Καρύστιος καλὰ τὰς αὐτὰς γινόμενος χρόνους, καὶ ἀναγράψας αὐτῶν [τὸν βίον, φησὶ τὸν Πύῤῥωνα διωκόμενον ὑπὸ κυνὸς, ἀναφυγεῖν ἐπί τι δένδρον· σκωπτόμενον δ' ὑπὸ τῶν παρόντων, εἰπεῖν ὡς χαλεπὸν εἴη τὸν ἄνδρωπον ἐκδῦναι (51). i. e. "Antigonus Caryſtius, who lived in the ſame time, "and wrote their lives, relates, that Pyrrho, to ſave "himſelf from a dog, ran to a tree; and being "laughed at for it by thoſe who were preſent, he "replied, it is extremely difficult to put off the "man."

(48) Diog. Laert. lib. 9. num. 66.

(49) Idem, ibid.

(50) Ariſtocles, *apud* Euſebium, *Præparat. Evangel.* lib. 14. cap. 18. p. m. 763.

(51) Idem, ibid. p. m. 763.

[H] *Theſe*

greatly miſtaken [*H*]. Moreri has not committed many errors [*I*].

(*b*) See the rem. [*E*].

The equality he put between life and death (*b*) has been very much applauded by Epictetus, though, in other reſpects, he had Scepticiſm in the utmoſt contempt [*K*].

☞ For the ſatisfaction of many perſons, we ſhall add ſome reflections to this article of Bayle [*A*].

PYRRHUS,

[*H*] *Thoſe who relate that he was made a Deniſon of the city of Athens, for having killed a King of Thrace, are greatly miſtaken.*] This error was occaſioned by a ſimilitude of names. One Pyrrho, a Diſciple of Plato (52), was made a deniſon of Athens, for having killed Cotys King of Thrace (53). To this is owing the falſity of thoſe who aſſert that our Pyrrho committed this murder, and obtained the juſt mentioned reward (54).

(52) Plut. *adverſus Colotem*; *circa fin.* See alſo *de laudando ſeipſo*, p. 542, and *de gerenda Republica*, p. 816.

(53) Demoſthenes, *adverſus Ariſtocratem*, p. m. 445.

(54) Diocles ſays ſo, *in* Diog. Laert. lib. 9. num. 65.

[*I*] *Moreri has not committed many errors.*] Only five. I. Theſe words, *Pyrrho was of opinion that men did nothing but by cuſtom*, are abſurd. He was not ſo ſtupid as to ſay this. He was ſenſible that ſome Philoſophers aſſerted the natural difference there is between vice and virtue; and that a numberleſs multitude of people do a thouſand things in compliance with the laws. He ought to have expreſſed himſelf thus: Pyrrho maintained, that in reality, nothing was either this or that; but that the nature of things depended on the laws and on cuſtom; that is, that men, by their laws and cuſtoms, declared ſome things to be good, laudable, bad, blame-worthy, &c. This was his Doctrine. If Diogenes Laertius did not mean this, ſo much the worſe for him. I expreſs myſelf in this manner, becauſe his words are not ſo clear, to make his readers believe that the meaning of them is, that *mankind by their laws and cuſtoms, make every thing to be ſo or ſo.* Καὶ ὁμοίως ἐπὶ πάντων, μηδὲν εἶναι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, νόμῳ δὲ καὶ ἔθει πάντα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις πράττειν· οὐ γὰρ μᾶλλον τόδε ἢ τόδε εἶναι ἕκαστον. *Eadem ratione & de omnibus, nihil verè eſſe: cæterum lege atque conſuetudine cuncta homines facere. Neque enim eſſe quicquam iſtud potius quam illud* (55). II. I know not in what author he found, that *Pyrrho did not care to be interrupted in his philoſophical meditations.* Diogenes Laertius does not ſay this, though he declares him to be fond of ſolitude; and he even ſays, that ſuch as put any queſtions to him were never diſſatisfied with his anſwers (56). III. This error is a ſlight one in compariſon of what follows. *It is nevertheleſs confeſſed, that he lived to ninety years of age.* This is ſuppoſing, that a man who delights to be alone, and does not love to be interrupted in his meditations, could not live to an advanced age. Moſt perſons, who meditate, earneſtly deſire to be free to carry on their meditations without having the thread or ſeries of them interrupted; for the leaſt interruption breaks the chain of their reflections, and is ſo much loſt time to them; and when a man delights in ſolitude, and is diſpleaſed with company, thoſe, who let him be as much alone as he pleaſes, prolong his life. It may therefore be affirmed, that Moreri has made a very ill application of the word *nevertheleſs*. IV. It does not appear that Pyrrho was made a Deniſon of Athens: this error was copied from la Mothe le Vayer (57). V. Had Moreri copied faithfully another particular from him, this remark would have ended before now. He ſays, that by the eighth manner of ſuſpending one's judgment, which is that of relation, the Scepticks ſhew, *that we judge of things only by compariſon* (58). Moreri adds to this the word prejudices or prepoſſeſſions; the *Scepticks*, ſays he, *declare, that we judge only by prejudices or compariſon.* A bad disjunctive particle; for the manner hinted at here does not relate to prejudices, but only to ſuch judgments as we form of relative qualities, as weight, hardneſs, bigneſs, ſmallneſs, &c.

(55) Diog. Laert. lib. 9. num. 61. p. 581.

(56) Ibid. num. 64.

(57) See the rem. [*D*].

(58) La Mothe le Vayer, *on the Virtue of the Heathens*, Tom. 5. p. 217.

[*K*] *The equality he put between life and death has been very much applauded by Epictetus, though, in other reſpects, he had ſcepticiſm in the utmoſt contempt.*] "Epictetus had a peculiar veneration for Pyrrho, becauſe "he put life and death upon a level. He was eſpe- "cially fond of the repartee he made (59), &c. "(60) . . . Though he had a high regard for Pyrrho, "he yet had ſo ſtrange a contempt for the Scepticks, "that he could not endure them. He one day ſaid "to a Sceptic, who endeavoured to prove that the "ſenſes always impoſe upon us: who among you "ever miſtook ſo far, as to go to the mill when he "intended to go to the hot bath? He uſed often to "ſay, * were I a ſervant to the Scepticks, I ſhould "take a pleaſure in plaguing them: they ſhould ſay "to me; Epictetus, pour ſome oil into the bath, I "would pour brine on their heads: if they ſhould "aſk me for barley-water, I would bring vine- "gar. And in caſe they blamed me for this, I "would tell them they were miſtaken, and perſuade "them that vinegar is barley-water, or oblige them "to renounce their opinion (61)."

(29) It is in rem. [*E*], citat. (38).

(60) Giles Boileau, in the Life of *Epictetus*, p. 11. 43.

* *Arrian. lib. 2. Diſſ. c. 20.*

(61) Giles Boileau, *in Epictetus's Life*, p. 49, 50.

[*A*] *Add ſome reflections to this article of Bayle.*] That there are people in the world, who doubt abſolutely of all things, and dare not perſuade themſelves that they think and exiſt, this we cannot figure to ourſelves without ſuppoſing them to be diſtracted. The greateſt part of the Scepticks believe many things; for we cannot quite extinguiſh nature, nor go ſo far as entirely to forget what we are: they therefore are endued with a conſciouſneſs; and they not only are conſcious of their being ſomething, but they likewiſe believe that they have an intercourſe with the reſt of mankind, and they accede to ſeveral truths: this happens always when they are not upon their guard: but the inſtant any queſtion is aſked them, or that they call to mind the law they have laid down to themſelves, *viz.* of always thinking in a quite different manner from the reſt of mankind, they then will own nothing; they ſeek for evaſions and intricacies, to puzzle themſelves and puzzle others. . . . . There are ſome errors can never triumph entirely over nature; there are ſome prejudices which we defend with warmth, the inſtant the truth of them is conteſted, but which we do not follow, in any manner, the moment we ceaſe to attend particularly to them: we think, we ſpeak, we act directly as if we profeſſed quite oppoſite principles: ſuch, for inſtance, is the condition of a man who denies free will, who has taken it into his head to believe that all things are mechaniſm, (governed by the laws of mechanicks) within, without, in bodies and in ſpirits; for, at intervals, he will deliberate, will weigh the reaſons on both ſides; and, according to the importance of the ſubjects, and the concern he has in them, chooſes to ſuſpend his judgment rather than determine inconſiderately. He is pleaſed with himſelf for any caution he may uſe; he eſteems thoſe who uſes him well, thinks it incumbent on him to be grateful, hates the ungrateful; complains of injuſtice, incivility and haughtineſs; blames thoſe whom he thinks have uſed him ill; loves to make them odious, and to leave them no excuſe if poſſible; publiſhes their defects, and occaſionally inveighs againſt them with the utmoſt ſeverity. But what a farce would all this be, if all things are mechaniſm! I ſhould think it equally ſagacious in a man, who ſhould compliment the North wind, and quarrel with that of the South, when he ſtands in need of one, and the other blows againſt him. If there is no ſuch thing as injuſtice, why ſhould a Sceptick complain when he is treated unjuſtly? But this ſet of people are ever accuſtomed to contradict themſelves: they laugh at the credulity of others, though according to their own principles, they ſhould not ridicule any one, ſince nothing is ridiculous. Although too ſlight a tincture of the ſciences, and too quick a ſurvey of them had made Cicero declare for uncertainty; he yet, by intervals, is himſelf again; when yielding to the voice of nature, he acknowleges that ſome truths are ſo very evident, that it is impoſſible to prove their being otherwiſe. *Eſt quædam ita perſpicua veritas, ut eam in firmare nulla res poſſit. . . . Quanquàm omnia alia falſa, incerta ſunt, caduca, mobilia, Virtus eſt una altiſſimis defixa radicibus, quæ nunquam ulla vi labefactari poteſt, nunquam dimoveri loco* (1). . . When we perceive that a perſon is quite fixed in this way of thinking, and obſtinately

(1) Cicero, *Orat. pro P. Quintio.*

PYRRHUS, the ſon of Achilles and Deidamia, daughter of Lycomedes King of the iſland of Scyros, was born in that iſland a little before the war of Troy. He was brought up in it till Ulyſſes and Phœnix fetched him from thence (*a*), to take him to that famous ſiege after his father's death; and he went thither, though invited to ſtay by the tears of his grand-father on the mother's ſide [*A*]. The Greeks had been told, that Troy would never be taken, without the ſon of Achilles. He was called Neoptolemus, becauſe he was ſo very young (*b*) [*B*]; as the name, Pyrrhus, had been given him

(*a*) Sophocles, *in Philoct.* See alſo Homer, *Odyſſ.* lib. 11.

(*b*) Euſtath. *in Iliad.* 19.

obſtinately determined to perſevere in it; that he delights in it, and contemns other people; that man muſt be almoſt as mad as he is, who ſhould attempt to change his way of thinking. We might chain down one who ſhould be ſo frantic as to attempt to tear out his bodily eyes, but how would it be poſſible to bind a man who takes a pleaſure in ſhutting thoſe of his mind; who is for ever making an ill uſe of his free will; and fixes, in that perpetual abuſe, his delight and glory? Such a man ought to be abandoned and deſpiſed, ſince nothing can more deſerve contempt than for a perſon to arm himſelf againſt evidence; for what can be more contemptible in itſelf and more frantic, than to combat, with reaſons, the principles of reaſoning? What is it they pretend to conclude, if they have no principles, and if they are ignorant of the method how ſuch a conſequence is to be drawn, as may be reaſonable and worthy of ſome attention? . . . Were we to look upon ſuch obſtinate and prejudiced men with all the contempt they merit, they perhaps would be aſhamed of themſelves, at leaſt thoſe whoſe minds are not yet depraved by them, would be aſhamed to admire them; but a little warmth of imagination, a certain politeneſs of behaviour, ſome ſhew of erudition, and, above all a ſecret corruption of the heart, and the art with which they diſguiſe and colour vice, procures them the acquaintance and applauſe of many perſons not very conſpicuous for their virtue. . . . That man has carried Scepticiſm to its utmoſt height, and his evil is abſolutely incurable, when, forced by ſuch an evidence as he cannot elude without falling into a ſeries of contradictions, he yet refuſes to acquieſce in it, upon the ridiculous pretence, that another perſon will find out ſuch anſwers and evaſions as he himſelf is not able to hit upon. When a moſt obſcure, and moſt uncertain *perhaps* of this kind, ſhall prevail, in a man's mind, over the ſtrongeſt and moſt convincing light; I again repeat it, muſt not he who ſhould continue to attempt to recover ſuch a man, be almoſt as frantic as he is? . . . With regard to ſuch, who, through exceſſive fear, from a weakneſs of complexition, or whom the ſophiſms of ſome prevailing fancy have thrown into doubts, perplexity, and ſuſpenſion of mind; in my opinion ſuch ought to be treated like crazy perſons and thoſe who are oppreſſed with melancholy. When a perſon is preyed upon by gloom, and ſeems determined to brood over it, we ought not to cenſure his frenzy directly, nor endeavour too haſtily to cure him of it. It will be better to combat it at a diſtance, and endeavour to amuſe him with a variety of recreations. We ſhall, at laſt, certainly find ſome auſpicious moment, in which the moſt gloomy mortal will conſent to emerge from his melancholy, and abandon himſelf to ſome glimmerings of joy; and even on theſe occaſions, we muſt not inſiſt too much upon his continuing in it, but rather make him return to it by intervals. He muſt be brought, by inſenſible degrees, to reliſh pleaſure; and when he is a little uſed to it, then will be the time to aſk him, if ſuch a ſtate of ſatisfaction and joy is not better than that of a gloomineſs of temper; and afterwards exhort him to ſtruggle with and gain an entire conqueſt over himſelf. In like manner we ought to aſk a man, whoſe mind is ſo unhappy as to be in an obſtinate ſuſpenſion, if he thinks; if he exiſts; if uncertainty is pleaſing to him; if he would willingly extricate himſelf from ſuch a condition; if he is ſenſible of his being in a ſtate of uncertainty; and when a pleaſure ſucceeds an uneaſineſs, he then ſhould be aſked, if both thoſe conditions are alike to him; whether he is certain that the latter is more agreeable than the former. By theſe trials ſuch a man as we are ſpeaking of will be prompted to acquaint himſelf with that evidence which conſtrains, and that ſenſation of truth which convinces, when a perſon is willing to feel it, and give his attention to it. . . . If the Scepticks are in the right, it muſt be confeſſed that mankind are greatly obliged to thoſe, who have impoſed upon them; and who, after flattering themſelves with the thoughts that they knew what they really did not, prevailed ſo far as to eſtabliſh various maxims, and make them paſs for indiſputable. Were it not for ſuch happy errors, we ſhould paſs our lives without any principles or rules; and there is no light, inſtruction or proof, which we ſhould not be ready to abandon, at the firſt whim that ſhould come into our heads; for of what uſe would it be for us to put ourſelves under any reſtraint to follow what perhaps is good; and perhaps is not ſo? Can a man be juſtly accuſed for quitting uncertain maxims? . . . All that Cicero looks upon as dreadful, with reſpect to mankind, in the opinion of thoſe who deny a providence, agrees ſtill more with the Scepticks. *In primiſque magna diſſenſio eſt: eaque niſi dijudicetur, in ſummo errore neceſſe eſt homines, atque in maximarum rerum ignoratione verſari . . . quorum ſi vera ſententia eſt, quæ poteſt eſſe pietas? quæ ſanctitas? quæ religio? . . quibus ſublatis, perturbatio vitæ ſequitur, & magna confuſio. Atque haud ſcio, an pietate adversùs Deos, ſublata fides etiam & ſocietas humani generis, & una excellentiſſima virtus, juſtitia tollatur* (2). If the Scepticks are in the right, there are no ſuch things as Religion, Piety, Juſtice nor Commerce among mankind; and ſociety muſt neceſſarily be deſtroyed by confuſion and diſorder (3). The corruption of the heart of man is the grand principle of Scepticiſm. We love to make our minds ſquare with our inclinations; and a man who abandons himſelf to the impreſſions of the ſenſes, and the miſleading chimæras of the imagination, which are quite unſetled, never once reproaches himſelf with his own levity, when once he is perſuaded that there is no ſuch thing as a certain rule; and at the ſame time that he lives at random, he applauds himſelf for living conſequentially (4). Addit. by the Tranſlator.]

(2) Cicero, *de Nat. Deor.* lib. 1.

(3) *La Logique de Crouſaz.* Tom. 3. p. 211 *& ſeq.* 3d edit. Amſt. 1725. 12mo.

(4) Idem, p. 232.

[*A*] *Though invited to ſtay by the tears of his grand-father by the mother's ſide.*] Tully informs us of this particular, in the 20th chapter of his book de *Amicitia*, pag. 515 of Grævius's edition. *Rectè etiam*, ſays he, *præcipi poteſt in amicitiis, ne intemperata quædam violentia (quod perſæpe fit) impediat magnas utilitates amicorum, nec enim (ut ad fabulas redeam) Trojam Neoptolemus capere potuiſſet, ſi Lycomedem, apud quem erat educatus, multis cum lacrymis iter ſuum impedientem, audire voluiſſet.* i. e. "It may alſo be laid down as "a good rule in the article of friendſhip, not to pre- "vent, as often happens, in a violent manner, any "conſiderable advantages accruing to our friends; "for, (to return back to fables) Neoptolemus would "not have made himſelf maſter of Troy, had he "been prevailed upon by Lycomedes, with whom "he had been brought up; and who beſought him, "with a flood of tears, not to go to the Trojan "war." Langius declares, that there is either a voluntary or involuntary miſtake here, but he is miſtaken. Here follow his words, which may be ſeen in page 515 of Grævius's edition. *Quod de* Neoptolemo *Lælius ait, omnes de* Achille *narrant. Itaque vel errat per memoriam Cicero: vel, quod potius credo, de induſtria Lælio, ut illa ætate, Græcanicarum fabularum ignorationem concedit: quod etiam in Catone majore factum videmus; tametſi iſte jam ſenex Græcis litteris ſedulam operam navaverit.* i. e. "All authors apply "to Achilles, what Lælius relates of Neoptolemus. "Cicero therefore miſtakes, through a defect of me- "mory; or rather, conſidering that age, purpoſely "ſuppoſes Lælius to be ignorant of the Grecian fa- "bles; which circumſtance we alſo find in the elder "Cato, though he, when far advanced in years, ſtu- "died the Greek with great aſſiduity."

[*B*] *He was called Neoptolemus, becauſe he was ſo very young.*] Pauſanias (1) gives a moſt wretched reaſon

(1) Lib. 10. p. 343.

him from the colour of his hair (c) [C]. He proved himſelf worthy of the blood from which he ſprung; he being valiant, brutal and fierce. His noble military exploits, and good counſels, have been as wonderful, as it pleaſed Homer and other Poets, a long time after, to make them (d). One of his nobleſt combats was againſt Eurypylus, the ſon of Telephus (e). He killed his antagoniſt, and was ſo much delighted with this victory, that he inſtituted the Pyrrhic dance on that occaſion (f). The Dancers were to be armed Cap-a-pee. He was the boldeſt of all thoſe Greeks who ſhut themſelves up in the Trojan horſe (g); and the intrepidity, he ſhewed on that occaſion, freed them from the fears with which they were ſeized. The night the city was taken, he made a dreadful ſlaughter (h); and even cruelly murthered King Priam [D], regardleſs of his old age, or the ſacred aſylum in which he had ſheltered himſelf. He caſt head-long from the top of a tower, with no leſs barbarity, young Aſtyanax, the ſon of Hector (i); and it was he who ſacrificed, with his own hands, Polyxena, on Achilles's tomb (k). He did not behave with ſo much barbarity towards Andromache, the valiant Hector's widow; he took up with ſome remains of beauty which he diſcovered in her perſon, and made her either his wife or his concubine (l). Authors differ with regard to the country he went to after the taking of Troy. Some ſay that he went and took poſſeſſion of the Kingdom he inherited from his father, viz. Phthia in Theſſaly (m): others relate, that he went directly for Epirus; that he ſettled and founded a State there (n). It is ſaid that Helenus, the ſon of Priam, and a good Sooth-ſayer, who fell to his ſhare in the diviſion of the priſoners, adviſed him to return by land, becauſe of the dreadful ſtorms with which he foreſaw the Grecian fleet would be buffeted (o). It is judged, with probability, that Pyrrhus followed his advice, becauſe we find, that in his way, he made war with Harpalicus, in Thrace (p). He married the beautiful Hermione, daughter of Menelaus and Helena (q), but did not live happily with her. Hermione brought him no children, and grew jealous of Andromache, who had had a ſon by Pyrrhus (r). Jealouſy fired her with a reſolution to make away with her rival (s), and to diſpatch her ſon alſo; but ſhe met with obſtacles on that occaſion; and her deſign being diſcovered, and ſhe dreading her huſband's anger, ſhe liſtened with pleaſure to Oreſtes, who propoſed to ſteal her; convey her back to her father, and marry her; and indeed, ſhe had been betrothed to him before ſhe married Pyrrhus [E]. Others ſay that Oreſtes, firmly determined to take vengeance of his rival, had recourſe to expedients much more fatal than the carrying off his wife, with whom he did not live in good harmony (t); and he either killed, or cauſed him

(c) Servius, *in Æn.* 2. ver. 469.

(d) Homer, *Odyſſ.* lib. 11. Quintus Calaber, lib. 7, 8.

(e) Quintus Calaber, ibid.

(f) Heſychius, and Scholiaſtes Pindari, *in Pythion*, Od. 2.

(g) Homer. *Odyſſ.* 11.

(h) Virgil, *Æn.* lib. 2. ver. 500, 550. Quint. Calaber, lib. 13. See alſo Pauſan. lib. 10. p. 343.

(i) Pauſan. lib. 10. p. 342.

(k) Eurip. *in Hecub. Lycophr.* Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 13. Seneca, *in Troad. Hygin.* cap. 110.

(l) Virgil. *Æn.* lib. 3. ver. 219. *& ibi Servius.*

(m) Eurip. *in Troad. Dictys*, lib. 6. Homer. *Odyſſ.* lib. 4.

(n) Pauſan. lib. 1. p. 10. Pindar, *Nem.* 7. Juſtin. lib. 17.

(o) Servius, *in Æn.* lib. 2.

(p) See the iſſue of this war in the article HARPALICUS, and in Hyginus, cap. 193.

(q) Hygin. cap. 123.

(r) Pherecydes, *apud* Schol. Eur. *in Oreſte*, Pauſ. lib. 1. p. 10.

(s) Euripid. *in Androm.*

(t) Ovid. *Epiſt. Herm. ad Oreſt.*

ſon for this, viz. that Phœnix beſtowed this name upon him, becauſe Achilles, his father, had born arms when very young.

[C] *The name, Pyrrhus, had been given him, from the colour of his hair.*] Some ſay that he was called Pyrrhus, upon another account (2), viz. becauſe his father, when diſguiſed in a female habit at Lycomedes's court, was named Pyrrha (3). This circumſtance could not be very well known to the Grammarians, ſince Tiberius, endeavouring to puzzle them with knotty queſtions, aſked them, among other particulars, what was Achilles's name when he wore a female diſguiſe (4).

[D] *He even cruelly murdered King Priam.*] This is very finely imaged by Virgil.

> *Hoc dicens, altaria ad ipſa trementem*
> *Traxit, & in multo lapſantem ſanguine nati*
> *Implicuit comam læva, dextraque coruſcum*
> *Extulit, ac lateri capulo tenus abdidit enſem.*
> *Hæc finis Priami fatorum: hic exitus illum*
> *Sorte tulit* (5).

" With that he dragg'd the trembling ſire,
" Sliddering thro' clotted blood, and holy mire,
" (The mingled paſte his murder'd ſon had made)
" Haul'd from beneath the violated ſhade;
" And on the ſacred pile, the royal victim laid
" His right hand held his bloody fauchion bare;
" His left he twiſted in his hoary hair:
" Then with a ſpeeding thruſt, his heart he found:
" The luke-warm blood came ruſhing through the wound,
" And ſanguine ſtreams diſtain'd the ſacred ground.
" Thus Priam fell:" DRYDEN.

The altar hinted at here is that of Jupiter Hircæus (6). All authors indeed do not agree that Priam was murdered there: ſome (7) relate, that Neoptolemus forced him out of his palace; and that having been dragged to Achilles's tomb, his head was cut off, and carried, on the point of a lance, all through the city. Others (8) aſſert, that he was forced out of that Jupiter's temple; and that Pyrrhus, meeting him afterwards at the gate of his palace, ſlew him. Others ſeem to ſay, that Pyrrhus murdered him near an altar dedicated to Mercury (9). Such is the interpretation which the learned Meziriac (10) gives to thoſe words of Quintus Calaber, Ἑρμείῳ πολὶ βωμόν. Rhodomanus tranſlates them thus, *ad arum Jovis Hermæi*; i. e. " At the altar of Jupiter " Hermæius;" but we ought, very probably, to correct this text, by ſubſtituting Ἑρκείῳ, *Hercæi*, inſtead of Ἑρμείῳ. See Dauſquejus's notes, page 35, on this poet.

(2) Hygin. cap. 97.

(3) Hygin. cap. 96. Sidonius, *Apollin. Carm.* 9. ver. 137.

(4) Sueton. *in Tiberio*, cap. 71. See ſuch like queſtions in Juvenal, Sat. 7.

(5) Virgil. *Æn.* lib. 2. ver. 550.

(6) Euripid. *in Troad. Senec. Agamemn. Pauſ.* lib. 4. p. 127.

(7) *Apud* Servium, *in Æn.* lib. 2. ver. 506.

(8) Leſches, *apud Pauſan.* lib. 10.

(9) Quint. Calaber, lib. 13. ver. 222.

(10) On Ovid's *Epiſt.* p. 847.

[E] *Hermione . . . had been betrothed to him . . . before ſhe married Pyrrhus.*] Ovid (11) relates, that Tyndarus, his grandfather on the mother's ſide, had promiſed her to Oreſtes during the ſiege of Troy, in the abſence of Menelaus, who at the ſame time promiſed Pyrrhus that ſhe ſhould be his wife (12). Sophocles, cited by Euſtathius (13), had related this in a tragedy that is loſt. Euripides (14) ſays, on the contrary, that Hermione was promiſed to Oreſtes by Menelaus, to prevent Oreſtes's killing him, as he had killed Clytemneſtra his own mother. Therefore the promiſe of marriage in queſtion was made eight years after the ſiege of Troy. Sophocles, in another tragedy (15), relates theſe incidents in a quite different order. He ſays that Menelaus promiſed Hermione to Oreſtes before the ſiege of Troy; and that he promiſed her to Pyrrhus during the ſiege. Hyginus (16) has followed a particular opinion; viz. that Menelaus, notwithſtanding the promiſe he had made to Pyrrhus, when they lay before the city of Troy, gave his daughter to Oreſtes; and afterwards took her from him, in compliance with his firſt promiſe, when Pyrrhus went to Lacedæmonia, to require the performance of it. Here we have a great variety of opinions; but this is ſo very common a thing, that we ought not to wonder at it. We ſhould rather wonder how authors came to introduce, among facts or incidents, the plot of a tragedy; and that they ſhould relate, as the hiſtory of Hermione and Oreſtes, the fancies of a Poet, in order to fill his play with incidents and the marvellous. Muſt not that man have very little to do, who a thouſand years ſince ſhould think it incumbent on him not to omit, in

(11) *Epiſt. Hermione ad Oreſt.*

(12) Homer. *Odyſſ.* 4.

(13) In *Odyſſ.* lib. 4.

(14) *In* Oreſte.

(15) *In* Andromac.

(16) Cap. 123.

him to be killed, even in the temple of Delphi [*F*]. It is pretty certain that Pyrrhus was killed in it, but we are not equally ſure that he was buried there [*G*]. He had had three wives; Hermione who brought him no children, Lanaſſa, and Andromache. The two laſt brought him children; but we know not whether the Kings who ſwayed the ſcepter of Epirus, till the Monarch, whoſe Life will be given in the next article, deſcended from the ſons of Lanaſſa, or thoſe of Andromache [*H*]. Authors are divided on this ſubject; they agreeing only in this, that they ſprung from our Pyrrhus.

in the hiſtory of Cæſar and Pompey, all the circumſtances that Scuderi and Corneille relate concerning the death of thoſe two illuſtrious Romans?

[*F*] *Some ſay that he killed him in the temple of Delphi.*] Here is an incident which is accompanied with the fictions of the tragic Poets; for thoſe who relate the various accounts, which are found in writers, with regard to the fatal end of our Pyrrhus, do not omit what is told by Euripides (17), viz. that Pyrrhus, who was gone to Delphi to reproach Apollo with Achilles's death, and to require him to give ſatisfaction for it, returned thither in order to beg pardon for that inſult, and to appeaſe his anger. Other reaſons have been given for this journey. I. That Pyrrhus went to Delph, there to offer the ſpoils of the Trojans (18); II. That he went to the oracle, to enquire by what methods he might get children by Hermione his wife (19); III. That he intended to plunder the temple (20). Be this as it will, he was killed in this temple by Apollo's command (21); and the blow was ſtruck, by a Prieſt whoſe name is tranſmitted to us. This Prieſt's name was *Machæreus*, Μαχαιρεὺς; and thus we muſt read in the paſſage on Euripides's Scholiaſt (22), where mention is made of Pyrrhus's death. Here follows that paſſage according to the vulgar editions; καὶ ὁρᾷ καλὸν τὸ χρηστήριον κρέα διαρπάζοντας τοὺς Δελφοὺς ἀφαιρεῖται τὰ κρέα αὐτοὺς, ἑαυτὸν δὲ κλείσει μαχαίρᾳ. Now Meziriac (23) corrects in the beginning, ὁρῶν, and at the end αὐτὸν δὲ κτείνει Μαχαιρεὺς; ſo that, inſtead of ſaying that Pyrrhus killed himſelf with his own ſword, we may read, that *perceiving that the Delphians, near the place where the oracle ſtood, were forcibly carrying away the fleſh he was going to offer up in ſacrifice, took it from them, and was killed by Machæreus.* This cauſe is aſſigned for the quarrel in Pindar's Scholiaſt, and in Pindar himſelf (24). But the moſt common opinion is, that Pyrrhus's death was occaſioned chiefly by Oreſtes (25), either by his attacking him at the head of the Delphians, after having fallaciouſly aſſured them that their only deſign was to prevent the plundering of their temple; or whether he ſuborned ſome aſſaſſins (26) without being preſent at it. Virgil declares that he was killed by Pyrrhus.

Aſt illum ereptæ magno inflammatus amore
Conjugis, & ſcelerum furiis agitatus Oreſtes,
Excipit incautum patriaſque obtruncat ad aras (27).
" Till young Oreſtes, pierc'd with deep deſpair,
" And longing to redeem the promis'd fair,
" Before Apollo's altar ſlew the raviſher."
DRYDEN.

The ſame is affirmed by Velleius Paterculus (28) and Hyginus (29).

[*G*] *We are not equally ſure that he was buried there.*] For ſome Authors aſſert that his bones were ſcattered on the frontiers of Ambracia. *Cujus oſſa per fines Ambraciæ ſparſa ſunt quæ eſt in Epiri regionibus* (30). Ovid is of the ſame opinion.

Nec tua quam Pyrrhi felicius oſſa quieſcant,
Facta per Ambracias quæ jacuere vias (31).
" Reſtleſs as Pyrrhus's may be your bones,
" Which, thro' Ambracia's roads, whre ſcatter'd wide."

Boſſieu in his Commentary on theſe two verſes juſtly cenſures Caſaubon and Corradus, for ſuppoſing that they were ſpoken of the Pyrrhus who was engaged in war with the Romans; it being certain, from the teſtimony of three Authors (32), that this Pyrrhus had an honourable burial. He alſo cenſures Reineccius, for applying theſe words to a Pyrrhus who was not the ſon of Achilles. Farther, our Neoptolemus was buried in Delphi. Some declare that his tomb uſed to be ſhewn in the Grove ſacred to Apollo (33). Others obſerve that he was buried under the Temple-gate, but that Menelaus cauſed his body to be removed into the ſacred grove (34). Pauſanias not only ſays, that his tomb was ſeen, at the coming out of the Temple, towards the left hand; but adds, that the Delphians uſed to perform annually certain funeral expiations in his honour (35). They indeed treated him, for a long time, as an enemy, without paying the leaſt honour to his memory; ſince they did not honour him, till he appeared in the heat of the battle, fighting for them againſt the Gauls; when they attempted to take the city and plunder the temple (36). Dictys Cretenſis (37), and ſome other Authors, relate alſo that he was buried in that place.

[*H*] *We know not . . . . whether the Kings, who ſwayed the ſceptre of Epirus, deſcended from the ſons of Lanaſſa, or thoſe of Andromache.*] Juſtin informs us, that this Lanaſſa, grand-daughter of Hercules, was ſtole by Pyrrhus, who met her in the Temple of Jupiter Dodonæus (38). He adds, that Pyrrhus had eight children by her, and was ſucceeded by Pialis, his ſon. Meziriac (39) aſſerts againſt him, on the teſtimony of Plutarch, that Lanaſſa was the grand-daughter of Hyllus: now Hyllus was the ſon of Hercules. He obſerves, on the other hand, that according to Pauſanias (40), the ſucceſſor of Pyrrhus was named Pielus, and was Andromache's ſon.

(17) *In* Androm. Schol. Pind. *in Nem.* Od. 7. Strabo, lib. 9.

(18) Pindar. *Nem.* Od. 7.

(19) Pherecydes, *apud* Schol. Euripid. *in* Oreſte.

(20) Schol. Pindar. and Strabo, lib. 9. *vide etiam* Pauſan. lib. 10.

(21) Pauſan. lib. 1. p. 13.

(22) *In* Oreſtem.

(23) On Ovid's *Epiſt.* p. 855.

(24) Od. 7. *Nem.*

(25) Euripid. *in* Androm.

(26) *Dictys*, lib. 6. Juſtin. lib. 17. cap. 3. Pauſan. lib. 2. p. 72.

(27) Virgil. *Æn.* lib. 3. ver. 330.

(28) Patercul. lib. 1. cap. 1.

(29) Hygin. cap. 123.

(30) Hygin. ibid.

(31) Ovid. *in* Ibin, ver. 305.

(32) Val. Max. lib. 5. cap. 1. Plutarch *in* Pyrrho. *Auctor de Viris illuſtribus.*

(33) Strabo, lib. 9.

(34) Scholiaſtes Pindari, *in* Od. 7. *Nem.*

(35) Pauſan. lib. 10. p. 341.

(36) Idem. lib. 1. p. 4.

(37) Lib. 6.

(38) Juſtin. lib. 17. cap. 3.

(39) On Ovid's *Epiſt.* p. 861.

(40) Lib. 1.

PYRRHUS, King of Epirus, deſcended from the preceding [*A*], and famous for the wars he ſuſtained againſt the Romans, was one of the greateſt Captains of antiquity [*B*]. He was the ſon of Æacides and Phthia, daughter of Menon the Theſſalian. In his infancy he was expoſed to great dangers; for the Moloſſi, who had dethroned Æacides,

[*A*] *Deſcended from the preceding.*] See the laſt remark of the preceding article; and the remark [*E*] of the article ANDROMACHE. Lloyd and Hofman have, for want of a due attention, given into this overſight of Charles Stephens, *viz.* that Pyrrhus deſcended by the mother's ſide from Achilles; and from Hercules by the father's ſide. Now this was ſaid of Alexander the Great, not of Pyrrhus. He ſhould have ſaid, with a Roman Author (1), the very reverſe.

[*B*] *He was one of the greateſt Captains of antiquity.*] He was ſo violent, that thoſe who ſaw his ardour in battle, uſed to ſay, that Alexander was revived in him; and that, whereas other Kings were but the copies of that Conqueror, their maſter, in nothing but their purple habits, their life-guards, wry necks, and the ſtrong tone of their voices; Pyrrhus repreſented him by his valour, and his mighty atchievements. He had writ books on the art military (2), which were an indiſputable proof of his ſkill in encampments, in drawing up an army in order of battle, &c. and he invented the art of teaching that diſcipline, by a kind of game at cheſs (3). He alſo foreſaw early, that if providence indulged him life, he would be the greateſt Captain of his age (4). Hannibal gave him the pre-eminence over all other Captains, when he told Scipio, that Pyrrhus was the firſt; he (Scipio) the ſecond; and himſelf (Hannibal) the the third (5). But it muſt be confeſſed that Livy

(1) *Pyrrhus Rex Epeirotarum paterno genere ab Achille, materno ab Hercule oriundus.* Aurelius Victor.

(2) Cicero mentions this, *Epiſt. Fam.* 25. lib. 9.

(3) *Pyrrhus peritiſſimus ſtratagematon fuit, primuſque quemadmodum ea diſciplina per calculos in tabula traderetur oſtendit.* Donat. *in* Terent. Eunuch. Act. 4. Scen. 7.

(4) *Ant gonus* foretold this. Plut. *in Vita Pyrrhi*, p. 387.

(5) Plut. ibid.

des, and killed all ſuch of his friends as came in their way, endeavoured to ſeize his ſon, at that time ſo young as to be under the nurſe's care; but ſo much diligence was employed in ſaving him, that thoſe, who took care of him, conveyed him, notwithſtanding the purſuits of his enemies, to King Glaucias's court in Illyricum. That Monarch gave him an excellent education, and reſtored him to his Kingdom at twelve years of age. A freſh ſedition breaking out five years after, Pyrrhus loſt his Kingdom, on which occaſion he withdrew to the Court of Demetrius, his brother-in-law (*a*); he ſhared with him in the memorable battle of Ipſus (*b*) [C], and behaved there with the moſt ſignal bravery. A peace being concluded between Demetrius and Ptolemy King of Egypt, Pyrrhus was ſent as an hoſtage to the Court of the latter, where he became ſo conſiderable, that he married Antigone, whom Berenice had had by her firſt huſband, before ſhe married Ptolemy. By this alliance he procured ſuch ſuccours of men and money, as enabled him to recover his Kingdom. He ſhared it with the Uſurper (*c*), but did not long ſway the ſcepter in conjunction with him; for Pyrrhus being informed that the Uſurper intended to poiſon him, was beforehand with him; he inviting him to dinner, and murthering him in cold blood, on that occaſion. Not long after he meditated to ſatiate his ambition, by the conqueſt of Macedonia; the diviſions that reigned between the ſons of Caſſandra furniſhing him with an opportunity for it. Alexander requeſted ſuccours of him againſt Antipater his elder brother, which Pyrrhus granted, but obliged him to pay ſeveral provinces for it. Demetrius, to whom Alexander had alſo ſued for ſuccour, came to him very late, and yet too ſoon, he killing Alexander to prevent him, and got himſelf declared King of Macedon. This occaſioned the breaking out of a war between him and Pyrrhus, in which a battle was fought, where Pyrrhus ſignalized his bravery after a wonderful manner, and gained the victory. The inroad he afterwards made into Macedonia would have been vaſtly ſucceſsful, had he not been forced to retire with precipitation, and with a loſs of part of the army. Notwithſtanding the peace which was concluded a little after, he yet favoured Alexander's ſucceſſors, in the deſign they meditated of invading Demetrius

(*a*) He had married Deidamia, Pyrrhus's wife.

(*b*) The year of Rome 452, according to Calviſius.

(*c*) His name was Neoptolemus.

relates this quite otherwiſe; he ſaying that Hannibal having beſtowed the firſt place on Alexander, and the ſecond to Pyrrhus, aſcribed to himſelf the third. *What would you ſay*, ſays Scipio then to him, *had you overcome me? I then*, replied Hannibal, *ſhould have thought myſelf ſuperior to Alexander, to Pyrrhus, and all the Captains of the world.* It will be proper to cite Livy's words, to ſhew whence he borrowed this incident. *Claudius ſecutus Græcos Acilianos libros, P. Africanum in ea fuiſſe legatione tradit: eumque Epheſi collocutum cum Annibale. Et ſermonem etiam unum refert, quo quærenti Africano*, quem fuiſſe maximum imperatorem Annibal crederet, *reſpondiſſe*, Alexandrum Macedonum regem; quòd parvâ manu innumerabiles exercitus fudiſſet, quodque ultimas oras, quas viſere ſupra ſpem humanam eſſet, peragraſſet. *Quærenti deinde*, quem ſecundum poneret; Pyrrhum *dixiſſe . . . Exſequenti*, quem tertium duceret; haud dubiè ſemetipſum *dixiſſe. Tum riſum obortum Scipioni & ſubjeciſſe*, Quid nam tu diceres, ſi me viciſſes? Tum me verò, *inquit*, & ante Alexandrum, & ante Pyrrhum, & ante omnes alios imperatores eſſe. *Et perplexum Punico aſtu reſponſum, & improviſum aſſentationis genus Scipionem moviſſe: quod è grege ſe imperatorum velut inæſtimabilem ſecreviſſe* (6), i. e. "Claudius, copying Acilius's Greek works, relates that P. Africanus was "in this embaſſy, and had an interview with Hannibal in Epheſus. He likewiſe informs us of part "of their conference, which is as follows: *Africanus "aſking Hannibal whom he thought to be the greateſt Captain*; the latter anſwered, *Alexander, King of Macedon, and for this reaſon, becauſe he had defeated prodigious armies with only a handful of men; and travelled, beyond all human expectation, to the utmoſt limits of the earth.* Scipio then aſking, *whom "he thought to be the ſecond; he anſwered, Pyrrhus:* "being aſked, *whom he judged to be the third Captain, he replied, that himſelf was.* Scipio ſmiling "at theſe words, went on thus: *But what would you "have ſaid, had you defeated me? I would have declared myſelf*, replied Hannibal, *ſuperior to Alexander, to Pyrrhus, and to all the Captains that ever "lived.* Scipio was ſurprized at this artful anſwer, "and unlooked for compliment made him by the "Carthaginian, in thus ſingling him out from among "all the Generals, and declaring him to ſurpaſs "them infinitely." The reaſons for which Hannibal eſteemed Pyrrhus are as follow: *Caſtra metari primum docuiſſe, ad hoc neminem elegantius loca cepiſſe, præſidia diſpoſuiſſe, artem etiam conciliandi ſibi homines eam habuiſſe, ut Italicæ gentes regis externi, quam populi Romani tamdiu principis in ea terra, imperium eſſe mallent* (7). i. e. "The art of encampments was firſt "taught by Pyrrhus, no General ever pitched upon "ground for that purpoſe better than he; or knew "better how to lodge garriſons, and win the affections "of men; inſomuch that the nations of Italy choſe "to be governed by him, though a foreign Prince, "rather than be under the Romans to whom they had "been ſo long ſubject." Add to this, that Juſtin declares, that he not only poſſeſt the military virtues, but was alſo very conſpicuous for his probity and ſanctity of life. *Satis conſtans inter omnes auctores famu eſt, nullum nec ejus, nec ſuperioris ætatis regem comparandum Pyrrho fuiſſe; raroque non inter reges tantum, verum etiam inter illuſtres viros, aut vitæ ſanctioris, aut juſtitiæ probatioris viſum fuiſſe: ſcientiam certe rei militaris in illo viro tantum fuiſſe, ut cum Lyſimacho, Demetrio, Antigono, tantis regibus, bella gerens, invictus ſemper fuerit. Illyriorum quoque, Siculorum, Romanorumque, & Carthaginienſium bellis, nunquam inferior, plerumque etiam victor extiterit, qui patriam certe ſuam anguſtam, ignobilemque, fama rerum geſtarum, & claritate nominis ſui, toto orbe illuſtrem reddiderit* (8). i. e. "It is agreed by all Authors, that no Monarch, "either of the former age, or that in which Pyrrhus lived, was to be compared to him; that we "ſeldom find, even in a King or the moſt illuſtrious "men, more probity or a greater ſanctity of life, "than were conſpicuous in him; and he was ſo exceedingly well ſkilled in military affairs, that he "always came off unconquered with thoſe great "Kings, Lyſimachus, Demetrius, Antigonus. Likewiſe in his wars with the Illyrians, the Sicilians, "the Romans, and Carthaginians, he was never defeated, but generally came off victorious. He "made his Kingdom, which was but of a ſmall extent "and obſcure, famous throughout the world, by his "great name and his mighty atchievements." Cicero alſo applauds him highly for his probity (9.) The reader will find in the remark [L], that Pyrrhus knew how to make a very advantageous uſe of thoſe intrigues, the art of which is ſo very neceſſary to great Captains.

(6) T. Livius, lib. 35. p. m. 652.

(7) Idem, ibid. See alſo Amm. Marcellin. lib. 24. *init.*

(8) Juſtin. lib. 25. *ſub fin.* p. m. 452, 453.

(9) *Cum duobus ducibus de imperio in Italia decertatum, Pyrrho & Annibale. Ab altero, propter probitatem ejus non nimis alienos animos habemus, alterum propter crudelitatem ſemper hæc civitas oderit.* Cicero, *de Amicitia*, cap. 8.

[C] *He ſhared with* Demetrius *in the memorable battle of Ipſus.*] Moreri relates, that at the battle of Ipſus, *victory favoured* Pyrrhus's *ſide againſt Antigonus* and *Demetrius*. All this is falſe; Pyrrhus being then, on

Demetrius [D]. The Macedonians abandoned the latter, and declared for Pyrrhus, who, by this means, ſeeing himſelf maſter of Macedonia, ſhared it nevertheleſs with Lyſimachus. He loſt his half of the Kingdom, in the ſame manner as he had gained the whole; the Macedonians abandoning him to join Lyſimachus, who had been born among them. Thus Pyrrhus was reduced to his patrimonial Kingdom; however, he did not ſtay long in it, for being of a reſtleſs diſpoſition, one whoſe time would have lain very heavy upon his hands, had he not employ'd it in invading others, or in defending himſelf [E]; he therefore liſtened with pleaſure to the Tarentines [F], who invited him to croſs into Italy, and there head the troops againſt the Romans. Cineas of Theſſaly, a Diſciple of Demoſthenes, diſſuaded Pyrrhus from this enterprize; but all to no purpoſe, it being decreed by fate, *ſic erat in fatis.* This Monarch therefore croſſed into Italy with a very ſtrong army (d), and finding that the Romans marched forward, he himſelf advanced as far as Heraclea, near the river Siris [G], without waiting till all the confederate forces were ready; and offered to be Mediator to the Conſul Lævinus, who replied, that the *Romans would not accept of his mediation, and did not fear his enmity.* He went to take a view of the Roman army, on which occaſion he confeſſed that thoſe Barbarians did not diſcover

(d) The year of Rome 473, the laſt of the 124th Olympiad.

on the ſame ſide with Demetrius and Antigonus; or to ſpeak more accurately, Pyrrhus fought on that occaſion, only as a volunteer in the army of Demetrius. Hofman commits the ſame error with Moreri.

(10) See Plut. *ubi infra.*

[D] *He yet favoured Alexander's ſucceſſors, in the deſign they meditated of invading Demetrius.*] Pyrrhus was eaſily won by the temptation (10), when the chiefs of the confederacy repreſented to him, that his conduct was far from prudent. He was for keeping ſtrictly to the treaty of peace, at the time that Demetrius ſhould be involved in a mighty war; but this was loſing his opportunity, and giving his neighbouring Monarch time to expect a favourable one for himſelf. Wherefore, (was it ſaid to Pyrrhus) do not you chooſe to win Macedonia from a Prince who is not able to defend it, becauſe of the great number of enemies who will invade him, rather than run the hazard of being obliged to defend your own Kingdom againſt his invaſions, when he ſhall have concluded a treaty of peace? They alſo repreſented to him ſome injurious treatment he had met with from Demetrius, he having juſt before taken his wife from him, and diſpoſſeſſed him of the iſland of Corcyra. To underſtand this, the reader is to know that Lanaſſa, daughter of Agathocles the Syracuſan tyrant, had brought Pyrrhus that iſland in marriage; but perceiving that her huſband paid a greater regard to his other wives than he did to her, ſhe took it into her head to look out for another huſband; and as Demetrius was reputed to engage more eaſily than any other in new marriages, ſhe invited him to come and meet her in the iſland of Corcyra, whither ſhe was retired. He accepted of the invitation, married her, and left a garriſon in the iſland (11). Theſe reaſons were more ſufficient to induce a Prince of ſo ambitious a caſt of mind as Pyrrhus, to violate the treaty of peace. I ſhall obſerve here, by the way, that Antigona brought him a ſon named Ptolemy, who was killed by the Lacedæmonians (12); that Lanaſſa brought him Alexander, who ſucceeded him in the throne, and that he had Helenus (13), whom I ſhall mention in the remark [P], by Bircenna. We ſhall ſpeak of his daughters in the next article.

(11) Extracted from Plut. *in Vita Pyrrhi*, 388, 389.

(12) See the rem. [B] of the art. CLEONYMUS.

(13) Plut. *in Vita Pyrrhi*; but Juſtin, lib. 23. cap. 3. ſays that Helenus was the ſon of Agathocles's daughter.

[E] *Time would have lain very heavy on his hands, had he not employed it in invading others, or in defending himſelf.*] Pyrrhus was inordinately ambitious, and of a reſtleſs turn of mind. Plutarch (14) compares him to Achilles.

(14) *In Vita Pyrrhi*, p. 390.

Φθινύθεσκε φίλον κῆρ
Αὖτι μένων, ποθέεσκε δ' ἀϋτὴν τε πτόλεμόν τε (15).

(15) Homer. *Iliad.* 1. ver. 491.

" Pining at ſtaying there;
" His ſoul ſtill panting for dire war and noiſe."

(16) Plut. *in Vita Pyrrhi*, p. 400.

He was exceedingly well ſkilled in war (16), and executed his deſigns with wonderful courage and vigour; but then he knew better how to win theſe conqueſts, than keep thoſe he had won; becauſe, in proportion as he atchieved any new ones, he meditated mighty deſigns, and entertained freſh hopes, which prevented his taking the proper meaſures to preſerve what he had gained. *Ut ad devincenda regna invictus habebatur, ita devictis acquiſitiſque celeriter carebat. Tanto melius ſtudebat acquirere imperia quam retinere* (17). Antigonus uſed to compare him to a gameſter, who has a good game, but is unable to make an advantageous uſe of it. The ſame thing was ſaid of Hannibal: *Non omnia nimirum eidem Dii dederunt; vincere ſcis Annibal, victoria uti neſcis* (18). i. e. " The Gods did not beſtow all things on one " perſon: O Hannibal! You know how to conquer, " but are ignorant of the uſe which ought to be made " of a victory." This defect is not very uncommon; our age has frequently ſhewn us Generals, who did not know how to make a proper advantage of their victories. God orders matters thus, to prevent a nation from being overſpread at once. A thouſand ſayings of the like import might be cited.

(17) Juſtin, lib. 25. cap. 4.

(18) Livius, lib. 23. See alſo Florus, lib. 2. cap. 6. and the cloſe of the rem. [B] of the article CÆSAR.

Non minor eſt virtus quàm quærere parta tueri (19).

(19) Ovid. *de Arte amandi*, lib. 2. ver. 13.

" 'Tis no leſs virtue
" To keep things when attain'd, than to attain them."

Parari ſingula acquirendo facilius poſſunt, quàm univerſa teneri (20). i. e. " It is eaſier to gain things " ſingly, and by degrees, than to keep all when got."

(20) Liv. lib. 37. See Florus, lib. 2. cap. 17.

[F] *He liſtened with pleaſure to the Tarentines.*] This people fell out very unſeaſonably with the Romans; and afterwards, though they were inferior to them in power, they yet could never prevail with themſelves to live at peace with them (21). A certain ſet of people called *Demagogues*, uſed to blow up all things into a flame by their ſpeeches; and ſo vehement were they in inſpiring nothing but warlike thoughts, that they prompted the people to invite a foreign Prince, rather than conclude a peace. Now what was the conſequence of all this? They were forced to ſubmit to the Roman yoke much ſooner than they would otherwiſe have done.

(21) Μήτε εἰρήνην ἄγειν πόλεμον δυνάμενοι μήτε θέσθαι θρασύνοντι καὶ μεγηρία δημαγωγῶν. *Pares cum eis armis non eſſent, neque poſſent ea ob ferociam & pravitatem concionatorum ſuorum deponere.* Plut. *in* Pyrrho, p. 390.

I am to obſerve, that the Deputies of the Tarentines repreſented to Pyrrhus the ſervices they had done him in the war againſt the people of Corcyra; and added, that Italy was a finer country than Greece. But I am to obſerve eſpecially, that the Monarch in queſtion grounded his chief hopes of ſucceſs, on his being deſcended from Achilles, and becauſe the Romans were a Colony from Troy (22). We cannot meditate too much on the foibles and ridiculous ſuperſtition of great men.

(22) Pauſan. lib. 1. cap. 12.

[G] *As far as Heraclea, near the river Siris.*] Florus, in expreſſing himſelf thus, has committed an error with regard to geography. *Apud Heracleam & Campaniæ fluvium Lirim, Lævino Conſule, prima pugna* (23). i. e. " The firſt engagement was fought at " Heraclea, by Liris a river of Campania, under " the Conſulate of Lævinus." Salmaſius, in his notes on that Author, ſhews plainly that Heraclea was not in Campania, and that Florus has put the river *Liris* for the river *Siris:* the latter being in Campania, but not the former. Now, as it is certain that the firſt battle was fought near Heraclea; the error of miſtaking one of theſe rivers for the other, muſt have occaſioned his groſs error of fixing Heraclea in Campania. See Cluverius, *Cap. XIV. Lib. IV.* of *Italia Antiqua.* He would have us read thus in Florus: *Apud Heracleam & Lucaniæ fluvium Sirim, &c.* i. e. " At Herclea and Siris, a river of Lucania."

(23) Florus, lib. 1. cap. 18.

[H] *He*

discover any thing barbarous in their manner of encamping [*H*]. Soon after a battle was fought, in which Pyrrhus was in imminent danger, and the event was very doubtful. Each side gave ground several times; but at last victory declared for the Epirots, by the help of their elephants [*I*], whose smell terrified the Roman horses. The consequences of this victory were very considerable, though Pyrrhus had lost a great number of brave soldiers, and many good Officers. He remained master of the field of battle, and advanced within thirty-six miles of Rome (*e*). Notwithstanding Pyrrhus's approach, the Romans were not under the least apprehensions; nor did they even divest Lævinus of the Command, though great numbers of people complained of his conduct [*K*]. Pyrrhus being desirous of concluding a peace, sent Cineas to Rome (*f*) [*L*]. The eloquence and engaging carriage of this Embassador had prevailed in some measure upon the Senate; but Appius Claudius, who, by reason of his very advanced age, and his blindness had quite laid aside all concern in the affairs of Government, was carried to the Assembly, made a speech, which occasioned the Romans to declare to Cineas, that if Pyrrhus was desirous of maintaining a friendship with the Republick of Rome, he must first draw his forces out of Italy, and then they would treat with him. The Consul Fabricius was not so unfortunate as Lævinus; and did an action as glorious as if he had won a battle, with regard to the true glory of a nation; which was, to inform Pyrrhus, that his Physician offered to poison him (*g*). A mighty battle was fought near Asculum (*b*). Some Historians affirm, that the Epirots won it evidently; others say, that

(*e*) Eutropius says 18, and Florus 20. *Victor primo prælio Pyrrhus*, says he, cap. 18. lib. 1. *Totam trementem Campaniam, Lirim Fregellasque populatus, prope captam urbem à Prænestina arce prospexit, & vicesimo lapide oculos trepidæ civitatis fumo ac pulvere implevit.*

(*f*) The year of Rome 474.

(*g*) See the rem. [*D*] of the art. FABRICIUS.

(*b*) The year of Rome 475.

[*H*] *He confessed that those Barbarians did not discover any thing barbarous in their manner of encamping.*] Aurelius Victor makes him say, on this occasion, a thing which, by reason of its transposition, has no sense. *Viso*, says he, *Lævini exercitu eandem sibi ait adversus Romanos, quam Herculi adversus hydram, fuisse fortunam.* i. e. "Having beheld Lævinus's army, he said that the same fate happened to him, "with regard to the Romans, as had happened to "Hercules with respect to the Hydra." According to Plutarch (24), Cineas employed this comparison, when he saw with how much ease the Romans recruited their army after the first battle, and the multitude of inhabitants that were still in Rome, after so great a number of fresh levies. It was then just to call to mind the fresh springing heads of the Hydra; but it would have been absurd to entertain such a reflection before the first battle. As Authors seem to have taken an oath, never to agree in their relations, Florus ascribes this very thought to Pyrrhus himself. *Video me planè Herculis sidere procreatum, cui quasi ab angue Lernæo tot cæsa hostium capita de sanguine suo renascantur* (25). i. e. "It is plain that Hercules and "I were born under the same constellation; for the "Romans, when slaughtered, like the Hydra, spring "up again out of their own blood."

(24) Plut. *in* Pyrrho, p. 395.

(25) Florus, lib. 1. cap. 18.

[*I*] *By the help of their elephants.*] The Romans used to call them *boves Lucas*, because, as it is related, they first saw them in Lucania, in the time of their war with Pyrrhus (26). Pliny fixes this under the year 472; and observes that, seven years after, some were seen, in a triumph, at Rome. This seems to suppose, that the war in question continued seven years; and we must suppose, according to Pliny, that it ended in 479. Plutarch says that Pyrrhus returned to his native country six years after his leaving it. Calvisius's calculation, which I have put into the margin, traces the beginning of the war at the year 473, and the conclusion of it under 478. But father Labbe places the beginning of it under the year 474, and the end, at the year 480. What a shame it is that authors cannot be agreed in articles of so much importance! By the way, elephants did Pyrrhus both good and harm. They were of great service to him in the first battle. They were little dreaded in the second: the Romans wounded one, and thereby saw that they were not immortal (27). In the third battle they occasioned great disorder in Pyrrhus's troops. *Eædem feræ*, says Florus, *quæ primum victoriam abstulerant, secundam parem fecerant, tertiam sine controversia tradidere.* i. e. "The same "beasts, which were the occasion of gaining the first "battle, made the second an equal, a drawn, battle, "and brought us off conquerors in the third." Here we have an historian who did not know that he had said, a few lines before, that Pyrrhus had been totally defeated in the second battle, which he confirms again before he concludes his chapter. He had just before related, that the Romans did not leave off the slaughter till the night put an end to it, and that Pyrrhus was the last who fled: and since he affirms, in the recapitulation of his account, that this monarch's camp was twice plundered, *bis exuto castris*, he must have applied the first plunder to the second battle. What then can he mean by saying *secundam parem fecerant?*

(26) Plin. lib. 8. cap. 6. Varro, *de Lingua Lat.* lib. 6.

(27) *Cajus Minucius quartæ legionis hastatus unius proboscide abscissa, mori posse belluas ostenderat.* Florus, lib. 1. cap. 18.

[*K*] *Though great numbers of people complained of* Lævinus's *conduct.*] Fabricius used to say, that this loss ought not to be ascribed to the Roman soldiers, but to their General; and that it was not the Epirots who had conquered the Romans, but Pyrrhus who had vanquished the Consul Lævinus (28). Pyrrhus had before bestowed that elogium upon himself, he crying out; O how easy would it be for the whole earth to be conquered, either by Pyrrhus, were the Romans his soldiers; or by the Romans, were Pyrrhus their King! *O quam facile erat orbis imperium occupare aut mihi Romanis militibus; aut me rege Romanis* (29)!

(28) Plut. *in* Pyrrho, p. 394.

(29) Florus, lib. 1. cap. 18.

[*L*] *He sent Cineas to Rome.*] Any person, who saw the valour which Pyrrhus exerted, would imagine that he was determined to owe all things to his sword; however, such a conclusion would argue very little experience. The greatest warriors have commonly employed intrigues and negotiations (30). It was Pyrrhus's custom to send Cineas before him, in order for him to prepare the way, and smooth the difficulties he might otherwise have met with. Cineas by his eloquence, verified the following saying of Eurypides, that whatever may be effected by the sword, may also be brought about by words (31). Pyrrhus confessed, that Cineas's eloquent speeches had gained him more towns than his sword (32). In my opinion Cicero does not do Pyrrhus justice enough, when he includes him among those (33) against whom the following words of the Poet Ennius was levelled; *Semper fuit stolidum genus Æacidarum belli potentes sunt magis quàm sapientipotentes.* i. e. "The family of "the Æacidæ were ever foolish; and are more "powerful in war than in wisdom:" and only believes that he understood the meaning of the following ambiguous answer returned by the oracle.

(30) See the rem. [*B*] of the art. ATTILA.

(31) Ὅτι πᾶς ἑξαιρεῖ λόγος, ὁ καὶ σιδηρους πολεμίων δρᾶσειεν ἄν, *Omne id expugnare verba compta ferrum quod minax possit.* Plut. *in* Pyrrho, p. 391, *B.*

(32) Plut. ibid.

(33) Cicero, *de Divinat.* lib. 2.

Aio te Æacida Romanos vincere posse.

"O Pyrrhus, thou mayst overcome the Romans!"

I shall observe, by the way, that Cicero employs four reasons, to prove that this oracle was invented by Ennius: I. It was never once mentioned by the Greeks. II. Apollo never used to give his answers in Latin. III. He had ceased to pronounce his answers, in verse, in Pyrrhus's time. IV. This Prince would not have been so wrong-headed, as not to know the fallacy of it. But if it should be answered, that Ennius worked up, into a Latin verse, the answer which had been given in Greek prose, it would greatly weaken the force of his argument.

that the ſucceſs was doubtful [*M*]; and that both ſides ſounded a retreat. Pyrrhus's army was thinned to ſuch a degree, that when ſome perſons came to congratulate him on that occaſion, he replied, *ſuch another victory will ruin us.* He therefore was overjoyed at having a pretence to turn his arms againſt another power, I mean, to croſs into Sicily (*i*), whence Embaſſadors had been ſent to him, praying him to free that iſland from the Carthaginian yoke, as well as from ſeveral petty Tyrants. This expedition was, at firſt, prodigiouſly ſucceſsful; but theſe Iſlanders, whoſe too republican ſpirit did not ſuit Pyrrhus's temper, were greatly offended at him, for not behaving with that gentleneſs towards them as he did at firſt: and therefore, the ſame turn of mind, which had prompted them to implore his protection, made them ſoon ſeek another maſter. In this unhappy juncture, he received, very ſeaſonably, ſome letters from the Tarentines, informing him that they were in the greateſt want of his aid; by which means he had a fair pretence to boaſt, that he did not abandon Sicily, but was obliged to go and ſuccour ſome other allies. He found it extremely difficult to croſs over, the Carthaginians over-powering his fleet, and the Mamertini haraſſing his troops after their landing. It was then that Pyrrhus (*k*), though wounded in the head, ruſhed with ſo much fury on a Barbarian who challenged him, that he ſtruck him on the head with a ſcimiter, and cut his body aſunder [*N*]. The inſtant he arrived in Tarentum, he marched with the utmoſt expedition againſt the Romans, and loſt a battle near Beneventum (*l*); after which he reſolved to return to his country, where, though he had met with ſuch various ſucceſs, he yet could not be eaſy, but was for ever engaging in freſh expeditions. That of Macedonia was more ſucceſsful; for he defeated the army of Antigonus the ſon of Demetrius, and diveſted him of the greateſt part of his Kingdom. He next engaged in a war with the Lacedæmonians (*m*), at the ſolicitation of Cleonymus (*n*), who was diſſatisfied, becauſe he did not ſway the Lacedæmonian ſcepter; however, they repulſed his vigorous attacks with ſo much bravery, that they obliged him to content himſelf with laying waſte their country, and taking up his winter quarters there. While theſe things were doing, Ariſtias perſuaded him to go to Argos, where a faction was lately broke out between that Ariſtias and Ariſtippus; the latter being aſſiſted by Antigonus. Pyrrhus, though introduced into the city by Ariſtias, yet could not poſſeſs himſelf of it; but was forced to fight in the ſtreets with the inhabitants, and the troops of Antigonus; and here Pyrrhus loſt his life (*o*), being wounded in the head with a tile [*O*]. Antigonus treated him with great generoſity [*P*]. Some very ſtrange things have been related of Pyrrhus,

(*i*) The year of Rome 475.

(*k*) The year of Rome 478.

(*l*) In 478.

(*m*) In 480.

(*n*) See the art. of this CLEONYMUS.

(*o*) In 480, according to Calviſius, or 482, according to Father Labbe.

[*M*] *The ſucceſs was doubtful.*] It is not an invention of mankind in this age, for thoſe who are defeated to have recourſe to this ſhift, out of vanity, a falſe ſhame or policy; though poſſibly this ſpecies of inſincerity may be more in vogue now than anciently (34). The Romans did not deny but that Pyrrhus had won the firſt battle; but ſome of their hiſtorians have declared, that both ſides came off with equal advantage in the ſecond battle, or even that Pyrrhus was defeated in it (35). Plutarch quotes two authors, one of whom relates, that the Romans loſt, in the firſt battle, about fifteen thouſand men, and Pyrrhus thirteen thouſand; and the other affirms that the Romans loſt ſeven thouſand men, and Pyrrhus near four thouſand. With regard to the ſecond battle, one ſays that the Romans loſt ſix thouſand men, and Pyrrhus 3505, as appeared from the words of that Prince; the other ſays in general, that fifteen thouſand men were ſlain on both ſides: whence it appears, that Moreri ſhould not have ſaid, that the Romans, in the two firſt battles, ſuſtained leſs loſs than the Epirots. He alſo was miſtaken with reſpect to the date or time to which he applies the following reflection of Pyrrhus, *Should we again be conquerors, we are undone:* this reflection being made after the ſecond battle. By the way, Plutarch's two Authors differ greatly from Eutropius, who declares that the Romans had the entire advantage in that battle. *Pyrrhus,* ſays he, *vulneratus eſt, elephanti interfecti, viginti millia cæſa hoſtium, & ex Romanis tantum quinque millia. Pyrrhus Tarentum fugatus.* i. e. "Pyrrhus was wounded, the elephants were killed, and twenty thouſand of the enemy; and of the Romans, only five thouſand. Pyrrhus was obliged to fly to Tarentum." Frontinus (36) ſuppoſes the ſame number of men to be ſlain.

(34) See the rem. [*F*] of the art. FABRICIUS.

(35) See the contradiction found in Florus, in the rem. [*I*].

(36) *Stratagemata,* lib. 2. cap. 3.

[*N*] *He cut his body aſunder.*] Here we have one of the feats of our ancient Knight-errants, who uſed to cleave aſunder, to the very ſaddle-bow, the moſt daring giants. It is certain, that Plutarch has related ſome actions of Pyrrhus, which ſeemed thoſe of a hero of romance, much more than thoſe of a real hero. He did well to ſtrengthen himſelf with the authority of Homer, who ſays ſome-where, that valour is the only virtue, which is ſubject to fantaſtical tranſports and frenzical fits. Τῶν ἀρετῶν μόνην τὴν ἀνδρείαν φορὰς πόλλακις ἐνθουσιώδεις καὶ μανικὰς φερομένην. *Fortitudinem unam identidem lymphatico & phanatico motu ferri* (37). The northern nations, when Heathens, believed that Odinus, who preſided over wars, breathed or inſpired ſuch a fury, as enabled the weakeſt man to reſiſt ten. *Horum primarius Deus erat Odinus, qui res bellicas dirigere credebatur, furoremque hominibus, quem* Berſerkicum *vocabant, immittere, quo qui correptus erat, vel decem aliis poterat obſiſtere, utut infirmus extra raptum ac debilis* (38).

There is another paſſage in Plutarch, which may not improperly be cited here. "(39) Not only in "poetry, as Plato ſays, he who is inſpired and en-"rapt by the muſes, will make the profeſſor of every "other art or ſcience, how laborious and excellent "ſoever he may be, appear ridiculous: (40) but "likwiſe in battle, thoſe who are animated with a "noble reſolution, inſpired with a valour above the "generality of mankind, become invincible, and "cannot be withſtood. This is a martial fury with "which the Gods, according to Homer, inſpire war-"like men.

"His awful words the monarch's breaſt inſpir'd
"With mighty ſtrength.

"*And the following:*

"He fights with ſo much rage, that ſure ſome God
"Muſt aid him."

[*O*] *Being wounded in the head with a tile.*] A woman threw this tile, from a window, on the King's head. The Argivi, to make a miracle of that accident, and to heighten the credulity of the people, gave out that Ceres, in the diſguiſe of a woman, threw that tile. Leuceas the Poet did not omit this tradition, in his hiſtory of the Argivi (41).

[*P*] *Antigonus treated him with great generoſity.*] Pyrrhus's head being cut off, fell into the hands of Alcyoneus, who carried it to Antigonus's father, who, the inſtant he knew the head, beat his ſon very ſeverely; called him cruel and barbarous wretch; covered

(37) *In Vita Pyrrhi,* p. 398.

(38) *Acta eruditor.* 1690, p. 30. in the extract of Th. Bartholinus's book, *Antiquitatum Danicarum de cauſis contemtæ à Danis adhuc Gentilibus mortis.*

(39) Plut. *de Virtute morali,* ſub fin. p. 452.

(40) Περὶ τὰς μάχας τὸ προθυμικὸν καὶ τὸ ἐνθουσιῶδες ἀνυπόστολόν ἐστι καὶ ἀήττητον ὅ καὶ τοὺς Θεοὺς Ὅμηρος ἐμπνεῖν φησι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, (ὡς εἰπὼν, ἔμπνευσε μένος μέγα ποιμένι λαῶν. καὶ Οὐχ ὅγ' ἀνευθὲ θεῦ τάδε μαίνεται.) *In prœliis etiam animo concitati ac furore correpti ſubſiſti ſuperariique nequeunt qualem inſtinctum Homerus ait à diis homini inſeri.* Sic ait, atque duci per magnas flamine vires Inſeruit, & *rurſum:* Non abſque inſtinctu furit hic ita numinis.

(41) Pauſan. lib. 1. p. 12, 13.

(p) Extracted from Plutarch's *Life of Pyrrhus.*

Pyrrhus [Q], as, that he cured the ſpleen with the touch of his right foot; and that his great toe was endued with a divine virtue (p).

vered his face, and wept. He afterwards cauſed this head, and the reſt of Pyrrhus's body, to be honourably interred. Alcyoneus behaved better afterwards; for meeting Helenus, the ſon of Pyrrhus, he treated him in the kindeſt manner, and conducted him to Antigonus, who applauded this action; and told his ſon, that it would have been ſtill more pleaſing to him, had he taken off the wretched mantle which Helenus had on. He afterwards behaved with great friendſhip towards Helenus, and ſent him, well provided with every thing, into the kingdom of Epirus (42).

(42) *Ex* Plut. *ſub fin. Vitæ Pyrrh.* See alſo Juſtin. lib. 25. cap. 4. Valer. Maxim. lib. 5. cap. 1.

[Q] *Some very ſtrange things have been related of Pyrrhus.*] Whenever he was to cure any perſon of the diſeaſe of the ſpleen, he uſed to prepare for it, by ſacrificing a white cock; after which the patient uſed to lye down on the ground, and Pyrrhus preſſed the ſpleen gently with his right foot. He never refuſed to cure the pooreſt people. The patient, after he had ended his ſacrifice, uſed to give him a cock, which he uſed to accept with great pleaſure. His upper gum was one continued bone, with ſome lines in it which ſhewed the number of his teeth. The divine virtue of the great toe of his right foot appeared, when they burnt his body; this great toe being found entire. This we are told by Plutarch (43). Pliny (44) ſays, that this very toe had the virtue to heal; and that, coming out undamaged by the flames, it was buried apart in a Temple. Is there any doubt but that it was honoured as a ſacred relick? Can we afterwards charge the Heathens with not having Kings, who may be put in parallel with ſuch Chriſtian Princes who cured the Jaundice and the King's Evil? Having promiſed elſewhere (45) to mention a falſity relating to Achilles, it will be proper to take notice of it. Camerarius (46) having related, that Pyrrhus's great toe was endued with a divine virtue, and was found entire and undamaged in the midſt of the flames which had conſumed the reſt of the body, adds preſently after, that Homer affirms the ſame thing of Achilles. Caſpar à Reies ſays more than once, but always in general (47), that Pyrrhus's finger cured perſons afflicted with the ſpleen; and adds in one place, that *Homer ſays almoſt the ſame thing of Achilles* (48). He was miſled by Camerarius; but I ſhould be glad to know who miſled Camerarius. Homer does not ſay any thing like this; and I very much queſtion whether one ancient Author has ſaid it. Pyrrhus's great toe puts me in mind of a ſtory related by the Rabbins, which is mentioned by Agrippa. They ſay that there is a little bone in the body of man, called *Luz*, which cannot be broken nor burnt; and that our bodies will ſpring out of it at the reſurrection, in the ſame manner as a plant ſprings up again from its ſeed. *Eſt in humano corpore os quoddam minimum, quod Hebræi Luz appellant, magnitudine ciceris mundati, quod nulli ruptioni obnoxium, nec igne quidem vincitur, ſed ſemper conſervatur illæſum; ex quo (ut dicunt) velut planta ex ſemine, in reſurrectione mortuorum corpus noſtrum animale repullulaſcet* (49). I am obliged, for this paſſage, to Profeſſor Drelincourt; and it is with the higheſt pleaſure that I make a publick acknowledgment of it in this place.

(43) *In* Pyrrho, p. 384.

(44) Lib. 7. cap. 2.

(45) The rem. [H] of the art. ACHILLEA, about the end of it.

(46) *Horar. Succiſivar.* Centur. 3. cap. 42.

(47) He never ſays that it was the great toe of the right foot. See his *Elyſius Campus*, Quæſt. 24. num. 4. and num. 31. and Quæſt. 28. num. 24 and 26.

(48) Quæſt. 28. num. 26.

(49) Agrippa, *de occulta Philoſophia*, lib. 1. cap. 20. p. m. 32. See the rem. [K] of the art. BARCOCHEBAS, and citat. (42) of the art. NIHUSIUS.

PYRRHUS, King of Epirus, grandſon of the preceding, ſucceeded his father Alexander, and was at firſt under the guardianſhip of his mother Olympias. His minority encouraged the Ætolians ſo as to be unjuſt enough to ſeize upon a part of Acarnania. It was the part which fell to his father's ſhare, when they divided between them the conqueſts they had made. Olympias applied to Demetrius, King of Macedonia: and ſhe gave him her daughter Phthia in marriage, in order to determine him to aſſiſt her effectually. The Hiſtorian (a) leaves us here, without acquainting us with any other conſequences of the attempt of the Ætolians, but the irruption they made on the borders of the Kingdom in the reign of Ptolemy, the brother and ſucceſſor of our Pyrrhus. There muſt be ſomething omitted or wanting here; for there paſſed, no doubt, ſome years between the minority of Pyrrhus and his death. However it be, the Princeſs Olympias had recourſe to too violent means, when ſhe deſigned to put a ſtop to an amorous intrigue of her ſon; for ſhe cauſed his miſtreſs to be poiſoned (b) [A]. Ptolemy, who ſucceeded to his brother Pyrrhus, did not ſurvive him long. Their mother followed them ſoon after, being overwhelmed with grief at the death of her two ſons. There remained but two Princeſſes of the Royal Family, Nereis and Deidamia, the ſiſters of Olympias (c), and the daughters of Pyrrhus, the grand-father of him who is the ſubject of this article. Nereis married Gelon, King of Sicily, and Deidamia was murthered near the altar of Diana, during a ſedition. The Gods, in order to puniſh that crime, afflicted the people of Epirus ſo many different ways, that they were almoſt entirely deſtroyed by famine, and by civil and foreign wars (d).

(a) Juſtin, lib. 28. cap. 1. & *ſeq.*

(b) *Athen.* lib. 13. p. 589.

(c) She had married her brother Alexander. See Juſtin, lib. 28. cap. 1. & *ſeq.*

(d) Juſtin, *ubi ſupra.*

[A] *His mother cauſed his miſtreſs to be poiſoned.*] She was of Leucas, and named Tygris (1). Monſieur Boiſſieu (2) exploding all the other explications, which have been given of theſe two lines of Ovid;

Utque nepos dicti, noſtro modo carmine, regis
Cantharidum ſuccos dante parente bibas,

i. e. "That like the grandſon of the King, we have "juſt now mentioned in this Poem, you may ſwallow "the poiſon, adminiſtered to you by your mother." Monſieur Boiſſieu, I ſay, conjectures that our Pyrrhus is meant here, and that his mother Olympias did not ſpare him more than ſhe did his concubine Tygris. If it be ſo, Juſtin was very ſimple to aſcribe the death of that Princeſs to her grief for the loſs of her two ſons. One ought not to give ſo honourable a name to the cruel remorſe of conſcience, which ſhould torture a mother, who had put her own ſon to death.

(1) *Athen.* lib. 13. p. 589.

(2) *In* Ibin, p. 65.

PYTHAGORAS, the firſt of the ancient Sages, who took the title of Philoſopher [A]. He flouriſhed in the time of Tarquin, the laſt King of Rome, and not in the time

[A] *He is the firſt who took the title of Philoſopher.*] Before his time, they who excelled in the knowledge of nature, or who made themſelves commendable by an exemplary life, were ſtyled ſages, σοφοὶ, or wiſe men. Pythagoras thinking that title had ſomething too haughty in it, took another by which he hinted, that he did not pretend to be already poſſeſſed of wiſdom, but only deſired to attain it. He ſtyled himſelf therefore a Philoſopher, that is to ſay, a lover of wiſdom; ſince which time that name has conſtantly been

time of Numa [B], as ſeveral Authors pretend. He gained a very great reputation by

been given to the profeſſors of natural and moral ſciences. Cicero tells us where that new title firſt took its riſe, the occaſion which gave it birth, and what it ſignifies. *A quibus ducti deinceps omnes, qui in rerum contemplatione ſtudia ponebant, ſapientes & habebantur, & nominabantur: idque eorum nomen uſque ad Pythagoræ manavit ætatem: quem, ut ſcribit auditor Platonis Ponticus Heraclides, vir doctus in primis, Phliuntem ferunt veniſſe, eumque cum Leonte, Principe Phliaſiorum, doctè, & copiosè diſſeruiſſe quædam: cujus ingenium, & eloquentiam cùm admiratus eſſet Leon, quæſiviſſe ex eo, qua maximè arte confideret: at* illum *artem* quidem ſe ſcire nullam, ſed eſſe philoſophum: *admiratum Leontem novitatem nominis, quæſiſſe*, quinam eſſent Philoſophi, & quod inter eos, & reliquos intereſſet, *Pythagoram autem reſpondiſſe, SIMILEM ſibi videri vitam hominum, & mercatum eum, qui haberetur maximo ludorum apparatu totius Græciæ celebritate: nam ut illuc alii corporibus exercitatis gloriam, & nobilitatem coronæ peterent: alii emendi, aut vendendi quæſtu, & lucro ducerentur: eſſet autem quoddam genus eorum, idque vel maximè ingenuum, qui nec plauſum, nec lucrum quærerent, ſed viſendi cauſa venirent, ſtudioſeque perſpicerent, quid ageretur, & quo modo: item nos quaſi in mercatus quandam celebritatem ex urbe aliqua, ſic in hanc vitam ex alia vita, & natura profectos; alios gloriæ ſervire, alios pecuniæ: raros eſſe quoſdam, qui, cæteris omnibus pro nihilo habitis, rerum naturam ſtudioſè intuerentur: hos ſe appellare ſapientiæ ſtudioſos, id eſt philoſophos: & ut illic liberaliſſimum eſſet, ſpectare, nihil ſibi acquirentem, ſic in vita longè omnibus ſtudiis contemplationem rerum, cognitionemque præſtare. Nec verò Pythagoras nominis ſolùm inventor, ſed rerum etiam ipſarum amplificator fuit* (1). i. e. " After whom all they who applied themſelves to the ſtudy of nature, were held and called " wiſe men; which appellation they went by till the " time of Pythagoras, who, as Heraclides Ponticus, " a moſt learned man, and a Diſciple of Plato, writes, " came to Phlius, where he reaſoned learnedly and " fully upon ſome ſubjects with Leon Prince of " Phlius: who admiring his genius and eloquence, " aſked him to what art he chiefly truſted. Pythagoras anſwered, that *he knew no art, but that he was a Philoſopher* (a lover of wiſdom) Leon being then ſurprized at the novelty of the name, aſked him *who the Philoſophers were, and wherein they differed from the reſt of mankind.* Pythagoras replied, that the life of man ſeemed to him like that fair, to which all Greece reſorted, and in which all manner of games were celebrated; for as there ſome endeavoured to diſtinguiſh themſelves, and to win a prize by bodily exerciſes, and others by buying and ſelling had no other view but to get money; and others again, the moſt noble and generous of all, ſought neither applauſe nor love, but came only to ſee the ſhews, and to examine carefully what was done, and how it was performed: ſo we men come into this life from another life and ſtation, as it were out of ſome city to a fair; ſome aim at great reputation, others want to get money; ſome few there are, who reckoning all other things for nothing, apply themſelves diligently to the contemplation of nature: theſe he called the lovers of wiſdom, that is to ſay, Philoſophers. And as in a fair it is moſt generous to be a ſpectator, without pretending to get any thing for one's ſelf; ſo in this life the contemplation and knowledge of things is much preferable to all other ſtudies. Now Pythagoras was not only the inventor of that name, but he has alſo very much improved the knowledge of things themſelves."

(1) Cicero, *Tuſculan. Quæſt.* lib. 5. cap. 3. Diog. Laert. relates almoſt the ſame thing. See him in *Proœmio*, num. 12. where he quotes Heraclides Ponticus, ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς ἀπνοίας, *in libro de fœmina ſeptem diebus exanimi*, in the book concerning the woman who was ſeven days ſenſeleſs. He obſerves, that that diſcourſe was held at Sicyon. See alſo what he relates in the *Life of Pythagoras*, where he quotes Soſicrates *in* Succeſſionibus.

[B] *He flouriſhed in the time of Tarquin . . . . and not in the time of Numa.*] We cannot aſcertain on what day the name of Philoſopher was firſt uſed; we do not even know in what year it was. We are only told that Pythagoras had that diſcourſe before he went into Italy (2); and the time he went thither is mentioned only in general terms. It was, we are told, under the reign of Tarquin (3). *Hanc opinionem* (De Immortalitate Animæ) *Diſcipulus ejus* (4) *Pythagoras maxime confirmavit, qui cum regnante Tarquinio Superbo in Italiam veniſſet, tenuit magnam illam Græciam cum honore et diſciplina, tum etiam auctoritate.* i. e. " That opinion of the Immortality of " the Soul has been ſtrongly confirmed by his (Pherecydes's) Diſciple Pythagoras, who being come " into Italy under the reign of Tarquin the Proud, " taught there with reputation and learning, and " alſo with great authority." (5) *Pythagoras fuit in Italia temporibus iiſdem quibus L. Brutus patriam liberavit.* i. e. " Pythagoras was in Italy at the time " when L. Brutus delivered his country from tyranny." The miſtake of thoſe, who have aſſerted that he went into Italy in the time of Numa (6), is very glorious for him, for they fell into that miſtake for no other reaſon, but becauſe they imagined Numa could not have been ſo able a man, and ſo much a Philoſopher as he was, had he not been a Diſciple of Pythagoras. *Quinetiam arbitror*, ſays Cicero, *propter Pythagoreorum admirationem, Numam quoque regem, Pythagoreum à poſterioribus exiſtimatum: nam cùm Pythagoræ diſciplinam, & inſtituta cognoſcerent, regiſque ejus æquitatem, & ſapientiam à majoribus ſuis accepiſſent, ætates autem & tempora ignorarent, propter vetuſtatem, eum, qui ſapientia excelleret, Pythagoræ auditorem fuiſſe crediderunt* (7). i. e. " I am apt to think, that becauſe the Pythagoreans were very much admired, King Numa " was thought by poſterity to have been of that ſect: " for being acquainted with Pythagoras's doctrine " and precepts, and having learnt from their anceſtors " how juſt and wiſe that King had been, and not " being well ſkilled in Chronology, becauſe of the " remoteneſs of the times, they imagined that a " man, who excelled in wiſdom, muſt have been a " ſcholar of Pythagoras." Take notice, that Cicero only uſes ſlight conjectures, when he endeavours to perſuade us, that the Romans were acquainted with the tenets and with the reputation of Pythagoras (8). He would not have ſpoke thus, if Pythagoras had been honoured with the right of a Roman citizen, as Epicharmus relates he was (9). Let us obſerve by the by, that the Romans, being ordered by one oracle to ſet up a ſtatue to the braveſt, and to the wiſeſt man of Greece, erected one to the honour of Alcibiades, and another to the honour of Pythagoras (10). Pliny tells us at what time this was done. *Invenio*, ſays he (11), *& Pythagoræ & Alcibiadi, in cornibus Comitii poſitas, cum bello* (12) *Samniti Apollo Pythius fortiſſimo Graiæ gentis juſſiſſet & alteri ſapientiſſimo, ſimulacra celebri loco dicari: ea ſtetere donec Sylla Dictator ibi Curiam faceret. Mirumque eſt, illos patres Socrati cunctis ab eodem Deo ſapientia prælato Pythagoram prætuliſſe, aut tot aliis virtute Alcibiadem, aut quenquam utroque Themiſtocli.* i. e. " I find that there were two ſtatues erected " in the corners of the market-place, the one to " Pythagoras, and the other to Alcibiades, when, " during the war with the Samnites, the Pythian " Apollo had ordered to ſet up two ſtatues in a " publick place, the one to the wiſeſt man of " Greece, and the other to the braveſt. Theſe " ſtatues ſtood there till Sylla the Dictator built " a Court-hall in that place. I wonder that the " Senators preferred Pythagoras before Socrates, who " had been declared, by the ſame God, the wiſeſt " of all men; and as to courage, that they choſe " Alcibiades before ſo many other brave men, or " even that in both reſpects they preferred any to " Themiſtocles." Pliny wonders, you ſee, that the Romans choſe Pythagoras rather than Socrates. But how did he know that they were acquainted with the oracle given in Socrates's favour? After all, it will be found that they choſe the beſt. They may alſo be juſtified by theſe two reaſons (13). They were leſs acquainted with Socrates than with Pythagoras, for the latter had taught a long time in Italy with great reputation; and they were prepoſſeſſed in Pythagoras's favour, becauſe they imagined that Numa had been his diſciple. This was the vulgar opinion; and though it were falſe, yet the Magiſtrates fomented it. This appeared when it was pretended Numa's tomb was found out with his books (14); for it was divulged abroad, that theſe books related to the Pythagorean Philoſophy. *Adjicit Valerius Antias libros Pythagoricos fuiſſe: vulgatæ opinioni qua creditur Pythagoræ auditorem fuiſſe Numam: mendacio*

(2) *Qui cum poſt hunc Phliaſium Sermonem in Italiam veniſſet, exornavit eam Græciam, quæ magna dicta eſt, & privatim & publice, præſtantiſſimis & inſtitutis & artibus.* Cicero, *Tuſculan. Quæſt.* lib. 5. cap. 4.

(3) Idem, *Tuſculan.* lib. 1. cap. 16.

(4) That is to ſay, of Pherecydes.

(5) Cicero, *Tuſculan.* lib. 4. cap. 1.

(6) Ovid has followed that falſe tradition in the 15th book of his *Metam.*

(7) Idem, Cicero, *Tuſculan.* lib. 4. *init.*

(8) Idem, ibid.

(9) Plut. *in* Numa, p. 65.

(10) Idem, ibid.

(11) Plin. lib. 34. cap. 6. p. m. 99.

(12) That war began in the year 411 of Rome, and laſted a long time.

(13) Voſſius, *de Philoſoph.* ſect. p. m. 39, urges theſe reaſons.

(14) 555 years ſince the beginning of his reign. Plin. lib. 13. cap. 13. and not, about 400 years after his death, as Plut. aſſerts, *in* Numa, p. 74.

by his wiſdom, and by his virtue, and laboured ſucceſsfully to reform and inſtruct the world. His eloquence muſt have been very powerful, ſince by his exhortations he perſuaded the inhabitants of a great city, who were abandoned to an exceſſive diſſoluteneſs, to forſake their luxury and intemperance, and to live according to the rules of virtue (*a*). He prevailed even with the Ladies, to leave off their fine dreſſes, and all their ornaments [*C*], and to make a ſacrifice of them to the chief Deity of the place. He perſuaded his Diſciples to practiſe the moſt difficult things; ſince he made them ſubmit to

(*a*) Juſtin, lib. 20. cap. 4. I give his words in the rem. [*C*].

dacio probabili accommodata fide (15). i. e. "Valerius "Antias adds that they were Pythagorean books, "according to the opinion of the vulgar, who be"lieved that Numa was Pythagoras's diſciple; thus "credit was given to a probable falſity." Caſſius Hemina, and Lucius Piſo followed that vulgar opinion in their writings (16). If I be aſked, why the Romans choſe rather to believe that Numa was Pythagoras's ſcholar, than to give Italy the glory of producing ſo wiſe a King, who owed his philoſophy to the lectures of no foreigner whatſoever; I anſwer, 1. That in all likelihood they did not think of the intereſt of their own country, when they firſt gave riſe to that opinion. 2. They thought perhaps that the great merit of that Prince would be the eaſier credited, if it were ſuppoſed that he had ſo celebrated a man for his tutor. Would it have been eaſily believed, that a Barbarian could arrive at ſo high a degree of capacity, without the aſſiſtance of the Greeks? St. Auguſtin would eaſily have been perſuaded, that Numa was one of Pythagoras's diſciples; for he aſſerts that Thales lived in the reign of Romulus (17). Now we know that Thales and Pherecydes were contemporaries, and that Pythagoras was the diſciple of Pherecydes; ſome even pretend that Thales was alſo the diſciple of Pherecydes (18). It is certain at leaſt, that Anaximander, the diſciple of Thales, and Pythagoras lived in the ſame time (19). None of the commentators upon Diogenes Laertius give us notice of the erroneous tranſlation of theſe words. Φιλοσοφίας δὲ δύο γεγόνασι διαδοχαὶ, ἥ τε ἀπὸ Ἀναξιμάνδρου, καὶ ἡ ἀπὸ Πυθαγόρου. τῆ μὲν, Θαλῆ διακηκοότος (20). i. e. "There have been two ſucceſſions, "or ſects of Philoſophy, the one from Anaximander, "and the other from Pythagoras: Thales was A"naximander's diſciple." It is plain, that the Greek words ſignify, not that Thales was the diſciple of Anaximander, but on the contrary, that Anaximander was the diſciple of Thales.

Let us conclude this remark with a paſſage from Pliny (21), in which it is aſſerted, that Pythagoras was in Egypt, when Semneſerteus reigned there. This ſeems to be inconſiſtent with what others relate, namely that Pythagoras went into Egypt with letters of recommendation from Polycrates Tyrant of Samos, to Amaſis King of Egypt. This is aſſerted by Diogenes Laertius (22). Father Hardouin imagined (23) he could remove that difficulty, by ſuppoſing that Pythagoras went into Egypt under the reign of Amaſis, and continued ſo long in that country, that he was there even when Amaſis died, and in the reign of his ſucceſſor Semneſerteus. But that ſuppoſition is contradicted by Herodotus, who tells us that Cambyſes conquered Egypt ſix months after the death of Amaſis, to whom his ſon Pſammenitus had ſucceeded (24). One might perhaps ſay indeed, that the name of Pſammenitus was by degrees changed into that of Semneſerteus; and it muſt be obſerved that it ſeems Pythagoras was in Egypt when Cambyſes conquered it; for it ſeems that he was one of thoſe ſlaves, whom that monarch cauſed to be tranſported into Perſia. This could not be proved better than by a paſſage from Apuleius; but one would be obliged to correct it a little, and to change the word *Ægyptum* (to Egypt) into *Ægypto* (from Egypt) which would render the author's thought a little too perplexed. It is therefore better to ſay, that from that paſſage it appears only, that Pythagoras was in Ægypt in the time of Cambyſes: ſee the remark [*B*] of the article ZOROASTER. Here follow Apuleius's words. *Sunt qui Pythagoram ajunt eo temporis inter captivos Cambyſæ regis, Ægyptum cum adveheretur, doctores habuiſſe Perſarum Magos ac præcipue Zoroaſtrem, omnis divini arcani antiſtitem: poſteaque à quodam Gallo Crotonienſium principe reciperatum. Verum enim vero celebrior fama obtinet, ſponte eum petiſſe Ægyptias diſciplinas, atque ibi à ſacerdotibus, cerimoniarum incredendas potentias, numerorum admirandas vices, Geometriæ ſolertiſſimas formulas didiciſſe* (25). i. e. "Some aſſert, that when "Pythagoras was ſailing to Ægypt among Cam"byſes's ſlaves, he had for his tutors the Perſian "Magi, or wiſe-men, and chiefly Zoroaſter the "chief Prieſt of all their divine ceremonies, and "that he was afterwards inſtructed by one of the "chief men of Croton. But there is a much more "univerſal report, which is, that he went into Æ"gypt of his own accord, to learn the ſciences of "that country, and that the Prieſts there taught "him the incredible efficacy of ſacred ceremonies, "the wonderful properties of the number, and the "moſt ingenious rules of Geometry." John Bernart did not ſucceed very well in his criticiſm upon Pliny, for he urges againſt him the authority of Euſebius, as though he aſſerted that the reign of Semneſerteus began in the 23d olympiad, and ended in the 45th; that is to ſay, that King Amaſis came to the crown about 30 years after the death of Semneſerteus (26). If this were true, it would be impoſſible to clear Pliny, or to reconcile him with Diogenes Laertius. But let us not be concerned for him; John Bernart's account is falſe; Euſebius does not ſpeak of a King of Egypt, who was called Semneſerteus.

(15) T. Livius, lib. 40. p. m. 783.

(16) See Pliny, lib. 13. cap. 13.

(17) *Eodem Romulo regnante Thales Mileſius fuiſſe perhibetur unus e ſeptem ſapientibus.* Aug. *de Civit. Dei*, lib. 18. cap. 24.

(18) Tzetzes aſſerts it. See his words in Menage *in* Laert. cap. 1. num. 119.

(19) Diog. Laert. lib. 2. obſerves, that Anaximander flouriſhed chiefly in the time of Polycrates, Tyrant of Samos.

(20) Laert. *in Præmio*, num. 13.

(21) *Is obeliſcus quem Divus Auguſtus in circo magno ſtatuit, exciſus eſt à rege Semneſerteo, quo regnante Pythagoras in Ægypto fuit.* Plin. lib. 36. cap. 9. p. m. 296.

(22) Diog. Laert. lib. 8. num. 3.

(23) *In hunc locum Plinii.*

(24) Herodot. lib. 3. cap. 14.

(25) Apulejus, *Floridor.* lib. 2. p. m. 351.

(26) Joann. Bernartius, *in Boetium de Conſol. Philoſoph.* lib. 1. p. 169.

[*C*] *He prevailed . . . with the Ladies to leave off their fine dreſſes and all their ornaments.*] All that Juſtin tells us of the reformation of manners, which, Pythagoras introduced into the city of Crotona, is ſo remarkable, that I ſhall not omit one ſingle ſyllable of his diſcourſe. *Crotonam venit, populumque in luxuriam lapſum, auctoritate ſua ad uſum frugalitatis revocavit. Laudabat quotidie virtutem; & vitia luxuriæ, caſuſque civitatum ea peſte perditarum enumerabat; tantumque ſtudium ad frugalitatem multitudinis provocavit, ut aliquos ex his luxuriatos incredibile videretur. Matronarum quoque ſeparatam à viris doctrinam, & puerorum à parentibus frequenter habuit. Docebat nunc has pudicitiam, & obſequia in viros; nunc illos modeſtiam, & literarum ſtudium. Inter hæc velut genitricem virtutum frugalitatem omnibus ingerebat, conſecutuſque diſputationum aſſiduitate erat, ut matronæ auratas veſtes, cæteraque dignitatis ſuæ ornamenta, velut inſtrumenta luxuriæ deponerent, eaque omnia delata in Junonis ædem ipſi Deæ conſecrarent, præ ſe ferentes, vera ornamenta matronarum pudicitiam, non veſtes eſſe. In juventute quoque quantum profligatum ſit, victi fœminarum contumaces animi manifeſtant* (27). i. e. "He came to "Crotona, where he reclaimed the people from a "luxurious life to frugality and temperance. He "was daily commending virtue; and repreſenting "the evils which attend luxury, and how many cities "had been ruined by that vice; inſpired the multi"tude with ſo much love for temperance, that one "would not have thought ſome of them ever had led a "luxurious life. He alſo taught the women ſeparately "from their huſbands, and the children ſeparately "from their parents; the former he taught chaſ"tity and obedience to their huſbands; the latter he "inſtructed in the practice of modeſty, and inſpired "them with the love of learning. To all he taught "temperance, which is the mother of all virtues. "By his aſſiduous leſſons he prevailed with the Ma"trons to leave off their rich garments, and all their "ornaments, as being the inſtruments of luxury, and "to conſecrate them to Juno in her temple; pur"ſuading them, that chaſtity and modeſty, and not "rich habits, are the true ornaments of women. "How effectual his admonitions were on the young "men appears from his ſubduing the proud and ob"ſtinate hearts of the women." The laſt words of that author are ſomewhat ſatyrical; for he argues thus: Since Pythagoras conquered the obſtinate heart of the fair-ſex, judge from thence how great a progreſs he muſt have made in the reformation of the young

(27) Juſtin, lib. 20. cap. 4. p. m. 395.

to a probation time of ſilence [D], which laſted at leaſt two years, and which he continued ſometimes for five years with regard to thoſe whom he knew to be moſt inclined to talk (b). It appears from what I have obſerved in another place (c), how powerful and effectual his reproofs were. He obliged all his Diſciples to live in common (d): they gave up their right to their inheritance, and laid their whole eſtates down at their Maſter's feet. Men put a criminal conſtruction upon that union, which proved very fatal to them [E]. He took a particular care to reform the abuſes which men committed in matrimony [F]: and he was of opinion, that without this, the publick tranquillity, the enjoyment of liberty, a good conſtitution of the Government, and ſuch other things,

(b) Aulus Gellius, lib. 1. cap. 9.

(c) Above, quotation (27), of the art. HIPPONAX.

(d) See the rem. [E] towards the end.

young men. It is certain, the women's love of finery is ſo ſtubborn (28), that nothing reſiſts more than that, the ſtrongeſt exhortations of the Preachers. See how effectual Capiſtran's ſermons were againſt gameſters (29); we are not told, that he produced the ſame effect with regard to the jewels of the women. Conecte made more conqueſts upon the women's head-dreſſes by the ſtones which the boys threw at them, than by the figures of Rhethorick (30). Here then we have Chriſtian Preachers who cannot do that, which an Heathen Philoſopher executed. But let us not forget the noble action, which the Roman Ladies did in the time of Camillus (31).

(28) See the art. PERIANDER, quotat. (6) and (7).

(29) See above, rem. [E] of the art. CAPISTRAM.

(30) See the art. CONECTE, rem. [D].

(31) See the art. CAMILLUS, rem. [C].

A modern author has given us in a few words the moſt beautiful ſtrokes, that may ſerve to deſcribe Pythagoras's eloquence. "According to the ſame "Porphyry, when Pythagoras came into Italy he "changed the government of a great many cities, "and reſtored their liberty to them. By one ſingle "exhortation he won over to his Philoſophy above "two thouſand men; he taught them to conquer "their paſſions, to ſuppreſs all inclination to avarice "and ambition, to make but one common ſtock of "all they were poſſeſſed of, and to love ſilence, "retirement, and contemplation (32)." Let it not be objected, that I repreſent that Philoſopher here under the character of a rhetorician; this is not my intention; I am fully perſuaded that he exclaimed againſt vice in ſuch orations as were interſperſed with flowers of rhetorick, and compoſed according to the rules and the florid ſubtleties, which the Sophiſts of latter ages uſed. But yet we may aſcribe a wonderful eloquence to him, ſince his diſcourſes proved ſo effectual and perſuading. The ſtrength of that eloquence conſiſted, no doubt, in a grave expoſition of his arguments, and in the weight, which his wiſe and modeſt behaviour added to his words. He preached by his own example; his very ſilence was ſometimes eloquent, and contributed as much as his voice to the reformation he procured, as an ancient Poet has very well obſerved.

(32) Thomaſſin, *Methode d'etudier & d'enſeigner la Philoſophie*, liv. 1. cap. 15. p. 153.

Annon Pythagoræ monitus annique ſilentes
Famoſum Oebalii luxum preſſere Tarenti (33).

(33) Claudianus, *de Mallii Theodori Conſulatu*, ver. 156. We muſt read *Annon*, and not *& non*, without a point of Interrogation, as in Barthius's edit. Obſerve that Barthius, who is every where elſe ſo prolix, ſays nothing upon this paſſage. Claudianus had ſaid a little before, *Quidquid Democritus riſit, dixitque tacendo Pythagoras*, ibid. ver. 90.

[D] *A probation-time of ſilence.*] It was a very ſtrict diſcipline. Ἐξ᾽ ὧν πάντων χαλεπώτατον ἐγκρατευμάτων τὸ γλώττης κρατεῖν (34). That is to ſay, to conquer one's tongue is the moſt difficult victory one can gain. See how they, who can keep their tongue in due time, are commended in Cato's diſtichs (35). Servius mentions the probation time, which laſted five years (36); and here follows what Apuleius remarks concerning the probation time of near five years, which the leſs diſcreet Scholars were made to undergo. *Non in totum tamen* (Pythagorici) *vocem deſueſcebant, nec omnes pari tempore elingues magiſtrum ſectabantur: ſed gravioribus viris brevi ſpatio ſatis videbatur taciturnitas modificata. Loquaciores enim vero ferme in quinquennium, velut in exilium vocis mittebantur* (37). i. e. "Nor did the Pythagoreans "entirely loſe the uſe of ſpeech; nor did they "all follow their maſter in ſilence during the ſame "time: it was thought enough for the diſcreet, if "they were condemned to ſilence for a little time; "but [the talkative were forbidden to ſpeak during "almoſt five years; their tongue being, as it were, "ſent into baniſhment."

(34) Jamblichus, lib. 1. cap. 31.

(35) *Proximus ille Deo eſt qui ſcit ratione tacere.*

(36) Servius *in illud*, Æn. 10. ver. 564. *tacitis regnavit Amyclis.*

(37) Apuleius, *in Floridis.*

[E] *Men put a criminal conſtruction upon that union, which proved very fatal to them.*] That fellowſhip of ſtudents was reckoned to be a faction, which conſpired againſt the State; ſo that they put threeſcore of them to death, the reſt made their eſcape. *Sed tercenti ex juvenibus cum ſodalitii juris ſacramento quodam nexi ſeparatam à ceteris civibus vitam exercerent, quaſi cœtum clandeſtinæ conjurationis haberent, civitatem in ſe converterant, quæ eos, cum in unam domum convenirent, cremare voluit. In quo tumultu ſexaginta ferme periere, cæteri in exilium profecti* (38). i. e. "Three "hundred young men being united into a fellowſhip "by an oath, lived together ſeparated from the reſt "of the citizens; this raiſed the whole city againſt "them, as though they were ſecretly contriving a "plot; ſo that as they were one day met together in "the ſame houſe, it was ſet on fire with a deſign to "burn them all; near threeſcore of them periſhed "in the tumult, and the reſt went voluntarily into "baniſhment." It does not appear either from this paſſage of Juſtin, or from what goes before it, whether this ſtorm was raiſed during Pythagoras's life, or after his death. If we lay any ſtreſs upon this whole account, we ought rather to think that this perſecution did not extend to Pythagoras himſelf, than that it did. It ſeems therefore that Juſtin is relating here the ſame particular, which is mentioned by Polybius. Now according to Polybius the Pythagoreans were burnt in Greece ſome time before the war, which Dionyſius, tyrant of Syracuſe, waged againſt the Crotonians (39): it ſeems therefore that they were not burnt in their maſter's life time: for that war of Dionyſius againſt the Crotonians happened one hundred and twenty years after Tarquin was driven from Rome (40). Now Pythagoras went into Italy in Tarquin's reign, and died at Metapontum after he had lived twenty years at Crotona (41). Voſſius obſerves, that Juſtin, Polybius, Porphyry, and Jamblichus, ſpeak of the ſame event (42): now the two laſt aſſert, that two perſons only eſcaped out of the fire, namely, Archippus and Lyſis: this was not therefore, will ſome ſay, a cruelty exerted againſt the ſchool of Pythagoras in his life time, for Lyſis being retired to Thebes was tutor there to Epaminondas (43), who died 145 years after Tarquin was expelled. Theſe are difficulties only, I own it, and not ſtrong arguments againſt thoſe, who would maintain, that the fire, from which Lyſis eſcaped, happened during Pythagoras's life. Obſerve, that according to Plutarch, the two Pythagoreans who eſcaped were Philolaus and Lyſis. He obſerves this in his treatiſe concerning the genius of Socrates (44), and he gives there the name of Cyclonians to thoſe who ſet fire to Pythagoras's College at Metapontum. In another book he calls them Cylonians, and he obſerves that they burnt Pythagoras himſelf. Καὶ ὁ Πυθαγόρου ζῶντος ἐμπρησμὸς ἀπὸ τῶν Κυλωνείων. *Quod Pythagoræ vivo à Cyloneis illatum eſt incendium* (45).

(38) Juſtin, lib. 22. cap. 4. See the rem. [O].

(39) Polybius, lib. 2.

(40) See Calviſius, p. m. 95, 165.

(41) Juſtin, lib. 20. cap. 4.

(42) Voſſius, *de Philoſophor. Sectis*, cap. 6. num. 26. p. m. 38.

(43) Diog. Laert. lib. 8. num. 7. Cornelius Nepos, *in Epaminonda.* Ælian. Var. *Hiſt.* lib. 3. cap. 17.

(44) Plut. *de Socrat. Genio*, p. 583.

If you have a mind to know the name of the Author who tells us, that this Philoſopher's ſcholars diveſted themſelves of their property and eſtates, I refer you to this paſſage from Aulus Gellius. *Omnes ſimul qui à Pythagora in cohortem illam diſciplinarum recepti erant, quod quiſque familiæ pecuniæque habebat, in medium dabant, & coibatur ſocietas inſeparabilis, tamquam illud fuerit antiquum conſortium, quod re atque verbo appellabatur* κοινόβιον (46). i. e. "All they who were "admitted into Pythagoras's ſchool, uſed to put all "their eſtates and money together for the uſe of them "all: thus they formed an inſeparable fellowſhip, as "it were like that ancient ſociety, which both was, "and was likewiſe called a *Community of Living.*"

(45) Idem, *de Stoicor. Repugn.* p. 1051.

(46) Aul. Gell. lib. 1. cap. 9. See alſo Diog. Laert. lib. 8. num. 10.

[F] *He took particular care to reform the abuſes which were committed in matrimony.*] He repreſented that the deſign of the union of both ſexes was to produce lawfully another ſelf: that men muſt endeavour to get children well ſhaped, ſtrong and healthy; that one ought to uſe them to labour and ſobriety, and keep them from venereal pleaſures, till they be

things, to which he applied himſelf with the utmoſt zeal [G], were not ſufficient to make

twenty years old, and exhort them afterwards to indulge themſelves in thoſe pleaſures but ſeldom and from time to time. *Neceſſum eſſe ut pueri & virgines in laboribus & exercitationibus, omnibuſque tolerantiæ ac temperantiæ generibus congruentibus educentur ; ut conveniens victus ipſis adhibeatur, & laborum amans, temperans, & continens eorum vita ſit : ut de uſu rei venereæ ſero erudiantur ; ac pueros ſic inſtitui & educari oporteat, ut intra viceſimum ætatis annum talem congreſſum nullo modo quærant. Cum autem ad ætatem Veneri maturam perverenerint, hac raro utendum eſſe ; incontinentiam enim, bonamque corporis habitudinem, rarius conjunctas eſſe* (47). He loudly condemned thoſe, who indulge themſelves in the venereal act, after they have eat too much, and much more thoſe who do it when they are in liquor (48). He required from the huſbands not only that they ſhould forſake their concubines, but alſo that they ſhould behave towards their wives according to the rules of chaſtity and modeſty. They did neither ; but we are told that his proofs touched them to the quick, and that they laboured zealouſly to reform themſelves. *Fertur & Pythagoras Crotoniatas à pellicum & illegitimarum fœminarum conſuetudine abduxiſſe ; maritos etiam monuiſſe, ut erga uxores ſuas caſti & pudici forent : quo factum, ut Crotoniatæ omnem incontinentiam & luxuriam, quæ tum temporis in urbe, ceu peſtis, graſſabantur, è medio tollere laborarint* (49). The inhabitants of Crotona led a very diſſolute life ; they married only for form's ſake ; they took wives *ad honores*, they neglected and deſpiſed them, and adhered only to their concubines. This was giving a bad example ; ſuch a conduct might be of dangerous conſequence : they did not conſider it was to be feared leſt their wives ſhould imitate them, and perhaps they did not much care whether they did it or not. The maxim *frangenti fidem frangatur eidem* (he who violates his faith, muſt expect the ſame from others towards him) is but too often followed with regard to conjugal fidelity. This was a diſorder which Pythagoras undertook to reform. If we may believe Juſtin, the force of his inſtructions was ſufficient for that purpoſe : but ſome Authors hint that they proved ineffectual, and that he was obliged to employ a more powerful method ; which was his pretending that he deſcended into hell, where he had ſeen thoſe huſbands tormented, who did not pay the conjugal duty to their wives. This made him very much conſidered. Φησὶ δὲ Ἱερώνυμος καταβῆναι αὐτὸν εἰς ᾅδου τήν τε Ἡσιόδου ψυχὴν ἰδεῖν πρὸς κίονι χαλκῷ δεδεμένην καὶ τρίζουσαν· τήν δὲ Ὁμήρου, κρεμαμένην ἀπὸ δένδρου, καὶ ὄφεις περὶ αὐτὴν, ἀνθ' ὧν εἶπε περὶ θεῶν. κολαζομένους δὲ καὶ τοὺς μὴ θέλοντας συνεῖναι ταῖς αὐτῶν γυναιξί. καὶ δὴ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τιμηθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Κρότωνι. (50). *Hieronymus relates that he* (Pythagoras) *went into Hell, where he ſaw the ſoul of Heſiod tied with chains to a pillar of braſs, and lamenting ; and the ſoul of Homer hanging on a tree, and ſurrounded with ſnakes, as a puniſhment for what he had feigned concerning the Gods. He ſaw alſo thoſe tormented, who would not lye with their wives. For theſe reports he was very much eſteemed at Crotona.* This ſtory is no doubt the ſame with that which Hermippus relates. He obſerves (51) that this Philoſopher being arrived in Italy, ſhut himſelf up in a ſubterraneous habitation, after he had deſired his mother to keep an accurate regiſter of all that ſhould come to paſs. Having confined himſelf there sa long as he thought proper, his mother conveyed her regiſter to him according to their former agreement. He took notice of the dates, and of the other circumſtances of the events ; he got out of that place with a pale and lean face ; he called the people together, and told them that he came from Hell, and in order to perſuade them of it, he related to them what happened in the city ; he made the whole audience ſigh and weep, ſo much were they moved by his diſcourſe ; they did not queſtion but he was a divine man, and committed their wives to his care to be inſtructed by him. It was no doubt on this occaſion that he frighted the bad huſbands, by repreſenting to them, that they, who refuſe to their wives the careſſes they owe them, are puniſhed very ſeverely in Hell. It is probable that he mentioned alſo the puniſhment which is inflicted on diſſolute women ; and we ought to think this was one of the reaſons, which determined the inhabitants of Crotona to ſend their wives to his ſchool. Obſerve well the contradiction of which that great maſter was guilty : he taught on the one hand the doctrine of the Metempſychoſis, without confining himſelf to the three tranſmigrations of the ſoul mentioned by Pindar (52) : and on the other hand he dared to aſſert, that he had ſeen the ſoul of Homer, that of Heſiod, *&c.* cruelly tormented in Hell. The Metempſychoſis was inconſiſtent with Hell, as he declares in Ovid.

O genus attonitum gelidæ formidine mortis,
Quid Styga, quid tenebras, & nomina vana timetis,
Materiem vatum, falſique pericula mundi ?
Corpora ſive rogus flamma, ſeu tabe vetuſtas
Abſtulerit, mala poſſe pati non ulla putetis (53).

" Theſe I would teach, and by right reaſon bring
" To think of death as but an idle thing.
" Why thus affrighted at an empty name,
" A dream of darkneſs, and fictitious flame ?
" Vain themes of wit, which but in Poems paſs,
" And fables of a world, that never was.
" What feels the body, when the ſoul expires,
" By time corrupted, or conſum'd by fires ?"
DRYDEN.

But he choſe rather to gain authority, and to enable himſelf to extirpate the diſſoluteneſs of the people by contradicting himſelf, than to follow a well connected method of dogmatizing, which had not been ſo uſeful.

I have aſſerted that he did not confine himſelf to the three tranſmigrations mentioned by Pindar ; and ſhall give a plain proof of that aſſertion from Ovid's Verſes, which I ſhall quote hereunder (54). Forcatulus is therefore in the wrong to aſſert the contrary. *Conſtat*, ſays he (55), *Druidum imitatorem Pythagoram, deſultoriam animarum migrationem nonniſi tertiam aſſeruiſſe. Nam ſi perenni ſerie animas in alia atque alia corpora tranſcripſiſſet, quis quæſo locus fuiſſet Elyſiis campis, ut cæli ſedibus ? quod miror ſatyricis ſcriptoribus ſalſis admodum inſulsè derelictam. Quicumque, inquit Pindarus, ter in utraque vitâ à vitiis alieni fuerunt, viam ſibi à Jove deſtinatam adiere ad Saturni urbem. Ἔνθα μακάρων νῆσοι ὠκεανίδες αὖραι περιπνέουσιν, ἄνθεμα δὲ χρυσῷ φλέγει, id eſt, Ubi beatorum inſulam Oceanides auræ circumflant, & flores aurei fulgent.* i. e. " It is " certain that Pythagoras, who imitated the Druids, " held that the ſoul paſſed but three times out of one " body into another. For if he had ſuppoſed a con- " tinual tranſmigration, what occaſion had there been " for the Elyſian Fields, or for the celeſtial Seats ? " I wonder the ſmarteſt ſatyrical Writers were ſo " ſilly as not to level their ſtrokes againſt ſuch a ſup- " poſition. They, ſays Pindar, who in their three " lives have abſtained from vice, go to the city of " Saturn, through the way which Jupiter has deſign- " ed for them, where breezes from the ocean blow " about the happy iſland, and golden flowers ſhine " around."

[G] *The things to which he applied himſelf with the utmoſt zeal.*] His love for the publick good determined him to carry his inſtructions even into the palaces of great men (56). He was ſenſible that if he could inſpire the Princes and chief Magiſtrates with good Principles, he could eaſily make the reſt of mankind reap a great advantage from his philoſophy. He had the happineſs and glory to train up ſuch Diſciples, as proved excellent Legiſlators, a Zaleucus, for inſtance, a Charondas, and ſome others (57). When we mention a Legiſlator, we ſay a man, who muſt be looked upon as the beſt preſent that can be made to civil ſocieties. They who have made laws are more worthy of admiration, and of an immortal praiſe, than the greateſt Conquerors : and yet their name is not tranſmitted down to us with the ſame buſtle as that of a Cyrus and of an Alexander. It is becauſe our mind not being capable to know wherein true grandeur conſiſts, applies erroneouſly the notion of

(47) Omeiſius, *in* Ethica Pythag. p. 38. *ex* Jamblicho, *in* Vita Pythag. lib. 1. cap. 31.

(48) Idem, p. 39. *exeodem*, ib.

(49) Jamblichus, ibid. cap. 27. *apud* Omeiſium, ibid. p. 40.

(50) Diog. Laert. lib. 8. num. 21. p. 505.

(51) *Apud* Diog. Laert. ibid. num. 41. p. 521, 522. See alſo the Scholiaſt on Sophocles ; Monſ. Menage upon this paſſage of Laert. p. 372, 373, quotes his words.

(52) Olym. *Ode* 2.

(53) Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 15. ver. 153.

(54) In the rem. [M].

(55) Forcat. *de Gallor. Imperio & Philoſophia*, lib. 1. p. m. 90.

(56) Πυθαγόρας τοῖς πρωτεύουσιν Ἰταλιωτῶν. Plut. *cum principibus viris Philoſopho eſſe diſputandum*, p. 777, *A.*

(57) See Jamb. *in Vita Pythag.* lib. 1. cap. 30.

make private perſons happy. It is ſurpriſing that a Philoſopher ſo well ſkilled in Aſtronomy, in Geometry, and in the other branches of Mathematicks, as he was, ſhould have taken a delight to deliver his moſt noble precepts under the veil of enigmatical figures: that veil is often ſo thick, that it has afforded the Interpreters a large field for their conjectures [*H*], ſo that they have put upon them as many myſtical ſenſes as they pleaſed. Some take the order he gave not to eat any beans, in a literal ſenſe [*I*]. There

of it to ſuch actions as make a great noiſe in the world: it cannot diſtinguiſh what is great, from what is pompous and ſplendid (58); and thus the life of a man, who applies himſelf to remedy the inward diſorders of a State by uſeful laws, does not make a great impreſſion upon our mind, becauſe ſuch a work is performed gently. But when a man conquers Cities and Provinces, when he puts millions of men to death, when he reduces ten times as many to poverty and want, he acquires ſo great a fame, that the remoteſt poſterity never mentions his name but with admiration and rapture. However, it will be for ever a great glory to Pythagoras, with thoſe who know how to judge right of things, that he furniſhed the world with ſome good Legiſlators. This is a glory which returns back upon philoſophy itſelf, as Seneca has very well obſerved. *Poſtquam, ſurrepentibus vitiis, in tyrannidem Regna verſa ſunt, opus eſſe cepit Legibus, quas et ipſas inter initia tulere ſapientes. Solon . . . . Licurgus . . . . . Zaleuci Leges, Charondaque laudantur; hi non in foro, nec in conſultorum atrio, ſed in Pythagoræ tacito illo ſanctoque ſeceſſu didicere jura, quæ florenti tunc Sicilia, et per Italiam Græciæ ponerent* (59). i. e. "The vices creeping in "afterwards, Kingdoms were turned into tyrannical "Governments, ſo that it began to be neceſſary to "enact laws, which in the beginning were made by "the wiſe men or Philoſophers, by Solon . . . . by "Lycurgus . . . . The laws of Zaleucus and of "Charondas are alſo famous. Theſe men did not "ſtudy at the bar, or in a Counſellor's chamber, but "in the holy and ſacred receſs of Pythagoras: there "they learned thoſe laws which they eſtabliſhed in "Sicily, which was then in a flouriſhing condition, "and throughout Italy where the Greeks had ſettled." Pythagoras applied himſelf alſo very zealouſly to ſuppreſs the wars which aroſe in Italy, and thoſe domeſtick factions which diſturbed the cities (60). He often uſed to ſay, we ought to wage war, only againſt theſe five enemies, the diſtempers of the body, the ignorance of the mind, the paſſions of the heart, the ſeditions in cities, and diſorders of families. Theſe are five monſters which we ought to fight againſt with fire and ſword, without giving them any quarter. *Suſtuliſſe penitus omnes diſcordias, non à notis ſolum & familiaribus, eorumque poſteris ad aliquot ſecula, ſed ab omnibus omnino Italiæ atque Siciliæ civitatibus, tam inteſtinas quàm externas, auctor eſt Porphyrius in ejus Vita: qui addit, hoc apophthegma crebrò ei in ore fuiſſe, Fugandum omni conatu, & igni atque ferro, & quibuſcumque denique machinis præcidendum; à corpore quidem morbum; ab anima ignorantiam; à ventre luxuriam; à civitate ſeditionem; à familia diſcordiam* (61). It is no wonder that the inhabitants of Crotona would have their Senate follow the advices of ſo excellent a man. It is Valerius Maximus who aſſerts it, in order to prove that Pythagoras's authority was acknowledged even out of his ſchool. *Pythagoræ tanta veneratio ab auditoribus tributa eſt; ut quæ ab eo acceperant, in diſputationem deducere nefas exiſtimarent: Quinetiam interpellati ad reddendam cauſſam; hoc ſolum reſpondebant, Ipſum dixiſſe: Magnus honos, ſed ſchola tenus. Illa urbium ſuffragiis tributa eſt. Enixo Crotoniatæ ſtudio ab eo petierunt ut ſenatus ipſorum, qui mille hominum numero conſtabat, conſiliis ſuis uti paterentur* (62). i. e. "Pythagoras's ſcholars had ſo great "a veneration for him, that they looked upon it as "a crime to call into queſtion any thing he had "taught them: and when they were required to "give ſome reaſons for what they admitted, the "only anſwer they made was, *he has ſaid it:* this was "indeed a great honour to him, but confined within "his ſchool. There was another honour conferred "upon him by the ſuffrages of whole cities. The Crotonians begged moſt earneſtly of him, that their Senate, which conſiſted of a thouſand men, might "be guided by his councils." The ſame Author tells us that ſeveral cities in Italy felt the happy effects of this Philoſopher's ſtudies (63).

(58) See Pliny the younger, *Epiſt.* 16. lib. 3. where he ſhews *alia eſſe clariora, alia majora.*

(59) Seneca, *Epiſt.* 90. p. m. 369. See Peter Petit's *Miſcellaneæ Obſervationes*, p. 265.

(60) See the Letter which it is pretended he wrote to Anaximenes, *apud* Laert. lib. 8. num. 49.

(61) Menagius, *in* Laert. lib. 8. num. 50.

(62) Val. Max. lib. 8. cap. 15. num. 1. *in Externis.*

(63) *Plurimis & opulentiſſimis urbibus effectus ſuorum ſtudiorum approbavit.* Idem, ibid. cap. 7. num. 2. *Externor.*

[*H*] *It has afforded the interpreters a large field for their conjectures.*] See for inſtance what they have obſerved upon this precept of Pythagoras, *do not ſit down upon the Chœnix, Chœnici ne inſideas*; ſee it, I ſay, in the diſſertations, to which I have referred in another place (64). That ſymbolical method of teaching was very much uſed in the Eaſt and in Egypt: Pythagoras had no doubt borrowed it from thence. He returned from his travels loaded with the ſpoils of learning which he had gathered in all the countries he had viſited. It is pretended that he reaped a plentiful harveſt particularly among the Jews, and that he learnt many things from Ezekiel and Daniel. It is even aſſerted that his *Tetractys* is the ſame thing with the name *tetragrammaton*, an ineffable name, which abounds with myſteries, if we may believe the Rabins. Conſult the learned Monſieur Huet. *Adde*, ſays he (65), *& veri perſimilem conjecturam Seldeni, & Wendelini, qua mirificam illam Pythagoræ* τετρακτὺν *ipſum eſſe ſuſpicantur Dei nomen* τετραγράμματον, יהוה, *atque ejus notitiam à Daniele jam ſene Pythagoram, cum in Babylonia degeret accepiſſe. Danieli adjungi poterat & Ezechiel, ut oſtendam infrà.* Others pretend, that this *Tetractys*, that great object of veneration, and by which they ſwore, was nothing but a myſterious manner of dogmatizing by numbers (66). Conſider theſe words from the *Acta Eruditorum* for the year 1685, page 204, in the extract of an Engliſh book of John Turner. *Ex hac ipſa tamen gentilium notitia inſcite à quibuſdam colligi ait, Pythagoræorum Tetractyn quam tam reverenter habuerunt, & per quam jurare etiam ſoliti leguntur, eſſe unum idemque cum nomine tetragrammato, quod à Judæis ipſis acceperint. . . . . Aliam proinde viam demonſtrat Autor tetractyn iſtam explicandi, deſumptam puta à methodo Pythagoræorum myſtica, qua dogmata ſua fere per numeros certos indicare & explanare fuerint ſoliti.* i. e. "He obſerves that from this knowledge of the Hea"thens ſome infer unſkilfully, that the tetractys of the "Pythagoreans for which they had ſo great a vene"ration, and by which, we read, that they were "wont to ſwear, is the ſame with the name compoſ"ed of four letters, which they borrowed from the "Jews themſelves. . . . . The author ſhews us "therefore another manner of explaining that te"tractys, namely by the myſtical method of the "Pythagoreans, who uſed to expreſs and explain "almoſt all their doctrines by numbers." Let us not forget to obſerve, that Pythagoras and his followers had a two-fold method of teaching, the one confined to the initiated, the other deſigned for the ſtrangers and profane: the former was plain and undiſguiſed; the latter was ſymbolical and enigmatical. See on this ſubject, the 13th chapter of the book of John Schefferus Profeſſor at Upſal, *de natura & conſtitutione Philoſophiæ Italicæ*. This book was printed at Upſal in the year 1664, in 8vo.

(64) In the art. EPICURUS, rem. [*L*].

(65) Huet. *Demonſtr. Evang.* propoſit. 4. cap. 2. num. 8. p. 89. edit. Lipſ. 1694. See alſo Sir John Marſham's *Chron. Canon. Ægyptiac.* ſæc. 9. p. m. 277, 278.

(66) Διὸ καὶ ἐφθόγγυντο οἱ Πυθαγορικοὶ, ὡς μεγίστε ὁρκε ὄντος τῆς τετράδος,
Οὐ μὰν τὸν ἱμετέρᾳ ψυχᾷ παραδόντα τετρακτύν.
Παγὰν ἀενάου φύσεως ῥιζώματ' ἔχουσαν.
Itaque ſanctiſſimum jusjurandum Pythagorei quaternario ſunt complexi, quam tetractyn vocant.
Per tibi noſtræ animæ præbentem tetrada juro
Naturæ fontemque & firmamenta perennis.
Plut. *de Placit.* lib. 1. cap. 3. p. 877, *A.*

[*I*] *The order he gave not to eat any beans.*] They, who take that prohibition in a literal ſenſe, alledge, among other reaſons, that Pythagoras was inſtructed by the Egyptians, and did even ſuffer himſelf to be circumciſed that he might be admitted into their moſt ſecret myſteries. Διʼ ὃς καὶ περιετέμετο, ἵνα δὴ καὶ εἰς τὰ ἄδυτα καταλθὼν, τὴν μυστικὴν παρ' Αἰγυπτίων ἐκμάθοι φιλοσοφίαν: *For whoſe ſake* (the Egyptian Prophets) *he alſo was circumciſed, that he might be admitted into their moſt ſecret places, and learn their myſtical Philoſophy* (67). Now the Egyptians abſtained from beans; they ſowed none, and if they happened to meet with any that were grown without being ſown, they would not touch them (68). Their Prieſts carried ſuperſtition ſtill farther, they would not ſo much as caſt an eye upon that kind of pulſe, they held it polluted, and would rather have eat the fleſh of their parents, than to taſte of any beans. Θᾶττον ἂν τὰς κιφαλὰς

(67) Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. lib. 1. p. 302.

(68) Herodotus, lib. 2. cap. 37.

There are few perſons of thoſe ancient times who travelled as much as he has done.

κεφαλὰς φαγεῖν φασι τῶν πατέρων ἢ κυάμους. *Dicunt ſe parentum capita citius eſuros quam fabas* (69). Whence it is inferred, that we ought to believe that Pythagoras, who was the diſciple of thoſe people, prohibited literally that kind of pulſe. Several grave authors among the ancients underſtand this prohibition in that ſenſe. Some have aſſerted, that he choſe rather to be killed by thoſe who purſued him, than to make his eſcape by croſſing a field ſown with beans (70), ſo much did he reſpect or abhor that plant. Ariſtoxenus is, I think, the only author, who aſſerts that Pythagoras uſed often to eat beans. *Ariſtoxenus muſicus vir literarum veterum diligentiſſimus, Ariſtotelis philoſophi auditor, in libro, quem de Pythagora reliquit, nullo ſæpius ligamento Pythagoram dicit uſum quàm fabis : quoniam is cibus & ſubduceret ſenſim alvum, & lævigaret. Verba iſta Ariſtoxeni ſubſcripſi.* Πυθαγόρας δὲ τῶν ὀσπρίων μάλιστα τὸν κύαμον ἐδοκίμασε λίαν κινητικόν τε γὰρ εἶναι, καὶ διαφορητικόν. διὸ καὶ μάλιστα κέχρηται αὐτῷ (17). i. e. " Ariſtoxenus the Muſician, " a man well verſed in antiquity, and the diſciple of " Ariſtotle, wrote a book concerning Pythagoras, in " which he obſerves, that Pythagoras uſed to eat no " kind of pulſe oftner than beans, becauſe they eaſe " the belly by degrees, and looſen it." Our learned men do not make much account of this authority of Ariſtoxenus : they ſuppoſe that he was miſtaken ; they look upon Pythagoras's abſtinence from beans as an unqueſtionable matter of fact, and inquire into the reaſons of it. Ariſtotle hints four or five reaſons of that abſtinence : he pretends that Pythagoras prohibited the uſe of beans, either becauſe they reſemble the privy part, or becauſe they reſemble the gates of hell, or becauſe they prompt men to venery, or becauſe they reſemble the nature of the univerſe, or becauſe they were uſed in the election of the Magiſtrates (72). They who take that prohibition to be a moral precept, and that Pythagoras meant it in an allegorical ſenſe, imagine, that he deſigned thereby to forbid his diſciples to meddle with the government. The ground of this opinion is, that in ſome cities men gave their votes with beans when they were about chooſing the Magiſtrates. Others pretend that Pythagoras intended to prohibit the venereal pleaſure. Here follows a paſſage from Aulus Gellius ; it is extracted from the chapter in which the author relates and approves Ariſtoxenus's account. *Videtur autem de κυάμῳ non eſſe tacto cauſam erroris fuiſſe, quia in Empedocli carmine quo diſciplinas Pythagoræ ſecutus eſt, verſus hic invenitur :*

Δειλοὶ, πάνδειλοι, κυάμων ἀπὸ χεῖρας ἔχεσθαι.

opinati enim ſunt plerique κύαμον legumentum vulgo dici. Sed qui diligentius anquiſitiuſque carmina Empedocli arbitrati ſunt, κυάμους hoc in loco teſticulos ſignificare dicunt ; eoſque more Pythagoræ opertè atque ſymbolicè κυάμους appellatos, quia ſint εἰς τὸ κυεῖν δεινοῖ καὶ αἴτιοι τοῦ κυεῖν ; & genituræ humanæ vim præbeant, idcircoque in Empedocli verſu iſto non à fabulo edendo, ſed à rei venereæ proluvio voluiſſe homines deducere (73). i. e. " It ſeems " that the miſtake of not eating beans is owing to " the following line, which is to be met with in " Empedocles, who followed the philoſophy of Py- " thagoras, *They are miſerable, very miſerable who uſe* " *beans.* Moſt perſons imagined that by the word " beans (κυάμων) the pulſe ſo called was meant here. " But they, who have examined Empedocles's poems " with more care and attention, have judged that " by κυάμους we muſt underſtand here the *Teſticles* ; " which, after the manner of the Pythagoreans, are " called thus ſymbolically, and obſcurely ; becauſe " they ſerve to the propagation of mankind ; ſo " that Empedocles, in the line before us, warns us, " not againſt the eating of beans, but againſt the uſe " of venereal pleaſures." Mauro, in a poem in which by the name *della Faba* (of the beans) he means ſomething obſcene (74), joins together the opinion of Ariſtoxenus, and the contrary opinion. He pretends that Pythagoras prohibited the uſe of beans, that is to ſay, the venereal pleaſure, and yet that there was no food he uſed more commonly than beans : he practiſed himſelf what he forbad others to do ; and this conduct is very common, if we may believe Mauro.

Non fè Natura mai coſa sì ghiotta
Che ſenza quaſi romperla co i denti
Pare, ch'ogni perſona ſe la inghiotta.
Furon certi Filoſofi prudenti,
De' quali fù Pitagora il maeſtro,
Che vietava la Fava a quelle genti.
Eran ribaldi, e ladri da capeſtro.
Che ingannavan con arte gli ignoranti.
E poi ſe re mangiavano un caneſtro.
Così fanno hoggi certi mormoranti,
Che ogni perſona ſepeliſcon viva,
Chimando amore, Venere i furfanti.
Riprendono in altrui la vita attiva,
Et eſſi ogn'hor di veſpro, è di mattino
Hanno in uſo l'attiva, e la paſſiva.
Così Maometto già per torre il vino,
Seppe perſuader provincie, e regni
Co'l ſuo ſottile ingegno, e diavolino.
Gli parue, che i plebei non foſſer degni
Di quel liquore, e così ſempre al mondo
Sovra la forza ſon ſtati gl'ingegni.
Pitagora, c'havea peſcato al fondo,
E de le coſe la ragion ſapea,
Ogni gran ſavio fea parer ſecondo.
E de le Fave nemico parec,
Ma ſe ne confortava il guſto, e'l tatto,
E d'altra coſa quaſi non vivea (75).

Cicero hints that the eating of beans was prohibited, becauſe they prevented fore-boding dreams : for they heat the blood too much, and by irritating the ſpirits, they do not leave the mind in that eaſy and quiet ſituation which is neceſſary for the ſearch of truth. *Ex eadem item opinione M. Cicero in libro de divinatione primo, hæc verba poſuit :* Jubet igitur Plato ſic ad ſomnum proficiſci corporibus affectis, ut nihil ſit quod errorum animis perturbationemque afferat. Ex quo etiam Pythagoreis interdictum putatur, ne faba veſcerentur : quod habet inflationem magnam is cibus tranquillitatem mentis quærentibus contrariam (76). *Hæc quidem M. Cicero* (77). i. e. " According to the " fame opinion, Cicero, in his firſt book concerning " Divination, writes thus. *Plato adviſes men to go* " *to reſt with their bodies ſo affected, as not to diſturb* " *the mind, nor to lead it into any error. For which* " *reaſon it is alſo thought that the Pythagoreans were for-* " *bidden to eat beans, becauſe that food is apt to heat* " *them too much, which is not good for thoſe who en-* " *deavour to have an eaſy mind.* Thus far Cicero." The learned Windet has enquired into the reaſons of that abſtinence, more learnedly and deeply than any other Author. He examines chiefly the opinion of thoſe, who think that by the beans are meant the gates of Hell. We have obſerved above, that one of Pythagoras's reaſons was, that the beans are like thoſe gates. Windet explodes the opinion of thoſe who have aſſerted, that by κύαμος, Pythagoras meant a woman's breaſt, or a man's teſticles (78). He adheres to the literal ſenſe ; but he confeſſes that beans were prohibited from a principle of chaſtity. He diſplays a great deal of learning upon that ſubject ; he ſhews, that according to Pythagoras's way of ſpeaking, to deſcend into Hell was to be begotten ; and ſignified nothing elſe but the change which the ſoul undergoes, when ſhe leaves the ſuperior regions, to be united upon earth, with an organiſed body. *Cum autem ἅδης* (localiter) ſit regio naturæ corruptibilis, *hinc* Pythagoricis *animæ cæleſte ſolum vertentes atque ἴῶσαι εἰς γένεσιν dicuntur etiam καταλθεῖν εἰς ἅδου* (79). He ſhews that beans having no joints or knots in their ſtalks, are thereby like the gates of Hell, through which the ſouls have always a free paſſage, when a body is begotten. He adds, that as Pythagoras conſidered this Life as a kind of death, or of baniſhment, he endeavoured to diſſuade men from begetting children, and would have them labour to return to their celeſtial abodes (80). *Atque in eo* Portæ Inferni *ſimilis eſt* Faba, διὰ τὸ ἀγόνατον εἶναι, quod genuum expers ſit, *ut loquitur* Ariſtoteles (81), *vel* διὰ τὸ δι' ὅλου τετρῆσθαι, καὶ μὴ ἐγκόπτεσθαι ταῖς μεταξὺ τῶν γονάτων ἐμφράξεσιν, *id eſt*, prodterea quod penitus perforetur, nec articulorum

(69) Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhonic. Hypotypoſ.* lib. 3. p. 156. See alſo St. Chryſoſtom, *Homil.* 2. *in Joann.*

(70) See the rem. [P], quot. (128)

(71) Aul. Gell. (lib. 4. cap. 9. p. m. 131.

(72) Ariſtoteles, *in libro de Fabis, apud* Diog. Laert. *in* Pythagora, lib. 8. num. 34.

(73) Aul. Gell. lib. 4. cap. 11. p. m. 131.

(74) See the art. MOLZA, rem. [D].

(75) Mauro, *Capitolo in lode della Fava*, folio 76 *verſo*, in a collection of *Rime piaccevoli*, printed at Vicenza, 1603.

(76) Cicero ſays, *Inflationem magnam is cibus tranquillitati mentis quærenti vera contrariam.* Aul. Gell. muſt have truſted to his memory, when he quoted that paſſage.

(77) Aul. Gell. lib. 4. cap. 9. p. 131.

(78) *Eſt qui nixus parum firmo tibicine de papillis muliebribus intellexit ; alii teſtes operte ſignificari volunt, alii, alia quæ parumper attinet deſpicere.* Ja. Windet, *de Vitæ functorum Statu*, p. 791. edit. Londin. 1677.

(79) Idem, ibid. p. 106.

(80) Idem, p. 110, 111.

(81) *Apud* Diog. Laert. lib. 8. num. 34. Ἢ ὅτι ἅδου πύλαις ἀγόνατον γὰρ μόνον. *Sive quod inferni januis* (ſimiles ſint fabæ) *ſolæ enim geniculatæ non ſunt.*

(e) See Apuleius, *in* Floridis.

done (e). Some perſons thought him an eminent Magician [K]: we ſhall ſee upon what grounds. We ſhall likewiſe obſerve, that Naudé juſtifies him [L]. I have an hundred things ſtill to remark, but am obliged to be ſhort, and I omit every thing that may

ticulorum ſive geniculorum obicibus intercipiatur: *perinde* ac porta inferni nunquam oppeſſulata animabus εἰς γένεσιν κατιούσαις in generationem deſcendentibus perpetuo patet. Pythagoras *ergo* Fabas vetando, cavit à generatione continua ac perpetua; *inſinuans ſuis, ſatius fuiſſe pollutum corruptibilis hujuſce regionis hoſpitium nunquam intrâſſe, ſed quando id integrum jam non fuerit, ſaltem ut admiſſi quàm primum* generationem ſiſtant, *atque ad ſuperiora redire nitantur*. He refutes thoſe, who imagine that the diſciples of Pythagoras were forbidden to eat beans becauſe it is an unclean food: It was, ſays he, for holy and myſterious reaſons, which they revealed to no man (82). Some of them choſe to die rather, than to declare ſo great a ſecret. A Pythagorean woman cut off her tongue, that ſhe might have no reaſon to fear leſt the cruelty of torments ſhould make her ſpeak (83). *ipſum autem* Pythagoram *ferunt ſe vita potius ſpoliandum perſequentibus ultrò ſtitiſſe, quam per* Fabetum *fuga ſibi conſulere voluiſſe*. Jamblichus *decem*, Suidas *quinquaginta* Pythagoreis *itidem factum memorat*. Myllias Crotoniata *mori maluit, quàm* Dionyſio *cauſas exponere propter quas* Pythagorei Fabis *abſtinerent*. *Perinde etiam eſt quod de ipſo* Pythagora *refert* Suidas. Malliæ *uxor* Timycha, *in ſimilem quæſtionem veniens, ſuam ſibi linguam præmordit, ne, tormentis victa, cogeretur* τῶν ἐχεμυθημένων τί ἀνακαλύψαι, arcanorum quidpiam detegere, *referente* Jamblicho (84). Monſieur Menage quotes a paſſage from the life of Saint Artemius, in which we read, that Theano the diſciple and wife of Pythagoras, refuſing to declare the reaſons for which ſhe abſtained from beans, was put to death; but ſhe had her tongue cut off before ſhe underwent that puniſhment (85).

(82) *Nimis autem populariter dictum eſt Ægyptios & Phereatas ipſumque Pythagoram Fabas utpote immundas adſpernatos: cum revera non ob immunditiem ſed ob ſacras rationes abſtinuerint.* Windet, *de vita functorum Statu*, p. 81.

(83) Compare with this, what the Courtezan Læna did at Athens. Plin. lib. 34. cap. 8. p. m. 322. Athenæus, lib. 13. p. 596. Pauſan. lib. 1. p. 41. Polyænus, lib. 8. mention it. See Father Bouhours, *Entretien du Secret*, p. m. 197, 198.

(84) Idem, Windet, *de vita functorum Statu*, p. 84.

I ſhall obſerve by the way, that the *School of Salerno*, in René Moreau's edition, forbids to eat beans: *Manducare fabam caveas, facit illa podagram*. i. e. "Forbear to eat beans, for they give the gout." The large and learned collections, which that Phyſician has publiſhed upon this precept, deſerve to be conſulted. The reader will meet there with many obſervations concerning Pythagoras.

[K] *Some take him to have been an eminent Magician.*] Let us quote the apology for the great men, who have been accuſed of Magick. *He has been deemed a ſorcerer and a wizard, becauſe he had lived firſt a great while in Egypt, and had applied himſelf to the reading of Zoroaſter's books, whence he learnt, as we may gueſs, the properties of certain herbs, which he called* Coraceſia, Callicia, Menais, Corinthas, *and* Apronix, *the two firſt of which being put into water made it freeze; the two next were very good remedies to cure the bite of ſerpents; and the laſt blazed on a ſudden from what diſtance ſoever it was expoſed to the fire; as alſo becauſe in one of his ſymbols he expreſsly forbid the uſe of beans, which, according to the ſame ſuperſtition, he uſed to boil; and then expoſed them for ſome nights to the moon, till by the great power of Magick they were turned into blood, which he made uſe of afterwards, to perform that other trick which Cælius Rhodiginus * mentions from Suidas, and from the Scholiaſt on Ariſtophanes's Comedy, entitled* the Clouds, *who aſſert that this Philoſopher uſed to write with blood upon a concave glaſs whatever he pleaſed; and that expoſing thoſe letters to the full moon he could read, on the diſk of that planet, all that he had wrote on his glaſs. To which may alſo be added, that he appeared with a golden thigh at the Olympick games, that he cauſed the river Neſſus to bow to him, that he ſtopped an eagle in her flight, that he tamed a ſhe-bear, that he killed a ſnake, and drove away an ox which was trampling a field ſowed with beans, and that he did it only by the ſecret virtue or power of ſome words. And farther, that he appeared on the ſame day and at the ſame hour, in the city of Crotona, and in the city of Metapontum; and that he foretold future events with ſo much certainty, that many perſons think he was called Pythagoras, becauſe his anſwers were not leſs certain and true than thoſe of Apollo Pythius.* That paſſage is extracted from Naudé's *Apollogie des grands hommes accuſes de Magie*, chap. XV, page 215. He tells us in page 214, that we may infer all this *from Jamblichus, from Pliny, from Tertullian, from Origen, from St. Auguſtin, from Ammianus Marcellinus, from the Jeſuit Delrio, and from Boiſſardus.*

(85) Θεανὼ δὲ, ἡ τότε γαμετὴ καὶ μαθήτρια, μὴ θέλουσα τὴν αἰτίαν κατειπεῖν, δι' ἣν τοὺς κυάμους οὐκ ἐσθίουσι, τὴν γλῶτταν ἐκτμηθεῖσα πρότερον, καὶ αὐτὴ προαπόλλυται, &c. *Vita Sancti Artemii, in Codic. MS. Bibliothecæ Colbertinæ, numero* 82. p. 48. *Apud* Menagium Notis in Diog. Laert. lib. 8. n. 50. p. 378.

* Lib. 9. cap. 23.

[L] *The Sieur Naudé clears him of that imputation.*] Conſult his Apology for the great men charged with Magick; I ſhall extract only the following paſſage from it. "The arguments which are grounded on "that Philoſopher's forbidding to eat beans, and on "the method he uſed, to turn their juice into blood, "can be as eaſily confuted as the preceding; ſince "Reuchlin juſtly laughs at all the ſilly things which "many fooliſh and brainleſs heads have invented "with regard to that prohibition, ſuch as might be "the fancy of Hermippus in Diogenes, who imagined that Pythagoras choſe rather to ſuffer himſelf to be killed near a field ſowed with beans, "than to make his eſcape through it. And if it be "true that he prohibited them, it was for no other "reaſon but the firſt of the five which Monſieur "Moreau urges † in the paſſage which we have "quoted from his Commentary on *the ſchool of Salerno* (86) . . . . We may alſo ſay, that there was "nothing extraordinary in his turning beans into "blood; ſince the ſame Monſieur Moreau ſhews "very plainly in his Commentary already mentioned, "that according to the principles of the Chymiſts, "who put the ſimilitude and reſemblance for the "cauſes of the action, it is a thing that can be done, "and may be accounted for by natural cauſes; though "we nevertheleſs ought not to imagine, that Pythagoras made uſe of that elixir of beans, or of human blood, to write upon his concave glaſs. For "beſides that there is no reaſon why he ſhould have "uſed blood, rather than any other liquor, Campanella * proves by very ſolid arguments, that this "operation is abſolutely impoſſible; and when Agrippa † boaſted that he knew that ſecret, and "when Noel des Comtes ** related, that they knew "at Paris, at night, what happened in the day at the "Caſtle of Milan, the former ſaid it only out of "vanity and to gain a reputation, as we ſhall fully "demonſtrate in the chapter relating to him; and "the account of the latter is a mere ſtory, and a falſity invented by thoſe who pretended that theſe two "great Princes (87) uſed magical arts together with "their arms, as Ninus and Zoroaſter, Pyrrhus and "Cræſus, Nictanebus and Philip of Macedon, are "ſaid to have done formerly. Which ſhould make "us judge, that all that is related concerning Pythagoras's concave glaſs is as falſely aſcribed to him "as the ſuperſtitious arithmetick, and the wheel of "onomanty; or that if he did ever practiſe it, it "was certainly ſome art and cunning trick or device: "and to conclude with Suidas, παίγνιον διὰ κατόπτρου (88), *an illuſion performed by the means of a glaſs*. . . "Nor is there any occaſion to dwell much longer "upon what is related of Pythagoras, namely, that "by pronouncing certain words he killed a ſnake, "which did a great deal of damage in Italy; for "Boiſſardus who cites Ariſtotle as his voucher for "that ſtory, does not quote the book from which "he extracted it; and if we enquire more deeply into the truth of the matter, we ſhall find it entirely falſe; ſince it has no other foundation but the "ignorance of thoſe who change the name of Socrates into that of Pythagoras, and who take for "a matter of fact a fabulous ſtory which is related, "of the former, in a book of the cauſes and properties of the Elements, which Patricius * ſhews to "have been erroneouſly aſcribed to Ariſtotle. But "that overſight of Boiſſardus might be eaſily excuſed, if he had not committed a much greater and "more remarkable blunder, by quoting Plutarch in "the life of Numa, as his authority for the ſtory of "the Ox, which Pythagoras † cauſed to go out of "a field of beans, after he had whiſpered ſome words "in the ox's ear. He had done better to confeſs "that he tranſlated this ſtory from Cœlius Rhodiginus, who indeed, in the beginning of his chapter,

† Cap. 19.

(86) Naudé, *Apolog. des grans Hommes accuſez de Magie*, p. 225, 226.

* *Liv.* 4. *de ſenſu c.* 16.

† *Lib.* 1. *de occult. Philoſoph. c.* 6.

** *Lib.* 3. *c.* 17. *Mytholog.*

(87) See the art. FRANCIS I. rem. [K].

(88) Naudé, *Apolog. des grans Hommes accuſez de Magie*, p. 226, 227.

* *Diſcuſſion. Peripal. tom.* 1. *lib.* 3.

† *Lib.* 19. *cap.* 7.

may be found in Moreri. However, though we find the metamorphoſis there, I ſhall inſiſt

" chapter quotes Plutarch, but for quite another thing " than that ſtory, of which you will never find that " Plutarch ever ſaid a word (89)."

(89) Naudé, ib. p. 237.

I imagine that the Reader will be well pleaſed to meet here with the Greek words of the Scholiaſt on Ariſtophanes, as they have been corrected by the learned Meziriac. *I ſhall cloſe this diſcourſe,* ſays he (90), *with a pretty obſervation, which the Scholiaſt on Ariſtophanes's Comedy of the Clouds, and Suidas make on theſe words.* Θετταλὴ γυνὴ (the Italian woman) *concerning a wonderful piece of magic with regard to the moon. Here follow the Scholiaſts own words.* Ἔστι δὲ καὶ Πυθαγόρειον παίγνιον διὰ τῆς κατόπτρου τοιοῦτον. πληροσελήνου τῆς σελήνης οὔσης, εἴτις ἔσοπτρον ἐπιγράψειεν αἵμασι ὅσα βούλεται, καὶ προσιπὼν ἑτέρῳ, σταὶς κατόπιν αὐτοῦ, δεικνὺς πρὸς τὴν σελήνην τὰ γράμματα, κἀκεῖνος ἀτενίσειεν ὁ πλησίον εἰς τὸν τῆς σελήνης κύκλον, ἀναγνοὶς πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ κατόπτρῳ γεγραμμένα, ὡς ἐπὶ τῆς σελήνης γεγραμμένα. There is a ſport invented by Pythagoras which is performed by the means of a glaſs after this manner. The moon being at the full, ſome one writes what he pleaſes with blood upon a glaſs, and having given notice of it to another, he ſtands behind him, and turns the letters written on the glaſs towards the moon; the other, looking earneſtly upon the moon, reads all that is written on the glaſs, as if it were wrote upon the moon. *I have corrected two errors in that paſſage, putting* πληροσελήνου the full of the moon, *inſtead of* προσελήνου the wane of the moon, *according to the opinion of the learned Meurſius, in his book of the games of Greece, who has taken that correction from Suidas; I have alſo put* ἀτενίσειεν *inſtead of* ἀτενίσαι. *As for Suidas, he ſeems to have only tranſcribed that paſſage word for word. But there are many errors in all the printed books of that Author.* You will meet with the correction of theſe errors in Meziriac. Conſult the remarks on the *Berger Extravagant* (91). i. e. The " fooliſh Shepherd." Noel le Comte's ſtory (92) has been tranſcribed into many books, ſo true is it, that to publiſh any thing from a mere hearſay is wronging the publick. There are but too many Authors who receive it from one another as a matter of fact. Becauſe the Monk St. Romuald had inſerted that ſtory into his Chronological Treaſure, Father L'Enfant inſerted it into his general Hiſtory of all the Ages of the new law. *The manner,* ſays he (93), *of acquainting abſent perſons with what happens, without any magical practice, is as follows: You muſt write it in a large letter upon a glaſs, and preſent it to the moon, which will ſhew the writing to one in a diſtant place who obſerves the moon in another glaſs. Thus when Francis I. was at war with Charles V. for the Dutchy of Milan, they knew at Paris the very night what had happened in the day time* (94). If an Author related ſuch things only to laugh at them, he would avoid being cenſured. It is after that manner that John Leo has related a ſtory which was commonly told in Egypt. *Among the Ptolemy's,* ſays he (95), *there was formerly a King of Alexandria, who in order to make that city ſecure and impregnable, and that he might without any danger avoid the powerful attempts of his enemies, cauſed a pillar to be ſet up, on the top of which was put a large reflecting mirrour of ſteel, the property of which was ſuch, that all the enemy's ſhips which ſailed by that pillar (the mirrour being uncovered) were miraculouſly ſet on fire; and it was only for that purpoſe he had ſet up that pillar near the entrance of the Port. But it is ſaid, that when the Mahometans came there they ſpoiled that mirrour, ſo that it came to loſe its property, which was no leſs wonderful than unuſual, and they had the Pillar taken away. A ridiculous ſtory this, which is fit only to be told to children, and not to thoſe who have any judgment.* Add to this what I have obſerved in the remark [L] of the article HERCULES, and theſe words of William Bouchet. *The mirrour of that woman muſt have been enchanted, and made with the deviliſh magic of Toledo, ſince the inhabitants of Rhodes could ſee the ſhips which were ſailing to Syria or to Egypt, in a Mirrour which hung from the neck of the ſun on their Coloſſus* (96).

(90) Meziriac, *ſur les Epitres d'Ovide*, p. 607, 608.

(91) Upon the 7th book, p. m. 321.

(92) See his *Mythologie*, liv. 3. chap. 17. p. m. 253.

(93) David l'Enfant, a Dominican Frier, *Hiſt. generale de tous les Siecles*, under the 21ſt of June, p. 347. He quotes the *Treſor Chronolog.* p. 519. Tom. 1.

(94) See hereunder, the rem. [Q].

(95) Jean Leon, *Deſcription d'Afrique*, folio 358, of the Antwerp edit. 1556. I make uſe of the French tranſlation made by John Temporal.

(96) Guillaume Bouchet, *Serée* 19. p. m. 171, 172.

The ſtory of Noſtradamus's Mirrours is not much better than the foregoing. Men will have it, that he ſaw in aſtrological mirrours thoſe future events, which is pretended he has ſo luckily foretold. *Fuit, qui narravit, ſpeculis quibuſdam Aſtrologicis Noſtradamum ad has prædictiones uſum. Nam, qui arcaniora Phyſica & Aſtrologica cognita habent, ajunt è metallis, tanquam Planetis terreſtribus, eadem configuratione, qua Planetæ in Thematibus Natalitiis ponuntur, ſub certis conſtellationibus ſpecula fieri poſſe, in quibus futura cernantur. Talia ſpecula non pro hominibus tantum, ſed & nationibus, urbibus, ſeculis ut illi ajunt, fabricari poſſunt* (97). i. e. " There is one, who relates, that Noſtradamus uſed " aſtronomical mirrours to foretel future events. For " they, who are acquainted with the ſecrets of Natural Philoſophy and Aſtrology, pretend, that it " is poſſible to make mirrours in which one may ſee " future events; provided theſe mirrours be made of " ſome of the metals, which are, as it were, terreſtrial planets, and of the ſame figure in which the " planets are placed in the calculation of Nativities, " and under certain conſtellations: theſe mirrours " ſerve to foreſee future events, relating not only to " private perſons, but alſo to cities, nations, future " ages, as they ſay."

(97) Marhoffius, *Polybiſt.* lib. 1, cap. 10. p. 96.

*(a) It has been aſſerted in a ſatyr againſt the Jeſuits entitled, *De ſtudiis abſtruſioribus Jeſuitarum*, (of the moſt ſecret ſtudies of the Jeſuits) " that father Coton uſed " to ſhew to King (Henry the Great) *in a ſtarry (or " Aſtrological) Mirrour* all that was tranſacting at the " Courts, and in the cabinets of all the Princes upon " earth *:" and the Jeſuit, who acquaints us with that particular, confutes that ſtory with great warmth. Nicholas Paſquier relates another ſtory much like that; and takes notice, that he does not tell it with a deſign to turn it into ridicule, but he relates it in the graveſt manner in the world in a letter which is full of the *Prognoſtications which did forebode the death of* Henry the Great. I am ſo much the more willing to tranſcribe his ſtory here, that it is related with all its circumſtances, and conſequently moſt proper to make the Reader ſenſible how ridiculous it is. " The " late Queen-Mother (Catharine de Medicis) ſays " Paſquier †, being deſirous to know, whether or " not all her children ſhould be raiſed to the Throne, " a Magician, in the caſtle of Chaumont, ſituated " on the bank of the river Loir, between Blois and " Amboiſe, ſhewed her in a great room, in the circumference of a circle which he had drawn, all " the Kings of France which had been and were to " be for the future, who turned as many times about " the circle as they were to reign years, and when " Henry the third had made fifteen turns, the late " King appeared ſtrong and healthy, who made " twenty turns, and as he was finiſhing the twenty-" firſt, he diſappeared. After him came a little " Prince, about eight or nine years old, who made " thirty-ſeven or thirty-eight turns; after which all " things vaniſhed away, becauſe the late Queen-mother would not ſee any more of it." Obſerve, that his pretended enchantment is erroneous the moment it enters upon futurity. He ſays, truly enough, that Henry III. made fifteen turns, and Henry IV. twenty, and diſappeared at the twenty-firſt, becauſe this was wrote after the event **: but when he comes to ſpeak of Lewis XIII. he is out. He makes him perform thirty-ſeven or thirty-eight turns, which ſuppoſes that he was to reign till the year 1647 or 1648. Whereas all the world knows that he reigned only till the year 1643. The Author of a ſmall pamphlet, entitled, *Remarques ſur le Gouvernement du Royaume durant les Regnes de Henry IV, de Louis XIII, & de Louis XIV*, (Obſervations on the adminiſtration of the kingdom during the reigns of Henry IV, Lewis XIII, and Lewis XIV) printed at Cologne for Peter Martou * in 1688, in 12mo, relates that ſtory thus. *It is reported that ſhe* (Catharine de Medicis) *made uſe alſo of the inchantments of her Diviners, in order to know the ſucceſſors of her ſon: and that by the means of a Mirrour they made thoſe appear before her, after the family of the Valois was extinct. The firſt who appeared was Henry IV; but ſhe entertained an implacable hatred and averſion againſt that Prince, and endeavoured continually after that time to deſtroy him, by all the artifices ſhe could*

* *Reponſe Apologet, à l'Anti-Coton*, p. 141.

† *Letires de Nicolas Paſquier*, p. 10.

** His book was publiſhed in 1623. The letter bears no date; but it appears that it was wrote ſoon after the death of Henry IV.

* This is a fictitious name.

infiſt a little upon it [*M*]. I believe, that it was on account of this opinion, that he diſapproved of the ſacrifices of beaſts; and it is obſerved, that he adored an altar, upon which no victim had been ſacrificed; that he adored it, I ſay, as a place which had not been

could imagine. Notumque furens quid fœmina poſſit. *It is well known what an enraged woman is capable to do; there is nothing but ſhe finds means to execute it. But God delivered that Monarch from all her ſnares. After King Henry IV, the Mirrour ſhewed her Lewis XIII, and Lewis XIV with a Majeſtic ſhape and countenance. After whom appeared in the Mirrour a band of Jeſuits, who were in their turn to be maſters of the kingdom of France. She would not ſee any more of that ſhew, and was even like to have broke the mirrour in pieces; however it was preſerved, and ſeveral perſons aſſert that it is ſtill kept in the Louvre* †. It is very plain that this account is nothing but Nicholas Paſquier's ſtory reviſed and improved. But do not you wonder with how much boldneſs it has been falſified. I. Henry IV is there made to appear the firſt, whereas Paſquier makes all his Predeceſſors appear before him. II. The ſtory is carried on to Lewis XIV, and even beyond him, whereas he had carried it only to Lewis XIII. III. It is hinted that this happened in the Louvre, whereas Paſquier ſays it was at Chaumont on the river Loir. IV. Here they ſpeak of a mirrour or looking-glaſs, and he mentions only a circle. V. They pretend the mirrour is preſerved, which, they ſay, is ſtill in the Louvre. VI. They aſſert, that Catharine de Medicis would have broke the looking-glaſs; whereas Paſquier ſays only, that ſhe would not ſee any more of the ſhew. I ſay nothing of the reflection which is there ſo wittily brought in, and contradicted immediately after; nor of that fine prediction in behalf of the Jeſuits, the falſity of which appears ſo plainly at this time; nor of what is ſo ridiculouſly aſſerted concerning the cauſe of Catharine de Medicis's animoſity againſt Heny IV. It is well known that ſhe had other reaſons to hate him. It will perhaps be thought that this is dwelling too much on ſuch trifles; but it is not ſo uſeleſs, as ſome perſons may imagine, to refute thoſe kinds of traditions, and to trace them up to their original; ſince we meet daily with perſons ſo credulous as to believe them, and to relate them without any ſhame. How many perſons are there, for inſtance, who have read the latter of theſe two accounts, without knowing, or ſo much as ſuſpecting it was only an improvement of Paſquier's ſtory? Such is the fate of thoſe ſorts of traditions, many additions are made to them in time; ſo that we may very well apply to them this ſaying, *vires acquirit eundo.* CRIT. REM.

† *Remarques ſur le Gouvernement du Royaume, &c.* p. 15 and 16.

[*M*] *I ſhall dwell a little upon* the metempſycoſis.] It is pretended that Pythagoras boaſted in that reſpect of a moſt particular privilege; for he boaſted that he remembered what bodies his ſoul had animated before he was Pythagoras; but he did not go higher up than the ſiege of Troy. He had been firſt Æthalides the reputed ſon of Mercury, and having got leave to beg of that god whatever he pleaſed, he prayed that he might remember every thing even after his death. Some time after he was Euphorbus, and was wounded by Menelaus at the ſiege of Troy. After the death of Euphorbus he was Hermotimus, and then a fiſher-man of Delos named Pyrrhus, and at laſt he was Pythagoras, a man who remembered all thoſe tranſmigrations, what he had ſuffered in hell, and what the other ſouls ſuffer there (98). Here is a little contradiction (99): for if the ſouls when they have a body go into another, they do not go into hell. In Ovid our Philoſopher does not go up higher than Euphorbus.

(98) *Ex* Heraclide Pontico, *apud* Laert. lib. 8. num. 4 and 5.

(99) Compare with this what is obſerved above towards the end of the rem. [*F*].

Morte carent animæ, ſemperque priore relictâ
Sede, novis domibus vivunt, habitantque receptæ.
Ipſe ego (nam memini) Trojani tempore belli
Panthoides Euphorbus eram: cui pectore quondam
Hæſit in adverſo gravis haſta minoris Atridæ.
Cognovi clypeum lævæ geſtamina noſtræ
Nuper Abantæis, templo Junonis, in Argis (100).

(100) Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 15. ver. 158.

" Even I, who thoſe myſterious truths declare,
" Was once Euphorbus in the Trojan war;
" My name, and lineage I remember well,
" And how in fight by Sparta's King I fell.
" In Argive Juno's fane I late beheld
" My buckler hung on high, and own'd my former
" ſhield." DRYDEN.

O the happy memory of the man, does Lactantius cry out here merrily! *O miram, & ſingularem Pythagoræ memoriam. O miſeram oblivionem noſtrum omnium, qui neſciamus, qui ante fuerimus; ſed fortaſſe vel errore aliquo, vel gratia ſit effectum, ut ille ſolus lethæum gurgitem non attigerit, nec oblivionis aquam guſtaverit. Videlicet ſenex vanus (ſicut otioſæ aniculæ ſolent) fabulas tanquam infantibus credulis finxit. Quòd ſi benè ſenſiſſet de iis, quibus hæc locutus eſt, ſi homines eos exiſtimaſſet, nunquam ſibi tam petulanter mentiendi licentiam vendicaſſet. Sed deridenda hominis leviſſimi vanitas* (101). i. e. " Oh, the wonderful and remarkable " memory of Pythagoras! Oh, the wretched forget- " fulneſs of us all, we do not remember what men " we have been formerly. But it happened perhaps " by a miſtake, or by a particular favour, that he " alone eſcaped the gulf of the river Lethe, and did " not drink of the waters of oblivion. But indeed that " ſilly old man (as idle old women uſe to do) was " telling ſtories as it were to credulous children. For " if he had had a good opinion of thoſe he ſpoke " to, if he had thought them men, he would never " have dared to lie ſo ſhamefully. But we muſt " only laugh at the boaſting of that moſt trifling old " man." Lactantius ought not to have queſtioned whether Pythagoras aſcribed his memory to a favour of the gods, ſince he might have read it in Heraclides: and beſides this, will ſome ſay, we may eaſily imagine that Pythagoras prevented the objections, which other men could urge againſt him from their not remembring a ſtate of pre-exiſtence. Here follows an anſwer to that objection. In ſome reſpects it is not probable that he was bold enough to boaſt of ſuch a thing: he muſt have had, as Lactantius obſerves, an exceſſive contempt for the reſt of mankind. But if you turn the tables, you will not find herein any thing that claſhes with probability. He had gained ſo great a reputation, and had ſo often tried the blind docility and exceſſive credulity of his hearers, that he might very well hope and expect that they would grant every thing he ſhould aſſert concerning his memory. If you have a mind to know his tranſmigrations ſince the death of Pythagoras, do but look into the following paſſage, and you will ſee there, that at the third removal he was a Courtezan *Pythagoram vero ipſum ſicuti celebre eſt Euphorbum primo ſe fuiſſe dictitaſſe; ita hæc remotiora ſunt his, quæ Clearchus & Dicæarchus memoriæ tradiderunt, fuiſſe eum poſtea Pyrandrum, deinde Callicleam, deinde fœminam pulchra facie meretricem, cui nomen fuerat Alce* (102). i. e. " It is publickly known that Py- " thagoras himſelf ſaid, he had been firſt Euphor- " bus; but what Clearchus and Dicæarchus relate " is not ſo well khown, namely that he has been " ſince Pyrander, then Callicles, and afterwards a " beautiful Courtezan named Alce." Let us obſerve, that Pythagoras was not the inventor of the doctrine of the tranſmigration of ſouls; he learnt it from the Egyptians (103). This made him ſpoil the beautiful inſtructions he had received from Pherecydes concerning the immortality of the ſoul, and which made ſo deep an impreſſion upon his mind, that on a ſudden he left off his trade of a wreſtler, to apply himſelf to the ſtudy of Philoſophy. *Quis nunc extremus idiota, vel quæ abjecta muliercula non credit animæ immortalitatem, vitamque poſt mortem futuram? Quod apud Græcos olim primus Pherecydes Aſſyrius cum diſputaſſet, Pythagoram Samium illius diſputationis novitate permotum ex athleta in Philoſophum vertit* (104). i. e. " What ſimple and illiterate man or mean woman is " there, who do not believe the immortality of the " ſoul and a future life? Which point being firſt " maintained

(101) Lactant. *divin. Inſtitut.* lib. 3. cap. 18. p. m. 196.

(102) Aul. Gell. lib. 4. cap. 11. See above the article PERICLES, quotat. 186.

(103) Herodotus, lib. 2. cap. 123. where he does nevertheleſs omit the name of Pythagoras. But Diod. Sicul. lib. 1. *ſub fin.* does not omit it.

(104) Auguſtin, *Epiſt.* 3 p. m. 9.

been profaned or polluted [*N*]. I have not mentioned Pythagoras's country, becauſe there is a great variety of opinions upon that ſubject; ſome will have him to be a Tyrrhenian; others repreſent him as a Syrian; others that he was born in the iſle of Samos, and others in the iſle of Cephalenia (*f*), &c. (*g*). Nothing can be formed among the Pagan Philoſophers nobler, than what he ſaid concerning God, and the end which we ought to aim at [*O*]; and probably he would have carried his orthodoxy much farther, if he had had courage enough to expoſe himſelf to martyrdom. The circumſtances of his death

(*f*) At Samos, a city of that iſle.

(*g*) See Farnaby, in Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 15. ver. 60.

" maintained among the Greeks in diſputation by " Pherecydes the Aſſyrian, Pythagoras the Samian " was ſo touched by the novelty of the ſubject, that " from a wreſtler he turned philoſopher."

[*N*] *It is remarked, that he adored an altar. . . . . as a place, which had never been profaned or polluted.*] It was an altar dedicated to Apollo in the iſle of Delos. Read the following words of Macrobius (105). *Conſtat, ſicut Cloatius Verus ordinatorum libro ſecundo docet, eſſe Deli aram; apud quam hoſtia non cæditur, ſed tantum ſollemni deum prece venerantur, verba Cloatii hæc ſunt:* Deli ara eſt Apollinis Γενήτορος, in qua nullum animal ſacrificatur: quam Pythagoram velut inviolatam adoraviſſe produnt. . . . . *Meminit hujus aræ & Cato de liberis educandis in hæc verba:* Nutrix hæc omnia faciebat in verbenis ac tubis ſine hoſtia, ut Deli ad Apollinis Genitivi aram. " It is certain, " as Cloatius Verus tells us in *L. II. Ordinat.* that " there is an altar at Delos, on which no victim is " ſacrificed, but the people worſhip the Deity in a " ſolemn prayer. Cloatius's words are: *At Delos is " an altar of Apollo* Γενήτορος, *on which no animal is " ſacrificed, and which Pythagoras is ſaid to have adored " as unpolluted.* . . . . Cato mentions this altar in " his book of the education of children, in the following words: *The nurſe performed all this with " vervain and trumpets without a victim, as at the " altar of Apollo Genitivus at Delos.*"

(105) Macrob. *Saturn.* lib. 3. cap. 6. p. m. 316.

[*O*] *Nothing can be found among the Pagan Philoſophers finer than what he ſaid concerning God, and the end, which we ought to aim at.*] He owned the unity of God; for he ſaid, that unity was the principle of all things, and that from it ſprung the ſubject which it employed as matter, and that its agency upon matter was the cauſe of numbers, figures, the elements, the viſible world, &c. Ἀρχὴν μὲν τῶν ἁπάντων, μονάδα. ἐκ δὲ τῆς μονάδος ἀόριστον δυάδα, ὡς ἂν ὕλην τῇ μονάδι αἰτίῳ ὄντι ὑποκεῖσθαι, (106). *Omnium rerum id quod unum eſt, eſſe initium; ex eo geminum quod infinitum eſt, profectum tanquam materiem illi ipſi uni, quod cauſa eſt, ſubjectum eſſe*, &c (107). He ſays, that this unity was God, Good, the underſtanding and the mind. Τὴν μὲν μονάδα θεὸν, καὶ ἀγαθὸν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ ἑνὸς φύσις, αὐτὸς ὁ νοῦς. *Unitatem Deum ac bonum quæ ſit Unius natura, ipſa mens* (108). Caſaubon the younger (109) cites a paſſage of Stobæus, which ought to be corrected. Πυθαγόρας τῶν ἀρχῶν τὴν μὲν μονάδα θεὸν καὶ τ' ἀγαθὸν. ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ νοὸς φύσις· ὁ αὐτὸς ὁ νοῦς· καὶ τὴν ἀόριστον δυάδα, καὶ τὸ κακὸν περὶ ἣν ἐστιν τὸ ὁλικὸν πλῆθος. Stobæus had taken this from Plutarch (110); we ought therefore to ſtrike out τοῦ νοὸς, and inſert τοῦ ἑνός. Pythagoras's doctrine is not ſo orthodox in this paſſage as in that of Diogenes Laertius; for according to Plutarch he admitted two independent principles, unity and binary, and he aſcribed to the former the divine eſſence, goodneſs, underſtanding, and to the latter the nature of demon, evil, matter. We ſhall judge more advantageouſly of his opinion, if we take it from Clemens Alexandrinus. Οὐκ ἀποκρυπτέον οὐδὲ τοὺς ἀμφὶ τὸν Πυθαγόραν, οἳ φασιν, Ὁ μὲν Θεὸς, εἷς· χ' οὗτος δὲ οὐχ ὡς τινες ὑπονοοῦσιν, ἐκτὸς τῆς διακοσμήσεως, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῇ ὅλος, ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κύκλῳ, ἐπίσκοπος πάσης γενέσεως, κράσις τῶν ὅλων· ἀεὶ ὤν, καὶ ἐργάλας τῶν αὐτοῦ δυναμίων καὶ ἔργων ἁπάντων, ἐν οὐρανῷ φωσὴρ, καὶ πάντων παλὴρ, νοῦς καὶ ψύχωσις τῷ ὅλῳ κύκλῳ, πάντων κίνασις (111). i. e. " Nor are Pythagoras's followers " to be paſſed over in ſilence, who aſſert, that God " indeed is one, but not ſo, as ſome imagine, as if " he were out of the adminiſtration of the world, " but he is wholly in it, in the whole circle, the " ſuperintended over all generation, the diſpoſer of " all things, who always exiſts, and employs his " powers in the work, the author of all the heavenly motions, the father of all things, the mind and " animator of the whole circle, and the ſource of " all motion." The misfortune is, that Pythagoras in repreſenting God as the mover of the univerſe, and the ſoul of the world, aſſerts that our ſouls are portions of the Deity. The objection propoſed to him upon this point in Cicero is not to be anſwered. *Nam Pythagoras, qui cenſuit* (Deum) *animum eſſe per naturam rerum omnem intentum & commeantem, ex quo noſtri animi caperentur, non vidit diſtractione humanorum animorum diſcerpi & dilacerari Deum: & cùm miſeri animi eſſent, quod pleriſque contingeret, tum Dei partem eſſe miſeram: quod fieri non poteſt. Cur autem quicquam ignoraret animus hominis, ſi eſſet Deus? quomodò porrò Deus iſte, ſi nihil eſſet niſi animus, aut infixus, aut infuſus eſſet in mundo* (112). i. e. " For " Pythagoras who thought that God is a mind per- " vading all nature, from which our ſouls are ta- " ken, did not ſee, that by the diſtraction of human " ſouls, the Deity ſuffers a diſcerption and dilacera- " tion; and when human ſouls are miſerable, which " happens to be the caſe of moſt of them, then " part of the Deity is miſerable, which is impoſſi- " ble. But how can the mind of man be ignorant " of any thing, if it be God? How can God, if he " be nothing but the ſoul, be infixed or infuſed in " the world?" St. Epiphanius aſcribes to this Philoſopher an opinion, which is very abſurd, viz. that he aſcribed to God a corporeal and organical nature, God being nothing but the heavens, and making uſe of the ſun and moon as two eyes, and ſo with regard to other parts of the firmament (113). But here follows a ſentiment, which is abſolutely true, Clemens Alexandrinus compares it with St. Paul's words. There is none wiſe but God, ſaid Pythagoras (114). The author of the Jewiſh antiquities ſeems greatly ſatisfied with what ſeveral Philoſophers, and particularly this, thought concerning the nature of God; and he does not doubt, that they would have ſpoken ſtill more orthodoxly, if they had not been apprehenſive of perſecution; for, as Plato ſays, it is not ſafe to declare to ignorant perſons the truth concerning the divine nature. Καὶ γὰρ Πυθαγόρας καὶ Ἀναξαγόρας καὶ Πλάτων, καὶ οἱ μετ' ἐκείνους ἀπὸ τῆς σοᾶς φιλόσοφοι, καὶ μικροῦ δεῖν ἅπαντες οὕτω φαίνονται, περὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ φύσεως πεφρονηκότες. ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν πρὸς ὀλίγον φιλοσοφοῦντες εἰς πλῆθος δόξαις προκατειλημμένον τὴν ἀληθειαν τοῦ δόγματος ἐξενεγκεῖν οὐκ ἐτόλμησαν. . . . Αὐτὸς δὲ Πλάτων ὁμολόγησεν, ὅτι τὴν ἀληθῆ περὶ θεοῦ δόξαν εἰς τὴν τῶν ὄχλων ἄγνοιαν οὐκ ἦν ἀσφαλὲς ἐξενεγκεῖν. *Pythagoras enim, & Anaxagoras, & Plato, & poſt illos philoſophi Stoici, & pæne cuncti, videntur de divina ſapuiſſe natura. Sed hi quidem ad breve philoſophantes, populo ſuperſtitionum opinionibus jam præoccupato veritatem dogmatis proferre timuére* (115). . . . . *Ipſe ſiquidem Plato confeſſus eſt, quia veram de Deo opinionem propter ignorantiam plebis proferre ſecurum non eſt* (116). The ſame Joſephus aſſerts, that Pythagoras ſurpaſſed in piety and wiſdom all the ancient Philoſophers (117). We muſt not omit the following obſervation of Plutarch; when he ſhews the conformity between the ſentiments of Numa and Pythagoras, he ſays that Numa would not have the Deity repreſented by images, and that God, according to Pythagoras, is an impaſſible nature, which does not fall under the ſenſes, and can only be the object of the underſtanding (118). Οὔτε γὰρ ἐκεῖνος αἰσθητὸν ἢ παθητὸν, ἀόρατον δὲ καὶ ἀκήρατον καὶ νοητὸν ὑπελάμβανεν εἶναι τὸ πρῶτον. *Neque enim ille ſenſui aut ulli dolori expoſitum rerum principium eſſe, ſed inviſibile, incorruptum, ſola mente exiſtimavit apprehenſibile* (119).

With regard to the end of our actions and ſtudies, nothing can be ſeen more admirable or Chriſtian, than what Pythagoras has ſaid; for he would have the ſtudy of Philoſophy tend to make men like to God. Πρὸς τὴν θείαν ὁμοίωσιν ἀνάγει, καὶ τῆς Πυθαγορικῆς φιλοσοφίας τὸν τελειότατον σκοπὸν ἐκκαλύπτει (120). i. e. " They lead men to a reſemblance of the Deity, and " ſhew the moſt perfect end of the Pythagorean " Philoſophy."

(106) Diog. Laert. lib. 8. num. 25.

(107) Thus Aldobrandini tranſlates it at the beginning of his notes on theſe words of Laert. See alſo Meric Caſaub. upon Laert. ibid. num. 83.

(108) Plut. *de Placitis Philoſ.* lib. 1. cap. 7. p. 881.

(109) *Not. in* Diog. Laert. *in* Alcmæone, lib. 8. num. 83.

(110) After what has been cited from Plut. we read, Τὴν δ' ἀόριστον δυάδα δαίμονα καὶ τὸ κακὸν, περὶ ἣν ἐστι τὸ ὑλικὸν πλῆθος. ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ ὁρατὸς ὁ κόσμος. *Infinitam autem binarii naturam, genium & malum unde eſt multitudo materiæ, & viſui expoſitus mundus.*

(111) Clem. Alexandr. *in* Admonit. *ad Gentes*, p. 47, *C.* See alſo Juſtin Martyr, *Orat. ad Gentes*, p. 58.

(112) Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*, lib. 1. p. m. 41. Conſult Minucius Felix, who ſays p. m. 151. *Pythagoræ Deus eſt animus per univerſam rerum naturam commeans, & intentus: ex quo etiam animalium omnium vita capiatur.* Lactantius ſays the ſame thing, lib. 1. cap. 5. p. m. 14.

(113) Epiphan. *Hær.* 15. p. 14.

(114) *Apud* Clement. Alexandr. *Stromat.* lib. 4. p. 477.

(115) Joſephus, *contra Appion.* lib. 2. p. 1071.

(116) Idem, ib. p. 1076.

(117) Σοφία καὶ τῇ περὶ τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβείᾳ πάντων, ὑπειλημμένος δυνηκεῖν τῶν φιλοσοφησάντων. *Sapientia & divina pietate Philoſophos omnes excellens.* Idem, lib. 1. *contra Appion.* p. 1046.

(118) Plut. *in* Numa, p. 65.

(119) Idem Plut. ibid. *B.*

(120) Hierocles, *in Præfatione ad Carmina aurea circa finem.* See alſo Stobæus, *Eclog.* 11. cap. 3. where he ſays, Σωκράτης, Πλάτων ταῦτα τῷ Πυθαγόρᾳ, τέλος ὁμοίωσιν θεοῦ. *Socrates & Plato quemadmodum Pythagoras finem dixerunt, dei ſimilitudinem.*

death are variouſly related [*P*]. I ſhall mention ſome Authors, who have treated of his opinions [*Q*]. What relates to him as a Phyſician, may be ſeen in the Hiſtory of Phyſick (*b*).

(*b*) Printed at Geneva in 1696, and written by D. L. C. D. M. that is, David le Clerc, M. D. He is brother to Mr. le Clerc, Profeſſor at Amſterdam.

I would add to what I have ſaid concerning the fable of his Mirrours (*i*), a ſtory, which I have juſt read in a News-Writer [*R*].

(*i*) In th... [*L*].

PYTHEAS,

" Philoſophy." This is the encomium given to a poem, which contains the Doctrines of that philoſopher. They conſiſted of two parts, which might be compared to the purgative method, and the unitive method, of which our Myſtics have ſaid ſo many fine things. *Hierocles, qui commentarios eruditiſſimos in Carmen Aureum Pythagoræ reliquit, ſtatim ab initio de Pythagorica Philoſophia diſſerens, appellat eam* κάθαρσιν καὶ τελειότητα, purgationem, & perfectionem. *Quæ duo cum ſubindicent officium ipſius duplex ac propoſitum, ut loco alio monſtravi, duplicem videri poſſunt Pythagoras & Pythagorici habuiſſe philoſophiam, quarum illa ſit* καθαρτική, *hæc vero* τελική, *illa, quæ purgat à malis, ſeparat à materia & corpore, liberat à vinculis & carcere; hæc, quæ perficiat, evehat & reportet ſurſum, &* εἰς τὸ εἶδος τῆς πρόσθεν ἕξεως, *ut loquitur Hierocles, id eſt habitus prioris formam inducat, ſimileſque faciat Deo. . . . . Id quod ipſe indicat Hierocles in ſequentibus, quando dicit,* περιέχει (*carmen aureum*) πάσης φιλοσοφίας πρακτικῆς καὶ θεωρητικῆς τὰ καθόλου δόγματα, δι' ὧν ἄν τις ἑαυτὸν καθαρὸν ἀπολάυσι καὶ τὴν πρὸς θεὸν ὁμοίωσιν ἐντυχήσειε. Continet philoſophiæ omnis practicæ ac theoreticæ decreta ſumma quibus quis & purgare ſe, & ſimilem deo facere valeat (121). The author whom I quote, cites (122) ſeveral paſſages, which ſhew, that according to this Philoſopher, the acquiſition of truth was the only means of obtaining the reſemblance of God; but that to know the truth it was neceſſary to ſearch for it with a mind, purified, and ſuperior to the paſſions of the body; whence he concludes what we are going to read: *Ex iis quæ ſuperiori capite attulimus, manifeſtum eſt, philoſophiam Pythagoricam id habere ſibi maxime propoſitum, ut ad quandam ſimilitudinem cum Deo ſectatores ſuos ducat; id vero fieri aliter non poſſe, quam ſi veritati atque ſapientiæ pura integraque mente incumbatur* (123). i. e. " It is evident from " what we have produced in the preceding chapter, " that the Pythagorean Philoſophy had this point " chiefly in view, to lead its followers to a reſem- " blance of God; which could be done only by pur- " ſuing truth and wiſdom with a pure and ſound " mind." Let us add to this the teſtimony of the anonymous writer of Pythagoras's life. He ſays (124), that the followers of this Philoſopher taught, that man is perfected by three methods: 1. By converſing with the Gods; for during this converſation he abſtains from all evil actions, and becomes like the Gods as far as it is poſſible. 2. By doing good to others; for this is the property of God, and an imitation of God (125). 3. By leaving this life. The nobleſt gifts, which Heaven has made for man, are, according to Pythagoras, to ſpeak truth, and to do good offices: theſe two things, ſaid he, reſemble the works of God (126).

(121) Joannes Schefferus, *de natura & conſtitutione Philoſophiæ Italicæ*, cap. 10. p. 78.

(122) Ibid. cap. 7.

(123) Idem, ib. cap. 8. p. 56.

(124) *Apud* Photium, *Codice* 249, p. 1313.

(125) Δεύτερον ἐν τῷ εὖ ποιεῖν. Θεῷ γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ θείας μιμήσεως. *Deinde bene de aliis merendo: Dei enim hoc proprium eſt, in eoque Deum imitatur.* Photius, ibid.

(126) Ælianus, *var. Hiſt.* lib. 12. cap. 59.

(127) Diog. Laertius, lib. 8. num. 39.

(128) Aul. Gell. lib. 1. cap. 9.

(129) Laert. lib. 8. num. 39.

(130) Ἀλῶναι μᾶλλον ἢ πατῆσαι· ἀναιρεθῆναι δὲ κρεῖττον ἢ λαλῆσαι. *Capi præſtat quam bas dare preſſum, cædique ſatius eſt quam quicquam loqui.* Idem, ib. Meric Caſaub. conjectures, that inſtead of λαλῆσαι we muſt read εἰλύσαι *vagari*, to wander wretchedly.

(131) Idem, ib. num. 40.

(132) Idem, ib.

[*P*] *The circumſtances of his death are variouſly related.*] He lived at Crotona at Milo's houſe with his diſciples, and was burnt there. A man whom he would not admit in that ſociety, ſet fire to the houſe (127). It is probable, that the phyſiognomy of the man was not a good one; for Pythagoras admitted none as his ſcholars whoſe countenance did not pleaſe him, after he had examined it according to the rules of art. This was his firſt ſtep. *Jam à principio adoleſcentes qui ſeſe ad diſcendum obtulerant,* ἐφυσιογνωμόνει. *Id verbum ſignificat, mores naturaſque hominum, conjectatione quadam de oris & vultus ingenio, deque totius corporis filo atque habitu, ſciſcitari. Eum, qui exploratus ab eo idoneuſque fuerat, recipi in diſciplinam ſtatim jubebat* (128). Some ſay (129), that he was ſuſpected of contriving to uſurp the government; and that to prevent this deſign, the people of Crotona ſet fire to his houſe. He eſcaped through the flames, and left the city; but entring into a field of beans, he ſtopped, and choſe rather to be killed than to open his mouth, and to ſpoil the beans (130). According to Dicæarchus (131) he fled to the temple of the muſes at Metapontus, and died there of hunger after having faſted forty days. Others ſay (132), that upon his return from a voyage, which he had taken to the iſle of Delos, in order to cloſe the eyes of his maſter Pherecydes, and to bury him, he put an end to his own life by abſtaining from food. According to others (133) he conducted all his diſciples to the aſſiſtance of the Agrigentines againſt the Syracuſans; and being defeated was killed as he was flying round a field of beans. This does not agree either with the eighty years, which he is ſaid (134) to have lived, or the ninety years (135), much leſs with the ninety nine years (136), or the hundred and four years (137), which others aſcribe to him. See with reſpect to all theſe particulars the learned collections of Menage (138). He does not forget to quote Arnobius, who affirms, that Pythagoras was burnt alive in a temple. *Pythagoras Samius ſuſpicione dominationis injuſta vivus concrematus in fano eſt: numquid ea, quæ docuit vim propriam perdiderunt, quia non ſpiritum ſponte, ſed crudelitate appetitus effudit* (139)? i. e. " Pythagoras the " Samian upon an unjuſt ſuſpicion of an intent to " uſurp the government was burnt alive in a " temple. Did what he taught loſe its force, " becauſe he did not die a natural but a violent " death?" Juſtin intimates, that he died a natural death at Metapontus, whither he had retired after having lived twenty years at Crotona; that he died there, I ſay, ſo greatly admired, that his houſe was converted into a temple, and he was honoured as a God. *Cum annos viginti Crotonæ egiſſet, Metapontum migravit, ibique deceſſit, cujus tantæ admiratio fuit, ut ex domo ejus templum facerent, eumque pro Deo colerent* (140). Valerius does not go ſo far; but he declares expreſsly againſt thoſe, who ſay, that he was ill treated. *Cujus ardentem rogum plenis venerationis oculis Metapontus aſpexit: oppidum Pythagoræ quam ſuorum cinerum nobilius clariuſve monumento* (141). i. e. " Me- " tapontus ſaw his funeral-pile with eyes of venera- " tion; a city more noble and famous for the aſhes " of Pythagoras than its own."

(133) Idem, ib.

(134) Idem, ib. num. 44.

(135) Idem, ib.

(136) Tzetzes, *Chil.* 11. ver. 366.

(137) Anonymus, *apud* Photium, p. 1313.

(138) Menagius, *in* Diog. Laert. p. 371 *& ſeq.*

(139) Arnobius, lib. 1. p. 23.

(140) Juſtinus, lib. 20. cap. 4. p. 396.

(141) Valerius Max. lib. 8. cap. 7. num. 2. *in Ext.*

St. Epiphanius was groſsly miſtaken when he ſaid, that Pythagoras died in the country of the Medes (142).

(142) Epiphanius, *Hær.* 15. p. 14.

[*Q*] *Some Authors who have treated of his doctrines.*] I confine myſelf to the Moderns. William Canterus tranſlated into Latin the fragments of Pythagoras, collected by Stobæus Eraſmus (143), Philip Beroaldus, Gyraldi, Claudius Minos, Francis Berni, Nicolas Scutelli, and ſome others, have written notes upon the ſymbols of this Philoſopher. Conſult alſo Lipſius (144), Ritterſhuſius's Commentaries on Malchus; Holſtenius's Diſſertation *De Vitâ & Scriptis Pythagoræ*; Rodericus de Caſtro's Pythagoras; Paganinus Gaudentius *De Pythagoreâ animarum tranſmigratione*; Ambroſius Rhodius's Dialogue *De Tranſmigratione*; Claudius Lignier's Diſſertation *de ſecta Pythagoricâ*; Mark Mappus's Theſis *de Ethicâ Pythagoræ*, maintained at Straſburg under Profeſſor Schallerus; Schilterus's Diſſertation *De diſciplinâ Pythagoricâ*; John Scheffer's book above quoted; the book entitled *Ethica Pythagorica* (145), written by Magnus Daniel Omeis, Profeſſor at Altdorf. The reader may likewiſe ſee La Mothe le Vayer's book of the Virtue of the Heathens. It is thought that Pythagoras's golden Verſes are the work of his ſcholar Lyſis. An ancient Philoſopher of Alexandria named Hierocles wrote a Commentary upon them; we have it commented upon by Caſaubon the younger. We have alſo Commentaries upon the ſame verſes by Vitus Amerbachius, Theodore Marcilius, Henry Brem, Michael Neander, John Straſilius, William Diezius, and Magnus Daniel Omeis. I had omitted the treatiſe of Joachim Zehnerus (146).

(143) In the beginning of his *Chiliads of Proverbs.*

(144) *Manuductio ad Philoſoph. Stoic.* lib. 1. Diſſertat. 6.

(145) Printed at Altdorf, 1693.

[*R*] *A ſtory, which I have juſt read in a News-Writer.*] " A modern Author has aſſerted, that " the late Marſhal Schomberg commanding the " French troops in Portugal, when the Kingdom " threw off the yoke of the Spaniards, wrote what " paſt in that country upon a glaſs, and holding it " up to the moon, Cardinal Mazarin, who was at " Paris, by the means of a teleſcope, read in that

(146) *Paſtor at Superintendens Schleugenſis.* He publiſhed at Leipſick, in 1603, *Vitam & Fragmenta Pythagoræ.*

PYTHEAS, was born at Marſeilles: to aſcertain the time when he lived with the greateſt accuracy, we muſt place him, I think, in the age of Alexander the Great [*A*]. He wrote geographical works [*B*], which were probably nothing elſe but an account of his

(147) Extracted from p. 63 of a little book, entitled, *La Clef du Cabinet des Princes de l'Europe, ou Recueil Hiſt. & Politiq. ſur les matieres du tems*, for July 1704. It is thought that this book was printed at Luxemburg: in the title page it is ſaid, *printed for James le Sincere, at the ſign of Truth.*

(148) See the *Memoirs* of Fremont d'Ablancourt, p. 12.

(1) Voſſius, *de Philologia*, p. 55. in his treatiſe *de Hiſt. Græc.* he adds, p. 467, *vel certe proximus huic tempori fuit*: or he lived at leaſt very near that time.

(2) *In* Indice Plinii.

(3) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc.* p. 110.

(4) *Apud* Strabon, lib. 1. p. 71.

(5) See hereunder, the rem. [*F*].

(6) Strabo, lib. 1. p. 71.

"Planet all that the Marſhal wanted to inform him "of: if this ſecret was as true as it is fabulous, *&c.* "(147)." Since the News-Writer paſſes a right judgment of this pretended ſecret, I have only taken notice of the anachroniſms of his account. Marſhal Schomberg did not arrive in Portugal till November 1661 (148). Cardinal Mazarin had been dead eight months; and Portugal had above ten years before thrown off the yoke of Spain.

[*A*] *To aſcertain the time when he lived with the greateſt accuracy, we muſt place him . . . in the age of Alexander the great.*] Voſſius does not confine himſelf to ſo general a determination. He makes him live under Ptolemy Philadelphus (1). Father Hardouin follows him in this (2). Moreri reckons that time to be the year 440, or 445 from the building of Rome: he ought to have known that the firſt year of Ptolemy Philadelphus's reign is, according to Calvius, the year of Rome 468. There are reaſons to think that Pytheas flouriſhed before that time. Voſſius has ſhewed that Eratoſthenes wrote after Pytheas (3); but he has not urged the ſtrongeſt proof: he has only proved it by this obſervation, namely that Polybius, having choſen among other Geographers, Dicæarchus, Eratoſthenes and Pytheas for the objects of his cenſure, aſſerts (4) that Eratoſthenes wrote the laſt of all. There is in the ſame page a more deciſive proof than this; ſince Strabo relates there, that Polybius wondered Eratoſthenes could believe what Pytheas wrote. Polybius's ſurprize was ſo much the greater, as he obſerved that Eratoſthenes gave credit to ſome particulars which Dicæarchus diſbelieved. Pytheas therefore was already an author before Eratoſthenes and Dicæarchus wrote their books of Geography (5). We ſhall draw ſome inferences from it below. But before that, I muſt give my opinion concerning the paſſage, in which Strabo judges that Polybius's way of reaſoning, which we have ſeen juſt now, is ridiculous. He miſtook perhaps Polybius's meaning. I am apt to think that that able man reaſoned thus: Dicæarchus is a very credulous author, who has committed an hundred blunders; and yet he would not believe ſeveral particulars related by Pytheas: we may therefore wonder that Eratoſthenes, who came after him, gave credit to thoſe very particulars, which he ſaw were exploded by Dicæarchus. Now here follows the reaſoning which Strabo imputes to Polybius: Dicæarchus is a very judicious author, who ought to ſerve as a guide; it is therefore very ſtrange that Eratoſthenes ſhould have given credit to Pytheas with regard to thoſe particulars which Dicæarchus did not believe. ſuppoſe that Polybius argued after that manner, Strabo might very well ridicule him, conſidering the vaſt number of errors, which Polybius had cenſured in Dicæarchus's writings; but, once more, I would not be poſitive that he took Polybius's meaning right. I wiſh we might verify it by examining his own books; they would acquaint us with many other particulars the knowledge of which is loſt to us with thoſe books. I ſhall take notice by the by of a miſtake in the Latin tranſlation of Polybius. The whole ſtrength of this repetition, μήτε Δικαιάρχῳ πιστεύσαντι, *(Dicæarchus himſelf not believing it)* is entirely enervated in that tranſlation. In order to give the full ſenſe of that paſſage the tranſlator ſhould have preſerved the ſame repetition which is in the original. The reader will be able to judge of it, if he will take the trouble to examine the following quotation. Ἐρατοσθένη δὲ τὸν μὲν Εὐήμερον Βεργαῖον καλεῖν, Πυθέᾳ δὲ πιστεύειν· καὶ ταῦτα δὲ μὴ τῇ Δικαιάρχῳ πιστεύσαντι. Τὸ μὲν οὖν μὴ τε Δικαιάρχῳ πιστεύσαντι, γελοῖον ὥσπερ ἐκείνῳ χρήσασθαι κάνονι προσῆκον καθ' ὃ τοσούτους ἐλέγχους αὐτὸς προφέρεται (6). i. e. "Eratoſthenes, whom he calls "Euemerus Bergæus, gives credit to Pytheas, though "Dicæarchus himſelf did not believe it. Theſe "words, *though Dicæarchus himſelf did not believe it*, "are ridiculous, as though it were fit to follow him "as a guide, whom Polybius himſelf found guilty "of ſo many blunders." However all this be, we learn at leaſt from thence, that the books of Pytheas were wrote not only before thoſe of Eratoſthenes, but even before thoſe of Dicæarchus. Now it is well known that this laſt ſtudied under Ariſtotle, and that he dedicated a book to Theophraſtus, Ariſtotle's favourite diſciple. It is therefore very probable that Pytheas lived before the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, ſince his writings preceded thoſe of Dicæarchus, who muſt have been an old man under that Prince's Reign. For he came to the crown the laſt year of the 123d Olympiad; Ariſtotle left off teaching before the end of the 114th Olympiad (7), and his ſcholars were generally grown men. We learn from Pliny that Pytheas had publiſhed his works before Timæus publiſhed his own (8): for the latter relates on the credit of the former what I have obſerved concerning Amber (9). But neither Timæus, nor Eratoſthenes, who both wrote after Pytheas, can prove any thing againſt Voſſius, becauſe they lived ſo long (10), that they might have read Pytheas's account, though they had been publiſhed only under Ptolemy Philadelphus; and it is well known that an author, who quotes what he read in another, may yet be older than him, and even die before him: ſo that one cannot draw any certain inference concerning the time when Pytheas lived from Timæus and Eratoſthenes writing later than he has done. The beſt argument we can have for placing him before the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus muſt be borrowed from his being quoted by Dicæarchus. Voſſius did not remember this when he placed Dicæarchus before Pytheas (11). If Sanſon, one of the beſt Geographers of the XVIIth century, had examined this point of Chronology, he would not have aſſerted that Pytheas mentioned the converſations, which the father of Scipio Africanus had with the Deputies of Marſeilles, in the year of Rome 532 (12). One of Pytheas's lies, in Polybius's opinion (13), was his aſſerting that none of the inhabitants of Marſeilles could acquaint Scipio with any remarkable particulars concerning Britain. We have cenſured in the Article ABBEVILLE the other miſtakes of Sanſon upon this ſubject. We have only to obſerve here, that by that Scipio he ought not to have underſtood him who landed at the mouth of the Rhone, in order to watch Hannibal's motions; ſince it is not poſſible that Pytheas ſhould have wrote after that voyage of Scipio, conſidering that his works were read by Dicæarchus the diſciple of Ariſtotle: for there are at leaſt an 100 year between the time when Ariſtotle left off keeping a ſchool, to the beginning of the ſecond Punic war. It would be, doubtleſs, a difficult taſk to determine who that Scipio was, who, according to Pytheas, inquired for ſome particulars concerning Britain of the inhabitants of Marſeilles, of thoſe of Narbonne, and of thoſe of Corbilon, but it was certainly not the father of him who conquered Carthage. I wonder that father Labbe did not cenſure that miſtake of Monſieur Sanſon, nor do I think he was in the leaſt inclined to ſpare him purpoſely. He might alſo have cenſured him with regard to the diſtance of near an hundred years, which he ſuppoſes between Pytheas and Polybius (14). This is inconſiſtent with his own ſyſtem, in which he ſuppoſes that Pytheas wrote his relations after the year of Rome 532; which was but 16 years before Polybius was born (15). It muſt even be ſaid, according to that ſuppoſition, that Pytheas was not yet come back from his travels in the year 532: for if he had been returned the Deputies of Marſeilles would have had ſomething to anſwer to the Roman Conſul's queſtions.

I give my readers notice here, that Monſieur Sanſon, the worthy ſon of the great Geographer, has done me the favour to ſend me a copy of the anſwer to father Labbe, which his father had prepared for the preſs, concerning thoſe antiquities. That anſwer is learned and ingenious. I ſhall meet, I hope, with ſome opportunities to make extracts from it.

[*B*] *He wrote Geographical works*] The Scholiaſt on Apollonius (16) mentions a book of Pytheas entitled

(7) Apollodorus, *apud* Diog. Laert. *in* Ariſt.

(8) Plinius, lib. 37. cap. 2.

(9) Above, in the Text of the next page, quotation (*e*).

(10) Eratoſthenes lived 80 years. He was born in the 126th Olympiad, and died in the 146th. See Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc.* p. 108. Lucian makes him live 82 years, and makes Timæus live 96 years. Now ſince Timæus wrote an account of the war which Pyrrhus waged againſt the Romans, he muſt have lived under Ptolemy Philadelphus.

(11) *De Philolog.* cap. 11. num. 7. Moreri quotes erroneouſly, *de Philoſ.* cap. 11. num. 6.

(12) Nicolas Sanſon, *Recherches des Antiquit. d'Abbeville.*

(13) *Apud* Strabon, lib. 4. p. 131.

(14) Sanſon, *Recherch. des Antiq. d'Abbeville*, p. 85.

(15) He was born in the year of Rome 548. See Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc.* p. 122.

(16) In lib. 4.

his travels. He abuſed in a very ſtrange manner this maxim, *he who comes from remote countries may ſafely tell lies*; for he related a thouſand falſe ſtories concerning the Northern Countries: he knew very well that there were but few eye-witneſſes to contradict him; but poſterity at leaſt has not left his impudence unpuniſhed. Strabo falls moſt ſeverely upon him on ſeveral occaſions (*a*). Polybius cenſured him very bitterly. Theſe two Authors could not bear he ſhould relate with impunity, that in the iſle of Thule [*C*] at ſix days diſtance from Great Britain towards the North, and in all thoſe quarters there was neither land, nor ſea, nor air, but a compound of the three, which was much like the *Sea-Lung* [*D*], and on which the ſea and earth hung, and which ſerved to keep all the parts of the univerſe together, nor was it poſſible, ſaid he, to go thither, either on foot, or in a ſhip. He boaſted to have ſeen that ſubſtance which was like the Sea-Lung, and for the reſt he confeſſed that he ſpoke of it only from hearſay. He boaſted alſo that he had travelled over all the countries in Europe which are ſituated on the ocean, from Cadis as far as the Tanais, which Polybius could not believe of an inconſiderable private man, as he was, not very well provided with money (*b*). However it is confeſſed at leaſt, that he was pretty well acquainted with the properties of the Northern countries as to their ſituation with regard to the ſun (*c*), and what he aſſerted (*d*) that the Barbarians ſhewed him the place where that Planet went to reſt, and that there were countries in which the night laſted but three hours, and others in which it continued but two hours, does by no means ſavour of any thing fabulous, and is infinitely more honourable to him than another particular which Pliny relates after him; namely, that there was an iſland a day's journey diſtant from the country of the *Guttones*, a people of Germany, who uſed amber inſtead of wood for fuel (*e*). The reader will do well to conſult the apology, which Peter Gaſſendi wrote for Pytheas [*E*], at Monſieur de Piereſc's requeſt. Theſe two illuſtrious Gentlemen of Provence were deſirous to exalt the glory of their own country, by keeping up the reputation of a Writer, who was born at Marſeilles. Gaſſendi, though a very learned man, was yet miſtaken in his conjectures concerning that Author [*F*]; But notwithſtanding this we may learn many things from his Apology. We ought

(*a*) Πυθέας ἀνὴρ ψευδίσατος ἐξήτασται. Pytheas was a notorious liar. Suid. lib. 1. p. 43. See alſo p. 44. and lib. 2. p. 71, 79. lib. 4. p. 139.

(*b*) Φησὶ δ' αὐ ὁ Πολύβιος ἄπιστον καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο πῶς ἰδιώτῃ ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ πένητι τοσαῦτα διαστήματα πλωτὰ καὶ πορευτὰ γένοιτο. Polybius ſays it is impoſſible to believe that a private man, who was even in want, ſhould have travelled ſo far by ſea and by land. Strabo, lib. 2. p. 71.

(*c*) Strabo, lib. 4. p. 139.

(*d*) *Apud* Geminum, *Iſagog. ad Phænom.*

(*e*) *Incolas pro ligno ad ignem uti eo, proximiſque Teutonis vendere.* Plin. lib. 37. cap. 2.

titled γῆς περίοδος, *The circuit of the earth.* In the abridgment of Artemidorus the Epheſian, printed with the ancient Geographers, Pytheas is placed in the number of thoſe, who have deſcribed the circumference of the world, *periplum orbis* (17). The deſcription of the iſle of Thule was probably a part of that work. His book *de Oceano* is quoted by Geminus. Nicholas Sanſon (18) is not the only one who had a mind to vindicate Pytheas againſt Strabo's cenſure. We ſhall ſee very ſoon that Gaſſendi took very much to heart the defenſe of that ancient inhabitant of Marſeilles.

(17) See Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc.* p. 110.

(18) *Retherches des Antiq. d'Abbeville*, p. 85.

[*C*] *That in the iſle of Thule.*] As I have proved by ſolid arguments that Pytheas publiſhed his books about the time of Alexander, I may give up one of the arguments, which father Vavaſſeur urges againſt Photius. I have refuted another in the article ANTONIA (19). Photius conjectures, that Antonius Diogenes was not much poſterior to the reign of Alexander the great. To which father Vavaſſeur objects, among other things, that he does not think the iſle of Thule was much known at that time (20). You muſt know that that Antonius Diogenes was the author of a Romance, entitled *Incredibilia de Inſula Thule*, (incredible things concerning the iſle of Thule). It is no matter if that iſland was unknown to the vulgar, or in general, if it was not much known. For when ſuch a traveller, as Pytheas was, had publiſhed an account of that iſland, this was enough to engage ſome romantick writer to take it into his head to make that iſland the ſcene of his chimerical narrations. I do not examine whether or not Photius be in the right: it is enough for me that he is not well refuted.

(19) A Roman family, rem. [*B*].

(20) *Suſpicio quoque eſt nondum cognitam vulgo Thulen inſulam de qua illi feruntur inſcripti libri.* Vavaſſor, *de lud. Dict.* p. 148, 149.

[*D*] *Like the* Sea-lung.] La Mothe le Vayer obſerves (21), that it is a *Spongius Zoophyte*, to which the Italians have given a very obſcene name; and after having related, that Pytheas aſſerted that *that matter was what kept the univerſe together*, and that he had had *the impudence to ſpeak of it as of a thing he had ſeen with his own eyes*, he mentions to us *an honeſt Anchoret, who boaſted that he had been at the world's end*, and who ſaid, *that he was obliged to bend his ſhoulders very much, becauſe the heaven and the earth unite together in that extremity of the world.*

(21) *Lettre* 89. Tom. 11. of his works, in 12mo. p. 255.

[*E*] *The Apology which Peter Gaſſendi wrote for Pytheas.*] The occaſion of it was as follows. When Monſieur de Piereſc cauſed the ſolſtitial elevation of the ſun to be obſerved at Marſeilles in the years 1636, they compared the proportion they found between the ſhadow and the needle of the dial, they compared it, I ſay, with the proportion which Hipparchus ſays (22) was found by Pytheas. Gaſſendi was deſired to write upon that aſtronomical operation, and to vindicate Pytheas at the ſame time againſt Strabo's invectives. *Voluit rurſus* (Piereſkius) *ut quoniam Strabo multa congeſſit adverſus Pytheam, ipſe in gratiam comprovincialis apologiam conſcriberem, purgaremque virum qui primus Thulen inſulam demonſtravit, & quo non habet Occidens totus quem antiquiorem in doctis habeat* (23). i. e. "As Strabo has urged a great many things againſt "Pytheas, Peireſc would have me write a vindi- "cation of this our countryman, and clear him, "who is the firſt that diſcovered the iſle of Thule to "us, and who of all the learned muſt be moſt eſteem- "ed in the Weſt." What Gaſſendi wrote in Pytheas's defenſe is to be met with in the fourth volume of his works (24). He was ſure not to forget to obſerve that Cleomedes ſtyles Pytheas a Philoſopher; and that Hipparchus having cenſured Eudoxus for aſſerting that there is a certain ſtar, which never moves out of its place, and which is the pole of the world, commends Pytheas for teaching that the pole is a place void of ſtars, and which makes as it were a ſquare with the three ſtars next to it. Hipparchus, after the example of Eratoſthenes, improved his geography by Pytheas's labours; and it is no wonder if the latter was miſtaken with regard to the Tanais, conſidering the ignorance of mankind in thoſe times as to the ſituation of the Pontus Euxinus, of the Caſpian Sea, and of the Palus Mæotis. When Alexander was arrived on the banks of the Caſpian Sea, he was thought to be arrived on the ſhore of the Pontus Euxinus. Gaſſendi adds ſeveral other obſervations to theſe in behalf of Pytheas. The reader may have ſeen in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (25), that Olaus Rudbecks took this traveller's part with a great deal of zeal.

(22) *Apud* Strabon. lib. 2. p. 78.

(23) Gaſſendus, *in Vita Peireſk.* lib. 5. *Oper.* Tom. 5. p. 327.

(24) p. 524, & *ſeq.*

(25) For the Month of February 1685, p. 133.

[*F*] *Gaſſendi was miſtaken in his conjectures concerning that Writer.*] He imagined that the people of Marſeilles being aſhamed of having no anſwer to make to Scipio's queſtions concerning Britain, and encouraged alſo by his counſels, reſolved to ſend ſome perſon to view that country, and choſe for that purpoſe Pytheas who was a good mathematician. The Republick of Marſeilles was already powerful at ſea, and minded trade very much: ſhe might therefore have a mind to enquire whether the diſcovering of theſe unknown countries might be of any ſervice to her Commerce. This removes the objection ſtart-

ought not to miſtake our Pytheas for the Athenian Orator of that name, who was contemporary with Demoſthenes [G].

ed by Polybius; we ought not to think it ſtrange that Pytheas being a poor private man could little bear the expence of ſo great a voyage. And without ſuppoſing this one might anſwer, that a company of merchants, or ſome rich citizen, pitched upon Pytheas for diſcovering thoſe countries, and furniſhed him with all that he wanted for that purpoſe. If Gaſſendi had ſaid no more than this, I would have nothing to cenſure in his Apology: but he aſſerts, that the perſon who aſked the inhabitants of Marſeilles what they knew of Britain, at the time of the ſecond Punic War, which began in the 140th Olympiad, was either Scipio Africanus, or the father or the uncle of that Scipio. This cannot be true, ſince Dicæarchus had read Pytheas's travels. In order to evade that argument Gaſſendi aſſerts that Strabo's words may be taken in the following ſenſe: namely, that Dicæarchus might have diſliked Pytheas's relation: but it is certain, that this was not Strabo's meaning; his participle πιστώσας (26), and the whole ſtreſs of this argument are inconſiſtent with that explication. Godfrey Wendelinus, to whom Gaſſendi wrote theſe things, anſwered to his queſtion *at what time Pytheas lived*, that it was in the time of Alexander the Great; which he proved, 1. By Dicæarchus's railleries againſt Pytheas. 2. By the familiarity in which Timæas the enemy of Agathocles lived with Pytheas at Marſeilles during his baniſhment. Whence Wendelinus infers that Pytheas lived before Agathocles (27). That conſequence is not well drawn; for though a traveller lives familiarly with a baniſhed perſon, it does not follow from thence that he was older than the man who baniſhed that perſon. And beſides, here is one of thoſe, who make an Author ſay much more than he really ſaid: Wendelinus refers us to Pliny (28), where we read only, that Timæus believed what Pytheas related concerning amber.

(26) See above, the rem. [A].

(27) See Gaſſendi's works, Tom. 6. p. 483.

(28) Lib. 37. cap. 2.

[G] *We ought not to miſtake our Pytheas for . . . . him who was contemporary with Demoſthenes.*] Father Hardouin (29) applies to the Pytheas of Marſeilles, what Plutarch relates of a Pytheas in the Life of Demoſthenes, page 855. But the Pytheas whom Plutarch mentions in that paſſage was certainly the ſame Athenian Orator whom he ſpeaks of in page 849, where he obſerves that Pytheas ridiculed Demoſthenes becauſe his Orations were too elaborate (30). In the Life of Phocion (31) he ſpeaks of the ſame Pytheas as of an Orator who was a great talker, and very impudent, and whom Phocion was obliged to check. Suidas gives him the ſame character, and tells us that he made his eſcape out of priſon, where his creditors kept him, and that he retired into Macædonia. Plutarch relates, that Pytheas being fled from Athens took ſanctuary with Antipater, and did him all the ſervice he could by his orations. He had at that time great quarrels in Arcadia with Demoſthenes, who though baniſhed did nevertheleſs join with the Athenian Embaſſadors to perſuade the cities of Greece to confederate together againſt Antipater, whoſe cauſe Pytheas defended (32).

(29) *In* Indice Plinii.

(30) See Ælian. *Hiſt. Dio.* lib. 7. cap. 7. he mentions him alſo in lib. 14. cap. 28.

(31) p. 751.

(32) Plut. *in* Demoſt. p. 858.

Plutarch, in his Precepts concerning the Government of a Commonwealth, relates a quick repartee of that man. *As Pytheas the Orator*, ſays he (33), *was oppoſing the honours they would decree to Alexander, ſome perſon aſked him, how dare you to ſpeak of ſuch great things, you that are ſtill ſo young? Why, replied he, Alexander, of whom by your decrees you make a God, is younger ſtill than I am.*

(33) Plut. *de gerenda Reipub.* p. 804. Mr. Bayle quotes Amyot's French tranſlation. See alſo Plut. *in* Apophth. p. 187.

PYTHIAS, the daughter of Ariſtotle, was married three times, firſt to Nicanor, according to her father's laſt will [A]; then to Proclus deſcended from Demaratus King of Lacedæmon, and laſtly to Metrodorus the Phyſician, who was the Diſciple of Chryſippus of Cnidus, and the Maſter of Eraſiſtratus. The two ſons (a) ſhe had by her ſecond huſband ſtudied Philoſophy under Theophraſtus. The ſon ſhe had by Metrodorus was named Ariſtotle (b) [B]. It appears from ſome ſentences, which are aſcribed to her [C] that her Father had given her a very good education. Obſerve that PYTHIAS was the name of her mother.

(a) The one was called *Procles*, and the other *Demaratus*.

(b) Extracted from Sextus Empiricus, *adverſus Mathematic.* cap. 12. p. 51.

[A] *She was married . . . . to Nicanor, according to her father's laſt will.*] We do not meet with that particular in Sextus Empiricus; but we read there that Ariſtotle, after his father and mother's death, was educated at the houſe of Proxenus a native of Atarnea, and that in order to requite that kind ſervice he educated Nicanor the ſon of Proxenus, made him learn all that was proper for him to know, and adopted him, and ordered even by his laſt will that his daughter Pythias ſhould marry him (1).

(1) Extracted from Ammonius, *in* Vita Ariſtot. *init.* See alſo Ariſtotle's *Laſt Will*, *in* Diog. Laert. lib. 5. n. 12. and Caſaubon's *Note*.

[B] *The ſon ſhe had by Metrodorus was named Ariſtotle.*] Pliny was miſtaken with regard to that genealogy; for he imagined that Ariſtotle's daughter had a ſon, who was the Phyſician Eraſiſtratus. *Horum placita*, ſays he (2), *Chryſippus ingenti garrulitate mutavit, plurimumque & ex Chryſippo diſcipulus ejus Eraſiſtratus Ariſtotelis filia genitus.* i. e. "Chryſippus by "his immenſe prating has altered their tenets, and after "him his Diſciple Eraſiſtratus the ſon of Ariſtotle's "daughter." Let us conſider the Greek words of Sextus Empiricus. Τρίτῳ δὲ Μητροδώρῳ ἰατρῷ, Χρυσίππου μὲν τοῦ Κνιδίου μαθητῇ, Ἐρασιστράτου δὲ ὑφηγητῇ· ὃν γίνεται παῖς Ἀριστοτέλης. *Tertio autem Metrodoro Medico*, (Pythias filia Ariſtotelis nupſit) *Chryſippi quidem Cnidii diſcipulo, præceptori autem Eraſiſtrati, cui natus eſt filius Ariſtoteles* (3). It is not an eaſy matter to miſtake the ſenſe of theſe words: any one may perceive with a little attention that they ſignify, that this Ariſtotle was the ſon of Metrodorus the Phyſician and of Pythias: but we may think that all the Authors, who mentioned the marriages of Ariſtotle's daughter did not place their words in a proper order, and expreſſed themſelves after ſuch a manner, that a reader, who did not conſider their words with much attention, might imagine they meant, that Eraſiſtratus was the ſon of Metrodorus and Pythias. Let us ſuppoſe that they ſaid; Τρίτῳ δὲ Μητροδώρῳ ἰατρῷ Χρυσίππου τοῦ Κνιδίου μαθητῇ, ὃν Ἐρασίστρατος, γίνεται παῖς Ἀριστοτέλης. *Tertio autem Metrodoro Medico* (Pythias Ariſtotelis filia nupſit) *Chryſippi Cnidii diſcipulo, cujus Eraſiſtratus* diſcipulus (4) *natus eſt filius Ariſtoteles.* We may eaſily apprehend, that if a reader be a little abſent, he may imagine that Eraſiſtratus was the ſon of Pythias. How do we know but Pliny followed an Author who had placed his words thus, or in an order more proper ſtill to miſlead a reader. Take notice of the Latin tranſlation I have tranſcribed; it makes us think at firſt that Eraſiſtratus was the father of Ariſtotle. However it be, I chooſe rather to adhere to theſe conjectures, than to Father Hardouin's (5). He imagines that Eraſiſtratus had been adopted by Pythias, as the Emperor Galba was adopted by his ſtep-mother. He muſt therefore ſuppoſe that Eraſiſtratus was the ſon of Metrodorus; but Sextus Empiricus makes him only his Diſciple.

(2) Plin. lib. 29. cap. 1. p. m. 663.

(3) Sextus Empiricus, *adv. Mathematicos*, p. 51.

(4) That word is often omitted, and to be ſupplied, when the Greeks ſpeak of the ſucceſſion of the Philoſophers.

(5) Harduin. *in* Plin. lib. 29. cap. 1. p. 664.

[C] *Some ſentences which are aſcribed to her.*] She ſaid among other things that the fineſt colour that can be ſeen on the face of a man was that of ſhame or modeſty. *Celebrantur quidem multa dicta Pythiados filiæ Ariſtotelis graviſſima, ut appareat eandem ipſam non tam in gremio educatam quam in ſermone patris, quo nemo unquam fuit vel acumine præſtantior, vel feſtivitate & lepore politior, vel ſuavitate conditior. Ex illis autem id etiam accepimus, nullum eſſe pulcrius coloris genus in facie hominis ingenui quam id quod ob verecundiam ſuperveniret* (6). i. e. "They report many grave "ſayings of Pythias, Ariſtotle's daughter, by which "it appears that ſhe was educated not ſo much in "her father's lap, as by his diſcourſes and learning; "for no man was ever more ingenious, witty, and "agreeable, than Ariſtotle. Among her ſayings "the following has been tranſmitted down to us; "namely, that it is impoſſible to behold a finer "colour upon an honeſt man's face, than that which "is occaſioned by modeſty." See Eraſmus, in the VIIIth book of his Apophthegms (7).

(6) Petrus Alcyonius, *in Medice Legato poſteriore*, folio h 1 *verſo*.

(7) p. m. 621.

Q.

QUELLENCE (CHARLES DE), Baron of Pont in Britany, made a great figure under the name of Soubiſe among the Reformed in the reign of Charles IX. He took the name of Soubiſe in the year 1568 when he married Catharine de Parthenai, the only daughter of John de Parthenai Lord of Soubiſe. I have mentioned in another place (*a*) ſome circumſtances in which he ſhewed his courage, and I have related how he defended himſelf againſt the murderers on St. Bartholomew's-Day (*b*), by whoſe hands he fell at laſt: the curioſity of ſome Ladies of the Court with regard to his naked body, which was placed with many others before the Louvre, has already been mentioned (*c*). The action of impotency, which was brought againſt him [*A*], and which will give me an opportunity to quote ſome paſſages from a book, which

(*a*) In the art. SOUBISE (John de Parthenai.)

(*b*) Above, quot. (8), of the art. PARTHENAI (Catharine de).

(*c*) Ibid.

[*A*] *The action of impotency which was brought againſt him.*] Thuanus aſſerts poſitively, that it was his mother-in-law, and not his wife, who brought that action againſt him. Monſieur Varillas ſays the ſame in the two editions of his Charles IX. Mezerai, not minding enough the conſequences, ſays of the wife, what Thuanus ſaid only of the mother-in-law: I have cenſured him upon that account (1), for the honour and reputation of Catharine de Parthenai. For though a woman may enter ſuch an action againſt her huſband without expoſing her reputation, yet it is certain that ſhe is more commended for not commencing ſuch a ſuit, eſpecially when ſhe is ſo young as the heireſs of Soubiſe was at that time. There are ſome actions (2), which are not a ſin, which do not render a perſon infamous, neither *de jure*, nor *de facto*, and which nevertheleſs it were better not to do than to do: they have ſomething in them which tarniſh a perſon's reputation; ſo that an hiſtorian ought to take care not to impute ſuch actions to thoſe who have not committed them; he is not allowed to want accuracy in that reſpect, to take the daughter for the mother, or one ſiſter for another. The more celebrated an hiſtorian is, the more careful he muſt be; for when he is very famous, he becomes a publick ſpring, and ſerves inſtead of a record to an infinite number of writers diſperſed throughout the whole earth. How many learned men will there be, who will not think they could be miſled by following Monſieur Mezerai (3)?

(1) In the rem. [*C*] of the art. PARTHENAI (Catharine de).

(2) In the ſchools they call certain qualities, *perfectio ſimpliciter ſimplex*. Every quality *melior ipſa quam non ipſa*, is of that kind.

(3) *Franciſcus Quelletrius Dux e Britannia, cui ab uxore Catharina Parthenia Subizia impetentiæ accuſato divortium intentabatur.* Ulr. Huber. *Hiſt. Civil.* Tom. 2. p. 353.

I have obſerved ſomething in another place (4) which may ſerve to excuſe the Lady de Soubiſe, and what ſhe did againſt her ſon-in-law does certainly want an apology. A time of perſecution as that in which ſhe lived, was not a proper ſeaſon for ſuch proceedings. A Church under affliction, and in arms at the ſame time, and which is in that condition for no other reaſon but to ſupport the Reformation of Doctrines and Manners, ought not to call a young huſband before Judges of a contrary Religion for the ſake of impotency. It is even certain that actions of that kind are at all times and in all places very little to the honour of thoſe who enter them: and whether they come to get another huſband or not, they are generally objects of riallery and contempt for the remainder of their life. And not without ſome reaſon: for the ſteps they are obliged to take are ſo inconſiſtent with modeſty, that virtue which is the ornament and the crown of their ſex, and without which they cannot have the leaſt ſhare in the glory of this world, that one cannot eſteem a woman, who is capable of taking ſuch ſteps.

(4) Above, rem. [*C*], of the art. PARTHENAI (Catharine de).

We may ſay of thoſe women, without going beyond the bounds of indulgence, what has been ſaid with a little too much ſeverity of thoſe widows who marry again. I ſhall make uſe of Monſieur du Vair's expreſſions (5). *Jerom*, to Marcella, *ſays, that* ſecundas nuptias non appetimus, ſed concedimus, *we do not approve a ſecond marriage, but only ſuffer it, by a certain indulgence, which is not quite free of ſome diſgrace. As though he ſaid, with the law,* indulgentia quos liberat notat, *A diſpenſation from the law ſtains the reputation of thoſe to whom it is granted* . . (6) *In whatſoever words this ſaying of the Apoſtle be expreſſed,* juniores viduæ nubant, *let young widows marry, it ought to be underſtood by an indulgence granted to the incontinency of ſome women,* ut maritum potius accipiant quam diabolum, & ſciant ſibi non tam maritos datos quam adulteros imputatos, *that they may receive an huſband rather than the devil, and they muſt know that it is not ſo much an huſband that is given them, as an adulterer that is impoſed upon them, as St. Jerom ſays to* Salvina. *Or as St. Cyprian obſerves,* aliud eſt ad veniam ſtare, aliud eſt ad gloriam pervenire; *to obtain mercy is one thing, and to arrive at the glory of heaven is another. There is a great difference between ſaying that their incontinence ſhall not be accounted to them as a ſin, and ſaying that it ſhall be accounted to them for righteouſneſs.* This is the leſs ſevere judgment that can be paſſed on thoſe women, who enter an action of impotency, conſidering the way of proceeding they are obliged to follow in ſuch a caſe.

(5) Du Vair, p. 820 of his works, edit. of Geneva, 1617.

(6) Idem, p. 824, 825.

I. It is a great matter for a woman to confeſs publickly that ſhe cannot contain herſelf. Now every woman, who commences ſuch a ſuit, declares before all the world, that ſhe labours under that defect: ſhe delivers a deed or inſtrument of it (7) which is lodged among the publick records, and which affords matter of riallery to all the jeſters, and makes even the new huſband tremble. For if he happens to be under a neceſſity to take a long journey, or if he labours under a diſtemper which continues a great while, how can he depend upon the virtue of a wife, who has confeſſed her incontinency before all the world?

(7) Take notice that I do not pretend to aſſert, that they make ſuch a confeſſion in as many words. I know very well, that generally they ſpeak only of their deſire of getting children. But the world is not to be impoſed upon with this; they put ſuch a conſtruction upon it as I have hinted.

II. The examination, which muſt be ſtood out before the Judges, is ſo tickliſh and ſo uneaſy to a woman of honour, that one cannot have a good opinion of a virgin who is capable to get over ſuch difficulties, and to anſwer to ſuch particulars. I ſay virgins, becauſe they who accuſe their huſbands of impotency, do almoſt always boaſt that they have ſtill their maidenheads: and they muſt indeed boaſt of it, when they are married for the firſt time, as is generally the caſe. A certain Counſellor did once prodigiouſly puzzle the Plaintif. He aſked her in the preſence of ſeveral perſons, whether her huſband had coaxed her, kiſſed her, hugged her? She anſwered, Yes. And who told you that this is not all? did the lawyer aſk her? How come you to know the reſt? Who taught it you? If you have got your maidenhead ſtill, as you pretend, you ought not to know that your huſband is impotent; and if you know it, it is a ſign that you have tried what other men can do. He preſſed this ſo home to her, that he made her bluſh, and forced her to confeſs that ſhe was not able to anſwer to ſuch puzzling queſtions. Let us tranſcribe the whole Latin paſſage which contains this ſtory. *Erumpit interdum inverecunda intemperies mulierum . . . . Erumpit, inquam, impudens, et in facie erubeſcentium populorum, genialis tori revelat & denudat arcana, & de mariti frigiditate conqueritur, allegans hanc ſufficientem & evidentem repudii vel divortii cauſam, quod ſemivir eſt & inutilis matrimonio, qui non eſt promptus ad coitum. Eleganter quidem Gaufridus de Heroum villa, familiaris meus, unius talium in cauſa hujuſmodi confudit audaciam, Cum enim ei patronus datus eſſet à judice celebraturo ut putabatur divortium, & mulier generoſa audientibus amicis & ſuffragatoribus, advocato ut ſit diligentius merita cauſæ ſuæ exponeret, ſcrutatus eſt ab ea vir prudens, an alium maritum quandoque habuerit, Quod cum illa negaſſet, quæſivit*

which was publiſhed in the year 1612, was the true cauſe of that curioſity. Thuanus does

quæſivit iterum an adhuc virgo eſſet, dicens: hoc ſibi inquiſitu, & ſcitu perneceſſarium, ne à diſcreto judice caperetur occaſione aliqua in ſermone. Illa vero hoc (verecunde tamen, eo quod ſibi non bene credebatur) aſſeruit. Et ille, an ſimul de noctu dormire conſueverint, & ſe invicem oſculari & amplexari maritus & ipſa, inquiſivit. Quæ omnia cum illa fateretur: unde ergo, inquit patronus, noſti virgo pudiciſſima, prudentiſſima, pudoratiſſima, quod efficacem tecum virum non impleverit, & totius matrimonii jura non perſolvit? Quis te docuit, quid ſit coitus, ut eum tecum coiiſſe neges, inter tot oſcula, tot amplexus, qui te pro libitu quoties voluit pertractavit licentia maritali? Nam & quædam animantia certum eſt ſe invicem oſculando miſceri. Alia ſe tenuiter tangendo concipiunt. Et ſunt qui ſuo gravidante calore, ab aere temperato imprægnantur, & pariunt. Hic illa tandem erubuit, hoc ſolum dicens, ſe quid ad hujuſmodi captiones hiſceret, non habere (8). i. e. " The women's diſgraceful and " immoderate appetites will ſometimes break out . . . " They break out with impudence, I ſay, when a " wife reveals the myſteries of the nuptial bed before " a whole body of people bluſhing at her indiſcretion, " when they hear her complain of her huſband's im- " potency, urging as a ſufficient reaſon for a divorce " that he who is not capable of carnal copulation is " but half a man, unfit for marriage. Walfrid de " Heronville a friend of mine did once in a cauſe of " that kind wittily confound the impudence of a " woman. He was appointed her Council by the " Judge, who, it was thought, would pronounce a " ſentence of divorce; and as ſhe was to expoſe to " him the merits of her cauſe, before her friends " and favourers, as it is uſual, he, like a prudent " man, aſked her whether ſhe had ever been married " before; to which ſhe replied, no; then he aſked " whether ſhe was a virgin, for it was, ſaid he, ne- " ceſſary for him to know it, leſt he ſhould give a " prudent judge ſome occaſion to take him by his " own words. She declared ſhe was a virgin, tho' " ſhe ſaid it with ſome ſhame, becauſe ſhe perceived " that they did not believe her. Are you uſed to lye " with your huſband, continued he, do you hug and " kiſs one another? She confeſſed it: how then " came you to know, aſked he again, you that are " a moſt baſhful, chaſte, and prudent virgin, that " he has not done with you the duty of a perfect " man, that he has not performed all the nuptial " rites? Who taught you what copulation is, that " you dare to aſſert he never knew you carnally, " among ſo many kiſſes, ſo many embraces from a man " who uſed you with all the freedom of an huſband? " For it is certain that there are ſome animals which " are copulated together only by kiſſes; ſome con- " ceive by a mere touch; and there are ſome who, " when their heat is come to a certain degree, are " impregnated by a moderate air, and bring forth " young ones. Here the woman bluſhed at laſt, and " ſaid only, ſhe had nothing to anſwer to ſuch cap- " tious queſtions."

(8) Joan. Saresberienſis, *in Policratico, ſive de nugis curialium, & veſtigiis Philoſophorum*, lib. 8. cap. 11. p. m. 504, 505.

III. A woman muſt reſolve to ſuffer her moſt ſecret parts to be viſited and examined: all the other proofs being too weak, the judges have recourſe to this, and order to view the parts: the woman is ſearched by ſkilful perſons in order to know whether ſhe has been deflowered or not. Where is the modeſty and ſhame of thoſe women who dare to commence a ſuit, which is to be attended with ſuch conſequences? What an impudence muſt they not put on? There was in the beginning of the reign of Lewis XIII. an Advocate of the Parliament of Paris, who wrote very ſtrongly againſt that practice of ſearching women: he urged two arguments againſt it, the one that it is ſhameful, the other that it is uncertain. *This is at preſent*, ſays he (9), *the firſt thing which is ordered in thoſe ſuits, when the marriage was contracted with a maiden: after ſuch a ſearch the woman being declared a virgin, and not deflowered, this is taken for a full proof of the huſband's impotency, and a ſufficient reaſon for diſſolving the marriage. . . . .* (10) *Such a ſearching is ſhameful, and inconſiſtent with that chaſtity which ought to be peculiar to the female ſex; and is conſequently odious and to be avoided; for there is nothing muſt be dearer to a woman than modeſty.* Gratia verecundiæ mulieris ſuper aurum, *the grace of modeſty in a woman is more valuable than gold, ſays the Author of Eccleſiaſticus in the 7th chapter, and chiefly in one who ſtyles herſelf a maid and a virgin*; quæ ſeipſam debet erubeſcere, & nudam videre non poſſe, *who muſt be aſhamed of herſelf, and not bear to ſee herſelf naked, ſays St. Jerom*, Epiſtola citata ad Lætam, de inſtitutione filiæ, *in his Epiſtle to Læta, of the education of a daughter: and St. Ambroſe his 64th Epiſtle*, nihil ſanctius in virgine quàm verecundia, *there is nothing more ſacred in a virgin than modeſty; and in the firſt book of Offices*, Eſt pudicitiæ comes verecundia, *modeſty is the companion of chaſtity: and again in his book of the education of a virgin, the firſt chapter*, in virgine eſt dos quædam verecundia, quæ taciturnitate cognoſcitur, *modeſty is a kind of dowry to a virgin, and is known by her ſilence; ſo that ſhe who complains of her huſband's impotency, and in order to be divorced from him, ſuffers other men to uncover her, to behold and handle thoſe parts which nature bids her conceal, muſt be reputed an impudent and ſhameleſs woman . . .* (11) *A woman (ſays Herodotus in the beginning of his hiſtory) puts off her modeſty together with her ſhift, and St. Cyprian*, De habitu virginum, tractatu 2. Simul cum amictu corporis, pudor ponitur. *Pliny in the ſeventh book of his natural hiſtory, chapter the 17th obſerves, that the body of men who are drowned, are always found ſwimming on their back, with their face upwards, but the bodies of women on their belly with their face downwards, as though nature, being careful of their modeſty, would hide thoſe parts in them, which cannot be decently ſeen.* Quaſi pudori defunctarum parcente natura. *Nay, that undreſſing and ſtripping of them was formerly a kind of puniſhment, as Nicephorus obſerves in the ſeventh chapter of his Hiſtory, and Tacitus, in his book concerning the manners of the Germans* (De Moribus Germanicorum) *where he ſpeaks of the puniſhment inflicted on adulterous women. For that reaſon only, ſeveral perſons have diſliked and condemned that practice of ſearching the women. St. Ambroſe, in that ſame 64th Epiſtle, where he reproves Syagrius, Biſhop of Verone, for ordering a Nun to be ſearched, who was accuſed of diſſoluteneſs, has theſe words.* Quid ſibi velit, & quo ſpectet quod Obſtetricem adhibendam credideris non poſſum advertere; itane ergo liberum erit accuſare omnibus, & cum probatione deſtiterint, petere genitalium ſecretorum inſpectionem? & addicentur ſemper ſacræ virgines ad hujuſmodi ludibria, quæ & viſu & auditu horrori & pudori ſunt? Quæque in alienis auribus ſine damno pudoris reſonari non queunt, ea poſſunt ſine ejus tentari verecundia (12)? i. e. " I cannot conceive " for what reaſon you thought it neceſſary to make " uſe of a midwife; ſhall it then be free to all per- " ſons to accuſe, and when they want proofs to " make good the charge, to demand the ſearching " of the ſecret parts? Shall ſacred virgins be ſentenced " to undergo ſuch ſhameful trials, which it is an a- " bomination and a diſgrace to ſee or to hear? And " can ſuch things be tried upon them without affect- " ing their modeſty, which it is impoſſible to relate " to others, without detriment to theirs." *You ſee that that great man abhorred even to hear of ſuch a ſearch, ſo far was he from approving it; adding, that he never read any where that maidens were ſearched. Nor do we find that the Romans, who were ignorant of nothing that is reaſonable with regard to manners, ever uſed that method to convict their Veſtals, when they were ſuſpected and accuſed of inceſt, though they were very ſtrict in the examination of that crime, and puniſhed it ſeverely. . . .* (13). *Whence it may be inferred, that in ſuch a caſe, the Romans did not cauſe the women to be ſearched, in order to know the truth of the matter, and to gather from thence a proof, either of their virginity, or of their being deflowered, as is practiſed at this time; they rejecting that method of ſearching, either becauſe they thought it too uncertain, and not ſufficient, or becauſe they judged it ſhameful, and inconſiſtent with the women's modeſty, for which they had ſo great a regard, that the ſame Valerius Maximus, in the firſt chapter of his ſecond book, ſpeaking of Spurius Carvilius, who divorced his wife, becauſe ſhe was barren, obſerves that the*

(11) Ibid. p. 69.

(12) You will meet in Monſ. Du Pin's *Bibl.* Tom. 2. p. 278 of the Dutch edit. with a very accurate and beautiful abſtract of that *Letter* of St. Ambroſe to Siagrius.

(9) Vincent Tagereau, *Diſcours de l'Impuiſſance de l'homme & de la femme*, chap. 4. p. 57. edit. of Paris 1612.

(10) Ibid. p. 58.

(13) Tagereau, *Diſcours de l'Impuiſſance*, p. 63.

does not ſay, that the Queen mother would examine on the Baron's naked corps whether that

the Romans would not ſuffer that ſhe ſhould be ſearched or touched in the leaſt. Quo matronale decus, munimento verecundiæ tutius eſſet, in jus vocanti corpus ejus attingere non permiſerunt, ut inviolata manus alienæ tactu relinqueretur. *Wherein they do not follow their example, who, in ſuch actions of divorce, order immediately, that the wife ſhall be ſearched, though they might with more decency and reaſon begin with ſearching the huſband, which not proving ſufficient, they might then order to ſearch the wife; without going ſo faſt, and having them both ſearched at the ſame time, and without any interval, that they might come the ſooner to a ſeparation, as though it were a very preſſing affair, which could not be delayed, without great prejudice to the publick.*

IV. A woman muſt reſolve to ſubmit to the *Congreſs*, for the other methods of trying a man's impotency do almoſt always fail. Now it is not to be conceived how a woman who is not loſt to all ſenſe of ſhame and modeſty, can without horror think of the circumſtances of a Congreſs: for after the parties have ſworn (14), *that they will endeavour honeſtly and without any foul play to perform the matrimonial functions, neither party labouring to prevent it in the leaſt,* and alſo after *the Viewers* have ſworn, *that they will give a true and faithful account of what ſhall have paſſed in the Congreſs, they* all *retire into a room prepared for that purpoſe, where the huſband and the wife are again ſearched; the huſband in order to know whether he does not labour under ſome diſtemper. . . . . The wife, in order to view her ſecret parts, and to know by that means the difference of her opening and dilatation before and after the Congreſs, and whether the intromiſſion be performed or not. In * ſome caſes (as in that of De Bray* (15),*) the parties are viewed quite naked from head to foot, every part of their body is examined,* etiam in podice, *in order to find whether or not there be any thing in them that might promote or prevent the Congreſs; the man's ſecret parts are waſhed with luke-warm water (to what purpoſe I cannot tell) and the woman is put to her waiſt into a bath, in which ſhe continues ſome time* (16) *This being done the man and the woman go together into a bed at noon day, in the preſence of the Viewers, who ſtay in the room, or (if the parties, or either of them require it) they retire into the next wardrobe or gallery, leaving nevertheleſs the door upon the jar; and as for the Matrons they ſtay near the bed, the curtains being drawn, and then it is the huſband's buſineſs to prove himſelf a man by a carnal copulation with his wife, and performing the intromiſſion, when often* (17) *. . . . Laſtly the parties having been ſome time in bed, as for inſtance an hour or two, the Viewers being called in, or coming of their own accord, if they be weary, as it is often the caſe,* ſi ſint viri (when they are men) *they draw near, and opening the curtains they aſk what has paſſed between the parties, they ſearch the woman again, in order to know whether ſhe be more open and dilated, than when ſhe went to bed, and whether the intromiſſion be performed, and alſo* an facta ſit emiſſio, ubi, quid, & quale emiſſum. *All which is not done without a wax-light, and a pair of ſpectacles for thoſe who uſe them on account of their old age, nor without very obſcene and odious inquiries: then they draw up an account or verbal proofs of what paſſed at the Congreſs, or rather of what they themſelves pleaſe, and preſent it to the Judge, who is in a room or hall of the ſame houſe, with the Proctors and Practitioners of the Eccleſiaſtical Court, waiting for the end of the Comedy.* This is not all, if the huſband ſucceeds in his attempts he is permitted to call the Viewers to witneſs it. Anthony Hotman obſerves, that Doctor Hoſtienſis adviſed the Midwives *to uſe hot water to waſh the bodies of the women they ſearch, in order to take off all that might be reſtrictive. Which Panormus repeats after him* in cap. Fraternitatis de frigid. & malef. (18). The Advocates for the Congreſs pretended to make an advantage of that practice, but Anthony Hotman aſſerts that it is proper to miſlead us. *When we urge againſt them,* ſays he (19), *the artifices which ſome women uſe in order to make themſelves narrower, they make no account of it, ſaying that by waſhing the body before it is ſearched, all vaniſhes away, and the truth appears. We have ſeen nevertheleſs in our time, that a woman of no great quality, having entered an action of impotency againſt her huſband, which ſhe dropt afterwards becauſe ſhe proved to be with child, had made herſelf artificially ſo narrow, on account of the examination and ſearch ſhe was to undergo, that ſhe could not be delivered afterwards without the aſſiſtance of a Surgeon. And* Præpoſitus in cap. conſultationis de frigidis & malef. *and after him the author of the book, entitled* Sylva Nuptialis, lib. 2. ampliatione 5. *relate that a woman in Italy made herſelf ſo narrow in order to pleaſe her huſband, that afterwards neither he, nor any other man could have to do with her.* Here follows another paſſage from the Advocate of Paris (20). *De Bray, who is ſo much talked of, and of whoſe trial caſes have been printed on both ſides,* ſiniſtrum tantum habebat teſticulum ex defecta naturali, *and at the firſt Congreſs (for he went to it twice in the ſame day)* arrexerat ſufficienter ad coeundum, ac ſubſtantiam ſeroſam & aquoſam extra vas emiſerat, quæ non poterat dici verum ſemen, ſed non intromiſerat, *according to the report * of three Phyſicians, three Surgeons, and three Matrons who were preſent. However the judges, without minding that natural deformity, nor the imperfection of the ſeed, ordered, before they gave a final ſentence, that † De Bray ſhould come again to the Congreſs, if he pleaſed (hinting thereby that he had not done enough, ſince the intromiſſion was wanting) and as he declared that he would not go any more to the Congreſs, becauſe his party had twice prevented him from performing the buſineſs, he was divorced for no other reaſon but for want of the intromiſſion at the Congreſs; and it is to be obſerved that when he went † to the Congreſs the ſecond time, the Judges warned him that in caſe he performed the intromiſſion he ſhould call the Viewers that they might ſee it, and bear witneſs to it. Whence it appears that in ſuch law ſuits, they do not mind the nature of the ſeed, nor whether the man* arriget, etiam ſufficienter ad coeundum, *but that they require and demand an intromiſſion before witneſſes, which is a very indecent thing.* Was not that Civilian in the right to aſſert (21) that a Congreſs is not only *more proper to oppreſs the truth than to make it known?* but that it is *alſo indecent and brutiſh?* Is he not in the right to oppoſe the impudence of thoſe women who demand it, to thoſe remains of ſhame and modeſty which are to be obſerved even in publick ſtews. *Even publick proſtitutes,* ſays he (22), *lock themſelves up, and hide themſelves.* Eſt aliqua etiam proſtitutis modeſtia, *ſays the ſame Seneca,* & illa corpora publico objecta ludibrio aliquid, quo infelix patientia lateat, obtendunt, adeo quodammodo lupanar verecundum eſt. i. e. "Even proſtitutes have ſome modeſty, and thoſe "bodies, which are expoſed to publick ſhame, are "covered with ſome thing that conceals what they "wretchedly bear: ſo that there is ſome modeſty "even in publick ſtews;" *and Ovid ſays,*

Ignoto Meretrix corpus junctura Quiriti,
Oppoſita populum ſubmovet ante ſera.

i. e. "A proſtitute who is to lye with an unknown "Roman, keeps the people off by ſhutting her door." He quotes alſo (23) this beautiful paſſage from St. Auguſtin. *Opus ipſum quod libidine peragitur, non ſolum in quibuſque ſtupris ubi latebræ ad ſubterfugienda hominum judicia requiruntur: verum etiam in uſu ſcortorum (quam terrena Civitas licitam turpitudinem fecit) quamvis id agatur quod ejus Civitatis nulla lex vindicat, devitat tamen publicum etiam permiſſa & impunita libido conſpectum, & verecundia naturali, habent proviſum Lupanaria ipſa ſecretum, faciliuſque potuit impudicitia non habere vincula prohibitionis, quam impudentia removere latebra illius fœditatis. Quid concubitus conjugalis qui ſecundum matrimonialium præſcripta tabularum procreandorum fit cauſa liberorum? nonne & ipſe, quamvis ſit licitus & honeſtus, remotum ab arbitris cubile conquirit? nonne omnes famulos, atque ipſos etiam Paranymphos, & quoſcumque ingredi quælibet neceſſitudo permiſerat, ante mittit foras quam vel blandiri conjux conjugi poſſit? Nec ipſi filii, ſi qui jam inde nati ſunt, teſtes fieri permittuntur.* i. e. "That work which is performed out of luſt requires "ſecrecy; not only in thoſe kind of pleaſures, where-"in men avoid to be diſcovered, but even in publick "ſtews, the frequenting of which, though ſhameful

"in

(14) Tagereau, *Diſcours de l'Impuiſſance*, p. 123.

* This appears from the report of the laſt Congreſs, dated April the 21ſt, 1578.

(15) He was a Treaſurer. See Brantome, *Dames Galantes*, Tom. 1. p. m. 97, 98.

(16) See for what reaſon, hereunder, quot. (18).

(17) See the reſt of this paſſage hereunder, quot. (31).

(18) Ant. Hotman, *Traite de la Diſſolution du Mariage.* Tract. 1. p. 47.

(19) Ibid. in the 2 *Traite*, p. 34. See alſo p. 47 of the 1ſt treatiſe.

(20) Tagereau, *Diſcours de l'Impuiſſance*, p. 30, 31, 32.

* That report is dated April the 11th, 1578.

† That order is dated the 14th of May following.

† This appears from the reports, and from the verbal proceſs of the ſecond Congreſs.

(21) See the 7th chap. of his treatiſe.

(22) Ibid. p. 153. In p. 157, he quotes theſe lines of Martial, lib. 1. *Epigr.* 35. (and not 91 as he writes). *Et meretrix abigit teſtem veloque ſeraque. Raraque Summenii fornice rima patet.*

(23) Ibid. p. 154, 155, quoting the 18 chapt. of the 4th book *de Civit. Dei.*

that action was well grounded or not: nor do our other celebrated Hiſtorians relate it. It

" in itſelf, is yet permitted by the civil ſociety; and " notwithſtanding it be not puniſhable by any law, " yet on thoſe occaſions men avoid to do publickly, " what is permitted and lawful. So that through a " natural modeſty, private places are provided even " in bawdy houſes; and it was eaſier for diſſoluteneſs " not to be prohibited, than for impudence to ſhew " itſelf out of thoſe retreats in which alone thoſe " obſcene actions are perpetrated. What ſhall we " ſay of the nuptial rites, which by the laws of ma- " trimony are deſigned for the procreation of chil- " dren? Though they be lawful and honeſt, yet do " not they require a bed-chamber into which no wit- " neſſes are admitted? Are not all the ſervants, the " very bride-men and bride-maids, and all they, " who by being relations or friends were ſuffered to " enter the room of the new-married couple, put out " of doors, before the bridegroom does ſo much as " give a kiſs to his bride? The very children, if " there be any, are not ſuffered to be witneſſes to their " parent's embraces."

Such are the proceedings, which the heireſs of Soubiſe was obliged to ſubmit to, when ſhe went to law with the Baron du Pont. They would ſtain the reputation of the illuſtrious mother of the Duke of Rohan, of that heroine who ſignalized herſelf at the ſiege of La Rochelle; they would ſtain her reputation, I ſay, if it could be ſuppoſed, that in her moſt tender years, ſhame and modeſty did not prevent her to commence ſuch a ſuit againſt her huſband, in which ſhe was obliged to act ſo diſhonourable a part. Wherefore I have taken a great deal of care to clear her, by charging her mother with all that contrivance: I have alſo endeavoured to excuſe her mother. When I have aſſerted that all theſe proceedings were to be ſubmitted to at that time, I aſſerted it with reſpect to the decree of the Parliament of Paris, *which on the 18th of February* 1677, *forbad all civil and eccleſiaſtical Judges, for the future, to order the proof of the Congreſs in caſes relating to matrimony* (24). It is ſurpriſing, that a body, which always conſiſted of ſuch wiſe men, ſhould have thought ſo late of abrogating a cuſtom like that. " There have been many more " marriages declared void during an hundred years " that the Congreſs was eſtabliſhed in France, than " was ever ſeen before. Wherefore the Parliament " of Paris having judged at laſt, that the Congreſs " is an enemy to chaſtity, and no true proof of a " man's virility, did on the 18th of February 1677, " by a ſolemn decree, forbid, &c (25)." Theſe are the words of a very able Phyſician, who had juſt been ſaying, " (26) That the Congreſs, which was for- " merly aboliſhed by the Emperor Juſtinian, as being " inconſiſtent with the holineſs of Chriſtianity, has " been eſtabliſhed again only by ſome curious perſons " of our age. For it is an infamy to both ſexes, and " a diſgrace to our time; and I queſtion whether " we could meet with any inſtances of it in hiſtory, " but ſuch as are ridiculous. It is a law which is " prejudicial to chaſtity; and is too hard and too " injurious to man. He muſt ſhew to all the world, " thoſe parts, which nature took ſo much care to " hide, and ſeek even for witneſſes, which we avoid " when we follow the dictates of nature. For what " ſhame is it not to ſhew at noon-day, what we take " care to conceal, even during the darkneſs of night? " It is nothing but a pretence to divorce, and an " effect of the laſciviouſneſs and impudence of the " women. They put it into the head of Judges to " order a trial, which is as uncertain, as it is inde- " cent. There is hardly perhaps one man in a thou- " ſand, who can come off with flying colours from a " publick Congreſs." It is a long while ſince this abuſe was complained of. The Civilian I have quoted, and who lived in the beginning of the 17th century, ſhewed very ſtrongly the injuſtice of that cuſtom. Seeing the diſorder encreaſing daily, he endeavoured to put a ſtop to it. *And ſince divorces*, ſays he (27), *occaſioned by the impotency of the men, are at this time more frequent than ever, though there be not more frigid men now, than in former days, they having always been pretty few, (ſuch at leaſt, the impotency of whom ſome ſign can diſcover, when they are ſearched, whether the defect be natural or accidental,) and of ten divorces, there will hardly be one inſtance, in which ſome defect could be diſcovered in the man by ſearching him, which makes many people wonder and complain; I have carefully examined, whence this could proceed.* He obſerves, that there were many perſons, who countenanced thoſe diſſolutions of marriages. *Not being able to conceive that the man or the woman who complains of the other's impotence, could be ſo impudent and ſo unconſcionable, as to demand a divorce without any reaſon, the moment ſuch an action is entered, they paſs their judgment too inconſiderately, and condemn the accuſed as impotent; and if he be a man, who out of ſhame, or for ſome other reaſons refuſes the Congreſs, or, if he ſubmits to it, does not perform the intromiſſion, they look upon him immediately as impotent, ſaying, that if they were in his ſtead, they would effectually ſhew their ſtrength and courage, which, perhaps, they would be puzzled to do, if they were in his caſe, on account of the ſhame, the fear, the vexation, and the hatred, which ſuch an act is unavoidably attended with, and which prevents its execution* (28). He enters into a particular account upon this ſubject, which is very curious, and very well reaſoned. I ſhall tranſcribe it here, without fearing that judicious perſons will take it amiſs; for why ſhould they be angry to find in this place, what a grave author publiſhed at Paris with the King's licenſe above fourſcore years ago (29), with no other view but to inſpire men with horror for indecent and unlawful cuſtoms. " (30) It is indeed a ſtrange and almoſt " incredible thing, that ſuch an action, which was " condemned by the heathens on account of its " ſhamefulneſs, and its being againſt nature (that is " to ſay, againſt ſhame and modeſty, which accord- " ing to St. Auguſtin, are naturally in all men) " ſhould have been admitted among the Chriſtians " and by Miniſters, in whoſe conduct there ought to " appear a greater decency than in that of other " men. It is true, that it is not long ſince that " method began to be in uſe; which was firſt in- " troduced (as we may preſume) by ſome impudent " man, who having an action of impotency entered " againſt him, demanded a Congreſs, boaſting that " he ſhould prove himſelf a man in it; which might " have been granted him rather from a probability " of ſucceſs, than for any good reaſon. It was per- " haps alſo introduced with a view to deter the wo- " men from commencing ſuch ſuits, that they might " not be reduced to make ſuch a ſhameful trial. " But that practice ſerved neither to prove the men's " ability, nor to deter the women from entering ſuch " actions againſt their huſbands: on the contrary, " it has rendered them more bold ſtill, becauſe they " knew that the intromiſſion, which is required in " the Congreſs to prevent a divorce, is intirely in " their power, no man being able to perform it " without their conſent either voluntary or forced " (31), and that it is a ſure and infallible method " to carry the cauſe and be divorced. And (what " is worſe) it is become a cuſtom and conſtant prac- " tice, to order the Congreſs in thoſe ſuits for a di- " vorce on account of a man's impotency, the ancient " forms being omitted or neglected on thoſe occa- " ſions, ſo far that the men are obliged to go to " the Congreſs upon pain of impriſonment, if they " will not go to it voluntarily, or conſent to a ſepa- " ration: which is ſo abſurd, that one could never " believe it, if one did not ſee it. Now ſuch a prac- " tice being eſtabliſhed without any good reaſon, " ought not to have been followed nor continued. " *Quod enim non ratione introductum eſt, ſed errore primum, deinde conſuetudine obtentum eſt, in aliis ſimilibus obtinere non debet.* 1. *Quod non ratione. De legibus & ſenatus-conſultis.* Beſides the ſhame which a " Congreſs is attended with, and which is ſufficient " to prevent the execution of it, the following cir- " cumſtances render it impoſible: namely, the fear " a man ſtands in of ſo many perſons, who ſee, ſearch " and handle him, on whoſe report his reputation, " his ruin or his preſervation depend; as alſo the " fear he is under not to perform what he has un- " dertaken, and which is of ſo great conſequence " to him: his vexation occaſioned by that ſhameful " action

(24) Venette, *Tableau de l'Amour Conjugal*, p. 579. See alſo the *Journal des Savans*, for the 5th of July 1677. p. 208, of the Dutch edit.

(25) Nicholas Venette, Doctor of Phyſick, the King's Profeſſor of Anatomy and Surgery, and Dean of the Phyſicians aggregated to the Royal College of la Rochelle, p. 578, of the *Tableau de l'AmourConjugal*, 7th edit, 1696. That edit. is more complete and more correct than all the former. The Author has added a Preface to it, which deſerves to be read. I have quoted it in the art. JOUBERT, rem. [C].

(26 Ibid. p. 577.

(27) Tagereau, *Diſcours de l'Impuiſſance*, p. 7 and 8.

(28) Ibid. p. 9 and 10.

(29) The 2d edit. of Tagereau's book, which I make uſe of, was printed in the year 1612, and the firſt in the year 1611.

(30) Ibid. p. 159, *& ſeq.*

(31) He ſays, p. 125, that in the Congreſs *there ariſe often ſhameful and ridiculous quarrels, the man complaining that his party will not ſuffer him to do it, and hinders the intromiſſion; ſhe denying it, &c.*

It might nevertheleſs be true, that ſhe caſt an eye upon his ſecret parts with that view, and there are books in which ſhe is charged with it [*B*], and even with giving orders to look

" action brought againſt him, which makes him a " laughing-ſtock to all the world. The hatred he " entertains againſt his wife, who expoſes him to " ſo troubleſom a ſuit, whereas ſhe ought to have " promoted his happineſs and his reputation. Add " to this the compulſion which is uſed againſt him, " for he muſt be ſent to priſon, unleſs he goes to " the Congreſs of his own accord, or conſents to be " parted from his wife. All which things being real " remedies againſt love, and inconſiſtent with the " chief act of it, which requires ſecrecy, boldneſs, " kindneſs, and a mind undiſturbed with ſhame, " fear, hatred and vexations, theſe things, I ſay, " render the effect and execution of the Congreſs " extremely difficult, nay abſolutely impoſſible, as " Ambroſe Paré has obſerved in the 28th book of " his works, of the 6th edition, where he treats *Of " the affinity there is between the impotency of men, and " of women*, which is not in former editions, which " I obſerve that the reader may not be miſtaken. " A man muſt be deſtitute of all ſhame and fear, " worſe than the very brutes, to execute the Congreſs " notwithſtanding all theſe impediments. Conſidering " alſo (as St. Auguſtin obſerves in the ſame 14th " book of the city of God, chapter 23) that copu- " lation does not depend upon our will alone, " &c."

Mr. Venette is too polite a man to be angry with me for thinking that he is miſtaken in what he obſerves concerning Juſtinian. I have heard very learned Civilians ſay, that there is not the leaſt footſtep of a congreſs in the ancient laws, and that it is an abomination invented in theſe latter ages. Let us quote Vincent Tagereau again (32). " Now, tho' " marriage be indiſſoluble by its firſt inſtitution, " and by the Law of the Goſpel, unleſs by the " death of either party, in ſuch a manner at leaſt " as that the ſeparated parties be at liberty to marry " again, and though we do not find that among " the Jews, the Greeks, and the Romans, with " whom divorces were in uſe, there was any law " concerning the marriage of frigid perſons, except one " among the Athenians made by Solon, by which it " was lawful for a woman married to a man unable " to know her carnally, to lye with whom ſhe pleaſed " of her huſband's relations; and another among the " Romans, made by the Emperor Juſtinian, near " thirteen hundred years after the building of Rome, " (we meeting with none made before) by which he " is the firſt who, out of favour rather than accord- " ing to reaſon and to the law of God, gave the " women leave to part with their huſbands and di- " vorce them for their impotency, as he made ſeve- " ral other laws in the women's favour, at the per- " ſuaſion of the Empreſs Theodora, who had an " abſolute influence over him, and made him do " what ſhe pleaſed, as the ſame Bodin writes in the " paſſage of his Republic, quoted above (33), and " in the ſecond chapter of the fifth book; yet the " Canoniſts, after the example of Juſtinian, have " granted ſuch a liberty to the women, in caſe of " the huſband's impotency, that they marry another " man after they are divorced; having alſo given " the ſame liberty to men married with women who " are too narrow, which Juſtinian had not done, there " being hardly any ſuch women."

The Counſellors, who in the year 1677 pleaded for . . . . aſſerted *that the Congreſs had no foundation either in the authority of the laws, or in the opinion of the Civilians. That neither in the civil nor in the canon law do we meet with the ſearching, nor with the Congreſs: that it is practiſed no where but in France, and only about an hundred and twenty years ago. That the books of the ancients afford us but two ridiculous inſtances that can ſupport it* (34).

Monſieur Venette's miſtake is owing probably to ſome tranſpoſition of ideas in his mind, which made him miſunderſtand Juſtinian's law. That Emperor would not ſuffer that the age of puberty in boys ſhould be any longer determined by inſpecting their ſecret parts. He fixed it at the age of fourteen whether they were vigorous or not. He looked upon the practice which had been in uſe till that time, as a very indecent one. He thought himſelf under an obligation to improve upon the modeſty of the Romans, who prohibited to determine the age of puberty by inſpection with regard to maidens (35); but they did not prohibit it with regard to boys.

Theodoret has very much exclaimed againſt Plato's laws, by which it was enacted, not only that young maids, and elderly women, ſhould perform quite naked the exerciſes proper for men, but alſo that there ſhould be inſpectors, who in order to judge of the age of puberty in both ſexes ſhould make young men and women ſtrip (36). Τὴν δὲ τῆ τῶν γάμων χρόνῳ ξυμμετρίαν δικασὴς σκοπῶν κρινέτω, γυμνὰς μὲν τὰς ἄῤῥενας, γυμνὰς δὲ ὀμφαλῶ μέχρι θεώμενος τὰς γυναῖκας. *Judex vero inſpiciens judicet quænam ætas celebrandis nuptiis conveniat: eamque ob rem nudos mares, nudaſque umbilico tenus fœminas inſpiciat* (37). To act fairly Theodoret ſhould not have overlooked the Legiſlator's caution with regard to the maidens which he would have ſtripped to the navel only (38). Theoret, I ſay, ought to have argued againſt that law of Plato thus limited as it is, but he argues againſt it, as though there were no limitation added to it. He urges firſt what was ſaid by the wife of King Candaules, that a woman, who pulls off her ſhift, ſtrips herſelf of her modeſty at the ſame time; whence he infers that that Philoſopher and law-giver taught brides to give over all ſhame. Τοιγαρῦν ὁ φιλόσοφος τὰς νυμφευομένας γυμνοῖ τῆς αἰδοῦς, καὶ ἀναίδειαν ἐκδιδάσκει. *Quare philoſophus pudore ſponſas exuit, & impudentiam docet* (39). Theodoret's way of arguing has not here all the accuracy and exactneſs which is required from a good dialectician; but what he obſerves againſt the Platonic inſtitution concerning the dances and ſhews, where the two ſexes might come naked, is well grounded. Οὐ γάρ πω μόνον εἰς ἀναίδειαν ἐπαιδοτριβοῦντο γυμνούμενοι καὶ γυμνουμένους ἄνδρας θεώμενοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλὰς ἀλλήλοις ἀφορμὰς προυξένουν ἀκολασίας· τῶν γὰρ δὴ γυμνῶν σωμάτων ἡ θεωρία καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας, καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας εἰς ἔρωτας ἐκτόπους ἠρέθιζεν (40). *For theſe women being naked, and beholding naked men were not only thereby taught to be impudent, but they offered alſo each other many opportunities to be incontinent; for the ſight of naked bodies could not but inſpire both the men and the women with a criminal love.* This confirms the remarks I have made in another place (41). But it muſt be obſerved that the laws of Plato were not put in practice as thoſe of Lycurgus were. They were only projected laws, which, as Theodoret obſerves (42), were not even received in that Philoſopher's own country: ſo that it cannot be ſaid, that Juſtinian was obliged to ſuppreſs the abuſes, which that father of the Church has condemned. Let us cloſe this remark with a paſſage from the *Menagiana*, in which we find that the abuſe of the Congreſs had ceaſed being ſo common. They who love to hear that publick ſcandals become leſs, will be edified by reading this. " An Official in the time of " Monſieur de Gondy, whoſe name I do not call to " mind, told me that during forty years he exerciſed " the functions of his office, he ordered the Congreſs " but once. It was to a Miller; and as he was do- " ing his duty perfectly well in that trial, his wife " told him, Jacob, why did not you do ſo when we " were at home, it would have ſaved us the trouble of " coming here (43)? "

[*B*] *There are books in which ſhe is charged with it.*] John Lætus Profeſſor at Franeker (44) that the Queen gave orders to look for the corps of Soubiſe, a Gentleman ſuſpected of impotency, and that after it was found ſhe conſidered the ſecret parts of it with a great fit of laughter, in the preſence of a great many of her ladies. " *Subiſii* nobilis qui frigidæ & " minimè ad procreandam ſobolem aptæ naturæ eſſe " dicebatur *cadaver* juſſit inveſtigari *Regina*, inven- " tum (45) *pudenda illius, cum ſuarum pediſſequarum* " *numeroſo comitatu non ſine magno & effuſo riſu in-* " *ſpexit*." Could a particular of that kind be unknown to d'Aubigné? and if he had known it was it poſſible for him to omit it in his hiſtory? His ſilence is certainly here a deciſive proof; the more, becauſe

(32) Tagereau, *Diſcours de l'Impuiſſance*, p. 4 and 5.

(33) That is to ſay, in the 3d chapt. of the 1ſt book.

(34) *Journal des Savans*, for July the 5th, 1677. p. 208, of the Dutch edit.

(35) *Pubertatem autem veteres quidem non ſolum ex annis, ſed etiam ex habitu corporis in maſculis æſtimari volebant. Noſtra autem Majeſtas dignum eſſe caſtitate noſtrorum temporum exiſtimans, bene putavit: quod in fœminis etiam antiquis impudicum eſſe viſum eſt, id eſt, inſpectionem habitudinis corporis, hoc etiam in maſculos extendere. Et ideo noſtra ſancta Conſtitutione promulgata, pubertatem in maſculis poſt decimum quartum annum completum illico initium accipere diſpoſuimus: antiquitatis normam in fœminis bene poſitam, in ſuo ordine relinquentes, ut poſt duodecim annos completos viripotentes eſſe credantur.* Inſtitut. lib. 1. tit. 22.

(36) Theodor. *de Græc. Affect.* lib. 9. p. m. 615.

(37) Idem, ibid. p. 616.

(38) We muſt underſtand that it was by beginning from the head.

(39) Theodor. *de Græc. Affect.* lib. 9. p. m. 616.

(40) Idem, ibid.

(41) In the art. LYCURGUS.

(42) *De Græc. Affect.* lib. 9. p. 615.

(43) *Menagiana*, p. 291, 292, of the firſt Dutch edit.

(44) *Compend. Hiſt. Univerſ.* p. m. 424. He quotes *De ſtatu relig. in Gallia.* We ſhall ſee in the following rem. the words of the Author he quotes.

(45) Theſe words are here a ſolœciſm.

look for the Baron du Pont's corps among the reſt of the ſlain [C]. I ſhall relate in a note, why I give that Gentleman the name of QUELLENEC [D].

The paſſages which I have quoted in the firſt remark of this article have raiſed complaints from many perſons, and made them aſſert with a great deal of warmth, that there were inſufferable obſcenities in thoſe paſſages. I was always of opinion that they did not take things right; and yet I was almoſt determined to omit thoſe paſſages in this ſecond edition, as ſome perſons adviſed me for whom I have a very great regard. But other perſons not leſs judicious have diſſuaded me from it, and told me that the reaſons I have given for my conduct were a very good excuſe, and that it would be enough if I did but give here my Apology, which has already been ſeen in a ſmall pamphlet. I follow that advice, and ſhall give thoſe reaſons hereunder [E]. I ſhall add to them an inſtance taken from

becauſe he obſerves that *the Ladies conſidered* in Soubiſe *whether he was incapable of marriage, becauſe there was an action againſt him upon that account* (46). Varillas would not have concealed that action of the Queen-mother; for he does not ſpare her with regard to things leſs important or more important than this. Speaking of the Siege of Rohan he obſerves (47) that *the Queen Regent was blamed for carrying the King her ſon into the forts as ſoon as they were taken, as though ſhe had deſigned to uſe that young Prince to the ſight of murder and ſlaughter; and they found fault with her for examining with too great curioſity the naked body of a dead maiden, who had dreſſed herſelf in men's clothes, in order to encreaſe the number of thoſe who defended the place: ſo much are men inclined to forgive no fault to the great.* Another Profeſſor of Franeker aſſerts, that the Queen examined very attentively whether there were any marks of impotency on Soubiſe's corps (48).

[C] . . . . *and even with giving orders to look for the Baron du Pont's corps among the reſt of the ſlain.*] This is an aggravating circumſtance: I do not anſwer for it; let the Author who relates it name his vouchers. It is a Proteſtant Writer. *Rex, Regina, fratres & Regius comitatus frequens ſub veſperam Lupara egrediuntur, ſtragis illius per urbem effuſæ conſpiciendæ cauſa. Subixius vir nobilis, frigidæ & minimè ad procreandam ſobolem aptæ naturæ eſſe dicebatur: illius cadaver juſſit inveſtigari Regina, & pudenda illius, cum ſuarum pediſſequarum numeroſo comitatu, inſpicit, non ſine magno & effuſo riſu* (49).

[D] *The name of* Quellenec.] Thus Monſieur Varillas calls him in the 2d edition of his *Charles* IX. Now as that edition has been corrected according to the remarks of Monſieur d'Hoſier the greateſt genealogiſt in France (50), we cannot queſtion but we muſt call thus the Baron du Pont who was married to the heireſs of Soubiſe. That name is quite diſfigured in moſt of the Hiſtorians, which is probably owing to an error of the preſs. The printers of Thuanus put *Quellevetum Pontium* (α) inſtead of *Quellenecum Pontium*; which made Monſieur de Mezerai name this Baron *Quellevé-Pontivy:* this was committing two blunders. For Pontivy was a Lord of the Houſe of Rohan: this laſt blunder is not in the *Abregé Chronologique*, but only in the large Hiſtory. Let us obſerve by the by, that in his abridgment he calls the ſame perſon *Francis*, whom he had named *Charles* in his large Hiſtory. In Thuanus, and in the ſecond edition of Varillas the Baron du Pont is called Charles: this therefore was, I think, his true name. Varillas in his firſt edition made uſe of the word *Kuellevé*. This was again a blunder of the printers of Thuanus. The ſpelling of that name being altered was owing probably to people's remembering that ſeveral noble families in Britany wrote their name with a K. A celebrated Author has ſaid lately, *Franciſcus* Quelletrius, *Dux è Britannia* (51).

* (α) In the *Index Thuani*, drawn up according to the Geneva edition, we read *Quellinecus Pontius.* CRIT. REM.]

[E] *I ſhall give thoſe reaſons hereunder.* I queſtion whether any of my readers do ſtill remember two pamphlets printed in the year 1597, the one with this title, *Jugement du Public . . . ſur le Dictionaire Critique.* i. e. "The opinion of the Public . . . . "concerning the Critical Dictionary;" the other "entitled, *Reflections ſur . . . le Jugement du Public.* i. e. "Reflections upon . . . the opinion of the "Public, &c." It is the latter of thoſe two pamphlets which contains the Apology, I was adviſed to inſert in this place, and which was thought proper to remove all the ſcruples of my readers. I wiſh with all my heart it may produce ſo good an effect. Here then follows what I anſwered to my Cenſurer (52). "To the three inſtances he has urged may be added "what he obſerves againſt the article in which I "tranſcribe ſome paſſages from Tagereau's book. "He could not chooſe a more ill grounded cauſe to "complain, for I ſhall ſhew in a proper time and "place, that I had all manner of right to inſert "into my work what relates to the Congreſs. As "an Hiſtorian I had a right to relate, that Quellenec "was accuſed of impotency, and that it was his "mother-in-law, and not his wife, who entered an "action againſt him. I owed that obſervation to "the truth of the matter, in behalf of an Heroine "of our party. As a faithful Hiſtorian I was under "an obligation to cenſure thoſe who caſt a blemiſh "on that Lady's reputation, by pretending that in "her moſt tender age ſhe commenced a ſuit of that "kind. This was declaring that I do not think it "honourable for a woman to engage herſelf in ſuch "proceedings. Every Author has a right to urge "the reaſons why he admits of ſuch or ſuch an opi-"nion. And therefore, as the Commentator of my "own text, I might, and was even obliged to alledge "the arguments on which I grounded my opinion, "and conſequently to quote what Tagereau has pub-"liſhed againſt the practice of thoſe times. We "pretend to appear more wiſe than our fathers, and "in reality we are leſs ſo. That Advocate in the "Parliament of Paris did eaſily obtain a licence to "publiſh a work in which he expoſed all the abomi-"nations of the Congreſs, and in Holland they will "raiſe a thouſand clamours againſt an Author, who "tranſcribes ſome paſſages from that work. Is not "this having a reſpect for perſons, which is ground-"ed only on a falſe notion of the mind, or on the de-"pravation of the heart? But will thoſe people ſay, "that Advocate entered into theſe particulars with "no other deſign but to perſuade the Judges to put "a ſtop to a practice which is ſo inconſiſtent with "modeſty, and ſo proper to give occaſion to an un-"juſt ſentence. And do not I declare, even with "the utmoſt indignation, that it was an infamous "practice, becauſe it enervates and roots up the prin-"ciples of ſhame, the moſt valuable ſpring of cha-"ſtity. Is it poſſible to take the beſt ſide of the "queſtion with more zeal, and more vigorouſly than "I have done in that article? And beſides this, had "I not a right, as an Hiſtorian, to give an account "of thoſe proceedings, which have been a long time "in uſe in the Parliament of Paris, and which are not "yet abrogated every where elſe. The manner of "proceeding in civil and criminal matters belongs cer-"tainly to hiſtorical facts; and if it has ſomething "ſingular and remarkable in it, there are many tra-"vellers, and many Writers of hiſtorical Relations, "who endeavour to be particularly acquainted with "it. How great a pleaſure had it not been for "Pietro della Valle, if he had met in Perſia with a "book, which could acquaint him with an odd "cuſtom as well as Tagereau could acquaint him "with all the particulars of a Congreſs. I aſk whe-"ther the verbal proceſſes or the verdicts of juries "and matrons in certain cauſes, are pieces to be "rejected or neglected by thoſe who are making "accurate compilations concerning the practices and "cuſtoms of a certain country? Furetiere was not "writing

(46) D'Aubigné, *Hiſt.* Tom. 2. p. 545.

(47) Varillas, *Hiſt. de Charles IX.* lib. 4. under the year 1562.

(48) *Cujus cadaver cum reliquis ante Regiam projectum, a Regina ejuſque puellis diligenter, ſi nota impotentiæ appareret, inſpectabatur.* Huber. *Hiſt. Civil.* Tom. 2. p. 353.

(49) *Commentar. de Statu Religionis & Reipubl. in Regna Galliæ.* part. 4. folio m. 39 *verſo.*

(50) See the Letter publiſhed by Mr. de Larroque, in his *Critique de Varillas.*

(51) Huber, *Hiſt. Civil.* Tom. 2. p. 353. printed at Franeker, in the year 1692.

(52) *Reflexion ſur un Imprimé qui a pour Titre* Jugement du Public, &c. p. 3 and 4.

from Juſtus Lipſius's approbation of a piece compoſed by a lawyer, who, in a cauſe concerning the diſſolution of a marriage [*F*], was obliged to relate obſcenities, and who did even make himſelf a little more merry than his ſubject abſolutely required. They, who

" writing an hiſtorical Dictionary attended with a " Commentary upon it, but a grammatical Dictionary, " and yet he has made uſe of ſuch verbal proceſſes; " who did ever murmur againſt it? . . . . Monſieur " Menjot . . . . who was a very honeſt man, has " inſerted many obſcenities in a Diſſertation upon " the uterine fury, and upon barrenneſs. It were " ridiculous to blame him for it, ſince as a Phyſician " he had a right to do it, and his ſubject required " and ſuffered it. Now I muſt tell them that a " compiler who relates and comments has the ſame " right, with a Phyſician, with an Advocate, *&c.* " and as occaſion offers, he may make uſe of their " verbal proceſſes, and of the technical words. If " he be giving an account of the divorce of Lotha- " rius and Tetberga, he may give extracts from " Hincmarus Archbiſhop of Rheims, who wrote " down all the obſcene actions which were proved " during the courſe of the proceedings. One ſhould " never judge of an Hiſtorian who is at the ſame " time a Commentator of his own work, before one " be acquainted with the laws of Hiſtory, and the " privileges of a Commentator. If theſe Gentlemen " had read Andrew Tiraqueau's Commentary upon " the Laws of Matrimony, they would have met there " with a much greater heap of obſcenities. And " yet he was a Councellor in the Parliament of Paris, " and one of the moſt illuſtrious men of the laſt " Century, both for his learning and for his virtue."

[*F*] *Juſtus Lipſius's approbation of a piece compoſed by a Lawyer, who in a cauſe concerning the diſſolution of a marriage.*] Sebaſtian Rouillard, one of the moſt learned Advocates in the Parliament of Paris, pleaded in the year 1600 for a Gentleman, whom his wife had accuſed of impotency. She had carried her cauſe before the Official of Sens, and afterwards again before the Delegates of the Primacy of Lyons. The huſband appealed from their ſentence, and obtained Commiſſaries from the holy apoſtolical See, to give a final judgment, without farther appeal. Rouillard, who was his Counſellor, publiſhed a *Capitulaire auquel eſt traicté qu'un homme nay ſans teſticules apparens, & qui ha neantmoins toutes les autres marques de virilité: Eſt capable des œuvres du Mariage.* i. e. " A treatiſe, in which it " is proved, that a man, whoſe teſticles do not ap- " pear, and who has nevertheleſs all the other ſigns " of virility, is capable to perform the buſineſs of a " huſband." The Gentleman was born thus, and it was upon that defect his wife grounded the charge of impotency. He aſſerted that he had conſummated the marriage; *not by the ridiculous means ſhe ſuppoſed, but by the natural ſtrength of his ſex* (53). He demanded to be ſearched, and *to carry his proofs as far as it was poſſible, he offered the ſtrongeſt and moſt common argument that is uſed on thoſe occaſions, I mean, that he propoſed a Congreſs, in order to demonſtrate that he was a man, that he had the erection, intromiſſion, and emiſſion, which were diſputed to him* (54). The Judges had ordered neither the ſearching, nor the Congreſs, the wife having repreſented that both theſe methods offended her modeſty (55). Rouillard drew from the huſband's offers, ſuch conſequences, as he judged moſt to the purpoſe; he expatiated at large on the functions of the teſticles, according to the doctrine of the Philoſophers, and according to the anatomical obſervations. He did not make uſe of circumlocutions, nor of covered expreſſions: he made uſe of the technical words with the utmoſt liberty, and interſperſed his diſcourſe with very ſmutty Latin lines, but which were very ingeniouſly applied. One would think he never recedes from a grave ſtyle, and yet the whole piece abounds every where, with merry jokes, and pretty free ſtrokes of wit. He ſent a copy of it to Juſtus Lipſius, who wrote him the following anſwer. *Ita, ita, venit ad nos libellus tuus, Deum immortalem! venuſtus, lepidus, & pro ipſa re libellus* (56). . . . . *Sed ô te (auſim dicere?) nequam! Novios, Pomponios, Titinnios, Petronios, quidquid hoc genus Atellanas, Mimos, Satyras ſcripſit, vincis aut æquas. Imo uno vincis, quod ſalvo pudore & probitate jocaris. Quid jocaris? ſerio loqueris, & de illo quod Græci* Neceſſarium *vocant, neceſſario, atque id apud judices, agis. Meum & meorum riſum! quâ fronte, quam ſubſtricta aure, Caſſii & Catones veſtri hæc audiunt? . . . . Extra jocum, argutus tuus libellus & in re ſeria, nec ſeria, ſerio doctus* (57). *i. e.* " Yes, I have received your little book; good " God, how pretty and witty it is! It is indeed a ſa- " tyr. . . . . But oh you wicked man, if I dare call " you ſo! you excel above, or at leaſt equal Novius, " Pomponius, Titinnius, Petronius, and all the others " who ever wrote plays, farces, or ſatyrs. Nay, you " have the advantage of them in this, that you jeſt " without going beyond the bounds of modeſty and " honour. What do I ſay, you jeſt? You ſpeak ſe- " rioufly, and you handle that ſubject, which the " Greeks call the neceſſary thing, as you ſhould, " ſpeaking before the Judges. Lord! with what " face, with what attentive ears muſt your grave Ma- " giſtrates, your Caſſii and your Cato's have heard " you? . . . . Without joking, your book is very " ſmart, and in a ſubject at the ſame time both ſe- " rious and merry, it is ſeriouſly learned." In another letter he declares ſolemnly, that he has commended Rouillard's *Capitulary* without irony, and that he had not any deſign to caſt the leaſt reproach upon the Author's morals, which he knew to be blameleſs, and of the utmoſt innocence. *Ego te, cum Varrone hoc dicam, modo ſcænatili tetigerim? ὦδ' ὡς ὄναρ. Joci fuerunt innoxii, puri, & niveos dicam, quia & frigus, credo, habuerunt. De moribus tuis ne mihi verbum, ſcio ſanctos eſſe: aut ſcripta tua mihi mentiuntur, character ille interioris mentis* (58). i. e. " ſhould I have " uſed you after the manner of the ſtage-players, to " quote an expreſſion of Varro? No, not even in my " dream. Your jokes were harmleſs, innocent, and " I may ſay, like ſnow, for I imagine that they had " ſome coldneſs in them. But for your morals, I " have not ſaid a word of them. I know they are " pure and holy, unleſs your writings deceive much, " which do generally ſhew the inward character of " the mind." Obſerve, that Lipſius had already ſet up for a Bigot, when he wrote this, and yet he paſſed a very judicious and equitable ſentence upon Rouillard's Capitulaire. I do not know whether the wife's Counſellor publiſhed his pleadings; but tho' he had been never ſo baſhful and modeſt, he could not have avoided to utter a thouſand groſs obſcenities. His *Factum*, or his Anſwer to Rouillard, would have acquainted us with many particulars of that trial. I know but very few of them. See the margin (59).

I muſt obſerve, that Rouillard and Tagereau, did not follow the ſame principles. The intereſt of the cauſe, which Rouillard pleaded, made him aſſert, that the practice of the Congreſs, and the ſearching of the ſecret parts, was juſt and reaſonable. So that, ſays he (60), " all theſe circumſtances concurring to- " gether, this was a ſufficient reaſon for the Judges " to order what the ſaid Appellant offered to un- " dergo, ſince he aſſerted that he had known his " wife carnally, and in ſuch a caſe, a man muſt be " credited, *ſtandum eſt verbo viri, qui dicit ſe uxorem " cognoviſſe cap. continebatur de deſponſat. impub.* con- " ſidering that the man is the head of the wife, " and ought to enjoy that privilege above her; add " to this, that the preſumption of the law is in his " favour, namely, that he has known his wife, *gloſſ.* " *cap. inſpicimus de regul. in* 6. *cap. literas ë de pre- " ſumpt.* . . . . At leaſt, in order to remove that " preſumption, it is neceſſary, that the Matrons or " Midwives ſhould depoſe the contrary, and that by " ſearching the ſecret parts of the wife, they ſhould " have found her a virgin: *cap. propoſuit ë de probat.* " Now they are ſo far from urging this at the trial, " that on the contrary the defendant, after many " diſſimulations, acknowledges that ſhe was deflower- " ed by her huſband; and as ſhe pretended it was " not done by any act of manhood, of which a " judgment might be formed by inſpecting the parts, " ſhe would not conſent to be ſearched, nor would " the Judges order it, though the Appellant demanded " it moſt earneſtly, and with the greateſt importuni- " ty

(53) Rouillard, *Capitulaire*, p. 8.

(54) Ibid. p. 9.

(55) Ibid. p. 40.

(56) Lipſius, *Ep.* 66. *Centuriæ ad Germanos & Gallos*, p. m. 697.

(57) Idem, ibid. p. 698.

(58) Idem, *Epiſt.* 75. *ejuſdem Cent.* p. 707.

(59) It appears from theſe two *Letters* of Lipſius, that Rouillard pleaded for a Baron, and carried the cauſe. I am apt to think, it was on this occaſion that Julian Peleus, Advocate in the Parliament of Paris, wrote the treatiſe *De ſolutione matrimonii ob defectum teſtium non apparentium.* See the laſt break of this remark [*F*].

(60) Rouillard, *Capitulaire*, p. 39.

who will not be ſatisfied with what I urge in my own defenſe, are deſired to conſider that it would have been to no purpoſe to leave out of my ſecond edition the paſſages from Tagereau, for his book is by no means ſcarce, and is to be met with entire in an alphabetical compilation, and conſequently in a work which is very much like a Dictionary. Laurence Bouchel, Advocate in the Parliament of Paris, has inſerted it at length in his *Bibliotheque du Droit François* (Bibliotheque of the French Law) in the letter S. under the word *Separation* (*d*). He is not blamed for adopting the whole book of Tagereau, why then ſhould I be cenſured for tranſcribing ſome paſſages from it? Is it becauſe men are more nice and ſcrupulous at this time, than they were in his? I ſhall anſwer that objection

(*d*) I have been acquainted with this by Monſ. Marais, Advocate of the Parliament of Paris.

(61) Rouillard, *Capitulaire*, p. 41.

" ty . . . . (61). As for the Congreſs, which that " Lady ſays ſhe refuſed out of ſhame ;

" *Ah ſi cubitum locus exigit, omnibus illum*
" *Deliciis imple & ſit procul inde pudor.*

" *If the place invites you to lye down, fill it with all* " *manner of pleaſures, and let ſhame be baniſhed* " *from thence.* For duelling is indeed prohibited by " the edicts, to prevent men from revenging themſelves with offenſive arms. But there is no law againſt a duel between man and wife, of which the " half ſweet and half ſour deeds tend only to reſtore " peace and love between them. However it be, in " the preſent caſe, it is *bellum juſtum*, as Livy ſaid, " *quia neceſſarium*, a juſt war, becauſe it is neceſſary : " neceſſity renders that lawful, which otherwiſe would

(62) Ibid. p. 43.

" be unlawful in itſelf . . . . (62). The Congreſs " is the moſt common and moſt certain trial that can " be made in ſuch a caſe, wherein an action of impotency is entered againſt a man, as Lucian obſerves in his Eunuch. *Nec inimicum videri debet* " *probationis genus, quod ſolum eſt*, ſaid Quintilian, in " his 7th declamation, i. e. *That kind of trial muſt* " *not be thought unjuſt, which is the only one that can* " *be made.* It is at leaſt admitted in the Biſhop's Courts in France, and the Parliament has allowed " it by ſeveral decrees, particularly by that of January the 20th, 1597, given againſt one, who being " ſued for want of teſticles, refuſed to ſubmit to the " Congreſs. . . .

(63) Ibid. p. 44.

(63) The greateſt precaution that " can be taken, is to come immediately to the actual trial. *Nec enim de veritate dubitari poteſt, quoties* " *cum incertis experimenta conveniunt, æquumque eſt* " *non ſemper auribus ſed & oculis credere.* i. e. *When* " *experiments confirm what was uncertain before, the* " *truth of it can no longer be queſtioned : it is reaſonable not to truſt always to our ears, but alſo to our* " *eyes* ; eſpecially when we are determined to it by " ſo great a good as peace is, which will much more " excuſe a lawful copulation, though performed publickly, than all the ſhameful actions done in the " dark, can palliate an unlawful divorce. Otherwiſe it would be abſurd, that in order to try a cauſe " of adultery, one ſhould admit the teſtimony of him " who ſhould depoſe that he had ſeen ἄῤῥεν ἐν ἄῤῥεσι, " that in order to prevent the ſuppoſition of a delivery, the civil laws ſhould permit the inſpection of " the woman's ſecret parts, and that they prove the " validity of a marriage, (which is a much more important affair) men ſhould diſlike to ſee *impactum* " *Thyrſum horto in Cupidinis, The tree of love planted in* " *Cupid's garden.*"

Theſe reaſons, and many others which he urges, are not by a great deal ſo ſtrong as the arguments which Tagereau urges on the other ſide of the queſtion. I imagine, that if Rouillard had pleaded ſome months after for a woman, who out of modeſty refuſed to ſubmit to be ſearched, and to undergo the trial of the Congreſs, he would then have urged the maxims with Tagereau, and have effectually refuted himſelf. This is the fate of Lawyers : they are under a neceſſity to argue now after this manner, and then after another manner, according as they have different cauſes to plead (64), and obſerve, that for quite contrary ſubjects, they quote the ſame authorities. You have ſeen above (65), how Tagereau quotes the authority of St. Cyprian and St. Ambroſe againſt the practice of ſearching : and you ſhall ſee now how Rouillard quotes the ſame Authors to juſtify that practice (66). " Nor is it to any purpoſe for " his wife, who pretends too late to modeſty, where " it is no longer neceſſary, to urge that it would be a " ſhame for her to ſuffer her ſecret parts to be ſearched, " or to ſubmit to the congreſs ; for ſhe muſt now " undergo that ſhame, ſince ſhe is the cauſe of all " the evil.

" *Quàm bene diſpoſitum terris ut dignus iniqui*
" *Fructus conſilii, primis authoribus inflet.*

i. e. " *How well is it ordered upon earth that the Au-* " *thors of a wicked deſign ſhould be the firſt that feel* " *the bad conſequences of it.* Add to this, that in ſuch " a caſe it is cuſtomary to ſearch the woman, ſo that " it cannot be ſaid there is any fraud required in " what is agreeable to the common law. For we learn " from St. Cyprian in his Epiſtles, from St. Auguſtin, " and from St. Ambroſe, that in caſes of virgins being deflowered, recourſe is always had to the in- " ſpection of the parts : we even find in St. Cle- " ment *Alex.* 7. *ſtrom.* and in Suidas under the word " *Jeſus*, that the Virgin Mary ſuffered it, it being " ordered by the Sanhedrim of the High Prieſt that " ſhe ſhould be ſearched in order to know whether " or not ſhe had continued a virgin, and whether " our Lord, whom they deſigned to receive into " their Order, ſhould be matriculated in their re- " giſters, under the name of the ſon of Joſeph, or " under the name of the living God, and of a Virgin-mother. Chaſſaneé (67) gives a full account " of it in the fourth part, *Catalogi gloriæ mundi*, " *diſtinct.* 6." Rouillard has made uſe of an artifice of his trade. The Fathers whom he quotes condemn the practice of ſearching, they teſtify therefore that it was in uſe. He quotes them to prove it was in uſe, and omits the reſt. This is not fair : one muſt not thus cut an authority in two, and here we may very well apply the maxim of the Civilian Celſus. *Incivile eſt niſi tota lege perſpecta, una aliqua particula ejus propoſita judicare vel reſpondere* (68). i. e. " It is not well to judge and paſs ſentence upon " the producing of part only of a law without conſidering the whole."

(67) It is certain that Chaſſanée, p. m. 824, gives a large account of this : but obſerves that Clemens Alexandr. lib. 7. *Strom.* p. m. 756, does not mention the Sanhedrim, he ſays only, μετὰ τὸ τεκεῖν αὐτὴν μαιεύσαν, φασί τινες παρθένον ἀνηθῆναι. Some ſay, that after ſhe was delivered, ſhe was ſearched by Midwives, and found a virgin.

(68) *Leg. incivile* 24 *D. de Legibus.*

There is one thing in which both the Counſellors agree, namely in deploring and lamenting the multitude of ſuch actions of impotency entered againſt huſbands. " (69) Her relations . . . . had unjuſtly " . . . . prompted her to commence that ſuit for " diſſolving her marriage with him, becauſe of his " pretended impotency, and for ſome other facts " which are mere ſtories, and which ſhe had done " better to conceal

" *quam protinus urbi*
" *Pandere res alta ſylvâ & caligine merſas.*

(69) Rouillard, *Capitulaire*, p. 5 and 6.

" than to diſcover to an whole city ſuch things as " ought to be buried in darkneſs and oblivion. How- " ever the misfortune of the appellant is, that the " corruption of this age has given a full ſcope to " ſuch proceedings, *dedit hanc contagio labem, & dabit* " *in plures.* Whereas during twelve hundred years " that modeſty poſſeſſed the mind and covered the " face of the matrons of France, there have hardly " been ſo many trials of that kind, as there are at " this time, now they are become ſo frequent, that " there are daily ſome . . . . (70) The Appellant, " from a ſenſe of the misfortune of this age, in " which the women upon very ſlight pretences " divorce and part from their huſbands, will " only repreſent to you this complaint of Tertullian. *Ubi eſt illa felicitas matrimoniorum qua per* " *ſexcentos ferme annos nulla repudium domus ſcripſit ?* " *at nunc in fœminis præ auro nullum eſt leve mem-* " *brum præ vino nullum eſt liberum oſculum, repu-* " *dium vero quaſi votum eſt, & matrimonii fructus.* " i. e. *Where is now that happineſs of matrimony,*

(70) Ib. p. 46.

" *which*

(64) Compare what is obſerved above, remarks [*B*] and [*C*], of the art. ANTHONY (Mark) the Orator.

(65) In the rem. [*A*], num. 3.

(66) Rouillard, *Capitulaire*, p. 49.

(e) In the rem. [G].

(f) The *Bibl. du Droit François*, written by Bouchel, was reprinted at Paris in the year 1667. See the *Journal des Savans*, for May the 16th, 1667. p. m. 196.

jection in an explanation at the end of this work, and I obſerve here before hand, that I have given notice that the work I quoted was printed in the year 1612. Should men wonder, or take offence, becauſe the ſtyle of ſuch a work is now obſolete? I add that even at this time there are obſcenities in cauſes of that kind which are pleaded in a full Court [G], and that though the Judges be Divines, they do not reform it. They cannot do it, nor will they make any uſe of the obſervations of the Author, whom I have quoted (e). See the margin (f). To conclude, as the Epoch of thoſe practices, which have ſomething ſingular and extravagant in them, is a particular which the curious are glad to be acquainted with, I thought it would be of ſome uſe to ſet down here what the Authors tell us concerning the Epoch of the Congreſs [H].

QUETIF

" *which during almoſt ſix hundred years was ſuch, that* " *no divorce was heard of? But now nothing pleaſes* " *in a woman but her gold, no kiſſes are ſo acceptable* " *as wine. A divorce is the wiſh of married people, and* " *as it were, the very deſign of matrimony.* Which is " of moſt pernicious conſequence both to the pub- " lick, and to private perſons." Thus far Rouillard; compare this with what we have quoted above from Tagereau (71).

(71) Quot. (27).

If it be aſked to what purpoſe all theſe paſſages from Rouillard are here tranſcribed? I anſwer, 1. They prove that the moſt venerable Courts of Judicature have ſuffered the Lawyers to expreſs themſelves plainly upon obſcence ſubjects. 2. They ſhew how far the approbation of a great Critick (72) went, which I have given as an inſtance. 3. They confirm ſome of Tagereau's obſervations, or they ſerve to clear up that whole matter, by the oppoſition of the arguments, which are urged on both ſides. If it be replied that I have not the ſame right theſe Lawyers had, I ſhall reply in my turn, that it ought to be as lawful for me, as it is for the compilers of decrees and ſentences, to telate the arguments, which a Counſellor has urged. The very nature of my work, which contains a narration, and a critical commentary upon it, requires it. A compiler who would give at this time, either a diary of the hearings, or a Journal of the Court of Juſtice, and who begins his account with the celebrated cauſes, which were tried in the beginning of the XVIIth century, might very well give the ſubſtance of Roulliard's Capitulary, in the very words of that author. He would perhaps think it more proper to uſe a more modern ſtyle inſtead of the old French; but no man can juſtly blame thoſe, who quote for their vouchers the very words of the original authors, rather than a tranſlation. This is the method which I was determined to follow conſtantly.

(72) Juſtus Lipſius.

(73) Monſ. Marais, Advocate in the Parliament of Paris.

Since this was printed a perſon of worth (73) has acquainted me with the following particulars; 1. That the Baron of Argenton married with Magdalen de la Chaſtre was the perſon for whom Roulliard publiſhed his *Capitulary*. We may know by this the ſenſe of theſe words of Juſtus Lipſius's letter to that Counſellor. (74) *Quid autem ille Baro? te patrono vir erit, aut fiet? . . . . Unum tamen etiam quæro, vel te augure Cominæos* (75) *nobis radicula hæc propagabit? Cui tamen favere me fateor, ob ſacrum illud nobis nomen. Illius autem miſereor, quæ tua opera fortaſſe Tantali aliquo fato contabeſcet.* i. e. " What ſhall I ſay " of tnat Baron? You being his Counſellor, he ſhall " be or become a man. I only beg leave to aſk " even of you as of an augur; Will that little " ſprout ever bring forth any young Commines? " For I confeſs, that for the ſake of that ſacred name, " I am concerned for him. But I pity her, who " will perhaps meet with the fate of Tantalus, and " pine away by the ſide of an unkind huſband." 2. That there is an edition of Roulliard's *Capitulary* which contains more than that, I have made uſe of. Mine is in 8vo, and has but 47 pages, the other is a large 12mo, and contains 139 pages. *There is in page* 139 *a ſonnet made by the author, and in another page which is not numbered, we meet with the following Epigram,*

(74) Lipſius, *Epiſt.* 66. *Centuriæ ad Germ. & Gallos*, p. 698.

(75) All the world knows that Philip de Comines was Baron of Argenton.

Ad Lectorem.

Hæ ſi ſcripta putes parum ſeverè
Fruſtra te mihi præbeas ſeverum.
Nam quis ſchemate nî Thalaſſionis
Inumbrare queat Thalaſſionem?
Ergo quamlibet obſtrepente Momo
Fas ſit porrigier manu pudica
Quod ſolum datur auribus pudicis.

i. e. " If you think this is not wrote gravely enough, " yet if you be ſevere upon me it will be to no " purpoſe: for who can deſcribe the rites of " the nuptial bed, but with ſuch expreſſions as are " proper to repreſent them. Whatever therefore " Momus may ſay, let it be lawful for me to offer " with a chaſte hand, what is deſigned only for " chaſte ears."

[G] *There are obſcenities in cauſes of that kind, which are pleaded in a full Court.*] Here follows a paſſage from a letter written by Monſieur Bouſault to the Biſhop of Langres. " I have often wondered, that " you, who are our Lords the Prelates, ſhould ſuffer " the Judges of your Courts to be Prieſts, or that the " cauſes are not pleaded there privately, conſidering " the many free things that muſt be heard there, " which do generally degenerate into downright ob- " ſcenities. I never had the curioſity to go thither, " but I have heard ſo many different perſons ſpeak of " thoſe Courts, and what they have told me of them " appeared to me ſo free, that they are probably " Courts, from which all modeſty is baniſhed. I " want no other proof of it but the occaſion which " gave riſe to theſe lines.

" *Dans une Officialité*
" *Ces jours paſſez une Soubrette*
" *Paſſablement belle & bien faite,*
" *Et d'une robuſte Santé;*
" *Avec la Bienſéance ayant fait plein divorce,*
" *Dit qu'un vieux Médecin l'avoit priſe par force,*
" *Qu'il falloit ou le pendre, ou qu'il fût ſon Mary:*
" *Et comment, dit le Juge, a-t-il pû vous y prendre?*
" *Vous éte, vigoureuſe, il falloit vous deffendre;*
" *L'avoir égratigné, dévisagé, meurtry:*
" *J'ay, Monſieur, luy répondit-elle,*
" *De la force quand je querelle:*
" *Mais je n'en ay point quand je ry.*

" The ſenſe is; *A certain chamber-maid, pretty hand-* " *ſome and very healthy and ſtrong, having loſt all ſenſe* " *of ſhame, complained the other day before the Biſhop's* " *Court, that an old Phyſician had raviſhed her by main* " *force, ſo that he muſt either be hanged, ſaid ſhe, or* " *marry me. How could he do it by main force, ſaid* " *the Judge; you are very ſtrong, you ought to have* " *defended yourſelf, you ſhould have ſcratched him, pulled* " *out his eyes, and diſfigured his face. Sir, replied the* " *maid, I have ſtrength enough when I quarrel, but* " *none at all when I laugh.*

" Was not that maid really raviſhed by main force, " ſince ſhe was a laughing all the while (76)?" All that can be done is only to leſſen the exceſs; but whenever a cauſe of adultery, of impotency, of maintaining baſtards, of making a woman reparation for her loſt honour, it will be impoſſible for the Judges not to hear obſcenities. An Advocate of Paris (77) has bitterly exclaimed againſt the cuſtom which is ſtill tolerated in the Court of Juſtice of pleading during the Carnaval what they call the *ſmutty* cauſe. But if that abuſe was reformed, there would ſtill be many cauſes which differ from that only as more from leſs.

(76) Bourſault, *Lettres nouvelles*, p. 173, 174. Dutch edit.

(77) Named Martin Huſſon. See his book *de Advocato*, printed at Paris in the year 1666. It is mentioned in the *Journal des Savans*, for April the 15th, 1666. p. 178, of the Dutch edit.

[H] *What the Authors tell us concerning the Epoch of the Congreſs.*] We have ſeen above (78) when it was abrogated in the whole diſtrict of the juriſdiction of the

(78) Above, quotat. (24).

the Parliament of Paris. We may aſſert poſitively it was on the 18th of February 1677. But the epoch of its introduction is uncertain. Some authors ſay it is a practice, which began to be in uſe only towards the middle of the XVIth century, and that the ancients did not uſe it. We have refuted the Phyſician, who imagined, that the Emperor Juſtinian aboliſhed it. That Emperor " (79) in Code * *de repudiis*, declares that if a man and a woman have " lived two years together, without conſummating " the marriage (80), it muſt be diſſolved. In the " 22d novel (81) he prolongs the term of two years " to three, beginning from the day on which the " nuptials were celebrated. That novel adds a remarkable reaſon, which ſhews that nature ought " not to be forced by a trial not only ſhameful, but " ſometimes over-haſty, *edocti namque ſumus ex iis quæ ante hoc provenerunt, quoſdam amplius quam biennium temporis non valentes, poſtea potentes oſtenſos miniſtrare filiorum procreationi.* i. e. *For we know from what has happened before, that ſome, who had been two years without being able to perform their part, have afterwards proved themſelves men by begetting children.* This is all we meet with in the Civil Law, concerning the charge of impotency. The common law agrees in this reſpect with the civil law, and all its determinations upon this ſubject are confined within two different kinds . . . . . (82) However another kind of proof has alſo been made uſe of, namely the ſearching of the parts; it is allowed by ſeveral conſtitutions, and particularly in the chapter *Literas de frigidis*; but we muſt make two important reflections upon this. The firſt . . . . . The ſecond . . . . that if by ſearching the parts the marriage appear to have been conſummated, there is no occaſion to confirm it by any other proof. This is the deciſion of the gloſs on the chapter *propoſuiſti de probationibus.* And even as to that ſearching, the way of proceeding is as follows. The huſband is ſearched firſt; if he be found capable, they do not go any farther; the woman is ſilenced; and even againſt her own will they ſpare her modeſty, which the raſhneſs of her pretenſions had already but too much affected. But if after ſearching the huſband, there remain ſome doubts concerning his abilities, then the woman is ſearched, but only in caſe ſhe had not been married before. The Canon † *requiſiſti* goes farther ſtill; it enacts that if the ſearching of the huſband prove favourable to him, the marriage cannot be broke, though he himſelf ſhould confeſs his impotency . . . . . Theſe are all the proofs we meet with in the civil and canon law; in the civil law the *Triennium*, or three years time; in the canon law, the affirmation of the parties concerned, with that of ſeven of their relations, and at all extremity, the ſearching of their parts. The laws require no more than this: there is not the leaſt mention made of the Congreſs . . . . (83) The Congreſs . . . . owes no doubt its riſe to nothing but the raſhneſs of ſome young man, who having required it in the Court, the Judges ſurprized at the novelty of ſuch a requeſt imagined at firſt that it could not be refuſed. So that as one inſtance gives riſe to another, that bad practice of the Congreſs has been eſtabliſhed inſenſibly. Thus all the authors, who have handled this ſubject *, ſpeak of it, and among others Anthony Hotman, a celebrated advocate in the Parliament of Paris, towards the end of the laſt Century. He aſſerts, that when he wrote his work it was but forty years ſince that practice was eſtabliſhed. . . . . The writings of the Ancients afford us but two inſtances proper to ſupport it; and even thoſe inſtances are both equally ridiculous. The one is in Lucian, who relates, that one Bagoas being deſirous to be received in an aſſembly of Philoſophers, his manhood was called into queſtion; whereupon it was propoſed to try him that way. A propoſal anſwerable to the impudence, with which that Author ſo often charges the falſe Philoſophers. The other inſtance is to be met with in Petrus Ancharanus, upon the chapter *Litteræ* †, in which he relates, that a certain Officialof Venice being willing to try a man charged with impotency, had him ſhut up in a room with a common proſtitute, upon whoſe report he unmarried him. " Ancharanus has not ſaid that ſuch an example was " to be imitated; and indeed it has not been followed in his own country, nor in the other parts of " Italy, nor in Spain, nor in the Low-Countries. " The other nations admit nothing but the ſearching " of the parts in a cauſe of impotency, and we do " not find by the writings of their Civilians, that the " Congreſs was in uſe among them."

The chronological account, which is given us here, as though it were extracted from a book of Anthony Hotman, is there more general than it is reported. Here follows that Author's words (84). *The argument which is urged to vindicate* the Congreſs, *grounded on the practice of former times, cannot be traced up higher than about thirty or thirty five years. And it is very probable, that it was introduced not ſo much by the order of the Judges, as by a reſolution of the parties, who of their own accord offered to ſubmit to that trial, in which caſe it is ſaid,* nullas eſſe judicis partes, *it is none of the Judges buſineſs.* 1. Si convenerit. De jud. *And that practice, (with ſubmiſſion to better advice) ought not to be made a cuſtom, to be publickly authoriſed: on the contrary, if it were tolerated formerly, it is better to reform it now, as has been done with regard to many affairs of the ſame kind.* " As for the Congreſs, " ſays he in another place (85), which practice was " introduced about thirty five or forty years ago, tho' " at firſt ſight it ſeems proper to diſcover the truth " in caſe of the impotency of a man, and (if I may " ſay ſo) repair the error that may have been committed in the ſearching, which, perhaps, had not " been ordered ſo ſoon, had it not been for the Con " greſs that was to follow it, yet that practice being " ſeriouſly conſidered, and not with a prepoſſeſſed " mind, and without attention, will appear not only " indecent and even brutiſh, but alſo uſeleſs, on ac" count of the circumſtances which attend it, and " render the effect and execution of it impoſſible." The Author who ſpeaks thus died in the year 1696. But I do not know the true date of this work (86). I have only the Paris edition of it, printed in 1610. So that I cannot aſcertain the Epoch we are enquiring for. All I can ſay is, that if we admit the authority of that Writer, we cannot place it higher than the year 1540. You may have obſerved, that he maintains the ſame Theſis with Tagereau. He goes even farther than him with regard to obſcenities. So that we have here a new inſtance, and a very illuſtrious one too, of the liberty men have to expreſs themſelves in a ſmutty manner, when the ſubject they handle requires it; and when they endeavour to ſuppreſs a filthy abuſe, and very inconſiſtent with publick decency. Hotman is ſaid to have compoſed that work, *in behalf of a relation of his, who had appealed from a ſentence by which a Congreſs was ordered* (87), and who was caſt. Rouillard reproaches him with this in the edition in 12mo of his *Capitulary*. The Judges ought to have been blamed for the loſs of that cauſe, and not the Counſellor, who urged ſo many ſtrong arguments againſt that new practice, that he deſerved to have a ſentence given agreeable to his pleadings and demands. He did not forget to obſerve, that the proceedings in a Congreſs are the ſubject of numberleſs jokes and ſilly diſcourſes in all converſations. " The moſt prudent men have al" ways endeavoured to find out the mildeſt and leaſt " ſhameful remedy: whereas it ſeems, that at this " time, men make no account of the rules of honour, " modeſty, and decency, and have a mind to favour " a brutiſh impudence; and what is a greater ſhame " ſtill, in ſome ſuits the men have ſearched the wo" men, and women have been admitted to ſearch " the men; which has occaſioned ſo much banter " and raillery, that ſuch proceedings have afforded " matter for ſmutty ſtories, and merry jokes in many " places: whereas all that relates to law proceedings " ought to be treated ſeriouſly, with fear and reve" rence (88)." Among many other arguments he urges the following, namely (89), that it was never obſerved that *the Viewers reported,* mulierem fuiſſe carnaliter à viro cognitam *at the Congreſs: it is ſaid indeed, that on one or two occaſions the woman cried out as though her huſband had hurt her very much, and that the by-ſtanders hearing this, adviſed the parties to agree and return together, which they did, and the woman*

(79) *Journal du Palais*, 5th part, p. 23.

* L. 10.

(80) The words of the law are, *ſi maritus coire minime propter naturalem imbecillitatem valeat.*

(81) The Novel calls that *agere quæ à natura viris data ſunt*, and in Greek, πράττειν τὰ παρὰ τῆς φύσεως ἀνδράσι διδόμενα, to perform what nature gave man to perform. I have this obſervation from Monſieur Marais.

(82) *Journal du Palais*, 5th part. p. 24.

† *Quæſt.* 33.

(83) *Journal du Palais*, p. 25.

* Vincent Tagereau, Anthony Hotman, Peleus, Anne-Robert.

† In the Decretals *de frigidis.*

(84) Ant. Hotman, *Traiſté premier de la diſſolution du mariage pour l'Impuiſſance & froideur de l'homme ou de la femme*, p. 59.

(85) Idem, 2d *Traiſté*, p. 58.

(86) See the rem. [B] of the art. ROBERT.

(87) *Journal du Palais*, 5th part. p. 20.

(88) Ant. Hotman, *Traiſté premier*, p. 63.

(89) Ibid. *au ſecond Traiſté*, p. 63.

QUETIF (JAMES), a Pariſian, and Dominican Frier, was reputed a man of great learning. He publiſhed ſome books [*A*]; and had employed a great number of years in drawing up a Bibliotheque of the Writers of the Dominican Order, when he was ſnatched away by death, at Paris, in the Convent of the Reform, in St. Honore's Street, the ſecond of March 1698, aged fourſcore years (*a*).

(*a*) Extracted from a letter of Mr. Pinſſon des Rielles.

man never complained afterwards. Which is as much as to ſay, that the parties having agreed together after the action was entered, and they had been ſearched, they were adviſed to uſe that expedient, by which it might appear that the woman had not complained without reaſon, ſhe being ſtill a virgin, and reported to be ſuch, and that the huſband was not in the wrong to maintain that he was not frigid; thus the reputation of the woman's ſincerity was ſaved, and her report held to be true, and all parties were pleaſed. He does not condemn the ſearching leſs ſtrongly, than he does the Congreſs, though without mentioning *the many occaſions in which* the Edict of the Prætor *de ventre inſpiciendo* was infringed *afterwards* (90).

(93) *Journal du Palais*, 5th part. p. 20.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome books.*] Here follow the titles of them: *Concilii Tridentini Canones, editio aucta, cui acceſſit Index accuratus Legatorum, Patrum, & Oratorum. Item Index Librorum prohibitorum*, Paris 1666, in 12mo. *Hieronymi Savonarolæ Epiſtolæ ſpirituales & aſceticæ ex Italico in Latinum verſæ. Item Vita Savonarolæ à Joanne Franciſco Pico, cum Notis. Compendium Revelationum Savonarolæ & Additiones quibus varia ad hanc vitam acta, epiſtolæ, diplomata, inſtrumenta publica, ſcriptorumque monumenta, apologiæ &c. referuntur* (1), Paris 1674, three volumes in 12mo. *Petri Morini Pariſienſis Opuſcula & Epiſtolæ primum editæ*, Paris 1675, three volumes, in 12mo. See the ſelect Letters of Mr. Simon (2) concerning this Peter Morin, and this edition of his tracts.

(1) See *Journal des Savans*, of the 20th of January 1676, p. 23. Dutch edit.

(2) p. 241 & *ſeq.*

QUILLET (CLAUDIUS), a native of Chinon in Touraine, was a good Latin Poet in the 17th Century. I mentioned elſewhere (*a*) the reaſon which obliged him to retire into Italy. I add, in this place, that being in Rome, and "frequenting the houſe "of Marſhal d'Etrées, the French Embaſſador, he entered into that family in quality "of Secretary of the Embaſſy (*b*) [*A*]." I know not what it was that made him angry with Cardinal Mazarin; but it is certain that he ſpoke very unhandſomly of his eminence [*B*], in a Poem he publiſhed in 1655 (*α*). This Cardinal was no ways offended at the inſult; and was ſo eaſily ſatisfied with the Author's excuſes that he promiſed him an Abbey [*C*]. The Poem I am ſpeaking of contains ſome particulars, which have been ſtrongly cenſured by Baillet, in the ſtrongeſt terms [*D*]. Abbot Quillet wrote ſome other

(*a*) Rem. [*E*] of the art. GRANDIER.

(*b*) *Sorberiana*, p. 173, Dutch edit.

[*A*] *He entred into that family in quality of Secretary of the Embaſſy.*] "Mr. de Lionne concluded "with him for that employment, which Quillet "got; when de Lionne, for want of better employ-"ment, entred into the ſervice of Cardinal Mazarin, "after Quillet had refuſed to engage in it, who "made the worſt choice, as the event ſhewed; the "one of them dying without having raiſed himſelf "higher, whereas the other happily attained to the "moſt exalted employments in the State (1)." Theſe particulars are curious enough, but I cannot ſay whether they are exactly true.

(1) *Sorberiana*, under the word *Quillet*, p. m. 173.

[*B*] *It is certain that he ſpoke very unhandſomely of his eminence.*] The reader may ſee what he ſays againſt him, in the ſequel of the Menagiana (2).

(2) p. 131, 132, Dutch edit.

§ (*α*). The firſt edition of the Callipædia of Claudius Quillet was printed at Leyden in 1655, 4to; the ſecond at Paris in 1656, 8vo; the third in England in 1708, 8vo; and the fourth at Leipſic in 1709, 8vo, though the title ſays, *Pariſiis apud Thomam Joly*. The firſt edition bears the following title: *Calvidii Læti Callipedia, ſive de pulchræ prolis habendæ ratione, Poema, Ludgd Batav.* 1655, in 4to. And the laſt under the following title: *Cl. Quilleti Callipædia, ſeu de pulchræ prolis habendæ ratione. Poema didacticon cum uno & altero ejuſdem Autoris carmine. Juxta exemplar excuſum Pariſiis, apud Thomam Joly*, 1709, in 8vo. Coſtar greatly applauds this poem of Quillet, *pag.* 860, Letter 334, *Tom.* I. of his Letters, *pag.* 862, Letter 335 of the ſame tome, and *pag.* 598, Letter 250 of *Tom.* II. REM. CRIT.]

[*C*] *Cardinal Mazarin . . . was ſo eaſily ſatisfied with the author's excuſes, that he promiſed him an Abbey.*] This particular deſerves to be related at length, as we find it in the ſequel of the Menagiana (3). "Mr. Quillet's Callipædia, diſguiſed under the name "of *Calvidius Lætus*, is a very beautiful Latin poem. "Some diſguſt he entertained, prompted him to in-"troduce ſome verſes in it againſt Cardinal Mazarin "and his family. He got his work printed in Hol-"land. The Cardinal being informed of this, ſent "to ſpeak with Quillet; when, inſtead of ſhewing "any reſentment on that occaſion, he only complain-"ed, in the moſt gentle terms, for making ſo free "with his character, as he had done in that poem. "You are ſenſible, added he, that I have long had "an eſteem for you, and that, if I have not beſtow-"ed any marks of my favour on you, the reaſon is, "becauſe they have been extorted from me by a "parcel of importunate people with whom I am "perpetually ſurrounded; but I promiſe to collate "you to the firſt Abbey that ſhall be vacant. Quil-"let, ſtruck with the Cardinal's generoſity and good-"neſs, fell on his knees and begged his pardon, pro-"miſing to correct his poem in ſuch a manner as ſhould "give him ſatisfaction; beſeeching him at the ſame "time, to permit him to dedicate it to his eminence, "and the Cardinal conſented to it. Accordingly, "he printed that ſecond edition corrected, in 8vo, "at Paris in 1656, and dedicated it to the Cardi-"nal, who, a little before, had given him a conſi-"derable Abbey, which, however, death did not "permit him to enjoy long. The firſt edition of "this book, which is the ſcarceſt, is printed at "Leyden, in 4to, 1655; but that of Paris contains "more."

(3) p. 130, 131. See Coſtar's *Letters*, Tom. I. p. 176.

[*D*] *The poem I am ſpeaking of contains ſome particulars, which have been ſtrongly cenſured by Baillet, in the ſtrongeſt terms.*] Here follows what he ſays of it (4). "This Abbot, intending to teach men how "to get pretty children, has endeavoured to reduce "all the precepts of that new art into four books, "in Latin verſe, entitled *Callipædia*. Though he "does not inform the publick how he gained his "knowledge of ſo many rare particulars; it was "nevertheleſs obſerved, that, for an Abbot (5), he "knew more on this article than the moſt experi-"enced among the Laity, and that he was capable "of teaching even nature herſelf . . . . (6). It is "ſaid that ſome paſſages in it are finely touched; "but that it alſo contains ſome deſcriptions, concern-"ing procreation, which are abominable, and un-"worthy a man who has any ſenſe of modeſty; and "that he ſeems, every where, to glory in his hav-"ing read Petronius. For this reaſon we muſt con-"ſider, as mere compliments of civility, the elogi-"ums which Coſtar forms of Callipædia, in a letter "he wrote to the author (*)."

(4) *Jugemens ſur les Poetes*, art. 1511.

(5) According to the *Menagiana*, above, citat. (3), he was not an Abbot when he wrote that poem.

(6) Baillet, *Jugemens ſur les poetes*, art. 1511.

* It is the 250th *Letter* of Tom. 2. of Coſtar, p. 598, 599.

Since the firſt edition of this Dictionary, I have read the Callipædia, printed at Paris in 1656 (7), the title of which runs thus: *Cl. Quilleti Callipædia ſeu de pulchræ prolis habendæ ratione Poema didacticon. Cum uno & altero* (8) *ejuſdem Authoris carmine.* The preface points out thoſe particulars, which were added to

(7) Mr. Bouhier has been ſo good as to ſend it me.

(8) Theſe two poems are an epiſtle *ad Eudoxum*, in hexameter verſe, and an elegy *in obitum Petri Gaſſendi.*

other works which were never publiſhed [*E*]. [He died in September 1661 *.]

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. p. 979. vol. 4.

to the Paris edition, which are more in number than thoſe that were ſuppreſſed. The verſification of this poem is very beautiful, and the author appears therein to have ſtudied Lucretius much more than Petronius. Thoſe were not miſtaken, who told Baillet that the author ſpeaks very plainly of what relates to procreation; but it is falſe to aſſert that this is unworthy a man, who has any ſenſe of modeſty; Abbot Quillet ſaying nothing but what is found in grave authors who have wrote on Phyſic. I cannot ſay whether he had any other tutors; but I am perſuaded we may learn, barely by the reading of the moſt ſerious writers, all the precepts laid down by him. He ſtyles himſelf *Abbas Dudavillæus*, at the end of the privilege; and *Abbas D. S.* in the dedication.

(9) In the catalogue of thoſe perſons who preſented him with books.

[*E*] *He wrote ſome other works which were never publiſhed.*] Abbot des Marolles having mentioned (9) the Poem entitled *Callipædia*, and ſome other Latin and French verſes which Quillet had made him a preſent of, goes on thus: *He had wrote another long Latin poem, in twelve books, entitled* Henriciados, *in honour of King Henry IV; but I do not know whether this work, or his tranſlation of all Juvenal's Satyrs in French verſe, will ever be publiſhed; ſince editions of the fineſt poems by the ableſt writers muſt be paid for now; and thoſe which are printed, of which there are great numbers even in Latin, are ſcarce read. I ſhall not ſpecify them, which, were I to do, it would ſurprize my readers.* I believe the following words of Coſtar relate to the *Henriciad*. "I am ſorry you have taken "from me the words *convoiter* (to covet) and *convoi-* "*tiſe* (coveting or deſire). For I would employ them "to very good purpoſe, to expreſs the paſſionate de- "ſire I have to read the ſequel of your divine La- "tin poem, the beginning of which you favoured "me with. If the remainder is equally beautiful, "it exceeds the beautiful *Callipædia*, as much as that "charming poem is ſuperior to all the compoſitions "written in this age. What an entertainment, Sir, "will it be for me, if you keep your word; and "bring me hither four thouſand as fine verſes as "thoſe I juſt now read (10)?"

(10) Coſtar, *Letre à l'Abbé Quillet.* It is the 250th, of Tom. 2. p. 598.

QUINTUS CURTIUS RUFUS, wrote a Hiſtory of Alexander. It is a beautiful work, and finely writ; and therefore it is not juſt to ſuppoſe it writ by ſome Author in the middle age [*A*]: but we may juſtly wonder that no one mentioned it before the 15th

[*A*] *To ſuppoſe it wrote by ſome author in the middle age.*] Here follows a paſſage from Guy Patin. "Are "you certain that Quintus Curtius lived under Tibe- "rius? ſome ſay it was under that of Auguſtus, from "the beauty of his Latin diction; and others under "Veſpaſian, with ſome appearance of reaſon. I for- "merly learnt of a maſter, who had a peculiar way of "thinking with regard to Quintus Curtius. He ſaid "that Quintus Curtius was only a romance; that the "Latin indeed was very beautiful, but that there were "a great number of geographical errors in it. . . . "This maſter uſed to tell us, that this book was writ "by a learned Italian, about three hundred years a- "go. That none of the ancients had cited Quintus "Curtius, and that it was a ſuppoſititious name. That "mention is there made of the river Indus, the Ganges, "and other parts of India, that were unknown to the "ancients who lived before Ptolemy, who is the firſt "and moſt ancient Author who mentioned China "under the word *Sinæ*. . . . . But this is a contro- "verſy, . . . which I hope will be cleared up in the "edition now printing in Holland, of the noble work "of the late Mr. Voſſius, on the Latin Hiſtorians "(1)." Some particulars in this paſſage ought juſtly to be criticiſed. I. It is falſe to aſſert, that the Indus, the Ganges, and other parts of India, were unknown before the age in which Ptolemy lived; for Strabo and Pliny, who lived, the one under Auguſtus, and the other under Veſpaſian, ſpeak of theſe two rivers; and Ptolemy lived under Marcus Aurelius. II. What kind of argument is the following? Quintus Curtius mentions ſome rivers, *that were unknown to the ancients who lived before Ptolemy*; conſequently this book was writ about the middle of the 14th century? Can it be denied, that at the very time in which Ptolemy flouriſhed, people might have ſpoke of the rivers and provinces mentioned by him? III. Since Quintus Curtius did not employ the word *Sinæ*, to ſignify China, there was no reaſon for obſerving, that no perſon had uſed that word before Ptolemy. I am to obſerve, that Patin's letter is dated the 15th of September, 1650; and that, in a letter dated the 14th of June of the ſame year, he ſpeaks as having read Voſſius's work; wherefore then does he mention it here as a book that was in the preſs? By the way, Guy Patin's Schoolmaſter is not miſtaken, when he affirms, *that none of the ancients had cited Quintus Curtius.* We cannot ſufficiently wonder at this ſilence, which is a moſt peculiar misfortune. The Hiſtorian in queſtion has this in common, with many others, that we neither know his age nor country; not to mention that his work has been mutilated and corrupted. But he perhaps is the only deſerving Author whom no one has quoted during ſo many ages (2). Acidalius was a little angry at it. *Illa autem*, ſays he

(1) Patin, *Letter* 44 p. 186, 187, Tom. 1.

(2) This is more than what I ſaid concerning PATERCULUS. (See the cloſe of the rem. [*B*], of the art. PHÆDRUS) and of QUINTUS CALABER, in his art. citat. (7).

(3), *vix omnino quemquam calamitas extra Curtium afflixit, ut reliquorum ſcriptorum nemo mentionem ejus uſquam, vel uno verbo, certam dico mentionem, & indubitatam faciat, ad unum omnibus tacentibus, quaſi de compacto ut conſpiraſſe videantur ad ſupprimendum hominis nomen, ad famam prorſus opprimendam. In hoc quis non indoleat? quis non miretur, & indignetur?* i. e. "Curtius was "almoſt the only Author, who has been ſo unfortu- "nate as ſcarce to be mentioned in a certain and un- "doubted manner, by a ſingle Author; all of them "being ſilent on that head, inſomuch that one "would be apt to conclude, they had all conſpired "together to ſuppreſs his name, and throw the deep- "eſt vail over his reputation. What man, who con- "ſiders this, is not ſtruck with grief, ſurprize and in- "dignation?" Father le Tellier is ſurprized at this ſilence; and takes it to be the reaſon why this Hiſtory was thought to be writ by a modern. *Hic mirari cum Acidalio licet ſingulare Curtii fatum, quod ſcriptor Nobiliſſimus, & nihilo primis inferior, non ſolum communi illa temporum injuria duobus truncatus libris, aliis quoque locis mutilus, plurimis depravatus ad nos pervenerit: verum etiam, quod nulli forte præterea contigit, tam multis ætatibus ignotus latuerit, ſicut ante ſeculum à Chriſto nato decimum nemo omnium repertus ſit qui vel per tranſennam Curtii hiſtorici, ſcriptæve ab illo hiſtoriæ mentionem injecerit. Quæ res, opinor, nonnullos adduxit, ut ſuſpicarentur non genuinum Curtii ac vetuſtum, ſed ſuppoſititium recentioris cujuſquam ſcriptoris fœtum eſſe, qui poſt renatas litteras, felici veterum imitatione eximiam ſcribendi facultatem adeptus, opus hoc ſuum Romano ſub nomine prodire voluerit* (4). i. e. "I here may wonder with "Acidalius, at the ſingular fate of Curtius, viz. that "this moſt noble writer, who was no ways inferior "to thoſe of the greateſt reputation, ſhould yet not "only be tranſmitted to us, (by the uſual inclemen- "cy of time) imperfect in two books, but be muti- "lated in other places, and corrupted in many; but "likewiſe, which poſſibly never happened to any o- "ther Author, that he ſhould lye concealed and un- "known, during ſo many centuries; ſo that, before "the tenth century from Chriſt's nativity, not a ſin- "gle Author is found, who makes the leaſt tranſient "mention of Quintus Curtius, or the Hiſtory written "by him. This circumſtance, I preſume, induc- "ed ſome perſons to ſuſpect, that we are not "poſſeſſed of Curtius's ancient and genuine work, "but only of the ſuppoſititious compoſition of a more "modern Writer, who, after the revival of litera- "ture, having acquired a beautiful manner of wri- "ting, by a happy imitation of the ancients, pub- "liſhed this piece of his under the name of a Ro- "man Author." We might infer from theſe words, that this Hiſtorian began to be cited in the 10th century, and yet this Dauphin Scholiaſt does not name

(3) Valens Acidalius, *Animadv. ad* lib. 4. Curtii.

(4) Michael le Tellier, *in præfat. ad* Quint. Curtium *in uſum Delphini.*

15th Century (*a*). We ought not to wonder ſo much at our meeting with incredible incidents in it, as that we do not find more. The Author was even ſo prudent, as to obviate the reproach, which he feared would be made to him, *viz.* of his being too credulous [*B*]. It would have been ſtill better, had he related fewer prodigies; and oftener obſerved that he did not believe all the particulars related by him. I obſerved elſewhere (*b*), that a King of Naples was cured by the peruſal of his book. We have a moſt beautiful verſion of his work (*c*). The learned Freinſhemius made very fine Commentaries on this Hiſtorian; he alſo wrote a Supplement, conſiſting of the two firſt books, and ſome other paſſages that are loſt. The Preface (*d*) of Father Michael le Tellier, the Jeſuit, ſhews, that we have greater reaſon to believe he lived under the Emperor Claudius, than under Veſpaſian. At the ſame time that I take notice of Moreri's errors, I ſhall have occaſion to mention ſome other things [*C*]. Cardinal du Perron

(*a*) See in the rem. [*A*] the words of Father la Tellier, and the reflections I make on them.

(*b*) Citat. (11), of the art. NAPLES (Alphonſus I. King of).

(*c*) By Vaugelas.

(*d*) *Ad* Qu. Curt. *in uſum Delphini.*

any perſon who ſpeaks of him before the 15th century; Anthony Panormita being the oldeſt Author produced by him, in the catalogue of the teſtimonies given in honour of Quintus Curtius. This catalogue is much more ample in Freinſhemius; and yet it does not ſpeak of one Author prior to Panormita (5). I know not why Abbé de la Roque, in his *Journal des Savans*, of the 18th of April, 1678, makes Father le Tellier ſay, that *no Writer, before the middle of the 15th century, has ranked* Quintus Curtius *among the Hiſtorians* (6). It is certain that this Jeſuit does not ſay the 15th century, but the 10th; I have cited his words (7). The argument he employs againſt thoſe, who are of opinion that this Hiſtory of Alexander was drawn up ſince the reſtoring of polite literature, is not convincing. He ſays that one Gaultier wrote a poem, entitled, *Alexandreis*, which very often conſiſts entirely of Quintus Curtius's words put into verſe, and that this Poet lived in the 12th century. *Quorum conjecturam vel una refellit Gualteri Belgæ Alexandreis, jam inde uſque a duodecimo æræ Chriſtianæ ſeculo condita, ex unius ſæpe Curtii vocibus in verſum redactis* (8). Could it not be anſwered, that a modern Author being deſirous of writing a Hiſtory of Alexander, and publiſhing it as a work of Quintus Curtius, made very great uſe of Gaultier's poem, and turned into proſe all ſuch parts of it as he pleaſed? With regard to myſelf, who cannot think that any learned man of the 15th century was capable to write Latin with ſo much beauty, and with that air of antiquity which we find in Quintus Curtius; theſe are reaſons ſufficient to perſuade me, that the Author of this Hiſtory was prior to Suetonius. I therefore approve thoſe who cenſure Angelus Decembrius, for having ſaid that Quintus Curtius borrowed many particulars from Arrian (9). I am ſenſible that Iſaac Pontanus, a man of great learning, very much approved the opinion of Decembrius, but he was not infallible. *Nos quoque*, ſays he (10), *poſt Decembrium aliquot ad varios datis epiſtolis . . . idem adſtruximus ac demonſtravimus poſt ævum Trajani & Adriani claruiſſe, & Taciti inſuper maximi Authoris imitatorem eſſe, ejuſque non ſemel verba ac dictionem expreſſiſſe, & uſum ſubinde iis vocibus quæ non niſi ab authoribus ejus ævi uſurpantur.* i. e. "I likewiſe, after Decembrius, have laid down and demonſtrated the "ſame thing, in ſome letters to various perſons, "viz. that he flouriſhed after the time of Trajan "and Adrian; particularly that he imitated that "great Author Tacitus, he ſometimes employing "his very words and phraſes; and alſo ſuch words "as were uſed only by the Authors of that age." This is affirming directly, that Quintus Curtius flouriſhed after the age of the Emperor Adrian; how comes it then that Pontanus, in two other letters (11), endeavours to ſhew, that the paſſage of this Author, which ſome apply to Auguſtus, and others to Claudius or Veſpaſian, ought to be underſtood of Trajan?

I will conclude this remark with a paſſage from Vigneul Marville. "Some criticks, ſays he (12), "imagine that the name Quintus Curtius was forged "by an Italian wit, who wrote this Hiſtory or Ro"mance about three hundred years ago. What proof "there is of this I know not; but a ſure circum"ſtance is, none of the ancients mention him. But "taking this for granted, it is ſurprizing that a man, "who wrote beautiful Latin, and who had compoſed "a book capable of immortalizing himſelf, had he "made himſelf known, ſhould have ſacrificed his glory "to an imaginary Quintus Curtius, who could not enjoy it. A learned man endeavoured formerly to "perſuade me, that the name of this Author, who "was an Italian, is latinized in that of Quintus Cur"tius. This might be ſo; but what man can ex"plain that emblem? It would be too late to attempt "it now."

(5) I am informed, by a letter of Mr. de la Croſe, of Berlin, that Johannes Sarisburienſis, in the 12th century, and Michael Scot, *in Menſa Philoſophica*, in the 13th century, cite Quintus Curtius.

(6) Abbé de la Roque, having ſpoke the words cited by me, and ſome other particulars, continues thus; *Father le Tellier, after this remark, examines, &c.* This proves that he aſcribes to him all he had ſaid before.

(7) I am to obſerve, that the *Journal of Trevoux*, for May 1705, p. 811. ſhews that there is a typographical error in the paſſage of Father le Tellier; and that we muſt read it thus; *ante Seculum a Chriſto nato quintum decimum.*

(8) Michael le Tellier, *in præf. ad* Q. Curtium.

(9) *Græcorum & Arriani conſtat hiſtoria, ex quorum fontibus hic ſcriptor . . . opus ſuum excudit.* Ang. Decembrius, *de Politia Litteraria.*

(10) Joh. Iſacius Pontanus, *Epiſt. ad* Wicquefortium. This is the 75th of thoſe publiſhed by Matthæus in Leyden in 1695.

(11) Written to Voſſius. Theſe are the 87th and 97th of the ſame collection of Matthæus.

(12) Vign. Marville, *Mélanges*, Tom. 2. p. 302, Dutch edit.

[*B*] *He was even ſo prudent, as to obviate the reproach, which he feared would be made to him*, viz. *of his being too credulous.*] I borrow this from la Mothe le Vayer's judgment on the principal Hiſtorians, pag. 204. Tom. III. of the 12th edition of his works. He ſays that Arrian *is one of the moſt cautious Authors in relating ſurprizing particulars or prodigies*; but that Quintus Curtius is more ſo. "We need no other "proof of this, than what they write concerning "one or two miraculous fountains which ſpring up "the inſtant Alexander had pitched his camp near "the river Oxus. Arrian ſays, that the one was of "oil, and the other of clear water, without ſuggeſt"ing to his reader's mind, the leaſt ſcruple with re"gard to the truth of ſuch a ſtory. Quintus Cur"tius *, who does not ſpeak of the fountain of oil, "relates that, as men were digging wells, a foun"tain was diſcovered in the King's tent; and that it "being late before it was perceived, a report was "ſpread that it was a new one; Alexander himſelf "being very deſirous of having it thought, that it "was owing to the favour of Heaven, and a gift "which God had beſtowed upon him (13). To ſhew "evidently the circumſpection, which this Author al"ways employed in treating of ſuch particulars as "might juſtly be ſuſpected, I will here tranſcribe "the words added by him to the relation he gives of "the dog in the Kingdom of Sophita, who ſuffered "himſelf to be cut to pieces rather than let go his "hold of a lion. *Equidem*, ſays he †, *plura tranſcribo, quam credo. Nam nec affirmare ſuſtineo de quibus dubito, nec ſubducere quæ accepi.* I indeed tranſcribe more particulars than I give credit too; for "I neither can affirm what I myſelf doubt of, nor "conceal what was told me by other people. We "muſt apply this paſſage to that paſſage in the ſame "book, where, when Ptolemy was ſick, a ſerpent "pointed out to Alexander, in his ſoundeſt ſleep, "the herb that would cure him. And indeed, when "an Author ſhews by ſuch cautions, that he does "not deſire to impoſe on the reader's credulity, he "may write any thing, as I before ſhewed in the "chapter on Livy."

* Lib. 7.

(13) Compare this with the remark [*B*] of the art. PHASELIS. Q. Curtius's words, lib. 7. cap. 10. num. 14. are remarkable. *In ipſo tabernaculo regis conſpectus eſt fons, quem quia tarde notaverant ſubito extitiſſe finxerunt rexque ipſe credi voluit donum Dei id fuiſſe.*

† Lib. 9.

[*C*] *At the ſame time that I take notice of Moreri's errors, I ſhall have occaſion to mention ſome other things.* I. He had no good reaſon for beſtowing on Quintus Curtius the title of Roman Knight; this title not being given to the Quintus Curtius, in Cicero, the Curtius Rufus in Tacitus, nor the Quintus Curtius Rufus of Suetonius, three men, one of whom, in the opinion of ſome learned perſons, was our Hiſtorian. II. The excellency of his ſtyle is no good reaſon for his doubting, *whether he did not live before Livy*; on the contrary, this very conſideration ſhould make one ſuppoſe that he was not prior to Livy, but his contemporary. It is more eaſy to meet with a harſh ſtyle, before Livy's time, than in the age in which he lived; for was it not the golden age of the Latin diction? III. Quintus Curtius does not make a *digreſſion*, in his tenth book, or elſewhere, *with regard to the facility of the age he lived in*; it ſhould have been *on the felicity.* I mention this only to ſhew Moreri's careleſſneſs; he copying, without the leaſt judgment, the very errors

Perron was too great an admirer of Quintus Curtius [*D*].

Nothing could contribute more to leſſen the prodigious eſteem which any man might have for him, than the remarks publiſhed by Mr. le Clerc, and entitled, *Judicium de Quinto Curtio.* Theſe are annexed to his work *de Arte Critica*, and prove demonſtratively, that this famous Hiſtorian had committed ſeveral great faults; his ignorance in Aſtronomy and Geography, his contradictions, his irregular deſcriptions, his ill taſte in the choice of matters, his negligence with regard to the dates in which events happened, &c. Moſt of theſe faults would be found in almoſt all the ancient Hiſtorians, was a perſon capable, or would give himſelf the trouble, to animadvert on them with ſeverity. I don't know whether it might not be obſerved, that the ignorance he has ſhewn in ſome particulars is a proof that he did not live in theſe latter ages; for a man of the 14th or 15th century, who had been capable of writing that Hiſtory of Alexander, muſt have had more talents than were neceſſary for compoſing it in the firſt century; he muſt have poſſeſt the moſt ſhining qualities, and grown old in ſtudy. Could he have been ignorant of what was univerſally known at that time, viz. that the moon is not eclipſed both when it is new and full (*e*)? Now this is one proof of Quintus Curtius's ignorance.

(*e*) Q. Curtius, lib. 4. cap. 10.

of the preſs. This had crept into La Mothe le Vayer (14), which he copied faithfully, though he might eaſily have perceived the correction that was wanting. IV. Suetonius does not ſay, that Quintus Curtius Rufus, *a famous Rhetorician*, lived under Tiberius. What he ſaid of this Rhetorician is not come down to us; we knowing that he has ſpoke of him, by a catalogue found in a manuſcript. Voſſius perhaps is not miſtaken, in conjecturing, from the age of thoſe who proceed and follow the Rhetorician, in the catalogue in queſtion, that he lived under Tiberius (15); but it does not follow that it is right to affirm, that Suetonius placed him under that Emperor. V. It ſhould not have been aſſerted, that the Q. Curtius Rufus of Suetonius, is the ſame Curtius Rufus mentioned by Tacitus (16). The Curtius of Tacitus was, a gladiator's ſon, and was raiſed to the Conſulate without ever having taught rhetoric (17). VI. Moreri had no reaſon to *be ſurprized, that Quintilian, as he mentioned every Hiſtorian of any figure, in the tenth book of his Inſtitutions, written under Domitian, is entirely ſilent with regard to Quintus Curtius*'s Hiſtory. What is there ſaid of Quintilian is falſe; he ſpeaking of but four Hiſtorians at moſt; for which reaſon his ſilence is no manner of ſervice with regard to thoſe who alledge this as a proof, that Quintus Curtius had not publiſhed his book yet. *Quod argumentum . . . . validius ſemper mihi viſum eſt, quam quod à Quintiliani ſilentio petunt adverſarii. Quaſi vero hiſtoricorum catalogum Fabius texuerit, qui quatuor admodum ex iis appellavit: ſuperſtites autem, in quibus eſſe potuit Curtius, conſulto prætermiſerit* (18). VII. We likewiſe may conſider as a new error what is ſaid in the following words; *which cannot* (19) *be accuſed, but by ſuppoſing that this work had not yet been publiſhed in his time.* All theſe errors are in La Mothe le Vayer (20). VIII. Raderus did not write a Supplement, but Commentaries, on Quintus Curtius. I ſay nothing of the falſe citations (21). I ſhall obſerve occaſionally, that the Supplements of Chriſtopher Bruno were publiſhed in 1545. This Author taught the Belles Lettres in Munich, and dedicated his Quintus Curtius to the Duke of Bavaria. Poſſevin (22), and James Gourdon (23) affirm, that Quintianus Stoa had ſupplied whatever was wanting in Quintus Curtius, but Freinſhemius never ſaw that Supplement (24). Others affirm, that Quintianus Stoa never wrote any (25). I will add what Colomeſius obſerves with regard to the edition of Quintus Curtius, *Lugduni apud Paulum Frellon*, 1615 in 12mo. "This edition, ſays he (26), which is little known, "has this peculiar to it, that, beſides the common "Supplements aſcribed to Chriſtopher Bruno, a Ba"varian Monk; it contains others, copied from a "manuſcript in the library of St. Victor, by John "Maſſon, Archdeacon of Bayeux, brother to Papy"rius Maſſon, well known among the learned. Theſe "Supplements, the Author of which the two Maſſons "could not diſcover, were writ by Francis Petrarch, "if we may credit Scaliger in the ſecond *Scaligerana*. "*In Bibliotheca S. Victoris*, ſays he, *primus liber Q. "Curtii erat, ſed deprehendi eſſe compoſitum à Petrarcha.*" I ſhall add farther, that Vaſſan wrote one day to Goldaſtus, that the firſt book of Quintus Curtius would be ſoon publiſhed. *Eſt in manibus Pap. Maſſonii liber ille* 1. *Quinti Curtii hactenus deſideratus, quem ubi primum publicaverit tibi exhibebo* (27).

(14) It is in my edit. in 12mo, of La Mothe le Vayer's works, Paris 1681. p. 197. Tom. 3.

(15) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 152.

(16) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 11.

(17) Before he was raiſed to any high employment in the government, he was in the ſervice of the Governor of Africa. *Tenuis adhuc & obſcurus obtinenti Africam comes hæſerat.* Plin. *Epiſt.* 27. lib. 7.

(18) Michael le Tellier, *in Præf. ad* Q. Curt.

(19) *i. e.* Quintilian's ſilence.

(20) Tom. 3. of his works, p. 197, 198.

(21) Moreri cites Pliny's *Epiſt.* 7; but it ſhould be *Epiſt.* 27; and Voſſius, lib. 2; but it ſhould be lib. 1.

(22) In *Bibl. Selecta.*

(23) In *Chronol.* cap. 20. num. 31. *apud* Freinſh. *Proleg.* cap. 3.

(24) Freinſhem. ibid.

(25) La Mothe le Vayer, *Oeuvres*, Tom. 3. p. 199.

(26) Colomeſius, *Bibl. choiſie*, p. 184, 185.

(27) See *Letter* 31, of the collection of Letters written to Goldaſtus, publiſhed in 1688.

QUINTILIAN (MARCUS FABIUS), was a native of Calagurris, or Calahorra, in Spain (*a*). It is pretended that he was brought to Rome by Galba (*b*), but it is certain that he taught Rhetorick in that city with great reputation. He was the firſt who taught it there publickly, and at the expence of the Government (*c*); but he was diſcharged from that painful employment after having exerciſed it twenty years (*d*). He was ſo unhappy as to labour under many domeſtick afflictions, which had liked to have tired out his patience, and forced him to complain of the cruelty of his fate [*A*]. He regretted

(*a*) *Aſſerat uſque licet Fabium Calagurris alumnum.* Auſonius, *in* Profeſſorib. p. 145. That city now ſtands on the Ebro, and is now called Calahorra.

(*b*) *Chronic.* Euſebii, *ſub Olymp.* 211. p. m. 162. See rem. [*E*].

(*c*) Ibid. *ſub Olymp.* 216. p. 164.

(*d*) *Poſt impetratam ſtudiis meis quietem quæ per viginti annos eruditis juvenibus impenderam.* Quintil. *Præf.* lib. 1.

[*A*] *He was ſo unhappy as to labour under a great many domeſtic afflictions . . . . . which forced him to complain of the cruelty of his fate.*] He loſt his wife, who was but nineteen, and was inconſolable for her death. He beſtows the higheſt applauſe on her. *Omni virtute quæ in fœminas cadit functa, inſanabilem attulit marito dolorem . . . . illi dolori quem ex matre optima atque laudem omnem ſupergreſſa, paucos ante menſes ceperam gratulor* (1). She left him two ſons, one of whom died at five years old, and the other at ten, who was the oldeſt, and poſſeſſed extraordinary talents: beſides, fortune had already prepared his way

(1) Quintil. *Præf.* lib. 6. p. m. 267.

regretted particularly a ſon, aged ten years, who was ſnatched away by death, and was a child of extraordinary hopes (*e*). He did not only lay down rules for juſt ſpeaking, but exhibited his eloquence at the bar; pleaded for Queen Berenice in her preſence (*f*), and was judged to be ſo able a Lawyer, that his pleadings were writ down in order for their being ſold to the Bookſellers [*B*]. Some imagine that he was Conſul [*C*]; but it

(e) See the rem. [*A*].

(f) Quintil. *Præf.* lib. 4. cap. 1. p. m. 168.

way for attaining the higheſt dignities, a man who had been Conſul having adopted him; and another who was Prætor, and his uncle by the mother's ſide, would have made him his ſon-in-law. *Tene conſulari nuper adoptione ad omnium ſpes bonorum patris admotum, te avunculo prætore generum deſtinatum, te omnium ſpe Atticæ eloquentiæ candidatum ſuperſtes parens tantum ad pœnas, amiſi?* Quintilian's affliction was very great, at the ſight of ſo many loſſes; he would have left off writing, and have thrown into the fire all his compoſitions. He was afraid he ſhould be charged with being hard hearted, in caſe he ſhould employ, thence forward, his tongue in any thing, but in enveighing againſt Heaven. He did not omit ſaying, that there is a malicious and jealous Being, who does not ſuffer very promiſing children to be long lived. It will be neceſſary for me to quote his words, to ſhew, how great a looſe the wiſeſt of the Heathens gave to their impatience. *Tunc igitur optimum fuit, infauſtum opus, & quicquid hoc eſt in me infelicium literarum, ſuper immaturum funus conſumpturis viſcera mea flammis injicere, neque hanc impiam vivacitatem novis inſuper curis fatigare. Quis enim mihi bonus parens ignoſcat, ſi ſtudere amplius poſſum? ac non oderit hanc animi mei firmitatem, ſi quis in me eſt alius uſus vocis, quàm ut incuſem deos, ſuperſtes omnium meorum? nullam terras deſpicere providentiam teſter? ſi non meo caſu, cui tamen nihil objici, niſi quòd vivam, poteſt: at illorum certè, quos utique immeritos mors acerba damnavit* (2). . . . . *Juro per mala mea, per infelicem conſcientiam, per illos manes numina doloris mei; has me in illo vidiſſe virtutes ingenii, non modò ad perſpiciendas diſciplinas, quo nihil præſtantius cognovi, plurima expertus, ſtudiique jam tum non coacti; (ſciunt præceptore) ſed probitatis, pietatis, humanitatis, liberalitatis; ut prorſus poſſit hinc eſſe tanti fulminis metus; quòd obſervatum ferè eſt, celerius occidere feſtinatam maturitatem; & eſſe neſcio quam, quæ ſpes tantas decerpat, invidiam; ne videlicet ultra quàm homini datum eſt, noſtra provehantur* (3). i. e. "The beſt thing to have been "done then was, to have caſt into the fire, which "was to conſume my bowels, that impropitious "work, and all the unhappy learning I am maſter "of; nor any longer fatigue my impious long life "with new ſtudies. For what worthy parent will "forgive me, ſhould I be able to ſtudy any more? "And will not abhor the ſtrength of mind I poſſeſs, "if I ſhould make any other uſe of my voice, than "to exclaim againſt the Gods, for permitting me to "ſurvive my whole family, and to declare that no "providence preſides over mankind? If not on my "own account, to whom not a ſingle objection can be "made, except that I am ſtill living; yet certainly on account of thoſe, who, though ſo extremely "deſerving, were ſnatched away cruelly by an untimely death. . . . I ſwear by my calamities, by "my gloomy reflections, by thoſe ſhades the deities "of my affliction; that I perceived a vaſt genius "in him, not only for receiving inſtruction, in "which no one ſurpaſſed him; but alſo that he "likewiſe poſſeſſed the virtues of probity, piety, humanity, and liberality; ſo that the dread of this thunder-"ſtrokes might ariſe from the following obſervation, "that whatever comes ſuddenly to maturity as ſud-"denly decays; and that a certain envy blaſts ſuch "mighty hopes, leſt we ſhould go beyond thoſe "bounds which are preſcribed to man." However, he changed his mind with regard to his work; he continuing and completing it.

(2) Quintil. *Præf.* lib. 6. p. m. 267.

(3) Idem, ibid. p. 268.

[*B*] *His pleadings were wrote down, in order for their being ſold to the bookſellers.*] There were, at this time, certain perſons in Rome, who, by the help of ſhort-hand, would carry away an entire ſpeech, tho' the orator ſpoke ever ſo faſt. This art is now known and practiſed in England better than in any other country in the world. Thoſe who uſed to take the pains to write in this manner, all the ſpeeches they heard at the bar, did not do it always out of curioſity; they being ſometimes prompted by avarice, to procure valuable pleadings, in order to ſell them to the bookſellers. This ſometimes did a prejudice to authors; they finding that the writer had forgot ſome valuable particulars; by which means the works that appeared under their names were imperfect. This was Quintilian's caſe, as he himſelf informs us, after ſpeaking of a plea, which a youthful ambition had prompted him to communicate to the publick. *Id eſt in cauſa Nævii Apruniani ſolum quæſitum, præcipitatane eſſet ab eo uxor; an ſe ipſa ſua ſponte jeciſſet. Quam actionem equidem ſolam in hoc tempus emiſeram, quod me ipſum feciſſe ſeductum juvenili cupiditate gloriæ fateor. Nam cæteræ, quæ ſub nomine meo feruntur, negligentia excipientium in quæſtum notariorum corruptæ, minimam partem mei habent* (4). i. e. "The only "quære in the cauſe of Nævius Aprunianus was, "whether he threw his wife headlong, or whether "ſhe voluntarily caſt herſelf down. This is the only "pleading I have yet publiſhed, to which I will "own I was induced by a youthful thirſt after glo-"ry. For as to the reſt, which go under my name, "as they were corrupted by the negligence of the "writers, whoſe only view was gain, they contain "but very little of what I can call my own."

(4) Quintil. *Inſt.* lib. 7. cap. 11. p. m. 321, 322.

[*C*] *Some imagine that he was Conſul.*] They ground their ſuppoſition on the following words of Auſonius: *Quintilianus conſularia per Clementem ornamenta ſortitus, honeſtamenta nominis potius videtur quam inſignia poteſtatis habuiſſe* (5). i. e. "Quintilian hav-"ing obtained, through the favour of Clemens, the "conſular ornaments, ſeems to have poſſeſſed the "trappings or honour of the title rather than the "marks of the power." Vinetus, on this paſſage, ſays, that Marcus Arricinus Clemens, and Titus Flaccus Clemens, after having enjoyed, for ſome time, a great ſhare in Domitian's favour, loſt it afterwards to ſuch a degree, that he put them to death. He does not know which of the Clemens's procured Quintilian the honour mentioned by Auſonius; but he adds, that it was not the ordinary Conſulſhip, becauſe no mention is made of it in the *Faſti*. It therefore muſt have been only another Conſul's ſubſtitute (6). Vinetus might have grounded his conjectures on Flavius Clemens, as will be ſeen below. The abovementioned paſſage of Auſonius is confirmed by the following verſes of Juvenal:

(5) Auſon. *in Gratiar. Actione*, p. m. 712, 713.

(6) Vinet. *in* Auſon. p. 713.

Unde igitur tot
Quintilianus habet ſaltus? exempla novorum
Fatorum tranſi: felix, & pulcher, & acer,
Felix, & ſapiens, & nobilis, & generoſus
Appoſitam nigræ lunam ſubtexit alutæ:
Felix, orator quoque maximus, & jaculator,
Et ſi perfrixit, cantat bene: diſtat enim, quæ
Sidera te excipiant modo primos incipientem
Edere vagitus, & adhuc à matre rubentem.
Si fortuna volet, fies de rhetore conſul,
Si volet hæc eadem, fies de conſule rhetor (7).

(7) Juven. *Sat.* 7. ver. 188.

"From whence then comes Quintilian's vaſt
"eſtate?
"Becauſe he was the darling ſon of fate;
"And luck, in ſcorn of merit, made him great.
"Urge not th' example of one ſingle man,
"As rare as a white crow, or ſable ſwan.
"Quintilian's fate was to be counted wiſe,
"Rich, noble, fair, and in the ſtate to riſe:
"Good fortune grac'd his action, and his tongue;
"His colds became him, and when hoarſe he ſung.
"O, there's ſtrange difference, what planets ſhed
"Their influence on the new-born infant's head!
"'Tis fate that flings the dice; and as ſhe flings,
"Of Kings makes pedants, and of pedants Kings."

Mr. CHARLES DRYDEN.

We learn, at leaſt, from this paſſage, that Quintilian attained to riches and honours; but Juvenal inſinu-

it is more certain that he was Preceptor to the grandſons of Domitian's ſiſter [*D*]. It is not very certainly known, whether he was ſon or grandſon to the Orator mentioned by Seneca the Father [*E*]. Several Criticks aſcribe to this Orator the declamations publiſhed

ates, that good fortune contributed to it, as much, or more, than merit. If the 32d epiſtle of the 6th book of Pliny, was wrote to our Quintilian, we have no room to believe, that Juvenal had reaſon to take notice of the wealth of this rhetoric-profeſſor. Pliny affirms, that the perſon he wrote to was not very rich (8). He does not think he is able to fit out his daughter in ſuch a manner as may be ſuitable to be married to a man of figure; for which reaſon he makes her a preſent of a handſome ſum of money, in order that ſhe may enter her huſband's houſe in an honourable manner (9). *Cùm tamen ſit nuptura honeſtiſſimo viro, Nonio Celeri, cui ratio civilium officiorum neceſſitatem quandam nitoris imponit, debet ſecundum conditiones mariti, veſte, comitatu augeri: quibus non quidem augetur dignitas, ornatur tamen, & inſtruitur* (10). i. e. "As ſhe is going to be married to a perſon of "eminence, Nonius Celer, who is obliged, on ac- "count of his employment, to make ſome figure, ſhe "ought to have clothes and attendance ſuitable to "her huſband's rank: for though theſe do not in- "hance a perſon's worth, they yet illuſtrate and ſet "it off." It might be objected, that the father of this young Lady was not our Quintilian; for one would have concluded, that Pliny would have taken ſome notice of the advantage he had had in being his pupil, and he wrote to his profeſſor. Farther, it might be ſaid, that Quintilian having loſt a wife and two ſons, repreſents himſelf as a perſon whom the Gods had deprived of his whole family (11). He even ſays that his wife died at nineteen years of age, after having brought him two ſons (12). Would he have wrote in this manner, if he alſo had a daughter by her? But theſe reaſons are no ways demonſtrative. Quintilian, perhaps, married again; and might have had the daughter, mentioned by Pliny, by his ſecond wife. His circumſtances might have been very much leſſened after the time that Juvenal wrote his 7th ſatyr. This Poet might even have conſidered him as very wealthy in compariſon of the other rhetoricians; and Pliny might have looked upon him as but in indifferent circumſtances, in proportion to the family in which the young Quintiliana was going to marry. I am to obſerve, that he was certainly one of Quintilian's pupils (13); but then he might write to him without mentioning that circumſtance.

(8) *Te porro animo beatiſſimum modicum facultatibus ſcio.* Plin. *Epiſt.* 32. lib. 6. p. m. 400.

(9) *Tanquam parens alter puellæ noſtræ confero quinquaginta millia nummum.* Idem, ibid.

(10) Idem, ibid.

(11) Quintil. *Præf.* lib. 6. *Inſt. Orat.*

(12) *Nondum expleto ætatis undeviceſimo anno duos enixa filios.* Idem, ibid.

(13) Plin. *Epiſt.* 14 lib. 2. and *Epiſt.* 6. lib. 6.

[*D*] *He was preceptor to the grandſons of Domitian's ſiſter.*] He himſelf teſtifies this by the following paſſage: *Cum mihi Domitianus Auguſtus ſororis ſuæ nepotum delegaverit curam, non ſatis honorem judiciorum cæleſtium intelligam, niſi ex hoc quoque oneris magnitudinem metiar* (14). Moreri does not tranſlate this paſſage juſtly, when he ſays, that this Emperor *committed to Quintilian's care, the education of his nephews.* Barthius would have committed the ſame error, if, by the word *nepotis*, he did not underſtand grandſon, as he very probably does (15). He nevertheleſs is miſtaken: the writer who drew up the contents of the chapters in Quintilian, affirms that this rhetorician taught the ſons of Domitian's ſiſter. This is pretending to ſettle this matter, with regard to the pupils, better than Quintilian himſelf. But, (will it be objected to me) where ſhall we find theſe grandſons of Domitian's ſiſter? I anſwer, that it is very probable they were the two ſons of Flavius Clemens, couſin german to that Prince. From their infancy he had declared them, as it were, publickly for his ſucceſſors, giving one of them the name of Veſpaſian, and the other of Domitian (16). It is therefore probable that he gave them, for preceptor, the greateſt maſter who was in Rome at that time, I mean Quintilian. It will be objected to me, that Flavius Clemens was married to Domitian's ſiſter, and conſequently that his ſons were not the grandſons of that Emperor's ſiſter. Philoſtratus will be cited, who affirms that the wife of Flavius Clemens was Domitian's ſiſter (17). To this I anſwer, that Philoſtratus ought not to be ſo ſoon credited as Dión, who only ſays, that ſhe was this Prince's relation. Τὸν Φάβιον Κλήμεντα ὑπατεύοντα καίπερ ἀνεψιὸν ὄντα ᾗ γυναῖκα ᾗ αὐτὴν συγγενῆ ἑαυτῷ Φλαβίαν Δομιτίλλαν ἔχοντα καλίσφαξεν ὁ Δομιτιανός (18). i. e. "He put to death Fabius Cle- "mens the Conſul, though his couſin-german, and "the huſband of Flavia Domitilla, firſt couſin to Do- "mitian." Farther, I ſhall obſerve that Domitilla, Domitian's ſiſter, was not living when Flavius Clemens was put to death; and yet Philoſtratus affirms, that the wife of this Flavius was baniſhed after her huſband's death. He therefore is miſtaken, when he affirms that ſhe was Domitian's ſiſter. Suetonius informs us, that Flavia Domitilla brought her huſband Veſpaſian but three children, viz. Titus, Domitian and Domitilla; and that he loſt his wife and his daughter before he was Emperor (19). I ſuppoſe that Domitilla, Veſpaſian's daughter, left a daughter who was wife to Flavius Clemens. According to this ſuppoſition, the ſons of Flavius Clemens, pupils to Quintilian, are the grandſons of Domitian's ſiſter, a relation which Quintilian expreſsly gives them. There was a long interval enough, between Domitilla's death to the Empire of Domitian, to authorize me to aſſert, that Domitilla's grandſons were old enough to be Quintilian's pupils, in that reign; for I may very well be allowed to ſay, that Veſpaſian's daughter died long before he came to the empire, which was not till he was threeſcore. The inſcription *Flavia Domitilla Imp. Cæſaris Neptis* (20) ought to be underſtood, as Triſtan obſerves, not of a daughter of Veſpaſian, but of a daughter of Domitilla, ſiſter to Titus. In fine, I ſay that he who raiſed Quintilian to the conſular dignity was called Clemens. Now he beſtowed that honour on him, to reward Quintilian for teaching, as appears by the view Auſonius had in mentioning this particular. Conſequently either the father of Quintilian's pupils, or one of his pupils muſt have beſtowed that reward; whence I infer, that the pupils of this rhetorician were ſons to Flavius Clemens; and conſequently that this Flavius had married a daughter of Domitian's ſiſter. I am ſurprized that neither Caſaubon (21) nor Marcilius who criticiſed him (22), took notice of Philoſtratus's error. Both of them approve his ſaying, that the wife of Flavius Clemens was Veſpaſian's daughter, and that ſhe lived at the time that this Flavius was put to death. Now this is expreſly contradicted by Suetonius (23).

(14) Quintil. *Præf.* lib. 4. *Inſt. Orat.*

(15) *Sic Domitianum adulatur Quintilianus curæ Nepotum ejus admotus.* Barthius, *in Statium*, Tom. 3. p. 1592.

(16) Suet. *in* Domit. cap. 15.

(17) Ἐτυχε μὲν γαρ Κλήμεντα ἀπεκτονὼς . . . ᾧ τὴν ἀδελφὴν τὴν ἑαυτῷ ἐδέδωκει. *Cum Clementem . . cui ſororem ſuam nuptum dederat occidiſſet.* Philoſt. *in Vita Apollonii*, lib. 8.

(18) Xiphil. *in* Domitiano, p. m. 236.

(19) Suet. *in* Veſpaſ. cap. 3.

(20) It is in Gruterus, p. 355.

(21) Caſaub. *in* Suet. Domit. cap. 15.

(22) Theodor. Marcilius *in* Suet. ibid.

[*E*] *It is not very certainly known, whether he was ſon or grandſon to the orator mentioned by Seneca the father.*] This orator muſt have lived under Auguſtus, Seneca the father ſpeaking of him as a perſon then dead, and whoſe reputation was extinct (24). Now Quintilian was very young, when Domitius Afer, who died under Nero, was far advanced in years (25). It is therefore not very juſt to make him ſon to a man who flouriſhed under Auguſtus. It were better to ſay that he was his grandſon; but perhaps it might be objected, that he mentions his father as an orator (26), without once ſpeaking of his grandfather. Some good criticks (27) aſcribe neither to Quintilian's grandfather nor father the declamations publiſhed by Pithoeus. Thoſe pieces, *ſay theſe*, have not the caſt of the Auguſtan age; and it is no ways probable that the compoſitions of Quintilian, mentioned by Seneca, are come down to us; whilſt other works wrote in the ſame age, and much more finiſhed, are loſt. They obſerve that, according to Seneca, all Quintilian the orator's reputation died with him (28). If they conclude from thence, that he had not publiſhed any books, they argue wrong; how many authors are there all whoſe fame and glory die before them, or at leaſt at the ſame time with them? I muſt not omit this remark: Quintilian's father uſed to plead cauſes; he therefore lived in Rome, ſay ſome writers; wherefore then is it affirmed, in Euſebius's chronicle, that Galba brought Quintilian, from Spain, to Rome? Was it the cuſtom, for a man ſetled in Rome, to leave his children in one of the provinces? Tillemont (29) ſhews, that theſe are not convincing objections, but he nevertheleſs acknowledges the error in Euſebius's chronicle. He ſhews it is therein falſly aſſerted, that Galba carried Quintilian to Rome in the year 69; he ſhews it, I ſay, for

(23) *In* Veſpaſ. cap. 3.

(24) Seneca, *Controv.* lib. 5. *in Præf.*

(25) *Domitio Afro quem adoleſcentulus ſenem colui.* Quintil. lib. 5. cap. 7. p. 212.

(26) Idem, lib. 9. cap. 3. p. 432.

(27) See Faber's notes on Seneca's *Controverſies*, lib. 5. *in Præf.*

(28) *Quorum fama cum ipſis extincta eſt.* Seneca, *ubi ſupra.*

(29) Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* Tom. 2. p. 873, 874. Bruſſel's edit.

lished by Ugolinus Parmenſis, and afterwards by Petrus Pithoeus [F]; but the *Inſtitutiones Oratoriæ* are univerſally allowed to be the production of our Quintilian. Poggius diſcovered the manuſcript of them in a manner that deſerves to be related [G]. It would have been of the utmoſt prejudice to the literary world, had Quintilian's works been loſt; he being an excellent Author; and it were to be wiſhed, that all perſons who ſet up for Authors, would, before they take up the pen for that purpoſe, read him very attentively. I am extremely ſorry that I did not know the importance of this advice, till it was too late. La Fontaine, who was ſo great a Judge of things of merit, had a prodigious eſteem for this Rhetorician. See, in his poſthumous works (g) the verſes, which he ſent to the Biſhop of Avranches, *upon preſenting him with the tranſlation of Quintilian, by Horatio Toſcanella.* Mr. Nicolle the Father, and Abbe de Pure, have given French

(g) p. 52. Dutch edit.

for this reaſon; Quintilian heard Domitius Afer in Rome, who died in 59. Obſerve that Tillemont does not employ a good proof. He cites a paſſage which imports, not that Quintilian heard Domitius Afer plead, but that a particular pleading of that author was greatly eſteemed (30). He ſhould have quoted another paſſage (31). He will not have any ſtreſs laid on Martial's omiſſion, and I confeſs that it cannot be conſidered as a demonſtrative proof; but it is nevertheleſs a very ſtrong objection againſt thoſe who aſſert that Quintilian was a Spaniard. Martial took a great pleaſure in mentioning the illuſtrious men of Spain, and in obſerving that they were natives of the country. Now would he have forgot to obſerve the ſame thing with regard to a perſon of Quintilian's eminence? Would he have ſpoke in ſuch a manner as would have induced his readers to conclude that Quintilian was born in Rome, rather than perſuade them of the contrary?

Quintiliane vagæ moderator ſumme juventæ,
Gloria Romanæ Quintiliane togæ (32).

" Quintilian, chief director of our youth;
" The Roman gown's beſt ornament and grace."

I leave this to the reader's judgment; but I muſt obſerve, that this paſſage in Martial does not prove Quintilian to have been a native of Rome; and that thoſe, who concluded, from a paſſage in Trebellius Pollio, that he was a citizen of Rome (33), have reaſoned falſly. *Fuit autem*, viz. Poſthumius the younger, *(quod ſolum memoratu dignum eſt) ita in declamationibus diſertus, ut ejus controverſiæ Quintiliano dicantur inſertæ, quem declamatorem Romani generis acutiſſimum, vel unius capitis lectio prima ſtatim fronte demonſtrat* (34). i. e. " He was ſo eloquent an orator, (which is the " only circumſtance that deſerves to be remembered) " that his controverſies are ſaid to have been inſert- " ed in Quintilian, who, as inſtantly appears by the " reading of a ſingle chapter, was the moſt ſubtle " declaimer among the Romans." Theſe are Trebellius Pollio's words, which ſignify no more than this, that Quintilian was a Latin rhetorician. He is there mentioned in oppoſition, not to the writers of the provinces, but the Greeks (35).

[F] *The declamations publiſhed by Ugolinus Parmenſis, and afterwards by Petrus Pithoeus.*] He publiſhed only an hundred and thirty ſix. Peter Pithoeus, made a more correct edition of them in 1580, more correct, and enlarged by nine declamations never publiſhed till then. Voſſius obſerves this in one of his books (36); but in another, he makes no diſtinction (37) *cujus declamationes CXLV à Tideo Ugolino primùm editas, ex veteri codice reſtituit P. Pythæus* (38). Moreri has followed this guide in a paſſage where he ought to have forſaken him. By the way, I will not forget to obſerve, that Voſſius did wrong in not informing us at what time Ugolinus Parmenſis lived (39); and for not taking notice that Peter Ayrault publiſhed (40) Quintilian's declamations before they were publiſhed by Peter Pithoeus. He boaſts of this in his treatiſe on paternal power; *Quintilian*, ſays he (41), *whom I firſt publiſhed, and the learned Pithœus afterwards.*

[G] *Poggius diſcovered the manuſcript of them, in a manner that deſerves to be related.*] This was in the Abby of St. Gal, at the time of the holding the Council of Conſtance. The Quintilian which was then in Italy was horridly mutilated: *Ita lacerum ita circumciſum, ut nulla forma, nullus habitus hominis in eo recognoſceretur.* The reader will ſuppoſe that the publick was overjoyed to hear that Poggius had diſcovered the entire manuſcript. He gave immediate notice of it, but the letter was not printed; it being annexed to a manuſcript of Quintilian in the library of Milan, as we are informed by father Mabillon, who has given us the curious fragment of that letter. *Fortuna quædam fuit, cum ſua, tum maxime noſtra, ut cum eſſemus Conſtantiæ otioſi, cupido inceſſerit viſendi ejus loci, quo ille recluſus tenebatur. Eſt autem monaſterium ſancti Galli, prope urbem hanc millibus paſſuum viginti. Itaque nonnulli animi laxandi, & ſimul perquirendorum librorum, quorum numerus maximus ibi eſſe dicebatur, gratia eo perreximus. Ibi inter confertiſſimam librorum copiam, quos longum eſſet recenſere, Quintilianum reperimus, adhuc ſalvum & incolumem, plenum tamen ſitu, & pulvere refertum. Erant enim in bibliotheca libri illi, non ut eorum dignitas poſtulabat, ſed in teterrimo quodam & obſcuro carcere, fundo ſcilicet unius turris, quo ne vita quidem damnati detruderentur. . . . . Reperimus præterea libros tres primos & dimidiatum quarti C. Valerii Flacci Argonauticῶν; & expoſitiones, tamquam thema quoddam, ſuper octo Ciceronis orationibus Q. Aſconii Pediani eloquentiſſimi viri, de quibus ipſe meminit Quintilianus. Hæc mea manu tranſcripſi, & quidem velociter, ut ea mitterem ad Leonardum Aretinum & Nicolaum Florentinum: qui cum à me hujus theſauri adinventionem cognoviſſent, multis à me verbis Quintilianum per ſuas litteras quam primum ad eos mitti contenderunt* (42). i. e. " It was his godd fortune, but " eſpecially mine, that whilſt we were paſſing our " time unemployed in Conſtance, we were deſirous " of ſeeing the place in which he was immured. It " is the monaſtery of St. Gall, ſituated about twenty " miles from this city. Some of us went thither, " to unbend our minds, and ſearch for books, of " which we were told there were great numbers in " that place. There, among a vaſt heap of books, " to mention all which would be too tedious, we " found Quintilian quite ſafe and ſound, but muſty " and covered with duſt. For the books, which com- " poſed this library, were not ranged proportionably " to their merit, but depoſited in a filthy dark dun- " geon at the bottom of a tower, in which a crimi- " nal ſentenced to die would not be impriſoned. . . . " We there found alſo the three firſt books, and half " the fourth, of Valerius Flaccus's Argonauticks; and " Expoſitions on eight of Tully's Orations, by Q. " Aſconius Pedianus, a very eloquent man, who is " mentioned by Quintilian himſelf. I tranſcribed " theſe ſwiftly with my own hand, to tranſmit them " to Leonard Aretinus, and Nicholas Florentinus, " who hearing of the treaſure I had found, were " very urgent with me to ſend them Quintilian as " ſoon as poſſible." By the way, we need but read a letter of Petrarch (43) to know the very imperfect condition, in which Quintilian had always appeared till that time. One Gaſparinus Bergamenſis, who taught polite Literature in Milan, was greatly to be pitied; he taking vaſt pains about this maimed manuſcript, before a more perfect one was diſcovered (44). Here follows a miſtake of Varillas. " Poggio, ſays he " (45), had the good fortune to diſcover the Inſti- " tutions, and nineteen firſt declamations of Quinti- " tilian, as he was ſearching the ſhop of a German " grocer, who was going to make them waſte paper, " in order to wrap up goods in them (46); and thoſe " who know that this was the only copy extant, will " think themſelves eternally obliged to Poggio's " memory on that account." Mr. de Larroque has ſhewn, that it is a great miſtake to ſuppoſe there was but that copy extant of Quintilian. His words are as

(30) He quotes chap. 1. book 10. of Quintilian, where are theſe words; *nobis pueris inſignes pro Voluſeno Catulo Domitii Afri, Criſpi Paſſieni, Decimi Lælii orationes ferebantur.*

(31) That I cited in citation (25) above.

(32) Martial. *Epigr.* 90. lib. 2.

(33) Catanæus, *in* Plin. *Epiſt.* 14. lib. 2. p. m. 120, 121, is one of them.

(34) Trebellius Pollio, *in Poſth. juniore*, p. 260. Tom. 2. *Hiſt. Aug. Script.*

(35) As in the following words of Pliny, chap. 12. book 1. *Rationem quidem defectus utriuſque* (Solis ac Lunæ) *primus Romani generis in vulgus extulit Sulpicius Gallus. . . . . Apud Græcos autem inveſtigavit primus omnium Thales.*

(36) Voſſius, *in Inſt. Orat.* lib. 1. cap. 11. p. m. 198, 199.

(37) Idem, *de Rhetorices natura*, p. 105.

(38) It ſhould be *Pithœus.*

(39) He lived in the 15th century. Philelphus ſpeaks of him. See Reinſius, *Epiſt.* 63. *ad Daumium*, p. 167.

(40) At Paris in 1563.

(41) Ayrault, p. m. 271. See alſo his *Diſſertat. de la nature & mutation des Loix*, p. m. 189.

(42) Mabillon, *in Muſeo Italico*, Tom. 1. part. 1. p. 211.

(43) That which he wrote to Quintilian.

(44) Volaterran. lib. 21. p. m. 772, 773.

(45) Varillas, *Anecdotes de Florence*, p. 163.

(46) P. Jovius, *in Elogior.* cap. 10. p. m. 30, ſays only, *ita ut & ei quoque* (Pogio) *Quintiliannum in ſalſamentarii taberna reperſum debere fateamur.* Paul Jovius is miſtaken, and Varillas ſtill more ſo; Quintilian being found in the abbey of St. Gal.

French verſions of it. The moſt correct edition of Quintilian is that of Mr. Obrecht [*H*]. The dialogue *de cauſis corruptæ eloquentiæ* is inſerted in this edition, as in all the reſt; though all Criticks do not think Quintilian to be Author of it, many aſcribing it to Tacitus, and it being commonly printed with the works of that Hiſtorian. It is certain that our Author had writ a book *de cauſis corruptæ eloquentiæ* (*h*). I am of opinion that it is loſt, and am perſuaded that it was as excellent, in proportion, as the compoſitions of that Author which are now extant. I have not yet given an account of every part of his merit; but muſt farther obſerve, that he appears to be a very honeſt man in his works, which likewiſe contain a great number of excellent moral inſtructions. He is blamed for being too laviſh of his applauſes on Domitian; and though he did this but tranſiently, and with great art and delicacy (*i*), yet the Criticks will not pardon this fault in him, which doubtleſs appears a very great one, to ſuch as have read the hiſtory of that wicked Prince. This article might have been a good one, could I have procured Dodwell's *Annales Quintilianei* (*k*); but, from a misfortune which I ſo often complain of, viz. my being in want of the moſt neceſſary books, I have not had an opportunity of conſulting that work.

(*h*) Quintil. *Inſt.* lib. 6. *init.* and lib. 8. *in fin.*

(*i*) Idem, ib. lib. 10. cap. 1.

(*k*) Printed at Oxford in 1698.

(47) That of the manuſcript which the German Grocer was going to tear to pieces.

(48) Larroque, *Preface des Nouvelles Accuſations contre Mr. Varillas*, folio * 4 *verſo*.

as follow: "How great ſoever this loſs had been "(47), it yet would not be irreparable; a fine ma- "nuſcript of this Roman Rhetorician, above five "hundred years old, and now in the Bodleian Li- "brary, would have compenſated the publick for "the loſs of the other; as well as ſeveral others of "conſiderable antiquity, which I was lately aſſured "by the learned Grævius, were found in Colen and "Berne. And had theſe happened to have fallen in- "to the hands of ſome mercileſs grocer, this loſs "might alſo have been repaired, there being ſeve- "ral of them in the library of his Gallic Majeſty. "If the catalogue I have ſeen is not erroneous, there "are fourteen or fifteen copies of it there (48)."

[*H*] *The moſt correct edition of Quintilian is that of Mr. Obrecht.*] It was publiſhed in two volumes in 4to, at Straſburg in 1698. This Editor has reſtored the text in ſeveral places, either by the aſſiſtance of manuſcripts, or his own conjectures (49). He did not follow the beaten road of Criticks, who inſert in their notes, or at the end of their works, the readings which they judge to be the beſt, and leave thoſe in the text which they look upon as correct: but this Author gives the text as he thinks it ought to be read. Mr. Salo gives this advice in 1665, to all editors of ancient Authors. See his *Journal des Savans* of May 16. 1665 (50).

(49) See *Acta eruditor.* for Dec. 1698. p. 546 *&* *ſeq.*

(50) p. m. 222.

QUINTIN (JOHN), Profeſſor of the Canon Law at Paris, in the 16th century, was born at Autun. He was a man both of learning and genius. He, at firſt, liked what were called the new opinions, (thoſe of the reformers) and declared his mind ſo freely, in that particular, in a ſpeech, that he drew ſuch a ſtorm upon himſelf, as obliged him to leave Poitiers [*A*]; but his faith, which was only temporary [*B*], was not proof againſt a long perſecution. He ſoon after accepted of a good benefice, to which he was collated ſoon after, among the Knights of Malta (*a*); and when he returned from that iſland, where he had been in the ſervice of the Grand-maſter, he was appointed Profeſſor of the Canon Law at Paris in 1536. The circumſtance for which he was moſt ſpoken of was the ſpeech he pronounced in the name of the Clergy, in the Aſſembly of the States of Orleans, in December 1560. He required, in the name of the Clergy, that thoſe who profeſſed the new opinions ſhould be proſecuted with the utmoſt ſeverity; a demand that would have been ſtill more ſurprizing, had it not been a thing frequently practiſed for many ages: but notwithſtanding that this blood-thirſty ſpirit had prevailed ſo long, people were very much ſurprized to hear a Miniſter promote ſuch an affair [*C*]. Quintin did not ſuppoſe, that the chief of the Proteſtants would exert themſelves

(*a*) Doujat. *Præn. Canonic.* lib. 5. cap. 8. p. 620.

[*A*] *To leave Poitiers.*] Preſident de la Place informs us of this in manner following. "Several "perſons, who heard the ſpeech of the ſaid Quintin, "were aſtoniſhed at it, not imagining he would "have delivered ſuch a one, becauſe he had been "formerly ſuſpected, nay perſecuted, on account of "his religion; and forced to leave the city of "Poitiers, for a ſpeech he had delivered in publick, "in a very different ſtrain from that ſpoken by "him then (1)." Beza ſays the ſame thing (2).

(1) La Place, *de l'eſtat de la Religion & Republiq.* lib. 4. folio 151 *verſo*.

(2) Beze, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Tom. 1. p. 436.

[*B*] *His faith . . . . was only temporary.*] Beza (3) ſpeaks as follows concerning him. "Some years "before another ſtudent named Quintin, a native "of Autun, had alſo entered the liſts; but having "been forced to retire, he was ſo far from perſever- "ing, that he, on the contrary, fell entirely off; "and at laſt being a famous Doctor of the Canon "Law in the Univerſity of Paris; and having ob- "tained a conſiderable benefice among the Knights "of Rhodes, he became a moſt violent perſecu- "tor." This Hiſtorian ſpeaks of ſeveral other perſons, whom he conſidered as people who had received the ſeed *in ſtony ground* (4), and among thorns: they had heard the word, and *immediately received it with joy*; but they had no root in themſelves; they were temporizers; ſo that *tribulation or perſecution ariſing becauſe of the word, by and by they were offended*; *the care of this world, and the deceitfulneſs of riches*, choaked the word, and made it unfruitful.

(3) Ibid. p. 63.

(4) St. Matt. xiii. 20.

[*C*] *To hear a Miniſter promote ſuch an affair.*] Quintin having demanded, that all the inhabitants of the Kingdom ſhould be obliged to turn Roman Catholicks; that the Non-chriſtians, *i. e.* the heretics, ſhould not be *admitted into the converſation and ſociety of the Chriſtian Subjects* (5); *and* that *thenceforward, all Heretics ſhould be prohibited and forbid to trade in any merchandiſe, whether books or other goods* (6), added the terrible words following (7). "And "therefore our requeſt is juſt, reaſonable, holy and "catholick, and grounded on the expreſs command "of God, who enjoins your Majeſty to grant it to "us; he repeating in different places and at various "times his ſaid command. He ſpeaks of the Ido- "laters and Gentiles eſtranged from the law; the "heretics among the Chriſtians are conſidered and re- "puted ſuch. The words of the ſaid law of God are "as follow: be ſure never to contract a friendſhip, to "aſſociate with, or marry among them. Suffer them "not to inhabit the earth: have not the leaſt com- "paſſion for them; beat them and kill them. And "now follows the reaſon of that command: leſt "they ſhould make thee ſin againſt me, if thou "ſhouldſt imbibe their opinions; which will occa- "ſion a ſcandal and offence that will raiſe my fury "againſt

(5) La Place, *de l'eſtat de la Religion & Republ.* folio 139 *verſo*.

(6) Ib. p. 140.

(7) Ib. p. 141.

themſelves with ſo much vigour in that aſſembly; much leſs did he foreſee that he ſhould be ſo extremely affected with the animadverſions that would be made on his ſpeech; had he foreſeen theſe things, he doubtleſs would have continued in Paris; and have choſe to explain ſome decretal to his pupils, rather than give leſſons of cruelty to his Sovereign, in preſence of the three Eſtates of the Kingdom. Admiral Chatillon made ſuch loud complaints againſt this ſpeech of Quintin [*D*], that the King and Queen-mother ſent for this Orator, in order to call him to an account for the things he had advanced. He anſwered, that he had only obeyed the orders and inſtructions of the body of men, whoſe ſpokeſman he had been. This anſwer did not give ſatisfaction (*b*); ſo that he was obliged to promiſe to declare, before the aſſembly of the States, that he did not intend to reflect in any manner on Admiral Chatillon, and was as good as his word. But that which gave him the greateſt pain was the jokes and criticiſms on his declamation, which were handed about [*E*]. This mortified him to a prodigious degree; and he took it ſo much to heart, that he fell ſick upon it, and died about the beginning of April 1561.

(*b*) *Commentaires de l'etat de la Religion & Republ.* lib. 4. fol. 152. Thuan. lib. 27.

He

" againſt thee; ſoon after which I ſhall deſtroy thee. " I beſeech both your Majeſties, if you love to preſerve your ſouls, and the ſceptre you ſway, take " warning by thoſe horrid and dreadful menaces. " This, may it pleaſe your Majeſty, is what your " Clergy of France propoſes and remonſtrates to you " with all imaginable ſimplicity, obedience, humility, ſubmiſſion, and correction, with regard to the " honour and ſervice of God in your Kingdom; and " for the extirpation and abolition of whatever is " contrary to it, *viz.* of ſects and hereſies: the " whole being amply and circumſtantially diſcuſſed " and handled in their memorial, to which we expect an anſwer." Quintin's whole ſpeech is inſerted in Preſident de la Place's Hiſtory. It is plain that *the moſt humble and devout orators for the Clergy* (8) propoſed the ſhedding of blood, in caſe it was neceſſary; ſince they reminded the King of the command and menace of Moſes: not to mention that Quintin had already declared very expreſsly, that *his Majeſty being powerful, and armed with the ſword*, ought to reſiſt heretics; *for this end, and no other, God had put the ſword into his hand, that he might defend good men and puniſh the wicked, and that no one can deny but that a heretic is capitally wicked, and conſequently ought to be puniſhed capitally, and be ſubject to the ſword of the civil Magiſtrate* (9),

(8) Quintin is made to ſpeak in this manner, in La Place, *Comm. de l'eſtat de la Religion & Republ.* fol. 139.

(9) Ibid. folio 134 *verſo.*

The Clergy of France behaved in a more artful manner an hundred and twenty five years after; for, in a ſpeech they made to the King ſome months before the repealing the edict of Nantes, they declared, that they did not deſire his Majeſty to employ his power, to extirpate heretics. This artifice, in the main, is no very deep one; and I do not know whether the too ingenuous openneſs of the year 1560, is not preferable to the diſſimulation employed in 1685. Read the following words of Mr. Claude (10). " Whilſt the thing was only preparing, the " real fomentors of the perſecution did not conceal " themſelves; but concealed the King as much as " poſſible . . . . . (11) When things were carried to " the laſt extremity, and open force, they then did " all that lay in their power to hide themſelves, and " revealed the King in open day light. Nothing " was then heard but ſuch words as theſe: *The King " will have it ſo; the King has made it his buſineſs, " the King goes greater lengths than is agreeable to the " Clergy.* By theſe two methods, they have had the " cunning to charge themſelves with only the leaſt " violent part of this perſecution; and to charge the " King with the moſt conſpicuouſly odious part of " it."

(10) *Complaints of the Proteſtants*, p. 130.

(11) Ib. p. 131.

[*D*] *Admiral Chatillon made ſuch loud complaints againſt the ſpeech of Quintin.*] He had been ſo plainly pointed at in ſome parts of this ſpeech, that every one fixed their eyes on him, not to mention that he had been deſcribed in a moſt offenſive manner; and plainly ſhewn, that a deſign was formed in order to load him with infamy, and deſtroy him. Here follows one of theſe paſſages (12). " Firſt, we beſeech " your Majeſty, that if any broacher of old hereſies, " already dead and buried, ſhould be ſo impious as " to attempt to introduce or revive any ſect already " condemned, (as are all thoſe in general of theſe " calamitous and ſeditious times) and in order to it " petition for a church, deſire leave to inhabit in " his Kingdom, (as ſome of your Provinces have lately very impudently done in their particular aſſemblies) that ſuch a petitioner, as a favourer of heretics, ſhall himſelf be looked upon and declared " a heretic; and as ſuch ſhall be proceeded againſt " in all the rigour of the conſtitutions canonical and " civil, that the evil may be taken away from among " us; *ut auferatur malum de medio noſtri.*" Here follows another (13). " Gainas, Captain General of " both foot and horſe, under the Emperor Arcadius, " anno 410 or 412, conſpiring againſt his Sovereign's Crown, with a deſign to drive him from " the throne; to cloak his wicked deſign, and conceal " his treachery, found no better way for that purpoſe, " than to requeſt the liberty to have a Church apart in " Conſtantinople, in order to pray in (as he ſaid) and " ſing with his brethren, who were all heretics, " as are all thoſe who now ſue for Churches."

(12) La Plac. *de l'etat de la Religion & Republ.* fol. 135 *verſo.*

(13) Ib. p. 136 *verſo.*

[*E*] *Jokes and criticiſms in his declamation . . . . . were handed about.*] The Author of the Commentaries *De ſtatu Religionis & Reipublicæ in Regno Galliæ*, does not ſay poſitively, that theſe jokes and ſatyrs, which were poſted up in ſeveral places againſt Quintin, occaſioned his death; he makes an alternative between this and his remorſe of conſcience (14). Preſident de la Place and Varillas uſe no alternative; and the former does not ſuppreſs the reaſons, which were offered in juſtification of Quintin. His words are as follow. " Some obſerved, that ſuch perſons " as blamed him on that account, did not conſider " that his leſſon had been given him in writing; " which indeed he read all the time, without making " the leaſt motion or action, as is uſual with Orators; and that the chief Prelates, the Cardinals, " *&c.* were the witneſſes and comptrollers of what " he read. However, whether he was, or was not, " the Author of that piece, he died a few days after, " greatly afflicted to ſee ſo many pieces publiſhed " againſt him (15)." Let us now hear the other Hiſtorian. " The zealous Calviniſts, ſays he (16), did " not ſhew ſo much moderation; they publiſhing ſo " bloody a libel (againſt Quintin) divided into three " parts, the firſt of which contained the groſs ignorance, the ſecond the manifeſt calumnies, and the " third the malicious omiſſions in the ſpeech; that this " doctor, who was more ſtrongly affected than he ſhould " have been, took to his bed a little after he had " read this libel written againſt him, and never roſe " from it afterwards." Had Varillas given himſelf the trouble to read this libel, he would not have called it a *bloody* one: it is a little piece, of three pages, by way of remonſtrance to the Queen, which however was not preſented to her, and *came but into few hands.* The whole is inſerted in Beza's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory (17), and has in no manner the air of a libel or ſatyr, but is rather a kind of inſtrument, exhibited before the Judges, in the uſual ſtyle and the common formalities. Little more is done than to mention the heads of the complaint; and the following words were added to the calumnies there ſpecified: *We require theſe accuſations to be proved before us, being ready to ſubmit to puniſhment, upon condition that the accuſers, in caſe they cannot make out their allegations, ſhall be puniſhed, as the branding us with ſuch calumnies may juſtly merit.* It is very probable, that the mortal affliction, with which this Author was ſeized, aroſe " from

(14) *Paſſim vero in eum dicteria jactari, libellos affigi: ille denique palam irrideri: tandemque ſeu contumeliarum illarum impatiens, ſeu male geſtæ rei conſcientia in morbum delapſus, vitam cum morte commutavit.* Folio 87.

(15) La Place, *de l'eſtat de la Religion & Republ.* folio 151 *verſo.*

(16) Varillas, *Charles IX.* Tom. 1. p. 18.

(17) Tom. 1. p. 437.

(c) This was John de Beaumont, a Dr. of Phyſick.

(d) See John de Launoi, *De varia Ariſtotelis fortuna*, cap. 13. p. m. 52. and the art. RAMUS, rem. [D].

He was buried at Paris, in the quire of the church of St. John de Lateran [F]. I ſhall mention the works publiſhed by him [G]. Peter Ramus made choice of him for one of the Judges in the diſputation he had with Govea in 1543; but Quintin, and the other Judge (c) choſen by Ramus, would not concern themſelves in that affair, when the deciſion was to be given (d).

(18) *Sane ob id mordacibus libellis ac dicteriis petitus tantum dolorem cepit, ut contracto inde morbo paulo poſt deceſſerit, homo alioqui minime malus, ſed Decretalis Juris quam rerum agendarum peritia clarior, & qui ſerio de emendanda Eccleſia aliquando cogitaverat.* Thuan. lib. 27.

from ſome other writings. Thuanus employs the plural number; and obſerves that Quintin, in other reſpects, was an honeſt man; and had formerly endeavoured, in good earneſt, at the reformation of the Church (18). There was no meddling with the Proteſtants at that time, they having too many able pens on their ſide. Here we find a man pine away and die, for declaring prepoſterouſly againſt them. Let us add him to the examples mentioned in the article HIPPONAX (19).

(19) Rem. [F].

[F] *He was buried at Paris in the Quire of the Church of St. John of Lateran.*] His epitaph is ſeen there, which is as follows (20).

(20) *Vide Doujatii Præn. Canonic.* lib. 5. cap. 8. p. 620.

Quintinus Doctor, librorumque Helluo ſummus,
Dum nulla dapis alterius tentatur orexi,
Dumque fidem pro qua calamo pugnavit & ore
Fortiter, affligi videt, acrius & dolet, ex hoc
Orbe, invitis, non invitus, migrat amicis
Obiit nona Aprilis 1561.

" Quintin, devourer of whole loads of books,
" Still fond of them, no other food requir'd.
" When he the faith, for which he oft had fought
" With pen and voice, ſaw ſhaken and oppreſt,
" Grief ſeiz'd his ſoul, and willingly he left
" The world; his friends lamenting oft his loſs.
" He died the ninth of April 1561.

The reader will here take notice, that the Author of this Epitaph aſcribes Quintin's death to the ſorrow, with which he was ſeized to ſee the Church afflicted, whilſt others aſcribe it to the melancholy into which he was plunged, to ſee himſelf made a laughing-ſtock. This is a ſubterfuge which mock zealots have employed on all occaſions.

[G] *The works publiſhed by him.*] *Melitæ Inſulæ deſcriptio, Tractatus de ventis, & nautica buxula ventorum indice. Scholia in Tertulliani librum de præſcriptionibus hæreticorum* (21). *Repetitæ Prælectiones Capituli de multa providentia, de præbendis & dignitatibus, & Cap. novit. de judiciis.* The ſubject of the laſt mentioned work is the plurality of benefices, and the ariſtocracy of the Chriſtian Religion. *Octoginta quinque Regulæ ſeu Canones Apoſtolorum, cum vetuſtis Joannis Monachi Zonaræ ſcholiis Latine modo verſis. Speculum Sacerdotii. Synodus Gangrenſis explicata commentariolis ex Gratiani diſtinctione trigeſima. Hæreticorum Catalogus & Hiſtoria ex Gratiano.* He had made a Latin verſion of *Syntagma Canonum Græcorum*, written by Frier Matthew Blaſtares. This tranſlation, which is ſtill in manuſcript, is in the King's Library (22).

(21) *Epit. Bibl. Geſneri.*

(22) *Doujatii Præn. Canonic.* lib. 5. cap. 8.

QUINTUS CALABER, a Greek Poet, lived in the fifth century, if we may rely on the conjectures of ſome learned perſons [A]. He wrote a large ſupplement to the Iliad, in which a relation is given of the Trojan war, from the death of Hector to the deſtruction of Troy. Cardinal Beſſarion firſt made that poem known [B]. He met with it in St. Nicholas's church, near Otranto in Calabria, for which reaſon the Author was named *Quintus Calaber*. Others being more accurate, call him *Quintus*, or rather *Cointus Smyrnæus*, they ſuppoſing him a native of Smyrna. Thoſe who ſay that he taught youth in that city [C], ſeem to have no good foundation for it. The learned Reineſius

[A] *He lived in the fifth century, if we may rely on the conjectures of ſome learned perſons.*] Rhodomanus (1) aſſerts very juſtly, that he did not flouriſh before the mighty conqueſts atchieved by the Romans; he introducing Calchus the ſoothſayer, who foretells that Æneas ſhould reign in Italy; and leave poſterity in that country which ſhould extend his empire from eaſt to weſt.

(1) Laurent. Rhodomanus, *in Præf. ad* Cointum Smyrnæum.

Ἐκ τῶ δὲ γίνε͡ται μετόπισθεν ἀνάξειν,
Ἄχρις ἐπ' ἀντολίην τε καὶ ἀκάμαντον δύσιν ἔλθῃ.

——— Ejuſque exinde progenies regnet,
Donec ad ortum & occaſum inſuperabilem imperii fines extendat (2).

(2) Cointus Smyrnæus, lib. 13. ver. 340. p. m. 650.

Beſides, he mentions (3) the exerciſes of the Circus, as practiſed under the Roman Emperors. Hence we may be perſuaded that he did not live before the firſt Cæſars; but this circumſtance being too general to ſatisfy an inquiſitive mind, a more limited conjecture has been drawn from his ſtyle. Rhodomanus thinks that the characteriſtic of his muſe reſembles ſo much thoſe of Tryphiodorus, Coluthus, &c. that we muſt conclude they were all contemporaries (4). *Character ipſe carminis γραμματικώτερον elaboratus oſtendit, eum Coluthi (qui ad quintum Chriſti nati ſeculum poema lepidiſſimum de Helenes raptu conſcripſit) aliorumque illa ætate vigentium, æqualem aut vicinum fuiſſe. Enimvero ſi dictionem Cointi, Coluthi, Tryphiodori, Muſæi, (illum dico, qui Leandri Heruſque amores cecinit) & Nonni, ad examen criticum vocâris, ſimillimam & ferè eandem ſermonis ideam ſtructuræque rationem deprehendes; unde ætate quoque propinquos inter ſe fuiſſe ratiocineris.* i. e. " The elaborate characteriſtic of his muſe ſhews " that he was either contemporary with or lived near " the age of Coluthus (who wrote a moſt beautiful " poem on the rape of Helen, in the fifth century " after Chriſt) and with other authors who flouriſhed " at that time. For if we examine, in a critical " way, the diction of Cointus, Coluthus, Tryphiodo- " rus, Muſæus (the poet I mean who ſung the loves " of Hero and Leander) and Nonnus, we ſhall find " a very exact reſemblance between the caſt and " manner of his writing, and theirs; whence one " may juſtly infer, that they lived about the ſame " time." The circumſtance added by Rhodomanus, viz. that the name *Cointus*, derived from the Latin, ſeems to imply, that this Poet was made a Roman citizen, is a very trifling proof to confirm what he had ſaid before; for this Poet, though he had lived before Cicero, might have been made a citizen of Rome. Reineſius (5) has good reaſon to laugh at thoſe who declare that he lived under ſome of the Emperors of the family of *Julia*. They ground their opinion on the oracle of Calchas; and pretend, that Nero being the laſt of the family of the firſt Cæſar, the Poet muſt have lived, at fartheſt, under Nero's reign. This is an ill way of drawing conſequences! The Poets of this age might introduce Calchas making this prediction, though it is many Centuries ſince the Roman Empire was diſmembered. Cointus had no occaſion to conſider the Emperors, who declared themſelves the deſcendants of Æneas: it was ſufficient for his purpoſe, that the city founded by Romulus, who deſcended from Æneas, did rule, or had ruled, in the Eaſt and in the Weſt.

(3) Lib. 6.

(4) Rhodomanus, *in Præf. ad* Cointum Smyrn. folio †† *verſo.*

(5) Thom. Reineſius, *Epiſt.* 67. *ad Rupert.* p. 593.

[B] *Cardinal Beſſarion firſt made this Poem known.*] Here follows a paſſage from Conſtantine Laſcaris. *Poeſis autem Homericiſſimi Quinti jam multo tempore omnibus ignota fuit, & tanquam extincta: ſed propius Beſſarion Nicæas Cardinalis Tuſculani, ille ſane quam bonus & vere doctus, & ut Homericè dixerim, ſimilis Deo vir, aliaque plurima in nos, & hanc ex Apulia cum ſervaſſet, volentibus tradidit, quam & ipſe olim deſiderabam* (6). i. e. " The poem written by Quintus, an author " prodigiouſly like Homer, was, during a long courſe " of years, unknown, and extinct as it were; but " lately Cardinal Beſſarion that excellent, truly learn- " ed, and to uſe Homer's words, that godlike man, " having

(6) Conſtant. Laſcaris, *in* Grammatica, *apud* Lorenzo Craſſo, *Iſtoria de' Poeti Greci*, p. 436.

neſius pretends, that he is the ſame perſon with a Grammarian called *Corintus* [D], who publiſhed

" having preſerved many pieces for me, and particu-
" larly this in Apulia, delivered it to me, who had
" long deſired it of him." Very few writers have mentioned this poem (7). This ought to leſſen our ſurprize, that no one ſhould have mentioned Quintus Curtius during ſo many ages. The firſt edition of our Cointus is that of Aldus Manutius. It abounded with errors (8).

(7) *Hujus præter unum atque alterum e Græcis, & quidem recentioribus, nemo in ſcriptis ſuis mentionem facit.* Rhodom. *in Præfat.*

(8) Geſner, *in Bibl.* folio 575.

[C] *That he taught youth in Smyrna.*] Rodomanus argues as follows. Since our Cointus declares, that he fed the muſes ſheep in the beautiful garden of Smyrna, we muſt ſuppoſe that he taught a very famous ſchool on this Ionian coaſt. This was not a petty ſchool, he ſaying that his pupils were perſons of eminence; he therefore muſt have been one of thoſe profeſſors of philoſophy and eloquence called Sophiſts. This is the ſubſtance of Rhodomanus's argument; but here follows his own words at length. *Ex indicio iſto, quod de ſe ipſe facit, Muſarum oves in liberali Smyrnæ horto ſe paviſſe teſtatus, ſcholam in Ioniæ littore iſto nec infrequentem nec incelebrem habuiſſe Poetam noſtrum, colligere eſt. Nec triviale magiſterium id fuiſſe apparet inde, quod oves ſuas, id eſt diſcipulos, nobiles ſeu fama illuſtres,* (περίκλυτα) *epitheto ſatis emphatico, appellat, unde ſi divinare licet, id tandem elicimus, Cointum fuiſſe ex profeſſione illorum, quos Sophiſtas, id eſt philoſophiæ & eloquentiæ magiſtros, Grammaticos, qui Poetarum interpretes erant, & juventutis ſcholaſticæ doctores; florens adhuc Græcia indigitabat. Quid enim aliud per Muſarum hortum & oves, præterquam ſcholam, & diſcipulos in ea doctrinæ & eloquentiæ ſtudiis addictos, intelligi exiſtimemus* (9)? i. e. i. " From the account he
" gives concerning himſelf, viz. that he had fed the
" muſes ſheep in the fine garden of Smyrna, it may
" be inferred, that our Poet had a large and renowned
" ſchool, on that Ionian coaſt. And that it was not
" a petty ſchool appears from the emphatical title
" (noble or illuſtrious) he beſtows on his ſheep, that
" is, his ſcholars. If therefore I may be allowed to
" gueſs, I would conclude, that Cointus was of the
" profeſſion of thoſe perſons, who, when Greece was
" in a flouriſhing ſtate, were called ſophiſts, that is,
" maſters who taught philoſophy and eloquence, and
" Grammarians, who uſed to explain the Poets, and
" taught youth: for what elſe can we think is meant,
" by the muſes garden and ſheep, than a ſchool,
" and pupils educated there in eloquence and philo-
" ſophy?" He had ſpoke as follows a little before (10): *Cum tota ejus vita ignorantiæ tenebris involuta ſit, patria tamen ſola vindiciis inde aſſerta eſt. Nam libro XIV & hanc & vitæ quodam modo genus exprimit; ubi ſe Muſarum ovibus paſcendis Smyrnæ operam dediſſe profitetur.* i. e. " Though we are quite igno-
" rant as to the particulars of his life, yet the place
" of his birth may be diſcovered; for in book XIV,
" he declares this, and, in ſome meaſure, the kind
" of life he led; he there affirming, that he ſpent
" his time at Smyrna, in feeding the muſes ſheep."
Here follows a ſurprizing inſtance of a wild imagination. I will firſt cite the Greek lines of Cointus. Theſe are not in the 14th book, as is affirmed by Rhodomanus, but in the 12th, and conſiſt of an invocation to the muſes, concerning the enumeration of thoſe, who had the courage to get into the wooden horſe.

(9) Rhodoman. *in Præf. ad* Cointum Smyrn. folio †† 2 *verſo.*

(10) Ibid. p. 2.

Τὰς μοι νῦν καθ' ἕκαστον ἀνειρομένῳ σάφα μῦσαι
Ἑσπετε, ὅσοι κατέβησαν ἴσω πολυχαιτέϊ ἵππῳ·
Ὑμεῖς γὰρ πᾶσαν μοι ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θήκατ' ἀοιδὴν,
Ἰλίῳ μοι ἀμφὶ ταφῇ κατασκίδνασθαι ἴλλον,
Σμύρνης ἐν δαπέδοισι περικλυτὰ μῆλα νέμοντι (11).

(11) Cointus Smyrn. lib. 12. ver. 302. p. 610.

" Ye muſes, clearly now relate to me,
" The Greeks, who entred the fam'd Trojan horſe:
" 'Twas ye who taught me ev'ry kind of verſe,
" Before the riſing down my chin o'erſpread,
" Whilſt I, in Smyrna's meads, fed tender ſheep."

It is plain this author ſays to the muſes, that they made him a Poet at a time, when, being yet beardleſs, he fed ſhep in the Smyrnean fields. Now can this ſignify that he taught youth; that his ſchool was famous, and his diſciples perſons of eminence? Is a beardleſs youth qualified to exerciſe ſuch a profeſſion? Is it poſſible that Rhodomanus ſhould have been ſo inattentive; he who ſpent many years upon that Poet; made a Latin tranſlation and an epitome of it in Greek and Latin verſe? Where had he ſeen Cointus boaſting, that he had fed the muſes ſheep (12)? What follows ſhews the indolence of another learned man. *Nunc veriſimilius Smyrnæum nuncupant: quia ipſe lib.* XIV. *dicat, ſe* περικλυτοῖς *ſive illuſtribus Muſarum ovibus Smyrnæ paſcendis, operam dediſſe: ex quo ſi de patria haud certo colligitur, ſaltem videmus ſcholam non infrequentem præſtantium diſcipulorum habuiſſe Smyrnæ* (13). i. e. " Now he is called, with greater
" probability, a Smyrnean; becauſe he himſelf ſays
" in book XIV, that he had been employed in feed-
" ing the illuſtrious ſheep of the muſes in Smyrna;
" from which circumſtance, if we cannot certainly
" diſcover the place of his birth; we, at leaſt, ſee,
" that he muſt have had a numerous ſchool of emi-
" nent pupils in Smyrna." Voſſius, without giving himſelf the trouble to look into Cointus, only followed Rhodomanus's preface: he copied from thence the falſe quotation of book 14, and the falſe commentary with regard to the muſes ſheep, with the whole conſequence which this tranſlator drew from it. He and other learned men are a thouſand times guilty of ſuch faults. I am ſurpriſed that Reineſius ſhould approve ſuch an explication of Cointus's verſes. He alſo is of opinion, that they inform us that our Poet taught ſchool in Smyrna. *Convenit autem*, ſays he (14), *ut quod maximè, Grammatico, qualis fuit Corintus, ludimagiſtri officio fungi & docere pueros, quod noſter de ſe profitetur l. II* (15), *verſibus dulciſſimis: neque falſi ſunt viri docti, imprimis* Parrhaſius, *& diligentiſſimus ejus recenſitor ac interpres* Laur. Rhodomanus, *qui eos de inſtitutione ſcholaſtica apud Smyrnenſes interpretati ſunt.* i. e. " It ſuits
" perfectly well with the character of a Grammarian,
" as Corintus was, to keep a ſchool, and inſtruct
" youth, which our Poet affirms he did, book II,
" in very delightful verſes; nor are learned men
" miſtaken, particularly Parrhaſius and his moſt ac-
" curate reviſer and commentator Laurence Rhodo-
" manus, who explain them as relating to his teach-
" ing ſchool among the Smyrneans." What he ſays in the following paſſage is better grounded, where he rejects the opinion of thoſe who affirm that Cointus meant nothing more in that paſſage, than to boaſt his following Homer. *Dubitoque igitur quenquam ita ſimplicem eſſe, qui* Smyrnæ oves paſcere idem eſſe ac Homerum ſequi, quem bona pars Smyrnæum cenſuit, *credere velit, aut ita perſpicacem qui duo iſta eadem eſſe videre poſſit. Mihi quidem tam beato eſſe nondum contigit, & habeo pro violenta & à ſenſu Poetæ alieniſſima eam expoſitionem* (16). i. e. " I therefore doubt
" very much whether any one can be ſo ſilly, as to
" believe, *the feeding ſheep at Smyrna, to be the ſame*
" *as following Homer, whom many think a Smyrnean*;
" or ſo ſharp-ſighted, as to ſee thoſe two things to
" be one and the ſame. I muſt confeſs that I was
" never ſo fortunate; and cannot but conſider that
" interpretation as forced, and quite wide of the
" Poet's meaning." I myſelf am of opinion, that the whole myſtery is no more than an imitation of Heſiod. Read the following paſſage of le Fevre. *Heſiod became a Poet as he was keeping ſheep; and I hope you will believe him, as he declares ſo himſelf. And thoſe, who have ſaid this ſince, affirm it wholly on the authority of the Poet, or as they were told it by the Bœotian ſhepherds, who looked upon that incident as ſo extraordinary, that they made a ſong on it, which is ſince loſt* (17). Our Cointus, if I miſtake not, meant, that the muſes indulged him the ſame favour as they had done to Heſiod (18). By the way, it is without the leaſt ſhadow of reaſon that Volaterranus and ſome other authors declare him to be a Roman; and that Geſner (19) imagined Volaterranus does not hint at the ſame Poet, whoſe XIV books *derelictorum ab Homero*, were publiſhed by Aldus. The epitomizers of Geſner have not corrected this error; they having divided, after him, in two articles, the *Quintus Poeta Romanus* of Volaterranus, and the *Quintus Calaber* printed by Aldus.

(12) *Se Muſarum ovibus paſcendis Smyrnæ operam dediſſe profiteretur.* Rhod. *in Præf. ad* Cointum Smyrn. folio †† 2 *verſo.*

(13) Voſſius, *de Poetis Græcis*, p. 81.

(14) Thom. Reineſius, *Epiſt.* 67. *ad Rupert.* p. 593.

(15) It ſhould be lib. 12.

(16) Reineſius, *Epiſt.* 67. *ad Rupert.* p. 593.

(17) Le Fevre, *Vie de Poetes Grecs*, p. m. 10.

(18) Compare this with rem. [C] of the art. ÆSCHYLUS.

(19) *In Bibl.* fol. 575, where he cites Volaterranus's words.

[D] *Reineſius pretends, that he is the ſame perſon with a Grammarian*

published a book concerning dialects. The beſt edition of the poem of Quintus Calaber, is that of Rhodomanus [*E*]. Some Criticks admire Cointus, whilſt others ſpeak very contemptuouſly of him. See the paſſages quoted by Lorenzo Craſſo (*a*); and Baillet's Judgments on the Poets (*b*). One Udenus Niſielus praiſes him for certain things, and cenſures him for ſome others. See his *Progymnaſmata :* it is an Italian work.

(*a*) Lorenzo Craſſo, *Iſtoria de Poeti Græci*, p. 436 & *ſeq.*

(*b*) Baillet, *Jugemens ſur les Poetes*, Tom. 2. num. 1195.

a Grammarian called Corintus.] Reineſius's words are as follow : *Fuit Corintus Grammaticus, cujus libellum* de dialectis *ad ſtudioſum quendam juvenem ſcriptum habemus editum cum appendice H. Stephani, eumque citat* Joh. Petrus Nunneſ. not. ad Phrynichum. Sylburg. ſpicil. ad Herod. Betuleius not. ad Lact. l. 1. c. 6. Joh. Talenton. l. 2. rer. recondit. c. 19. *è cujus vero nomine* κόριντ☉ *amiſſa una literula vel prætervisa à primo deſcriptore exiit* κοῖντ☉ (20). i. e. " Corintus " was a Grammarian, and his treatiſe concerning " dialects, addreſſed to ſome ſtudious youth, was pub- " liſhed, with an Appendix of Henry Stephens ; " and is quoted by John Peter Nunneſius in his notes " &c. by Betuleius and by Joh. Talentonus &c. *Co-* " *rintus*'s true name was, through the omiſſion or " overſight of a ſingle letter by the firſt copiſt, " changed to Cointus." It muſt be owned that κόριντ☉ might eaſily have been changed into κοῖντος ; and that our author's poem ſeems to be very much in the caſt of a Grammarian (21). Reineſius proves this at large. He obſerves that Corintus the Grammarian lived after John Philoponus, in the VIth or 7th century ; and that he cannot be made later, ſince Tzetzes cited him (22). *Fuit autem poſt Johann. Gramm. Alexandrinum, d. Philoponum, teſte ipſo in* procem. l. de dial. *inter mediæ ætatis Græcos ſeculo ſexto ſeptimove, quibus Græcia etſi à politia degeneraſſet plurimùm, viros tamen doctos & memorandos aliquos aluit. . . . . Pauci ſunt, quos nominare poſſumus iſtorum temporum :* Johannes Stobæus, Georgius Piſides, Theophyl. Simocates, Thomas & Coprogenius Magiſtri, Euphronius, Moſchopulus, Chœroboſcus, Demetrius Triclinius, Georg. Syncellus, Euſtathius, *& extremo octavi* Photius, *& qui ex ejus doctiſſimis epiſtolis noti ſunt : prioribus inter memoratos etiam adcenſeri debet* Corintus *iſte. Fuiſſe in æſtimio & non inferiorem tempore quàm determinavi inde apparet, quod laudantur à γραμματικωτάτῳ* Tzetze in Chiliad. & comm. ad Lycophr. *ubi de Machaone* (23). i. e. " But he lived later than " John Philoponus, a Grammarian of Alexandria ; " he himſelf delaring in the preface to his dialects, " in the ſixth or ſeventh century, among the Greeks " of the middle age, at which time, though Greece " was greatly degenerated in politeneſs, it neverthe- " leſs gave birth to ſome learned and eminent men. " . . . Some few, of that age, whom we may enu- " merate, are *John Stobæus, George Piſides, Theophyl.* " *Simocates, Thomas and Coprogenius, Magiſtri, Euphronius,* " *Moſchopulus, Chœroboſcus, Demetrius Triclinius, George* " *Syncellus, Euſtathius,* and, in the cloſe of the eighth " century *Photius* ; and ſuch as were made known to " the world by his moſt learned epiſtles : that *Co-* " *rintus* ought alſo to be ranked among the firſt. " That they were eſteemed, and not later than the " period I mentioned, is evident from their being " applauded by that learned Grammarian Tzetzes in " Chiliad, and the commentary on Lycophron, where " he mentions Machaon."

(20) Reineſius, *Epiſt.* 67. *ad Rupert.* p. 591.

(21) *Non autem niſi πρέσβυτα quendam Grammaticum & conſummatæ peritiæ literatorem iſta Paraleipomena ſcripſiſſe patet imprimis ex accurata & curioſa valde locorum deſcriptione, quæ diligentius multo enarrat, quam aliquis de vulgo Poeta faceret ; ut cum, &c.* Reineſius, ibid.

(22) Tzetzes lived at the cloſe of the 12th century. See the preface of Nicholas Gerbelius on Tzetzes.

(23) Reineſius, *Epiſt.* 67. *ad Rupert.* p. 592.

[*E*] *The beſt edition . . . is that of Rhodomanus.*] I have not that of Hanaw 1604, mentioned in the Bodleian catalogue ; but have that of 1614, *ex officina Aubriana.* It contains all Rhodomanus's labours on that author ; and the notes of Claudius Dauſquejus *in Quintum Calabrum, Tryphiodorum, & Coluthum.* One Jodocus Valaræus made a proſe tranſlation of Cointus, which was printed at Lyons in 1541 (α). There is another tranſlation of Bernardinus Baldus.

§ (α). There is a preceding edition, in 12mo. Antwerp, *apud Joannem Steelſium* 1539. It is in the title *editio prima* ; and the dedication is dated the XIth of the calends of Auguſt of that year. REM. CRIT.]

QUIQUERAN (*a*) (PETER DE) Biſhop of Senez, in the 16th century, was ſon to Anthony de Quiqueran, Lord and Baron of Beaujeu (*b*) in Provence. He ſtudied Rhetorick and Poetry at Paris, under James Lewis Strebe, after which he went to Italy, and there applied himſelf very aſſiduouſly to the ſtudy of Muſick. Being returned to Paris, he applied himſelf to the Mathematicks ; and wrote, in Latin, a book in praiſe of Provence, his native country. Whilſt the impreſſion of it was carrying on, he died at Paris, the 18th of Auguſt, 1550, aged twenty-four years. His mother and ſiſter completed the impreſſion of this work (*c*). It is a ſmall folio volume, conſiſting of 89 leaves, printed at Paris by Lambert Dodu, in 1551. There were added to it an hundred Latin hexameter verſes, written by Quiqueran, on the arrival of Hannibal at Arles. There is a great deal of learning, and a conſiderable number of curious particulars in this Author's work, who doubtleſs, had Heaven indulged him a longer life, would have been one of the moſt learned men of his time. He merited the fine elogiums which are beſtowed on him in the epitaphs given hereunder [*A*]. Any perſon who conſiders that he had not attained

(*a*) Moſt Authors, who quote him, call him, falſely, *Quinqueran* or *Quinqueranus.*

(*b*) This is the reaſon why he ſirnames himſelf *Bellojocanus.*

(*c*) Extracted from the dedication to the book, entitled, *de Laudibus Provinciæ*, by Amandus Caſſius.

[*A*] *The Epitaphs given hereunder.*] I have tranſcribed them from the antiquities of Paris, collected by Corrozet. *In another chapel of* the Church belonging to the Auſtin Friers in Paris, in *the nave, is the effigies of a Biſhop on his knees, fixed on high ; and, underneath, two epitaphs, between which, on the ſide of the baſe, is raiſed, in mezzo relievo, an image of fame, ſitting on a globe, and leaning on a lute ; in one hand ſhe holds a trumpet ; and under her feet are books ; round her is a ſphere, a compaſs, and other inſtruments of the liberal arts. The firſt epitaph is in gold letters.*

Epitaphium domini Petri Quiquerani Epiſcopi Senecenſis.

Dum Juvenilis honos, prima lanugine malas
Veſtit, & in calido pectore fervet amor,
Me rapuit, que cuncta rapit, mors invida doctis :
Hei mihi, cur vitæ tam brevis hora fuit
Cur brevis hora fuit ? rerum ſic volvitur ordo,
Alternatque ſuas tempus & hora vices.
Si fera longævæ tribuiſſent fata ſenectæ
Tempora, venturis poma dediſſet ager.
Flos periit, periere ſimul cum cortice fructus,
Aridáque ante ſuos poma fuere dies.
Nemo tamen lacrymis nec triſtia funera fletu
Fœdet, cur ? volito docta per ora virum.

The Epitaph on Peter Quiqueran, Biſhop of Senez.

" In youth's gay bloom, whilſt love inſpir'd my breaſt,
" Death, that grim tyrant, tyrant to the learn'd,
" Tore me from life ; alas ! why ſnatch'd ſo ſoon !
" Why ſnatch'd ſo ſoon ! but ſo the fates decreed.
" Had Heav'n indulg'd me a long courſe of years,
" A fruitful crop I then ſhould have produc'd.
" But oh ! the flower and fruit are wither'd both,
" And the fair tree which gave thoſe beauties birth.
" Yet, let none mourn for me, or weep my fate,
" Since my far ſpreading name can never die"

The

attained to the age fitted for discharging the episcopal functions, will not be surprized that the particulars he relates concerning some of his amusements or diversions, shew him to have little practised the duties of a Bishop [*B*]. A very pernicious custom prevailed at that time, viz. the bestowing Bishopricks on children.

The other Epitaph.

Hic jacet nobilis vir reverendus in Christo pater dominus Petrus Quiqueranus Episcopus Senecensis filius domini Anthonii Quiquerani equitis & Baronis Bellojocani illustrissimi in Provincia : cujus libri tres de Laudibus Provinciæ extant disciplinarum ac rerum cognitione efflorescentes, obiit anno domini 1550 *Kalen. Septembris* 15 *annos natus* 24 (1). i. e. "Here lyes the noble and reverend Father in God Peter Quiqueran, Bishop of Senez, son to Anthony Quiqueran, Knight and Baron of Beaujeu in Provence; whose three books are extant in praise of Provence, and they abound with knowledge and learning. He died in 1550, the 15th of the calends of September (Aug. 18.) aged twenty four years." Peter de St. Romuald (2) was very much in the wrong to quote the first of these epitaphs as declaring, that *Quiqueran . . . . . was a great Orator, a great Poet, and a great Divine.* It is plain the epitaph does not say this. This Author observes, that he died, *as it is thought, before he was consecrated.*

(1) *Antiquitez de Paris, par* Gilles Corrozet, folio 89. Paris edit. 1586. 8vo.

(2) In his *Journal Chronologique*, Tom. 2. p. 183. under the 17th of August. He should have fixed Quiqueran's death at the 18th, and not the 17th.

[*B*] *Some of his amusements or diversions shew him to have little practised the duties of a Bishop.*] The trophies about his monument suit infinitely better a man who was passionately fond of the polite arts, than to a Bishop; but the reading of the book *De Laudibus Provinciæ*, will shew, that our Bishop of Senez employed himself in things quite different from the Government of a Diocess. He did not study the diseases of the soul, and the remedies proper for healing them. His curiosity prompted him to search into the properties of plants, minerals, and animals. He kept a great number of beasts, was a great sportsman, and took vast delight in cock-fighting. Camerarius cites him often (3); but it is only about such things as these. He quotes particularly the passage in which the Author confesses that his amusements or employments were condemned. "John Pierius Valerianus * relates, that the most courageous cocks are in the island of Rhodes; and says that he himself had seen the proofs of this, in some which had been brought from thence to Rome, where some were of a prodigious size, and surprizingly brave. Peter Quinqueran confirms this, he saying †, a cock, brought from Rhodes, was presented to me, and I paid a great price for it. Though he was but six months old, he yet was so courageous, and fond of fighting, that any dog who ventured into my court-yard, was sure to be furiously set upon: as to such common cocks as ventured near him, he killed them all. I myself used to be highly delighted with making him fight with a large Turkey-cock I had, as weighty as a fat sheep. Turkey cocks are extremely cholerick, and raise themselves haughtily, as is evident from their swelling necks, and the noise they make; though otherwise their voice is plaintive or whining, and ridiculous. As to my Rhodian game-cock, after having fought a numberless multitude of battles he fell sick; and though all the methods possible were tried to recover him, died; whereof the history of the preceding battles, as well as those of others, gave me sufficient warning. But reading the diversions of this kind practised by the Delians, Athenians, Greeks, Asiaticks, even the Roman Emperors, and by the various nations of Italy, where people used to stake all they had in the world, that such and such a cock would be victorious in battle; I also was desirous of tasting this pleasure. Neither the judgment of the ancients, nor my own inclination, deceived me; and I have frequently viewed such battles with pleasure; on which account certain enemies, whom I had formerly disgusted, not knowing on which side to attack me, took occasion, as often as they could, to say that I took a pleasure in cock-fighting. They one day carried matters so far, that crowds of men, women, and children, and old men, ran to my episcopal palace, and afterwards gave out that I was too much addicted to those sports. Do you ask whether I disdained or laughed at their folly? I really know not what reply to make. I probably should have acquiesced in their judgment, had I not known that they themselves have none at all (4)."

(3) In Tom. 2. of his *Historical Meditations*. See there the pages marked in the index of the Authors cited under the word *Peter Quinqueran*, in the French translation of Simon Goulart.

* In his *Hieroglyph.*

† Book 2. *Of the Praises of Provence.*

I am to observe, that Quiqueran does not say in his Latin original, that people flocked to his episcopal palace. His words are as follow: *Tandem viri, fœminæ, juvenesque, senesque certatim exiliunt, proclamant, in libellis proscribunt me studiosiorem gallinaceæ pugnæ* (5). Camerarius has corrected some typographical errors that were in the original, but those who printed from him have made others more considerable (6). Simon Goulart's translation is not always just, which those will soon find, who compare, with his version, the following words of Quiqueran: *Mox paulo nequicquam tentatis omnifariis remediis perierit, ejus solatii ex Gallorum pugnis, historia me admonuerat. Quippe eas cùm legerem quàm frequenter celebrassent Delii, quàm Athenienses . . . . decrevi ego quoque ejus voluptatis particeps fieri.* Goulart supposes that the Author's meaning is, that the History of the preceding battles of the cocks, and those of others, had sufficiently warned him, that his Rhodian cock would be sick, and could not be cured by any remedy; but that nevertheless the reading of the diversions of the ancients had excited him to taste the same pleasure. Now this sense is false, and partly absurd. Quiqueran says only this, that History had informed him of the pleasure, which people may taste in cock-fighting.

(4) Camerarius, *Meditations historiques*, Tom. 2. liv. 5. chap. 9. p. 365, 366. according to the French translat. of Simon Goulart, Lions edit. 1610.

(5) Quiqueranus, *de Laudibus Provinciæ*, lib. 2. folio 39.

(6) In the Frankfort edit. of 1658.

Custom might, in some measure, excuse our Prelate, for the diversion he took in hunting, several Bishops in that age taking that exercise, not remembering that it is forbid by the Canons. See the *Extravagantes* or decrees, *De Clerico venatore* (concerning the hunting of Priests). One of the Monks, who wrote against the Bishop of Bellai, insinuates, that Bishops laid out great sums in hawks and hounds (7). He wrote about the year 1644.

(7) See the *Anti-Basilisk* of Camus, Bishop of Bellai, p. 550, 551.

QUIRINUS (PUBLIUS SULPICIUS) Consul the year of Rome 742 (*a*), was born in Lanuvium, and not related to the Patrician family *Sulpicia* (*b*). He owed his rise and advancement entirely to the services (which were very assiduous and ardent) he had done Augustus, especially in war. After his Consulship, he commanded an army in Cilicia (*c*), in order to subdue certain nations (*d*), who were looked upon as the fiercest in all that country (*e*). He conquered them by starving them (*f*), for which he was honoured with a triumph (*g*). Some place this at the time of our Saviour's birth; and imagine, that although there was another Governor in Syria, yet Augustus gave to Quirinus, to reward the glory he had lately obtained, a commission for the taxation mentioned by St. Luke (*h*), it not being doubted that the person called Cyrenius (*i*) in scripture, is the same with our Quirinus. Augustus plainly shewed the high regard and esteem he had for him, when he appointed him Governor to Caius Cæsar his grandson, after Lollius's death, who had enjoyed that post. The Reader may have seen elsewhere (*k*) the difference, which Tiberius made between these two Governors of Caius Cæsar. Quirinus's

(*a*) Dio, lib. 54. p. m. 619.

(*b*) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 3. cap. 48.

(*c*) Idem, ibid.

(*d*) Called *Homonadenses.*

(*e*) Strabo, lib. 12. p. 392.

(*f*) Idem, ibid.

(*g*) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 3. cap. 48.

(*h*) In the 2d chapter.

(*i*) Ibid. ver. 2.

(*k*) In the rem. [*B*] of the art. LOLLIUS.

Quirinus's marrying Æmilia Lepida, is a very ſtrong proof of the great credit in which he lived; that young Lady having been deſigned for Lucius Cæſar, grandſon to Auguſtus (*l*). She was not happy in her marriage with Quirinus, he divorcing her; and, ſeveral years after, charged her with the guilt of many crimes [*A*], for which ſhe was ſent into baniſhment. This conduct of Quirinus was looked upon as ſo ſtrange, that people were moved to compaſſion for Lepida, though ſhe was quite infamous and guilty [*B*]. The conqueſt he gained over her was publickly deteſted; the world compared, on this occaſion, the meanneſs of his extraction, to that Lady's exalted birth. He alſo had made himſelf odious by the ſordid manner he paſſed his old age in the midſt of an immenſe eſtate. He died in the year of Rome 774; and, at Tiberius's requeſt, a publick funeral was made in his honour (*m*). Thoſe who deſire to know whether he ought to

(*l*) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 3. cap. 23.

(*m*) *Ex eod.* Tacit. ibid. and cap. 48.

[*A*] *He divorced his wife; and, ſeveral years after, charged her with the guilt of many crimes.*] He charged her with pretending, that ſhe had had a child by him. There might be ſtrong motives on one ſide for ſuch a pretence; he being very rich, and having neither ſons nor daughters. The other charges related to adultery, poiſoning, and the conſulting of ſoothſayers with regard to the Imperial Family. *At Romæ Lepida, cui ſuper Æmiliorum decus L. Sulla ac Cn. Pompeius proavi erant, defertur* ſimulaviſſe partum ex P. Quirino divite, atque orbo, *adjiciebantur* adulteria, venena: quæſitumque per Chaldæos in domum Cæſaris, *defendente ream Manio Lepido fratre. Quirinus poſt dictum repudium adhuc infenſus, quamvis infami ac nocenti miſerationem addiderat* (1). i. e. "But "Lepida, who not only had the honour to deſcend "from the Æmilian family, but alſo was grand-"daughter to L. Sylla and Cn. Pompey, was im-"peached in Rome of falſely affirming that ſhe had "had a child by P. Quirinus, a wealthy man who "had no children. She likewiſe was charged with "the crimes of adultery, poiſonings, and conſulting "ſoothſayers, with regard to Cæſar's family; Ma-"nius Lepidus, her brother, being counſel for her. "Quirinus, though he had divorced her, continuing "ſtill exaſperated, moved the people to pity, though "ſhe was infamous and criminal." It appears by the beginning of this paſſage, that Æmilia Lepida was great grand-daughter to Sylla and Pompey: but ſhe was not the better woman for that. I am ſurprized that Suetonius, who wrote after Tacitus, ſhould reduce the charge to one article; he ſaying only, that Lepida was accuſed of a deſign of poiſoning her huſband Quirinus. *Condemnatam & generoſiſſimam fœminam Lepidam, in gratiam Quirini conſularis prædivitis, & orbi, qui dimiſſam eam è matrimonio poſt vigeſimum annum veneni olim in ſe comparati arguebat* (2). i. e. "Lepida, a Lady of great diſtinction, was likewiſe "condemned at the ſuit of Quirinus, a very wealthy "man, of conſular dignity, and having no children, "who twenty years after he had divorced her charg-"ed her with having formerly attempted to poiſon "him." This omiſſion of Suetonius is attended with another fault; he ſaying, that ſhe was condemned twenty years after ſhe had been divorced from Quirinus. However, he is not accurate in his chronology, which I thus prove. This Lady was ſentenced in the year 773. There was a deſign to marry her to Lucius Cæſar, grandſon to Auguſtus; and conſequently ſhe was not married to Quirinus till after the death of that young Prince. Now he died in 755, according to the calculation of Archbiſhop Uſher and Father Noris (3); or the year 756 according to Petavius, or the year 757 according to Valeſius (4). It is not probable that Quirinus repudiated her before they had been married a twelvemonth; he conſequently could not have divorced her twenty years in 773. The Commentators on Suetonius are quite ſilent on that head, and yet it ought to have been cleared. Father Noris (5) has juſt reaſon to cenſure Archbiſhop Uſher, who declared on one hand, that Lucius Cæſar died in 755; and on the other, that Lepida was married to Quirinus in 753. Now theſe two things are inconſiſtent, ſince it is certain that the marriage of Quirinus was after Lucius Cæſar's death; now will any one ſay, that there was a deſign to marry the Emperor's grandſon to a woman whom Quirinus had abandoned or divorced? Archbiſhop Uſher fell into this miſtake by his truſting to Suetonius, that is, by ſuppoſing that Suetonius had exactly calculated the years between Lepida's divorce, and her proſecution. He ought not to have entertained ſo good an opinion of him. I muſt not omit, that Tiberius, after the ſentencing of the Lady in queſtion, declared at laſt, that he was certainly informed by the teſtimony of Quirinus's domeſticks, that ſhe had attempted to poiſon her huſband. *Dein tormentis ſervorum patefacta ſunt flagitia, itumque in ſententiam Rubellii Blandi, à quo aqua atque igni arcebatur: huic Druſus adſenſit, quamquam alii mitius cenſuiſſent, mox Scauro qui filiam ex ea genuerat, datum, ne bona publicarentur. Tum demum aperuit Tiberius,* compertum ſibi etiam ex P. Quirini ſervis, veneno eum à Lepida petitum (6). i. e. "The ſervants being afterwards "racked, her wickedneſs was diſcovered; and the opi-"nion of Rubellius Blandus was agreed to, by which "ſhe was voted to baniſhment; Druſius aſſented to "it, though others had been more favourable in "their opinion; and immediately after Scaurus, to "whom ſhe had brought a daughter, obtained that "her eſtate ſhould be preſerved. But at laſt Tibe-"rius aſſerted, that he had diſcovered evidently by "Quirinus's ſervants, that Lepida had attempted to "poiſon him." We ſhall preſently ſee, that Lepida, in all probability, was ſentenced very juſtly to baniſhment.

(1) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 3. cap. 22.

(2) Suet. *in* Tiberio, cap. 49.

(3) See *Cenotaphia Piſana* of Father Noris, p. 258 and 260.

(4) *In Notis ad Excerpta Dionis*, p. 90. See Noris, ibid. p. 259.

(5) Noris, ibid. p. 258.

(6) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 3. cap. 23.

[*B*] *People were moved to compaſſion for Lepida, tho' ſhe was quite infamous and guilty.*] It cannot be aſſerted that Tacitus has reflected too much on Tiberius, much leſs can it be ſaid that he ſpared him in any manner. Since therefore he confeſſes that Lepida was guilty, and ruined in her reputation (7), we muſt ſuppoſe it an evident fact. He does not deny but that Tiberius took ſome ſteps during Lepida's trial, which ſhewed that he was for having her puniſhed; but he confeſſes, by ſome other ſteps, he might be ſuſpected of being inclined to pardon her. *Haud facile quis diſpexerit illa in cognitione mentem Principis, adeo vertit ac miſcuit iræ & clementiæ ſigna* (8). i. e. "It was not an eaſy matter to diſcover, in this trial, "the intention of that Monarch, he ſo changed and "blended the indications of his anger and clemen-"cy." The worſt that can be ſaid, is, that Tiberius uſed his utmoſt endeavours under hand, to prove the crimes laid to Lepida's charge. This is not called to oppreſs innocence, injuſtice, nor tyranny, *&c.* Let us therefore conclude, that the Lady in queſtion merited the puniſhment to which ſhe was ſentenced. Nevertheleſs the people were highly exaſperated againſt the contrivers of that proſecution, and murmured aloud, and with dreadful imprecations, at ſo illuſtrious a Lady's being ſacrificed to Quirinus. She had found the art to move the people to compaſſion, by the complaints ſhe made during the ſolemnization of the public games, not to mention that Quirinus had made himſelf odious. This was the grand point; for thoſe who make themſelves obnoxious to the people, endear to themſelves the intereſt of thoſe perſons they attack, though thoſe perſons have really no merit, but are even very guilty. *Quirinus quamvis infami ac nocenti miſerationem addiderat* (9). . . . . *Lepida ludorum diebus, qui cognitionem intervenerant, theatrum cum claris fœminis ingreſſa, lamentatione flebili* majores ſuos, *ciens* ipſumque Pompeium, *cujus ea monumenta, & adſtantes imagines viſebantur, tantum miſericordiæ permovit, ut effuſi in lacrymas,* ſæva & deteſtanda Quirino *clamarent,* cujus ſenectæ atque orbitati, & obſcuriſſimæ domui, deſtinata quondam uxor L. Cæſari, ac divo Auguſto nurus, dederetur (10). i. e. "Quirinus had raiſed the com-"paſſion of the people, though ſhe was infamous and "criminal.

(7) *Quamvis infami ac nocenti.* Idem, ibid. cap. 22.

(8) Idem, ibid.

(9) Idem, ibid.

(10) Idem, ibid. cap. 23.

to be called Quirinus, or Quirinius (*n*), may read Mr. Ryck's notes on Tacitus's Annals, p. 37. Joſephus calls him Κυρήνιος *Cyrenius*; and informs us that he had filled all employments, and was one of the moſt illuſtrious perſonages of that age (*o*).

(*n*) He is called ſo in moſt of the editions of Tacitus.

(*o*) Joſeph. *Antiquitat. Judaic.* lib. 18. cap. 1. p. 616.

" criminal. . . . . Lepida, during the ſolemniza-
" tion of the public games, which happened at the
" ſame time with the trial, coming into the theatre
" with ſeveral Ladies of diſtinction; calling, with
" the heavieſt moan, upon her *anceſtors*, and eſpecially
" upon Pompey, whoſe monuments and images be-
" ing there exhibited to the view, excited their pity
" to ſuch a degree, that burſting into tears, *they*
" *vented the moſt horrid imprecations againſt Quirinus,*
" *to whom, when old, childleſs, and of a very mean*
" *extraction, Lepida was ſacrificed, though ſhe was*
" *deſigned formerly to be the wife of L. Cæſar, and*
" *daughter-in-law to the divine Auguſtus.*" The puniſhment inflicted on Lepida only increaſed the odium of the people againſt Quirinus (11). Compare this with what was ſaid above (12).

(11) *Sed cæteris haud læta memoria Quirini erat, ob intenta, ut memoravi, Lepidæ pericula ſordidamque & præpotentem ſenectam.* Idem, ibid. cap. 48. (12) Article MARILLAC (Lewis de) rem. [*A*], num. 1.

R.

R.

RACAN (HONORAT DE BEUIL, MARQUIS OF) ſon to a Knight of the Order of St. Michael, was born a Roche Racan in Touraine (*a*), anno 1589 (*b*). He was one of the Pages to his Majeſty in 1605 (*c*); and as he began to amuſe himſelf with writing Poetry, he got acquainted with Malherbe, *from whom he learnt all the ſkill he had in French Poetry. . . . . This acquaintance and friendſhip with Malherbe laſted till his death, which happened in* 1628 (*d*). He was choſen one of the Members of the French Academy, at the time of its foundation; and there had a ſpeech written by him, againſt the ſciences, which was read, the 9th of July 1635 (*e*). Had he been in Paris, he would have ſpoke it himſelf, but he was then in the country at his native place. He printed this ſpeech with ſome of his poems (*f*), and died in 1670. The ſeat become vacant by his death was filled by Mr. de la Chambre, Pariſh-Prieſt of St. Bartholomew's. He happened to write a Quatrain, (a ſtanza of four verſes) exactly like that of a Poet, whoſe writings he believed he had never read [*A*]. I ſhall obſerve

(*a*) Peliſſon, *Hiſt. de l' Academie Franc.* p. m. 344.

(*b*) I ſhall obſerve, in the rem. that he was 19 years old in 1608.

(*c*) Malherbe's *Life*, p. 5.

(*d*) Ibid. p. 6.

(*e*) Peliſſon, *Hiſt. de l' Academie Franc.* p. 102, 103.

(*f*) Ibid.

[*A*] *He happened to write a Quatrain, . . . exactly like that of a Poet, whoſe writings he believed he had never read.*] Menage relates ſeveral curious particulars, which deſerve to be tranſcribed in this place; "(1) I have frequently heard Mr. Chapelain ſay, "that himſelf and Mr. d'Andilli had wrote the "ſame verſe (2), without knowing it was Mal-"herbe's. And at the time I am writing this remark, "Mr. Furetiere informs me, that the ſame thing "had happened to him. I have alſo often heard "Mr. Corneille ſay, that he had hit upon, in his "Polyeucte, the two famous verſes following, rela-"ting to fortune.

"*Et comme elle a l' éclat du verre,*
"*Elle en a la fragilité.*

"Fortune, like glaſs, is ſhining and is brittle.

"He had compoſed, I ſay, theſe lines, without "knowing that they were firſt made by Biſhop Go-"deau, who had introduced them into an ode, ad-"dreſſed by him to Cardinal Richlieu, fifteen years "before Corneille had given them a place in his "Polyeucte. It is a common thing for writers to "hit upon the ſame thought and expreſſion. Por-"phyry, in a fragment of his book on philology, "quoted by Euſebius in Chap. III, Book X. of his "*Præparatio Evangelica*, mentions one Aretades, who "had compoſed an entire treatiſe on ſuch fortuitous "hits. . . . . It is, I ſay, common enough for a "writer to hit upon the ſame thought and expreſſion "of others; and particularly when ſuch a one has "ſeen that thought and expreſſion before, as d'An-"dilli, Chapelain and Furetiere, had doubtleſs "ſeen that verſe of Malherbe, and Coneille thoſe "two of Biſhop Godeau; for it often happens "that we remember a thing, but forget the au-"thor of it. But what happened to Mr. de Racan "is very extraordinary. In 1608, he being in gar-"riſon at Calais, and but nineteen years of age, "compoſed the four verſes following.

"*Eſtime qui voudra la mort épouvantable,*
"*Et la face l'horreur de tous les animaux;*
"*Quant à moy je la tiens pour le poinct deſirable,*
"*Où commencent nos biens, & finiſſent nos maux.*
"Let death be formidable deem'd by men,
"And made the horror of all animals;
"For different are my thoughts; to me it ſeems
"The point where bliſs begins, and mis'ry ends.

"Being ſome time after in Paris, and repeating theſe "verſes, as his own, to his friend Ivrante, the latter "told him, that he ſhould not impoſe on him in that "article: that he very well knew thoſe verſes were "wrote by Mathieu; and that it was the firſt qua-"train of his book entitled *Les Tablettes de la vie* "*& de la mort*. Mr. de Racan, who had never ſeen "that book, perſiſted with obſtinacy, a long time, "in declaring, that it was not poſſible for Mathieu "to have wrote thoſe verſes; and would not yield "till Ivrante, to Racan's great aſtoniſhment, ſhewed "him them in Mathieu's book. I do not doubt "the truth of this ſtory; firmly perſuaded that "Mr. de Racan, who has often told it me before "many perſons, is a man of ſtrict veracity. But I "very much queſtion the truth of what Leonard "Salviati informs us of, in his firſt book on *Anver-*"*timenti della lingua Italiana*, viz. that a Poet, his "contemporary, wrote ſonnets exactly like thoſe of "Cardinal Bembo, though he had never ſet eyes on "them." We ſee that Menage makes a great difference between what happened to Racan, and the incident relating to the reſt of the Poets mentioned by him. There appears to him ſomething more extraordinary in the former. However, were I to ſpeak my thoughts on that matter, I ſhould form a different judgment. Moſt people know, that children who are well educated, are commonly taught ſome religious and moral maxims; and that they are made to learn by heart ſome ſententious ſtanzas before they can read. The Proteſtants chooſe, for this purpoſe, ſome paſſages in David's pſalms; or, as the Romaniſts, ſome quatrains of Pibrac, or from another Poet of the ſame ſtamp (3), ſome of whom are found in all countries. Doubtleſs Racan, when but five or ſix years of age, had heard his governeſs or his mother, repeat ſome of the fine quatrains in queſtion, or thoſe of Mathieu, which are commonly bound with thoſe of Pibrac. The traces of theſe, which imprinted themſelves on his brain, were ſtopped for ſome years; but afterwards they opened again, and preſented themſelves to him as a quite new object; and without calling up the particular remembrance of the author, or of the book from which they had been taken. He therefore imagined himſelf to be the author of thoſe four verſes, though they, in reality, were no more than a recollection. Was a man to enquire attentively into his own mind, he would find that, on a hundred occaſions, thoughts which he fancies were invented by himſelf, were, in reality, no more than what he had heard or read before; but only that he did not remember that circumſtance. I will here quote ſome verſes from Moliere, which confirm what I obſerved with reſpect to the education of children. Here follows the cenſure of a coquet, whom her father is ſuppoſed to addreſs in manner following.

Voilà, voilà le fruit de ces empreſſemens,
Qu'on vous voit nuit & jour à lire vos Romans:
De colibets d'amour vôtre tête eſt remplie,
Et vous parlez de Dieu bien moins que de Clelie.
Jettez moi dans le feu tous ces méchans écrits,
Qui gâtent tous les jours tant de jeunes eſprits:
Liſez moi comme il faut, au lieu de ces ſornettes,
Les Quatrains de Pibrac, & les doctes Tablettes
Du Conſeiller Matthieu, ouvrage de valeur,
Et plein de beaux dictons à reciter par cœur:
La guide des pécheurs eſt encor un bon livre,
Ce'ſt là qu'en peu de tems on apprend à bien vivre,
Et ſi vous n'aviez leu que ces moralitez,
Vous ſçauriez un peu mieux ſuivre mes volontez (4).

"Such

(1) Menage, *Obſervations ſur Malherbe*, p. 254 *& ſeq.* He has inſerted all this in the *Anti-Baillet*, chap. 128.

(2) i. e. *d'arbitres de la paix, de foudres de la guerre*, which line is found in the paraphraſe of Pſalm 145, by Malherbe.

(3) There is a book entitled, *Le miroir des vertus et le chemin de bien vivre.* (The mirrour of the virtues, and rules for holy living.) This *mirrour* is a collection of chriſtian and moral *Quatrains*, by Peter Habert, Counſellor and Secretary to the King.

(4) Moliere, *Sganarelle ou le Cocu imaginaire*, Scene 1.

(g) Rem. [F] of the art. TIRESIAS.

observe elsewhere (g), how fond he was of the favours of the fair.

" Such is the benefit, which you have reap'd
" By poring o'er Romances day and night:
" With love's vain toys your silly brain is fill'd,
" And *Clelia* less than God, employs your thoughts.
" But, instant, burn those idle, trifling books,
" Which, daily, spoil the morals of our youth.
" Study attentively the learned Matthieu,
" Or virtuous Pibrac, noble pieces both,
" And fill'd with maxims which enrich the mind.
" To these you well may add the Sinner's guide,
" By which frail man is led to virtue's temple.
" Ah! had these heavenly books been all your study,
" My will, in every thing, you'd have obey'd."

[Bayle supposes above, that Racan, when a child, had read the *Tablettes* of Matthieu; and that afterwards, the first quatrain occurring to his memory, he imagined he himself was author of it. Bayle did not know that the *Quatrains ou Tablette de la Vie & de la Mort*, were not published till 1609, Racan being then twenty years old, and having wrote verses at fifteen or sixteen years of age. However, I am of opinion, with Bayle, that when he wrote the four verses in question, he was indebted for them to his memory, and not to his judgment *.]

* From the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. vol. 4. p. 979. col. 1.

(a) See the advertisements to the 2d edit. of this Dict.

RADULPHUS, or RALPH (a), Archbishop of Bourges, was the son of Radulphus, Count and Lord of Turenne, Lay-Abbot of Tulle, Count of Quercy, and of Agana his wife. He was of illustrious birth, being of the Blood-royal of France; and of the same stock with Wifridus, Count of Bourges (b), which the acts of St. James the Hermit, and those of St. Genulfus, affirm to have sprung from the Kings of France (c).

(b) Mabillon, *Act. SS. Benedict.* sæc. 4. Tom. 2. p. 156. ibid. p. 151. *Robertus quidem Saxiaci vici, & circumjaculis regionis dominus, vir potens, & nobilis, ex regum Francorum genere ortus erat, & quod optabilius est Christiana pietate insignis: cui affectu & origine respondebat uxor ejus nomine Agana, ex patre Wifrido comite quondam Bituriensi, regali prosapia exorto, & Matrona Oda nomine, filia, & hi omnes ex regio Francorum sanguine traxerant originem.*

(c) Ibid. p. 226. Vita S. Genulphi. *Wifredus hic ex illa Nobilium Scarra quam gloriosus rex Pipinus præfati Augusti Ludovici avus, in urbe Biturica ad Quaifarii Ducis Aquitaniæ partes expugnandas reliquerat, originem trahens regali quoque prosapia oriundus.*

(d) Ibid. p. 157.

(e) Ibid.

(f) Ibid. *Et Gall. Christ. à Sammarthanis*, Tom. 1. p. 151, 152. *Patriarch. Bituricon*, cap. 47. *in Bibliotb.* Labbe, Tom. 2. p. 66.

(g) La Thaumassiere, *Hist. du Berri*, p. 294.

(h) Besli, *Hist. des Comtes de Poictou, & Ann. Bertini*, ad ann. 855.

(i) *Sirm. Concil. Gall.* Tom. 3. cap. 11. p. 141.

(k) Ibid. p. 144.

(l) *Sæc. Benedict.* 4. Tom. 2. p. 165.

(m) *Sirm. Concil. Gall.* Tom. 3. p. 160.

(n) Ibid.

(o) Cron. Vierzon, *in* Bibl. Labb. Tom. 2. *Act. SS. Benedict. Sæc.* 4. Tom 2. p. 158, *& seq.*

(p) Ibid.

(q) *Hist. de S. Martial*, part. 3. p. 315.

(r) *Dominici, Ausberti familiæ redittiva. Du Bouchet, Veritable orig. de la Maison de France.* Labbe, *Tableaux genealogiques.*

(s) *Fragmentum vit. S. Jacobi Eremitæ*, relatum *in Patriarch. Bituricensi*, cap. 67. Labbe, *Bibl.* Tom. 1.

(t) *Interea vir Dom. Jacobus inter tot præclara bonorum operum exercitia illustratus gratia divina prædixit obitum præstantissimi pontificis Rodulphi, qui insita sibi prudentia, animi quoque nobilitate sua tempestate plebem sibi creditam optime regens, merito pater patriæ à cunctis Aquitaniæ gentis Primoribus dici poterat. Idem refertur in* Vitâ S. Jacobi Eremitæ, *apud* Mabillonium. *Sæc. Benedict.* 4. Tom. 2. p. 256. *in Elog. Hist. Sanct. Radulph. Archi. Biturie.*

(u) *Gall. Christ. à Sammarth.* Tom. 1. p. 151, 152.

(x) *Nicolai I. Papæ Epist.* 39.

(y) *Sæc. Bened.* 4 Tom. 2. p. 164.

(z) *Appendix ad Canones Rhegiuonis à Stephano Baluzio*, p. 528. Justel, *Preuves de l'Hist. de Turenne*, p. 15.

(aa) *Annal. Bertin.* ad ann. 866.

(bb) *Bibl. Cluniac.* p. 84.

(cc) Justel, *Preuves de l'Hist. de Turenne*, p. 18.

He founded, with his patrimony, several Abbies, viz. that of Devre in Berry, afterwards translated to Vierzon (o); that of Beaulieu in Limosin; that of Vegenues in the same country; and that of Sarasac in Querci. The two last are ruined (p).

He also rebuilt Château-Gourdon, in Saisseau. This town was part of his patrimony. He there deposited the body of St. Satire, whence it was called St. Satur, which it bears to this day (q). It is situated near Sancerre, which was the chief place of the other part of Saisseau, possessed by Wifridus, Count of Bourges; and which Agana his daughter, brought in marriage to Robert, brother of Ingeltrude, wife of Pepin I. King of Aquitain (r). This Robert is the same person with Robert the Strong.

An ancient Author informs us (s), that St. Radulphus governed the people who were under his care, with so much prudence and greatness of soul, that he might justly be called, by all the great men of Aquitain, the Father of his country (t). He took a very particular care of his Clergy; and it was, in the view of instructing and edifying them, that he drew up fifteen canons or ordinances, which Mr. Baluse printed. He likewise drew up some other canons, which Mr. Baluse promises also to publish. He is the first Archbishop of Bourges, whom we certainly know to have been Patriarch and Primate of the Provinces of Aquitain and Narbonne (u). It was, on this account, that Pope Nicholas I. wrote a long letter to him, which informs us, that Primates ought not to take immediate cognizance of the affairs of the Clergy of the other Dioceses, within their own, but only by appeal (x).

He died the twentieth of June 866, and was canonized (y).

Himself, his brothers, and the descendants of those brothers, adhered all very zealously to Robert the Strong, and his descendants.

Two of his brothers, GODFREY and ROBERT, left posterity. That of Robert ends with Aimar, Viscount of lower Limosin, a Lay-abbot, and Restorer of the abbey of Tulle. He restored to the Monks of this house, the dignity of Abbot, and the revenues of the abbey; these having been in his family ever since the time of his great-grandfather, who had obtained them by the munificence of our Monarchs (z).

Count Godfrey fought against the Normans in the battle of Brieserthe, with Robert the Strong, who was slain in it (aa). He left two sons, Count GODFREY, of whom St. Eudes, Abbot of Clugni says, that he would oblige St. Geraud, Count of Aurillac, to become his vassal (bb).

RANULPHUS, younger brother of Godfrey, carried on the line. The elder branch of his descendants ends in SULPICE, who, by marriage, brought Turenne into the family of Comborn (cc). The younger branch, which assumed the name of Souillac, when sirnames became hereditary, still exists; and continues the line of those Princes, Counts, and Lords of Turenne, sprung from the same stock as Wifridus, Count of Bourges.

RADULPHUS

RADULPHUS (RALPH), a Benedictin Frier, ſirnamed *Flaviacenſis*, or *Flaicenſis*, becauſe he belonged to the Convent of St. Germer de Flaix, in the dioceſe of Beauvais, flouriſhed in 1157, as Albericus (*a*) affirms, on the teſtimony of Helinand (*b*). Several eminent Writers have committed an error in placing him under the year 910 (*c*): he is called by ſome Raoul, or Ralph the Black (*d*). His commentary on the book of Leviticus is ſtill extant; it being inſerted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, and printed ſeparately at Colen in 1536. There (*e*) has been reſtored, to him, a commentary on Solomon's ſong, which was thought to be a work of St. Gregory. The partizans of the hiſtory of Pope Joan [*A*] rank him among their teſtimonies with regard to her, but they are greatly miſtaken in ſo doing.

(a) *Albericus trium Fontium Monachus* in *Chronic.* See F. Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſ.* Tom. 2. p. 274.

(b) A Monk of Froimond, in the dioceſe of Beauvais, about the cloſe of the 12th century, and the beginning of the 13th. See Father Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſ.* Tom. 2. p. 275.

(c) See Father Labbe, ibid. p. 273.

(d) Mr. du Pin. *Bibl.* Tom. 9. p. 185, is one of theſe.

(e) Father Hommey, in the *Supplement. Patrum*, in 1684.

RADZIWIL

[*A*] *The partizans of the hiſtory of Pope Joan, ranked him among their teſtimonies, with regard to her, but they are greatly miſtaken in ſo doing.*] This aroſe from confounding him with a Benedictin Frier, named Ranulphe de Hygeden (Ralph Higden) an Engliſhman, who died in 1363. Father Labbe imagines that Conrad Decker firſt occaſioned this blunder. *Auctor Primus illius apud Blondellum erroris atque in Mareſio malæ fidei fuit homo furioſus Conradus Deckerus in libro, cui titulum fecit de Papa Romano & Papiſſa Romana, quod Joannes Octavus fuerit mulier & puerpera, Oppenheimii ad Rhenum in 8vo anno* 1612; *ſic enim loquitur pagina* 430. *Deſcripſit Radulfus hanc Hiſtoriam in ſuo Polychronico libri V. cap.* 32. *teſtis locupletiſſimus & omni exceptione major, utpote in quo veritatis Hiſtoricæ nulla deſiderantur κρίνρια: & vixit juxta Trithemium anno circiter* 930. *ita ut Papale hoc puerperium ab iis accipere poterit, qui illud videerunt. Atque ex illo cænoſo fonte promanavit in cæteros error* (1). i. e. "The "firſt ſource of that error in Blondel, and diſingenuity in Mareſius, was one Conrad Decker, a man "of a violent ſpirit, in a book to which he gave "the title, of *The Roman Pope, and the Roman Popeſs*, "declaring that John VIII was a woman, and had "been delivered of a child, which book was printed "in Oppenheim on the Rhine, in 1612, 8vo; he "writing as follows in page 430. This ſtory was "told by Radulphus in his Polychronicon, book 5, "chap. 32, he being a moſt authentic witneſs, and "to whom nothing can abſolutely be objected, there "being none of the marks belonging to an hiſtorian "wanting to him. Farther, he lived, according to "Trithemius, about the year 930, ſo that he might "have been informed of Pope Joan's delivery by "thoſe who were eye-witneſſes to it. The error "ſpread itſelf from this polluted ſpring, to other "writers." But it is certain that Vignier had committed it two years before Conrad Decker's work was printed. He publiſhed as follows in 1610. "What Baronius and Bellarmin ſay, viz. that Ma"rianus Scotus, who wrote about the year 1080, "firſt publiſhed that ſtory, is falſe; as is evident "from the Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory of the late Nicho"las Vignier my father, in which he produces the "teſtimony of Ranulphus, in his Polychronion, who "was a benedictin, and lived about the year 930, "according to Trithemius (2)." A capuchin who wrote againſt Vignier in 1611, did not know how to make a proper uſe of the advantages he had. He was not enough acquainted with books and authors; and did not know that the author of this *Polychronicon*, which his adverſary had quoted, lived in the XIVth century, and not in the Xth. Here follows the anſwer he made to him. *Read your father again attentively; you will find, in the hiſtorical library, on the ſame ſubject, firſt, that he commits an error where he ſays*, that all who have wrote the hiſtory of the Popes, Anaſtaſius excepted, declare unanimouſly that Pope Joan ſucceeded Leo IV. *as he might have learnt from Onuphrius, whom he quotes in the ſame place. Secondly, that he ſpeaks timorouſly and doubtfully of this affair, as well as others, who were miſtaken concerning it. Thirdly, it will appear from his text, when duly examined, that he quotes Marianus as the firſt author who tells this ſtory. Fourthly, that he does not quote in any manner, in this place, your Arnulphus, but mentions John Lucidus; but if you are deſirous of making but one of thoſe two, know that we give but very little credit, or rather none at all, to the allegations of your ſaid father* (3). But this was not aiming at the mark, nor diving to the bottom of the cauſe. Vignier furniſhed weapons againſt himſelf, in giving the title of Ranulphus's work. It was owing to this title that father Labbe (4) diſcovered, by a paſſage in Decker, the ſource of this miſtake. The learned Blondel had taken no notice of this title; whence he was prevailed upon to believe, that Radulphus Flaviacenſis has ſpoke of Pope Joan (5). He indeed has not given into the error of thoſe who place him either under the year 910 or 930. He fixed his death to the year 1157, and grounds his conjecture on the teſtimony of Albericus; but he ought to have obſerved, that Albericus does not place the death of our Radulphus under that year, but the proſperous part of his life. They were not more accurate, when they repreſented to him that his Radulphus is of greater antiquity than he had made him, that he is a teſtimony to the ſtory of Pope Joan, prior to Marianus; and, in a word, that he might have really ſeen Pope Joan (6). *Hic* (Radulphus Flaviacenſis) *inter teſtes veritatis malè tertius ponitur à Mariano: Nec enim Radulphus Flaviacenſis mortuus eſt denuò anno* 1157. *niſi eum multò longæviorem faciamus Johanne de Temporibus; cùm floruerit ipſo nono Chriſti ſæculo, pluſquam* 100. *annis antequam Marianus naſceretur, adeo ut ipſam Joannam vidiſſe potuerit: Etenim Bellarminus* de Scriptor. Eccl. *Radulphum ait floruiſſe anno Chriſti* 910 (7). i. e. "This "Radulphus Flaviacenſis is wrongly ranked in the "third place, among thoſe who witneſſed to the "truth, after Marianus; for Radulphus Flaviacenſis "did not die in 1157, unleſs we can ſuppoſe him "much more ancient than *Johannes de Temporibus*, "ſince he flouriſhed in the ninth century after "Chriſt, above a century before Marianus came into "the world, ſo that he might have ſeen Pope Joan; "for Bellarmin ſays, in his Eccleſiaſtical writers, "that Radulphus flouriſhed in the year of Chriſt "910." He who wrote in this manner plunged into ſome miſtakes, which father Labbe cenſured with ſurprizing ſeverity (8).

Had Hartnac known this, when he publiſhed a new edition of Micrælius's *Syntagma Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiaſticæ*, he doubtleſs would have informed his readers, that the following words, *Nobile indignari, Aventine, Onuphri, Raymunde* (9), *Bellarmine, Baroni, Bini, Florimunde, quod veſtram audaciam in negando muliebri hoc pontificatu nihil curans, veritatem rei profero ex* Rudolpho Flaviacenſi, *monacho Benedictino qui vixit circa annum* 1000. *ex* Mariano Scoto, *qui natus, &c* (10). i. e. "Aventinus, Onuphrius, Raymundus, "Bellarmin, Baronius, Binius, Florimundus, now "vent your noble indignation, becauſe that, without "paying any regard to your impudence, in denying "the reality of this female pontificate, I prove it to "be true, by Rodolphus Flaviacenſis, a Benedictin, "who lived about the year 820, and by Marianus "Scotus, who was born &c." That theſe words, I ſay, are erroneous, and that we muſt eraze *ex Rodolpho Flaviacenſi*. This ſhews how much it concerns controverſial writers not to rely on the writers of their own party, without entirely diſcuſſing all the replies of the adverſe party. If a writer ſhould content himſelf with only conſulting Mareſius, he would copy his quotations; but if he alſo conſulted the author who refuted him (11), he then would diſcover the good from the bad. I muſt obſerve by the way, that Hartnac has mentioned in the margin, the names of ſeveral Proteſtant authors who adhere to the ſtory of Pope Joan, and moſt of whom wrote after Florimond de Remond (12). He quotes, among others, the famous Gerhard, Whitaker, and Andrew Willet.

(1) Labbe, *in Cenotaphio everſo, ad calcem*, Tom. 1. *de Script. Eccleſ.* p. 986, 987.

(2) Nicholas Vignier, *Theatre de l'Anti-chriſt*, part. 2. chap. 28. p. m. 1055.

(3) Silveſtre de l'Aval, *Predicateur Capucin, les juſtes Grandeurs de l'Egliſe Romaine*, liv. 3. p. 78.

(4) Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſ.* Tom. 1. p. 987.

(5) Blondel, *in Examine Quæſt. de Papa fœmina*, p. m. 5.

(6) It is pretended that ſhe came to the Pontificate after Leo IV. who died in 855.

(7) Sam. Mareſius, *in Johanna Papiſſa reſtituta*, p. 5.

(8) See Tom. 2. of his *Diſſert. de Script. Eccleſ.* p. 274, and 795, *& ſeq.*

(9) He ought not to have been diſtinguiſhed from Florimunde, who comes after; they have ſplit an Author, and made two of him.

(10) Micrælius, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 3. ſect. 1. *de Papis*, p. 508. edit. 1699.

(11) i. e. Father Labbe.

(12) Compare this with rem. [*F*] of the art. POPE JOAN.

RADZIWIL (NICHOLAS) IV. of that name [*A*], Palatin of Vilna, grand Marſhal and Chancellor of Lithuania in the 16th century, was a very illuſtrious man. He travelled into moſt parts of Europe in his youth; and was ſo ſkillful in bodily exerciſes, that he ſurpaſſed all the Gentlemen of his time in that particular. He had a conſiderable ſhare in the eſteem and friendſhip of King Sigiſmund Auguſtus; was Captain of his guards, and commanded thrice in Livonia. He there obtained a ſignal victory over the Germans, whereby he diſpoſſeſſed them of that province, and ſubjected it to Poland. He brought to the King, the Archbiſhop of Riga, and the Grand-Maſter of the Knights of Livonia, and delivered up to him, in full Senate, the ſeal of that order, and the croſs which the Grand-Maſter uſed to wear about his neck. This noble expedition crowned him with glory. When he was ſent Embaſſador to Charles V. and of Ferdinand King of the Romans, he ſtood god-father to Archduke Erneſt. He died in 1567, and was carried to the grave on the ſhoulders of his four ſons (*a*) [*B*]. I muſt not omit that he turned Proteſtant, and cauſed the Bible to be printed in the Poliſh language [*C*]. He anſwered, with the utmoſt ſharpneſs and ſeverity, Lippoman, the apoſtolical Nuncio, who had ſpoke to him in very reproachful terms [*D*]. The Clergy of Vilna

(*a*) Extracted from Simon Starovolſcius, *in Sarmatiæ Bellatoribus*, p. 172, 173.

[*A*] *IV of that name.*] Jagello being converted to Chriſtianity, and having united his country, Lithuania, to the crown of Poland, which had been beſtowed on him, created a Nobleman named Radziwil, Palatine of Vilna, he having alſo turned Chriſtian. This Palatine aſſumed the name of NICHOLAS at his baptiſm; and ordered that, for the future, all the eldeſt ſons of his family ſhould be named Nicholas. He lived to above an hundred years of age (1). His only ſon NICHOLAS II, Palatine of Vilna, ſerved the commonwealth very glorioufly under ſix Kings ſucceſſively. He died at fourſcore and nineteen years of age (2). The eldeſt of his four ſons, NICHOLAS III Palatine of Vilna, was created Prince of the Empire by the Emperor Maximilian I; and died full of glory aged above ſeventy years (3). GEORGE RADZIWIL his brother, Palatine of Kiovia, Marſhal of the Court, Caſtellain (a kind of Lieutenant General) of Vilna, and Great General of Lithuania, was father of Barbara Radziwil, ſecond wife to King Sigiſmund Auguſtus. He died in 1565 (4). JOHN RADZIWIL, his brother, the laſt of the four ſons of Nicholas II, was created a Senator of the Kingdom by King Sigiſmund I. He was afterwards Caſtellan of Troci, and at laſt grand Marſhal of Lithuania. He went to Rome under the Pontificate of Julius II (5). He left an only ſon, NICHOLAS RADZIWIL IV of that name (6), who is the ſubject of the preſent article.

(1) Simon Starovolſcius, *in Sarmatiæ Bellatoribus*, p. 163, 164.

(2) Idem, ibid. p. 165, 166.

(3) Idem, ibid. p. 167 *& ſeq.*

(4) Idem, ibid. p. 169, 170.

(5) Idem, ibid. p. 171, 172.

(6) Idem, ibid.

[*B*] *He was carried to the grave on the ſhoulders of his four ſons.*] The reader will ſoon hear their names and employments. Read only the following Latin paſſage: *Quatuor filios, itidem bello inclytos, nec deteriores ingeniis (qui, ut inquit Valerius Maximus patriæ rem non ſuam augere properabant) reliquit. Nicolaum Hieroſolymitana peregrinatione clarum: Georgium, Vilnenſem primò deinde Cracovienſem Epiſcopum, & S. R. E. Cardinalem; Albertum ſupremum M. D. L. Marſalcum: & Staniſlaum Samogitiæ Toparcham: qui cum plurimis lachrymis, patre pro concione laudato funeratoque ampliſſime, propriis manibus Urnam Mauſoleo inferre non erubuerunt* (8). i. e. "He left four ſons famous for their "warlike actions, and no leſs renowned for their "genius, who, as Valerius Maximus ſays, endeavoured to increaſe their country's wealth, and "not their own; theſe were Nicholas, famous for "his travels to Jeruſalem; George, Biſhop of Vilna, "and afterwards of Cracow, and Cardinal; Albert, "Grand Marſhal of the great Dukedom of Lithua-"nia; and Staniſlaus, principal Governor of Samo-"gitia: all theſe having heard, with a flood of "tears, their father's funeral ſermon, were not a-"ſhamed to carry, with their own hands, his body "to the grave, he being buried with great magni-"ficence." Thuanus (9) obſerves, that they all four returned to the Communion of the Church of Rome, and that Albert married a daughter of the Duke of Courland. He fixes the death of Nicholas Radziwil to the 28th of May 1565, as does alſo Bucholcerus in his *Index Chronologicus*. I am to obſerve that David Chytræus (10) relates the ſame particulars as Thuanus. The paſſage I quoted from Simon Starovolſcius informs us, that Nicholas Radziwil, eldeſt ſon of our Nicholas Radziwil, was famous for his journey to Jeruſalem. This obliges me to take notice, that the ſame Author obſerves in another work (11), that Thomas Treterus, Canon of Warmia, tranſlated into Latin the Journey to Jeruſalem of NICHOLAS CHRISTOPHER RADZIWIL (12). This journey was performed in 1584; Nicholas Chriſtopher Radziwil including it in four letters in the Poliſh tongue. I have ſeen the Latin verſion of it printed at Antwerp in 1614. The dedication of Treterus the tranſlator is dated in 1601.

(9) Thuan. lib. 38. p. 769.

(10) David Chytræus, *in Saxonia*, lib. 21. ad ann. 1565. p. 558. edit. Lipſ. 1602.

(11) Staravolſc. *in centum Polonorum Elog.* p. 70, 71.

(12) This is the ſame with our Nicholas Radziwil's eldeſt ſon.

He who performed that journey died in February 1616; and was buried in a pilgrim's habit, in the College of the Jeſuits of Nieſwiez (13). He had been created Prince of the Empire, and left four ſons (14), from one of whom, if I miſtake not, Prince STANISLAUS ALBERT RADZIWIL *deſcended, who was Duke of Olyka and Nieſwiez, Chancellor of the great Dukedom of Lithuania* (15), and Author of a Panegyric of our Lady of Czeſtochovia. He flouriſhed at the ſame time that Le Labourer publiſhed the relation of a journey to Poland, that is, in 1647.

(13) Staravolſc. *in Bellatoribus Sarmatiæ*, p. 176.

(14) Idem, ibid.

(15) Le Laboureur, *Relation de Pologne*, part. 3. p. 25.

[*C*] *He cauſed the bible to be printed in the poliſh language.*] Nicholas Oleſnicki, as I obſerved elſewhere (16), eſtabliſhed the Proteſtant Religion in Pinczovia, at Stancarius's deſire. In the ſame place was alſo ſettled a ſchool which was a nurſery of learned men. John Laſcus, George Blandrata, Francis Liſmaninus, Martin Crovicius, Peter Statorius, George Schoman, Gregory Pauli, Brelius, Triceſſius, and ſome others, rendered it ſo flouriſhing that Pinczovia was then looked upon as the Athens of Poland (17). It was there that thoſe learned perſons tranſlated the whole bible into the vulgar tongue. Their tranſlation was printed at Breſt in Lithuania at the expence of our Nicholas Radziwil. He was Governor of the Royal City, and had ſet up a printing-houſe there. David's Pſalms, a collection of ſpiritual ſongs, and ſome other works of the ſame kind, were printed at the ſame place, and greatly contributed to the converſion of the people. My Author's words are as follow: *Ibi* (Pinczoviæ) *à Viris illis piis & doctis univerſa Biblia Sacra in Linguam vernaculum tranſlata, ſumptibus Nicolai Radzivilii Palatini Vilnenſis Principis Magnificentiſſimi & Fortiſſimi renaſcentis veritatis vindicis impreſſa ſunt Breſtiæ Lithuanorum. Huic enim urbi Regiæ Præfectus datus erat, in qua comparatam privato ære officinam typographicam condiderat, & illi Wojewodæ Cracoviâ evocato commiſerat. Ibidem exſcriptus fuit liber Pſalmorum & Hymnorum aliique ejus notæ, quorum lectione populus à Romanis ſuperſtitionibus ad veram Dei colendi rationem revocabatur* (18). This Author obſerves (19), that this impreſſion of the bible was finiſhed in 1563, and that it was the firſt verſion made of the Scriptures into the Poliſh tongue. He adds, that it was followed by another in 1572, compoſed by Simon Budæus, and that of the New Teſtament, five years after, by Martin Czechovicius. It is to be obſerved, that the tranſlators of the bible, printed at the expence of Nicholas Radziwil (20, were but five in number, according to John Lætus (21). Theſe were Orſacius, Zazius, Triceſius, James Lubelſcius, and Statorius.

(16) In the art. STANCARUS.

(17) *Ita ut tunc Pinczovia, velut Athena Sarmatica celebraretur.* Staniſlaus Lubieniecius, Hiſt. Reformat. Polonicæ, lib. 1. cap. 5, p. 33.

(18) Staniſl. Lubieniecius, *Hiſt. Reform. Polon.* lib. 1. cap. 5. p. 33.

(19) Idem, ibid. lib. 3. cap. 1. p. 170.

(20) He laid out ten thouſand florins on that occaſion. Jo. Lætus, *ubi infra.*

(21) Jo. Lætus, *in Compend. Hiſt. Univerſ.* p. m. 412. He cites Laſicius, lib. 5. Chytræus, *in Sax.* ad ann. 65.

[*D*] *He anſwered with the utmoſt ſharpneſs and ſeverity Lippoman the Apoſtolical Nuncio, who had ſpoke to him*

(c) Regenſvolſc. *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Slavonicar.* p. 142.

(d) Elizabeth Sidlowieski.

(e) David Chytræus, *in* Saxonia, lib. 15. p. 393.

Vilna not permitting the Proteſtant Miniſters to preach in churches, he made them preach in the yard of his houſe, oppoſite to St. John's church (*b*). The firſt Proteſtant Synod was held, under his protection, at Vilna, in December 1557 (*c*). His Lady (*d*) aſſiſted him very zealouſly in endeavouring to ſettle the reformation (*e*). At this time one CHRISTOPHER RADZIWIL turned Proteſtant; and it is ſaid, that his change was owing to ſome impoſtures of the Monks which had been diſcovered [*E*]. Others call him Nicholas (*f*), and ſay that he was firſt couſin to the Gentleman who is the ſubject of the preſent article; and brother to Barbara Radziwil, who married Sigiſmund Auguſtus,

(b) David Chytræus, *in* Saxonia, lib. 15. p. 393.

(f) See the cloſe of the rem. [*E*].

him very reproachful terms.] I am perſuaded that the reader will be well pleaſed to find part of that anſwer here. *Apoſtaſia cum ei non ſine conviciis à* Lippomano Pontificis Legato *exprobraretur, eidem docta* Apologia *reſpondit, fidei ſuæ rationem dedit, inter alia vero:* Certum tibi eſſe volo, ſic me nunc doctiſſimorum virorum videndorum deſiderio teneri, ut ſi ſcirem me eos, aut alios etiam ex præcipuis illis qui ſunt in Germania, Melanchthones, Brentios, poſſe in mea poſtulata aliquomodo pertrahere, in eo vel præcipuè, non ſervitoris tantum mittendi laborem conferendum, ſed etiam omnes opes facultateſque meas eſſe mihi experiendas putarem: quos quia per inſignem malitiam hæreticos appellas, omnium Hæreticorum, quos orbis terrarum habet, maxime Hereticus es (22). i. e. "*When Lippomanus, the Pope's Nuncio,* "*branded him in moſt opprobrious terms with being an* "*Apoſtate; he anſwered him by a learned apology,* "*wherein he gave the reaſon of his faith, and ſaid,* "*among other particulars*; I would have you to know, "that I have ſo earneſt a deſire to ſee and converſe "with the moſt learned men, that if I knew it was "poſſible for me to prevail with them, or others "ſo famous in Germany, as Melanchthon and Brentius, to acquieſce with my requeſt; I then ſhould "look upon it as incumbent on me, not only to "ſend a ſervant for that purpoſe, but likewiſe to "ſpend my whole eſtate; and as you, through the "moſt inverate malice, call theſe men heretics, you "yourſelf are the greateſt heretic in the world for "ſo doing." The latter he received from Lippomanus, and his anſwer to it was printed at Koinſberg in 1556 (23).

(22) Jo. Lætus, &c. p. 390, 391.

(23) Regenſvolſcius, *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Slavonicar.* p. 142.

[*E*] *It is ſaid, that his* (Chriſtopher Radziwil's) *change was owing to ſome impoſtures of the Monks which had been diſcovered.*] When the Reformation began to be eſtabliſhed in Lithuania, this Chriſtopher Radziwil being extremely *ſorry that a Prince of his family,* embraced that religion, he went to Rome, and *paid all imaginable honours* to the Pope. *The Roman Pontiff being alſo deſirous of indulging his kindneſs to him, gave him, at his departure, a box filled with relicks. Being returned to his houſe, and the news of theſe relicks being ſpread abroad, certain Friers, ſome months after, came and told this Prince, that a man was poſſeſſed with the devil, who had been exorciſed to no purpoſe. They therefore beſought him, for the ſake of that unhappy wretch, to lend them the precious relicks which he had brought from Rome. The Prince granted them very readily, upon which they were carried to Church in ſolemn pomp, all the Monks going in proceſſion on that occaſion. At laſt they were laid on the altar; and, at the day appointed, a numberleſs multitude of people flocking to this ſhew, after the uſual exorciſms, the relicks were applied. At that very inſtant the pretended evil ſpirit came out of the body of the man, with the uſual poſtures and grimaces. Every one cried out, a miracle! And the Prince lifted up his hands and eyes to Heaven, to return thanks for his having brought ſo holy a thing, which performed ſuch miracles. But ſome days after, as he was in that admiration and tranſport of joy, and was beſtowing the higheſt elogiums on the virtue of thoſe relicks, he obſerved that a young Gentleman of his houſhold, who had the keeping that rich treaſure, began to ſmile, and made certain geſtures, which ſhewed he only laughed at his words* (24). The Prince flew into a paſſion, and would know the reaſon of his deriſion. A promiſe being made to the Gentleman that no harm ſhould be done him, he declared ſecretly to the Prince, "that in their return from "Rome, he had loſt the box of relicks, which "had been given him to keep; and that not daring "to divulge this, for fear of puniſhment, he had "found means to get one like it, which he had "filled with the little bones of beaſts, and ſuch "trifles as reſembled the relicks he had loſt. That "ſeeing ſo much honour was paid to that vile heap "of filth, and that they even aſcribed to it the virtue of driving away devils, he had juſt cauſe to "wonder at it. The Prince believed this ſtory to "be true; and nevertheleſs, being deſirous of geting farther light into this impoſture, he ſent for "the Monks the very next day, and deſired them "to enquire, whether there were no more Demoniacks who wanted the aſſiſtance of his relicks. "A few days after they brought him another man "poſſeſſed with an evil ſpirit, who acted the ſame "part with him who had appeared before. The "Prince commanded him to be exorciſed in his "preſence; but as all the exorciſms which are "uſually employed on thoſe occaſions proved ineffectual, he ordered that man to ſtay in his palace "the next day, and bid the Monks withdraw. After they were gone, he put the Demoniac among "his Tartarian grooms, who, purſuant to the orders "which had been given them, firſt exhorted him "to confeſs the cheat: but as he perſiſted obſtinately in it, ſtill making his furious and dreadful geſtures, fix of them chaſtiſed him ſo ſeverely "with rods and ſcourges, that he was obliged to implore the Prince's mercy, who pardoned him the "inſtant he had confeſſed the truth. The next "morning the Prince ſent for the Friers, when the "wretch in queſtion throwing himſelf at his feet, proteſted that he was not poſſeſſed, and had never been "ſo, but that thoſe Friers had forced him to act "the part of one who was ſo. The Monks, at "firſt, beſought the Prince not to believe this; ſaying that it was an artifice of the devil who ſpoke "through that man's mouth. But the Prince anſwered, that if the Tartarians had been able to "force the devil to tell truth, they would alſo be "able to extort it from the mouth of thoſe Friers. "But now theſe Monks, ſeeing themſelves put to it "in this manner, confeſſed the impoſture, ſaying, "that they had done all this with a good intention, "and to check the progreſs of Hereſy. But the "Prince offered up his hearty praiſes to God, for "having been ſo gracious as to diſcover ſuch an "impoſture; and now entertaining a ſuſpicion of "a religion, which was defended by ſuch diabolical "practices, though they went by the name of *pious* "*frauds*, ſaid, that he would no longer depend on "any perſon for his ſalvation; and thereupon began "to read the Scriptures with unparallel'd aſſiduity. "In ſix months time, all which he ſpent in reading and prayer, he made a wonderful progreſs "in piety, and in the knowledge of the myſtery of "the Goſpel. After which he himſelf, with his "whole family, publickly profeſſed his religion in "1564 (25)." This paſſage is from Mr. Drelincourt, Miniſter of the Proteſtant Church in Paris. It is related in an anſwer publiſhed by him in 1663, to the letter which Prince Erneſt, Landgrave of Heſſe, had writ to the five Proteſtant Miniſters of Paris; and he adds the following words (26): *Your Highneſs may give credit to it, if you judge proper: but I proteſt to you, the ſame as if I was before the Almighty's throne, that this ſtory was told me in this manner, by the Miniſter belonging to Prince Januſſius* Radziwil; *nay, he delivered to me in writing, part of what he told me, and which he explained to me more at large by word of mouth.*

(24) Drelincourt, *Reponſe au Prince Erneſt Landgrave de Heſſe*, p. 357.

(25) Drelinc. &c. p. 359 & *ſeq.*

(26) Ibid. p. 362.

Regenſvolſcius (27) gives the name of Nicholas Radziwil, to him, whom the diſcovery of a monkiſh impoſture prompted to quit the Popiſh errors in 1564;

(27) Regenſvolſcius, *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Slavonicar.* p. 145.

Auguſtus, King of Poland, who died the 12th of May 1551. They obſerve that the Church he built for the Proteſtants in Vilna, of which he was Palatine, was honoured with a noble privilege by King Stephen Battori in 1579, and that he died the 27th of April 1584; that Nicholas and Chriſtopher RADZIWIL, his two ſons, continued in the religion in which he had brought them up, and that their deſcendants preſerved that ſacred *Depoſitum*, as an invaluable treaſure (*g*) [*F*].

(*g*) *Ex eodem* Regenſvolſc. *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Slavonic.* p. 144, 145.

1564; but he does not take any notice, either of his journey to Rome, or of thoſe relicks. He only ſays that the Monks of Czenſtochovia (28) had ſuborned a pretended Demoniac, during the time that Nicholas Radziwil was on a pilgrimage, for the performance of which he had made a vow, after obtaining a great victory over the Muſcovites.

(28) See La Laboureur, *Relat. de Pologne*, part. 3. p. 18 & *ſeq.* concerning the miraculous image of the bleſſed virgin, honoured in this place.

[*F*] *Their deſcendants preſerved that ſacred* depoſition, *as an invaluable treaſure.*] NICHOLAS RADZIWIL, Palatine of Novogrod, was the father of GEORGE, who died Caſtellan of Troki in 1614, and left no children. CHRISTOPHER RADZIWIL, brother of this Nicolas, was Palatine of Vilna, and died in 1604, leaving two ſons, JANUSSIUS and CHRISTOPHER. Januſſius Duke of Bierze, and Caſtellan of Vilna, died in 1621, aged forty two years. He had by his wife, who was the daughter of the Elector of Brandeburg's daughter, a ſon named BOGESLAUS. His brother Chriſtopher, Palatine of Vilna, Grand Marſhal of Lithuania, died the 19th of September 1640, aged 55 years, and left an only ſon named JANUSSIUS, who was great Chamberlain of Lithuania. This Bogeſlaus, and Januſſius RADZIWIL, couſin Germans, were living, and profeſſed the Proteſtant Religion, at the time that the Author whom I cite (29), wrote his book about the year 1650. We were informed by the News-papers, in the beginning of the year 1681, that Princeſs LOUISA RADZIWIL, being fourteen years of age, married Prince Lewis, ſecond ſon by the Elector of Brandeburg, at Koniſberg the 7th of January 1681, that ſhe was the only daughter of the late Prince Bogeſlaus, and poſſeſſed in Lithuania, a Dukedom, above forty leagues in extent, on the Frontiers of Livonia, with two fortreſſes. She was a Proteſtant; but after the death of Prince Lewis of Brandeburg, ſhe was married again in 1688, to a ſon of the Elector Palatine, and turned Roman Catholick. It had been reported, that there were ſome thoughts of marrying her to Prince James, ſon to John Sobieſki King of Poland.

(29) Regenſvolſcus, *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Slavonicar.* p. 145, 146.

RAIMARUS (NICHOLAS), an Aſtronomer of the 16th Century. See URIUS.

RAMUS (PETER), in French *de la Ramée*, was one of the moſt famous Profeſſors of the 16th Century. He was born in a village in Vermandois, in Picardy, in anno 1515 (*a*). His grandfather withdrew to that Province after having loſt all his poſſeſſions, at the time that his native place, in the territory of Liege, was reduced to aſhes [*A*], by the laſt Duke of Burgundy. He was obliged to earn his livelihood, during the remainder

(*a*) Theophilus Banoſius, *in Vita Petri Rami*, p. 2.

[*A*] *His native place in the territory of Liege was reduced to aſhes.*] This is not conformable either to Moreri or Teiſſier. The former ſays, *that Ramus's grandfather had been forced, during the wars, to leave Burgundy*, and that *he retired to the Vermandois*; the latter ſays (1), that Peter Ramus *was deſcended from a noble family, which came originally from the town of Evreaux; for his grandfather having been drove from his native country, and diſpoſſeſſed of his eſtate by the Burgundians, flew for ſhelter to the Vermandois.* Thus, according to Moreri, Ramus's grandfather was a Burgundian; but according to Teiſſier, a Norman. Now I can anſwer my readers that he was neither, he being a native of the territory of Liege, and this I prove in the following manner. *Parentes Rami agricolæ fuerunt pauperrimi. Avus certe, ut ipſe commemorat in Præfatione Regiæ ſuæ profeſſionis, in Eburonum gente familia in primis illuſtri fuit: ſed patria à Carolo Burgundionum duce capta, & incenſa, in Veromanduorum agrum profugus, ob paupertatem carbonariam artem exercuit* (2). i. e. " Ramus's parents were very " poor huſbandmen. His grandfather, as he him- " ſelf informs us, was certainly of a moſt illuſ- " trious family in Liege; but his native country be- " ing ſeized upon and burnt by Charles Duke of " Burgundy, he fled to the Vermandois, where he " was in ſuch miſerable circumſtances, that he was " forced to turn collier to ſupport himſelf." We find, by all good Geographers, that the *Eburones* are the ſame people as the inhabitants of Liege. [As Bayle ſays that Ramus was born in 1515, " he, at " that rate, was but 57 years of age when he loſt " his life in the maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's-Day; " but it is my opinion that he was a great deal older. " The time of Ramus's birth is of importance, " becauſe many perſons imagine that he had diſtin- " guiſhed himſelf very early, particularly in his diſ- " pute with Govea, &c. My proofs are as follow. " I. Cayet who had known him at Paris, and been " acquainted with him whilſt he was Profeſſor, ſays " expreſsly in his *Navarreide* (in the annotations, p. " 17.) *it is written that Ramus died a bachelor aged " ſeventy years.* Cayet makes a long elogium of " him, p. 672. II. *Du Boulay*, Tom. VI. p. 967. " ſays, *Ramus Academiæ nomen dedit*, an. 1527. Now " it is not at all probable that he was but twelve " years old at that time. There is no reaſon to " doubt but that du Boulay ſpeaks truth, ſince Ramus " himſelf in his *Actio prima* of 1566, ſays that he " had ſeen and heard, during near forty years, what " paſſed in that Univerſity: *Multa per annos fere " quadraginta in Academia Pariſienſi vidi & audivi.* " I do not know that the names of ſuch ſcholars " are written in the Univerſity books, as are but in " the ſixth and other low claſſes, but only the Phi- " loſophers, &c. III. Ramus informs us that he had " many misfortunes in his youth, &c. of which " Bayle himſelf takes notice. Would it therefore be " probable, that he was put to ſchool at twelve years " of age, that he purſued his ſtudies afterwards " without interruption, &c? IV. Ramus, in his *Actio " ſecunda* againſt Charpentier, in March 1566. expa- " tiated on his ſilver hair and his old age, (pag. " 22.) *Rami canos . . . . & annos*, &c. imagining " that theſe would make his adverſaries reverence " him. If we ſuppoſe him ſixty four years of age, " he would have ſpoke with propriety; but on the " contrary, he muſt have expreſſed himſelf very ri- " diculouſly, had he been but fifty one or fifty two " years old. It is to be obſerved that Charpentier " his adverſary, againſt whom he oppoſed his *white " hair and his age* as a buckler, had, at that " time, been upwards of twenty two years Profeſſor " in the Univerſity in queſtion; and conſequently " forty five years old, or thereabouts, at leaſt. Un- " leſs a man ſhould doat before he comes to old age, " would ſuch a man, becauſe he was fifty two years " old, lay any ſtreſs upon *his old age*, to get the bet- " ter of a cauſe over an adverſary, who was forty " five at leaſt? V. Charpentier in his ſpeech againſt " Ramus, ſpeaks of him as an old man who might " be allowed to doat becauſe of his advanced age. " See page 4. of *Jacobi Carpentarii . . . contra impor- " tunas Rami actiones . . . . . Oratio habita initio pro- " feſſionis* (Mathematicæ) *in Auditorio regio an.* 1566. " *Cal. April.* He there ſays, *Ramum qui* ÆTATIS " *beneficio Regii Gymnaſii Decanus*, &c. And page 51. " *Ramo* JAM GRANDI ÆTATE *erat, conſiderandum*, " &c. He ſays, page 12. that meeting Ramus, he " had ſaluted him, imagining that he owed that " reſpect

(1) Teiſſier, *Addit. à Monſr. de Thou*, Tom. 1. p. 371. edit. 1699.

(2) Theophilus Banoſius, *in Vita Petri Rami*, p. 2.

mainder of his days, by making and ſelling coal. He left a ſon, who got his bread by following huſbandry (*b*), and was the father of our Ramus, that is, of a man who was the ſport of fortune; his life being one perpetual viciſſitude of proſperity and adverſity. A thirſt of learning having prompted him at eight years of age, to go to Paris (*c*); he was forced by poverty to leave that city; but returned to it as ſoon as he could, when being unable to ſupport himſelf, he left it a ſecond time; but his paſſion for ſtudy was ſo violent, that notwithſtanding he had been unfortunate in two journies, he yet went once again to look for a place in that city. He was maintained there during ſome months by one of his uncles, after which he was obliged to be a ſervant in the College of Navarre [*B*]. Spending the day in waiting upon his maſters, and the greateſt part of the

(*b*) *Ex eodem* Theophilo Banoſio, *in Vita Petri Rami*, p. 2.

(*c*) Ibid. p. 3.

" reſpect to his long beard, and his advanced age, " *&c. quod exiſtimarem* hoc *ætati & barbæ deberi*, " &c. Ramus did not return him the bow, nor to " thoſe who accompanied him, among whom was " Leger du Cheſne *(Leodegarius à Quercu)* and were " ſurpriſed, on that occaſion, at SENIS *ineptias*, &c. " All thoſe people were acquainted with Ramus, and " particularly Charpentier, who, as I have already " obſerved, had been a Profeſſor ever ſince October " 1543. I believe they do not know very exactly " Ramus's age, and that they perhaps thought him " older by ſome years than he really was; but then " it is no ways probable, that he was ſo far miſtaken " as thoſe are who fix his birth at 1515. VI. John " Dorat, who was one of Ramus's adverſaries in " that quarrel, wrote the year following 1567, a ſa- " tyr upon him, entitled, *Decanatus, Hoc eſt in Petrum* " *Ramum Decanatum Collegii Profeſſorum Regiorum ſibi* " *vindicantem.* We there find that Ramus called " himſelf Dean of the Royal College, not only be- " cauſe he was at that time the moſt ancient Pro- " feſſor, but becauſe he was the oldeſt of them all. " He pretended alſo, as he was Dean, to be thereby " entitled to a kind of ſuperiority, or juriſdiction, " imagining himſelf to have a right to examine the " Profeſſors, *&c.* Our Poet in his anger, as he him- " ſelf confeſſes by the hemiſtich which he joins to " his piece, GENUS *irritabile vatum*, alludes pleaſant- " ly enough to the names of his two antagoniſts, " *Charpentier* and *Ramus*, ſignifying *branch*, &c.

" *Tua ligna tortuoſa*
" ANNOSA CARIOSA DE SENECTA
" (Carpentarius) . . . . LABORE *pertinaci*
" *Runcinat, dolat atque deſcobinat,*
" *Planat, lævigat, aſciat, remulcat,*
" *Torquet, dirigit, exigit bicrucis*
" *Ad normæ juga, pendulamque amuſſim*
" *Aptat, denique circinat, terebrat,*
" *Et quæ cætera nota ſunt tibi ipſi*
" *Ex Fabri patrui tibi officina,*
" *A quo prima rudis tibi atque craſſa*
" *Monſtrata eſt* PURO *Matheſis*;
" *De qua tu tamen ipſe diſciplina*
" *Te jactans* SENIOR *ſuperbienſque*, &c.

" Theſe are all the terms, which denote what is done " by a carpenter, who intends to employ in ſome " work, the bough of a tree that is quite worm- " eaten through age. Dorat ſays, *& cætera quæ*, " &c. becauſe he ſuppoſes that Ramus underſtood all " the terms of the trade; he having been brought up " at an uncle's, a carpenter, who taught him ſome " of the lower parts of the mathematicks. (It ap- " pears by the remark [*B*] hereunder of Bayle, that " this uncle of Ramus's was named Carpentier, but " Dorat ſuppoſes it was his trade. See Dorat, pag. " 282.) Dorat indeed does not ſay that Ramus was " the oldeſt of all the Profeſſors, but then he does " not deny it. He contents himſelf with ſaying to " him, that if he is the oldeſt, he is not therefore " the wiſer, p. 278.

" . . . . *Nec unus inter illos* (ſodales)
" *Unus fortè vetuſtior, nec unus* (es)
" *Ni longa, ſapientior, bifurcæ*
" *Barbæ canitie. Si ecce contra*
" *Te tuamque ſenilitatem*
" *Reclamat* . . . . . .
" *Mens tua nec ſatis ſenilis*
" *Et pluſquam pueriliter ſuperba* . , . .

" And page 283.

" *Audes tam tibi tamen placere*
" *Ut noſter ſtudeas Decanus eſſe*
" *Cum non ſis ſenior, ſaniorve,*
" *Vel quamvis ſenior, tamen cerebro*
" *Nullos de ſeniere ſat ſeniles*
" *Senſus dictaque proferas* . . . .

And page 287.

" . . . . . *Heus tu*
" *Longa canitie ſenex verende* . . . . .
" *Et vis ut ſenior Decanus eſſe* . . . . .

" Ramus's collegues at that time were, John le " Mercier, John de cinq Arbres, Denys Lambin, du " Hamel &c. If Leger du Cheſne, who certainly " was his collegue in 1568, was the ſame in that " year 1567, Dorat had juſt reaſon to doubt whe- " ther Ramus was really the oldeſt of the profeſſors " as he pretended to be, for Du Cheſne was in 1701. " After all, I believe that every one who reads what " Dorat ſays of Ramus's advanced age, (Dorat might " have known him thirty years) muſt ſuppoſe Ramus " to have been at that time more than 51 or 52 " years of age. By the way Dorat looked upon " Ramus as much older than himſelf. Bayle could " not anſwer this laſt circumſtance, which forms an " argument *ad hominem* againſt him. [According " to Bayle, whom I refuted under the Article DAU- " RAT, the latter was born in 1507, conſequently " he muſt, according to Bayle, have been eight " years older than Ramus. But I do not lay any " ſtreſs on this, becauſe I proved, in the ſame place, " that Dorat was not born till the year 1517 *."]

* From the remarks to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 979, 980.

[*B*] *He was obliged to be a ſervant in the College of Navarre.*] I have followed Banoſius, and not Joſeph Scaliger. The latter pretends that Ramus was a ſervant when he went to Paris (3). *Ramus ad annum uſque decimum nonum, ne quidem primas notas didicerat, inſerviebatque Dom. de la Broſſe* (4). *Lutetiam deductus tantum famulus profecit maximo diſcendi deſiderio percitus, ut quamvis repugnante ingenio tardo, rudi & ſtupido; repugnante, quod majus eſt, inſtitutione ſera: labore & diligentia in id litterarum decus pervenerit, quò pervenire vix credibile ſit, ita ut anno trigeſimo contra Ariſtotelem ſcripſerit meliori ſtylo quam poſterioribus annis.* i. e. " Ramus did not know his letters, when he was " nineteen years old, and was Mr. de la Broſſe's ſer- " vant. Though brought to Paris only in quality of " a ſervant, he yet was fired with ſo ſtrong a thirſt " for learning, that though he was of a ſlow and hea- " vy genius, and what was a ſtill greater obſtacle, did " not apply himſelf to ſtudy till late; yet by his care " and pains, he attained to ſuch a perfection in " learning as is almoſt incredible; inſomuch that he " wrote, in the thirtieth year of his age, againſt " Ariſtotle in a better ſtyle than in his riper years." I can ſcarce believe all that we are here told by the great Scaliger; it is no ways probable that Ramus lived till the age of nineteen (5) without being able to read, nor that he was dull and heavy in his underſtanding. Be this as it will, he was not thirty when he began to write againſt Ariſtotle; his book, after a thouſand conteſts, was condemned the 10th of May 1543, at which time he was but eight and twenty. I therefore ſhould chooſe to credit Banoſius, who relates that Ramus, at eight years of age, came to Paris of his own accord, &c. *Anno ætatis ſuæ circiter octavo ſponte Lutetiam venit, & inde bis abductus violentia temporis, bis eodem tamen, quam libet reflantib. ventis reverſus, & ardenti diſcendi ſtudio incenſus, ab Honorato Carpenterio avunculo victum per aliquot menſes perexiguum accepit, ut artes addiſceret: deinceps neceſſitate*

(3) *Scaligerana prim*, p. 127.

(4) Teiſſier, *Addit.* Tom. 1. p. 371, imagines that Scaliger ſpeaks of a Lady; but *Dom.* is the contraction of *Domini* as well as *Dominæ*.

(5) Teiſſier, ib. citing the *Scaligerana* 1. ſays only nine years.

the night in ſtudy (*d*), he made ſo conſiderable a progreſs, that when he took his Maſter of Arts Degree, he offered to maintain a quite oppoſite doctrine to that of Ariſtotle, or whatever might be objected to him (*e*) [*C*]; but it muſt be obſerved that, before this, he had gone through a courſe of Philoſophy, which took him up three years and a half in the ſchools (*f*). He anſwered extremely well the objections which were made him during a whole day. This ſucceſs gave him an inclination to examine the doctrine of Ariſtotle more cloſely, and to combat it vigorouſly; but he applied himſelf to little more than the improving the ſcience of logic: all his ſtudy was directed to that, and even all the lectures of eloquence which he uſed to read to his pupils (*g*). The two firſt books he publiſhed, the one entitled, *Inſtitutiones Dialecticæ*, the other *Ariſtotelicæ Animadverſiones*, occaſioned great diſturbances in the Univerſity of Paris [*D*]: and Francis I. was obliged to intermeddle in this affair; and to bring before himſelf the cauſe carrying

(*d*) *Ex eodem*, ib.

(*e*) Jo. Thomas Freigius, *in Vita Petri Rami*, p. m. 10.

(*f*) Idem, ibid.

(*g*) Idem, p. 10 and 11.

tate coactus multos annos duram ſervitutem in collegio Navarræ ſervivit. Sed quum interdiu dominis ſuis fidelem operam præſtitiſſet, nocte, Cleanthis Philoſophi exemplo non diſſimili, oleo & lucerna diſciplinarum lumen brevi tempore tantum ſibi comparavit, ut artium liberalium laurea ſit donatus (6). i. e. "When he was about "eight years of age, he travelled to Paris of his own "accord; and though drove twice from thence by "the violent commotions, he yet returned twice to "that city, though very much oppoſed by fortune; "when being fired with a ſtrong thirſt for learning, "he contented himſelf with being ſlenderly ſubſiſted, during ſome months, by Honoratus Charpentier his uncle, in order to have an opportunity of "attaining the liberal ſciences. Neceſſity afterwards "obliged him to undergo, during many years, a hard "ſervice in the College of Navarre. But as he uſed "to diſcharge his duty faithfully to his maſters in "the day-time, ſo, in the night, in imitation of "Cleanthes the Philoſopher, he, by the aſſiſtance of "his oil and lamp, made ſo great a progreſs in a "ſhort time in the liberal arts, that he was admitted "to a degree in the Univerſity." But here follows a ſtrong proof againſt Banoſius, which I borrow from Ramus's own words, as related by John Freigius. *Confiteor vitam mihi totam acerbiſſimis fluctibus jactatam eſſe. Puer vix è cunis egreſſus duplici peſte laboravi: juvenis invita modiſque omnibus repugnante fortuna Lutetiam ad capeſſendas artes ingenuas veni, inde bis abductus violentia temporis, bis eodem tamen quamlibet reflantibus ventis reverſus, atque eò ardentiore diſcendi ſtudio incenſus, quò vehementius prohibebar* (7). i. e. "I will "own that all my life has been the ſport of ill "fortune. When but a child I laboured under a "double calamity; and when I was grown up, and "a young man, I came to Paris to learn the liberal "arts, fortune being my enemy in all reſpects. "Though I was drove twice from that city by the "commotions which then raged, I nevertheleſs returned twice thither, though in the moſt unhappy "circumſtances, and was fired with the ſtronger "thirſt for learning, in proportion as I was prevented from ſatiating it." If Ramus was but eight years old the firſt time he went to Paris, would he have employed the word *juvenis?* would he not have made uſe of the word *puer?* Surely not. [As Bayle ſays above that Ramus, after having been ſubſiſted ſome months by his uncle, was a ſervant in the College of Navarre, this ſeems to prove very ſtrongly, that he was not then a boy of only twelve years old; for what ſervice could a child of that age do in a College, &c (*)?]

(6) Banoſius, *in Vita Petri Rami*, p. 3.

(7) Joh. Th. Freigius, *in Vita Petri Rami*, p. 7. *ex Scheckiano epilogo Rami.*

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 980. col. 1.

[*C*] *He offered to maintain a doctrine quite oppoſite to that of Ariſtotle, on whatever might be objected to him.*] Taſſoni looks upon this as a great boldneſs. *Ma più audace*, ſays he (8), *fu la prova di Pietro Ramo, autore per altro poco degno d'eſſere nominato. Queſti dovendo ſecondo l'uſo di Parigi ſoſtener concluſioni prima che foſſe creato Maeſtro, per bizarria d'ingegno propoſe queſta ſola a qualunque voleſſe argumentare, dando libero campo à tutti.* Quæcunque ab Ariſtotele dicta ſint, falſa, & commentitia eſſe. *La quale havendo eccitati contra di lui tutti gl'ingegni, tutte le profeſſioni, tutte le ſcuole; egli nondimeno con tanta protezza, e ſottigliezza di riſpoſte la diſeſe, che fe remaner confuſa e ſtupita la Città di Parigi: E ben ne' ſuoi libri appariſcono ancora i ſegni della ſua audacia.* i. e. "But bolder ſtill was the proof given "by Peter Ramus, an author, in other reſpects, not "worthy of being mentioned. This man being, according to the cuſtom of Paris, to maintain ſome "theſes before he took his Maſter of Arts degree, "was ſo whimſical as to maintain the following "doctrine to whomſoever ſhould oppoſe it, that "*whatever Ariſtotle has advanced is falſe and feigned.* "This having made all ſorts of ſcholars, men of "every profeſſion, and all the ſchools his enemies, "he nevertheleſs defended himſelf with ſo much "quickneſs and ſubtlety, that the whole city of Paris "was ſurprized and confounded; and the marks of "his boldneſs are ſtill ſeen in his writings." The beſt of all is, he does not deny but that the reſpondent defended this theſis with ſo much ſubtlety, that all Paris was ſurprized. Here follows what Freigius relates concerning this adventure. *Lutetiæ magiſterii titulum ſuſcepturus, pro more & conſuetudine ſcholarum liberam diſputandi copiam examinatoribus facere cogebatur. Problema igitur ſumpſit: Quæcunque ab Ariſtotele dicta eſſent, commentitia eſſe. Attoniti novitate & inſolentia problematis Magiſtri, cùm authoritatem Ariſtotelis (qua tanquam ſcuto ſeſe ad omnes inſultus muniri conſueverunt) ſibi ereptam viderent, irrito conatu per diem integrum, Magiſtrandum (ut barbari barbarè vocant) oppugnarunt. Ex hoc fortuito ſucceſſu anſam deinceps ſeriò & liberè in Ariſtotelem animadvertendi & inquirendi arripuit* (9). i. e. "When he was going to take "his Maſter of Art's Degree in Paris, he was "forced, purſuant to the cuſtom of the ſchools, "to give the examiners full liberty of diſputing "with him. He therefore advanced the following "problem; that *whatever Ariſtotle has advanced is* "*falſe*. Our Maſters or Profeſſors being ſurpriſed at "the novelty and inſolence of ſuch a problem, "as they ſaw that they were going to be diſpoſſeſſed of the authority of Ariſtotle, which they "uſed to make uſe of as a ſhield, to defend themſelves againſt all attacks; they in vain employed "a whole day to prevent his taking his Maſter's "Degree: and from this accidental ſucceſs he afterwards took an occaſion to enquire ſeriouſly and "freely into Ariſtotle's opinions." [I very much doubt, 1ſt, That he offered to maintain an oppoſite doctrine, &c. 2dly, That his examination laſted *a whole* day. I am firmly perſuaded, that, beſides that this is the uſual cuſtom, he would not, in that caſe, have been admitted to his Maſter's Degree *.

(9) Freigius, *in Vita Petri Rami*, p. 9, 10.

* See the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 980. col. 1.

[*D*] *The two firſt books he publiſhed . . . . occaſioned great diſturbances in the Univerſity of Paris.*] The Profeſſors of Paris, who were admirers of Ariſtotle, ought to have refuted Ramus's books by writings and lectures; but inſtead of confining themſelves within the juſt bounds of academical wars, they proſecuted that Anti-peripatetic before the civil Magiſtrate, as a man who was going to ſap all the foundations of religion. They raiſed ſuch clamours, that the cauſe was carried before the Parliament of Paris; but the moment they perceived it would be examined equitably, and according to the uſual forms, they, by their intrigues, took it from that tribunal, and brought it before the King's Council. *Vix Ariſtotelicæ animadverſiones lectæ erant, cum Petrus Ramus repente non ad humanam aliquam, & literis uſitatam diſputationem ab Academia vocatur, ſed ad Prætorii tribunalis capitalem contentionem per certos homines falſo Academiæ nomine rapitur, novique & ante hunc diem inauditi criminis accuſatur, quòd Ariſtoteli repugnando Theologiam & artes enervaret. Hac enim oratione Ariſtotelea actio inſtituta eſt. Hinc Ariſtoteleorum clamoribus agitatus ad ſummum Pariſienſis Curiæ conſilium traducitur: deinde cum legitimo judicii more res agi, atque apertiùs iniquiſſimæ fraudis invidia percipi videretur, novis artibus à Senatu Pariſienſi ad regiam*

carrying on in the Parliament at Paris, between Ramus and Anthony Govea. Judges were aſſigned to the parties, to pronounce on their controverſy after they ſhould have ended

(10) Audomarus Talæus, in ſua *ad Carolum Lotharingium Cardinalem Academia*, apud *Launoium de varia Ariſtotelis fortuna*, p. 57, 58. Paris 1653.

cognitionem disjicitur (10). i. e. " Ramus's animad- " verſions on Ariſtotle had ſcarce been read, but he " was ſent for, not by the Univerſity to diſpute on " ſome learned ſubject as uſual; but was dragged " by certain perſons who falſely called themſelves " the Univerſity, and carried to the Judge, before " whom he was impeached of a new, and till then, " unheard of crime, *viz.* that he weakened divi- " nity and the liberal arts, by his oppoſing Ariſtotle; " the Ariſtotelian pleading begun with this " ſpeech. It was brought from hence, by the cla- " mours of the Ariſtotelians, before the Parliament " of Paris; but thoſe afterwards perceiving, that " the cauſe would be tried there legally, and that their " abominable frauds were diſcovered more and more, " they got it removed, by new artifices, from the " Parliament of Paris to his Majeſty's Council." The King ordained, *that Anthony Govea, who had offered to oppoſe and refute the ſaid books, and the ſaid Ramus who ſupported and defended them, ſhould nominate and chooſe, each of them reſpectively, two worthy men well ſkilled in Greek and Latin, and verſed in Philoſophy* (11). Purſuant to this ordinance, Govea and Ramus choſe each two perſons. Peter Danes and Francis Vicomercat were pitched upon by Govea; John Quintin, Doctor of the Canon Law, and John de Beaumont, Doctor of Phyſick, were choſen by Ramus. His Majeſty appointed *for the fifth, John de Salignac, Doctor of Divinty*. The preamble to the letters patents is as follows. " Before whom (12) " the ſaid Govea and Ramus would have been heard " in their diſputes and conteſts, till the ſaid Ramus, " to put a ſtop to the affair, lodging an appeal from " the ſaid cenſors, which coming to our ear, we " iſſued out letters patents, directed to our Provoſt of " Paris, or his Lieutenant, to compel the ſaid Govea " and Ramus to put an end to their diſputes; in or- " der that the ſaid information might be given us, " by the ſaid cenſors, notwithſtanding any appeal to " the contrary. Purſuant to theſe letters, the ſaid " Govea and Ramus appeared again before the ſaid " Cenſors; when the ſaid Ramus finding he could " not defend the ſaid books, he declared he would " diſpute no longer, and that he would ſubmit them " to the cenſure of the ſaid Judges. And as they " would have proceeded in it, the ſaid Quintin and " Beaumont declared reſpectively that they would no " longer be concerned in it. Upon this the ſaid " Ramus was ſummoned and required to nominate " and chooſe two others, which he refuſed to do, and " ſubmitted entirely to the judgment of the three " others abovementioned. Theſe having examined " and conſidered the whole matter, declared it as " their opinion, that the ſaid Ramus was raſh, ar- " rogant, and impudent, for having rejected and " condemned the logic received by all nations, of " which he himſelf was ignorant; and that his ig- " norance was manifeſt, from his daring to reprove " Ariſtotle in his book of Animadverſions. Far- " ther, that he ſhewed his evil intention for pretend- " ing to blame Ariſtotle for many things which he " never once dreamt of. In the whole, that the " ſaid book of Animadverſions was ſtuffed with lies " and ſlanders; and therefore that it would be of " advantage to learning to have the ſaid book en- " tirely ſuppreſt. In like manner the other book, " entitled, *Dialecticæ Inſtitutiones*, as containing alſo " many falſities, and particulars that are foreign to " the ſubject." The King's order upon this is as follows. " We declare, that having ſeen the ſaid " information, and had other informations and de- " liberations about it, with many learned and wor- " thy men, we have condemned, ſuppreſſed, and " aboliſhed, and do condemn, ſuppreſs, and aboliſh, " the ſaid two books, the one entitled, *Inſtitutiones* " *Dialecticæ*, and the other *Ariſtotelicæ Animadverſiones*; " and we have forbiden, and do forbid all printers and " bookſellers of our kingdom, country, territories and " lordſhips; and all our other ſubjects of what rank " or condition ſoever, not to print again, or cauſe " to be printed the ſaid books; nor to publiſh, ſell, " or put off, in our ſaid kingdoms, countries, terri- " tories, and lordſhips, upon pain of forfeiting the " ſaid books, and of corporal puniſhment, whether " printed in our ſaid kingdoms, countries, territories " and lordſhips, or other places not ſubject to us. " We alſo command the ſaid Ramus not to read the " ſaid books any more; not to cauſe them to be " writ, copied, publiſhed, nor diſperſed in any man- " ner; nor to read any logical or philoſophical Lec- " tures without our expreſs permiſſion firſt obtained. " Likewiſe not to employ any more invectives and " ſlanders againſt Ariſtotle, nor againſt any other " ancient Authors received and approved; nor againſt " our ſaid daughter the Univerſity, and members " thereof upon the penalty above-mentioned. We " therefore order and command, *&c.* (13)."

(11) Theſe are the words of the King's letters patents, dated the 10th of May 1543. See Launoi, *de varia Ariſtotelis fortuna*, p. m. 52. Theſe letters patents of the King are inſerted in du Verdier Vau-Privas's *Bibl. Franc.* under the word *Pierre de la Ramée.*

(12) *i. e.* the five Judges; him nominated by the King, and the four choſen by the parties.

(13) See Launoi, *de varia Ariſtotelis fortuna*, p. 52.

The man who hears but one party hears nothing; for which reaſon it will be proper for me to relate the whole proceedings, as given by one of Ramus's friends. Ramus, in obedience to his Majeſty's orders, appeared before the five Judges, though three of them were great enemies to him. They diſputed two days, He aſſerted that Ariſtotle's logic was imperfect, becauſe it did not contain either definitions or diviſions. The two Judges choſen by him declared in writing, the firſt day, that definition is neceſſary in all regular diſputes (14): but the three others declared in writing, that logic may be perfect without definition (15). They acknowledged the next day in writing, that diviſion is neceſſary to logic; but ſeeing that Ramus concluded from thence, that he had reaſon to condemn Ariſtotle's logic, ſince it was not divided, they put off the affair to another day; when finding that they themſelves were ſo much puzzled that they could not get off with honour, they declared that it would be neceſſary to begin the diſpute again, and look upon whatever had been tranſacted the two days before as nothing. *Ne non damnaretur Ramus, novum conſilium initur ut ab initio tota diſputatio retexatur, & adhuc injudicata induceretur, proque nihilo haberetur* (16). Ramus complained aloud of this procedure, in which the Judges not only ſhewed that they deſigned to condemn him, but alſo that they themſelves annulled their own judgment. He therefore excepted againſt them, and entered an appeal againſt whatever they might decree. However, his appeal was annulled by Francis I. who ordained that the five Judges ſhould pronounce definitively in that cauſe. Upon this the two Judges nominated by Ramus withdrew, being unwilling to be preſent at the judgment, as they foreſaw that it would be unjuſt (17). The other three pronounced whatever their paſſion and prejudice ſuggeſted; and the King's mind was ſo greatly prepoſſeſſed by falſe reports, that they obtained a confirmation of their ſentence. *Hæc omnia Regis, licet omnium Regum & humaniſſimi & literarum amantiſſimi, tamen per falſas & improbiſſimè confictas calumnias inducti, auctoritate confirmantur* (18). i. e. " Though no Monarch was " of a more tender diſpoſition, or had a ſtronger " love for literature than Francis I. nevertheleſs all " theſe ſentences were confirmed by his Royal Au- " thority, which the perſons in queſtion had obtained " by the falſeſt and moſt villainouſly contrived ca- " lumnies." I am to obſerve that the King declares in his letters patents, that Ramus *ſubmitted entirely* to what theſe three Judges ſhould determine, after the other two had withdrawn themſelves. Now this incident is falſe according to the Author cited by me; for after having ſaid that the two Judges would not concern themſelves any farther with the proceedings, he adds, that Ramus did the ſame; and that the three others condemned him unheard. *Idemque Ramus ipſe non ſine ſtomacho, cùm à tribus illis contumeliosè illuderetur, fecit, & ſe tempora ſperare dixit, quibus tales judices de ſuo facto nequaquam parem eſſent voluptatem percepturi. Ita vi victa vel certe hominum quorumcunque opinione ad tempus oppreſſa cauſa eſt. Condemnantur igitur triumvirali ſententia, non modò indicta, ſed incognita planè cauſa, animadverſiones Ariſtotelicæ* (19). i. e. " Ramus was greatly diſguſted to " ſee

(14) *Omnem diſputationem quæ via & ratione procederet definitione proficiſci debere.* Audom. Talæus, *in* Academia, *apud* Launoium, ibid. p. 58.

(15) *Ad Dialecticæ artis perfectionem definitione nihil opus eſſe.* Idem. ibid.

(16) Idem, ibid.

(17) *Ex eo autem conſeſſu ſe diſcedere quia ſe non ſocios conſiliis, ſed injuriæ quæ Ramo fieret adhibitos teſtes intelligerent.* Idem, ibid.

(18) Idem, ibid p. 59.

(19) Idem, ibid.

ended their diſputation. Govea had all the advantages he could deſire; Ramus's books being prohibited in all parts of the Kingdom, and their Author ſentenced not to teach Philoſophy any longer. His enemies diſcovered a moſt ſurprizing joy on that account [*E*]. This happened in 1543. The year following, the plague made great havock in Paris, and forced moſt of the Students in the college de Prele to quit it; but Ramus being prevailed upon to teach in it, ſoon drew a great number of auditors (*b*). The Sorbonne attempted to drive him from that college, but to no purpoſe, he maintaining the Headſhip of that houſe by Arret of Parliament (*i*). [" I imagine that theſe incidents, (from " the year 1543, mentioned above) are miſplaced, and that Ramus was not Principal " of de Preſle college ſo early as is mentioned here. It was in the college of *Ave Ma-* " *ria*, that Ramus, Omer, Talon, and Bartholomew Alexander, opened their ſchools " together, the 4th of November 1544, where each of them made a ſpeech. Talon, " who ſpoke firſt, was for polite Literature, Alexander for the Greek tongue, and Ra- " mus for the Mathematicks. Theſe orations were printed under the following title: " *Tres orationes à tribus liberalium Diſciplinarum Profeſſoribus Petro Ramo, Audomaro* " *Taleo, Bartholomeo Alexandro Lutetiæ, in gymnaſio Mariano habitæ, & ab eorum diſ-* " *cipulis exceptæ, Anno Salutis* 1544. *Pridie Nonas Novembris.* Paris, 4to, containing " 16 leaves *."] The Cardinal of Lorrain proved ſo generous a Patron to him, that he obtained from Henry II. the liberty of writing and ſpeaking in 1547; and the royal Profeſſorſhip in Philoſophy and Eloquence, in July 1551 (*k*). The Parliament of Paris had, before this, maintained him in the liberty of joining Philoſophical Lectures to thoſe of Eloquence (*l*), which Arret or Decree had put an end to ſeveral proſecutions, which

(*b*) Theoph. Banoſius, *in Vita Rami*, p. 7.

(*i*) Idem, ibid.

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 980. col. 1, 2.

(*k*) See the rem. [*L*].

(*l*) Theoph. Banoſius, *in Vita Rami*, p. 7 and 8.

" ſee himſelf ſo ſcandalouſly uſed by the three men " in queſtion; and ſaid, that he hoped the time " would come when ſuch Judges as they ſhould not " reap ſo much pleaſure from what they had done. " Thus being overcome by force, and the opinion of " certain men, the cauſe was trampled upon for a " time. In this manner the animadverſions in A- " riſtotle were condemned by the ſentence of three " men, not only without their ſhewing any cauſe, " but without any cauſe being known." It might be obſerved, that this incident is related in this manner, not in any anonymous work, but in a piece which Audomarus Talæus dedicated to the Cardinal of Lorrain. If we give credit to this, we muſt reject as a fable what Peter Galland relates. He ſays that Francis I. being informed that a certain Sophiſt was perpetually inveighing againſt Ariſtotle, Cicero and Quintilian, had reſolved to ſend him to the gallies; but that Caſtellanus mentioned another kind of puniſhment, which was, to oblige this Sophiſt in queſtion to engage in a diſpute, in which his folly would be ſhewn, by the ſilence to which he would be reduced. The King was pleaſed with this expedient; and when he ſaw that the perſon in queſtion was put to a nonplus, he was contented with inflicting this puniſhment on him. Peter Galland hints at Ramus on this occaſion; but it muſt be remembred that the former was his great enemy. *Cùm in hac ſchola ante annos octo Sophiſta famoſus Muſis iratis natus, gloriæ popularis ſiti inexplebili præceps, Ariſtotele, Cicerone, & Quintiliano petulanter & ignoranter vexatis, nullum finem in quemvis auctorem claſſicum debacchandi facturus videretur, priuſquam præſentem literarum ſtatum labefactaſſet, & ad ſuam libidinem pervertiſſet; permulti doctrina & virtute conſpicui homines audaciam tam prodigioſam indigniſſime tulerunt. Cumque de eo apud regem ita conqueſti eſſent, ut ille, pro ſua perpetua in literas & literarum Profeſſoris benevolentia, hunc indignabundus ad remum damnatum triremibus addicere ſtatueret, Regis animum faceti leporis ſuavitate emollitum, ad mitiorem ſententiam traduxit. Sophiſtam nugantem & inepte philoſophantem ab humaniſſimo Rege nullo capitali ſupplicio puniendum eſſe. Verum cum doctis hominibus coram gravibus diſceptatoribus in diſputationis certamen commiſſum, argumentis convincendum, & ratione aliqua leviore ad ſanitatem reducendum. Quorum ſententiæ, cum illum Rex inſcitiæ, impudentiæ, & temeritatis damnatum, ſilentiique pœna multatum vidiſſet, facile acquievit, neque acerbius quicquam in eum ſtatuit* (20). [" Bayle is right in ſaying that as ſoon as the two " books hinted at in the beginning of this note were " publiſhed, they *occaſioned great troubles &c.* Theſe " troubles broke out in December 1543; and Bayle, " as well as ſeveral before him, who dated the diſ- " pute between Ramus and Govea, and the letters " patents againſt Ramus, in May 1543, are miſ- " taken; the whole being in 1544. It is to be ob- " ſerved that theſe letters patents are dated, in ſome " books 1543, and in others 1544; but that it is always " expreſſed *anno regni noſtri trigeſimo*, and in the " French, *le trentiéme de notre regne* (the thirtieth year " of our age,) which plainly points at the year 1544. " The thirtieth year of this Prince's reign began the " firſt of January of that year, ſince he aſcended " the throne the firſt of January 1515 *."]

(20) Petrus Gallandius, *in Vita Petri Caſtellani*, num. 45. p. 75, 76.

[*E*] *His enemies diſcovered a moſt ſurprizing joy.*] They made a greater noiſe, in proportion, than the proudeſt Princes for the taking of a conſiderable city, or the winning of a very important victory. The ſentence of the three Judges was publiſhed in Latin and French in all the ſtreets of Paris, and in all parts of Europe whither it could be ſent. Plays were acted with great pomp, in which Ramus was mocked and abuſed a thouſand ways, in the midſt of the acclamations and applauſes of the Ariſtotelians (21). *Triumphus de tam nobili victoria mirificus agitur, triſtis illa & horrenda Triumvirûm ſententia impreſſis & Latina & Gallica oratione libellis, non modo per hujus urbis compita, ſed per orbis terrarum loca omnia, quò expectari potuit* (22), *promulgatur. Ludi magno apparatu celebrantur, ubi ſpectantibus & plaudentibus Ariſtoteleis, omni ludibrii & convicii genere Ramus afficitur.* [" I " look upon a great many particulars concerning " Ramus, as related by Bayle, to be doubtful, but I " have not time to make the proper inquiries, nor " all the books requiſite for that purpoſe. Freigius, " from whom Bayle has ſo often borrowed in this " life, was not, in my opinion, ſufficiently informed " of particulars, and flattered Ramus too much, of " which I will here give an inſtance. He tells us, " in the remark [*K*] of Bayle, that Ramus was of " a very diſintereſted a turn of mind, *that he refuſed* " *ſome advantageous profeſſorſhips, and choſe rather to* " *teach in the College of Preſle, though he had not a* " *publick ſalary there.* He adds, *that he did not ac-* " *cept of any preſents from his pupils* &c. He tells us " on the other hand in the ſame place, *that he main-* " *tained ſome ſtudents at his own expence.* It is like- " wiſe very certain that Ramus had purchaſed 700 " livres a year, in the Town-houſe of Paris, before, " the year 1568, as appears from his will remark " [*N*] in Bayle. He alſo had a valuable library, " which, it is ſaid, was worth a thouſand crowns, " and which was plundered in 1562. Now do not " theſe laſt incidents evidently deſtroy what we are " told by Freigius? Ramus was poor in himſelf, and " had no patrimony; this is an undoubted fact. If " therefore he had *no ſalary* when he was profeſſor, " and did not accept of *any preſents* from his pupils, " how could he be maſter of a fund amounting to " fourteen thouſand livres; of a library valued at a " thouſand crowns; and be able to *defray the expences* " *of ſome pupils *?* "]

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Tom. 4. p. 980. col. 1.

(21) Idem, Talæus, *apud* Launoium, *de varia Ariſtotelis fortuna*, p. 59. See alſo Ramus's *Life* by J. Tho. Freigius, p. 17.

(22) Thus we read in Mr. de Launoi, *de varia Ariſtotelis fortuna*, p. 60; but Freigius, *in Vita Rami*, p. 17. relating the ſame paſſage of Talæus, ſays *quo exportari potuit.*

* From the rem. edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 980, col. 2.

which Ramus and his pupils had ſuffered. They had been proſecuted ſeveral ways [F], both before the Univerſity Judges and the Civil Magiſtrates (m), during the winter of the year 1551 (n). As ſoon as he was made Regius Profeſſor, he was fired with a new zeal for improving the Sciences; and was extremely laborious and active on this occaſion, in ſpite of the hatred of his enemies, who were never at reſt; and who even affirmed, that the manner in which himſelf and his Collegues pronounced the letter Q, was an innovation, for which he deſerved to be proſecuted [G]. They carried their animoſity to ſuch lengths, that he was obliged to conceal himſelf; and went, for that

(m) Jo. Thomas Freigius, *in Vita Rami*, p. 18 & *ſeq.*

(n) Ramus, *in Orat. habita anno* 1551. p. m. 9.

[F] *They had been proſecuted ſeveral ways.*] I ſhall not relate the particulars of thoſe perſecutions, but will refer the reader to Freigius (23). I ſhall only obſerve, that when Ramus's enemies perceived that the reſt of the complaints did not make impreſſion enough, they accuſed him of perverting the minds of young perſons, by ſowing in them the ſeeds of hereſy and ſcepticiſm. *Unius primum accuſationem graviſſimam audivit, ramum Academicum nominantis, & inaudita calumnia deſcribentis, humanarum divinarumq; rerum hoſtem & inimicum, qui de humanis diviniſque legibus addubitaret, deque iis dubitare diſcipulos ſuos doceret: qui lubricos Divi Auguſtini locos ſuis auditoribus ad effrænatam & impiam libertatem proponeret, qui (quò facilius incautis animis abuteretur) omnes Logicas diſputationes tolleret* (24). i. e. "The firſt thing he heard (the "heavieſt of all accuſations) was the charge of one "perſon againſt Ramus, againſt whom he vented un"heard of calumnies, and declared that he was an "enemy to all learning both divine and human; "who not only doubted in his mind, of the laws "both of God and men, but alſo taught his pupils "to entertain the ſame doubts; who employed ſome "dangerous paſſages of St. Auſtin, to his auditors, "to inforce an unbridled and impious liberty; and "who, that he might the more eaſily impoſe on "thoughtleſs, unwary ſouls, inſiſted that all logical "diſputations ſhould be taken away."

(25) Freigius, *in Vita Rami*, p. 18 & *ſeq.*

(24) Idem, ib. p. 20. this is extracted from Ramus's inaugural ſpeech, ſpoke in 1551.

[G] *The manner in which himſelf and his collegues pronounced the letter Q.*] The regius profeſſors corrected, among other abuſes, that which had crept into the pronunciation of the Latin. Some of the Clergy followed this regulation, though the Sorboniſts were ſo much offended at this innovation. A Miniſter who had a good living was very ill treated by them on that account, they cauſing him to be ejected from his benefice. He applied to the Parliament, and the regius profeſſors fearing he would fall a victim to the credit and authority of the faculty of Divines, for preſuming to pronounce the Latin tongue purſuant to their regulations, they thought it incumbent on them to aſſiſt him. Accordingly they went to the Court of Juſtice; and repreſented in ſuch ſtrong terms the indignity of ſuch a proſecution, that the perſon accuſed was cleared. *Quas novas turbas innovata pronunciatio peperit? Sub annum milleſimum quingenteſimum quinquageſimum, cum Profeſſores regii ſinceriorem Latinæ linguæ pronunciationem ſenſim introducere cœpiſſent, moleſtè ferebant cùm alii, tum præſertim Sorbonici, inveteratam loquendi conſuetudinem Gallorum improbari, ut quæ pueri didiciſſent, ſenes perdenda fateri cogerentur: in primis verò de ſono ipſius literæ Q. ambigebatur: regiis ſic, uti debet, cum ſequente* u *pronunciantibus, Quiſquis, Quanquam: Sorbonicis verò conſuetudine vernacula, Kiſkis, Kankam. Jam cum ſacris addictum hominem ob genuinam pronunciationem ampliſſimis proventibus Sorbonici ſpoliandum curaſſent, & lite coram Senatu Pariſienſi conteſtata, ne miſer ille ob grammaticam hæreſin (ut illi vocabant) theologicis fructibus jure excideret, periculum eſſet: profeſſores regii, & inter hos Petrus Ramus facto agmine in Curiam convolant, & judicii inſolentiam præfati, quod Jureconſulti de legibus regiis diſputare ſoliti, ad grammaticorum leges dijudicandas ſeſe dimiſiſſent, judices ita commoverunt, ut ſententiis ſuis non modo ſacerdotem abſolverent, ſed & impunitatem de Grammatica pronunciatione diſputandi tacito aſſenſu in perpetuum ſtabilirent. Ergo Kis, & Kalis, & Kantus, & Miki, & ſimiles Gottiſmi & Barbariſmi erant in Pariſienſi Academia ante regios profeſſores uſitati: quos barbariſmos ſi collega aliquis imitari nollet, acerbè & contumelioſè accipiebatur, quod collegii conſuetudinem violare diceretur. E ſchola regia tum primum Quis, Qualis, Quantus, Mibi, Latinè & Romanè ſonuerunt, & pudor fuit, regiis Profeſſoribus tanquam regis ipſius voci palàm reclamare* (25). i. e. "What new com"motions were occaſioned by the innovation in pro"nouncing words? In the year one thouſand, five "hundred and fifty, the regius profeſſors having be"gun to introduce a purer pronunciation of the La"tin tongue, ſeveral profeſſors were offended, and "particularly the Sorboniſts, to find the pronuncia"tion uſed anciently by the French condemned; and "conſequently, that they ſhould be obliged to blot "from their memory, in their old age, what they "had learnt when boys. The diſpute began with "the ſound of the letter Q; the regius profeſſors "pronouncing it, when followed by the letter *u*, as "it ought to be, viz. *Quiſquis, Quanquam*; but the "Sorboniſts ſounded it according to the genius of "their native tongue, *Kiſkis, Kankam.* The Sor"boniſts had endeavoured to eject a Miniſter from a "very good living, becauſe he employed the true "pronunciation; and the cauſe being brought before "the Parliament of Paris, there was great danger "that this unhappy Pariſh-prieſt would be deprived "of his living, for a grammatical hereſy, as it was "termed by them. But the regious profeſſors, a"mong whom was Peter Ramus, aſſembling toge"ther, flew to the Parliament, where expatiating this "unuſual method of procedure, viz. that Lawyers, "who were accuſtomed to diſpute on the laws enact"ed by the King, ſhould deſcend ſo low as to judge "the rules of grammar; this, I ſay, made ſuch an "impreſſion on the judges, that they not only ac"quitted the Miniſter, but alſo, by a tacit aſ"ſent, eſtabliſhed, for all future times, an impunity "with regard to any future diſputes about grammati"cal pronunciation. Thus *Kis, Kalis, Kantus, Miki*, "and ſuch Gothciſms and barbariſms were uſed, "in the Univerſity of Paris, before the Regius "Profeſſors; which barbariſms, if any of them "refuſed to make uſe of, he met with very harſh "treatment, as being one who preſumed to violate "the laws of the College. It was then that *Quis*, "*Qualis, Quantus*, and *Mibi*, were firſt ſounded, "after the true Roman manner, in the King's Col"lege; and people did not dare to criticize openly "the regius profeſſors, they being conſidered as the "voice of the King himſelf." This is ſo ſtrange and ſurprizing an incident, that I thought proper not to omit a ſingle word of the author who informs us of it. He tells us, immediately after, another which ſurprizes me ſtill more, the original of which I ſhould be glad to find in the archives, otherwiſe I would not adviſe any perſon to give entire credit to it, any more than to the proſecution relating to *Kankam* and *Kiſkis*. The other affair is as follows. It was neceſſary to employ the authority of the ſtate, to oblige many Doctors of Paris, to give up the following theſis which they maintained obſtinately, viz. that *ego amat* is as juſt a phraſe as *ego amo*. Freigius's words are as follow: *Incredibile propè dictu eſt, ſed tamen verum & editis libris proditum, in Pariſienſi Academia Doctores extitiſſe, qui mordicus tuerentur ac defenderent, Ego amat, tam commodam orationem eſſe, quàm Ego amo; ad eamque pertinaciam comprimendam conſilio publico opus fuiſſe* (26) (α). i. e. "It is almoſt incre"dible to relate, yet true, and alſo publiſhed, that "there were ſome Doctors in the Univerſity of Paris, "who obſtinately maintained and defended, that *Ego* "*amat* was as good grammar as *Ego amo*; and "they were obliged to have recourſe to the autho"rity of the ſtate, in order to overcome this obſtina"cy." However, notwithſtanding my incredulity, I yet will obſerve, that many things happened in the XVIth century, in the faculty of Divines at Paris, at which they now bluſh whenever they recall them to their memory. They were heartily laughed at on that account.

(26) Idem, ibid.

(25) Freigius, *in Vita Rami*, p. 24.

§ (α). Extracted from Agrippa, *de vanitate Scientiarum*,

that purpoſe, with the King's leave, to Fontainebleau (o) [*H*], where, by the help of the books he found in the King's library, he continued his Geometrical and Aſtronomical labours. But as ſoon as his enemies knew he was there, he imagined himſelf no ways ſafe; ſo that he was forced to go and conceal himſelf in ſeveral other places (*p*). During this interval, his library in the college of Preſle was plundered; but after a peace was concluded in 1563, between Charles IX. and the Proteſtants, he again took poſſeſſion of his employment; maintained himſelf in it with vigour, and was particularly aſſiduous to promote the ſtudy of the Mathematicks. This laſted till the ſecond civil war in 1567. He then was forced to leave Paris, and ſhelter himſelf among the Huguenots (*q*), and was in their army at the battle of St. Denys. Peace having been concluded ſome months after, he was reſtored to his Profeſſorſhip; but fore-ſeeing that the war would ſoon break out again, he did not care to venture himſelf in a freſh ſtorm; and for that purpoſe begged the King's leave to go and viſit the Univerſities of Germany, which was granted. He accordingly undertook this journey in 1568, and received very great honours wherever he came (*r*). He returned to France after the third war in 1571 (*s*); and loſt his life miſerably, in the maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's day, as appears from the paſſage of Thuanus quoted by Moreri. He doubtleſs was a great Orator [*I*], a man of univerſal learning, and endowed with very fine moral qualities; free from avarice, ſober, chaſte;

(o) Freigius, *in Vita Rami*, p. 26.

(p) Idem, p. 28.

(q) Idem, p. 30.

(r) Idem, ibid. and p. *ſeq.*

(s) This is grounded on its being related, that he made a ſpeech at Baſil in 1571.

rum, cap III, de *Grammatica*. See note 8, on chapter 19, of book I. of Rabelais. REM. CRIT.]

[*H*] *He went . . . with the King's leave*, to conceal himſelf *in Fontainebleau*.] I wiſh Freigius had not ſuppreſſed the particulars of Ramus's retreat, and I wiſh particularly that he had ſpecified the time; but, perhaps, had he ventured to mention the year, he would not have been more juſt, than when he ſays (27) that Ramus's *animadverſiones* were condemned in 1545, and the author at the ſame time forbid to concern himſelf any more with Philoſophy; but that Ramus, being reſtored by King Henry (28) at the ſolicitation of the Cardinal of Lorrain, made a ſpeech in 1546, *de Studiis Philoſophiæ & Eloquentiæ conjungendis*. Be this as it will, he inſinuates plainly, that the King, not daring to protect Ramus openly, ſent him to Fontainebleau, to ſave him from the fury of his enemies. *Paucis menſibus per reliqua Geometriæ myſteria pervaſiſſet, niſi curſus induſtriæ per fatalem quandam calamitatem abruptus fuiſſet. Acceptis igitur à rege literis, ad regiam Fontiſbellaquei bibliothecam profectus, mathematicas ſuperiorum temporum prælectiones ab initio plenius & uberius retractavit & conſideravit* (29) . . . . . *Hæc meditantem ſolitudo cervorum ac ſylva diutius occulere non potuit. In Italiam tum cogitavit, quò ipſum Bononia honorificè invitarat. In Germaniam noſtram ipſius illis mathematum amoribus chariſſimum ſæpe reſpexit, ſed viis omnibus terror mortis intentus ac pavor: rumor etiam Prælei ſui indignis modis direpti, tum bibliothecæ chariſſimis quibuſque rebus ſpoliatæ ac depopulatæ, ad regiam Vincennarum propius urbem revocarunt: quin alia vis etiam gravior accidit, ut è Vincennis per invia itinera profugiendum eſſet, & ſubinde variis in locis deliteſcendum: in fuga tamen latebris otium lucemque reperit* (30). i. e. "He would have gone thro' "the reſt of the myſteries of geometry, in a few "months, had not his great application and diligence "been ſtopped by a fatal calamity. Having there- "fore got a letter from his Majeſty, he went to the "royal library at Fontainebleau, where he reviſed "more fully, all his former mathematical lectures. ". . . But neither the ſolitude of ſtags, nor the em- "bowering woods could conceal him any longer "whilſt he was contemplating on theſe things. He "then had ſome thought of retiring to Italy, the inha- "bitants of Bologna having given him an honourable "invitation to their city. He frequently turned his "eyes towards Germany, a country he loved becauſe "the mathematics, his darling ſtudy, were ſo much "purſued there. But the ſaddeſt apprehenſions and "the fear of death ſurrounded him on all ſides. A "report that the College of Prele was ſhamefully "plundered, and his library ſtripped of the moſt "valuable things in it, made him return to Vincen- "nes, nearer the city. Another accident ſtill more "grievous than this happened, and forced him to "fly from thence by pathleſs ways, and to conceal "himſelf in ſeveral places. Nevertheleſs, during "his flight, and in his hiding places, he found op- "portunities to improve his mind." Banoſius informs us that Ramus withdrew to Fontainebleau, during the firſt war raiſed on a religious account, that is, in the year 1562 (31).

We find by a letter of Languet's (32), dated from Paris the firſt of February 1562, that Ramus was at the head of thoſe members of the Univerſity (33), who informed Catharine of Medicis, that they had no concern in the petition preſented to the Parliament, by the Rector or Principal, in the name of the whole Univerſity, to prevent the publication of the edict of January; but that, on the contray, they deſired it might be publiſhed. It is certain that the Rector had not deliberated about this, with perſons whom he knew to have an affection for the Proteſtant Religion (34). ["As to Bayle's ſaying, "*it is certain that the Rector had not deliberated about* "*this, with perſons whom he knew to have an affection* "*for the Proteſtant Religion*, this aſſertion is ground- "ed merely on caprice. *The 24th of January* 1561 "(1562 according to our computation) *the Rector, ac-* "*companied by ſome members of the Univerſity, went to* "*the Parliament, and there declared in the name of* "*the ſaid Univerſity, that he oppoſed the publication* "*and impreſſion* of the new edict of this month, and "which was favourable to the huguenots. The "26th, *in a numerous aſſembly* (habitis frequentis co- "mitiis) *the Univerſity reſolved to ſend a ſolemn deputa-* "*tion to the King, concerning the affair of Religion.* "Ramus was the only perſon who oppoſed this mo- "tion. *Interceſſit unus Ramus quominus mittantur* "*negati in Aulam regiam, quin prius intelligatur &* "*deliberetur publice de articulis Univerſitatis nomine ad* "*regem mittendis, actumque ſuæ interceſſionis à Scriba* "*petiit. Eadem die habitis privatis comitiis Deputato-* "*rum hora pomeridiana, idem Ramus Præſlei, Nicolaus* "*Charton, Doctor Medicus Bellovaci, Guillelmus Gal-* "*landius Becodiani* (de Bomourt) *Collegii primarii re-* "*clamarunt adverſus orationem à Rectore habitam die* "24 *nomine publico*. Such is the tenor, according to "du Boulay, p. 549. of the records of the Univer- "ſity *."]

[*I*] *He doubtleſs was a great Orator.*] I deſire no other proof of this than the following teſtimony of Brantome, it containing particulars, which I do not meet with in any other Author. Brantome, in the catalogue he has given of the learned men whom Henry II. maintained, ſays as follows. "Mr. Ga- "landus Torticolis was a good Orator; but was ſur- "paſſed by Ramus his enemy, he being a very elo- "quent Orator. Few have equalled him in that re- "ſpect, he having had an unparallelled graceful de- "livery. Having turned Huguenot ſome time after, "and attending the Prince and the Admiral in their "journey to Lorrain; the Reiſtres or German "Cavalry, they had ſent for, refuſing to march into "France, unleſs money was given them; after "the Huguenots had collected ſome monies among "themſelves from them, and Ramus had made a "ſpeech to them, they were prevailed upon; and "accordingly marched into the center of France, "where they committed great havock (35).

(27) Freigius, ib. p. 14.

(28) Henry II. did not begin to reign till the year 1547. Ramus was ſilenced in 1543.

(29) Freigius, *in Vita Rami*, p. 26.

(30) Idem, ibid p. 28.

(31) Banoſius, *in Vita Rami*, p. 20.

(32) The 68th of book 2. Hall edit. 1699.

(33) *Eorum qui Rectorem accuſant dux eſt Petrus Ramus.* Languet, *Epiſt.* 68. lib. 2. p. 201.

(34) Idem, ibid.

* From the Paris edit of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 980. col. 2.

(35) Brantome, *Memoires des Hommes illuſtres*, Tom. 2. p. 55.

chaſte [K]; fearing God; zealous for the Proteſtant religion; but at the ſame time a little obſtinate, and given to contradiction; and it is even ſaid that he robbed Ludovicus Vives of his inventions (t). He diſcovered great conſtancy and reſolution in his misfortunes [L]. The Proteſtant Miniſters did not love him much; he making himſelf a kind of

(t) See Keckerman, *in Præcognitis Logicis*, tract. 2. cap. 5.

[K] *He was free from avarice, ſober, chaſte.*] He refuſed very profitable Profeſſorſhips, and choſe rather to teach in the College of Prele, though he had no publick ſtipend there (36). He would not accept of the preſents which his pupils offered him (37), and he maintained ſome ſcholars at the own expence (38). He refuſed to go into Poland, though he had a promiſe of being well paid for his elogiums he ſhould beſtow on the Duke of Anjou: on this occaſion he anſwered, that eloquence ought not to be venal; and that an Orator ought to be a man of honour and probity. *Inter cætera referam quod cuidam reſpondit, qui in Poloniam legatus, Ramo, ut ſecum proficiſceretur ad Henrici, qui nunc eſt, Galliarum regis laudes decantandas, magno pretio perſuadere conatus eſt. At vero, ait, oportet Oratorem non tantum dicendi peritum, ſed virum bonum eſſe: nec viri boni lingua venalis eſſe debet* (39). We here learn a particular that is very worthy of being remarked, *viz.* that Monluc was deſirous of making uſe of Ramus's eloquence, to faſcinate the Poles, in order that this might incline them the more to make choice of the Duke of Anjou for their Sovereign; for it is not to be queſtioned, but that the perſon, who made this propoſal above-mentioned to Ramus, was Monluc Biſhop of Valence, who negotiated ſo ſucceſsfully the election of Henry III. and who, among other methods, employed the eloquence of ſome perſons, who, in their verſes and ſpeeches, beſtowed the higheſt encomiums on the Duke of Anjou's qualities. He had the good fortune to ſhun the ſnare mentioned in a maxim of Horace.

Multa fidem promiſſa levant, ubi plenius æquo
Laudat venales qui vult extrudere merces.
" To praiſe too much, like a deſign appears,
" When he extolls that would put off his wares."
CREECH.

(36) Thom. Freigius, *in Vita Rami*, p. 35.

(37) Idem, ibid.

(38) *Solebat in patriam proficiſcens bonæ indolis juvenes pauperes ſuis ſumptibus fovere; eoſque in Academia Prælea bonis informabat diſciplinis: ex quorum numero plerique ſuperſunt viri doctiſſimi.* Banoſius, *in Rami*, p. 14.

(39) Idem, ibid. p. 13.

(40) Horat. *Epiſt.* 2. lib. 2. ver. 10.

[" I can ſcarce believe what Bayle ſays here, *viz.* " that *Ramus refuſed to go into Poland*; and a Panegyriſt does not appear to me a good teſtimony on " this occaſion. Sigiſmund, King of Poland, did " not die till the 7th of July 1572; and it muſt be " ſome time before the news of it could reach France. " Henry III. then Duke of Anjou, did not immediately declare himſelf a candidate for that Crown. " Some time was required, before King Charles his " brother, and Queen Catharine of Medicis could " have made him take that reſolution, or conſent to " it. An affair of this conſequence is not concluded " in one day; and this being done, the Court " muſt caſt about for perſons capable of conducting " that negotiation, and Monluc was appointed for " that purpoſe. He afterwards muſt have ſought " out for perſons to aſſiſt him; and he choſe, as we " are told, Ramus, *who had a promiſe of being well* " *paid for the elogiums he ſhould beſtow on the Duke of* " *Anjou*. Nevertheleſs it is certain that Ramus was " killed in the maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's-Day, " which was the 24th of Auguſt; and conſequently " here was but an interval of forty eight days between the King of Poland's death and that of Ramus. I very much doubt whether ſo ſhort a time " was ſufficient for making the preparations neceſſary " for the journey to Poland, for appointing the perſons who were to head the negociation, *&c.* *."]

* From the Pariſ edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 980. col. 2.

Ramus's temperance was very exemplary. He contented himſelf with only boiled meat, and eat but little at dinner. He did not drink any wine during twenty years, and would not have drank any, had it not been preſcribed him by the Phyſicians. He lay upon ſtraw; uſed to riſe very early (41), and ſtudy all day (42). He led a ſingle life with ſuch a purity as was not ſuſpected of even the leaſt uncleanneſs; and fled from obſcene diſcourſes as if it had been poiſon. *Cælebs vixit honeſtiſſime, ab ſcortationis non tantum crimine, ſed etiam ſuſpicione ſemper immunis: colloquia obſcæna, utpote quæ bonos mores corrumpunt, tanquam toxicum fugiebat* (43).

(41) Banoſius, *in Vita Rami*, p. 12.

(42) Idem, ibid.

[L] *He diſcovered great conſtancy and reſolution in his misfortunes.*] Every man but he would have left Paris after the fulminating decree of Francis I. which his adverſaries gloried ſo much in, and were ſo liberal of their inſults; but he ſtood his ground in the College of Prele, and let them make what noiſe they pleaſed, without once anſwering the many pieces they publiſhed againſt him. It will be anſwered, that he did not dare to make any reply, as the King had forbid him to concern himſelf with any thing relating to philoſophy. But to this I anſwer, that had he not been a great maſter of his paſſions, he would have left the Kingdom, that he might have full liberty of venting his complaints. Perhaps nothing in the world is ſo difficult as for an Author, who has been attacked and cruelly ſatyrized on all ſides, to continue ſilent; and yet Ramus had patience enough to do this. I will relate it in the words of an Author, who expreſſes it very well. *Adverſus contumelias Doctorum quamlibet & eruditorum hominum perpetuum ſilentium juraverat. Nil Goveano, Gallandio, Perionio, Turnebo reſpondit: nil ingenii & doctrinæ per univerſam Germaniam principi Melanchthoni reſpondit. Cumque divulgatis per orbem terrarum Gallica & Latina lingua probris eſſet notatus, publicis ludis ignominioſiſſimè traductus: conſtricta lingua, vinctis manibus, prohibitus quicquam de philoſophia vel publicè vel privatim dicere, ſcribere, cogitare etiam (ſi menti tantùm potuiſſet imperari) prohibitus eſſet: adverſus tantas tot acerbitatum plagas, unicum patientiæ remedium adhibuit, in animoque ſemper illud habuit:* Grata ſuperveniet, quæ non ſperabitur hora (44). i. e. " He had ſworn to be for " ever ſilent, with reſpect to the reproaches and " ſlanders of his enemies, though men of the greateſt " learning. He did not make the leaſt reply to Go- " veanus, Gallandius, Perionius, and Turnebus; he " made no anſwer to Melanchthon, who was famed, " throughout all Germany, for genius and learning; " nor made any reply to other Germans, and certain " Italians. When he was branded with reproaches, " both in Latin and French, which were publiſhed in " all places againſt him; when he was ſhamefully " traduced in the theatres, though both his tongue " and his hands were reſtrained; and he was forbid, " either publickly or privately, to ſpeak, write, or " even think (had it been poſſible for him to have " conſtrained his mind ſo far) about philoſophy; ne- " vertheleſs, amid theſe numberleſs calamities, he " applied no other remedy to them but patience, and " ever had this in his mind, he always living in hopes " of ſeeing better times." This Author has publiſhed a circumſtance, which would have been a great ornament to this triumph, I mean the power he had over himſelf to be ſilent, for which he applauds Ramus. This Philoſopher, four years after, recovered the liberty both of his tongue and his pen, with regard to philoſophy; which he himſelf informs us of in the firſt ſpeech, delivered by him after he was Regius Profeſſor. *Miſero Rex Henricus, Hercules videlicet Gallicus, adfuit, meque quarto abhinc anno ad poſtulationem Caroli Lotharingi Cardinalis, & manibus & lingua ſolvit, ſolutoque Eloquentiæ & Philoſophiæ docendæ, exercendæ, illuſtrandæ poteſtatem fecit* (45). i. e. " King Henry, the Gallic Hercules, came to my aid " in my diſtreſs; and four years ago, at the requeſt " of Charles, Cardinal of Lorrain, gave me the li- " berty both of ſpeaking and writing; and impowered " me to teach, exerciſe, and explain eloquence and " philoſophy." Here follow ſome other proofs of his conſtancy and reſolution. The firſt time he explained his logic in the College of Cambray, the emiſſaries, who were ſet on by his enemies, did all that lay in their power to exaſperate him, and oblige him to leave his lectures. They hiſſed and hooted at him; they clapped their hands and ſtamped with their feet. However, all this ſignified nothing, they not being able to diſconcert him. He would ſtop at intervals till

(43) Ibid.

(44) Freigius, *in Vita Rami*, p. 34.

(45) Ramus, *in Orat. habita anno* 1551. *circa init.* p. m. 7.

of head of a party, to change the discipline of the Protestant churches; but his design was traversed and defeated in a national Synod [*M*]. I could have related a great many more particulars concerning him, had I not avoided repeating what we find in Moreri, and the ample collections of Teissier, not to mention that I could not consult a book (*u*) I formerly had, and which contains a great number of particulars. I shall make short observations on the relation given by those two Writers [*N*], in which the Reader

(*u*) *The Life of Peter Ramus*, by Nancelius. Teissier says nothing of it in his *Bibl. Bibliothecar.*

till such time as the noise was over, and in this manner used to go through with his lectures. His enemies were surprized at this resolution, and it afterwards made them be less insolent. *Anno* 1552, *cùm in Cameracensi schola frequentissimo auditorio suam dialecticam auspicaretur, ab æmulis clamores, strepitus, sibili ingentes per summam petulantiam excitari cœpêre. Hac insolentia nihil ipse permotus, eum se oratorem præstitit, ut multum diuque licet obnitentibus adversariis, per intervalla tamen clamorum, incredibili constantia, nec minori cum gloria perorarit. Qua ejus virtute consternati inimici, in posterum minus ei fuêre molesti* (46). He met with the same insults at Heidelberg, but with as little success, during the Lectures he read there in 1568 (47). This shews that he was become extremely obnoxious to several persons in Germany as well as in France, for having presumed to write against Aristotle. It must be confessed, that he had done this with a little too haughty an air; and had too studiously affected to divest this Philosopher of all his glory. He took from him, as far as he was able, the works that are ascribed to him; and when he found him to be the author of any pieces, he condemned the doctrine contained in it; and went so far as to calumniate his person by the odious description he gave of his vices and actions (48). See the two speeches which Perionius published in 1544.

(46) Freigius, *in Vita Rami*, p. 34.

(47) *Proinde minus debet mirum videri, si dum libera legatione regis permissu, tertio civili bello ardente Gallia fungitur, in Heidelbergensi Academia principali autoritate ad profitendum adductus, consimiles æmulorum clamores invicto animo pertulit, tanta quidem constantia ut adversarios suæ petulantiæ pudere merito debuerit.* Idem, ibid.

(48) See Keckerman, *in Præcognitis Logicis*, p. m. 95, 96.

[*M*] *His design was . . . defeated in a national Synod.*] He was for introducing a democratical government in the Church. He declared that the power of the keys, which Jesus Christ conferred on the people, ought to be allowed the consistories in no other view, than that they might weigh and debate matters, and that their opinion or judgment should afterwards be proposed to the people; and that they should not pass into a law, till confirmed by the votes of the heads of the several families. He affirmed that, without such a regulation, oligarchy and tyranny would be introduced into the Church. His opinion was examined in a national Synod (49), and rejected. Beza employed his utmost endeavours to get that ecclesiastical democracy rejected, which indeed would occasion numberless confusions, and produce anarchy. He was afraid that, should Ramus refuse to acquiesce with the judgment of the Synod, this would give rise to many disorders; he looking upon him as a pragmatical fellow. His words are as follow. *Pseudodialecticus ille, quem ὄζον ἄρην jampridem docti multi cognominarunt, contentionem non parvam excitavit de tota Ecclesiastica ὑπαξία, quam inquit Democraticam esse oportere, non Aristocraticam, sola προβουλεύματα presbyterio relinquens. Synodus ob eam causam Nemausi ineunte Majo coacta, cui etiam interfui, dogma istud planè, meo judicio, absurdum & pernicioſum, refutatis contrariis omnibus argumentis damnavit, cui si cum suis pauculis ille obsequatur, bene erit: sin minùs, certè turbas dabit homo ad turbanda optima quæque comparatus* (50). Ramus was not so stupid as to require to have the discipline abolished, he only attacking the jurisdiction of Consistories and Synods. He was of opinion, that the people ought to be judges of the doctrine, to choose Ministers, to excommunicate and absolve (51). It was suspected that the reason of his doing this was, in order to revive, in the Church, the power of the Demagogues of Athens, or that of the tribunes of Rome; for he was so eloquent, that he would have moulded the passions of the people at pleasure. *Ille nescio quem adeò Christianum populum somnians ut semper à Spiritu sancto regatur, solaque προβουλεύματα presbyterio relinquens, nihil vult ratum haberi, nisi quod præsens populus rogatis expressisque suffragiis decreverit, quod ni fiat, clamitat Oligarchiam ac Tyrannidem invehi in Ecclesiam, nihil interea Ochlocratiam reformidans, in qua nimirum ipse, & ejus similes dominentur. Contendunt iidem quibusvis etiam ἰδιώταις prophetandi partes in Ecclesia concedendas, huc detorto Pauli loco ex cap. prioris ad Cor* 14 (52).

(49) Held in Nismes, in May 1572.

(50) Theodor. Beza, *Epist.* 67. It is dated July 1. 1572.

(51) *Contendebat non adversus disciplinam, sed penes quos esset ecclesiastica gubernatio: volebat enim non penes paucos, sed penes universam Ecclesiam esse judicium doctrinæ, electionem ministrorum, excommunicationem, & absolutionem.* Simler. *in Vita Bullingeri*, folio 45.

[*N*] *I shall make some short observations on the relations given by* Moreri and Teissier.] I. I have already taken notice of their mistake (53) with regard to the country of our Ramus's grandfather. II. They mention an error of Thuanus without correcting it. This great man supposes (54), that Ramus, after having taught polite literature, philosophy, and afterwards the mathematics in the College of Prele, and afterwards in the King's College, invented at last a new philosophy opposite to that of Aristotle (55). But he is mistaken; for Ramus began by attacking Aristotle, as has been seen above (56). III. What they say with regard to the founding of a professorship for the mathematics is true; but then the reader is prompted to believe, from their relation, that Ramus paid five hundred livres a year to the Professor, who filled that chair, which I do not take to be true. His intention probably was, that this sum should be taken out of his estate, and paid to the Professor who should be chosen pursuant to the regulations published by him. Banosius (57) has given us his entire will. He made it the 1st (58) of August 1568, just before he went to set out, in order to visit foreign Universities. He appointed, by this will, that out of the yearly rent of 700 livres which he had on the town-house of Paris, five hundred should be paid by way of salary to a Professor, who should teach during three years, arithmetic, music, geometry, opticks, mechanicks, astrology, and geography, in the King's or the Royal College; and he appointed Frederic Reisnerus to be the first Professor who should enjoy that income. There is such a puerile error, in Pasquier's Recherches, on this occasion, that I am afraid of animadverting upon him for it. *This learned man, by forty five years study and industry, had got five hundred livres a year* *(β), *to be received from the town-house in Paris, an hundred livres of which he bequeathed to an uncle by the mother's side; another hundred to a nephew of his, son to his half sister; and the five hundred remaining livres, to that person who, on account of his learning, should best deserve the mathematical chair* (59). These are Pasquier's words. Here we have an instance of that absence of mind which I mentioned elsewhere (60); and is worse than if a person should say, in casting up a sum, 3 times 7 are 22. Pasquier has the sum of 500 livres under his eye. He takes a hundred from them on the one hand, and an hundred on the other, nevertheless he still finds five hundred livres remaining; and nevertheless though he reads over his period several times, he does not perceive that he has calculated wrong. If it is not he, who committed this error, we must put it to the account of the corrector of the press. By the way, Ramus was but fifty three years old when he made his will; how then shall we find the forty five years of his labour and oeconomy! Father du Breul (61) supposes, that Ramus bequeathed but five hundred livres to his mathematical professor. IV. Moreri had reason to say, that it *appears* by *Beza's letters*, that Ramus *was desirous of retiring to Geneva, there to be philosophy professor.* The two letters, which Beza wrote to him are remarkable enough, and plainly shew that there was very little friendship between them. The first of these letters is dated the 30th of September 1569. Beza therein answers some complaints of Ramus; but, at the same time, he assures him that he condemned his logic, and his old and obstinate disease, viz. his censuring the greatest authors, and approved of those who opposed him. *Illud ego multis sæpe dixi, & ad teipsum scripsi non temere, ut tu putas, neque vel ὑποψύμενος, vel ullo, ita me bene Deus amet, maledicendi studio, sed quoniam tuum istud in summis omnibus & extra omnem judiciorum aleam positis scriptoribus reprehendendis cacoethes probare nunquam potui, ac ne nunc quidem possum. . . . . Miror autem à me requiri, quod tam multi doctissimi viri tam accuratè & verbis & scriptis præstiterunt, quibus summo consensu tuas in Aristotelem animadversiones prorsus displicuisse non*

(52) Theo. Beza, *Epist.* 68. of the same date as the other.

(53) In the rem. [*A*].

(54) Thuan. lib. 52. p. 1078. ad ann. 1572. Spondanus commits the same error, ad ann. 1572. num. 15.

(55) *Postremo erroneam in Philosophicis doctrinam invexit, Aristotelem voce & scriptis importune oppugnans.* Idem, Thuanus, ibid.

(56) In the rem. [*D*].

(57) *In Vita Rami*, p. 15 *& seq.*

(58) And not the 8th, as Pasquier affirms, *Recher. de la France*, liv. 9. cap. 19. p. m. 835.

*(β) The latter editions of the *Recherches de Pasquier*, are very full of errors, and particularly that of Paris 1643. Nevertheless we read in this *seven hundred livres*, and not *five hundred*. It is in p. 835. *Rem. Crit.*

(59) Pasquier, ib.

(60) In the rem. [*C*] of the art. CATIUS.

(61) *Antiquitez de la Paris*, p. 568. Paris edit. 1639, 4to.

(x) *Scriptitans tam miſere pingeret, ut in legendis ipſius ſcriptis typographus inſudaret.* Petrus à S. Romualdo, *Fulienſis, in Continuatione Chronicæ Ademari*, p. 344.

Reader will find that ſome incidents are cleared up. He publiſhed a great number of books, the catalogue of which is inſerted in Teiſſier. His writing was ſcarce legible, and gave the Printers prodigious trouble (x). His ſect flouriſhed

ignoras. Cum iſtis ſi ferre non potes ut à te diſſentiam, tuo ſanè judicio fruere (62). i. e. "I have ſo frequently declared to many people, and alſo wrote "the ſame thing to you, not, as you ſeem to think, "heedleſsly by way of ridicule, or from a deſire of "ſlandering; but becauſe I could not, nor ever can, "approve of the ſtrong itch you have to condemn "the greateſt and beſt eſteemed authors. . . . . I "am ſurprized you ſhould expect from me, what ſo "many very learned men have performed ſo very "accurately both by their words and writings, and "to whom you are very ſenſible your animadverſions "on Ariſtotle were diſpleaſing. If you cannot al"low me to differ, with theſe perſons, from your "opinion, even follow your own judgment." Such are the gentle expreſſions that Beza wrote to him. He complains, in the other letter, of Ramus, for not communicating to him his deſign with regard to the profeſſorſhip of philoſophy in the Univerſity of Geneva, and looks upon this as an indication of diffidence (63). He was right in his conjecture; for it is certain that Ramus did not expect any favour from Beza, and had no reaſon to expect the leaſt in that reſpect. However, Beza made him ſome compliments; wrote to him in polite terms; but told him, upon the whole, that he muſt not expect any profeſſorſhip in Geneva: that all the employments were filled; the funds appointed for the ſalaries of the Profeſſors could not be augmented; and that the Univerſity was reſolved not to permit any ſyſtem but that of Ariſtotle. *Duo tantum obſtant quo minus quod optas, & noſtrum collegium alioqui vehementer cuperet, commodè nunc confici poſſe videatur. Unum, quòd nullus nunc ſit in ſchola vacuus locus, noſtrorum verò tenues adeò ac penè nullæ ſint facultates, ut nec augere poſſint profeſſorum numerum, nec conſtitutis antea ſtipendiis, quæ ſanè perexigua ſunt, quicquam adjicere: alterum, quòd nobis certum ac conſtitutum ſit & in ipſis tradendis Logicis, & in cæteris explicandis diſciplinis, ab Ariſtotelis ſententia ne tantillum quidem deflectere. Hæc ad te ingenuè ſcribo ex vetere formula. Inter bonos bene agier oportet* (64). There is a remarkable circumſtance. When Ramus was offered a noble employment out of the kingdom, he refuſed it ſeveral times; but when he deſired one in Geneva, it was refuſed him. V. Teiſſier tells us this, where he ſpeaks of the invitations which our Philoſopher refuſed. *After the death of Romulus Amaſeus, the city of Bologna offered him a thouſand ducats, provided he would ſucceed that profeſſor in his employment. The King of Poland invited him to Cracow: and John King of Hungary offered him the ſuperintendance of the Univerſity of Weiſſemburg* (65). Theſe words of Teiſſier anſwer to the following Latin paſſage of Banoſius. *Nulla eſt Chriſtiani orbis natio, quæ Rami ſapientiam non amaverit, & præmio laudando redimere ſtuduerit. Amiſſo enim Romulo Amaſæo, qui mille ducatorum ſtipendiis in celeberrima Bononienſi Academia docuerat, Angelus Papius totius Academiæ conſenſu illum in demortui locum evocavit. Ab Andrea Duditio Imperatoris legato Cracoviam eſt invitatus. Joannes Rex Pannoniæ Albæ Juliæ adminiſtrandæ magna propoſita mercede præficere voluit, & chirographo Regio obſignavit* (66). i. e. "There is no "country in the Chriſtian world but admires Ra"mus's wiſdom, and endeavours to purchaſe it at a "great price: for after the death of Romulus Ama"ſeus, who had a yearly ſalary of a thouſand crowns, "for teaching in the moſt flouriſhing Univerſity of "Bologna; Angelus Papius, by the conſent of the "whole Univerſity, invited him to ſupply the place "of the late Profeſſor. Andrew Duditius, the Em"peror's Embaſſador, invited him to Cracow. John "King of Hungary offered him the ſuperintendance "of the Univerſity of Weiſſenburg; promiſing him "at the ſame time a very conſiderable ſtipend, and "confirmed his promiſe with his ſign manual." The following ſhort cenſure will therefore not be addreſſed to Teiſſier, but to Banoſius. Romulus Amaſeus died in 1558, ſeveral years after Pope Paul III had taken him from the Profeſſorſhip of Bologna. Ramus therefore was not invited to fill the place, which had been left vacant by this Romulus's death. Banoſius ſhould have ſaid that this Profeſſorſhip was offered to Ramus, when Amaſeus quitted it, in order to go to Rome, to educate the grandſon of Pope Paul III. But if it was not offered him till after Amaſeus's death, Banoſius ſhould only have ſaid, that Ramus was offered a very honourable and profitable employment in the city of Bologna; the very employment which Amaſeus had formerly filled. It is miſleading the reader to tell him, that Ramus refuſed the profeſſorſhip, which was become vacant by the death of Romulus Amaſeus; for this is ſuppoſing that Romulus Amaſeus died in his profeſſorſhip at Bologna, which is not true. VI. Moreri is miſtaken in ſaying that *Ramus was baniſhed*, by virtue of the judgment or ſentence pronounced by the commiſſioners of Francis I. He only was enjoined not to concern himſelf any more with Philoſophy; immediately after which he taught polite literature in the College of Prele. I am of opinion that the following Latin paſſage of Audomarus Taleus miſled Moreri, or the authors copied by him. *Auctori Animadverſionum & Inſtitutionum toto Philoſophiæ regno velut aqua & igni, gravi etiam pœna addita, interdicitur, ne unquam vel ſcribendo, vel docendo in ullam Partem ingrederetur* (67). i. e. "The author of the animadverſions and inſti"tutions was baniſhed, as it were, from every part "of Philoſophy; and a heavy penalty added, in "caſe he ever preſumed to write upon, or teach it "any more." Some perſon, for want of attention, imagined that Ramus was baniſhed the whole kingdom of France; and did not take notice, that he was baniſhed only from the whole empire of Philoſophy, *toto Philoſophiæ regno*. VII. Moreri adds, that he was *charged with being a heretick, on account of the book entitled*, De Religione Chriſtiana, *which was printed at Francfort ſome time after his death*. This book was not known in the author's life-time, but the original of it was ſaved when his library was plundered (68); and being carried to Germany, Banoſius cauſed it to be printed in 1576 (69). I believe we might challenge all Moreri's friends to prove, that Ramus ever ſuffered any perſecution on account of that work. There were other proofs enough that he was a good Proteſtant: a ſpeech delivered in publick; an action that had ſomething like an image-breaker (70); and the anſwer he made to a buſy body, who aſked why he went ſo ſeldom to Maſs, would convict him on that occaſion. *Hujus zelo inflammatus, publica concione Pariſienſis ſcholæ monachos graviter admonuit, ut puriorem Theologiam ex Evangelio, relictis Sophiſtarum lacunis, diſcerent. Idola gymnaſii Prælei amoveri & recondi juſſit ne conſpicerentur. Miſſæ autem raro intererat. Interrogatus vero hac de re à viro graviſſimo, ſtrenue reſpondit, E toto Vetere Novoque Teſtamento nihil quidquam magis à noviſſimis Chriſtianis depravatum & corruptum eſſe, quàm ſecundum mandatum Legis & Cœnæ Sacramentum, ut homo in utroque per ſpeciem religionis in exſecrabilem idololatriam laberetur* (71). i. e. "Being inflamed with this zeal, he "gravely admoniſhed the Friers of the ſchool of "Paris, in a publick ſpeech, to learn a more pure "Divinity from the Goſpel, and leave the polluted "ſtreams of ſophiſtry. He commanded all the "images in the College of Prele to be removed, "and concealed in places where they might not "be ſeen. He went very ſeldom to Maſs. A very "grave perſon aſking him the reaſon of this, he "anſwered reſolutely, that nothing in all the Old "or New Teſtament was more depraved or cor"rupted by the modern Chriſtians, than the ſecond "commandment of the Decalogue, and the Sacra"ment of the Euchariſt; by which a man, in both "thoſe particulars, would be guilty of the moſt exe"crable idolatry, under the ſpecious ſhew of Reli"gion." He concealed himſelf during the firſt civil war; followed the Prince of Conde in the ſecond; and, during the third, he profeſſed, in Germany, the ſentiments of Calvin publickly, and received the communion at Heidelberg with the Proteſtants (72). He obſerves, among other particulars,

(62) Beza, *Epiſt.* 34.

(63) *Mallem ex te ipſo tuum hoc de ornanda noſtra ſchola conſilium quam ex amicis intellexiſſe, minime id quidem quod abs te vel quoquam alio rogari velim, ut homines ambitioſi ſolent, ſed quod inde conjiciam te nonnihil de meo in te animo dubitare cœpiſſe*, Idem, *Epiſt.* 36. It is dated the 1ſt of Decemb. 1570.

(64) Beza, *Epiſt.* 36.

(65) Teiſſier, *Addit. aux Eloges*, Tom. 1. p. 373, 374.

(66) Banoſius, *in Vita Petri Rami*, p. 9. See alſo Freigius, *in Vita ejuſdem*, p. 36 and 41.

(67) Audomar. Talæus, *in Academia*, apud *Launoium de varia Ariſtotelis fortuna*, p. 59.

(68) Banoſius, *in Vita Rami*, p. 28.

(69) I make uſe of the Frankfort edit. of 1594; but Ramus's *Life* that is prefixed to it, and which is written as a dedication to Sir Philip Sidney, is dated the 1ſt of January 1576.

(70) He removed all the images from the college of Prele, and hid them. See the following quotat. ["He "broke them, "*ſacras imagines* confregit. "See du Rou"lay, p. 549.] From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. vol. 4. p. 981. col. 1.

(71) Banoſius, *in Vita Rami*, p. 19 and 20.

(72) *Cum Heidelbergæ una apud Immanuelem Tremellium anno ſeptuageſimo viveremus, Gallicis concionibus ſemper interfuit, & ſacræ Cœnæ, edita primum fidei ſuæ confeſſione, cum magno Dei timore & cultus divini reverentia non ſemel communicavit.* Idem, ibid. p. 25.

ed pretty much for ſome time [O]. I muſt make an obſervation in oppoſition to Paſquier

lars, in a ſpeech delivered publickly in Baſil, that he had had the good fortune to compoſe it in the ſame place where Calvin had wrote his inſtitutions. *Inter Academiæ Baſilienſis hoſpites Joannes Calvinus præcipuè commemorandus eſt lumen Galliæ, lumen Chriſtianæ per orbem terrarum Eccleſiæ, lumen in hoc ipſo (in quo hæc meditor commentorque) hoſpitio præcipuè perſpectum : hic enim tanti luminis faces (ut Catharina Petita lectiſſima matrona ſanctitate ſingularis ingenii mirificè capta tum Calvini, modò etiam Rami hoſpita jucundè mihi narravit) primùm ſunt incenſæ : hic illuſtres illæ Chriſtianæ inſtitutionis cœleſteſque vigiliæ ſunt exaratæ & elaboratæ* (73). i. e. " Among the various ſtrangers, who came to the Univerſity of Baſil, " the moſt conſpicuous was John Calvin, the light " of France, the light of the Chriſtian Church " throughout the earth ; and a light that made itſelf " particularly conſpicuous in the very lodgings where " I am now meditating, and writing this piece : " here the burning torch was firſt lighted up, as I " have been often pleaſantly told by Catharine Petit, a " moſt valuable woman, who being prodigiouſly " ſtruck with Calvin's holineſs and talents, was at " that time his landlady, and afterwards Ramus's. " Here his celeſtial lucubrations, his renowned Chriſ- " tian inſtitutions were elaborately compoſed." In fine, being returned to France after the firſt peace he obtained from Charles IX. a ſpecial permiſſion to profeſs the new religion, with a conſiderable ſtipend. *Impetrat ergo à Rege ſtipendia perampla, ut non tantum privato ſtudio artes meditando ſcribendoque illuſtraret, ſed etiam ut, ſublatis impedimentis, reformatæ Religionis ſanctiſſimis exercitiis in poſtremum liberius frueretur* (74). [" Freigius, who only is cited on this occaſion, is " a very bad witneſs with regard to theſe incidents " which are no ways probable, conſidering the ſtate " of affairs at that time. We learn by the records " of the Univerſity, in du Boulay, p. 552. that " Anthony Muldrac Vice-Principal of the College of " Preſle, informed the Univerſity, in the aſſembly of " the 10th of February 1562, (1563 according to " our calculation) *Magiſtrum P. Ramum de hæreſi* SUSPECTUM *& ob hoc ex hac urbe expulſum, conari reditum in Academiam & Primariatum priſtinum.* The " concluſion of the aſſembly was, *ipſum* NULLATENUS *recipiendum.* No mention was there made of " permiſſion, *&c.* The word *ſuſpectus* ſhews, that " Ramus did not profeſs the principles of Calvin o- " penly. The particular I ſhall relate of the choice " which the Univerſity made of him, *&c.* proves " that he pretended to be a Roman Catholick in " 1564. His conteſt for the employment of Dean, " alſo proves the ſame thing *." VIII. Teiſſier affirms, that Ramus *taught himſelf philoſophy, without the aſſiſtance of a maſter* (75). Nevertheleſs Ramus himſelf told the publick, that he had gone through a courſe of philoſophy in the ſchools ; and that this courſe, as uſual, had laſted three years and a half. *Cum tres annos ſexque menſes, inquit, in philoſophia ſcholaſtica ex Academiæ noſtræ legibus poſuiſſem : Logicis Organi libris cognoſcendis, diſputandis, meditandis (ex omnibus enim Ariſtotelicis libris Logici præcipuè toto triennii tempore clamantur & reclamantur) cum, inquam, tempus illud ita traduxiſſem, & jam ut abſolutus artium ſcilicet magiſter, philoſophica laurea donatus eſſem : ſubducta ætatis meæ ratione, &c.* (76). " i. e. After I had " paſſed, ſays he, three years and a half in ſtudying " ſchool Philoſophy, purſuant to the laws of our U- " niverſity ; in learning, diſputing and meditating on " logical books, (for of all the works of Ariſtotle, " thoſe relating to Logic are chiefly ſtudied during " the three years ;) after, I ſay, I had ſpent my time " in this manner, and, having taken my Maſter of " Arts decree, was crowned with the philoſophical " laurel ; without a regard being had to my age, &c." IX. See number 4 of this remark, and then I leave my Reader to judge, *whether it appears by two letters, which Beza wrote to him in* 1570, that he intended to retire to Geneva, and that Beza *ſhewed a great regard for him* (77).

[O] *This ſect flouriſhed pretty much for ſome time.*] It was not known in Spain and Italy, and made but little progreſs in France ; then it ſpread very much in Scotland and England, and ſtill more in Germany. This is manifeſt, by the great number of books, which ſeveral German Ariſtotelians publiſhed againſt the Ramiſts. Some of them even thought themſelves obliged to take notice of the reaſons (diſadvantageous ones) why that ſect multiplied ; for they could not bear to have the progreſs it made alledged, as an indication of its truth. *Et miramur adhuc quid rei ſit, cur . . . . ea* (contra quam ſcribimus) *philoſophandi ratio locum inveniat hoc ſeculo in pleriſque Germaniæ provinciis, etiam in iis, de quibus id nunquam quiſquam vel metuere vel ſperare potuiſſet ? Non eſt ſanè cauſa hujus per Germaniam & Angliam etiam ac Scotiam incrementi (nam in Italia, Hiſpania & Gallia etiam ipſa planè obſcura eſt philoſophiæ Rameæ fama) ſed hæc cauſa eſt, quod cauſam optimam commode non agimus* (78). Theſe words are extracted from a chapter of Keckerman, in which the method of the Ramiſts is cenſured judiciouſly enough (79). This Author beſtows (80) great applauſes on a piece which David Pareus publiſhed againſt them in 1589. I have obſerved elſewhere (81), that this great Divine had little eſteem for their Founder. Keckerman makes great complaints of Henningus Rennemannus, the Ramiſt, who exclaimed with great fury againſt Beza and Zacharias Urſinus, about Ramus. He alſo ſpeaks of another haughty and violent Writer for the Ramiſts, and whoſe name was Caſpar Pfaffradius (82). *Scimus* Philoſophos Rameos *quodam eloquentiæ faſtu plerumque in alios (magiſtri ſui indole) deſpumare : exempla ſunt in luce : ex quibus unum illud proferam, quod & recens eſt, & præ reliquis inſigne,* M. Henningi Rennemanni Saxonis, *qui pro Ramea Philoſophia Diſſertationem ante annos circiter tres* (83) *ſcribere non potuit, quin maledicam linguam ſtringeret non tantum in Clariſſimum Philoſophum* Philippum Scherbium, *ſed & eos viros, qui Eccleſiam Chriſti adverſus Papatus furores, & Heterodoxorum ſophiſmata tot, tantis, tam tota Europa ſuſpiciendis ſcriptis juverunt . . . . .* (84) *Clariſſimum dico Theodorum Bezam, cujus ille Epiſtolas de* P. Ramo *ſcriptas, velut anathematicas livide exagitat ; & item ſummum illum atque admirabilem æque Philoſophum ac Theologum* Dominum Zachariam Urſinum, *piæ memoriæ, cujus de* P. Rami *Dialectica & Rhetorica ſcriptum ad voluntatem Friderici* 3. *Electoris Palatini Principis, merito certe, ſi quiſquam unquam Princeps, cognomentum* Pii *adepti, judicium,* furentem *vocat* Rami execrationem. i. e. " We know that " ſome Philoſophers, who are Ramiſts, inveigh with " a certain pomp of eloquence (in imitation of their " Maſter) againſt others. There are ſeveral exam- " ples of this, among which I ſhall ſelect the fol- " lowing, as happening lately, and being particular- " ly remarkable. It relates to Henningus Renneman- " nus, the Saxon, who, about three years ſince, could " not write a diſſertation againſt the philoſophy of " the Ramiſts, without exclaiming with ſcurrility, " not only againſt the moſt famous Philoſopher, Phi- " lip Scherbius, but likewiſe againſt thoſe men, who " undertook the defenſe of the Church of Chriſt, " againſt the fury of the Romaniſts, and the ſophi- " ſtry of the Heterodox, by writings ſo well received " in every part of Europe. . . . . The perſon I " mean, is the moſt famous Beza, whoſe Epiſtles re- " lating to Ramus he maliciouſly cenſures, as though " they had been anathematized ; and alſo that great " and wonderful Divine and Philoſopher, Zacharias " Urſinus, of pious memory, to whoſe judgment on " Ramus's rhetoric and logic, written at the com- " mand of Frederick III. Elector Palatine, (who " juſtly deſerved the ſirname of Pius, if any Prince " ever did) he gives the name of a furious invective " againſt Ramus." Paſquier relates (85), *that the philoſophy of Ariſtotle has been baniſhed from the univerſities which are in the dominions of the Landgrave of Hain* (86), *and received that of Ramus ; giving thoſe who ſtudy logic the title of Ramiſts.* I ſhall employ Scaliger's words, as the laſt proof. *Ramus was a learned man, but too high a value was ſet upon him. . . . . Ramus magnus fuit vir, ſed magni nimis fit* (87). The principles of Ramus had like to have been introduced into the univerſities of Holland, but were excluded from

(73) Ramus, *in Baſilea*, p. m. 58.

(74) Banoſius, *in Vita Rami*, p. 24.

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 981. col. 1.

(75) Teiſſier, *Addit. aux Elog.* Tom. 1. p. 372.

(76) Freigius, *in Vita Rami*, p. 10. *citant Ramus* in epilogo libri quinti ſcholarum Dialecticarum.

(77) Tieſſier, *Addit. aux Elog.* Tom. 1. p. 372.

(78) Keckerman, *in Prægogn Logicis*, tract. 2 cap. 4. p. m. 133.

(79) See alſo the preface to this work of Keckerman's.

(80) Ibid. cap. 6. p. 187.

(81) In the cloſe of rem. [H], of the art. PAREUS (DAVID).

(82) Idem, Keckermann. *in Præcogn. Logicis*, tract. 2. cap. 5. *ſub fin.* p. 169.

(83) This book of Keckerman was printed in 1599.

(84) Ibid. p. 170.

(85) Paſquier, *Recherches de la France*, liv. 9. cad. 18. p. 834.

(86) He means Heſſe.

(87) *Scaligerana* 2, p. 201.

Paſquier [*P*], in which ſome particulars will be ſeen with regard to Mercerus.

from it on account of the oppoſition made by Scaliger, and ſome others. *Cujus* (Ramiſticæ Philoſophiæ) *introductioni in Academias Belgii cordatiores & intelligentiores fortiter obſtiterunt, quos inter Joſephus Scaliger ſui ſæculi Phœnix eminuit* (88). I find by a letter of Iſaac Pontanus, written in 1629 (89), that the profeſſors of Harderwic adviſed the univerſity of Leyden to permit Ramus's Logic, or that of Du Moulin, to be taught indifferently.

I have been informed (90), that the doctrine of Ramus ſtill prevails in Switzerland; and that the Magiſtrates of Berne have taken it under their protection, inſomuch, that the Philoſophy Profeſſors of Berne and Lauſanne are obliged to make uſe of no other Logic, but that of Ramus; and if they dictate any thing from Claubergius, or *the Art of Thinking*, they do it as under the auſpices of Ramus, and by way of explaining his doctrine.

[*P*] *I muſt make an obſervation in oppoſition to Paſquier.*] He obſerves (91), that la Fon complains (92), *that one Ramus and Mercerus*, who *had gone aſtray from the old religion*, were the heads of the faction, who obliged the Parliament of Paris, in 1564, not to grant the Jeſuits their demands. He anſwers, that *neither Ramus nor Mercerus were particularly concerned in it; and that they only joined with their brethren, the Regius Profeſſors.* He adds (93), that *Mercerus was ſo far from engaging himſelf in cabals, that he was acquainted with nothing but his Hebrew books, which he uſed to ſtudy continually from morning till night. That he was prodigiouſly well ſkilled in that language, and ſurpaſſed the Jews in that reſpect, in the opinion of the moſt learned men; but that he was totally ignorant of all worldly affairs.* He afterwards ſays as follows. The Jeſuits *printed, in* 1595 *, Verſoris's plea. This man intending to render the univerſity odious, gives out, not that Mercerus, but Ramus and Gallandius had voluntarily acted as Solicitors of that cauſe; which circumſtance was judged ſo unlikely, that it was looked upon as a hyperbole, becauſe of the open enmity they had born to one another at all times, and which they carried to their graves. This enmity was ſtrongly ridiculed by Rabelais, the Lucian of our age, in the preface to his third book; and afterwards by that ingenious Poet, Joachim du Bellay, in one of his moſt remarkable poems; which ſatyrical pieces, written profeſſedly againſt them, are thought to be the prettieſt in all their works. Beſides, Gallandius was always a Roman-Catholick.* Paſquier forgets the beſt method he has to refute this plea, which is, that Gallandius, Ramus's adverſary, had been dead five years, when Verſoris pleaded the cauſe of the Jeſuits (94). Rabelais is not juſtly cited there; it ſhould be, the preface to the fourth book.

["As to Bayles's ſaying, that *Paſquier forgets the* "*beſt method . . . Gallandius, . . . Ramus's adver*"*ſary had been dead, &c.* Bayle himſelf has com"mitted a miſtake, as well as Paſquier, by his not "diſtinguiſhing two Gallandius's. Peter died, as "Bayle informs us, in 1559; but had been ſuc"ceeded, in the Headſhip of the College of Boncour, "by William Galland, whom I mentioned before. "It was this Gentleman who, in conjunction with "Ramus, oppoſed the reception of the Jeſuits in "1564. Bayle innocently committed the miſtake "I animadvert upon here; but it is difficult to ſay as "much of Paſquier. He denies, in the paſſage co"pied by Bayle, that Ramus and Gallandius had "acted as Solicitors againſt the Jeſuits, and the on"ly reaſon he gives for this is, that theſe two men "were ſworn enemies. But how is it poſſible for us "to ſuppoſe him ſincere on this occaſion? For here "are incidents which he could not poſſibly be igno"rant of, ſince he himſelf had ſo great a ſhare in "them. Du Boulay, who certainly was not very "favourable to the Jeſuits, has related what he "tranſacted for and againſt them; and even cites "and tranſcribes the particulars of that proſecution. "Here follows what we there learn concerning the "incident in queſtion. The four Advocates in the "univerſity, in 1564, were Montholon, Choart, "Chauvelin, and Chyppart, the laſt mentioned being "John Dorart's father-in-law. Theſe Advocates be"ing conſulted by the univerſity upon the following "queſtion, viz. whether they ſhould admit the Je"ſuits, voted for their reception; and not one of theſe "four, when the univerſity had formed a contrary "reſolution, pleaded, in its favour, againſt the Je"ſuits. See Verſoris's plea for thoſe Fathers, in du "Boulay, p. 598. Upon this the univerſity had re"courſe elſewhere, and pitched upon Paſquier, who "was then young. That body appointed, at the "ſame time, certain perſons to aſſiſt and furniſh him "with memorials. The records, according to du "Bouly, p. 593. declare as follow. *Anno* 1564, *die* "17 *Martii congregata fuit univerſitas . . . . præſertim* "*ſuper confirmatione ſententiæ D. D.* (Dominorum) "*Rectoris & deputatorum . . . . per quam elegerant D.* "*Paſchaſium qui agat cauſam ipſius univerſitatis in Se*"*natu . . . . & per quam ex ſingulis facultatibus elege*"*runt viros, inſignes videlicet . . . . ex artium Facul*"*tate* RAMUM & GALLANDIUM . . . . *qui cauſam* "*ipſis Patronis elucident.* Verſoris's plea ſays exactly "the ſame things, as appears from page 594, 598, "600 and 645. Verſoris was Paſquier's antagoniſt "on this occaſion; and therefore was it poſſible for "the latter to have forgot theſe particulars? Is it "not much more probable, that it was merely from "diſſimulation he pretended to believe, that when "Verſoris ſaid that *Ramus and Gallandius had acted* "*as ſolicitors againſt the Jeſuits*, he ſpoke of Peter "Galland? It is to be obſerved Paſquier anſwers, "as though he had never known nor ſpoke to ano"ther Gallandius *."]

(88) Sam. Mareſius, *in Præf. Indiculi præcipuar. Controverſ. Theologic. adverſus Witticb.*

(89) Printed in Matthæus's collection in 1695. It is the 99th.

(90) By Mr. des Maizeaux, a Memoir of whoſe was publiſhed by Mr. Barnard, in his *Nouv. les de la Republ. des Lettres*, Nov. 1700. art. 1.

(91) Paſquier, *Catechiſme des Jeſuites*, liv. 1. chap. 6. p. m. 45.

(92) See *Reponſe de Rene de la Fon, pour les Religieux de la Compagnie de Jeſus, au Plaidoié de Simon Marion*, p. 28.

(93) Paſquier, ibid. p. 46.

(94) Du Breul, *Antiquitez de Paris*, p. m. 565, ſays, that Peter Galland, Regius Profeſſor of the Greek tongue, died the 31ſt of Auguſt, 1559.

* Folio 24 and 32 of Plaidoié de Verſoris.

* From the rem. to Bayle's Dict. vol. 4. 981. col. 1.

☞ RANDOLPH (THOMAS), an eminent Engliſh Poet in the 17th Century, was born at Houghton according to Mr. Langbaine (*a*), or at Newnham near Daintry in Northamptonſhire according to Mr. Wood (*b*), on the 15th of June 1605; and was ſon to Mr. William Randolph of Hams near Lewes in Suſſex, (Steward to Edward Lord Zouch) by Elizabeth his wife, daughter of Mr. Tho. Smith of Newnham. He was educated in Weſtminſter-School, and thence elected as one of the King's ſcholars, to Trinity College in Cambridge in 1623, of which he became Fellow, and took the Degree of Maſter of Arts (*c*), in which he was likewiſe incorporated in the Univerſity of Oxford in 1631 (*d*). He had very early diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his excellent genius, for about the age of nine or ten years he wrote *the Hiſtory of the Incarnation of our Saviour* in verſe, which probably is ſtill preſerved in manuſcript under his own hand writing, as it was in Mr. Wood's time. His ſubſequent writings have eſtabliſhed his character [*A*], and gained him the eſteem and friendſhip of ſome of the greateſt men of that age, and particularly

(*a*) *Account of the Engliſh Dramatick Poets*, p. 411. edit. Oxford 1691.

(*b*) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 244. 2d edit.

(*c*) Idem, ibid.

(*d*) Idem, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 253.

[*A*] *His writings have eſtabliſhed his character.*] His dramatic performances are as follow: I. *The Muſes Looking-Glaſs*; a Comedy, which by the author was firſt called *The Entertainment*, as we learn from Sir Aſton Cockam's works, p. 98. This play anſwers both the deſigns of poetry, profit and delight; and Mr. Richard Weſt, a Student of Chriſt Church in Oxford, ſaid of it very juſtly,

Who looks within his clearer Glaſs, *will ſay,*
At once he wrote an Ethic Tract *and* Play.

II. *Amyntas: or, The impoſſible Dowry. A Paſtoral. Acted before the King and Queen at Whitehall.* III. *Ariſtippus;*

particularly of Ben. Johnſon, who adopted him one of his ſons; on which account Mr. Randolph wrote a gratulatory Poem to him, printed among his works. He died in March 1634, at the houſe of William Stafford of Blatherwyke in Northamptonſhire, Eſq; after having ſpent ſome time at his father's at Little Houghton in the ſame county. His body was interred on the 17th of that month in the Church of Blatherwyke, where a monument of white marble was erected to his memory, at the expence of Sir Chriſtopher (afterward Lord) Hatton of Kirby; the inſcription upon which in Latin and Engliſh was written by his friend Mr. Peter Hauſted of Cambridge (*e*). He had a brother named ROBERT RANDOLPH, who publiſhed his Poems, and was a good Poet himſelf, as appears from ſeveral copies of his verſes printed in various books. He was a ſtudent of Chriſt Church in Oxford, where he took the Degrees of Bachelor of Arts February the 18th 1627, and was at firſt Vicar of Barnetby, and afterwards of Donnington in Lincolnſhire, where he died, and was interred July the 7th 1671, aged about ſixty years (*f*).

(*e*) Idem, *Athen. Oxon.* col. 244, 245.

(*f*) Idem, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 239.

Ariſtippus: or, The Jovial Philoſopher. Preſented in a private ſhew. IV. *The conceited Pedlar, as it was preſented in a ſtrange ſhew.* London 1630 in 4to. V. *The Jealous Lovers. A Comedy preſented to their gracious Majeſties at Cambridge by the Students of Trinity-College.* Dedicated to Dr. Comber, Dean of Carliſle, Vice-Chancellor of the Univerſity of Cambridge, and Maſter of Trinity-College. This play was revived on the ſtage at London in 1682, as appears from an Epilogue written by Mrs. Behn, and printed in her *Collection of Poems* at London 1685 in 8vo. This Comedy was reviſed and publiſhed by the author himſelf, and was uſhered into the world by commendatory Poems of the chief wits of both Univerſities. Mr. Edward Fraunces ſpeaks of it thus:

" Tho' thou haſt made it public to the view
" Of ſelf-love, malice, and that other crew;
" It were more fit it ſhould impaled lie
" Within the walls of ſome great library;
" That if by chance, thro' injury of time,
" *Plautus* and *Terence*, and that * fragrant thyme
" Of Attic wit ſhould periſh, we might ſee
" All theſe reviv'd in his own Comedy.
" The Jealous lovers, Pander, Gull, and Whore,
" The doting father, Shark, and many more
" Thy ſcene doth repreſent unto the life,
" Beſide the character of a curſt wife,
" So truly given, in ſo proper ſtyle;
" As if thy active ſoul had dwelt a while
" In each man's body, and at length had ſeen
" How in their humours they themſelves demean."

* *Ariſtophanes.*

VI. *Hey for Honeſty, down with Knavery.* A Comedy tranſlated from Ariſtophanes's *Plutus*, and afterwards augmented and publiſhed by *F. J.* and printed at London 1651 in 4to. All theſe Dramatic pieces, except the laſt, were collected, and publiſhed together with his poems in one volume, by the care of our author's brother Mr. Robert Randolph; the fifth edition of which, *with ſeveral additions*, and *corrected and amended*, was printed at London 1664 in 8vo.

H.

RANGOUZE, was a French Author, in the reign of Lewis XIV. I know nothing of the bright part of his character, or his valuable qualities; for we cannot give this name to the induſtry, which an Author employs in reaping profit by his dedications and adulation. Not but that this induſtry, though very bad morally ſpeaking, may hold a very conſiderable rank among what we call good qualities, whether natural or acquired [*A*].

[*A*] *What we call good qualities, whether natural or acquired.*] All languages may be ſaid to be more or leſs barren; which is chiefly found with reſpect to ſuch things as are deprived of the perfection that is due to them. If this perfection be a moral virtue, thoſe things are termed bad: if it is a phyſical virtue, they alſo are called bad. On the other hand we call indifferently good things, thoſe which poſſeſs the moral virtue of thoſe ſpecies, and thoſe which poſſeſs the phyſical virtue of their condition. An unjuſt Judge is called a bad Judge; an ignorant painter is called a bad painter. That man is called a good Judge, who is equitable and wiſe; and he who draws fine pictures is called a good painter. We here are ſenſible that words are wanting (1), ſince we are obliged to employ the words good and bad, to denote a hundred things very different in their nature. The reader therefore muſt not wonder that I have ranked among the number of good things, the induſtry of Rangouze, after excluding it from among the moral virtues. It is good in the ſame ſenſe, that we ſay a good memory, ſight, hearing, ſmelling, *&c.* when thoſe faculties are endued with the perfection allotted them by nature. Every ſcience, without excepting even that of overreaching and cheating, is a kind of perfection. An acuteneſs of mind is a natural advantage, in like manner as ſtupidity and fooliſhneſs are great imperfections. The ſcience of cheating, morally ſpeaking, is neither good nor bad; but phyſically ſpeaking, it is a very good quality, it is an advantage, a perfection: a ſimpleneſs of mind, which is capable neither of cheating, nor to avoid being cheated, is, phyſically ſpeaking, a bad quality and a defect. If the art of cheating is reduced into practice, it becomes, morally ſpeaking, a very bad thing, and a crime that merits puniſhment; but when Government breaks on the wheel certain thieves, whoſe induſtry, and other natural qualities, had attained to a ſovereign perfection in their kind, we nevertheleſs admire the phyſical good in them, and only deteſt the ill uſe they had made of them. It therefore muſt be ſaid in general, that the art of growing rich, either by the revenues, or by trade, is a good thing, and a natural advantage, which deſerves eſteem, when ſeparated from the abuſe which men may make of it. The ſame muſt be ſaid of the induſtry of an Author who acquires riches by his pen, and the dexterity and ſubmiſſiveneſs, with which he deals about dedications and copies of his books ſent to different perſons. It cannot be denied, but that ſuch a man has a kind of genius, a ſort of ſagacity, and acute diſcernment, which are a natural perfection, that ought to be admired in certain reſpects, ſave the right we have to deſpiſe and blame it, becauſe of its abuſes and conſequences. Equitable perſons do not equally condemn this ſpecies of Authors: they do not diſcharge all the ſatyrical flings, which Furetiere has collected in his *Somme Dedicatoire* (2), at Authors, who, having a numerous family, without patrimony or penſion from the publick, have no other way of ſupporting themſelves than by their pens. People in that caſe excuſe the multiplicity of their dedications; and admire much leſs why each of their works are divided into various tomes, dedicated to ſo many different perſons; and that the ſecond editions are dedicated to new Mecænas's; people, I ſay, admire this much leſs, than they do to ſee them ſupport honourably, merely with their pens, their wives and children; and that this is the ſole way they have to ſupport themſelves. People extend, in their favour, a rule laid down by a wit, by way of apology for ſuch perſons as apply themſelves to trifles. His words are theſe: *Farther, it is certain that writers are ſometimes obliged, for very ſolid reaſons, to apply themſelves*

(1) It is to be obſerved, that the idleneſs of man, and the caprice of cuſtom, are alſo one cauſe of it. For if people would, other words might be found to denote a Painter, who underſtands, or is ignorant of his art.

(2) It is annexed to the *Roman Bourgeois.* A ſort of Latin tranſlation of it is inſerted in the preface to Tom. 3. *Obſervationum ſelectarum ad Rem Literariam ſpectantium*, printed at Hall, in 1701.

De Rangouze poſſeſſed it in an eminent degree [*B*], as will appear from my remarks.

ſelves to works, which ſeem to be far from ſolid; and that frequently a ſecret and unknown duty often prevails, without the leaſt injuſtice, over a publick and conſpicuous one. A writer for inſtance, whom we cenſure, perhaps found that, in order to reſtore his health which was loſt; to ſecure himſelf from ill fortune; or for the advantage of a family which was ſupported entirely by his pen; that it was more profitable to him to employ himſelf about compoſing ſongs, than about treatiſes of morality and politicks. If this be the caſe, I will venture to affirm, that the very principles of morality and philoſophy enjoin him to write ſongs; and that it is the greateſt injuſtice to condemn the employments of other perſons, when we know neither the motives nor circumſtances of them (3).

(3) Peliſſon, *Diſcours ſur les Oeuvres de Mr. Sarrazin*, p. m. 39, 40.

[*B*] *De Rangouze poſſeſſed it in an eminent degree.*] Coſtar furniſhes me a proof of this. "God forbid "I ſhould make a compariſon with the Sieur de Ran- "gouze, who by his eloquence, has gained fifteen or "ſixteen hundred piſtoles within theſe eight months, "and who may be called the Cherilus, in proſe, of "our age. *Cherilus incultis qui verſibus & malè natis "Retulit acceptos regale numiſma Philippos.* According "to the Goſpel rule, that tree is good, which pro- "duceth ſuch good fruit. Suppoſing what we are "told in the fabulous hiſtory to be true, the gar- "den of the Heſperides, ſo much boaſted by the "poets, was far leſs valuable, ſince, according "to a Greek Scholiaſt of great credit and authority, "the tree in queſtion bore golden apples only in its "ſeaſon, and not the whole year round (4)." Here follows another teſtimony, I mean the illuſtrious Mademoiſelle de Scudery. She ſpeaks of an author, *who had three epiſtles dedicatory ready drawn up for the ſame book, for three perſons vaſtly different with regard to their rank and merit; he having reſolved to make uſe of that which would produce him moſt money; and making uſe of a third perſon to manage that affair. Accordingly, he dedicated his book to that perſon, who gave him moſt money, though of the leaſt merit.* She ſays afterwards, that *a late author having prepared an epiſtle dedicatory, which might be looked upon as a great panegyric, ſuppreſſed it, becauſe, before his book was quite printed off, the perſon to whom he dedicated it was fallen into diſgrace.* She adds, *that a certain Dauphineze having wrote a panegyric on Cardinal Richelieu, and finding him dead at his arrival, he turned it into a panegyric of the Queen-mother, Anne of Auſtria. And I have alſo known, that an author, after having greatly and juſtly applauded a perſon who was living, bereaved him of all the encomiums he had beſtowed upon him, without his having done any thing to make him unworthy of it, except his dying, without having an opportunity to give this author what he imagined he deſerved. All theſe inſtances,* continues ſhe, *are very particular. But I have been told a whimſical ſtory of one Rangouze, who had made a collection of letters, which he printed without numbering them. By this means the book-binder, who bound his book, put that which the author thought proper, firſt; and by this means all the perſons to whom he preſented this book, ſeeing their names at the head, thought themſelves the more obliged to him for it. This appears to me very odd; and a writer muſt be as fond of dedicating, as an able Italian Phyſician was, who having wrote upon Hippocrates's aphoriſms, dedicated each book of his Commentaries to one of his friends, and the Index to another* (5). Sorel writes thus on the preſent occaſion. Rangouze's letters may juſtly be called *golden ones*, "ſince he boaſted that he did not "write any under twenty or thirty piſtoles; he writ- "ing very few but to perſons of the higheſt qua- "lity, and who were in circumſtances to pay him "for them. They all were as ſo many brief elo- "giums of the perſons to whom they were addreſſ- "ed; ſpecifying their moſt valuable qualities, and "moſt remarkable actions; and a profuſion of com- "pliments for thoſe, of whom little could be ſaid "with juſtice. Some ingenious perſons have been "ſurprized, how it was poſſible for this man, who "had no learning, to draw up ſo great a number "of different letters, on praiſes that reſembled one "another ſo much. I do not ſcruple to take notice "of him; becauſe thoſe who are unacquainted with "the quality and fortune of the great men of the "kingdom, may there be informed of them (6)."

(4) Coſtar, *Lettre* 50. part. 2. p. 115.

(5) Mademoiſelle de Scuderi, *Converſations ſur divers Sujets*, Tom. 1. in the dialogue at the beginning.

(6) Sorel, *Bibl. Franc.* p. m. 119.

RAPHELENGIUS (FRANCIS), born (*a*) in Flanders the 27th of February, 1539, gained great reputation by his ſkill in the oriental tongues. Having began his ſtudies in Ghent (*b*), his father died, for which reaſon his mother was forced to deſign him for trade: but the maſters whom he ſerved, having ſent him to Nuremberg, to ſome perſons who let him indulge the paſſion he had for learning, he again applied himſelf to his ſtudies. Being returned to Flanders, he found an opportunity to go to Paris, and there made a great progreſs in the Greek and Hebrew languages. The civil wars forcing him to ſeek for ſome other abode, he went into England, and taught Greek during ſome time in the univerſity of Cambridge. He afterwards returned again into the Netherlands, and was corrector of the preſs in Antwerp, to the famous Chriſtopher Plantin. He ingratiated himſelf ſo far into the favour of this Maſter, both on account of his abilities and candor, that he gave him his daughter in marriage in 1565 (*c*). He was of very great ſervice to him in his printing, particularly with regard to the edition of the famous Bible, called the Antwerp Bible [*A*]. Plantin going to Leyden, to be at a farther diſtance from the commotions, left his preſſes under the direction of his ſon-in law; but when he returned to Antwerp in 1585, Raphalengius went to Leyden with his whole family. He there had the direction of his father-in law's printing-houſe in that city; and pleaſed ſo well the Curators of the univerſity, that they made him Hebrew Profeſſor. He acquitted himſelf worthily of that employment, and ſpent part of his time in ſtudying the Arabic, and even compoſed a dictionary in that language (*d*). He ſcarce had ended it, but he was ſnatched away by death, the 20th of July 1597. He had wiſhed to die during

(*a*) At Lanoi, near Liſle.

(*b*) And not at Louvain, according to Moreri.

(*c*) And not in 1555, as Moreri writes.

(*d*) It was printed with Erpenius's notes, in 1613.

[*A*] *With regard to the edition of the famous Bible, called the Antwerp Bible.*] I ſhall make uſe of Meurſius's words, to ſhew the part our Raphelengius had in it. *In horum editione incredibile quantos labores Raphelengius ſuſtinuerit, dum accuratiſſime ſingula recognoſcit; Annotationibus, ubi opus erat, illuſtrat; verſionem interlinearem adornat; Grammaticam Hebræam, ex optimis quibuſque Grammaticis, cum judicio & cura collectam, addit; Epitomen Theſauri linguæ Hebrææ Santis Pagnini infinitis vocibus auget, & innumeris locis emendat; quod ſatis teſtimonio Benedicti Ariæ Montani, inter Prolegomena præmiſſo, patet. Multa iiſdem annis ad ornamenta librorum, quos ſocer excudebat, præcipue in linguis Orientalibus, corrigendo, illuſtrandoque, præſtitit; quamvis raro nomen ſuum adſcribi pateretur* (1). i. e. "It is incredible the prodigious pains Raphe- "lengius took in the printing of theſe books; he "reviſing every particular with the greateſt accu- "racy; illuſtrating them with annotations where- "ever theſe were neceſſary; improving the inter- "lineary verſion; adding a Hebrew Grammar, ju- "diciouſly and carefully compiled from the beſt "Grammars; augmenting, with a numberleſs multi- "tude of words, Pagninus's *Epitome Theſauri linguæ "Hebrææ,*

(1) Meurſius, *Athen. Bat.* p. 140.

ing three years; he being oppoſed by two domeſtic enemies (*B*), which greatly incommoded him; the one, the grief for having loſt his wife; and the other, a palſy with which he was afflicted (*e*).

(*e*) Extracted from Meurſius, *in Athen. Bat.* p. 140 *& ſeq.*

" *Hebræ*, and alſo correcting it in a vaſt number of " places; as is manifeſt from the teſtimony of Arias " Montanus, in the *Prolegomena*. During the time " we are ſpeaking of, he did great ſervice to his " father-in-law, in correcting and illuſtrating the " books he was then printing, particularly thoſe " wrote in the Eaſtern languages; and yet he very " ſeldom permitted his name to be put to them."

[*B*] *Being oppoſed by two domeſtic enemies.*] Moreri here falls into the Sophiſm called *à non ſufficienti enumeratione partium*, which is the leaſt reproach that can be made him; for it might be ſaid, that he neither relates the entire thought, nor part of it. Let us compare his words with thoſe of Meurſius. *He died*, ſays he, *with grief, for having loſt his wife.* Thus he tranſlates the following Latin paſſage: *Mors quam toto triennio præ tædio amiſſæ uxoris & paralyſi afflictatus ſæpe optaverat, virum optimum humanis exemit* (2). We do not there find, that Raphelengius died with grief for the death of his wife; we ſee only, that his grief for loſing his wife, joined to a palſy, had made him frequently wiſh for death during three years. If it be anſwered, in favour of Moreri, that as this grief might have brought the palſy upon him, it was juſt to reduce Meurſius's two cauſes to one; I anſwer, that a Copiſt ought never to give us his conjectures and arguments, as ſo many incidents extracted from the authors to whom he refers us. But we will leave theſe trifles, and come to a more important reflection. Raphelengius regretted his wife, and thought himſelf unhappy in ſurviving her; this is an indication that he had loved her, and that he had taſted many ſweets in the nuptial ſtate. This conſequently was a very happy marriage. Now conſider the conſequences of this propitious marriage, viz. three years paſt in a kind of deſpair. What muſt we therefore think of an unhappy marriage, ſince a happy one is expoſed to ſuch evils? Let us not argue here according to the rule of contraries; but rather ſay, that an unhappy marriage is attended with advantageous conſequences. The ſurviving perſon, in this caſe, feels no affliction; and his or her widowhood is a ſtate of reſt and pleaſure. So that, inſtead of conſidering only the miſeries of this life, we muſt conſider the mixture of good and evil allotted to man: we muſt remember the two caſks of Homer, which I ſpeak of elſewhere (3). We muſt ſay, that the liquor, which comes down upon the earth is of a mixed kind, but, in ſuch a manner, that frequently the good and the bad liquor come one after the other. If we begin with one, we end with the other. If a perſon has enjoyed happineſs in the wedded ſtate, he is unhappy in widowhood: but if he has been unhappy in marriage, then widowhood is a felicity. I do not deny, but that, in certain reſpects, the two liquors are mixed and confounded together as to their inſenſible parts, ſince there is ſcarce any pleaſure but what is immediately attended with ſome uneaſineſs; but it is certain that, in other reſpects, the lot or fate of man is in a glaſs, in which the good and bad liquor are ranged, as it were, in different gradations or ſtories. I have examined elſewhere (4), whether the bad liquor exceeds the good, with reſpect to quantity. I will ſay no more of this, but will nevertheleſs obſerve, that thoſe who alledge Raphelengius's marriage, to prove that the good ſurpaſſes the evil, might be miſtaken in their computation. He enjoyed his wife twenty nine years, and felt the anguiſh of widowhood but three years. It therefore will be ſaid, that his lot was blended with more good than evil; but this conſequence will be denied. A man, who, during three years, is ſo much tortured with grief and pain, that he frequently calls upon death to free him, ſwallows a greater quantity of the bad liquor, than he had ſwallowed, in proportion, of the good during thirty years. For it muſt not be ſuppoſed, that our man's marriage conſiſted of entire pure wine during the twenty nine years that it laſted. Not to mention the uneaſineſſes and ſorrows that flowed from other cauſes, let us only conſider the diſadvantageous parts of his marriage. Every huſband, who is extremely afflicted for the death of his wife, has not always lived with her, without ſome diſpute or other. Farther, the more he loves her, the more he is grieved whenever ſhe is ſick. It muſt not be here objected, that, at this rate, it were better he hated her; for it will be anſwered, that the indifference with which he would ſee her menaced with death, does not equal the horrid evils of conjugal hatred. It would even be ſaid, that if, on the one hand, he is not afraid ſhe will die, he is afraid on the other, that ſhe will not die. Now this fear may counter-balance that good. I am ſurprized that we do not find, in the books of the ancients, ſome dilemma expreſſed a little differently from that of Bias (5); for inſtance in manner following. You either will love your wife, or you will not love her. If you love her, you will be always afraid of loſing her; and if you do not love her, you will always be afraid of your not loſing her. This dilemma is not better ſtated than that of Bias; for without examining the other imperfections of it, we might content ourſelves with ſaying, that according to the uſual courſe of all ages, neither conjugal love nor hatred are carried to ſuch exceſs. We need not to fear, from a very ſmall number of inſtances, that we ſhall feel a tenderneſs that is accompanied with diſquiet, or ſuch an antipathy as will give the greateſt uneaſineſs. There is reaſon to believe, that we ſhall be one of the moſt numerous party, i. e. that we ſhall enjoy the preſent, without being much concerned about futurity; and with a good reſolution to be comforted in caſe that ſhould happen.

(2) Meurſius, *Athen. Batav.* p. 140.

A REFLECTION on the conſequences of marriage.

(3) About the middle of the rem. [*C*], of the art. MANICHEES.

(4) Rem. [*D*] of the art. XENOPHANES.

(5) See the art. BION, rem. [*G*].

RAPIN (NICHOLAS) exerciſed two profeſſions, which are ſeldom united in the ſame perſon, thoſe of Provoſt-marſhal and Poet. He committed but few faults in his poetical employment; but committed ſome ſo very enormous in the adminiſtration of juſtice, that, had it not been for his Protectors, he would have been put to death [*A*]. He

[*A*] *Had it not been for his protectors, he would have been put to death.*] I have but one teſtimony concerning this particular, ſo that the reader may give what credit he pleaſes to it. " All thoſe people of Fon- " tenay are good for naught; and ſo is Mr. Rapin, " whoſe life I ſaved, which he owned. He was a " prieſt's ſon; Mayor of the city of Fontenay and " put ſome Proteſtants to death; ſo that he was pro- " ſecuted at the extraordinary Seſſions, by all the in- " habitants of the city both Roman-Catholicks and " Proteſtants, and all the nobility of lower Poictou. " I was the only perſon who oppoſed all this, he " having bribed me by his verſes, and knew that I " had great intereſt. He owes his life to me, next " to Preſident du Harlay, ſo that he now loves the " Proteſtants (1)."

(1) Scaliger, *in Scaligeran.* Voce *Rapin*, p. m. 201.

[" The only proof Bayle brought for ſo erroneous " a charge, is a falſhood of Joſeph Scaliger, which " I have amply refuted in my *Bibliotheque du Richelet*, under the word Rapin. I have there given " ſeveral other particulars with reſpect to Rapin's " life; and would here add many others, had I more " room than can here be well allowed me. Here " follows an account of his life, in few words. He " was born at Fontenai-le-Comte, in the dioceſe of " Lucon; and was fellow ſtudent of Scævola and " Lewis Sammarthanus; the former, who, was born " in 1536, being ſome years older than Rapin. Af- " ter having gone through a courſe of law-ſtudy, he " was admitted an advocate in the Parliament of " Paris, and afterwards had judiciary employment in " the place of his birth. He married there about

He was a man of wit, and did not ſuffer himſelf to be corrupted by the Leaguers. He followed Henry III. when he fled from Paris, and wrote ſeveral verſes againſt the faction of the Sixteen (*a*). He writ a conſiderable part of the ingenious ſatyr, entitled, *Catholicon d'Eſpagne* [*B*]. After the death of his ſon, to whom he had given all his employments (*b*), he retired to Fontenai-le-Comte, where he was born, and died in the year 1609 [*C*]. I ſhall mention ſome circumſtances concerning his death, which appear to me very curious [*D*]. He was buried without pomp; but ſome ſay that his laſt deſire was

(*a*) *Sequutus eſt Henricum III cum fœderati eum Lutetia pellerent, & Cæſaroduni Turonum multa egregia carmina in monſtrum Pariſienſe, quod ſedecim capitibus conſtabat, vulgavit.* Continuat. Thuan. lib. 2. *ſub fin.*

(*b*) Ibid.

" the year 1565, and had a conſiderable number of " children, the eldeſt of which was killed in the ſiege " of Paris in 1590, in the ſervice of Henry IV. " Rapin was Mayor of Fontenai in 1570. The poſt " of Provoſt-marſhal being created in France, in the " year 1576, for Fontenai and the lower Poitou, he " purchaſed it. His ſervices were wanted in the " extraordinary Seſſion held at Poictiers in 1579; " Achilles de Harlay, who preſided in it, was ſoon " ſenſible of his abilities. This Magiſtrate being " appointed firſt Preſident in 1584, he, about the " end of that year, got Rapin to be made *Lieutenant* " *de la robe courte*, in the Provoſtſhip of Paris; and " having afterwards recommended him to Henry III, " his Majeſty beſtowed upon Rapin the poſt of *great* " *Provoſt of the Connetablie.* He was involved in " ſome difficulties about the year 1588; and it ap- " pears that Henry III, at the ſolicitation and for fear " of the League, removed him from his employment " of the *Connetablie.* However, he was reſtored a " very little time after, and was of great ſervice to " Henry IV. By an arret of Parliament of the 24th " of May 1599, againſt the pretended demoniac Mar- " tha Broſſier, ſhe was ordered to be carried back to " Romorantin, the place of her birth, by *Maitre* " *Nicolas Rapin Lieutenant de Robbe courte, de la dite* " *Provoſte de Paris.* Rapin not long after this re- " ſigned his employments, and retired to Fontenai, " and died in February 1609, aged only threeſcore " and eight years *."]

* From the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. vol. 4. p. 981. col. 1 and 2.

[*B*] *He wrote a conſiderable part of the* Catholicon d'Eſpagne.] We are told by du Puy's notes, publiſhed in the edition of this ſatyr publiſhed in 1677, that the ſpeech of the Archbiſhop of Lyons, that of Roze, and that which Engoulevent was to have ſpoke, were wrote by Rapin. If this be true, *d'Aubigné ſhould not have endeavoured to undeceive thoſe who aſcribe the whole ſatyr Menippée to that wit, and afterwards declare that he only contributed ſome verſes to it* *. *He poſſibly might have advanced this, becauſe that, in the 4to volume of Rapin's works, printed at Paris in* 1610, *we find only three Latin epigrams which form part of the Catholicon* (2)? This reflection of the Author of the new notes is judicious.

* *D'Aubigne To. 3. l. 3. ch. 13.*

(2) *Notes ſur les Catholicon*, p. 385. edit. of 1696.

De Vigneul Marville, who has collected a great number of curious particulars with reſpect to the Catholicon d'Eſpagne, obſerved that Paſſerat and Rapin compoſed the verſes of the ſecond part, which was entitled, *An abridgment of the ſtates of the League aſſembled at Paris, the tenth of February*; that Rapin wrote the ſpeech of the Archbiſhop of Lyons, and that of Doctor Roſe; and that he *collected all the reſt of the ſpeeches, and added them to the Catholicon d'Eſpagne* (3), *under the title of* Satyre Menippée; *and it is on this account that many have aſcribed the whole Catholicon to him* (4).

(3) It is the title of the 1ſt part of the work, written by Mr. le Roy, Canon of Roan.

(4) Vigneul Marville, *Melanges d'Hiſtoire & de Litterature*, Tom. 1. p. 201. Roan edit. of 1699.

[*C*] *He died in the year* 1609.] Botereius (5), the Mercure Francois (6), and the continuator of Thuanus (7), fix his death under that year. Father Garaſſe, whom I ſhall ſoon cite, ſays, that he was preſent in December 1608, at Rapin's death, before which he had languiſhed ſome weeks. Now, as Moreri relates that Rapin died the 15th of February 1608, I ſuppoſe Garaſſe means, that this brave man fell ſick in December 1608, and died ſome weeks after, if this be his meaning, he refutes Moreri, not with regard to the day, but to the year in which he died. Be this as it will, I join in opinion with thoſe, who ſay that Rapin died in 1609: and nevertheleſs I find that many accurate perſons agree with Moreri (8).

(5) Rodolph. Botereius, *de Rebus in Gallia geſtis Commentar.* lib. 16. p. 567, 568.

(6) Tom. 1. p. 408.

(7) Lib. 2. *in fine.*

(8) Baillet, *Jugemens ſur les Poetes*, num. 1376. The Author of *Notes ſur le Catholicon*, p. 385.

[*D*] *Some circumſtances concerning his death which appear to me very curious.*] Here follows a long account from father Garaſſe, of which the reader may form what judgment he pleaſes. " In December of " the year MDCVIII, I was at Poictiers (9) at the " deceaſe of the late Mr. Rapin, who having led, " during threeſcore and fourteen years, a pretty looſe " life, according to the genius of that age and his " own diſpoſition, whereby he contracted a dangerous " acquaintance with ſeveral perſons, after paſſing " ſome weeks in a languiſhing condition, was aſſiſted " by four of the fathers of our ſociety, and died in " their preſence. He expreſſed the higheſt ſatisfac- " tion at his departing this life ſo happily in the " hands of thoſe, whom he had perſecuted all his " life time, without knowing them. After mak- " ing his confeſſion, which he performed with the " ſtrongeſt ſenſe of the ſins he had committed, be- " fore he received the bleſſed Sacrament, the room in " which he died being filled with perſons of the " greateſt diſtinction in the city, he made the follow- " ing general confeſſion of all his paſt life, and that " in three articles. I. That he had never been a " Huguenot, nor wavering in his belief, though he " had lived familiarly among them, and ſtrongly " hated the Jeſuits. II. That he had led a very " licentious life; and did not think that God could " have found him ſo well diſpoſed in any other " moment of his life. III. That the only good he " remembred ever to have done, from his youth, was " his preventing ATHEISM from being publickly " taught in Paris; and then turning himſelf to the " Jeſuits who were preſent, he gave them a conciſe " account of that ſtory for our inſtruction. He ſaid " that there was in his time a certain miſcreant in " Paris; a ſtranger, and of a pliant and facetious " turn of mind (*α*); who having got familiarly ac- " quainted with the ſeven wits, that formed the " conſtellation of Poets, who were headed by Ron- " ſard; he began to ſpread ſome very wicked and " abominable maxims againſt the Deity, which had " begun to make an impreſſion on ſome of the band, " inaſmuch as our minds are more prone to evil " than to good; ſo that, ſays he, perceiving that " the novelty of this doctrine charmed ſome among " them, four of us oppoſed this impious wretch, and " fixed the unſettled minds of the other three, and " of ſeveral other perſons of our acquaintance, whom " the wretch in queſtion had corrupted by his diſ- " courſes. Ronſard, he ſaid, was the firſt, who in " the heat of his courage, exclaimed againſt him; " and wrote this fine poem againſt atheiſts, which " begins thus.

" *O ciel, ô terre, ô mer, ô Dieu Pere commun, &c.*
" O heaven, earth, ſea, O God, our common fa-
" ther, &c.

" Turnebus wrote a noble ſpeech againſt him. Sam- " marthanus compoſed an excellent poem, in Iam- " bic verſe, and entitled, IN MEZENTIUM, without " calling him by any other name, becauſe he was a " worthleſs wretch, whoſe name would defile paper. " And we did not give over, ſaid Rapin, till we " had got this infamous creature condemned to die " by an arret of Parliament; he being accordingly " hanged, and afterwards burnt publickly at the " Greve. Had we not made this ſtrong oppoſition, " I am afraid, continued he, that France would at " this time, have been a ſink of atheiſm; particu- " larly if we had countenanced him, and thereby " have given a ſanction to his maxims. Such were " Rapin's laſt words (10)."

(9) Moreri is therefore miſtaken, in ſaying, that *Rapin died at Tours.*

§ (*α*). He probably means Geoffry Vallée of Orleans, who for profeſſing atheiſm, was hanged and burnt at the Greve, the 9th of February 1573 *. With regard to the three poets of the conſtellation, whom Garaſſe declares that this wretch drew away. See *Memoires de l'Etat de France*, &c. Tom. I. fol. 278 verſo, of edition 1579. REM. CRIT.

(10) Garaſſe, *Doctrine Curieuſe*, liv. 2. p. 124 & *ſeq.*

* *Nouv. Menagiana*, Tom. 4. p. 311.

[*E*] *Some*

was not complied with in this particular [*E*]. He had oppoſed the Proteſtants ſtrongly [*F*], and afterwards the Jeſuits (*c*). *His friends beſtowed the following encomium upon him, that he was the moſt learned Soldier, and the braveſt Counſellor in the world* (*d*). Moreri informs us of other particulars.

(c) See the rem. [D].

(d) Garaſſe, *Doctrine Curieuſe*, p. 122.

[*E*] *Some ſay, that his laſt deſire was not complied with in this particular.*] Father Garaſſe ſhall be my voucher on this occaſion. " The late Scævola Sammarthanus, ſays he (11), honoured the late Mr. " Rapin, his good friend, with a true and very ho- " nourable elogium, in which he ſays, that *Delatus " eſt Fontenaium, & modico funeris apparatu, quemad- " modum Teſtamento præſcripſerat, ſepultus*; i. e. He " was carried to Fontenai, and privately buried there, " as he had ordered by his will; but it is proper in " juſtice to Rapin, to know punctually the ſtory, ac- " cording to the real truth, of which I myſelf was " an eye-witneſs. It is therefore certain, that the " late Mr. Nicholas Rapin being on his death-bed in " the year 1608, at the time of the extraordinary " cold winter, had made his will (before he confeſſed " himſelf to father James de Moucy) by which he " had ordered, that his body ſhould be carried from " Poictiers to Fontenay, in the ſame manner that that " of Budæus was carried from St. Avoye ſtreet to the " Convent of the Celeſtins, that is, without lights, " pomp, or company, on a waggon covered with " black cloth, a boy walking before with only a " bell and lanthorn. But he being told that ſuch a " burial might be ill conſtrued, and confirm the " opinion many perſons had, viz. of his thinking " too freely in matters of Religion, he changed his " opinion, and made a codicil, by which he revoked " his firſt will; and, inſtead of his Cook, whom he " had appointed his Executor, he beſought father " Francis Solier, who was there preſent, and who " was to preach the Lent ſermons of 1609 in Fon- " tenay, to cauſe his body to be honourably buried, " after the manner of the Catholicks, with the uſual " prayers, in which he put a great and peculiar con- " fidence. It is indeed true that, by the fault of his " heirs, his codicil was not directly executed accord- " ing to his deſires; but his end, his confeſſion, his " tears, and the ſtory I related in the ſecond book, " ſhew that he died a very good Catholick."

(11) Garaſſe, *Doctrine Curieuſe*, liv. 7. p. 922, 923.

[*F*] *He had oppoſed the Proteſtants ſtrongly.*] The reader has ſeen what Scaliger ſays on this ſubject; but a more expreſs proof is contained in the following paſſage, it thereby appearing that the Proteſtants poſſeſſing themſelves of Fontenai in 1570, could not be prevailed upon to comprehend Rapin (the Mayor) in the capitulation; however, they could not prevent his eſcaping. " The beſieged being ſum- " moned to ſurrender, had no ſooner demanded that " their lives ſhould be ſpared, and they ſhould march " out with their arms and their baggage, but it was " granted them by Soubize (who commanded in the " abſence of la Noue, till the reſolutions of the Coun- " cil of Rochelle ſhould be known) and the capitu- " lations faithfully obſerved by the Proteſtants, who " gave them leave to go to Niort, to carry the news " of that ſurrender, which was on the 28th of June, " without the participation of Rapin the Mayor. " This Magiſtrate was ſo much hated by the Prote- " ſtants, either becauſe he had declared expreſsly a- " gainſt them, or becauſe that, at his perſuaſion, " Landereau had ſided with the contrary party, that " he was carefully ſought after by every one, in or- " der to put him to death. But ſeeing the city was " ſurrendered, that his friends were going out of it " (and that the Proteſtants would never be prevailed " upon to comprehend the Mayor;) he diſguiſed " himſelf in the habit of a ſervant, when he hid " himſelf in a poor woman's houſe, whence he be- " ſought Creſſoniere to free him. Accordingly the " latter had him conducted ſafely out of the city, " after which he retired to Niort with the other Ca- " tholicks (12)."

(12) *La vraie & entiere Hiſt. des Troubles*, liv. 13. folio 387. Rochelle edit. 1573.

RAPIN (RENATUS), a famous Jeſuit, who profeſſed the fourth vow, was born at Tours in 1621, and entered into the ſociety in 1639. He taught Polite Literature during nine years (*a*). He had made it his particular ſtudy; and ſhewed, by ſome Latin pieces [*A*], that he was able to write on the fineſt ſubjects with great art and eloquence. He excelled in Latin poetry [*B*]; and venturing, at laſt, to write in French, he ſucceeded wonderfully well in that tongue. He wrote in that language, ſeveral treatiſes on Polite Literature, and on pious ſubjects, which met with a very favourable reception from the publick. The treatiſes on Polite Literature, having been publiſhed at various times, were collected in a body, and printed at Paris in 1684, in two volumes in 4to; and at Amſterdam in two volumes in 12mo, in 1686. Long extracts were given of them in the 1ſt tome of the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*, and in the *Acta Eruditorum* (*b*). Moſt of the treatiſes on pious ſubjects were collected in the Amſterdam edition of 1695 (*c*). Some think he is too peremptory, for a Writer who ſeems to have more good taſte and delicacy than depth of erudition (*d*). He died at Paris the 27th of October 1687. His elogium was publiſhed the month following (*e*). It is a ſhort piece, very well turned, and writ by Father Bouhours. He is there repreſented as poſſeſſed of the fineſt qualities that can adorn a man of probity, and a good chriſtian. We there find, among other particulars, that *his zeal for religion, and the honour of the ſociety, made him undertake, above twenty years ſince, a large work, to which he applied himſelf without interruption, though he ſaw no probability that he ſhould live to ſee it publiſhed, and yet Heaven*

(a) *Ex* Nathanaele Sotuello, *Bibl. Script. Societat.* p. 717.

(b) p. 192 and 263 & *ſeq.* ann. 1686.

(c) See *Acta eruditorum*, 1695. p. 387.

(d) See the paſſage of the *Menagiana*, in the rem. [F].

(e) His article, in the *Supplement to Moreri*, is extracted from thence. See an extract of this elogium in *l'Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Savans*, for Nov. 1687. p. 413. See alſo Rabutin's *Letters*; Letter 31 and 32, of part 2; and Letter 128, of part 3.

[*A*] *By ſome Latin pieces.*] Here follow the titles of ſome of them. *Sereniſſimæ Reipublicæ Venetæ trophæum ob debellatum Turcam & reſtitutam Societatem Jeſu*, at Paris 1657 folio. *Trophæum famæ Eminentiſſimo Cardinali Mazarino*, ib. 1657 folio. *Lacrymæ in alumni ſui Alphonſi Mancini tumultum nepotis ejuſdem Cardinalis* (1), ibid. 1658 folio. *Pacis triumphalia ad Em. Cardinalem Mazarinum*, ibid. 1659 folio. *Pax Themidis cum Muſis*, ibid. 1659 folio. *Pacifer Delphinus*, ibid. folio. Add to theſe *Elogium Franciſci Foucquet defuncti*, ibid. 1669.

(1) Father Rapin had directed the ſtudies of this nephew of Cardinal Mazarin.

[*B*] *He excelled in Latin poetry.*] Beſides the pieces mentioned in the preceding remarks, ſee his *Eclogæ ſacræ cum Diſſertatione de carmine paſtorali*, printed at Paris in 1659 4to. and his *Chriſtus patiens carmine heroico*, printed in the ſame city anno 1674. 12mo. But ſee particularly his *Hortorum libri* 4. *quibus addita eſt Diſputatio de univerſa hortenſis culturæ diſciplina*. This work printed in 4to. at Paris anno 1665 (2), was reprinted there in 12mo, anno 1666. It is highly applauded in the *Journal des Savans* (3). See Baillet (4), who in the chapter where Father Rapin is conſidered as a Poet, has collected a great number of curious remarks, moſt of which are in honour of this Jeſuit. See alſo the 9th *Journal des Savans* for the year 1682, where mention is made of the collection of all Father Rapin's poems (5).

Some perſons ſay, that he has been a little too much flattered in Baillet's Jugements; and that the Jeſuits think his verſes are far from coming up to the delicacy

(2) And not in 1661, as we are told by Sotuel, *in Bibl. Script. Societat.* p. 717.

(3) See the *Journal* of Feb. 9. 1665, and that of May 10, 1666.

(4) Baillet, *Jugemens ſur les Poetes*, num. 1537.

(5) Printed at Paris in 1682, in 2 vols 12mo.

ven was ſo indulgent as to give him an opportunity of publiſhing it before he died. This great work is the hiſtory of Janſeniſm. Father Rapin was a dangerous adverſary of that party. He attacked it, on its weak ſide, in a Latin work publiſhed by him in 1658 [*C*]. The Janſeniſts inveighed ſtrongly againſt an anonymous letter he publiſhed [*D*], ſince what they call the Peace of the Church. It is pleaſant enough to ſee this Jeſuit repreſented as a Phyſician in ſome *Bibliotheques* [*E*]. The circumſtances of the diſpute between him and his brother Jeſuit Francis Vavaſſeur have not been juſtly related in the *Menagiana* [*F*]. His enemies endeavoured to make him obnoxious to the late Prince of

cacy and purity of thoſe of Father Commire; or to the grandeur and majeſty of thoſe of father de la Rue; or to the eaſe and neatneſs of thoſe of Father Coſſart, not to mention thoſe of Father Hoſchius, and Father Vallius; that his gardens are his beſt poems, and that after this work he lived upon his reputation. They were reprinted at Naples, and tranſlated into Engliſh by J. Evelyn. This tranſlation was dedicated to the Lord Arlington, and printed at London in 1673 8vo.

[*C*] *He attacked* Janſeniſm *on its weak ſide* (6), *in a Latin work publiſhed by him in* 1658.] It is (7) entitled, *Diſſertatio de nova Doctrina, ſeu Evangelium Janſeniſtarum.* I confeſs I have not read it, and am of opinion that moſt learned perſons in foreign countries can ſay the ſame; but an ingenious man informed me of the turn which Father Rapin has given to it. He ſuppoſes a Janſeniſt, who goes to carry the light of the Goſpel into a country of Infidels, and who teaches them, with ſincerity, the ſyſtems of Grace, *viz.* that the greateſt part of mankind have, from all eternity, been predeſtinated to everlaſting puniſhment, and the remainder to the glory of Paradiſe; that God, the Author of this abſolute predeſtination, not being willing to want ſome pretence, in order to colour his decrees with regard to damnation, declares to mankind, that it is entirely in their own power to ſave themſelves, and that they need only obey his commands. He employs menaces and exhortations, and at the ſame time is ſenſible that he commands them impoſſibilities; that it is not in their power to obey; and that he refuſes all men, the elect excepted, efficacious grace, without which they cannot poſſibly be converted, or even have a good impulſe. Father Rapin ſuppoſes that the Infidels, who hear ſuch a Goſpel, are greatly ſurprized to hear ſuch a deſcription of God, and aſk why he ſends preachers to perſons who cannot poſſibly be converted, unleſs he indulges them his Grace, which yet he had bound himſelf, by his eternal decrees, to refuſe them. Father Rapin's Janſeniſt replies, that God acts in this manner in order to leave mankind no excuſe, and more deſerving of Hell torments. Here it is replied, that ſuch a motive is not worthy of an infinitely good Being, and is no ways adapted to deprive men of the means to defend themſelves before the Throne of the Almighty; that he leaves them the right of ſaying, that man is not obliged to do impoſſibilities; and that no legiſlator ever inflicts puniſhment, but on the ſuppoſition, that thoſe who violate the laws had it in their power to obey them; this is the reaſon why lunaticks are not puniſhed. We may eaſily figure to ourſelves what a Moliniſt, who knows how to make the beſt of an argument, may ſay *pro* and *con*, after entering upon the converſation in the manner related above. But beſides a hundred other good anſwers, he might be told, that a Janſeniſt, who was to preach for the firſt time to the Infidels of Japan or China, would not be ſo ſtupid as to begin with the doctrine that denies man's free-will, or that of abſolute predeſtination. He would preach agreeably to the manner of the Pelagians, as one of our moſt rigid *Predeſtinarians* (8) ſays we muſt do; and would ſuſpend his Janſeniſm, till ſuch time as his new converts would be no longer in want of milk, but be able to digeſt more ſolid food. Theſe are myſteries that ought to be diſcovered to none but the initiated.

[*D*] *The Janſeniſts inveighed ſtrongly againſt an anonymous letter he publiſhed.*] It is written to Cardinal Cibo, and dated in July 1680 (9). A French verſion of it was publiſhed in Holland anno 1684, and dated the 30th of Auguſt 1683. See what the Author of the *Republique des Lettres* ſays of it (10). As to the complaints made by the Janſeniſts againſt Father Rapin, ſee among other books the VIII. Tome of *Morale pratique*. The reader will alſo find (11) that Father Eſtrix, a Flemiſh Jeſuit, is Author of a book entitled, *De fraudibus hæreticorum*, publiſhed under the fictitious name of Francis Simonis; and that *Father Rapin thought this piece ſo beautiful, that he tranſlated it into French; and to give it the greater authority, he dedicated it to the Archbiſhops and Biſhops of France, with a Preface, in which he takes notice that the works of* Francis Simonis, *written in Latin and printed at Colen, had given occaſion to his, and furniſhed him with materials for compoſing it* (12). This work of Father Rapin is entitled, *Artifices des Heretiques.* It was printed at Paris in 1681, and reprinted the ſame year in Flanders. See *la critique generale* (13) *du Calviniſme* (14).

[*E*] *The Jeſuit is repreſented as a Phyſician in ſome* Bibliotheques.] He is not ſo called in the new edition of Vander Linden, *De Scriptis Medicis* (15); but his *Hortorum libri* are mentioned in it, and afterwards all his works in general, *Opera omnia, Lugduni Batavorum* 1672, in 12mo. I take no notice of Bartholinus, who has ranked this Jeſuit in his catalogue of ſuch Phyſicians as have been Poets (16), for he does not ſay that he was not a Jeſuit; but I cannot omit what has been already obſerved by Baillet. His words are as follow: "Mr. Koningius ſplits Fa-
" ther Rapin in two, and ſays, 1. *Henricus Rapinus*
" *quatuor libros Hortorum anno* 1671 *edi curavit.* He
" afterwards ſpeaks of Nicholas Rapin of Poitou,
" who is the Grand Provoſt of the *Connetablie, which*
" *he mentioned in its place*, and afterwards adds, 2.
" *Renatus Rapinus Medicus anno* 1659 *claruit. Opera*
" *ejus Medica prodierunt anno* 1672. *Extant ejuſdem*
" *Eclogæ ſacræ, item, Hortus Epigrammatum.* See
" page 678. What he calls works of Phyſick are no
" other than the four books of gardens, the title of
" which only (of the Utrecht edition) he had ſeen
" in the year ſpecified by him. One may eaſily ſee
" the cauſe of the other miſtakes. It is not but
" ſome other foreign Authors, as de Beughem in
" Holland, Lipenius in Germany, have alſo ranked
" Father Rapin among the Phyſicians. But they
" cannot be accuſed of committing an error, ſince
" they are not miſtaken in the name, the perſon,
" and work of the Author, and ſay nothing about
" his profeſſion. I did not intend to charge Koni-
" gius with being inaccurate; he having done no-
" thing on this occaſion but what is common enough
" to Bibliographers who ſpeak of foreign books, which
" they have not ſeen; but to ſhew, on the contrary,
" that thoſe who undertake ſuch works are excuſable,
" becauſe they cannot help falling into ſuch miſtakes
" (17)."

[*F*] *The circumſtances of the diſpute between him and his brother Francis Vavaſſeur have not been juſtly related in the* Menagiana.] I ſhall tranſcribe this entire paſſage from the *Menagiana*, becauſe it confirms a particular mentioned in the text of the Orator.
" Father Rapin had not capacity enough to draw the
" parallel between Virgil and Homer. Mr. le Fevre
" (Tanaquil Faber) of Saumur, whom he was en-
" deavouring to make a convert at that time, fur-
" niſhed him with the Greek paſſages cited by him.
" After he had read over his *parallel between Ariſtotle*
" *and Plato*, at the firſt Preſident Mr. de la Moignon's,
" I told him I found but one error in it, *viz.* that
" in ſpeaking of the Colophonian woman whom
" Plato loved, he had ſaid that ſhe was young;
" whereas the Epigram, in which mention is made
" of her, ſays that love had ſeated himſelf in her
" wrinkles. Here Abbé Tallemant ſaid, that the
" Father ought to be excuſed; he not imagining
" that it became a man of Plato's wiſdom to love an
" old woman. Father Rapin turned Latin verſes
" finely.

(6) Obſerve, that I do not mean that the tenet of grace is the weak ſide of Janſeniſm. I only mean that the weak ſide of this tenet gives a handle for exclaiming againſt the injuſtice of puniſhment, &c.

(7) Printed at Paris in 1658, 8vo.

(8) See Mr. Jurieu's book, entitled, *Jugement ſur les Methodes d'expliquer la Grace.*

(9) See the *Morale pratique des Jeſuites*, Tom. 8. p. 97.

(10) For January 1686. p. 97 & *ſeq.*

(11) p. 50.

(12) Ibid. p. 51.

(13) *Letter* 3. p. 302, of the 3d edit.

(14) i. e. of the *Hiſtory of Calviniſm*, by Father Maimbourg.

(15) See *Lindenius renovatus*, p. 938. It is there ſaid, that the *Hortorum libri* were printed in 4to, at Paris in 1661, and in 1666; and at Leyden in 12mo, in 1666, and 1668; and at Utrecht in 12mo, in 1672.

(16) Thom. Bartholin. *de Medicis Poetis*, p. 136.

(17) Baillet, *Jugemens ſur les Poetes*, Tom. 4. p. 293, 294.

of Conde, by the malicious turn they gave to his treatiſe on the Sublime (*f*).

(*f*) See ſome things in his juſtification, in the *Nouvelles de la Rebublique des Lettres*, for March 1686. p. 356. This work had been mentioned in the *Nouvelles* for February 1686. p. 237.

" finely, but was not very learned. Father Vavaſſeur " and he had great conteſts: and he bought up the " whole impreſſion of this Father's treatiſe *De Epi-* " *grammata*, (in which he writes againſt him) by " order of the firſt Preſident, in order to ſuppreſs it, " ſo that the book in queſtion is become extremely " ſcarce (18)." All that is here ſaid with reſpect to Vavaſſeur's book *de Epigrammate* is falſe, and has been rectified in manner following, in the ſecond edition. *He had a great quarrel with father Vavaſſeur on account of his* Reflections on Ariſtotle's poeticks, *which he got Muguet to print, without putting his* (Rapin's) *name to it. Father Vavaſſeur, who was diſſatisfied with him, publiſhed ſoon after* Remarks on thoſe reflections, *in which the author of thoſe reflections, whom he pretends not to know, is very ill treated. Father Rapin made a great buſtle about this, and openly complained of the proceeding of his brother Jeſuit, who anſwered, that he might thank himſelf for it; and that, had he declared himſelf to be the author of the* Reflections *in queſtion, he would never have wrote againſt them. The expedient found to reconcile theſe two Jeſuits was, to ſuppreſs father Vavaſſeur's Remarks, which accordingly was done by the authority of Mr. de Lamoignon, the firſt Preſident; ſo that this book, which was printed by Billaine in* 1675, *and conſiſts but of* 141 *pages, is become very ſcarce* (19). See the *Critique Generale* Maimbourg (20), in which ſome particulars are given with regard to this quarrel, and another in which father Rapin was engaged (21). Obſerve two other particulars (22); *As* father Vavaſſeur *wrote two large books of epigrams* (23), *he was not pleaſed with father Rapin for ſaying, in his reflections on Ariſtotle's poeticks*, that it is ſo unuſual a thing for an author to write admirable epigrams, that any perſon may be ſatisfied with having made a few in his life-time (24), and *this prompted him to write againſt father Rapin: I was told this by himſelf.* Theſe are Menage's words. The other particular I had to ſay is, that father Rapin, in the new edition of his Reflections, did not correct all the errors which his brother Jeſuit had cenſured. He contented himſelf with correcting a ſmall part of them, and retained ſome intolerable ones. He affirms, in the firſt edition, that Homer never vented any impiety (25): he affirms this in the other editions, and yet his cenſor had proved, that Homer has wrote ſeveral *profane falſities, as well as infamous impoſtures, in oppoſition to the veneration and reſpect he owed to his Gods* (26): nay, he had cited father Rapin as witneſſing this (27). I ſhall obſerve by the way, that the Cenſor did not correct, all the errors which are in the Reflections on Ariſtotle's poeticks; and that, had he criticiſed the reſt of the works of that Author, he would have found a conſiderable number of particulars that deſerved to be animadverted on. See the remarks [*A*] and [*T*] of the Article ARISTOTLE.

(18) *Menagiana*, p. 60, 61, of the firſt Dutch edit.

(19) *Menagiana*, p. 83, of ſecond Dutch edit.

(20) In the 4th *Letter*.

(21) That with Father Maimb.

(22) Menage, *Anti-Baillet*, chap. 84.

(23) You will find, at the end of the book *de Epigrammate*, the edit. of Paris 1672, three pretty ſmall books of *Epigrams*, by Vavaſſeur. In 1675, he publiſhed an appendix to the 3d book, and ſome time after the 4th book.

(24) Theſe words are in the *Anti-Baillet*, ch. 84.

(25) Rapin, *Reft. ſur la Poet. en general*, n. 9. p. 20.

(26) Vavaſſeur, *Rem. ſur les nouv. Reft* p. 21 *&c ſeq.*

(27) See Rapin, ibid. n. 25.

☞ RAPIN DE THOYRAS (PAUL DE), youngeſt ſon of James de Rapin, Lord of Thoyras, was deſcended of a good family [*A*], and was born at Caſtres March the 25th 1661. He was educated at firſt under a tutor in his father's houſe, and afterwards

[*A*] *Deſcended of a good family.*] It was originally from Savoy, where it has been eſtabliſhed from time immemorial, and paſſed through ſeveral honourable employments. We ſhall take notice only of that branch of the family, which was tranſplanted into France, where four brothers of that name ſettled in the time of King Francis I. One of them was Chaplain to Queen Catharine de Medicis, who obtained him from the Duke of Savoy. His brothers, (of whom only one left iſſue) entered into the ſervice, and embraced the Proteſtant Religion; for the profeſſion of which it is ſtrongly conjectured they left their country. The eldeſt had the command of a Regiment of Foot, and was Governor of Montaubon, with power over the Governors of the neighbouring forts. We find his name among the Viſcounts, who commanded the Proteſtant troops in the Southern Provinces of France. Some letters yet extant ſhew how well he was known to Henry IV. to the Princes of Condé, Lewis and Henry, to the Admiral Chatillon, and to a great many other perſons of the firſt rank. All that can be ſaid of another of theſe brothers named PETER is, that by circumſtances a commiſſion of horſe can hardly be referred to any other perſon than him; but this cannot be affirmed, as no name is ſet down. PHILIBERT, another brother, was a Gentleman of the Prince of Condé's Retinue, and Superintendant of his Houſhold; he was equally qualified for the field and cabinet, though the one and the other proved fatal to him, as they expoſed him to the hatred of the Roman Catholicks, and in particular to that of the Parliament of Toulouſe, by whoſe ſentence his head was ſtruck off at the very time he came by the King's order to inroll the Edict of Peace in 1569. The French Hiſtorians make frequent uſe of theſe two brothers; Father Daniel is the only one, who takes no notice of them, nor even the leaſt of this barbarous execution. The reaſon is not immediately obvious, for he cannot ſay, that this ſentence (however unjuſt it may be thought) was nothing more than a private affair, which for that reaſon he was at liberty to omit; ſince on the contrary it is plain, that an adventure ſo memorable in its circumſtances and conſequences, could not but merit a place in Hiſtory. But this Hiſtorian drew a double advantage from his artful omiſſion; the firſt, that he might, as much as he could, ſuppreſs a tranſport of rage, which is a blemiſh on the Roman Catholicks; the ſecond, that he might caſt an odium on the Proteſtants, when he came to relate the devaſtation for ſome time made by the Admiral's army in the neighbourhood of Toulouſe: but even in this particular he lay under a greater reſtraint than he could have wiſhed, being obliged to ſpeak in general terms, for he could not enter into particulars, without ſhewing the connexion between theſe diſorders and Rapin's death, which was both the cauſe of and excuſe for them. However of what he lightly touches, Thuanus and Mezerai give us a juſt detail, and ſet the affair in its true light. Mezerai, who is ſomewhat more particular than the other, and who tells us, that the Proteſtants deſpaired of reducing the town, as there were in it 8000 regular troops augmented by a great number of inhabitants, ſays expreſsly, that the Proteſtants ſet fire to the farms and houſes of the Counſellors, and that the ſoldiers with live coals wrote on the ruins, *Vengeance for Rapin's death.*

PETER RAPIN, Baron of Mauvers, ſon of Philibert, was Governor of Maſ-granier, one of the cautionary towns granted to the Proteſtants of Guienne. He was a ſoldier from his youth, and followed Henry IV. in all his expeditions, and by much the greater part of that time received nothing from his eſtate, which put him often, as well as others, under the ſame dilemma, to very great ſtraights. From an anſwer which he received, we may ſuppoſe even the King in no better circumſtances; for having loſt an horſe, he deſired his Majeſty to furniſh him with money to purchaſe another; upon which the King replied, *I would willingly do it, but my whole ſtock of linen amounts to no more than three ſhirts.* But Monſieur Rapin's ſufferings in theſe religious wars were not in the army only. He ſaw his houſe three times either burnt or pulled down, and every thing pillaged. The laſt time indeed he was as far as was poſſible indemnified, and that after a manner, which muſt have given him a ſenſible pleaſure; for the Roman Catholick Gentlemen of his neighbourhood, who had an eſteem and friendſhip for him, aſſembling themſelves reſolved every one to contribute his ſhare to-

afterwards ſent to Puyluarens, and thence to Saumur [*B*]. About the beginning of the year 1679, he returned to his father's houſe, with a deſign to apply himſelf ſeriouſly to the ſtudy of the Law; but he had made no great progreſs, when he found himſelf under an obligation, (as a great many other young Gentlemen were) of being admitted an Advocate, upon the news of an edict, which ſoon after came out, forbidding a Doctor's degree to any, who had not ſtudied five years in ſome univerſity. The ſame year the Court of the Edict was ſuppreſſed, which obliged Mr. Rapin's family to remove to Toulouſe. Mr. Rapin obſerving the unhappy condition of the Proteſtants, which every day grew worſe, deſired his father to conſent, that he might quit the profeſſion of the Law, and apply himſelf to that of the Sword; but received an anſwer, which tended only to the gaining time; for though his requeſt was thought reaſonable and well grounded, his father apprehended, that this new courſe of life, which, more than any other, awakens ambition, might expoſe his ſon to too ſtrong a temptation, as he would find his religion an obſtacle to his fortune, which impediment being once removed, he might hope to riſe, as well as others. This ſtate of uncertainty very much abated his ardour in the ſtudy of the Law; however, he pleaded one cauſe, and one only, and then with more than ordinary attention applied himſelf to the ſtudy of the Mathematicks and Muſick, in which he became a pretty good proficient. In 1685 his father died; and two months after the edict of Nantes being revoked, Mr. Rapin, with his mother and brothers, retired to a country houſe; but as the perſecution in a ſhort time after was carried to a great height, he and his youngeſt brother, in March 1686, went to England [*C*]. But as he had no hopes of any ſettlement in that Kingdom, his ſtay there was but ſhort; he went to Holland where he had ſome relations, and liſted himſelf in the company of French volunteers at Utrecht, commanded by Mr. Rapin, his couſin-german.

wards the ploughing and ſowing his lands; and as thoſe troubles were but of eight months duration, as ſoon as they were appeaſed he found a crop fit to reap, and his whole eſtate in as good a condition (excepting the loſs of his houſe) as the moſt careful owner could have put it. Upon the falſe rumour of his death, he had the pleaſure to read a letter from Queen Mary de Medicis, in which her Majeſty tells his family that ſhe was grieved for his loſs. He married the daughter of Monſieur de Lupé, Lord of Maravat, Captain of fifty men at arms, a Major-General, and Governor of Mauvez in a cautionary town. Monſieur de Rapin left a numerous iſſue, of which the ſecond ſon *James*, Lord of Thoyras, was the favourite of his parents: his father made a more ample proviſion for him than for any of the younger children; and his mother gave him, over and above his fortune, the eſtate ſhe inherited from John de Ferriere, Vidame of Chartres, one of the heads of the Proteſtants in France, which ſhe enjoyed in right of her mother. He, as well as his brothers, was deſigned for the army; but his mother unwilling to part with him, deſired, that he might apply himſelf to his ſtudies, which his father with ſome reluctance conſented to. After he had qualified himſelf, he was admitted an Advocate in the Court of the Edict of Caſtres; and contrary to the cuſtom of the country (for a Gentleman is never ſeen of that profeſſion) he practiſed to the day of his death at Caſtres, Caſtelnaudary, and Toulouſe; but in this computation we muſt take in four years, which he ſpent at Paris, whither he went upon notice of his brother-in-law Monſieur Peliſſon's being taken up with Monſieur Fouquet. He was thoroughly acquainted with every particular of that remarkable affair, and proved many ways very ſerviceable in it. He was one of the three who had an hand in the *Factum*, and furniſhed it with what relates to the Roman law; and Monſieur Fouquet wrote to him a letter from the Baſtille, in which he returns him hearty thanks for that piece. He was eſteemed one of the moſt able lawyers of his age, no leſs eminent for his juſtice than his knowledge. His wife, who died at Geneva, being baniſhed thither for refuſing to embrace the Roman Catholick Religion, was ſiſter to the famous George and Paul Peliſſon; her father and grandfather were Judges in the Parliament of Toulouſe, and of the Court of the Edict of Caſtres. Her great grandfather, who had been Maſter of the Requeſts and Embaſſador in Portugal, was afterwards firſt Preſident of the Senate of Chamberri, and General in Savoy, while in the poſſeſſion of the French. The youngeſt ſon of James de Rapin, was *Paul Rapin*, the ſubject of the preſent article.

[*B*] *Thence to Saumur.*] It was here, that when he was about ſeventeen years of age, upon a very ſlight occaſion he had a quarrel with a friend, which occaſioned a challenge. Whether it was that they had ſpent their time in fetching their ſwords, as ſcholars ſeldom wear any, or that they fought a long time, the night came upon them. While they were thus engaged, Mr. Rapin's blade broke off at the hilt, which he was not ſenſible of, but his adverſary, who immediately perceived it, had the generoſity to give him notice of it, which changing the duel into a friendly embrace, they returned together to the town. Some months after this he had another affair upon his hands with a perſon much ſuperior to him in age, who, as he was taking the air, met and rudely joſtled him in a narrow paſs. Mr. Rapin attacked him; but as there was a good deal of company preſent, they were ſoon parted. He immediately ran for his ſword, but at his return the perſon was gone, and though he made a diligent ſearch after him for ſeveral days he could not find him. He heard the aggreſſor was gone to Paris, whither Mr. Rapin ſoon followed him, but his uncle, Mr. Peliſſon, having received information from Saumur of the ſuſpected cauſe of his journey, acquainted the Marſhals of France with the affair, by whom he was put under an arreſt upon his arrival; and the aggreſſor was likewiſe ſecured. Both parties having had an hearing before the Marſhals, the aggreſſor was ſentenced to be immediately impriſoned in Fort l'Eveque, till Mr. Rapin conſented to his being diſcharged, which he did in about a month after, at the requeſt of the Prince of Furſtemburg, Biſhop of Straſburg, then at Paris. The day following the ſentence abovementioned, the brother of the priſoner meeting Mr. Rapin in the ſtreet treated him with ill language, which could not but make a freſh quarrel; upon which Mr. Rapin drew his ſword, and before any perſon could part them wounded his antagoniſt. By advice of friends on both ſides this affair was concealed for fear of irritating the Marſhals.

[*C*] *He and his younger brother in March* 1686 *went to England.*] He had not been long in London, before he was viſited by a French Abbé of diſtinguiſhed quality, a friend of Mr. Peliſſon, who introduced him to Monſieur Barillon, the French Embaſſador, who received him with great civility. Theſe Gentlemen perſuaded him to go to Court, promiſing to preſent him to the King, and aſſuring him of a favourable reception. Mr. Rapin, who ſaw no ground for his pretending to this honour, and fearing that a propoſal ſeemingly ſo advantageous might have unhappy conſequences, refuſed the offer in the civileſt manner. His preſent ſituation was not very agreeable,

german. Mr. Peliſſon, the ſame year, publiſhed his Reflections on the difference of Religions, which he ſent to Mr. Rapin, with a ſtrict charge to give him his opinion of the work, which he did at large, retorting in many places Mr. Peliſſon's own words; but nothing of this was found among his papers. He did not quit his company, till he followed the Prince of Orange into England, where in 1689, the Lord Kingſton made him his own Enſign; in which poſt he went into Ireland, where at the ſiege of Carrickfergus, which was undertaken ſoon after their landing, he gained the eſteem of all the Officers of his regiment, eſpecially that of Lieutenant-Colonel Fielding, who, before the cloſe of that year, procured him a Lieutenant's commiſſion. In the beginning of the year 1690, the regiment, in which he ſerved, was given to Lieutenant-General Douglas, who, upon the recommendation of three French Colonels, received Mr. Rapin with greater diſtinction than any other of the Subalterns, and afterwards repoſed a very great confidence in him. Mr. Rapin was preſent at the battle of the Boyne. At the ſiege of Limerick he was ſhot through the ſhoulder; and the ſiege being raiſed the next day, was obliged to ride four miles in very great torture; and being left with the wounded, (among whom was his own brother, who received a ſhot through his body) he could not join his regiment, which marched towards the north. Not long after this, he was appointed, by General Douglas, Captain of the Company in which he had been Enſign. The year following, that General, who commanded the Scots guards, being ordered for Flanders, made choice of Mr. Rapin to be Aid de Camp, whoſe ill ſtate of health would not allow him to accept of that offer. He continued in Ireland till towards the end of the year 1693 [*D*], when he was ordered for England, without any reaſon aſſigned; but a letter, which he received at the ſame time from Mr. Belcaſtel, informed him, that he was to be Tutor to the ſon of the Earl of Portland. Having never had any thoughts of this nature, he could not imagine to whom he owed the recommendation; which he at laſt found to be from the Lord Galloway. He immediately went to London, and entered upon his charge. This put a period to all his hopes of riſing to thoſe poſts in the army, which ſeveral younger Officers of his acquaintance afterwards obtained. All the return made him, was leave to reſign his company to his brother, who was afterwards a Lieutenant-Colonel of Engliſh dragoons, and died in the year 1719. The King, indeed, granted him a penſion of an hundred pounds a year, till he could provide better for him, which never happened. He enjoyed this penſion ſeveral years; but upon the death of that King, it was taken from him, and a poſt of ſmall value given him in exchange. While the Earl of Portland was Embaſſador in France, he was obliged to be ſometimes in that Kingdom, often in England, and not ſeldom in Holland; but at length he ſettled at the Hague, where the young Lord Portland was learning his exerciſes. While he reſided here, in 1699, he married Marianne Teſtard; but this marriage neither abated his care of his pupil, nor prevented his accompliſhing him in his travels, which they began with a tour through Germany, where they made ſome ſtay at different Courts, but eſpecially at that of Vienna. Hence they went into Italy by the way of Tirol, where the Mareſchal de Villeroy was at that time priſoner, who gave Mr. Rapin a letter for the Cardinal d'Etreés, then at Venice. Having finiſhed their travels, which put an end to his employment, he returned to his family at the Hague, where he continued ſome years [*E*]. But as he found his family encreaſe, he reſolved to retire to ſome cheap country, and accordingly removed in 1707, to Wezel, where he wrote the works publiſhed by him [*F*]. Though he was of a ſtrong conſtitution, yet ſeven-

able, being perpetually preſſedby the Marquis deSciſſac, and other French Catholicks then in London, upon the ſubject of Religion, and eſpecially by the Abbé, who, notwithſtanding he ſhewed the greateſt complaiſance, always turned the diſcourſe to controverſy. Finding it not poſſible for him, who was unprepared, to make his party good againſt a man converſant in every controverted point, and who had treated his ſubject with great art, he reſolved upon returning into the country without taking leave of the Abbé, though he came to town on no other account than to pay his reſpects to that Gentleman. He was ſenſible, that he ſhould be guilty of ill manners in taking this ſtep; however, he thought it better than to continue longer expoſed.

[*D*] *He continued in Ireland till towards the end of the year* 1693.] He was at the ſiege of Athlone, as likewiſe at the action, which happened in paſſing the river Shannon, reckoned not only one of the braveſt, but alſo one of the moſt difficult enterprizes, that ever ſucceeded, and which the Generals themſelves in a manner deſpaired of: two regiments of different nations were left in the town, commanded by their reſpective Lieutenant Colonels; neither of whom underſtanding the language of the other, and both being jealous of their authority, it might have proved the ground of continual diſſenſion, if it had not been prevented by the prudence of Mr. Rapin, and of a Captain in the other regiment his particular friend. Theſe two having great influence over their ſeveral commanding officers, and being themſelves diſpaſſionate, happily prevented all differences. From hence Mr. Rapin was ſent to other garriſons, in particular to Kilkenny, where he afterwards waited on the Biſhop, by whom he was very well received; and he ſhould have thought himſelf happy in this ſituation, had not the daily broils, which aroſe between the Mayor of the town and the officers, alloyed the pleaſure he found in that Prelate's agreeable converſation. He exerted himſelf in reconciling theſe animoſities; and it was chiefly owing to his care, that they did not come to extremities. He ſome time after joined his regiment at Kingſale, where Sir James Waller was commanding officer, with whom he contracted a ſtrict friendſhip.

[*E*] *Returned to his family at the Hague, where he continued ſome years.*] He employed his leiſure hours in the ſtudy of fortification, but eſpecially of hiſtory; which occaſioned his making ſeveral general and particular chronological and genealogical tables. He was not a little pleaſed with being one of thoſe, who founded an aſſembly of men of merit and letters, whoſe converſation generally turned upon ſubjects of literature.

[*F*] *The works publiſhed by him.*] In 1717 he publiſhed at the Hague in 12mo, *Diſſertation ſur les Whigs*

ſeventeen years application (for ſo long he was in compoſing his *Hiſtory of England*) intirely ruined his health. About three years before his death, he found himſelf exhauſted, and often felt great pains in his ſtomach. Had he either quite abandoned that work, or allowed himſelf ſome relaxation, he might have hoped for a cure. Though he was ſenſible of this, yet he could not throughly reſolve upon it; all that he could bring himſelf to, was the lying till ſix o'clock in the morning, after which time he could neither ſleep nor be eaſy in his bed. He was ſoon tired of the diverſions he allowed himſelf, the chief of which was taking the air ſometimes; and whenever his illneſs gave him the leaſt reſpite, he returned to his work, which was the ground of his diſtemper, and at the ſame time his only pleaſure. At length a violent fever, with an oppreſſion at his ſtomach, put at end to his life the ſeventh day, which was May the 16th, 1725, he being then 64 years old. He left one ſon and ſix daughters. He was naturally of a ſedate temper. While he was in the army, this diſpoſition, which inclined him to ſeek the company of ſpeculative perſons, injured him in the opinion of ſome of his comrades, and even of ſome of his ſuperior Officers, who would have had him a partner in their diverſions; but on the other hand, it gained him the eſteem and friendſhip of many men of merit, who were in conſiderable poſts. However, we muſt not imagiue, that he was altogether inſenſible of pleaſure; he could be gay upon occaſion, though it was ſeldom, and always with moderation. He compoſed ſeveral little lively pieces, both in proſe and verſe; but as they were upon light ſubjects, or of little importance, and written only for the immediate diverſion of his friends, he never thought them worth the trouble of reviſing (*a*).

(*a*) See *Bibliotheque Germanique*, Tom. 10. *Hiſt. Litteraire*, Fevrier 1726, and the *Life of Rapin* prefixed to his *Hiſtory of England*.

Whigs & les Torys; and drew up extracts from the ſeventeen volumes of Rymer's *Fœdera*, printed in Mr. Le Clerc's *Bibliotheque Choiſie*, and *Bibliotheque ancienne & moderne*. But his greateſt work was his *Hiſtory of England*, printed at the Hague 1724 in 8 volumes in 4to, and reprinted ſince that time. There are two tranſlations of it, one by the Reverend Mr. Nicholas Tindal, M. A. firſt publiſhed in 8vo, and afterwards reprinted in two volumes in fol. and the other by John Kelly of the Inner-Temple Eſq; in two volumes in fol. Mr. Thomas Carte in a paper of his, containing a plan for an Hiſtory of England, gives the following character of our Author's Hiſtory.

" Rapin, later in time than our other writers, en-
" joyed by that means one advantage, which all his
" predeceſſors wanted; but withal he laboured un-
" der greater diſadvantages than any of them, with
" regard to a civil hiſtory of this nation; as being
" a foreigner and utterly unacquainted with our con-
" ſtitution, laws, and cuſtoms, any further than he
" could learn in converſation, or pick up in Coffee-
" Houſes, the common habitation of his countrymen
" in this city; ſo that his reaſonings or reflections
" upon the paſſages of former times are too often
" founded upon the modern notions, which he had
" thus imbibed. Writing his hiſtory abroad, he
" wanted an opportunity (if the ſelf-ſufficiency, to
" which ſome natures are ſubject, had not ſtifled in
" him the inclination) of conſulting perſons better
" verſed than himſelf in antiquity, whoſe know-
" ledge might have ſupplied his defects, and whoſe
" informations might have helped to form or correct
" his judgment. The only advantage he had over
" others was, that he wrote after *Rymer's Fœdera* was
" publiſhed; and this circumſtance, more than any
" other, contributed to recommend his hiſtory. But
" as a number of technical words relative to parti-
" cular uſages are every where to be found in the in-
" ſtruments publiſhed in that collection, he thro' the
" want of ſufficient knowledge of thoſe uſages did
" not always underſtand their true meaning. The
" part, which he made moſt uſe of in that work,
" was the publick treaties with foreign Princes;
" but of theſe *Rymer* himſelf hath given us only an
" imperfect collection; his work containing no trea-
" ties, but ſuch as were inrolled in Chancery, and
" are preſerved in the Tower of London, or in the
" office of the rolls. Whilſt I was in France, I was
" curious in ſearching for every thing, that con-
" cerned my own country; and have notes or made
" abſtracts of near a thouſand inſtruments of treaties
" and tranſactions between the crowns of England
" and France, which do not appear in *Rymer*, and
" yet are preſerved in the King of France's *Treſor des*
" *Chartres*, and in the regiſters of the *Chambre des*
" *Comptes* of the *Parliament* of Paris. There lie con-
" cealed at this time in our own archives ſome
" hundreds of the like publick treaties with foreign
" Princes and States, which would afford great light
" to our hiſtory. I never obſerved in *Rapin* any
" quotation out of the Journals of our Privy Council,
" unleſs at ſecond hand out of Dr. Burnet's *Hiſtory of*
" *the Reformation*; though a conſcientious hiſtorian
" would never take up any thing on truſt, where
" he might examine the original, and a careful one
" would never have omitted to conſult the books of
" that Council, wherein the moſt important affairs,
" that paſs, as well within as without the nation, are
" debated and tranſacted. It doth not appear from
" his work, that he ever read, either the rolls of
" Parliament, or the Journals of either Houſe, which
" yet muſt be deemed abſolutely neceſſary for an
" Engliſh hiſtorian. It is certain, that he never ſo
" much as ſaw the *Paper-Office*, or he could never
" have been guilty of that groſs miſtake in affirm-
" ing, that there is not any one letter, that paſſed
" between Queen Mary of Scotland and Queen E-
" lizabeth and her Miniſters, preſerved in any of our
" archives or repoſitories of publick papers. When
" if he had ever looked into the preſs in that office
" marked Scotland, an hundred libels would have of-
" fered themſelves to his ſight, put on different
" bundles, and expreſſing them to be letters from
" thoſe very perſons to one another in different years
" from 1569 to 1587. In this office are preſerved
" the letters of all our Embaſſadors in foreign Courts,
" and the diſpatches of the Lords of the Privy Coun-
" cil, of the Clerks of the Council, and of our Se-
" cretaries of State to thoſe Embaſſadors, in a con-
" ſtant ſeries from the time of Edward IV down to
" the revolution in a regular order; beſides a great
" number of original treaties and other papers, which
" will be found exceeding uſeful for an Engliſh hiſ-
" tory. It will appear ſtrange to every one, who
" conſiders how neceſſary theſe are for the right un-
" derſtanding of our negotiations abroad and our
" tranſactions with foreign States, that no Hiſtorian
" hath yet made any uſe of the Papers in this Of-
" fice."

T.

(*a*) *Lindenius renovatus*, p. 537.

RASARIO (JOHN BAPTIST), an Italian Phyſician, was born in the territory of Novara [*A*], in 1517 (*a*). He taught Polite Literature (*b*) at Venice twenty-two years

(*b*) Ghilini ſays that he was Profeſſor of the Greek tongue at Venice; and Thuanus, that he was Profeſſor of Eloquence.

[*A*] *He was born in the territory of Navara.*] I ſpeak thus in general, becauſe Thuanus and Ghilini are agreed with regard to the name of the place of his birth. The latter calls it *Borgo di Seſia* (1); and the

(1) Ghilini, part. 2. p. 142.

years with great reputation (*c*); and his eloquence was greatly applauded, among other occaſions, at the time when he made an oration on the victory gained at Lepanto, in 1571 [*B*]. He afterwards went to Rome, where Pope Pius IV. offered him a very handſom ſalary; but he did not like to reſide in that city, and choſe rather to accept of the employment which the Senate of Milan offered him (*d*), viz. that of teaching Polite Literature in the univerſity of Pavia. He died there in 1578 (*e*), and not in 1573, as we are told in *Lindenius renovatus*. His Latin tranſlation of ſome of Galen's works was printed in 1545 (*f*). Neither Ghilini, Teiſſier, nor Moreri, make any mention of this tranſlation in the catalogue they have given of his works. The particulars, which Moreri ſays of Raſario are extracted from Teiſſier. The Reader will do well to look into this laſt mentioned Author, and alſo the original of Thuanus; but he will here find ſome miſtakes that want to be rectified [*C*].

(*c*) Thuan. lib. 65 *ſub fin.*

(*d*) Ghilini, Tom. 2. p. 142.

(*e*) Idem, ibid.

(*f*) *Linden. renovatus*, p. 537.

the former employs a phraſe I do not underſtand, and which is ungrammatical in my edition; *Oppido quod à valle Uziæ in Novarienſi diocæſi ſito nomen retinet familia nobili natus* (2). Theſe words have been thus tranſlated by Teiſſier, *deſcended of a noble family of Valdugia in the Novarreze* (3). Moreri adds, that *Valdugia* is a *town of the Novarreze*. Paul Freherus (4), quoting the *Thuanus enucleatus* of Gerard de Stocken, ſays, *in vallo Uziæ*, and not *à valle Uziæ*, which alteration, ſo far from leſſening the difficulty, increaſes it conſiderably.

(2) Thuan. lib. 65, *ſub fin.* p. 233. edit. Franc. 1625.

(3) Teiſſier, *Elog.* Tom. 1. p. 486. edit. of 1696.

(4) *In Theatro*, p. 1277.

[*B*] *When he made an oration on the victory gained at Lepanto in* 1571.] As ſoon as the *Te Deum* had been ſung in St. Mark's Church, Raſario was ordered by the Doge to make an oration to the people on this famous victory, which he performed accordingly in that Church, to the great admiration of the people. *Princeps Joanni Baptiſtæ Raſario viro doctiſſ. mandatum eodem die dedit, ut de hac victoria orationem ad populum haberet. Quam rem ille die tertio, cum eodem in templo expediret, Senatum, populum, peregrinos, adeoque infinitam prope auditorum multitudinem eloquentiæ ſuæ admiratione attonitam reddidit* (5). This ſpeech has borne ſeveral impreſſions.

(5) Jo. Petrus Contarenus, *de Bello Venetis à Selimo II illato*, p. *ult.*

[*C*] *Some miſtakes . . . . . want to be rectified in* Thuanus.] What he ſays with regard to the eſteem, which Philip II. had for Raſario was unknown to Ghilini, a circumſtance that ſurprizes me. This Prince began to know Raſario's merit, when he paſſed through Milan to go into Germany in 1548 (6). Thuanus adds, that he promiſed him great advantage in order to draw him into Portugal; and to induce him to accept of a Profeſſorſhip in the Univerſity of Coimbra; but that Raſario deſired to be excuſed on account of his advanced age; and yet could not refuſe his requeſt to go and teach eloquence in Pavia; he being obliged to him for procuring his brother his liberty, and the reſtitution of his poſſeſſions which had been confiſcated. Thuanus is miſtaken with regard to the Profeſſorſhip of Coimbra; for Philip II. had not made himſelf maſter of Portugal till the year 1580, and Raſario died in 1578, after having taught four years in the Univerſity of Pavia (7). This great Hiſtorian, attentive chiefly to other particulars that were more eſſential to his work, did not ſufficiently examine thoſe things, which relate to the lives of great men; but thoſe Writers, who have digeſted what he relates concerning them, and publiſhed their collection ſeparately, ought to add the neceſſary corrections.

(6) Thuan. lib. 65. p. 233.

(7) Thuan. ib.

RATALLER (GEORGE), in Latin *Ratallerus* (*a*), ſprung from an ancient and noble family in Frieſland, was born at Leeuwarden, about the year 1518. He firſt ſtudied at Utrecht under George Macropedius (*b*), and afterwards at Louvain, and in the univerſities of France and Italy (*c*). Being returned to Flanders, he was made Counſellor in the Council of the Province of Artois; afterwards in the ſupreme Council of Malines, and *Maître des Requetes* (*d*). The Ducheſs of Parma ſent him on a negotiation to Denmark; and as he acquitted himſelf well on that occaſion, he was appointed Preſident of the Council of Utrecht. He died ſuddenly in the Aſſembly of that Council the 1ſt of October, 1580, according to Sweertius (*e*); or the 6th of October, 1581, if we may credit Valerius Andreas (*f*). He was a perſon of merit, and highly worthy of eſteem for his merit, virtue, knowledge and politeneſs (*g*). He was a good Latin Poet; a proof of which he gave, among other works, by his tranſlation of Sophocles [*A*]. One John Lallemant, who alſo made a verſion of that Poet, borrowed a great number of verſes from our Rataller, without taking any notice of the Author from whom he borrowed them (*h*); and conſequently he may be ranked among the Plagiaries.

(*a*) And not *Rotellerus*, as in the *Epitome* of Geſner.

(*b*) Val. Andr. *Bibl. Belg.* p. 266.

(*c*) Sweert. *Athen. Belg.* p. 275.

(*d*) Val. Andr. *Bibl. Belg.* p. 269.

(*e*) Sweert, *Athen. Belg.* p. 275.

(*f*) Val. Andr. *Bibl. Belg.* p. 266.

(*g*) Idem, ibid.

(*h*) Præf. *Sophoclis à Ratellero metricè verſi.*

RAUBER,

[*A*] *Among other works by his tranſlation of Sophocles.*] His tranſlation of Heſiod (1) in hexameter and pentameter verſe, was printed at Francfort anno 1546 in 8vo, with a book of his epigrams (2). He tranſlated into various kinds of Latin verſe, conformable enough to the original, the ſeven Tragedies we have left of Sophocles; but he could not be prevailed upon to let this verſion be printed. However, his friends, who had copies of it, did not regard his ſcruples: but got Gryphius to print at Lyons in 1550 the Ajax (3), the Electra, and the Antigone. At laſt the Author ſuffered himſelf to be wrought upon; he putting the finiſhing hand to theſe three, and to the four others; and publiſhed them together at Antwerp, *Ex Officina Gulielmi Silvii Typographi Regii*, in 1570 in 8vo. Valerius Andreas knew nothing of this book. He has not only been guilty of an omiſſion on this occaſion, but alſo committed an error; he ſaying that Ratallerus tranſlated into Latin verſe, three Tragedies of Sophocles, the Phœnician Women, the Hippolytus, and Andromache, with the fragments of the ancient Poets found in Stobæus. He did not know that theſe three Tragedies were writ by Euripides, and not by Sophocles. They were printed with theſe fragments at Antwerp 1581, in 16°. as Sweertius (4) informs us. He has been more accurate in this than Valerius Andreas; but he was no ways accurate, when, after ſaying that Ratallerus had tranſlated all Sophocles's Tragedies into Latin verſe, he adds, *ejuſdem* (Sophoclis) *Fabulas III. carmine quoque Latino tranſtulit*, i. e. "*He alſo tranſlated into Latin "verſe, three Fables of Sophocles.*" A perſon muſt be extremely ignorant not to know that *Tragœdiæ Sophoclis, & Fabulæ Sophoclis*, are the ſame thing.

(1) *i. e.* of Heſiod's *Opera & Dies.*

(2) Val. Andr. *Bibl. Belg.* p. 266.

(3) And not the *Alexandria*, as in the *Epitome* of Geſner.

(4) Sweert, *Athen. Belg.* p. 276.

A Phyſician (5) of Autun, in Burgundy, publiſhed a Latin tranſlation of the ſeven Tragedies of Sophocles, at Paris in 1557, and ſtole many things from Ratallerus. *Hic multos verſus & paginas* . . . . and in the printed work as far as the word *evicerit* (6) inclufively.

(5) Joannes Lalemantius or Lalamantius.

Rattallerus's dedication to his Sophocles is worthy of being read. He dedicated it to Frederic Perenot, brother of Cardinal de Granvelle; and repreſented to him, in a noble manner, the advantages, which

(6) Adrian. Myſius, *Præf. Sophocles Ratalleri.*

men

(a) An article communicated by Mr. DE BRESLER.

(b) Valvaſor. *la Gloire du Duche de Carniole*, liv. 11.

RAUBER (*a*) (ANDREW EBERHARD), of Talberg and Weineck [*A*], Lord of the fortreſs of Petronel, a German Knight, and Counſellor of the Council of War to the Emperor Maximilian II (*b*). He gained great fame, not only by his great ſtrength, and high ſtature, but alſo by his beard, which was of an extraordinary length. He was deſcended from the very ancient noble family of Rauber, in the Dukedom of Carniola, which the Emperor Maximilian I. raiſed to the dignity of Barons [*B*]. Our Andrew Eberhard Rauber ſerved the Emperor Maximilian II. from his youth; travelled with him into foreign countries, and was always in the favour of that Emperor, who alſo appointed him Counſellor of his Council of War; and gave him for his firſt wife, Helen Scharſeginn [*C*], his natural daughter, but he was obliged firſt to win her by a whimſical ſort of a combat with his rival, in which there was no loſs of blood. He gave, on this occaſion, very ſingular proofs of his ſtrength [*D*]. He had no children by her; but his ſecond wife [*E*] compenſated largely for that defect, ſhe bringing into the world eight children who were twins, among whom was a ſon named Andrew Eberhard; and ſeven daughters, one of whom died unmarried, and the reſt married into very illuſtrious families. His ſtrength was ſo great, that he could break to pieces the ſtrongeſt horſe-ſhoe. One day that he took a Jew who had been baptized by the beard, and ſtruck upon it with his right hand, both the beard and jaw-bone came off into his hand [*F*]. His beard was a true prodigy, and of ſo ſurprizing a length, that it deſcended to his feet, and then back again to his girdle [*G*]. It doubtleſs exceeded that of all the Lombards in length [*H*]. At laſt Rauber died in the ſixty-eighth year of his age, at his caſtle of Petronel [*I*], in the year 1575 (*c*), and was there interred between his two wives.

(c) Ibid. p. 635.

☞ RAWLEIGH,

men in the higheſt ſtations may reap from Tragedy, when they are capable of profiting by the examples and maxims which the ſtage exhibits to them.

[*A*] *Weineck.*] This Weineck is a Caſtle in the country of Carniola, called in the language of the country Kraviek. It is ſituated on an eminence in the inward part of Carniola, four leagues from Layback, the capital of the country. It was formerly a caſtle whence came the family of the Lords of Weineck, the poſterity of which has been long extinct; as well as that of Hardegi of Petrau, Governor of Carniolas, who poſſeſſed this caſtle, in 1530. At laſt, after Count Hermann de Cilly had ruined this Caſtle, he gave it in 1433 to Frederic Rauber; ſince which time it has always been enjoyed by the Rauber family (1).

(1) Valvaſor. *la Gloire du Duche de Carniole*, p. 631 and 635.

[*B*] *Raiſed to the dignity of Barons.*] This was the 24th of December 1516, in the city of Hagenau; which dignity was conferred on Leonard Rauber, Grand Marſhal of the Emperor's Court, and Nicholas Rauber his brother, with the title of Baron of Planckhenſtein and Carlſtetten. But this title was dormant for ſome time, and afterwards revived by the preſent Emperor the 12th of April 1651 (2).

(2) Ibid. p. 637, 638.

[*C*] *Helen Scharſeginn.*] The Emperor Maximilian II. before he married, was ſmit with the daughter of a Count of Eaſt--Frieſland, who was looked upon as the moſt beautiful woman of her time. His love, and the great familiarity he had with her, had ſo much effect, that a daughter ſprung from it, named Helen Scharſeginn, who was not inferior to her mother in beauty; for which reaſon ſhe had a great number of admirers (3).

(3) Ibid. p. 634.

[*D*] *Of his ſtrength.*] We here have a whimſical and even a very uncommon manner of gaining a wife, which doubtleſs is not found in any romance. For though Romance-Writers tell us, that the heroes of ancient times uſed to gain their miſtreſſes by tournaments, duels, combats with giants, dragons, and a hundred whimſies of this nature; the manner employed by Rauber has not been known to any perſon. For when he demanded the Emperor's daughter in marriage, there happened to be, at the Court, a Spaniſh Gentleman of great quality, who alſo aſpired to be the Emperor's ſon-in-law. The reputation of this Spaniard's valour, as well as his tall ſtature, which exceeded that of Rauber, recommended him greatly. The Emperor not being willing to deny either of them, agreed that they ſhould decide the affair by a trial of their ſtrength. He cauſed to be given to each of them a ſack, large enough to hold his opponent, and promiſed that he who ſhould put the other into the ſack ſhould have his daughter in marriage. Accordingly our two lovers engaged before the Emperor, in a kind of combat, in which they exerted their utmoſt ſtrength, which was very much increaſed by love, and each of them, prompted by an ardent deſire to win the Emperor's daughter, endeavoured to force his adverſary into the ſack. At laſt Rauber came off victorious; ſo that the ſtrength and valour of the German put the proud Spaniard's bravery into the ſack. Thus Rauber got poſſeſſion of lovely Helen; and the Spaniard, after receiving ſo ſignal an affront, retired from Court (4).

[*E*] *His ſecond wife.*] She was a Hungarian, named Urſula de Tſchillack in Niemptſchitz. She was loſt at the taking of Niemptſchitz, as ſhe was withdrawing privately, and was found by a German Captain, who kept her, out of pity, during ſome time, at his houſe. But he afterwards made a preſent of her to the Emperor Maximilian II. who had her brought up in the apartment of his women; and when ſhe was grown up, he gave her to Rauber in marriage (5).

(4) Idem, ibid.

[*F*] *Came off into his hand.*] This happened at Gratz, at the deſire of the Archduke Charles, at whoſe Court there happened to be a baptized Jew, who, on account of his ſtature and ſtrength, ſeemed a giant. The Archduke Charles, deſirous of knowing whether his ſtrength ſurpaſſed that of Rauber, obliged each of them, as a trial of their reſpective ſtrengths, to receive a blow with the fiſt from the other; and at the ſame time permitted them to caſt lots who ſhould ſtrike firſt, which happening to fall to the baptized Jew, he gave Rauber ſo violent a blow, that it obliged him to keep his bed a week, and his room ſtill longer. Some time after he was recovered, the Jew was obliged to receive a blow from him; when Rauber took him by his long beard, and twiſting it twice round his left hand, he ſtruck, with his right, with ſo much violence, that not only his beard, but alſo his under jaw, came off in his hand, by which means the Jew ſoon after loſt his life (6).

(5) Idem, ibid.

[*G*] *To his girdle.*] It was ſtill longer, he winding it alſo round a ſtaff. He was ſo proud of it, that he ſeldom went to Court in a coach or on horſe-back, but generally on foot, to ſhew his long beard, which he carried like a ſtreamer, and let it fly with the wind. When he died, it was cut into two tufts.

(6) Ibid. p. 34.

[*H*] *It doubtleſs exceeded that of all the Lombards in length.*] The name of Lombard is generally derived from *Long-beard*, but this is a falſity. This name being rather borrowed from the old German word *Borde* or *Boerde*, ſignifying ſpace or extent of country; and this extent of country, which extends along the Elbe, from Tourgou in Miſnia, and by Magdeburg as far as Lunenburg, was formerly called *Long-Boerde*, that is, the long extent of country, or the long ſpace; and the inhabitants were called *Long-Bards*.

[*I*] *Petronel.*] The caſtle of Petronel is not far from Preſburg; it is now poſſeſſed by Count de Thum, and is built very magnificently.

[*A*] *Raleigh.*]

☞ RAWLEGH, or RALEGH [*A*] (WALTER), was deſcended of an ancient family in the county of Devon [*B*], and ſon of Walter Ralegh, Eſq; of Fardel, in the pariſh of Cornwood, near Plymouth [*C*]. He was born in 1552, at a farm-houſe called Hayes, in the pariſh of Budley, in that part of Devonſhire bordering eaſtward upon the ſea, near where the river Ottery diſcharges itſelf into the Britiſh channel (*a*). He was educated in the univerſity of Oxford [*D*]; and afterwards went to the wars in France about the year 1569 [*E*]; and upon his return from thence, is ſaid to have reſided in the Middle-Temple [*F*]. He went then to the wars in the Netherlands; and ſoon after attended Sir Humphrey Gilbert, his brother by the mother's ſide, in an expedition to the northern parts of America; and upon his return became Captain in the wars of Ireland (*b*); and in 1581, was one of the Commiſſioners for the Government of Munſter in that Kingdom, in the abſence of the Earl of Ormond, and afterwards Governor of Cork (*c*). After his return to England, he was introduced at Court [*G*]; and in June 1583, ſet

(*a*) *Life of Sir Walter Ralegh.* By William Oldys, Gent. p. 6, 7.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 7—16.

(*c*) Ibid. p. 17, 18.

[*A*] *Ralegh.*] This is the manner, in which he wrote his name himſelf, though other writers have ſpelt it differently.

[*B*] *Deſcended of an ancient family in the county of Devon.*] It flouriſhed in that county before the conqueſt; and with regard to that branch of it, from which Sir Walter Ralegh was deſcended, Smalridge in the pariſh of Axminſter was one of their moſt ancient ſeats (1).

(1) *Life of Sir Walter Ralegh.* By William Oldys, Gent. p. 4.

[*C*] *Walter Ralegh of Fardel Eſq; in the pariſh of Cornwood near Plymouth.*] This Gentleman was thrice married; and by his firſt wife Joan, daughter of John Drake of Exmouth in Devon Eſq; had two ſons, one named George, and the other John; the latter of whom married Anne the daughter of Sir Bartholomew Forteſcue of Filley in Devon, and relict of —— Gaicrick of Ford; and they had iſſue. Mr. Ralegh's ſecond wife was daughter of Mr. Darell of London; by whom he had a daughter named Mary, who was married to Hugh Snedale of Hilling in Cornwall Eſq; and had iſſue. His third wife was Catharine daughter of Sir Philip Champernon of Modbury, and relict of Otho Gilbert of Compton in Devon Eſq; He had by this wife his third ſon Carew, afterwards knighted, and of Wiltſhire, who married Dorothy daughter of Sir William Wroughton, and relict of Sir John Thynn; by whom he had iſſue; and laſtly his fourth ſon, WALTER, the ſubject of this Article, who was uterine brother of thoſe three eminent Knights, Sir John, Sir Humphrey, and Sir Adrian Gilbert. By this laſt wife Mr. Ralegh had alſo one daughter, Margaret, who was married firſt to Mr. Radford of Mount Radford in Devon, Clerk of the Peace, and afterwards to —— Hull of Larkebere Eſq; in St. Leonard's pariſh Exeter (2).

(2) Idem, ibid.

[*D*] *Educated in the Univerſity of Oxford.*] This appears from Mr. Hooker (3), Lord Bacon (4), and Mr. Wood (5), the laſt of whom tells us, that *he became Commoner of Oriel College, in or about the year* 1568, *when his kinſman C. Champernon ſtudied there; and that his natural parts being ſtrangely advanced by academical learning under the care of an excellent Tutor, he became the ornament of the juniors, and was worthily eſteemed a proficient in oratory and philoſophy.* But with regard to his coming ſo late thither, as Mr. Wood mentions, and ſtaying ſo long there as three years, as the ſame writer afterwards relates, Mr. Oldys (7) is of opinion, that this is a miſtake, ſince it is evident, that Mr. Ralegh was two years before that time in the wars abroad.

(3) *Epiſtle Dedicatory*, before his *Tranſlation and Continuation of the Chronicles of Ireland*, p. 7. printed in Hollingſhed, vol. 2. 1587.

(4) *Apophthegms new and old*, p. 292. edit. 1625, in 8vo.

(5) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 435. 2d edit.

(7) p. 7.

[*E*] *Went to the wars in France about the year* 1569.] Mr. Hooker (8) ſays, that *after Ralegh had laid a good ground to build his actions on at the Univerſity, he travelled into France.* And this is confirmed by Camden (9), according to whoſe account of time, Ralegh could not be, at his departure, above ſeventeen years of age; and by the occaſion of his firſt going over, it appears, that he firſt diſtinguiſhed himſelf there in a military courſe of life, in a ſelect troop of an hundred Gentlemen voluntiers, commanded by Henry Champernon, a relation by marriage of the Earl of Montgomery; which troop went to France to aſſiſt the Proteſtants in France.

(8) *Epiſt. Dedicatory*, ubi ſupra.

(9) *Annal. Reg. Eliz.* ad ann. 1569.

[*F*] *Upon his return from thence is ſaid to have reſided in the Middle Temple.*] Mr. Wood aſſerts (10), that after he had left the Univerſity, *he went to the Middle Temple to improve himſelf in the intricate knowledge of the municipal law. How long he tarried there, it is uncertain; yet ſure I am from an epiſtle or copy of verſes of his compoſition, which I have ſeen, that he was abiding in the ſaid Temple in April* 1576. Sir Robert Naunton likewiſe (11) mentions his having ſtudied at the Inns of Court. But Mr. Lewis Theobald (12) is of opinion, that this is a groſs miſtake, ſince Ralegh, at his arraigment at Wincheſter, in reply to the Attorney General, lays an heavy imprecation upon himſelf, *if ever he read a word of law or ſtatutes, before he was a priſoner in the Tower.* With regard to the verſes mentioned by Mr. Wood, they are a commendatory poem of three ſtanzas by *Walter Rawley* of the *Middle Temple*, as he is there written, and printed, among others, before a ſatyr called the *Steele-Glaſs*, publiſhed in 1576 by George Gaſcoigne Eſq; Mr. Oldys obſerves (13), that "as to the particular of his being of the Middle Temple, all we can conclude of it is, ſince he has ſo publickly and ſolemnly proteſted he never ſtudied the law there, that it might be as cuſtomary in the Inns of Court then, as it is now, for a young Gentleman to be with a friend, or have the uſe of his Chambers, while he is out of town, or even have chambers of his own, rather than be confined to the ſingularities of a family in lodgings, and never read a word of the law, much leſs have any purpoſe to practiſe it. And this is ſtrengthened by what I have met with both in ſome old writings and ſome hiſtorians of thoſe times, which obſerve, that the inmates not only in private houſes, but thoſe who dwelt among the Lawyers, and did not follow their profeſſion, grew ſo numerous and inconvenient, that there was an order or proclamation for their removal out of the Inns of Court about the latter end of Queen Elizabeth's or the beginning of her ſucceſſor's reign. Further to confirm this conjecture of Ralegh's being only an inmate there, I have been led to enquire after the regiſters of the Middle Temple, which are ſtill extant, of thoſe times; and upon a diligent ſearch have ſatisfied myſelf, that there was no ſuch perſon entered as a ſtudent of the law in that Inn, by the name of Walter Ralegh or any name like it, either in this year that he wrote the aboveſaid poem from thence, or any other year before, up to the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign; though ſome of his countrymen, and, I think relations, occur there in that ſpace of time."

(10) *Ubi ſupra.*

(11) *Fragmenta Regalia*, p. 33. edit. 1641.

(12) *Memoirs of Sir W. Ralegh*, p. 5. edit. 1719, in 8vo.

(13) p. 11.

[*G*] *Introduced to Court.*] Fuller only tells us (14), that it was upon the following occaſion. *Her Majeſty meeting with a plaſhy place, made ſome ſcruple to go on; when Ralegh dreſſed in a gay and gentile habit of thoſe times preſently caſt off and ſpread his new pluſh cloak on the ground, whereon the Queen trod gently over, rewarding him afterwards with many ſuits for his ſo free and ſeaſonable tender of ſo fair a foot-cloth. Thus an advantageous admiſſion into the notice of a Prince is more than half a degree to perfection.* After this, as the ſame writer obſerves, Ralegh coming to Court, and finding ſome hopes of the Queen's favour reflecting upon him, he wrote in a glaſs-window, obvious to her eye,

Fain would I climb, yet fear I to fall.

under which her Majeſty ſoon after wrote,

If thy heart fail thee, climb not at all.

Sir Robert Naunton (15) is "confident that among the

(14) *Worthies of England*, in Devon.

(15) *Fragmenta Regalia*, p. 34.

ſet out with Henry Gilbert in his expedition to Newfoundland, but within a few days was obliged to return to Plymouth, by reaſon his whole ſhip's company was infected with a contagious ſickneſs (*d*). In 1584, he obtained the Queen's Letters Patents for diſcovering of unknown countries, dated March the 25th. Upon the grant of which, Ralegh fitted out two barks, well furniſhed with men and proviſions at his own expence, which ſet ſail with his inſtructions for America, on the 27th of April following, and diſcovered the country of Wingandacoa (*e*), which Queen Elizabeth changed to that of *Virginia*. In the next ſeſſions of Parliament in the latter end of that year, he was elected Knight of the ſhire for the county of Devon (*f*); and ſoon after was knighted (*g*) [*H*]. About the time that her Majeſty granted him the Patent abovementioned, for the diſcovery of remote countries, ſhe ſeems alſo to have given him another, to licenſe the vending of wines throughout the Kingdom; that by the advantages of this, he might be the better able to ſuſtain the great charges, which the other brought upon him (*h*). The Parliament being prorogued on the 29th of March 1585, Ralegh appears ſeveral ways engaged in the laudable improvements of Navigation. For he was one of the *Collegues of the fellowſhip for the diſcovery of the North-weſt paſſage* [*I*]. In April the ſame year, he ſent his own fleet upon a ſecond voyage to Virginia, and deputed Sir Richard Greenville General of the expedition, and Mr. Ralph Lane, who was afterwards knighted, to be Governor of the colony, which they now tranſported. Soon after he received a grant from the Queen of twelve thouſand acres, in the counties of Cork and Waterford, in Ireland [*K*]. In June following, he ſent ſome ſhips on a third voyage to Virginia, which took ſeveral Spaniſh prizes at the Azores. By this eſtabliſhment of his colony, he was the firſt,

(*d*) Oldys, p. 21.

(*e*) Ibid. p. 22—25.

(*f*) Willis's *Notitia Parliamentaria*, vol. 2. p. 254. edit. 1716. in 8vo.

(*g*) Oldys, p. 25.

(*h*) Ibid. p. 26.

" the ſecond cauſes of his growth, there was a vari-
" ance between him and my Lord General Gray, in
" his ſecond deſcent into Ireland, which was principal
" for it, and drew them both over to the Council-
" table, there to plead their own cauſes; where
" what advantage he had in the caſe in controverſy,
" I know not; but he had much the better in
" the manner of telling his tale, inſomuch as the
" Queen and Lords took no ſlight mark of the man
" and his parts; for from thence he came to be
" known, and to have acceſs to the Lords. And
" then we are not to doubt how ſuch a man would
" comply to progreſſion, and whether or no my
" Lord of Leiceſter had then caſt a good word for
" him to the Queen, which would have done him
" no harm, I do not determine; but true it is, he
" had gotten the Queen's ear in a trice, and ſhe be-
" gan to be taken with his election, and loved to
" hear his reaſons to her demands. And the truth
" is ſhe took him for a kind of oracle, which net-
" tled them all, yea thoſe, that he relied on, began
" to take this his ſudden favour for an alarum, and
" to be ſenſible of their own ſupplantation, and to
" project his, which made him ſhortly after ſing,
" *Fortune my foe, why doſt thou frown?* So that finding
" his favour declining, and falling into a receſs, he
" undertook a new peregrination to leave that *terra*
" *infirma* of the Court for that of the wars." Another writer likewiſe tells us (16), that Ralegh *had a quarrel with Grey in Ireland, which being referred to a Council of War, it had like to coſt him his life; but by reference came afterwards to repetition at home before the Lords. Grey had the better cauſe, but Ralegh the advantage in pleading, who ſo took them, eſpecially Leiceſter, that the Queen was told the tale, and ſomewhat more of him. And no ſooner he came to be known to her, but ſhe took him to Grace.* And preſently after he writes (17), that *Ralegh's riſe of preferment was occaſioned upon a conteſt with the Lord Grey in the Queen's time, which they were to plead face to face; where in deed, but not in truth, Sir Walter had the better by the tongue, telling his tale to advantage, which took the Queen, who took him from that inſtant into favour.*

(16) *Aulicus Coquinariæ*, p. 75. edit. Lond. 1650.

(17) p. 89, 90.

[*H*] *Knighted.*] This title her Majeſty beſtowed, as all others of honour, with frugality and choice; and that this honour was intended by her as the moſt ſignificant teſtimony of perſonal merit, may be inſtanced, according to Oſborne (18), *in* Sir Francis Vere, *a man nobly deſcended, and Sir Walter Ralegh, exactly qualified, with many others, ſet apart in her judgment for military ſervices, whoſe title ſhe never raiſed above Knighthood, ſaying, when importuned to make Vere a Baron, that* in his proper ſphere, and her eſtimation, he was above it already. Sir Edward Walker, Garter, and Secretary of War to King Charles I, obſerves (19) with regard to the Queen's caution in conferring of honours, that " in all her forty four years
" reign ſhe created but ſix Earls and eight or nine
" Barons; ſo that when ſhe died, the nobility con-
" ſiſted but of one Marquis, nineteen Earls, two Vif-
" counts, and about thirty Barons." And he doubts,
" whether in the reign of King James, the diſpen-
" ſing of honours ſo liberally was not one of the
" beginnings of general diſcontents, eſpecially among
" perſons of great extraction. So that when this
" King died, having reigned but twenty two years,
" he left the nobility in his three Kingdoms above
" double the number to what he found them, though
" his reign was peaceable, and not full of action,
" which renders men in capacity highly to merit
" from their Prince, and ſo, without envy, receive
" advancement." And a little further he remarks, that, " when alliance to a favourite, riches, though
" gotten in a ſhop, perſons of private eſtates, and of
" families, that many of them and their fathers
" would have thought themſelves highly honoured
" to have been Knights in Queen Elizabeth's time,
" were advanced, then the fruits thereof began to
" appear, &c."

(18) *Traditional Memoirs of Q. Elizabeth*, among his miſcellaneous works, vol. 2. p. 43.

(19) *Obſervations on the inconveniences of frequent promotions to titles of honour*, in his *Hiſtorical Diſcourſes*, p. 300 and 302, &c. edit. 1705, in fol.

[*I*] *He was one of the* Collegues of the Fellowſhip for the diſcovery of the North-Weſt paſſage.] Sir Walter's brother, Adrian Gilbert of Sandridge, afterwards knighted, in purſuance of the arguments laid down by his brother Sir Humphrey Gilbert, having been at great charges in finding out the Northern paſſage to China and the Moluccas, and in conſideration thereof having obtained a patent from the Queen to purſue the diſcovery by partners, under the title of *The Collegues of the Fellowſhip for the diſcovery of the North-Weſt paſſage*; Ralegh was now one of the aſſociates in this enterprize; and after having duly conſulted about the likelieſt means for ſucceſs, and liberally contributed towards the expence, they choſe Captain *John Davis*, an experienced Navigator, to be undertaker of the exploit. He ſet firſt out upon it the ſummer of the year 1585, from Falmouth in two barks. When he came to land in ſixty ſix degrees forty minutes latitude, he anchored in a very fair road, under a mountain, which, for the ſplendid appearance of it, the cliffs thereof being as orient as gold, they named *Mount Ralegh*, in honour of their Proprietor; and ſoon after fell into the very paſſage they ſought, ſince well known by the name of *Davis's Straits*. The Captain made two voyages more thither in the two following years, and in a manner compleated the diſcovery (20).

(20) Oldys, p. 27, 28. And Hakluyt, vol. 3. folio 101.

[*K*] *He received a grant from the Queen of twelve thouſand acres in the counties of Cork and Waterford in Ireland.*] He kept this eſtate to the latter end of the Queen's reign, and then ſold it to *Richard Boyle*, afterwards Earl of Cork, as the Earl in a manuſcript memorial of his own life has related (21).

(21) Budgell's *Life of the Earl of Orrery*, p. 3 and 18. edit. 1732, in 8vo.

[*L*] *The*

firſt, who introduced the uſe of Tobacco into England [*L*]. Towards the latter end of the year 1586, he was made Seneſchal of Cornwall, and Lord Warden of the Stanneries. In April 1587, he ſent three ſhips upon a fourth voyage to Virginia; and about the ſame time was made Captain of the Queen's guard, and Lieutenant-General of Cornwall (*i*). In the beginning of the year 1588, he ſent another fleet upon a fifth voyage to Virginia (*k*). He did great ſervice the ſame year in deſtroying the Spaniſh Armada ſent to invade England; on which account, probably, he received a conſiderable augmentation of his patent of wines, by a grant of tonnage and poundage upon thoſe liquors. He ſet up likewiſe an office of addreſs [*M*]. He thought proper now to make an aſſignment to divers Gentlemen and Merchants of London, for continuing the plantation of Virginia with Engliſhmen [*N*]. In April 1589, he accompanied Don Antonio of Portugal in the expedition to that Kingdom; and in the latter end of the ſame year, in his return to England, touched upon the coaſt of Ireland, where he viſited *Spenſer* the Poet [*O*], whom he brought to England, introduced into the Queen's favour, and encouraged by his own patronage (*l*), being himſelf an excellent Poet [*P*]. In 1592,

(*i*) Oldys, p. 26——37.

(*k*) Idem, p. 42.

(*l*) Idem, p. 42—66.

[*L*] *The firſt who introduced the uſe of tobacco into England.*] The Queen was not backward in promoting the advantages, which were promiſed by the traffic of this herb; and we may collect from ſome Authors, that ſhe was very curious to know its virtues and properties; and that once converſing with Ralegh upon this ſubject, he aſſured her Majeſty, that he had ſo well experienced the nature of it, that he could tell her of what weight even the ſmoke would be in any quantity propoſed to be conſumed. Her Majeſty fixing her thoughts upon the moſt impracticable part of the experiment, that of bounding the ſmoke in a balance, ſuſpected that he played the traveller with her, and would needs lay him a wager that he could not ſolve the doubt. So he procured a quantity agreed upon to be thoroughly ſmoked; then proceeded to weighing the aſhes; and in the concluſion, what was wanting in the firſt weight of the tobacco, her Majeſty did not deny to have been evaporated in ſmoke; and farther ſaid, *that many labourers in the fire ſhe had heard of, who turned their gold into ſmoke; but* Ralegh *was the firſt who had turned ſmoke into gold* (22).

(22) *Apophthegms of the Engliſh Nation*, a manuſcript in 4to. inter Collect. *Rodnei Fane Armig.* and Howel's *Epiſt.* vol. 3.

[*M*] *Set up an office of addreſs.*] Mr. David Lloyd (23) having mentioned Sir Walter's diviſion of his time, who allowed five hours to ſleep, four to reading, two for diſcourſe, and the reſt to buſineſs and other neceſſaries, and having hinted at the diverſity of his correſpondencies, intelligence, and the like, ſays, that *in the capacity of an agency for all ſorts of perſons he ſet up a kind of* office of addreſs; and that *conſidering the diſpatch of ſuch variety of engagements in the former part of his life, one muſt be much to ſeek how a man of ſo many actions ſhould write any thing, and one of ſo many writings ſhould do any thing.* Mr. *Oldys* obſerves (24), that "by another little hint, that has "been elſewhere preſerved, we may conceive this "office did chiefly reſpect a more liberal intercourſe, "a nobler mutuality of advertiſement, than would "perhaps admit of all ſorts of perſons; and ſuch as "advanced rather to the improvement of men themſelves, than their means. But this ſuggeſtion is "drawn only from comparing it with the general "tendency of thoſe other ſchemes, among which I "once ſaw it mentioned, in a letter written by an "ingenious perſon of great note for his writings to a "Nobleman, who had the greateſt correſpondence "with ſuch perſons of any in his time; recommending *that long dried fountain of communication, which* "Montaigne *firſt propoſed, Sir* Walter Ralegh *put in* "*practice, and Mr.* Hartlib *endeavoured to revive.*" The latter mentioned by Mr. *Oldys* in this paſſage, was written by *John Evelyn*, Eſq; to Henry Earl of *Clarendon*. *Montagne*'s (or his father's) project was for having *an office of enquiry* in ſeveral towns, in which every perſon might regiſter what they were in ſearch or want of, with their terms for obtaining it (25). *There are*, ſays he, *always conditions, which are hunting after one another, and for want of hearing one another's occaſions leave men in very great neceſſity.* He then gives an inſtance of *thoſe two excellent ſcholars*, Lilius Giraldus *in Italy, and* Sebaſtian Caſtalio *in Germany, who died ſo poor, that they had ſcarce bread to eat*; and obſerves, that *thouſands would have retained or relieved them, if they had known their wants. For the world is not ſo generally corrupted, but that I knew a man*, ſays he, *who would heartily wiſh the eſtate his anceſtors had left him, might be employed in ſecuring rare and remarkable perſons of any kind from theſe misfortunes, which ſometimes perſecute them to the laſt extremity.* The reader may ſee an account of Mr. *Hartlib's* ſcheme for *an office of addreſs* in the article of (Sir *William*) PETTY.

(23) *Obſervations on the Stateſmen and Favourites of England ſince the Reformation*, p. 489. edit. 1665.

(24) p. 48.

(25) Montagne's *Eſſays*, l. 1. c. 34.

[*N*] *Thought proper to make an aſſignment to divers Gentlemen and Merchants of London, for continuing the Plantation of Virginia with Engliſhmen.*] The particular of this aſſignment we may collect from "an "inſtrument made the 7th of March. 31 *Eliz.* be"tween Sir *Walter Ralegh* of Coliton in Devonſhire, "Chief Governor of Virginia, and *Thomas Smith* "with other Merchants of London, and adventurers "to Virginia, and *John White* and other Gentle"men; reciting, that Sir *Walter Ralegh* had granted "to *John White* and the reſt free liberty to carry "into Virginia, and inhabit there, ſuch of her "Majeſty's ſubjects, as ſhould willingly accompany "them. And that the ſaid *Thomas Smith* and others "the ſaid adventurers purpoſing to be made free of "the Corporation and Company late conſtituted by "Sir *Walter*, in the city of *Ralegh*, intended to be "built in Virginia, had adventured divers ſums of "money, merchandizes, ſhipping, victual, and o"ther commodities to Virginia. Wherefore Sir "*Walter Ralegh*, by his indenture, grants to the ſaid "*Thomas Smith*, and others, and to the ſaid *John* "*White* and the reſt, their ſeveral heirs and aſſigns, "free trade and traffic for all manner of merchan"dize to and from Virginia, or any other part of "America, where the ſaid Sir *Walter*, his heirs or "aſſigns, did, or might claim any intereſt, title, "or privilege, from all rents, cuſtoms, and other "charges, except the fifth part of the oar of gold "and ſilver, which he reſerves to himſelf and his "heirs. And farther, the ſaid Sir *Walter Ralegh*, "as well for and in eſpecial regard and zeal of "planting the Chriſtian Religion in and among the "ſaid barbarous and heathen countries, and for the "advancement and preferment of the ſame, and the "common utility and profit of the inhabitants there"in, as alſo for the encouragement of the ſaid ad"venturers and other aſſiſtants in *Virginia*, does free"ly and liberally give them the ſum of one hundred "pounds."

[*O*] *Where he viſited* Spenſer *the Poet.*] *Spenſer* has deſcribed the circumſtances of Sir *Walter*'s viſit to him in a Paſtoral, which about two years after he dedicated to him, and entitled, *Colin Clout's come home again.*

[*P*] *Being himſelf an excellent Poet.*] We learn from a copy of verſes at the end of *Spenſer's Fairy Queen*, inſcribed to Sir *Walter*, that the latter had written a Poem, called *Cynthia*, which was in praiſe of the Queen, but not then publiſhed. And ſome of his Poems are quoted with great commendation in a book printed at London in 1589 in 4to, under the title of *The Art of Engliſh Poeſy, contrived in three Books*, ſaid to be written by Mr. *Puttenham*, one of Queen Elizabeth's Gentlemen Penſioners. In this book the Author obſerves (6), that "for ditty and "amorous ode, he finds Sir *Walter Ralegh's* vein moſt "lofty, inſolent, and paſſionate." Mr. Oldys has given us from a manuſcript the following piece, entitled,

(6) p. 51.

1592, he was appointed General of an expedition againſt the Spaniards at Panama. In the latter end of this year, and the beginning of the next, we find him very active in the Houſe of Commons (*m*). In 1593, he was aſperſed with Atheiſm, in a libel publiſhed againſt ſeveral Miniſters of State, who had procured a ſevere proclamation againſt the Engliſh Seminaries abroad [Q]. In 1594, he obtained a grant of the Manor of Sherborne [R]. He was for ſome time in diſgrace at Court, for an affair of gallantry with Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Nicholas Throgmorton, one of the Maids of Honour to the Queen; but Sir Walter ſoon after married the Lady, and afterwards lived with her in the ſtricteſt conjugal harmony (*n*). In 1595, he made a voyage to Guiana, and deſtroyed the city of San Joſeph, taking the Spaniſh Governor, Don Antonio de Berreo, priſoner, and entered the great Oronoque river (*o*); and upon his return, wrote a diſcourſe of

(*m*) Oldys, p. 66—69.

(*n*) Idem, p. 69—77.

(*o*) Idem, p. 77—94.

titled, *The Excuſe, written by Sir* Walter Ralegh *in his younger years.*

" Calling to mind my *eyes* went long about,
" To cauſe my heart for to forſake my breaſt;
" All in a rage, I ſought to pull them out;
" As who had been ſuch traitors to my reſt:
" What could they ſay to win again my grace?
" Forſooth that they had ſeen my miſtreſs' face.

" Another time my *heart* I call'd to mind,
" Thinking that he this woe on me had brought;
" Becauſe that he to love his force reſign'd;
" When of ſuch wars my fancy never thought:
" What could he ſay when I would have him ſlain?
" That he was hers, and had forgone my chain.

" At laſt, when I perceiv'd both eyes and heart
" Excuſe themſelves, as guiltleſs of my ill;
" I found myſelf the cauſe of all my ſmart,
" And told myſelf, that I myſelf would kill.
" Yet when I ſaw myſelf to you was true;
" I lov'd myſelf, becauſe myſelf lov'd you."

[Q] *Aſperſed with Atheiſm in a libel publiſhed againſt ſeveral Miniſters of State, who had procured a ſevere proclamation againſt the Engliſh Seminaries abroad.*] This libel was printed at Lyons in 1593 in 8vo. under the title of *Elizabethæ Reginæ Angliæ Edictum, promulg. Lond. Nov.* 29. 1591. *& Andr. Philopatris ad idem Reſponſio.* In this piece the Writer, who was *Parſons* the Jeſuit, inveighs againſt Sir *Walter Ralegh's ſchool of Atheiſm*, inſinuating, that he was not content with being a Diſciple, but ſet up for a Doctor in his faculty, and " ſeduced young Gentle-
" men into his ſaid ſchool, wherein the Old and
" New Teſtament were jeſted at, and ſcholars taught
" to ſpell God backwards." He then complains,
" what a miſerable thing it is, that her Majeſty ſhould
" make laws and proclamations according to theſe
" men's ſenſes and opinions." But as Father *Parſons* was famous for the virulency of his pen in ſlandering the greateſt men; *ſo till we find*, ſays Mr. Oldys (27), *a more credible father for the aſperſion, we may ſafely enough believe it no genuine iſſue of truth. Nevertheleſs ſome ten years after when* Ralegh *was trampled down by the Court, and there was a turn of State to ſerve, this might be a good ſerviceable obloquy enough to upbraid him with, and depreciate him in the eye of the populace.* Oſborn accounts for the grounds of this aſperſion. " Sir *Walter Ralegh*, ſays he (28), was
" the firſt (as I have heard) who ventured to tack
" about, and ſail aloof from the beaten tract of the
" ſchools; and who, upon the diſcovery of ſo appa-
" rent an error as a torrid zone, intended to proceed
" in an inquiſition after more ſolid truths; till the
" mediation of ſome, whoſe livelihood lay in ham-
" mering ſhrines for this ſuperannuated ſtudy, poſ-
" ſeſſed Queen Elizabeth, that ſuch doctrine was a-
" gainſt God, no leſs than her father's honour;
" whoſe faith (if he owned any) was grounded
" upon ſchool divinity. Whereupon ſhe chid him,
" who was (by his own confeſſion) ever after branded
" with the title of Atheiſt, though a known aſſer-
" tor of God and providence." That he was ſuch *a known aſſertor*, is confirmed by an Author of his acquaintance, who introduces the apparition of him ſpeaking to him in this manner (29): *Thou well knoweſt, that the world hath at ſundry times caſt a foul and moſt unjuſt aſperſion upon me for my preſumed denial of a Deity; from which abominable and horrible crime I was ever moſt free; and not any man now living better knows the ſame than thyſelf, in whoſe preſence I was often accuſtomed, highly to praiſe and eſteem the book of* Leſſius, *written in proof of the being of a Deity.* He then requeſts, that his friend would tranſlate that book into Engliſh, *which I myſelf*, ſays the ghoſt, *had done, if cruel fate had not untimely cut off the thread of my mortality; and let the title bear my name, that ſo the readers may acknowledge it was done by my ſolicitation.* Then the tranſlator of that book ſays in his own perſon to the reader: *It is well known, that Sir* Walter *was a man of great natural parts, and yet was ſuſpected of the moſt foul and execrable crime of Atheiſm. How truly God and himſelf only knows; yet I have reaſon to think it a falſe aſperſion.* If thus much is ſaid by an Author, who knew him, what credit ſhall we give to another, Mr. *A. Wood*, who wrote many years later? who never knew him, and produces no authority for the principles, with which he charges him; and yet pretends to give us the tutor's name, from whom he imbibed them, and that a man of no leſs learning and merit, than Mr. *Tho. Hariot*, whom we have vindicated (30) from the aſperſion of Mr. *Wood*, who tells us (31), that he infuſed his *Deiſtical* notions into " Sir *Walter Ralegh*, when he
" was compiling the *Hiſtory of the World.*" *This laſt inſinuation*, ſays Mr. *Oldys* (32), *is ſurely a manifeſt ſlander, as* Wood *himſelf muſt have owned, if he had ſufficiently read that* Hiſtory of the World, *where Sir* Walter *has in many places given ſtronger evidences of Chriſtian Faith, than any of his detractors did of their's.*

[R] *In* 1594 *he obtained a Grant of the Manor of Sherborne.*] Mr. Richard Iſacke (33) tells us, that about that year Dr. John Coldwell, Biſhop of Saliſbury, *who had been bred a Phyſician, gave his See a ſtrong purge, by alienating the Manor of Sherborne to Sir Walter Ralegh.* And Sir John Harrington obſerves (34), that " Sir Walter uſing often to ride poſt
" in thoſe days upon no ſmall employments between
" Plymouth and the Court, when Sherborne Caſtle
" being right in the way, he caſt an eye upon it,
" as Ahab did upon Naboth's vineyard. And once
" above the reſt being talking of it, of the com-
" modiouſneſs of the place, of the ſtrength of the
" ſeat, and how eaſily it might be got from the
" Biſhopric, ſuddenly over and over came his horſe,
" that his very face, which was then thought a very
" good face, ploughed up the earth where he fell.
" This fall was ominous, I make no queſtion; as
" the like was obſerved in the Lord Haſtings, &c.
" But his brother Adrian would needs have him in-
" terpret that, not as a Courtier, but as a Conqueror,
" it preſaged the quiet poſſeſſion of it." And this, through the Queen's favour came to paſs; for after Dr. John Piers was tranſlated to York, this Dr. Coldwell was elected to ſucceed him in the See of Saliſbury; but it lay vacant three years, during which interval, before the Biſhop's election was confirmed, Sir Walter importuned him to paſs Sherborne to the crown, and effected it, though a pretty large rent was reſerved to the Biſhopric. Sir Walter then begged the Manor of the Queen, who granted it to him. This is the account of Fuller (35), who obſerves, that " among the acts paſſed in King
" James the Firſt's Parliament, none were more
" beneficial for the Church, that which made
" the King himſelf and his ſucceſſors incapable of
" any

(27) p. 70.

(28) *Miſcellany of ſundry Eſſays, &c.* in the preface.

(29) *Sir* Walter Ralegh's *Ghoſt: or his Apparition to an intimate Friend, willing him to tranſlate into Engliſh, the learned book of* Levinus Leſſius, *entitled*, De Providentiâ Numinis, &c. edit. 1651, in 8vo.

(30) See the art. HARIOT (Thomas).

(31) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 460.

(32) p. 71.

(33) *Antiquities*, p. 141. edit. 1681, in 8vo.

(34) *Brief View of the State of the Church of England, &c.* p. 92.

(35) *Church Hiſt.* book 10. p. 27.

of his diſcoveries in Guiana [S]. In 1596 he was appointed one of the chief Commanders in the expedition to Cadiz (p). He was afterwards Rear-Admiral in the Iſland voyage (q). In 1600, he was appointed Vice-Admiral (r), and about May the ſame year, he was ſent on an Embaſſy to Flanders [T]; and ſoon after made Governor of the Iſle of Jerſey (s). Not long before the Queen's death, he ſettled his eſtate at Sherborne upon his ſon Walter, being challenged to a duel by Sir Amias Preſton [V]. Upon the acceſſion of King James I. to the Crown, he loſt his intereſt at Court [W], and being accuſed of a plot againſt the King [X], was tried for it at Wincheſter, November 17, 1603, and condemned

(p) Oldys, p. 94—106.

(q) Idem, p. 111 & ſeq.

(r) Idem, p. 133.

(s) Idem, p. 134, 135.

" any ſuch Church-land to be conveyed to them."

[S] *Upon his return wrote a Diſcourſe of his diſcoveries in Guiana.*] It was printed at London 1596 in 4to, under this title: *The Diſcovery of the large, rich, and beautiful Empire of* GUIANA; *with a relation of the great and golden City of* Manoa, *called by the Spaniards* El Dorado, *&c. performed in the year* 1595 *by Sir Walter Ralegh Knight, Captain of her Majeſty's Guard, Lord-Warden of the Stanneries, and her Highneſs's Lieutenant-General of the County of Cornwall.* It is reprinted in Hakluyt, vol. III. fol. 627, and was tranſlated into Latin with the title of *Brevis & admiranda Deſcriptio Regni Guianæ &c. per Dn. Gualt. Ralegh Equit. Angl. detectæ. Tabulâ Geographicâ Jodoci Hondii &c.* Nuremberg 1599 in 4to.

[T] *Sent on an embaſſy to Flanders.*] Commiſſioners had been ſent over to Bulloigne to negotiate a peace with Spain in May 1600; and about the ſame time Sir Walter Ralegh and the Lord Cobham were ſent on an embaſſy for the ſame purpoſe into Flanders. Their buſineſs was kept very ſecret; yet Albert Arch-duke of Auſtria, and Governor of the Netherlands having charged the Queen of England with relieving the Hollanders, and being likely to take umbrage at ſo many perſons of quality going over voluntiers to Prince Maurice, as the Lord Northumberland, Lord Rutland, and others; Secretary Cecil wrote in a letter dated July the 14th 1600 to the Commiſſioners at Bulloigne (36), that if the Arch-duke ſhould object in the like manner to Cobham and Ralegh, they were to return anſwer, " That theſe had no charge, " nor carried either horſe or men, except ſome half " a dozen of their own attendants; and finding the " Queen ſo reſolved to have a peace (if good con- " ditions could be had) they obtained leave, with " importunity, to ſee that one action (then except- " ed) before they might deſpair of ſeeing any more " of the like kind in his Majeſty's time." In another letter of Sir Henry Neville, who was one of thoſe Commiſſioners, to Mr. Winwood, dated July the 18th 1600, he mentions it as a report (37), that Cobham and Ralegh " were gone over upon pretext " to ſee the camp and ſiege of the Fort Iſabella " near Oſtend, where Count Maurice is yet unprofi- " tably, as he was before at Neuport; but I cannot, " ſays he, think, but they have ſome other end, and " that in England there is ſome alarum taken of " theſe matters, although we be not worthy to " know it." And in another letter of Sir Henry to Mr. Winwood, dated July the 23d 1600, he obſerves (38), that Cobham's and Ralegh's journey " was not altogether idle, nor upon curioſity only, " but that they carried ſome meſſage, which did no " harm. The particulars you ſhall know, when I " am better informed of them." By Secretary Cecil's Letter above cited, it appears, that Sir Walter was returned to England by the 14th day of July.

(36) Winwood's *Memorials*, vol. 1. p. 215. edit. 1725.

(37) Ibid. p. 230.

(38) Ibid. p. 231.

[V] *Challenged to a duel by Sir Amias Preſton.*] Sir Walter mentioned this challenge at his trial. The occaſion of this quarrel is not known. Fuller tells us (39), that he declined to accept the challenge; which ſeems to be a miſtake, ſince Sir Walter declared at his trial, that *he intended to anſwer it*; but the parties were afterwards reconciled, as Fuller remarks.

(39) *Worthies in Somerſetſhire.*

[W] *Loſt his intereſt at Court.*] It is ſaid, that the Earl of Eſſex, in Queen Elizabeth's reign, infuſed prejudices againſt him into King James; and, after the Earl's death, there are ſeveral circumſtances implying, that Secretary Cecil did the like. For though Cecil and Ralegh joined againſt Eſſex and his party; yet when theſe were overthrown, they divided (40). Dr. Welwood obſerves (41), that when King James came to England, Sir Walter preſented to him a *Memorial*, wherein " he reflected heavily upon Cecil " in the matter of Eſſex; and vindicating himſelf, " threw the whole blame upon the other; further " laying open (at the end thereof) the conduct of " Cecil and his father alſo in the matter of the " Queen of Scots (his Majeſty's mother,) bitterly " charging the death of this unfortunate Queen upon " them. But this had no influence over the King, " and only irritated Cecil the more againſt Ralegh." The ſame writer tells us, that this *Memorial* of Ralegh is mentioned in a manuſcript written by one Buck, Secretary to the Lord Chancellor Egerton. But what ſeems ſufficient to have incenſed the King againſt Ralegh, was his being of a party, who, in regard of the inveterate feuds between England and Scotland, deſired the King might be obliged to articles; for, as Oſborne writes (42), *among theſe noble and publick ſpirits were Sir John Forteſcue, Sir Walter Ralegh, the Lord Cobham, &c. all frowned upon after by the King, who had yet the luck to live ſo long as to change his opinion, and wiſh the number of his countrymen had been limited, and they not ſuffered, like Locuſts, to devour this kingdom.* There were likewiſe ſome other particulars, which might render him obnoxious to a perſon of the King's jealous diſpoſition; " for he " had (at the time of his Majeſty's acceſſion to the " throne) the daughter and heir of Baſſet to his " ward, who was to be married to his ſon Walter; " her eſtate was worth three thouſand pounds *per* " *ann.* But ſhe was (after his condemnation, we ſup- " poſe) taken from him, and married to Mr. Henry " Howard, who died ſuddenly at table; and ſhe " was afterwards married to the Earl of Newcaſtle, " who profeſſed he would never have wedded her, if " young *Walter Ralegh* had been alive; conceiving " her, before God, to be his wife, for they were mar- " ried as much as children could be (43)." Now theſe Baſſets were thoſe of Umberlegh and Heaton-Court in Devonſhire; who being deſcended from the Plantagenets, laid ſome claim, at this very time of the King's entrance, to the Crown of England (44).

(40) Oldys, p. 148.

(41) Notes on Arthur Wilſon's *Hiſt. of King James*, in the 2d vol. of Kennet's *Complete Hiſt. of England*, edit. 1706. p. 664.

(42) *Traditional Memorials of the Reign of K. James*, in the 2d vol. of his works, p. 102.

(43) *Obſervations on ſome particular Perſons and Paſſages, in a Book lately made publick* (by William Sanderſon) entitled, *A compleat Hiſt. of the Lives and Reigns of Mary Q. of Scotland, and her ſon James, &c.* p. 12. edit. 1656, in 4to.

(44) Prince's *Worthies of Devon*, p. 114. See alſo Wood's *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 366.

[X] *Accuſed of a Plot againſt the King.*] *Thuanus, Tom. V. L.* 129. *fol.* 1056. and *Cayet* in his *Chronologie Septenarie, p.* 424. *Edit. Paris* 1605, in 8vo, and the *Mercure François, Tom. XI. p.* 352 *Edit. Paris* 1626 in 8vo, have given a very falſe account of this affair, which they relate thus. That in the month of June, Sir Walter taking leave of his ſiſter at London, intreated her to commend him to God in her prayers, ſince he was going to a place, whence he expected never to return. That ſhe ſuſpecting that he was going to fight a duel, ſpoke of it to ſome Ladies of her acquaintance, till the rumour came to Court. That then Ralegh's friends and relations flocked about him to know his deſign; who imagining himſelf detected, confeſſed the whole matter, and being brought before the King, aſked his Majeſty's pardon, and acknowledged, that ſeeing his Majeſty give more countenance to the Scots than the Engliſh, and had deprived him of his command in the guards, and that many great men expected, when he was eſtabliſhed on the throne, he would be revenged for the death of his mother; he had therefore entered into a conſpiracy with others, whom he named, to ſhed his royal blood; and that they had unanimouſly deputed him to be his Majeſty's executioner, when he rode a hunting. That hereupon the ſaid conſpirators were taken up and tried. Thus far theſe Authors. But we ſhall from Sir Walter's trial draw out a ſhort and regular narrative of the moſt material facts, in which he appears any way concerned; and it is as follows. There was one Matthew de Laurencie, a Merchant of Antwerp, attendant on Count Aremberg, who about the beginning of June came over Embaſſador-extraordinary from

condemned to death [Y]. But being reprieved, was committed priſoner to the Tower of

from Albert, Arch-duke of Auſtria, to congratulate King James, and aſſiſt in compoſing the general peace. With this Merchant the Lord Cobham had held intelligence ſome years before upon matters of ſtate, with licence. Five days after Aremberg's arrival, that is, about the 9th of the ſame month, Cobham repaired to him with *Laurencie*, and that night *Cobham* ſupped with Sir Walter Ralegh at Durham-houſe in the Strand, whereby Ralegh came to underſtand, that Cobham had freſh negotiations with Aremberg; and was, as the chief of thoſe, who oppoſed the peace, offered a ſum of money by Cobham to be a promoter of it; though that offer, which was alſo made to Ralegh, before Aremberg came, was afterwards pretended to have been for treaſonable purpoſes (45). In the next month, thoſe perſons, with whom Cobham had carried on the conſpiracy (or part of it) then on foot, were diſcovered, either by the Spaniſh faction in revenge to Ralegh, the greateſt enemy of Spain then alive, thinking he was too far involved in it or privy to it to eſcape; or by ſome one of the Engliſh conſpirators to ſecure himſelf. And when Cecil, lately made Baron of Eſſenden, found, upon the firſt news of Anthony Copely, one of the conſpirators, who was apprehended on the 6th of July (46), that the King's perſon was to be ſurprized by the Lord Grey of Wilton, and George Brooke, brother to the Lord Cobham, he ſuſpected Cobham himſelf to be in the ſecret; and Cobham's great intimacy with Ralegh at this time, who was now buying an eſtate for him, and ſettling his houſehold-affairs, drew Ralegh alſo into ſuſpicion. Hereupon Cecil meeting Ralegh upon the Terrace at Windſor, tells him, that the Lords of the Council had ſomething to ſay to him. So he was examined about the *ſurpriſing treaſon*, and particularly about Cobham, as appears from his own words (47), whom he fully cleared. After examination Ralegh farther ſaid; "Whatſoever correſpondence there was between "Cobham and Aremberg, Laurencie might be bet-"ter able to give account of it. Therefore he ad-"viſed to the calling him;" though, as he farther explained, "he knew of no intelligence between "them, but ſuch as might be warranted (48):" and that advice he wrote alſo in a letter to Cecil. When Ralegh returned from examination a private priſoner to his own houſe, Cobham ſent to him to know what had paſſed. Ralegh wrote an anſwer by Capt. Keymis, "that he was examined, and had cleared "him of all;" and Keymis bid Cobham *be of good comfort, for one witneſs could not condemn him.* This precaution to arm Cobham againſt making diſcoveries was, after his confeſſion of it, objected againſt Ralegh; but he utterly denied, that he ſent any ſuch verbal meſſage (49). Now when Cobham was brought to his examination at Richmond, one date whereof appears to have been July the 18th; and after he had by a conſtant denial cleared both himſelf and Ralegh of all that was queſtioned againſt them, Cobham was, *by device*, ſays a Gentleman, who was preſent at the trial (50), induced to think, that Ralegh had firſt impeached and betrayed him. For that part of Ralegh's letter abovementioned to Cecil, referring the Lords to Laurence for Cobham's tranſactions with Aremberg, being ſhewed to Cobham, and accompanied with ſuch artful ſuggeſtions as were proper to inflame a man of Cobham's weakneſs, had the deſired effect; for he being led thereby to imagine, that Ralegh had accuſed him of all or more than he knew, burſt into vehement exclamations againſt Ralegh, and in his rage made the following confeſſion: "That having a paſſport to go to the Spa-"niſh King, he intended firſt to confer with the "Arch-duke; and becauſe he knew that he had "not money to pay his own army, meant from "thence to go to Spain, to deal with the King for "ſix hundred thouſand crowns; and then to return "by Jerſey. And that nothing ſhould be done about "the diſtribution of that money to the diſcontented "in England, till he had ſpoken with Sir Walter "Ralegh. Further, that he had never entered into "theſe courſes but by his inſtigation. He ſpake "alſo of plots, but of the particulars could give no "account; yet acknowledged, that he was afraid, "that Ralegh, upon his return to Jerſey, would have "him and the money to the King (51)." After all this, before Cobham departed to the ſtair-foot, he retracted his confeſſion, and profeſſed he had done Ralegh wrong (52); nor does it appear, ſays a certain writer (53), that he did ſubſcribe it. In another branch of his examination Cobham ſaid, that he had of Ralegh a book written againſt the King's title, which he gave to his brother Brook, and that Ralegh ſaid it was fooliſhly written. But this he alſo retracted. Upon this and other parts of his confeſſion more foreign to Ralegh, concerning the advancement of Lady Arabella Stuart to the crown, as alſo from that of George Brook, a known enemy to Ralegh (as Cecil could not deny) aſſerting, that his brother Cobham told him (though Cobham in his confeſſion refuſed to own it,) "that the Lord Grey "and others were only on the bye, but he and Ra-"legh were on the main; meaning thereby, ſaid "Brook, the taking away of the King and his iſſue;" together with what Ralegh acknowledged in his own confeſſion, "that Cobham offered him eight thou-"ſand crowns for his furtherance of the peace, "though the Lord Cecil and Earl of Northumber-"land were to have the ſame proffers (54);" and that in ſome diſcourſes he might have ſaid, that *the way to invade England was to begin with ſtirs in Scotland*; upon theſe circumſtances, I ſay, Ralegh was indicted at Stains on the 21ſt of September following (55): and from hence that heavy indictment appears to have been accumulated upon him, which we ſee prefixed to his trial. Three days after Cobham and Grey were likewiſe indicted at the ſame place; and not long after this they were all three returned priſoners to the Tower of London. When the time of their trial drew nigh, that is to ſay, in the beginning of November, Ralegh got a poor fellow in the tower to caſt up a letter, faſtened to an apple, in at Cobham's window, while the Lieutenant was at ſupper, to intreat him (becauſe he then knew not but Cobham might be arraigned before him) "for God's ſake to do him juſtice by his anſwer, "and ſignify to him, that he had wronged him in "his accuſation;" and Cobham did, by an anſwer under his hand, confeſs the ſame; which not being perhaps ſo full and expreſſive as Ralegh expected, he afterwards ſent Cobham another letter, deſiring that he would publiſh his innocence at his arraignment. But though Ralegh did not now requeſt any farther juſtification under his hand, Cobham ſent him another anſwer, clearing him in the moſt ſolemn manner (56).

[Y] *Tried for it at Wincheſter November the 17th 1603, and condemned to death.*] The outragious behaviour of Sir *Edward Coke*, the Attorney General, towards him, is well known and univerſally abhorred. A Gentleman, who was preſent at the trial in his letter to Mr. *Donne* (57), above quoted, obſerves, that "touching the ſetting up of *Arabella*, "nothing at all was proved; nor touching the in-"vaſion, nor ſedition in Scotland, or the deſtruction "of the King, &c. It was confeſſed by *Ralegh*, "that *Cobham* offered him eight or ten thouſand "crowns from the Arch-Duke, to make him a fa-"vourer of the peace; which he yet accepted not, "but referred him to another time. Such a book as "was ſpoken of he denied not to have had, but de-"nied that he ſent it to *Cobham*. The proof againſt "*Ralegh* did reſt only upon *Cobham*'s accuſation, and "ſome preſumptions, whereof that only was the "ground. *Ralegh* ſpent the time in diſabling that "accuſation, as being only uttered in fury, by rea-"ſon that by a device *Cobham* was brought to think, "that *Ralegh* had firſt accuſed him. *Ralegh's* defence "was that this accuſation proceeded out of paſſionate "revenge, and therefore was in itſelf diſabled to touch "a man's life. Beſides that he had relented it, and "repented it; and although afterwards by practice "he did affirm it, yet would he never be brought to "ſet his hand to the examination; all which was "clear. His labour was to prove out of divinity, "civil law, ſtatute law, common law, and conſci-"ence,

(45) Arraignment of Sir Walter Ralegh, printed in J. Sherley's *Account of his Life*, p. 124. edit. 1677, in 8vo.

(46) Stow's *Ann.* folio 826.

(47) Arraignment in Sherley's *Life of Sir Walter Ralegh*, p. 98.

(48) Ibid. p. 110.

(49) Ibid. p. 140.

(50) *Letter from a Member of Parliament to Mr. John Donne, concerning the Arraignment of Sir W. Ralegh*, MS. among the collections of Rodney Fane, Eſq; It is alſo printed in Sir Toby Matthews's *Collection of Letters*, p. 281. edit. 1660, in 8vo.

(51) Arraignment of Sir Walter Ralegh, in Sherley's *Life of him*, p. 97.

(52) Ibid. p. 100.

(53) Sir Tho. Overbury's *Copy of Sir Walter Ralegh's Arraignment*, p. 15. edit. 1648, in 4to.

(54) Ibid. p. 12.

(55) Stow's *Ann.* folio 830.

(56) Overbury's *Arraignment of Sir W. Ralegh*, p. 23.

(57) In Sir Toby Matthews's *Collection*, p. 280, *& ſeq.*

of London, and had his eſtate reſtored to him, though it was afterwards taken away from

" ence, (in every of which he had been plentifully " read) theſe two points; firſt, that there ought to " be produced againſt him two witneſſes; ſecondly, " that his accuſer might be brought to accuſe him " face to face. But the Judges reſolved, that this " latter requeſt did not ſtand with the uſe of law; " and to the former was anſwered, that a witneſs " accuſing another, together with himſelf, was *inſtar* " *multorum*. Many excellent reaſons he uſed in diſ- " proof of theſe opinions, but to little purpoſe; for " the Jury, without pauſe, delivered up their ver- " dict, that he was guilty. Some circumſtances " there were to give preſumption, but no proof at " all. But that which weighed moſt with me was, " that ſo ſoon as *Ralegh* had been queſtioned the firſt " time at large, when *Cobham* was not ſo much as " named, he ſpeedily diſpatched a letter to *Cobham* " to this effect; *I have been examined of divers points* " *touching you before the Lords of the Council, but I* " *have cleared you in all. Be firm, and know, that one* " *witneſs cannot hurt.* Which letter ſeemed to have " been written by *Ralegh* rather to arm *Cobham* for " that which might be to come, than to inſtruct him " for that which was paſſed, ſince there was in truth " no ground for ſuch a ſpeed. Again, it was urged, " that a month before *Cobham's* accuſation, *Brook* " had delivered it, as out of *Cobham's* mouth, *that* " Cobham *and* Ralegh *were upon the main, and that* " *it would never be well, till the King and his ſubjects* " (58) *were made away.* To this was anſwered, *Brook* " was his known enemy, and therefore cared not " what he uttered to endanger *Ralegh*; and beſides " that *Cobham* had never confeſſed that under his " hand. To the other point of *Ralegh's* letter; the " weakneſs of his anſwer made it ſtrong, for he de- " nied it improbably. But howſoever the main " evidence being *Cobham's* accuſation, which (all " things conſidered) was no more to be weighed than " the barking of a dog, I would not for much to " have been of the Jury, to have found him guilty. " For a little before the Jury was going forth, after " that *Ralegh* had put himſelf upon this, that *Cobham* " had never thoroughly departed from his relenta- " tion, and that if he would *vivâ voce* accuſe him " of any part, he would confeſs the whole indict- " ment; the attorney read a letter from *Cobham* to " the Lords bearing date the 16th of this month, " wherein he did again generally accuſe *Ralegh* as " before, and particularly that he had promiſed to " become a penſioner to the King of Spain for fif- " teen hundred pounds by the year, by which he " would diſcover to him all the ſecrets he could " come by; and withal confeſſed, that *Ralegh* pro- " cured him eight or ten days before to juſtify him " by letter; which though he had done by importu- " nity, yet this laſt letter to the Lords he proteſted " was true. To which *Ralegh* anſwered, confeſſing, " that *Cobham* had offered him ſuch a penſion; but " that he not only accepted it not, (though *Cobham* " told him of divers great Counſellors, as namely " the Lord *Cecil*, Lord of *Maſe*, ſhould have been " offered the like, for the furtherance of the Peace) " but ſo diſſuaded *Cobham* from thinking of the like, " as that he believed never to hear more of it. " And as for the letter, which *Cobham* confeſſed to have " written in *Ralegh's* juſtification, it was true, and " there it was, deſiring the Lord *Cecil* to read it, " (which he did) and praying the Jury to mark how " much more proteſtingly and particularly that was " written to acquit him, than the other to condemn " him. For mine own part, I never heard any thing " ſo religiouſly averred, as thus: leſt he ſhould be " guilty of the blood of an innocent perſon, which " he did continually hear crying to God for venge- " ance, therefore he had ſaid thus much for the in- " nocence of *Ralegh*, which upon the hope, that he " had of ſalvation, in the word of a Chriſtian, (and " I know not how many of the moſt ſerious pro- " teſtations) was true, ſo that he might conclude now " with denial, *purus ſum à ſanguine hujus* . . . . The " Lord *Cecil* carried himſelf favourably towards him " that day, the attorney moſt inſolently. Notwith- " ſtanding there were many occaſions given, *Ralegh* " took no hold to purge himſelf from the imputations, " that lye upon him by reaſon of his carriage to- " wards my Lord of Eſſex, nor yet from Atheiſm, " which the Chief Juſtice and the Attorney did ex- " treme bitterly remember him of. On the other " ſide, the Council learned urged not the leaſt word a- " gainſt him by occaſion of the guilty blow he " gave himſelf in the Tower." The writer of this letter likewiſe remarks (59), that Sir Walter upon his trial *behaved himſelf ſo worthily, ſo wiſely, ſo temperately, that in half a day the mind of all the company was changed from the extremeſt hate to the greateſt pity.* Cobham's letter to the Lords at Wincheſter the day before the trial was as follows: *I have thought fit to ſet down this to my Lords, wherein I profeſs on my ſoul to write nothing but the truth; I am come now near to the period of my time; therefore I confeſs the truth before God and his angels. Ralegh, four days before I came from the Tower, cauſed an apple to be thrown in at my chamber-window: the effect of it was to intreat me to right the wrong I had done him, in ſaying, that I would come home by Jerſey; which under my hand to him I have retracted. His firſt letter I anſwered not, which was thrown in the ſame manner, wherein he prayed me to write him a letter, which I did. He ſent me word, that the Judges were at Mr. Attorney's houſe, and that there was good hope the proceedings againſt us ſhould be ſtayed. He ſent me another time a little tobacco. At Aremberg's coming, Ralegh dealt with me to procure him a Penſion of* 1500 *pounds a year, for which he promiſed, that no action ſhould be againſt Spain, but he would give knowledge beforehand. He told me, the States had audience with the King. He hath been the original cauſe of my ruin; for I had no dealing with Aremberg but by his inſtigation. He hath been alſo the cauſe of my diſcontentment; he adviſed me not to be overtaken with Preachers, as Eſſex was; and that the King would better allow of a conſtant denial, than to accuſe any.* Some ſay, that this letter was not written by Lord Cobham himſelf; but that Sir William Wade, one of Cecil's creatures, tampering with his weakneſs, got Cobham to write his name to a blank; to *which Wade no queſtion* wrote the accuſation (60). Others intimate, that Cobham wrote it himſelf, after he had been informed by a letter from his Lady, that there was no way to ſave his own life, but to accuſe Ralegh; and that it was ſo reported upon the going together of the Jury (61). Cobham's letter to Ralegh, which the latter produced and deſired the Lord Cecil to read, was as follows: " Seeing my- " ſelf ſo near my end, for the diſcharge of my own " conſcience, and freeing myſelf from your blood, " which, which elſe will cry vengeance againſt me; " I proteſt upon my ſalvation, I never practiſed with " Spain by your procurement. God ſo comfort me " in this my affliction, as you are a true ſubject for " any thing that I know. I will ſay with Daniel, " *Purus ſum a ſanguine hujus.* So God have mercy " on my ſoul, as I know no treaſon by you." It is ſaid, that ſome of the Jury, after Ralegh was caſt, were ſo far touched in conſcience, as to demand of him pardon on their knees (62); and that even Coke the Attorney General himſelf, being retired into a garden to take ſome air, when his man brought him word, that the Jury had condemned Ralegh of treaſon, anſwered, *Surely thou art miſtaken, for I myſelf accuſed him but of miſpriſion of treaſon*; " and this rela- " tion, ſays a certain writer (63), upon the word of " a Chriſtian I have received from Sir Edward Coke's " own mouth." Sir John Hawles, Sollicitor-General to King William, in his *Reply* to a ſheet, entitled, *The Magiſtracy and Government vindicated*, printed in 1689 in fol. having obſerved, that the *Accuſations* of Sir Walter Ralegh did not amount to a *legal proof*, ſays farther (64); *not to mention all that might be excepted to in the trial of the caſe cited; I would know by what law is the depoſition of a perſon, who might be brought face to face to the priſoner, read as evidence? would know by what law it is forbidden, that the accuſer ſhould be brought face to face to the accuſed? I would know, by what law Brook's depoſition of what the Lord Cobham told him of Ralegh, was evidence againſt Ralegh? I would know, by what law the ſtory Dyer told of*

(58) So it is in the printed copy of this Letter; but it ſhould probably be *Cubs*, as it is in Ralegh's Trial.

(59) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 279.

(60) Sir Anthony Weldon's *Court and Character of King James*, p. 35. edit. 1650, in 8vo.

(61) Overbury's *Arraignment of Sir W. Ralegh*, p. 24.

(62) Osborne's *Memoirs of King James*, in the 2d vol. of his works, p. 108.

(63) *Obſervations on Sanderſon's Hiſt. of Mary Q. of Scots, &c.* p. 9.

(64) p. 55.

of what an unknown man ſaid to him at Liſbon of Don Ralegh, was evidence againſt Ralegh? I would know, by what ſtatute the ſtatutes of the 25th of Edward III, and the 5th of Edward VI. are repealed. This trial was ſo very irregular throughout, that I would willingly believe it was not ſo as it is related. But if it were ſo, I am ſure none can defend it; and even for that reaſon, if any ſuch reſolution was in the caſe, as is cited, I am ſure it ought to carry no credit with it, and there is no reaſon to believe there was any ſuch reſolution, there being no occaſion for it, the queſtion being only fact, which Sir Walter denied. The circumſtances of his trial, in which the Court always over-ruled the priſoner, were ſomewhat like the Lord Ruſſel's: he complained of the ill-uſage of the King's Council, as well as the Lord Ruſſel; and both had reaſon ſo to do. Hearſay was admitted to be given in evidence againſt both; all that either of them ſaid for themſelves, though very material, was ſlighted. The one was put in mind at his trial of the death of the Earl of Eſſex, as the other was of the death of the Viſcount Strafford; both in their dying ſpeeches vindicated themſelves of thoſe aſperſions. The principal witneſſes in both caſes had before the trials affirmed, they knew nothing againſt them. They were both accuſed of having heard what other perſons had ſaid in their company, and had not diſcovered it; they both gave the ſame anſwers, that they could not help other men's talk. I think it is plain at this day, that of Sir Walter is thought a ſham-plot; what the Lord Ruſſel's is thought, let the author ſay. When ſentence was given againſt Ralegh, he deſired, that the King might know the proofs againſt him; that he ſtill perſiſted in his loyalty, notwithſtanding that verdict, which he would pray, that his ſaid Jury might never anſwer for; and only begged pardon for concealing Lord Cobham's offer to him, which he did through a confidence, that he had diverted him from thoſe humours. And ſo he accompanied the Sheriff to the priſon *with admirable erection, yet in ſuch ſort as a condemned man ſhould do* (65). Juſt before his trial he had written a letter to the King (66), wherein he ſays: "I know, that among many preſumptions "gathered againſt me, your Majeſty has been per-"ſuaded, that I was one of thoſe, who were greatly "diſcontented, and therefore the more likely to "prove diſloyal; but the great God of heaven and "earth diſclaim me from both worlds, if I were "not the contrary." And having humbly beſeeched his Majeſty *not to believe any of thoſe, who, under pretence of offences to Kings, do eaſily work their particular revenge*, proceeds thus: "For my part, I proteſt "before the ever-living God, that I never intended "treaſon, conſented to treaſon, or performed trea-"ſon againſt you; and yet I know I ſhall fall into "their hands, *è quibus non poſſum evadere*, unleſs by "your Majeſty's gracious compaſſion I be ſuſtained." In another letter, which he wrote to the Lords, ſpeaking of the two principal accuſations againſt him, he ſays; *The firſt was, that money was offered me with a pretence to maintain the* Amity, *but the intent was to have aſſiſted his Majeſty's* Surpriſe: *the other, that I was privy to my Lord Cobham's Spaniſh journey. For the firſt, it ſeems, this money was offered to others long after it was offered to me, and upon other conſiderations than it was to me. For myſelf, I avow upon my allegiance, that I never knew or ſuſpected either the man or the* new intention. *To me it was but once propounded, and in three weeks after I never heard more of it; neither did I believe, that he had any commiſſion to offer it. For if that word* Amity *had been uſed to me colourably, I muſt have been alſo made acquainted with the true end, for which it ſhould have been given; which it ſeems was the* Surprize: *but of any ſuch honourable purpoſe, if ever I had ſo much as a ſuſpicion, I refuſe your Lordſhip's favour and the King's mercy. I know your Lordſhips have omitted nothing to find out the truth; but as you have not erred, like ill Surgeons, to lay on plaiſters too narrow for ſo great wounds; ſo I truſt you will not imitate unlearned Phyſicians, to give medicines more cruel than the diſeaſe itſelf. For the journey into Spain, I know I was accuſed to be privy thereto; but I know your Lordſhips have a reputation of conſcience as well as induſtry. By what means that revengeful accuſation was ſtirred, you, my Lord Cecil, know right well, that it was my letter about Keymis; and your Lordſhips all know whether it be maintained, or whether out of truth and out of a Chriſtian conſideration it be revoked . . . . . Your Lordſhips know, that I am guiltleſs of the* Surprize *intended; you know, or may know, that I never accepted of the money, and that it was not offered me for any ill. And of the Spaniſh journey, I truſt your conſciences are reſolved* (67). And in another letter, which he wrote to the King after his trial, he has theſe words: "Loſt I am for "hearing a vain man, for *hearing only*, and never "believing or approving; and ſo little account I "made of that ſpeech of his, which was my con-"demnation, that I never remembered any ſuch "thing, till it was at my trial objected againſt "me (68)." He was kept at Wincheſter near a month after he was condemned, in daily expectation of death; the time of which was ſo determined, that he wrote what he intended for his laſt words, to his wife, the night before he expected to be put to death, in a very pathetic letter, which was as follows:

"You ſhall receive, my dear wife, my laſt words "in theſe my laſt lines. My love I ſend you, that "you may keep it, when I am dead; and my "counſel, that you remember it when I am no "more. I would not with will preſent you ſorrows, "dear *Beſs*; let them go into the grave with me, "and be buried in the duſt; and ſeeing that it is "not the will of God, that I ſhall ſee you any "more, bear my deſtruction patiently and with a "heart like yourſelf. Firſt, I ſend you all the "thanks, which my heart can conceive or my words "expreſs, for your many travels and cares for me; "which, though they have not taken effect as you "wiſhed, yet my debt to you is not the leſs; but "pay it I never ſhall in this world. Secondly, I be-"ſeech you for the love you bear me living, that "you do not hide yourſelf many days, but by your "travels ſeek to help my miſerable fortunes, and "the right of my poor child. Your mourning can-"not avail me, that am but duſt. Thirdly, you "ſhall underſtand, that my lands were conveyed *bonâ "fide* to my child. The writings were drawn at "Midſummer was twelve months, as divers can wit-"neſs. And I truſt my blood will quench their "malice, who deſired my ſlaughter, that they will "not ſeek alſo to kill you and yours with extreme po-"verty. To what friend to direct you, I know not, "for all mine have left me in the true time of trial. "Moſt ſorry I am, that being thus ſurprized by "death, I can leave you no better eſtate. God hath "prevented all my determinations; that great God, "who worketh all in all! If you can live free from "want, care for no more, for the reſt is but vanity. "Love God, and begin betimes; in him you ſhall "find true, everlaſting, and endleſs comfort. When "you have travelled and wearied yourſelf with all "ſort of worldly cogitations, you ſhall ſit down by "ſorrow in the end. Teach your ſon alſo to ſerve "and fear God, whilſt he is young, that the fear of "God may grow up in him; then will God be an "huſband to you, and a father to him; an huſband "and a father that can never be taken from you. "Bailie oweth me a thouſand pounds, and Adrian "ſix hundred. In Guernſey alſo I have much ow-"ing me. Dear wife, I beſeech you for my ſoul's "ſake, pay all poor men. When I am dead, no "doubt you ſhall be much ſought unto, for the world "thinks I was very rich. Have a care to the fair "pretences of men, for no greater miſery can be-"fall you in this life than to become a prey unto "the world, and after to be deſpiſed. I ſpeak, "God knows! not to diſſuade you from marriage, "for it will be beſt for you both in reſpect of God "and the world. As for me, I am no more yours, "nor you mine: death hath cut us aſunder, and God "hath divided me from the world, and you from "me. Remember your poor child for his father's "ſake, who loved you in his happieſt eſtate. I ſued "for my life, but God knows! it was for you and "yours that I deſired it. For you know, my dear "wife, your child is the child of a true man, who, in "his own reſpect, deſpiſeth death and his miſhapen "and ugly forms. I cannot write much; God "knows! how hardly I ſteal this time, when all "ſleep; and it is alſo time for me to ſeparate my "thoughts from the world. Beg my dead body,

"which

(65) Overbury's *Arraignment of Sir Walter Ralegh*, p. 25.

(66) See his *Remains*, p. 185. edit. 1726.

(67) Ibid. p. 188, &c.

(68) Ibid. p. 192, &c.

from him, and given to Sir Robert Carr, afterwards Earl of Somerſet [Z]. During his confinement, he devoted a great part of his time to his ſtudies, and wrote ſeveral books [*AA*]. March the 25th, 1615-16, he was releaſed out of the Tower (*t*); and in 1617, received a commiſſion from the King, dated Auguſt the 26th, empowering him to

(*t*) *Camdeni Annal. Regis Jacobi ad ann.* 1615.

" which living was denied you; and either lay it in " Sherborne, or in Exeter Church by my father and " mother. I can ſay no more; time and death " calleth me away. The everlaſting God, power- " ful, infinite, and inſcrutable God Almighty, who " is goodneſs itſelf, the true light and life, keep you " and yours, and have mercy upon me, and forgive " my perſecutors and falſe accuſers, and ſend us to " meet in his glorious kingdom. My dear wife, " farewel; bleſs my boy; pray for me; and let " my true God hold you both in his arms.

" Yours that was, but now not mine own,

" *Walter Ralegh.*"

However, as *Cobham* never confirmed his accuſation of him, they both were, with the reſt of the priſoners, returned to the Tower of London; where the Lord *Grey* died; but *Cobham* was at laſt releaſed, and lived in very neceſſitous circumſtances.

[Z] *Had his eſtate reſtored to him, though it was afterwards taken away from him, and given to Sir* Robert Car, *afterwards Earl of Somerſet.*] This eſtate had been actually made over by Sir Walter to his ſon, both inheritance and fee, before Queen Elizabeth's death, as formerly was alſo the leaſe for years (69); ſo that, being entailed on " Sir *Wal-* " *ter*'s heirs, he could not forfeit them but during " his own life; and the King finding in himſelf the " iniquity of Sir *Walter*'s condemnation, gave him " all what he had forfeited again (70)." But ſoon after this a young Scotſman, named *Robert Carr*, becoming a great favourite at Court, and having no fortune of his own, it was contrived by thoſe, who had in vain ſought *Ralegh*'s eſtate for themſelves, to lay the foundation of this favourite's future greatneſs upon his ruin; for being thus fruſtrated of the effects of Sir *Walter*'s attainder, they pretended to find a flaw in his laſt conveyance of the fee and inheritance of Sherborne to his ſon; and to this purpoſe an information was exhibited in the Exchequer by the Attorney General *Hobart*, to which *Ralegh* put in his anſwer; and therein the ſaid grant or conveyance was ſet forth to be made over, as above-mentioned. Yet for want of a *ſingle word*, which was found notwithſtanding in the paper-book, and was only the overſight of the Clerk, they pronounced the conveyance invalid, and Sherborne abſolutely forfeited to the Crown; a judgment eaſily to have been foreſeen, ſince his Judge was his greateſt enemy, and the caſe argued between a friendleſs priſoner and the King of England (71). Upon this Sherborne was given to Carr. The Lady *Ralegh* and her children earneſtly petitioned the King for compaſſion, but could now obtain no other anſwer from him, than that *he* mun *have the land, he* mun *have it for* Carr. And ſhe, a woman of high ſpirit, on her knees prayed to God, that he would puniſh thoſe, who had thus wrongfully expoſed her and her children to ruin (72). There is an elegant letter of *Ralegh*'s extant to Carr himſelf upon this occaſion, which having been corruptly printed, Mr. Oldys (73) has given a more correct copy of it from ſeveral ancient manuſcript copies. It is as follows: " After ſome " great loſſes, and many years ſorrows, of both " which I have cauſe to fear I was miſtaken in the " end; it is come to my knowledge, that yourſelf, " whom I know not but by an honourable fame, has " been perſuaded to give me and mine our laſt fatal " blow, by obtaining from his Majeſty the inheri- " tance of my children and nephews, loſt in the " law for *want* of a *word*. This done, there re- " mains nothing with me but the name of life, de- " ſpoiled of all elſe but the title and ſorrow thereof. " His Majeſty, whom I never offended (for I ever " held it unnatural and unmanly to hate goodneſs) " ſtay'd me at the grave's brink; not, as I hope, " that he thought me worthy of many deaths, and " to behold all mine caſt out of the world with my- " ſelf; but as a King, who judging the poor in truth, " has received a promiſe from God, that *his Throne* " *ſhall be eſtabliſhed for ever*. As for yourſelf, Sir, " ſeeing your fair day is but now in the dawn, and " mine drawn to the evening, your own virtues and " the King's grace aſſuring you of many favours and " much honour, I beſeech you not to begin your " firſt building upon the ruins of the innocent; and " that their ſorrows, with mine, may not attend " your firſt plantation. I have been ever bound " to your nation, as well for many other graces, as " for their true report of my trial to his Majeſty, a- " gainſt whom I had been found malignant, the " hearing of my cauſe would not have changed ene- " mies into friends, malice into compaſſion, and the " minds of the greateſt number preſent into the " commiſeration of my ſtate. It is not the nature " of foul treaſon to beget ſuch fair paſſions; neither " could it agree with the duty and love of faithful " ſubjects, eſpecially of your nation, to bewail his " overthrow, who had conſpired againſt their moſt " liberal and natural Lord. I therefore truſt, Sir, " that you will not be the firſt, that ſhall kill us out- " right, cut down the tree with the fruit, and un- " dergo their curſe, who enter the field of the father- " leſs; which, if it pleaſe you to know the truth, " is far leſs frui ful in value than in fame; but that " ſo worthy a Gentleman as yourſelf will rather bind " us to your ſervice, being Sir, Gentlemen, not baſe " in birth and alliance, who have intereſt therein; " and myſelf, with the utmoſt thankfulneſs, will " ever remain ready to obey your Commandments." This letter, in one or two old copies, is dated December 1608; but it had ſo little effect upon *Carr*, or any other applications, which *Ralegh* might make to the King, with his Majeſty himſelf, that beſides Sherborne, and the manors belonging to it, thoſe other lands, which *Ralegh* himſelf had purchaſed, called, *Pinford* and *Primeſly*, *Barton*, and the manors appertaining thereto, forfeited with the reſt by his attainder, were alſo granted the following year 1609 to the ſaid favourite (74).

(69) *Carew Ralegh's Caſe at the Committee for ſale of Delinquents Eſtates*, MS. quoted by Mr. Oldys, p. 163.

(70) *Carew Ralegh's brief Relation of Sir Walter Ralegh's troubles, with the taking away of the Lands and Caſtle of Sherborne, in Dorſetſhire, &c.* p. 6. edit. 1669, in 4to.

(71) Ibid. and *Carew Ralegh's Caſe.*

(72) *Carew Ralegh's brief Relation*, p. 7.

(73) p. 164.

(74) See *Carew Ralegh's Caſe.*

[*AA*] *Wrote ſeveral books.*] We ſhall, after the example of Mr. *Oldys* (75), conſider his writings under the following heads, *viz. Poetical, Epiſtolary, Military, Maritimal, Geographical, Political, Philoſophical,* and *Hiſtorical.* I. *Poetical*; as his Poems on *Gaſcoigne's Steel-Glaſs*; *The Excuſe*; *The ſilent Lover*; the *Anſwer* to *Marloe's Paſtoral*; with his Poems of *Cynthia*, and two more on *Spenſer's Fairy-Queen*; *The Lover's Maze*; *A Farewel to Court*; *The Advice*; which laſt three pieces are printed in an old *Collection of ſeveral ingenious Poems and Songs by the wits of the age*, 1660, in 8vo. another little Poem, printed in the *London Magazine* for Auguſt 1734; ſeveral in the *Aſhmolean* Library at Oxford, namely, *Erroris Reſponſio*, and his *Anſwer to the Lie*, &c. three pieces written juſt before his death, *viz.* his *Pilgrim*, his *Epigram in Alluſion to the Snuff of a Candle*, and his *Epitaph*, printed in his *Remains*. There is likewiſe aſcribed to him a ſatyrical Elegy upon the death of the Lord Treaſurer *Cecil*, Earl of Saliſbury, printed by *Oſborne* in his *Memoirs* of King *James*, and ſaid to be our Author's by *Shirley* in his Life of *Ralegh*, p. 179. II. *Epiſtolary*, viz. Letters, eight and twenty of which Mr. Oldys tells us he has ſeen in print and manuſcript (76). III. MILITARY. Theſe diſcourſes relate either to the defenſe of England in particular, or contain general arguments and examples of the cauſes and reaſons of war among mankind. On the former ſubject he ſeems to have drawn up ſeveral remonſtrances, which are but ſparingly and ſlowly come to light. However, as he had a principal hand in the determinations of the Council of War for putting the nation in arms, when it was under immediate apprehenſions of the Spaniſh invaſion, there is good reaſon to believe, that he was the Author of a treatiſe concerning *Notes of Direction* for

(75) p. 173 & *ſeq.*

(76) p. 174.

to ſet forth ſhips and men upon a voyage to *the ſouth parts of America, or elſewhere within America, poſſeſſed and inhabited by heathen and ſavage people, to diſcover ſome commodities and merchandize profitable for the ſubjects of theſe Kingdoms, whereof the inhabitants make little or no uſe*, &c. Accordingly he ſet out with his fleet for Guiana in the beginning of July; but his deſign being betrayed to the Spaniards, it was defeated; and his ſon Walter was killed at St. Thome, which was burnt by Captain Keymis, who being reproached by Sir Walter for his ill conduct in the affair, killed himſelf. *Gundamor*, the Spaniſh Embaſſador in England, being informed of what had paſſed at Guiana, complained in very ſtrong terms to the King, who on the 11th of June, 1618, publiſhed a proclamation to this effect (*u*), that "Whereas we gave liberty to Sir *Walter* "and others, to undertake a voyage to *Guiana*, where they had pretended a probability of "diſcovering gold mines, &c. we did, by expreſs limitation and caution, reſtrain and "forbid them from attempting any act of hoſtility, upon any territories or ſubjects of "foreign Princes, with whom we are in amity; and more particularly thoſe of our "dear brother the King of Spain, in reſpect of his dominions on that continent, which, "notwithſtanding, they have, by hoſtile invaſion of the town of *St. Thome*, &c. broken "and infringed. We have therefore thought fit to make publick declaration of our "utter miſlike and deteſtation of the ſaid inſolencies; and for the better detection and "clearing up of the truth, we charge all our ſubjects, that have any underſtanding or "notice thereof, to repair to any of our Privy Council, and make known their whole "knowledge, that we may thereupon proceed to the exemplary puniſhment and coercion of all ſuch, as are found guilty of ſo ſcandalous and enormous outrages."

(*u*) See Rymer's *Fœdera*, Tom. 17. p. 192.

Ralegh

ſuch *Defence of the Kingdom*, written three years before that invaſion. To this treatiſe was alſo joined a *Direction for the beſt and moſt orderly retreat of an army, whether in Campaign or Straits*. And theſe were then preſented in manuſcript to the Privy Council. Herein one advice is, that ſince *Frontier* forces are unlikely to prevent an enemy from landing, if they ſhould land through the deficiency or abſence of our ſhipping (for this is the force which *Ralegh* was ever for having firſt uſed againſt ſuch foreign invaſions) it were better by driving or clearing the country of *proviſions*, and *temporizing*, to endeavour at growing ſtronger, and rendering the enemy weaker, than to hazard all by a confuſed and diſorderly deſcent of the populace to oppoſe the firſt landing, as their cuſtom was formerly. But this was one of the chief points, which a little before the approach of the *Spaniſh Armada* was oppoſed by *Thomas Digges*, Eſq; Muſter Maſter General of the Queen's Forces in the Low-Countries, in a *Diſcourſe* of the *beſt order for repulſing a foreign Force*, &c. which he then publiſhed, This occaſioned an *Anſwer*, which having been found in an old manuſcript copy among others of Sir *Walter Ralegh*'s diſcourſes, and by ſeveral circumſtances therein agreeing with many in his life, as well as with ſeveral orders in the aforeſaid Council of War, ſeveral paſſages in his *Hiſtory of the World*, and his other writings, it was publiſhed by *Nathaniel Booth* of Gray's-Inn, Eſq; at London 1734 in 8vo, under this title: *A Military Diſcourſe, whether it be better for England to give an invader preſent battle, or to temporize and defer the ſame*, &c. But if we would ſee *Ralegh's* opinion upon this ſubject in a more extenſive and univerſal manner, it muſt be in his *Diſcourſes* of the original and fundamental *cauſe* of *natural* and *neceſſary*, *arbitrary* and *cuſtomary*, *holy* and *civil wars*; which, though publiſhed ſeveral years after his death, have ſufficient marks of genuineneſs upon them. IV. *Maritimal*; viz. his *Diſcourſe of the invention of ſhipping*, &c. printed among his *Eſſays* in 1650 in 8vo. his *Obſervations and Notes concerning the Royal Navy and Sea-ſervice*, dedicated to Prince *Henry*, printed likewiſe among his *Eſſays*; his *Letter* to that Prince concerning *the Model of a Ship*, printed among his *Remains*; his *Report of the Truth of the Fight about the Iſles of* Azores, printed in 1591 in 4to. and reprinted by *Hakluyt*, Vol. II. Part II. p. 169. edit. 1599; his *Relation of the Action at* Cadiz, publiſhed among the *Remains* at the end of an *Abridgment of Sir* Walter Ralegh's *Hiſtory of the World*, 1700 in 8vo; and his *Memorial touching Dover Port*, printed in a pamphlet, entitled, *An Eſſay on Ways and Means to maintain the Honour and Safety of England*, publiſhed by Sir *Henry Sheers* in 1701. in 4to. Sir Walter in the Introduction to his *Obſervations and Notes concerning the Royal Navy and Sea-ſervice* mentions a *Diſcourſe of a maritimal voyage, with the paſſages and incidents therein*, which he had formerly written to Prince *Henry*; and in his *Hiſtory of the World* (77) he takes notice of another treatiſe, written to the ſame Prince, *Of the Art of War by Sea*; "a ſubject to "my knowledge, ſays he, never handled by any "man ancient or modern; but God has ſpared "me the labour of finiſhing it, by the loſs of that "brave Prince; of which, like an eclipſe of the "ſun, we ſhall find the effects hereafter." V. *Geographical*, viz. ſeveral diſcourſes and papers of his concerning the diſcovery, planting, and ſettlement of *Virginia*, which were formerly in the hands of Sir *Francis Walſingham* (78). *A Treatiſe of the Weſt-Indies* (79). *Conſiderations on the Voyage for Guiana*, a manuſcript containing leaves in 4to. in the Library of Sir *Hans Sloane*, Bart. *Diſcovery of the large, rich, and beautiful Empire of* Guiana, publiſhed by himſelf, and mentioned above. His *Journal of his ſecond Voyage to Guiana*, which remains ſtill in manuſcript; and his *Apology* for the ſaid voyage. VI. *Political*, viz. *The Seat of Government*; ſhewing it to be upheld by the two great Pillars of *civil Juſtice* and *martial Policy*, and how this is framed out of the *Huſband*, *Merchants*, and Gentry of the Realm. This piece was printed among his Remains in 1652, in 12mo. *Obſervations concerning the Cauſes of the Magnificency and Opulency*, printed likewiſe among his *Remains*. *The Prince; or Maxims of State*, printed at London 1642 in 4to. and reprinted among his *Remains*. Mr. *Wood* ſays, that it is the ſame with *Aphoriſms of State*, publiſhed by *John Milton* at London 1661 in 8vo. *The Cabinet-Council, containing the chief Arts of Empire, and myſteries of State diſcabineted*, &c. *publiſhed by* John Milton, *Eſq*; London 1658 in 8vo. In the ſecond edition at London 1692 in 8vo. it is entitled, *The Arts of Empire and Myſteries of State diſcabineted*, &c. *The Spaniard's Cruelties to the Engliſh in Havanna* (80). His *Conſultation about the Peace with Spain*, and our protecting the *Netherlands*, in manuſcript. *The preſent State of Spain, with a moſt accurate account of his Catholic Majeſty's Power and Rights; alſo the names and worth of the moſt conſiderable Perſons in that Kingdom*, in manuſcript; which ſeems to be a different piece from *The preſent State of Things, as they now ſtand between the three Kingdoms, France, England, and Spain*, in manuſcript. *A Diſcourſe on the match propounded by the Savoyan between the Lady Elizabeth and the Prince of Piedmont*, and another on that *between Prince* Henry *of England and a daughter of Savoy*; both which diſcourſes are in manuſcript. *A Dialogue between a Jeſuit and a Recuſant; ſhewing how dangerous their Principles are to Chriſtian Princes*, publiſhed by *Philip Ralegh*, Eſq; among our Author's *Genuine Remains* at the end of an *Abridgment* of his *Hiſtory of the world*, London 1700 in 8vo. *A Dialogue between a Counſellor of State and a Juſtice of Peace*, better known in the printed copies by the title of the

(77) Lib. 5. c. 1. ſect. 6.

(78) Oldys, p. 33 and 176.

(79) Idem, p. 177.

(80) Idem, p. 178.

Ralegh landed at Plymouth, which was about the beginning of July following (*w*); and though he heard that the Court was exaſperated by the Spaniſh Embaſſador, he was firmly reſolved to go to London; and after he had ſettled his affairs in the weſt, began his journey for London; but before he came to Aſhburnham, twenty miles from Plymouth, was met by Sir *Lewis Stucley*, Vice-Admiral of the county of Devon, who arreſted him in the name of his Majeſty, to whom Ralegh wrote a letter in vindication of himſelf

(*w*) Oldys, p. 209.

the *Prerogative of Parliaments*, dedicated to King James, and printed at *Midelburge* 1628 in 4to, and reprinted in 1642 in 4to, and likewiſe among his *Remains*. *A Diſcourſe of the words* Law *and* Right; in manuſcript in the *Aſhmolean* library. *Obſervations touching trade and commerce with the Hollander and other nations, as it was preſented to King James; wherein is proved, that our ſea and land commodities ſerve to inrich and ſtrengthen other countries againſt our own:* printed in 1653 in 12mo. But it is doubtful, whether this tract was written by our Author. VII. *Philoſophical*; viz. *A Treatiſe of the Soul*; in manuſcript in the *Aſhmolean* library. His *Sceptic* or *Speculations*; printed among his *Remains*. *Inſtructions to his Son and Poſterity*, printed in 1632 in 12mo, and reprinted among his *Remains*; and to this *Inſtructions* is ſubjoined *The dutiful Advice of a loving Son to his aged Father*. A treatiſe of *Mines and the trial of Minerals*, and a *Collection of Chymical and Medicinal Receipts*; both which are in manuſcript. VIII. *Hiſtorical*; viz. his *Hiſtory of the World*, publiſhed in April 1614 in fol. and reprinted many times ſince. It is highly eſteemed, and has been mentioned in terms of the ſtrongeſt approbation by the moſt eminent of our writers. It is a point worth examining, whether there is any foundation for the vulgar ſtory, that he continued this Hiſtory down to his own times, but deſtroyed this continuation, becauſe the firſt part did not meet with encouragement. He obſerves in his Preface, that he "propoſed to confine "his diſcourſe with this our renowned Iſle of Great "Britain;" and that he forbears "to promiſe a "ſecond or third volume, which he intends, if the "firſt receives grace and good acceptance, for that "which is already done may be thought enough "and too much." And in the concluſion of his *Hiſtory* he ſays; *Whereas this book by the title calls itſelf* The firſt Part of the General Hiſtory of the world, *implying* a ſecond *and* third *volume, which I alſo* intended *and* have hewn out; *beſides many diſcouragements perſuading my ſilence, it has pleaſed God to take that glorious Prince out of the world, to whom they were directed; whoſe unſpeakable and never enough lamented loſs has taught me to ſay with Job,* verſa eſt in luctum cithera mea, & organum meum in vocem flentium. Hence, as Mr. Oldys obſerves (81), it ſeems plain enough, that our Author had only ſome plan, or perhaps a few rough draughts of ſome ſucceeding parts of the hiſtory at his time drawn up; and that he was diſcouraged from making any further progreſs in them. Granting that his mind might change, and that there was time enough to finiſh the remaining volumes between this year and his death, which is ſcarcely allowable; yet as we know how moſt of that time was employed by him, it will admit of no room for any ſuch performance. For in 1615, the year, which followed that, wherein he publiſhed his Hiſtory, two at leaſt of his moſt celebrated tracts beforementioned were written. The ſame year he was alſo buſy in writing letters and making other intereſt for his releaſment, which he obtained before the end of it. After this his employments and affairs made it almoſt impoſſible for him to carry on ſo great a work. There is indeed an intimation of the deſign he had upon ſome part of the ancient Engliſh hiſtory, preſerved in a letter of his own, written, it ſeems, though not dated, before his great work was publiſhed, to Sir Robert Cotton, whoſe library was moſt likely to furniſh him with thoſe uncommon books which he wanted for his purpoſe. The letter is as follows:

(81) p. 186.

"Sir Robert Cotton,

"If you have any of theſe old books, or any ma-"nuſcripts, wherein I may find any of our Britiſh "antiquities, if you pleaſe to lend them me for a "little while, I will ſafely reſtore them, and think "myſelf much beholden unto you; or if you have any "old French hiſtory, wherein our nation is mention-"ed, or any elſe in what language ſoever.

"Your poor friend,

"*W. Ralegh.*"

The original of this letter is in the Cotton library, *Julius* C. 3; and at the top of it is a liſt of the old Authors, which Sir Walter refers to. But this does not ſufficienly inform us, whether the uſe of theſe books was to continue his *General Hiſtory*, or furniſh him upon ſome more particular ſubject; though Dr. Thomas Smith (82) inclines to the former opinion. However it is very probable, that Sir Walter's own intimations in the firſt part ſeem to be the only foundation of that formal ſtory related by Mr. Winſtanley (83), who tells us, that "ſome few "days before he ſuffered, he ſent for Mr. Walter "Burre, who formerly printed his firſt volume of the "*Hiſtory of the World*; whom taking by the hand, "after ſome diſcourſe, he aſked him how that work "of his had ſold? Mr. Burre returned this anſwer, "that it had ſold ſo ſlowly, that it had undone him. "At which words Sir Walter Ralegh ſtepping to his "deſk, reaches his other part of his Hiſtory to Mr. "Burre, which he had brought down to the times he "lived in. Clapping his hand on his breaſt, he "took the other unprinted part of his work "into his hand, with a ſigh ſaying, *Ah! my "friend, hath the firſt part undone thee? The ſecond "volume ſhall undo no more: this ungrateful world is "unworthy of it.* When going immediately to the "fire-ſide, he threw it in, and ſet his foot on it till "it was conſumed." Upon this paſſage Mr. Oldys remarks (84), *that Ralegh had no leiſure to finiſh ſuch a ſecond part of his Hiſtory down to his own time. In the next place, it is no ways probable, that he, who, in regard to the firſt part, could follow the rule of Seneca, that he, who having ſatisfied his own conſcience, could diſregard the cenſure of others, ſhould ſacrifice ſo great a part of his labours, or any part, in ſuch a raſh and inconſiderate manner, to the ſudden repreſentations of a bookſeller, without ever ſuſpecting any mercenary ends in him. Further it does not appear true, that the firſt part did ſell ſlowly, for there was a ſecond edition of it ſet forth by that very bookſeller, within three years after the firſt. And laſtly, the firſt one we can meet with, who reports the ſame, is a trifling and ſuperficial writer, who produces no authority for his aſſertion. As for the unfiniſhed parts he might have of ſuch a continuation, to admit that they were thus deſtroyed, would moreover in no wiſe agree with an account we have more ſatisfactorily atteſted of that great quantity there was in being of Sir Walter Ralegh's unprinted writings ſeveral years after his death. For it is affirmed to us,* that the famous Mr. Hamden, a little before the civil wars, was at the charge of tranſcribing three thouſand four hundred fifty two ſheets of Sir Walter Ralegh's manuſcripts, as the Amanuenſis himſelf told me (ſays my author) who had his cloſe chamber, his fire and candle, with an attendant to deliver him the originals, and take his copies as faſt as he could write them (85). *Yet what is become of this treaſure, I have not been able to learn: but if we ſuppoſe that Mr. Hamden would not be at the trouble and charge of tranſcribing any of our author's writings, which had then been printed, and grant that all of his, which have been printed ſince that time, as well as all we can hear of remaining in manuſcript, which are allowed to be his, were part of that collection or quantity; they will not both together amount to a fourth part thereof, though we ſhould admit two or three pieces more, alſo aſcribed to him, which have*

(82) *Vita D. Roberti Cottoni*, folio 25.

(83) *Worthies of England*, p. 256. edit. 1660, in 8vo.

(84) p. 187.

(85) *Obſervations on the Statſmen and Favourites of England ſince the Reformation.* By David Lloyd, M. A. p. 490. edit. 1665, in 8vo.

himſelf [*BB*]. He proceeded therefore with *Stucley* on his journey [*CC*], during which he wrote his *Apology* [*DD*]. Upon his arrival at London, he formed a deſign to eſcape, but being betrayed by Stucley, was ſeized in a boat on the Thames, Auguſt the 9th, and committed priſoner to the Tower of London, and two or three days after a Committee was appointed to examine into his eſcape; upon which ſubject he wrote a letter to the Marquis of Buckingham, dated October the 14th [*EE*]. On Friday October the 23d, there

have not yet been named. Theſe pieces are, 1. *A notable and memorable ſtory of the cruel war between the Carthaginians and their own mercenaries. Gathered out of* Polybius *and other authors.* Printed in 1647 in 4to. This is only a tranſcript from our author's *Hiſtory of the World*, L. 5. C. 2, &c. 2. *The Life and Death of* Mahomet; *the Conqueſt of Spain*; *together with the riſing and ruin of the Saraſen Empire:* printed in 1637 in 12mo. This, except a few leaves about *Mahomet*, is no more than a tranſlation of an Epitome made by ſome ignorant Spaniſh author; and the ſtyle very inferior to that of Ralegh. 3. *An Introduction to a Breviary of the Hiſtory of England*; *with the reign of King William I. entitled the Conqueror:* printed in 1693 in 8vo.

[*BB*] *To whom Ralegh wrote a letter in vindication of himſelf.*] The letter is as follows:

" May it pleaſe your Majeſty,

" If in my journey outward bound I had my men " murdered at the iſlands, and yet ſpared to take " revenge; if I did diſcharge ſome Spaniſh barks " taken, without ſpoil; if I did forbear all parts of " the Spaniſh Indies, wherein I might have taken " twenty of their towns on the ſea-coaſts, and did " only follow the enterprize I undertook for Guiana, " where, without any directions from me, a Spaniſh " village was burnt, which was new ſet up within " three miles of mine; by your Majeſty's favour, " I find no reaſon why the Spaniſh Embaſſador ſhould " complain of me. If it were lawful for the Spa- " niards to murder twenty ſix Engliſhmen, tying " them back to back, and then cutting their throats, " when they had traded with them a whole month, " and came to them on the land without ſo much " as one ſword; and it may not be lawful for your " Majeſty's ſubjects, being charged firſt by them, to " repel force by force; we may juſtly ſay, O miſera- " ble Engliſh! If Parker and Mecham took Cam- " peachy and other places in the Honduras, ſeated " in the heart of the Spaniſh Indies, burnt towns, " and killed the Spaniards, and had nothing ſaid " unto them at their return; and myſelf, who for- " bore to look into the Indies, becauſe I would not " offend, muſt be accuſed; I may as juſtly ſay, O " miſerable Ralegh! If I have ſpent my poor eſtate, " loſt my ſon, ſuffered by ſickneſs, and otherwiſe a " world of hardſhips; if I have reſiſted, with mani- " feſt hazard of my life, the robberies and ſpoils, " with which my companions would have made me " rich; if when I was poor, I could have made my " ſelf rich; if when I had got my liberty, which " all men and nature itſelf do much prize, I volun- " tarily loſt it; if when I was ſure of my life, I " rendered it again; if I might elſewhere have " ſold my ſhip and goods, and put five or ſix thou- " ſand pounds in my purſe, and yet brought her " into England; I beſeech your Majeſty to believe, " that all this I have done, becauſe it ſhould not be " ſaid, that your Majeſty had given liberty and " truſt to a man, whoſe end was but the recovery " of his liberty, and who had betrayed your Maje- " ſty's truſt. My Mutineers told me, that if I re- " turned to England, I ſhould be undone; but I be- " lieved in your Majeſty's goodneſs, more than in all " their arguments. Sure, I am the firſt, that being " free and able to inrich myſelf, yet hath embraced " poverty and peril; and ſure I am, that my example " ſhall make me the laſt. But your Majeſty's wiſ- " dom and goodneſs I have made my judges, who " have ever been and ſhall ever be

" Your Majeſty's moſt humble vaſſal,

" *Walter Ralegh.*"

[*CC*] *He proceeded therefore with Stucley on his journey.*] The particulars of his journey may be ſeen in *Captain Samuel King's Narrative of Sir Walter Ralegh's Motives and Opportunities for conveying himſelf out of the Kingdom; with the Manner how he was betrayed.* MS. two ſheets in fol. cited by Mr. Oldys; and in *Manourie's Declaration* annexed to King James's Declaration; and in a piece of Sir Lewis Stucley's, entitled, *To the King's moſt excellent Majeſty, the humble Petition and Information of Sir Lewis Stucley, Knight, Vice-Admiral of Devon, touching his own Behaviour in the charge committed to him for the bringing up of Sir Walter Ralegh, and the ſcandalous aſperſions caſt upon him for the ſame.* 1618 in 4to.

[*DD*] *Wrote his* Apology.] It appears to have been firſt publiſhed among his *Select Eſſays* in 1650 in 8vo. It was reprinted with theſe *Eſſays* in 1667.

[*EE*] *Wrote a letter to the Marquis of Buckingham, dated October the 14th.*] In it he writes thus: " If " I preſume too much, I humbly beſeech your Lord- " ſhip to pardon me, eſpecially in preſuming to " write to ſo great and ſo worthy a perſon, who " hath been told, that I have done him wrong. I " heard it but of late, but moſt happy had I been, " if I might have diſproved that villainy againſt " me, when there had been no ſuſpicion, that the " deſire to ſave my life had preſented my excuſe. " But, my worthy Lord, it is not to excuſe myſelf, that " I now write. I cannot, for I have now offended " my ſovereign Lord. For all paſt, even all the " world, and my very enemies, have lamented my " loſs; whom now if his Majeſty's mercy alone do " not lament, I am loſt. Howſoever, that which " doth comfort my ſoul in this offence is, that even " in the offence itſelf, I had no other intent than " his Majeſty's ſervice, and to make his Majeſty " know, that my late enterprize was grounded upon " a truth, and which with one ſhip ſpeedily ſet out " I meant to have aſſured or to have died; being " reſolved, as it is well known, to have done it at " Plymouth, had I not been reſtrained. Hereby I " hoped, not only to recover his Majeſty's gracious " opinion, but have deſtroyed all thoſe malig- " nant reports, which had been ſpread of me. " That this is true, that Gentleman, whom I ſo " much truſted, my keeper, and to whom I opened " my heart, cannot but teſtify; and wherein, if I " cannot be believed living, my death ſhall witneſs. " Yea, that Gentleman cannot but avow it, that when " we came back towards London, I deſired to have " no other treaſur than the exact *Deſcription* of thoſe " places in the Indies. That I meant to go hence " as a diſcontented man, God, I truſt, and my own " actions will diſſuade his Majeſty; whom neither " the loſs of my eſtate, thirteen years impriſon- " ment, and the denial of my pardon, could beat " from his ſervice. Nor had the opinion of be- " ing counted a fool, or rather diſtracted, by re- " turning as I did, balanced with my love to his " Majeſty's perſon and eſtate, any place at all in " my heart. It was that laſt ſevere letter from the " Lords for the ſpeedy bringing of me up, and the " impatience of diſhonour, that firſt put me in fear " of my life, or enjoying it in a perpetual impri- " ſonment, never to recover my reputation loſt, " which ſtrengthened me in my late and too late " lamented reſolution, if his Majeſty's mercy do not " abound; if his Majeſty do not pity my age, and " ſcorn to take the extremeſt and utmoſt advantage " of my errors; if his Majeſty in his charity do not " make a difference between offences proceeding " from a life-ſaving natural impulſion, without all ill " intents, and thoſe of an ill heart; and that your " Lordſhip, remarkable in the world for the noble- " neſs

there was a conference held upon the form or manner how priſoners, who have been attainted of treaſon, and ſet at liberty, ſhould be brought to execution, between all the Judges of England; and the queſtion being put, "Whether a Privy-Seal was ſufficient, "it being directed to the Juſtices of the King's Bench, to command them to award execu- "tion againſt Sir *Walter Ralegh*; or how they ſhould proceed before execution be a- "warded?" it was reſolved by all, that he ought to be brought "to the bar by "*Habeas Corpus* to the Lieutenant of the Tower, and then demanded, if he could "ſay any thing why execution ſhould not be awarded?" Upon this reſolution, a Privy-Seal came to the Juſtices of the King's Bench, commanding them to proceed againſt him according to law (*x*). On Wedneſday, October the 28th, Sir Walter was carried to the King's-Bench Bar at Weſtminſter, where ſentence of death was paſſed upon him [*FF*], and he was then led to the Gate-houſe near the Palace-yard; and the day following beheaded in the old Palace-yard in Weſtminſter [*GG*]. His body was interred in the chancel of the church of St. Margaret's Weſtminſter; but his head was long preſerved in a caſe by his widow, who ſurvived him twenty-nine years; and after her death, it was kept alſo by her ſon *Carew Ralegh* [*HH*], with whom it was buried (*y*). Biſhop Burnet (*z*) ſpeaking of ſome great errors in King James the Firſt's reign, proceeds thus: "Beſides theſe publick actings, King James ſuffered much in the opinion of all people, "by his ſtrange way of uſing one of the greateſt men of that age, Sir *Walter Ralegh*; a- "gainſt whom the proceedings at firſt were cenſured, but the laſt part of them was "thought both barbarous and illegal." And a little farther, ſpeaking of the ſame King, he ſays, "His reign in England was a continual courſe of mean practices: the firſt "condemnation of Sir *Walter Ralegh* was very black; but the executing him after ſo "many years, and after an employment, that had been given him, was counted a "barbarous

(*x*) Sir Richard Hutton's *Reports*, p. 21. edit. 1656, in folio.

(*y*) Oldys, p. 230.

(*z*) *Hiſt. of his own Time*, p. 16, 17. edit. 1724, in folio.

"neſs of your diſpoſition, do not vouchſafe to be- "come my interceſſor, whereby your Lordſhip ſhall "bind an hundred Gentlemen of my kindred to ho- "nour your memory, and bind me, for all the time "of that life, which your Lordſhip ſhall beg for "me, to pray to God, that you may ever proſper; "and over-bind me to remain

"Your moſt humble Servant,

"*W. Ralegh.*"

[*FF*] *Sentence of death was paſſed upon him.*] Mr. Oldys obſerves (86), that the King was all this while retired, as it were, or at ſome remoteneſs from this tragical ſcene, and as it is delivered down by particular tradition, was in Hartfordſhire, as if he would have diverted himſelf not only from the ſight or report, but even the thoughts of it. Yet what an effectual and expeditious hand he had in it, may farther appear from his ſpecial warrant for the execution of Sir *Walter*, which was produced ready ſigned at Weſtminſter, in a manner as ſoon as the ſentence was over, being dated the ſame day, and directed to the Lord Chancellor Bacon (87). Ralegh the night before his death wrote the following verſes, which were found in his bible.

(86) p. 226.

(87) See Rymer's *Fœdera*, Tom. 17. folio 115.

Even ſuch is time! who takes in truſt
Our youth, our joys, and all we have;
And pays us but with earth and duſt;
Who in the dark and ſilent grave,
When we have wander'd all our ways,
Shuts up the ſtory of our days.
But from that earth, that grave, and duſt,
The Lord ſhall raiſe me up, I truſt.

[GG] *The day following beheaded in the old Palace-Yard in Weſtminſter.*] He mounted the ſcaffold with a chearful countenance, and ſaluted the Lords, Knights, and Gentlemen of his acquaintance. He introduced his ſpeech with informing them, that as he was yeſterday taken out of his bed in a ſtrong fit of a fever, which much weakened him, if any diſability of voice or dejection of countenance ſhould appear in him, they would impute it rather to the diſorder of his body than any diſmaidneſs of mind. He concludes his ſpeech with theſe words: *And now I entreat, that you all will join with me in prayer to the great God of Heaven, whom I have grievouſly offended, being a man full of all vanity, who has lived a ſinful life in ſuch callings, as have been moſt inducing to it; for I have been a ſoldier, a ſailor, and a Courtier, which are courſes of wickedneſs and vice; that his Almighty Goodneſs will forgive me; that he will caſt away my ſins from me, and that he will receive me into everlaſting life. So I take my leave of you all, making my peace with God.*

Then Proclamation being made, that all men ſhould depart the ſcaffold, he prepared himſelf for death, giving away his hat and cap and money to ſome attendants, who ſtood near him. When he took leave of the Lords and other Gentlemen, he intreated the Lord Arundel to deſire the King, that no ſcandalous writings to defame him might be publiſhed after his death; concluding, *I have a long journey to go; therefore muſt take leave.* Then having put off his gown and doublet, he called to the headſman to ſhew him the axe, which not being ſuddenly done, he ſaid, *I pr'ythee let me ſee it: doſt thou think that I am afraid of it?* Having fingered the edge of it a little, he returned it, and ſaid ſmiling to the Sheriff, *This is a ſharp medicine, but it is a ſound cure for all diſeaſes*; and having entreated the company to pray to God to aſſiſt him and ſtrengthen him, the executioner kneeled down and aſked him forgiveneſs, which *Ralegh*, laying his hand upon his ſhoulder, granted. Then being aſked, which way he would lay himſelf on the block, he anſwered, *So the heart be right, it is no matter which way the head lies.* As he ſtooped to lay himſelf along, and reclined his head, his face being towards the Eaſt, the executioner ſpread his own cloak under him. After a little pauſe, he gave the ſign, that he was ready for the ſtroke by lifting up his hand, and his head was ſtruck off at two blows, his body never ſhrinking nor moving. His head was ſhewed on each ſide of the ſcaffold, and then put into a red leather bag, and with his velvet night-gown thrown over it, was afterwards conveyed away in a mourning coach of his Lady's (88).

(88) Prince's *Worthies of Devon*, p. 539, 540.

[*HH*] Carew Ralegh.] He was born in the Tower of London, where his father was priſoner in the latter end of the year 1604, or beginning of the year following, and was Gentleman-Commoner of Wadham-College in Oxford, and afterwards travelled abroad till the death of King James I. In the third year of the reign of Charles I. he was reſtored in blood, and about a year after married Philippa, Relict of Sir Anthony Aſhley, a rich young widow, by whom he had two ſons and three daughters. In 1635 he was made one of the Gentlemen of the King's Privy-Chamber. In the latter end of January 1659 he was appointed Governor of the Iſle of Jerſey. At the Reſtoration, King Charles II. would have conferred ſome perſonal honour upon him, which he declined. The King therefore knighted his eldeſt ſon Walter, who died ſoon after at Weſt-Horſely in Surrey, his father's ſeat. Mr. Ralegh had another

"barbarous ſacrificing him to the Spaniards." And Mr. Bevil Higgons, though otherwiſe a great oppoſer of Biſhop Burnet, agrees with him in this particular *(aa)*, where ſpeaking of the artifices, by which King James was prevailed on to put the gallant Ralegh to death, he ſays, that however, he thinks, it might reſult more from want of courage than from cruelty, *the action was inexcuſable, being not more unjuſt than mean-ſpirited, and one of the greateſt blemiſhes in his reign.*

(*aa*) *Short View of the Hiſtory of England*, p. 234. edit. 1734, in 8vo.

feat at Kenton-Park near Hampton-Court. He died in December 1666.

Mr. Wood tells us, that he had ſeen ſome ſonnets of his compoſition, and certain ingenious diſcourſes in manuſcript, and a Poem ſet to muſic by Mr. *Henry Lawes*. He is ſuppoſed likewiſe to be the Author of *Obſervations upon ſome particular perſons and paſſages in a book lately made publick, entitled*, A compleat Hiſtory of the Lives and Reigns of Mary Queen of Scotland, and of James King of England, written by W. Sanderſon, Eſq; London 1656 in three ſheets in 4to (89). Sir Henry Wotton (90) gives him the character of *a Gentleman of dextrous Abilities*. T.

(89) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 440, 441.

(90) *Letters*, p. 481. edit. 1672.

☞ RAWLEGH or RALEGH (WALTER), an eminent Engliſh Divine in the 17th century, was ſecond ſon of Sir Carew Ralegh, (elder brother of the celebrated Sir Walter Ralegh,) a Gentleman of an ancient family in Devonſhire, deſcended from John de Ralegh, a great man in the time of William the Conqueror, who knighted him in the ſecond year of his reign. His mother was relict of Sir John Thynne, of Longleate, in Wiltſhire, and daughter of Sir William Wroughton, Vice-Admiral under Sir John Dudley, (afterwards Duke of Northumberland) in the expedition againſt the Scots in 1544 (*a*). He was born at Downton in Wiltſhire, in the year 1586, and educated in Wincheſter ſchool, whence he was ſent to Magdalen-college, in the univerſity of Oxford, of which he became a Commoner in Michaelmas Term, 1602 (*b*). June the 11th, 1605, he took the degree of Bachelor of Arts (*c*), and June the 2d, 1608, that of Maſter (*d*); and being a noted diſputant, was made Junior of the Publick Act the ſame year, in which he diſtinguiſhed himſelf to great advantage (*e*). About that time he entered into holy orders, and became Chaplain to William, Earl of Pembroke, in whoſe family he ſpent about two years, when he was collated by his Lordſhip to the Rectory of Chedzoy, near Bridgewater in Somerſetſhire, in the latter end of the year 1620 (*f*). Being ſettled here, he married Mary, the daughter of Sir Richard Gibbs, and ſiſter of Dr. Charles Gibbs, Prebendary of Weſtminſter (*g*). He was afterwards collated to a minor Prebend in the church of Wells, and to the Rectory of Streat, with the chapel of Walton in Wiltſhire. About the time of the death of his patron the Earl of Pembroke, which happened in 1630, he became Chaplain in Ordinary to King Charles I. and by that title was actually created Doctor of Divinity in 1636. January the 13th, 1641, he was admitted Dean of Wells upon the death of Dr. George Warburton (*h*). Upon the breaking out of the Civil Wars, he was ſequeſtered on account of his loyalty, and hurried from one priſon to another [*A*], and ſtill there immured, where ſeveral priſoners died of the plague, and at laſt ſhut up in his own houſe at Wells, which was turned into a goal, where he was ſtabbed by David Barrett, a ſhoe-maker of that city, who was his keeper, and died of the wound [*B*] October the 10th, 1646, and was interred on the 13th of the ſame month before the Dean's ſtall, in the choir of the cathedral of Wells. His papers, after his death, ſuch as could be preſerved, continued for above thirty years in obſcurity, till at laſt coming into the hands of Dr. Simon Patrick, afterwards Biſhop of Ely, he publiſhed them at London 1679 in 4to, under this title: Reliquiæ Raleighanæ, *being Diſcourſes and Sermons on ſeveral ſubjects, by the Reverend Dr.* Walter Ralegh, *Dean of Wells, and Chaplain in Ordinary to his late Majeſty King Charles the Firſt.* Dr. Patrick tells us (*i*), that "beſides the quickneſs of his wit and ready elocution, he was maſter of

(*a*) Dr. Simon Patrick's *Account of Dr. Walter Ralegh*, prefixed to *Reliquiæ Raleighanæ*. edit. London 1679, in 4to.

(*b*) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 96. 2d edit.

(*c*) Idem, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 268.

(*d*) Idem, ibid. col. 179.

(*e*) Patrick, *ubi ſupra*, and Wood, *Athen. Oxon. ubi ſupra.*

(*f*) Patrick and Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(*g*) Patrick, *ubi ſupra.*

(*h*) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* ubi ſupra.

(*i*) *Ubi ſupra.*

[*A*] *Hurried from one priſon to another.*] Dr. Walker informs us (1), that it being Dr. Ralegh's month to wait on the King as his Chaplain, the Committee of Somerſet raiſed the rabble, and commiſſioned the Soldiers to plunder his Parſonage-houſe at Chedzoy; and in his abſence they ſeized upon all his eſtate ſpiritual and temporal, drove away his cattle and horſes, which they found upon his ground, and turned his family out of doors. His Lady was forced to lye two nights in the corn-fields, it being a capital crime for any of the Pariſhioners to afford them lodging. After this ſhe went to Downton in Wiltſhire, the ſeat of Sir Carew Ralegh, the Doctor's father; where her huſband met her. The King's party having had ſome ſucceſs in the Weſt, the Doctor had an opportunity to return to his family, and re-ſettle at Chedzoy; but the Parliament party ſoon gained the aſcendant by the defeat of the Lord Goring, Dr. Ralegh was obliged to take refuge at Bridgewater, then garriſoned by the King. Here he continued till that town was ſurrendered to Fairfax and Cromwell, when he was taken priſoner, and after much ſevere uſage ſet upon a poor horſe, with his legs tied under the belly of it, and ſo carried to his houſe at Chedzoy, which was then the head-quarters of Fairfax and Cromwell; and being extremely ſick through his former ill treatment, obtained the favour of continuing priſoner in his own houſe. But as ſoon as the Generals were marched, Henry Jeanes, who was ſolicitous for his Rectory of Chedzoy, and afterwards ſucceeded him in it, entered violently into the houſe, took the Doctor out of his bed, and carried him away priſoner with all his goods. His wife and children were expoſed to ſuch neceſſities, that they muſt have periſhed, if Colonel Aſh had not procured them the income of ſmall tenements, which the Doctor had purchaſed at Chedzoy. After this Dr. Ralegh was ſent priſoner to Ilcheſter, the County-Goal; thence to Banwell-Houſe, and thence to the Houſe belonging to the Deanery in Wells.

(1) *Attempt towards recovering an Account of the Numbers and Sufferings of the Clergy of the Church of England, &c.* part. 2. p. 71.

[*B*] *Stabbed by his Keeper, and died of the wounds.*] Dr. Simon Patrick gives the following account of the affair (2). The Committee of the county coming to ſit at Wells, the Doctor deſiring to be permitted to ſpeak with them, hoping to gain ſo much liberty as to go to Chedzoy to his wife and children, in order to ſettle ſome affairs, which nearly concerned them. In which reaſonable requeſt meeting with a denial,

(2) *Brief Account of Dr. W. Ralegh*, prefixed to *Reliquiæ Raleighanæ*.

" of a very ſtrong reaſon; which won him the familiarity and friendſhip of thoſe great " men, who were the envy of the laſt age, and the wonder of this, the Lord Falkland, " Dr. Hammond, and Mr. Chillingworth; the laſt of which was wont to ſay (and no " man was a better judge of it than himſelf) that Dr. Ralegh was the beſt Diſputant " that ever he met withal: and indeed there is a very great acuteneſs eaſily to be obſerved " in his writings, which would have appeared more, if he had not been led, by the " common vice of thoſe times, to imitate too far a very eminent man (*k*), rather than " follow his own excellent genius." *He was a maſter-workman even in his youth, when ſeveral of theſe pieces, it is evident, were compoſed; and had been a greater, if he had not fallen into a way wherein his wit was ſo much confined, that at laſt it broke out of it, as appears by his diſcourſe of* Oaths, *which is ſtrong and nervous, clear and judicious, as well as full of ſpirit and life, and may be ſufficient to ſhew what he could have done, if he had ſet himſelf to it, in other arguments, and handled them in the ſame manner, that the reſt of his friends before-named did thoſe, wherein they were engaged.* He is ſaid to have written a tract of *Millennianiſm*, to which notion he was inclined; but this piece has been long ſince loſt (*l*). In 1719, there was publiſhed at London in 8vo, by Laurence Howel, M. A. *Certain Queries propoſed by Roman Catholicks, and anſwered by Dr.* Walter Ralegh, *Dean of Wells, &c.* The Editor obſerves in his Preface (*m*), that he had this piece from a Gentleman, who received it from a Gentlewoman on her death-bed, whoſe name by her marriage was *Farthing*, her huſband being grandſon to Dr. Walter Ralegh; and that there were nineteen ſermons of the Doctor's in manuſcript, in the hands of the Gentleman who communicated the tract abovementioned.

(*k*) Dr. Patrick ſeems to mean Biſhop Andrews.

(*l*) Wood, col. 96, 97.

(*m*) p. 14.

a denial, though a Gentleman of a thouſand pound a year offered to be bound for his return at the time they ſhould appoint him, he could not but expoſtulate the matter with them, and happened to ſay, among other things, that it was very hard, that he ſhould be refuſed a courteſy from them, which ſeveral other perſons obtained without them, who had liberty to go home, ſome for a week, ſome for a month, when they pleaſed. This inſtead of mollifying the Committee towards him, only ſharpened their anger towards the Goaler, whom they reprimanded for his remiſſneſs, and threatned to turn him out of his place, if he took upon him any more to grant this licenſe to any priſoner. This rebuke ſtuck in the Goaler's mind, and the next morning entering into the Doctor's chamber, when he was writing to his wife to let her underſtand, that he could not procure leave to come and ſee her, he clapt his hand upon the paper, and demanded a ſight of it. To which the Doctor replied, that he ſhould with all his heart, if he had any authority from the Committee to require it; otherwiſe he might be ſatisfied with this proteſtation, that it was nothing elſe but a letter to his wife, to acquaint her with the denial the Committee had given him, as he knew well enough. Whereupon the Keeper began to endeavour to take it from him by force; but the Doctor being too ſtrong for him, wreſted it out of his hands; which being done, the Keeper ſtept back, drew his ſword, ran it immediately into the Doctor's belly, and gave him an incurable wound, *of which*, ſays Dr. Patrick, *after a few days he died.* But Dr. Walker tells us (3), that the Keeper *ran the ſword into Dr. Ralegh's belly home to the back bone, and gave him ſuch an incurable wound, that he tumbled out of his chair dead, but being brought to life again by ſome help and aſſiſtance, he lingered on about ſix weeks, and then died of his wound.* The author of *Mercurius Ruſticus* for the year 1647 informs us, that the Committee were ſo little affected with the affair, that afterwards they " turned the Doctor's wife and chil- " dren out of doors, and forced his ſon to fly the " country, for that he would have proſecuted the law " againſt his father's murderer." *Whether that be exactly true or no,* ſays Dr. Patrick, *I am not able to ſay; but this may be relied on (coming from an undoubted hand) that though his wife proſecuted him two aſſizes together, ſhe could not get him brought to a trial. But ſhe falling ſick before the third came, and not able to attend it, then the fellow appeared and was acquitted, there being no body ready to make good the charge againſt him.* Dr. Walker likewiſe obſerves (4), that " the Committee ſo much favoured the execrable " murderer, that they ſent out their Warrants to " apprehend the Doctor's eldeſt ſon, Mr. George " Ralegh, becauſe he carried on the proſecutions " againſt Barrett [the Keeper]; inſomuch that Mr. " Ralegh was forced to fly for his ſecurity, and then " Barrett was releaſed, and reſtored again by the " Committee to his place . . . The Committee like- " wiſe apprehended, impriſoned, and kept in cuſto- " dy (till the very hour of his death) one Mr. Stan- " diſh, a Clergy-vicar of the Church of Wells, be- " cauſe he had buried the Doctor by the Common- " Prayer."

(3) *Ubi ſupra.*

(4) *Ubi ſupra.* p. 71.

T.

☞ RAY [*A*] (JOHN) (*a*), ſon of Mr. Roger Ray, a Blackſmith, by Elizabeth his wife, was born at Black Notley in Eſſex, November the 29th, 1628. He received the firſt rudiments of learning at the Grammar-ſchool at Braintree, in the ſaid county, under Mr. Love; and on the 28th of June 1644, was admitted into Catharine-Hall in Cambridge, where he continued about a year and three quarters, and then removed to Trinity-College in the ſame Univerſity. In 1648, he took the degree of Bachelor of Arts, and on the 8th of September, 1649, was elected one of the Minor-Fellows of the college, and about ſix months after one of the Major-Fellows. He was afterwards one of the Senior-Fellows of that college. In 1651, he took the degree of Maſter of Arts. His intenſe application to his ſtudies having injured his health, he was obliged, at his leiſure hours, to exerciſe himſelf by riding or walking in the fields, which led him to the ſtudy of Plants. There is yet extant, a manuſcript of his, entitled, *Catalogus Plantarum non domeſticarum, quæ aluntur Cantabrigiæ, in hortis Academicorum & Oppidanorum*; in the drawing of which catalogue, he chiefly makes uſe of *Synonyma* of the two *Bauhines*, *Gerard*, and *Parkinſon*. He noted likewiſe from Johnſon, Parkinſon, and the *Phytologia Britannica*, the places where curious plants grew, digeſting them into counties

(*a*) For moſt of the particulars of this article, we are obliged to our Author's ingenious friend, Mr. Samuel Dale, Author of *Pharmacologia, ſeu Manuductio ad Materiam Medicam*, the third edition of which was printed at London 1737, in 4to. Since the writing Mr. Dale died at Braintree in Eſſex about March 1739.

[*A*] *Ray.*] In the former part of his life he wrote his name *Wray*; but he afterwards returned to the old way of ſpelling it always uſed by thoſe of his family. See his letter to Dr. Martin Liſter, dated Auguſt

counties in alphabetical order; and in the ſummer months of the year 1658, rode from Cambridge to the city of Cheſter; from whence he went into North-Wales, viſiting many places, and among others, the famous Hill of Snowdon, returning by Shrewſbury and Glouceſter. In 1660, he publiſhed at Cambridge, in 8vo, his *Catalogus Plantarum circa Cantabrigiam naſcentium*. December the 23d, the ſame year, he was ordained Deacon and Prieſt, by Dr. Robert Sanderſon, Biſhop of Lincoln, at his chapel in Barbican, London. In 1661, he accompanied Francis Willoughby, Eſq; and others, in ſearch of Plants, and other natural curioſities, into the North of England, and thence into Scotland; and having viſited Edenburg, Sterling, Glaſcow, and other places of that Kingdom, they returned to England by Carliſle, and arrived at Cambridge September the 7th. In 1662, they made a Weſtern tour from Cambridge to Cheſter, and through Wales to Cornwall, Devonſhire, Dorſetſhire, Hampſhire, Wiltſhire, and other counties, and returned to London by Windſor. This year, on the 24th of Auguſt, he quitted his Fellowſhip of Trinity college, which he had enjoyed near thirteen years; in which time he had been Burſar of the college, and Tutor to many of the Gentry and Clergy of England. The reaſon of his quitting his Fellowſhip was, that though he had never taken the *ſolemn League and Covenant*, believing it to be an unlawful oath, as he often declared, yet he could not in the oath of Abjuration ſwear, that he did not believe it to be binding upon others. In the year 1663, 1664, and 1665, he travelled with Mr. Willoughby abovementioned, Mr. Skippon, and Mr. Bacon, through Holland, Germany, Italy, France, &c. of which he afterwards publiſhed an account. In 1667, he and Mr. Willoughby made a ſecond tour into the Weſt of England; in which they viſited Worceſterſhire, and all the weſtern counties; and upon his return to London November the 7th, he was admitted Fellow of the Royal Society. In 1668, he viſited Kent alone, and afterwards made a ſecond tour into the North; but being ſeized with the Meaſles in Weſtmorland, he proceeded no farther, but went to the houſe of his friend Mr. Willoughby, at Middleton. In 1670, he publiſhed, in 8vo, his *Catalogus Plantarum Angliæ* (*b*), and in 1672, his *Dictionariolum trilingue ſecundum locos communes* (*c*), in 8vo. In June that year, Mr. Willoughby dying, appointed him one of his Executors and Guardians to his children, and left him an annuity of ſixty pound per annum for his life, which was duly paid him, without any deduction for taxes. In 1673, he publiſhed his *Catalogus Stirpium in exteris Regionibus obſervatarum*, and his *Obſervations topographical, moral and phyſiological, made in a journey through ſeveral parts of Europe*, in 8vo. In July the ſame year, he married Margaret, one of the daughters of John Oakley, of the Pariſh of Launton, in Oxfordſhire, Gent. a younger branch of the Shropſhire family; by whom he had only four daughters, three of whom ſurvived him. After his marriage, he continued in Warwickſhire till Michaelmas 1677, when he returned to Eſſex; and having lived about a year and three quarters at Faulkborn-hall, he removed to Black-Notley, to a houſe of his own building; where, to uſe his own words, *he intended (God willing) to ſettle for the ſhort pittance he had yet to live in this world; which accordingly happened.* He wrote ſeveral works beſides thoſe abovementioned [*B*].

(*b*) Reprinted in 1677.

(*c*) Reprinted in 1689 and 1696.

As to the caſualties of his life and his diſeaſes, there is nothing noted by him in his Diary, except the meaſles abovementioned, though he had the ſmall pox in his younger years. The latter part of his life was attended with much pain, occaſioned by certain ulcers in his legs, though it did not prevent him from proſecuting his ſtudies, till about three months before his death. As he was not born to any paternal eſtate, ſo he was not maſter of any conſiderable one, having often refuſed preferment; the legacy of Mr. Willoughby being much the greateſt part of what he enjoyed. In his converſation he was modeſt,

guſt the 22d 1670 (1); where he has the following words. *Videbis me in titulo Catalogi & Dedicatione Literam nominis mei initialem W. abjeciſſe, quod ne mireris, fateor tibi, me eam olim antiquâ & patriâ ſcriptione immutatâ citra idoneam rationem adſciviſſe.*

(1) *Philoſophical Letters between the late learned Mr. Ray, and ſeveral of his ingenious Correſpondents*, p. 72. edit. London 1718, in 8vo.

[*B*] *Several works beſides theſe above-mentioned.*] *Hiſtoria Plantarum, ſpecies hactenus editas, aliaſque inſuper multas noviter inventas & deſcriptas complectens. Tomi duo.* Fol. 1686. *Ejuſdem Tomus tertius, qui eſt ſupplementum duorum præcedentium; cum acceſſionibus Cavelli & Tournæfortii*, 1704, in fol. *Methodus plantarum nova cum Tabulis* 1682 in 8vo. *emendata & aucta*, 1703 in 8vo. *Faſciculus ſtirpium Britann. poſt editum Catologum Plantar. Angl.* 1688 in 8vo. *Synopſis methodica Stirp. Britann. in quâ tum Notæ Generales Characteriſticæ traduntur, tum ſpecies ſingulæ breviter deſcribuntur, &c.* 1690 in 8vo. *Eadem Synopſis multis ſtirpibus & obſerv. curioſis paſſim inſertis, cum Muſcorum Methodo & Hiſtoriâ pleniore, &c.* 1696 in 8vo. *Epiſtola ad D. Rivinum de Methodo plantarum, in quâ Elementa Botanica D. Tournefort tanguntur*, 1696 in 8vo. *Diſſertatio de variis Plantarum Methodis*, 1696 in 8vo. *Stirpium Europ. extra Britann. naſcentium Sylloge*, 1694 in 8vo. *Synopſis methodica Animalium, Quadrupedum, & ſerpentini generis*, 1693 in 8vo. *Franciſci Willughbeii Hiſtoria Piſcium cum Figur. recognivit, digeſſit, ſupplevit Jo. Raius.* Oxford 1686 in folio. *Ejuſdem Ornithologia cum Figur. edente eodem*, 1676 in folio. *The ſame much enlarged, in Engliſh* 1678 in folio. *Collection of unuſual or local Engliſh words*, 1674 and 1691 in 12mo. *Collection of Engliſh and other Proverbs.* Cambridge 1678. *Methodus Inſectorum*, 1705 in 8vo. *Hiſtoria Inſectarum, opus poſthumum.* London 1710 in 4to. *A Perſuaſion to a holy life*, 1700. *The Wiſdom of God manifeſted in the works of the Creation. In two parts. To which are added Anſwers to ſome Objections*, 8vo. the ſeventh edition 1717. *The Phiſico-Theological Diſcourſes*, &c. *With practical Inferences*, 1713, the 3d edition. *Synopſis Methodica Avium & Piſcium, opus poſthumum, quod vivus recenſuit & perfecit ipſe inſigniſſimus Author; in quo multas ſpecies in ipſius Ornithologiâ & Ichthyologiâ deſideratas adjecit, methodumque ſuam piſcium naturæ magis convenientem reddidit:* Cum Appendice & Iconibus. *Edente W. Derham*, 1713 in 8vo. *Philoſophical Letters between the late learned Mr. Ray, and ſeveral of his ingenious correſpondents,*

modeſt, affable, and communicative. He was a man of ſtrict probity, charitable, ſober, frugal, ſtudious and religious, allotting the greateſt part of his time to devotion and his ſtudies. He died January the 17th, 1705-6 [C], and as he never affected pomp in his life-time, ſo at his death he deſired to be privately buried, ordering his corps to be nailed up, that none might ſee it. And though the Rector of the pariſh offered him a place of interment in the chancel of the church, yet he modeſtly refuſed it, chooſing rather to be buried in the church-yard with his anceſtors, where a monument was erected to him [D]. He ſettled all his eſtate on his wife and daughters, except a ſmall legacy to the

ſpondents, natives, and foreigners. To which are added thoſe of Francis Willughby, *Eſq; The whole conſiſting of many curious diſcoveries and improvements in the hiſtory of quadrupeds, birds, fiſhes, inſects, plants, foſſils, fountains, &c. publiſhed by* W. Derham *Chaplain to his Royal Highneſs George Prince of Wales, and F. R. S.* London in 8vo.

[C] *He died January the 17th* 1705-6.] On the 7th of that month he wrote the following letter to Sir Hans Sloane, Bart. which was his laſt, and bears the marks of a dying hand.

" Dear Sir,

" The beſt of friends; theſe are to take a final " leave of you as to this world. I look upon myſelf " as a dying man. God requite your kindneſs ex- " preſſed any ways towards me an hundred fold: " bleſs you with a confluence of all good things in " this world, and eternal life and happineſs here- " after. Grant us an happy meeting in Heaven.

" I am, Sir,

" Black Notley,
" Jan. 1. 1704. " Eternally yours,

" *John Ray.*

" POSTSCRIPT.

" When you happen to write to my ſingular friend " Dr. Hotton, I pray tell him I received his moſt ob- " liging and affectionate letter, for which I return " thanks, and acquaint him, that I was not able " to anſwer it, or ——" His ſtrength failing, as may be perceived by his writing, which is ſcarce legible in this poſtſcript, he was forced to break off abruptly.

In the *Appendix* to our Author's *Philoſophical Letters* (2) is the following paper, entitled, *Mr.* Ray's *dying Words and Behaviour before the Reverend Mr.* Pyke, *Rector of Black Notley, and Prebendary of Norwich.* (2) p. 374, 375.

" I am a Prieſt of the Church of England, ordained " by Dr. Sanderſon, then Biſhop of Lincoln. That " I did not follow the peculiar duties of my function " more, is now the greateſt concern and trouble to " me. I do here profeſs, that as I have lived, ſo I " deſire, and by the grace of God reſolve to die in " the Communion of the Catholic Church of Chriſt, " and a true though unworthy ſon of the Church by " law eſtabliſhed in this Kingdom. I do think " from the bottom of my heart, that its doctrine is " pure, its worſhip decent and agreeable to the word " of God, and in the moſt material points of both " conformable to the faith and practice of the godly " Churches of Chriſt in the primitive and purer times. " I am not led to this perſuaſion ſo much from force " of cuſtom and education, as upon the clear evi- " dence of truth and reaſon. And after a ſerious " and impartial examination of the grounds thereof, " I am fully perſuaded, that the ſcruples men raiſe " againſt joining in Communion with it, are unrea- " ſonable and groundleſs; and that the ſeparation, " which is made, may very juſtly be charged upon " the Diſſenters themſelves, as the blame-worthy " Authors of it.

" He then deſired me to read to him the prayers " of the Church, which in the viſitation of the ſick " are appointed to be uſed by us; and the *Abſolution* " in particular he requeſted me to read; which I " having pronounced to ſuch a true, penitent, devout, " and humble ſoul, I could not but have theſe com- " fortable thoughts, that what was thus declared re- " mitted upon earth, would be remitted in Heaven " alſo. After this I gave him the Sacrament of the " Lord's Supper, which as it is men's duty often to " receive in the time of health, ſo at the hour of " death he ſaid it was a neceſſary *Viaticum* he thought " for the great journey he was now a going."

[D] *Where a monument was erected to him.* The inſcription upon it is as follows:

Eruditiſſimi viri JOANNIS RAII, *A. M.*
Quicquid mortale fuit
Hoc in anguſto Tumulo reconditum eſt,
At ſcripta
Non unica continet Regio:
Et Fama undiquaque celeberrima
Vetat mori.
Collegii SS. Trinitatis Cantab: fuit olim Socius
Necnon Societatis Regiæ apud Londinenſes Sodalis,
Egregium utriuſque Ornamentum.
In omni Scientiarum genere,
Tam divinarum quam humanarum,
Verſatiſſimus;
Et ſicut alter Solomon (cui forſan unico ſecundus)
A Cedro ad Hyſſopum,
Ab Animalium maximis ad minima uſque Inſecta
Exquiſitam nactus eſt Notitiam.
Nec de ſtantis ſolum quæ patet Terræ facie,
Accuratiſſimè diſſeruit;
Sed & intima ipſius viſcera ſagaciſſimè rimatus,
Quicquid notatu dignum in Univerſi Naturâ
Deſcripſit.
Apud exteras Gentes agens,
Quæ aliorum oculos fugerant, diligenter exploravit,
Multaque ſcitu digniſſima primus in lucem protulit.
Quod ſupereſt, eâ morum ſimplicitate præditus,
Ut fuerit abſque invidiâ doctus:
Sublimis ingenii,
Et (quod raro accidit) demiſſi ſimul Animi & modeſti.
Non ſanguine & genere inſignis,
Sed (quod majus)
Propriâ virtute illuſtris.
De opibus tituliſque obtinendis
Parum ſollicitus,
Hæc potius mereri voluit, quam adipiſci:
Dum ſub privato Lare ſuâ ſorte contentus,
Fortunâ lautiori dignus conſenuit.
In rebus aliis ſibi modum facilè impoſuit,
In ſtudiis nullum.
Quid plura?
Hiſce omnibus
Pietatem minimè fucatam adjunxit,
Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ
(Id quod ſupremo habitu confirmavit)
Totus & ex animo addictus.
Sic benè latuit, benè vixit vir beatus,
Quem præſens Ætas colit, Poſtera mirabitur.

This monument beginning to want repair by ſtanding expoſed in the Church-yard, was lately removed and ſet up in the Chancel of the Church; and to the Epitaph is added on the table of the Eaſt ſide what follows:

Hoc Cenotaphium
Olim in Cœmeterio ſub Dio poſitum,
Inclementis Cœli injuriis obliteratum,
Et tantum non collapſum,
Refecit & ſub tectum tranſpoſuit
J. Legge, *M. D.*
XVI Kal. Aprilis A. D. 1737.

On the table on the Weſt ſide are theſe words:

J. RAY { Nat. 29. Nov. 1628. / Ob. 17. Jan. 170½.

Our Author's Epitaph has been thus tranſlated into Engliſh:

" JOHN

the poor of his own pariſh, and five pounds to Trinity college in Cambridge, to purchaſe books for the library there. All his collections of natural curioſities, he beſtowed on his friend and neighbour, Mr. Samuel Dale, Author of the *Pharmacologia*, to whom he cauſed them to be delivered about a week before his death.

" John Ray, Maſter of Arts,
" Once Fellow of Trinity-College in Cambridge,
" Afterwards
" A Member of the Royal Society in London;
" And to both theſe learned bodies
" An illuſtrious Ornament.
" Hid in this narrow tomb, this marble ſpan,
" Lies all that death could ſnatch from this great
" man.
" His body moulders in its native clay;
" While o'er wide worlds his works their beams
" diſplay,
" As bright and everlaſting as the day.
" To thoſe juſt fame aſcribes immortal breath,
" And in his writings he out-lives his death.
" Of every ſcience every part he knew,
" Read in all arts divine and human too:
" Like Solomon (and Solomon alone
" We as a greater King of knowledge own)
" Our modern ſage dark nature's ſecrets read,
" From the tall cedar to the hyſſop's bed;
" From the unweildieſt beaſt of land or deep,
" To the leaſt inſect that has power to creep.
" Nor did his artful labours only ſhew
" Thoſe plants, which on the earth's wide ſurface
" grew,
" But piercing ev'n her darkeſt entrails through,
" All that was wiſe, all that was great he knew,
" And nature's inmoſt gloom made clear to com-
" mon view.
" From foreign ſtores his learning bright ſup-
" plies,
" Expoſing treaſures hid from others eyes,
" Loading his ſingle mind to make his country
" wiſe.
" But what's yet more, he was ſo meekly
" great,
" That envy unrepining ſaw his ſtate:
" For rare accompliſhment! his humble mind
" Poſſeſs'd a jewell, which it could not find,
" A great deſcent lent nothing to his fame;
" Virtue, not birth, diſtinguiſh'd his high name:
" Titles and wealth he never ſtrove to gain;
" Thoſe he would rather merit than obtain.
" His private life in humble ſhades he ſpent;
" Worthy a palace, with a cell content.
" Unwearied he would knowledge ſtill purſue;
" The only thing, in which no mean he knew.
" What more did add to theſe bright gifts, we
" find
" A pure, untainted piety of mind.
" England's bleſt Church engroſs'd his zealous
" care,
" A truth his dying accents did declare.
" Thus loſt he in retirement his great breath;
" Thus dy'd he living, who thus lives in death.
" Thus has Heav'n call'd his age's glory home,
" And the bright wonder of the age to come."

T.

RAYNAUD (THEOPHILUS), one of the moſt famous, as well as moſt learned Jeſuits of the 17th century, was born in Soſpello (*a*), in the Earldom of Nice; but having ſpent the greateſt part of his life in France, he has been conſidered as a Frenchman [*A*]. He enjoyed a very long life, which was traverſed with a great many misfortunes; nevertheleſs, he could never be prevailed upon to leave the ſociety [*B*], to enter into any other community, tho' very advantageous offers were made him on that condition. He was extremely laborious; and loſt but very little time, either at meals, or in converſing with female devotees [*C*]. His great delight was to write books, and to exerciſe himſelf in the duties of his character. He is Author of a prodigious number of books. Some of them were branded by the Inquiſition [*D*], a circumſtance that gave him the utmoſt pain. He diſcharged his wrath upon the Dominicans, in a work (*b*) wherein he collected a great number of particulars, extracted from their writings, which had never been cenſured, though they juſtly merited it. His conteſts with ſome Dominicans,

(*a*) Hence he is called *Ceſpitellenſis*, to denote the place of his birth.

(*b*) Entitled, *De immunitate Cyriacorum à Cenſuris.*

[*A*] *He has been conſidered as a Frenchman.*] Alegambe ſays expreſsly, that he was a frenchman, a native of Soſpello, *Natione Gallus, patria Ceſpitellenſis* (1). Theſe Latin words include what is called in ſchools *contradictionem in adjecto*; for *Ceſpitellum* or *Soſpitellum* is indiſputably in Italy. See Baudrand under theſe two words. Father Oldoini cenſured Alegambe for this error, and ranks our Theophilus among the writers born in Liguria. Soprani has alſo ranked him among them (2). They are more in the right than Sotuel, who expreſſes himſelf in doubtful terms, *Natione Gallus*, ſays he (3), *an potius Italus? patria Ceſpitellenſis in Comitatu Niceenſi.*

(1) Alegambe, *Bibl. Script. Societ. Jeſu*, p. 431.

(2) Oldoinus and Soprani publiſhed catalogues of that part of Italy.

(3) Natan. Sotuel, *Bibl. Script. Societ. Jeſu*, p. 757.

[*B*] *His life . . . was traverſed with a great many misfortunes; nevertheleſs, he could never be prevailed upon to leave the ſociety.*] Here follow Sotuel's words: *Vocationis ſuæ religioſæ tenaciſſimus, quamvis & utilia & honorifica extra ſocietatem ei promitterentur à Primoribus, ſi hanc inter aſpera quæ ſubinde patiebatur, deſerere vellet, nunquam eos auſcultare voluit* (4). i. e. " He adhered moſt ſtrictly to his religious voca-
" tion; though great advantages and honours were
" promiſed him, out of the ſociety, by perſons of
" high quality, if he would leave the ſociety of the
" Jeſuits, and the hardſhips he was from time to
" time obliged to undergo in it; but he would never
" liſten to any ſuch propoſals." See below (5) the paſſage of Monconys, and one from a Janſeniſt (6).

(4) Idem, ibid. p. 758.

(5) In the rem. [*L*].

(6) In the rem. [*K*].

[*C*] *He was extremely laborious; and loſt but very little time, either at meals, or in converſing with female devotees.*] He was a very ſober man, and uſed to ſit only a quarter of an hour at meals; and when he, by reaſon of his very advanced age, might have converſed with women without the leaſt danger or ſuſpicion, he yet never liſtened to them except in caſes of neceſſity, and told in few words what he had to ſay. I only tranſlate Sotuel's word's on this occaſion. *In victu valde abſtinens*, ſays he (7), *paucis & communibus ſemper uſus cibis, vix amplius uno quadrante dabat menſæ. Puritatis amator ſummus, mulierum colloquia cum erant neceſſaria, etiam ſenex, paucis verbis definiebat.* He would have been very glad that all the reſt of the Clergy had imitated him in this particular, as he himſelf declares in his book *de ſobria alterius ſexus frequentatione*. But, generally ſpeaking, this morality is not agreeable to thoſe who have the direction of other people's conſciences; they are not much tired with the company of their devotees, if we may judge of this from the length of their converſations, and the frequent repetition of them.

(7) Sotuel, *Bibl. Script. Societ. Jeſu*, p. 757.

[*D*] *Some of his books were branded by the Inquiſition.*] He took ſo much pains to have the cenſure taken off, that he at laſt obtained leave to reprint them, upon condition of his correcting them (8). Theſe treatiſes are *de Martyrio per peſtem, de Communione pro mortuis, & de Confixione Librorum* (9). As all men have different ideas of things; it is no wonder that our Jeſuit took ſuch a diſgrace to heart; though other writers ſtand ſo little in fear of it, that they are ſometimes very glad to have their works put into the

(8) *Poſtea ab auctore emendata, ab eadem ſacra congregatione anno* 1659 *recudi permiſſa ſunt & libere diſtrahi.* Idem, ibid. p. 759.

(9) Idem, ibid.

index

nicans, and a great many other people, gave riſe to many injurious and bitter writings; for it cannot be denied, but that he was of a very ſharp and ſarcaſtical turn of mind, which the Jeſuits themſelves confeſs in ſome meaſure [E]. He died of an apoplexy (c) at Lyons the laſt day of October 1663. The Bibliographers of the ſociety of Jeſus are not agreed with regard to his age [F]; and therefore I ſhall not venture to aſſert, that he lived to ſeventy-nine years of age, as Gallois aſſerts, in a work which will furniſh me with ſome good paſſages with regard to this Jeſuit's genius [G]. Patin had a great eſteem for him [H]; and it appears that he was a little too much applauded by him, and [L].

(c) *Ictus apoplexia migravit ad Dominum.* Sotuel. *Bibl. Script. Societ. Jeſu*, p. 758. This does not agree with the paſſage of Monconys, cited below, rem. [L].

index, or diſpleaſe the inquiſitors. This is frequently a proof of the goodneſs of a book. See what an ingenious man (10) has lately related with reſpect to the cenſure of the *Acta Sanctorum*.

(10) *L'Auteur des Lettres Hiſtoriq.* for March 1696. p. 245.

[E] *This the Jeſuits themſelves confeſs in ſome meaſure.*] They ſay that he was of an impatient impetuous temper; and that he did not ſpare father Bollandus, of the ſame ſociety with himſelf and his good friend, though he had done him very ſignal ſervices; and who had incurred his anger, only for differing in opinion from him with regard to a Biſhop of Lyons. Had not Raynaud's paſſionate expreſſions been ſuppreſſed, the publick would have ſeen, in the ſecond edition of the *Indiculus Sanctorum Lugdunenſium*, that Bollandus was very ill treated. Father Papebroch revealed this little piece of ſecret hiſtory. *Ita factus erat Theophilus*, ſays he (11), *ut neminem contradicentem ſibi patienter ferret, & niſi præſentes adfuiſſemus, cum prælo iterum pararetur Indiculus Sanctorum Lugdunenſium, noſque mature aliquis admonuiſſet, inveniretur ibi acriter perſtrictus P. Joannes Bollandus in S. Anemundo Lugdunenſi Epiſcopo, ſub regimine S. Bathildis occiſo, quia ad 26 Januarii eundem ſtatuerat cum S. Delfino contra Theophili ſententiam, cui alias Bollandus amiciſſimus erat, & in curanda operum ipſius impreſſione Antverpiæ meritus de illo optime.*

(11) *Papebroch. Elucidat. Hiſt. Actorum in Controv. Carmelit.* cap. 7. *in fine*, p. 110.

[F] *The Bibliographers of the ſociety of Jeſuits are not agreed with regard to his age.*] Alegambe (12) ſays, that father Theophilus, when ſixteen years of age, entred into their order in 1602; but, according to father Sotuel (13), he entred it in 1592, at ſixteen years old. Since therefore he died in 1663, he lived, according to father Alegambe, ſeventy ſeven years; and, according to father Sotuel, fourſcore and ſeven. Now, in caſe he had lived fourſcore and ſeven years, this expreſſion of father Sotuel would not be juſt, *Octogenario major . . . . migravit ad Dominum:* this is proper only for people who died at a little above fourſcore years old. Gallois ſeems to me more worthy of credit than theſe two bibliographers, when he ſays (14), that father Theophilus lived to ſeventy nine years of age. It is ſtrange that the Jeſuits themſelves, who are appointed to write the elogiums of their writers, cannot tell how many years one of their moſt famous writers lived.

(12) Alegambe, *Bibl. Script. Societ. Jeſu*, p. 431.

(13) Sotuel, *Bibl. Script. Societ. Jeſu*, p. 757.

(14) Gallois, *Journal des Savans*, for March 14, 1667. p. m. 127.

[G] *With regard to this Jeſuit's genius.*] It would be impoſſible to ſpeak more particularly of the edition of all this author's works, than Abbé Gallois has done, in his Journal dated the 14th of March 1667. This edition comprehends XIX volumes in folio, and was publiſhed at Lyons in 1665. This ſkilful Journaliſt, having given the contents of each volume in few words, gives us the following judgment. It appears by this author's works, that he was bold and peremptory, had a lively imagination, and a prodigious memory. "Theſe advantages. which nature "had indulged him, joined to the indefatigable "pains with which he had applied himſelf to "ſtudy from almoſt his infancy, till the age of "ſeventy nine at which time he died, had made him "one of the moſt learned men of his age. But he "was of too biting and ſatyrical a turn, which had "drawn upon him the enmity of a great many per"ſons. His ſtyle, though otherwiſe very clear, "ſeems obſcure, becauſe he affects to make uſe of "difficult terms, and words taken from the Greek; "he ſometimes alſo has ſome pretty extraordinary "thoughts, as, where treating of our Lord's good"neſs, in one of the chapters of the ſecond volume, "he entitles it, *Chriſtus bonus, bona, bonum.* As "the vaſt compaſs of his erudition furniſhed him "with a numberleſs multitude of particulars on "all ſorts of ſubjects, he frequently deviates from "the ſubject he had propoſed to write upon; as, in "the treatiſe *de roſa benedicta* (the holy roſe) a conſiderable part of which he employs, in examining "the manner in which Lent was obſerved in the "primitive Church. It alſo may be obſerved, that "he did not give ſcope enough to his own genius; "he contenting himſelf with mentioning what he had "read in ancient authors; and often employing "their words to expreſs what he perhaps would "have done better in his own. Notwithſtanding "all this his works deſerve eſteem, and are extreme"ly uſeful to ſuch perſons as apply themſelves to "divnity and preaching (15)." Here follows what he ſays in particular with regard to the XV and XVI volumes, entitled *Heteroclita ſpiritualia.* "This author "treats therein of ſeveral doubtful cuſtoms, which, "either an exceſs of zeal, or remiſſneſs have intro"duced into the worſhip of God and the Saints, into "the good works that are performed to give eaſe "to ſouls in purgatory, into the uſe of the Sacra"ment, and into all other ſpiritual exerciſes. He "examines all thoſe doubtful acts of devotions with "great ſeverity: he condemns ſome, defends others, "and enforces his judgment with a greater number "of learned remarks, extracted from Church hiſtory "and the fathers. It was in treating ſuch matters "as theſe that he ſhone moſt conſpicuouſly; for "being of a ſatyrical, biting caſt of mind, he never "wrote to more advantage than when he was to "criticize and reprove (16)." Here follows what the Abbot ſays, with reſpect to ſuch pieces as were not inſerted in the nineteen volumes. *They were not inſerted in this body or collection for a particular reaſon. The editors did not inſert in them the apologies againſt Hurtado, entitled* Depilationes, *becauſe this Frier is of an order called in Italy* Peloſi. *This collection does not contain the book, in which he treats whether a man may confeſs his ſins by way of letter; nor that entitled* Hipparchus, *in which he examines whether it is lawful for a Monk to concern himſelf with traffic. There alſo is omited in it the treatiſe* De Immunitate Cyriacorum à cenſuris, *a work levelled againſt the Dominicans; nor that entitled* Religio Beſtiarum, *wherein the predeſtination of the Thomiſts is refuted, nor another againſt father Combefis. Some other treatiſes of this author are wanting in the collection in queſtion, and theſe are eaſily diſtinguiſhed by the catalogue of his works which he printed ſeveral times. He deſigned to print all theſe pieces in one volume, and entitled* Apopompæus, *the name the Jews uſed to give to the Victim which they loaded with curſes, and abandoned in the deſert; but he was prevented from his deſigns by death* (17). I muſt obſerve that father Sotuel takes notice, that the 20th volume, entitled *Apopompæus*, was actually printed after the author's death (18).

(15) Gallois, ib.

(16) Gallois, ib. p. m. 122, 123.

(17) Gallois, *Journal des Savans*, for March 14, 1667. p. 124, 125.

(18) *Tomum 20, quem* Apopompæum *vocant, ediderunt alii poſt obitum Theophili, ſine approbatione ſuperiorum Societatis, unde hæc illum tanquam partum legitimum non agnoſcit.* Sotuel, *Bibl. Script. Soc. Jeſu*, p. 759. I have a copy of that *Apopompæus*, the title of which runs thus: *Tomus vigeſimus & poſthumus per Anonimum digeſtus, nunc primum in lucem prodiit Cracoviæ ſumptibus Annibalis Sangeyski bibliopolæ* 1669.

Here follows a word or two more from Abbe Gallois (19). *The moſt remarkable particular in the* VIIth volume, entitled Marialia (20), *is, the ſecond treatiſe written in defenſe of the devotion of the Scapulary; and the fifth, which, ſufficiently ſhews the great learning of this author, and the fruitfulneſs of his wit and genius. For being to preach on the ſeven ſolemn anthems which the Church ſings before Chriſtmas, and which begin by an O, he made this letter only the ſubject of his ſermons; and tho' ſo very barren a one, he yet ſtruck out a numberleſs multitude of beautiful particulars which form this treatiſe.*

(19) Gallois, *Journal des Savans*, for March 14, 1667. p. 118, 119.

[H] *Patin had a great eſteem for him.*] "Martin "Schoockius, who alſo wrote a great number of "books . . . is as learned as the ancient Sophiſts "who diſputed and wrote on all things that can be "known. He, and *Conringius*, in Germany, are, "in this ſort of knowledge and compoſition, the "moſt learned men in Europe. But father Theo"philus Raynaud ſurpaſſed them both. He was a "Jeſuit, and was perfectly well acquainted with the "Romiſh and Jeſuitical Divinity; but had it not "been for this, and the reſpect he paid his ſupe-

(20) Becauſe all the treatiſes included in it, relate to the perſecutions or worſhip of the Virgin. ibid. p. 118.

and has not been juſtly cenſured with reſpect to his ſtyle [*I*], he not imitating Juſtus Lipſius, not hunting after old words, nor taking a pleaſure in reviving certain obſolete, worn-

" riors, he might have given a looſe, and then he " might have done more than three others, in all " kinds of literature ; for, abſtracted from his learn- " ing, and his wonderful memory, he gave ſuch a " perfection to all his works, as none but a great " maſter could bring them to (21)." Here follows another paſſage. *If ever you ſee father Theophile, be ſo good as to preſent my ſervice to him ; and aſk him when we are to ſee his anſwer to a book printed againſt him in Amſterdam,* in 8vo, *and entitled,* Antidotus duplex contra duplex venenum, &c. 8. Hiſpali, 1657. *The printer has concealed, or diſguiſed the name of the town, it being printed in Holland, and not at Seville. I ſent him a copy of it, for which he returned me thanks, and told me that he would ſoon anſwer it. I have ſeveral letters of that worthy father ; and one of his friends, which I am not a little proud of, he being a very learned man* in genere multiplici. *I wiſh he would print a great number of MSS, he has by him. There is a great deal of learning in all his books* (22). Theſe applauſes are the more conſiderable, as they are beſtowed by a man who was more apt to cenſure than praiſe ; and did not ſcruple to take notice of the defects, which he ſuppoſed he found in the works of that Jeſuit. Here follows another paſſage from him. *The author of* Sanctus Georgius Cappadox *is an extraordinary, ſingular, and very learned man, except that he makes himſelf a Fiſhmonger on Eaſter-eve, and affects to write in ſuch a manner as is grown out of uſe, and nevertheleſs all his books are valuable,* eſt enim vir multi-jugæ eruditionis ac infinitæ lectionis, (he is a man of prodigious erudition and endleſs reading) *as Grotius uſed to ſay of the late* Salmaſius. *Father Theophilus Raynaud's ſtyle,* redolet Lipſianum, quo tamen eſt multò deterior ; (his ſtyle is very much like that of Lipſius, but much worſe) ; *there is not one author now who writes after this manner, if we except Mr. Blondel the Dean of our faculty, who, though one of the moſt learned men in the world, affects that kind of barbariſm,* & eadem ſcabie laborat cum Tertulliano, Lipſianus ſeu Lipſiomimus vel Lipſio minus, qualis aliquando fuit Erycius Puteanus, Petrus Gruterus, Theophylus Raynaudus, & pauci alii quos fama obſcura recondit (23). i. e. " and has the ſame defect with " Tertullian. He is Lipſius's ape, as formerly was " Erycius Puteanus, Peter Gruterus, Theophylus Ray- " naud, and ſome few others, who now are no more " talked of." I will confeſs that I know not on what foundation this Jeſuit is charged by Patin with affecting an obſcure, broken and abrupt ſtyle, filled with what is called Archaiſms, or an obſolete diction. I have read ſeveral of his books, and find a different ſtyle that takes its ſcope, and is not laid under any conſtraint by interruptions or ſuſpenſions, and ſuch like faults of Lipſius's imitators. Farther Raynaud's ſtyle, indeed, is not polite ; but if it be rude and barbarous, it is not from an affectation of antiquated Latin phraſes, of the Latin which abounds with phraſes of Plautus, or Greciſms (24), which ſome literati are ſo fond of ; it is rather by his interweaving a great number of terms borrowed from the ſchoolmen. I even obſerve that he cenſured one of his adverſaries for employing ſome Greek words ; upon which Raynaud was anſwered, that it did not become him to ſpeak about Greek, ſince he was ignorant of that tongue. *Mira hominis Buccafœtidi audacia, cæcus cum ſit, vult de coloribus judicare, & cum prorſus idiota ſit Græci idiomatis, judicare de vocibus Græcis . . . . quid vis apparere* ſerularius Mag. *in utraque lingua ? etſi enim* Latinam *bene calleas, at* Græcam *prorſus ignoras* (25). i. e. " This man's au- " dacioufneſs is ſurprizing, who, though he be blind, " does yet pretend to judge of colours ; and, at the " ſame time that he is quite unſkilled in the Greek " tongue, yet pretends to criticize Greek words . . . " Why ſhould you offer to paſs for a maſter of both " languages ? for though you are a very good La- " tiniſt, you are totally ignorant of the Greek." His opponent acknowledges that he underſtands Latin very well ; but this circumſtance is of no great weight (26), as this teſtimony is given by a perſon who himſelf uſed to make ſoleciſms in every page (27) ; who can hardly write three lines but he makes the moſt abominable barbariſms, and is ever claſhing with the laws of Grammar. *Barbararum lexeon, & ſolœciſmorum tanta ubertas eſt in Hurtadi opere, ut ſi tenui diligentia adhibita, notare Grammaticas ejus ſtribiligines liberet, totum pene ejus volumen eſſet exſcribendum. Vix tres lineas exarat, quin ſolœciſmis adeo pinguibus contaminet, ut miſerationem moveat* (28). *Thomas Hurtado . . . vix unquam emiſit periodum, qui non ſordeat ſtribiligine aliqua grammatica, & indigna colaphizatione Priſciani.* Four examples of this are quoted in the ſame page : *Deus expaveſcit nos* (29) *: opus bene executum : agendum eſſe de tactis* (30). At the end of the book (31) was a particular liſt of the boxes of the ear he had given to Priſcian, if I may be allowed to employ this Jeſuit's figure. Raynaud's antagoniſt endeavours to apologize for himſelf in manner following, I only imitate the fathers (32) in that particular, many of whoſe phraſes are not juſt : *Nonne in multis patribus inveniuntur ſimiles non ita vigoroſæ in latinitate locutiones ?* And he ſays (33) that John Buſæus drew up a table of above 250 barbariſms of Petrus Bloſenſis.

[*I*] *It appears that he was a little too much applauded by Patin, and has not been juſtly cenſured with reſpect to his ſtyle.*] " Theophilus Raynaud gave all his " works ſuch a caſt of perfection, as none but a " great maſter could have done. This judgment, " which is of Guy Patin, is not exactly true. The " caſt of perfection, which great maſters only are " capable of giving, ſuch as Petavius and Father " Sirmond, was wanting in Theophilus Raynaud. " His plans were whimſical and odd, his erudition " without choice ; and his ſtyle, though good in " itſelf, vitiated in many places by childiſh affecta- " tions ; not to mention that the Author was unpo- " liſhed, and wholly void of urbanity (34)."

The reader has already ſeen (35) in what manner Patin's judgment with regard to this Author's ſtyle was refuted ; but I have ſomething to ſay on that ſubject. Theophilus Raynaud obſerves, that very few perſons have objected to his ſtyle, as rough. The only cenſor he mentions is one Camerarius * who cenſures him as writing in a rough, inflated ſtyle, interſperſed with barbarous terms ; and to have followed Petronius and Apuleius, rather than the Ciceronians. *Non defuit, qui mei ſtyli ſqualorem opponeret. Arguebat ſanè Gulielmus Camerarius præfatione ad ſuam (ut inſcripſit)* Antiquitatis de novitate victoriam, *quod ſtylus ſcriptionum mearum ſcaber eſſet ac tumens : quod voces paſſim barbaras, & à nitore & lenitate Tullij alienas adhiberem : Et quod Petronio potius ac Apulejo, tumidis & inflatis ſcriptoribus, quam probatæ Latinitatis, ſtylique puri ac nativi Magiſtris, inter ſcribendum inhæſerim* (36). I ſhall not copy what he relates in his own juſtification ; but will content myſelf with mentioning the work which he wrote in his own defence. *Diſſertatio hujus & aliarum Camerarij calumniarum depulſoria, edita eſt hoc titulo,* Non cauſa ut cauſa, ſubjuncta vera cauſa ; Elenchus ſophiſmatis Gulielmi Camerarij Scoti (37). *Ea lucubratione* à pag. 16. *quam ridicula ſit hæc criminatio, & quam abſurdum ſit voces è Nizolij Ciceroniana pinacotheca anxiè ſublegere, in Didacticis præſertim ſcriptionibus, (cujuſmodi ferè ſunt omnes noſtræ, eaque nominatim, adverſus quam Camerarij æſtus inferbuit) plenè & accuratè demonſtratur.* I add that, in the ſame place whence I have extracted this paſſage, he continues to refute this Critique. He defends himſelf chiefly from the citations of ſeveral Fathers of the Church, who were careleſs as to the beauty of their ſtyle. He ſays (38) that St. Auſtin was very negligent on that head ; and refers us to Bernard Vindicus's *Prolegomena ad Criticum Auguſtinianum caſtigatum,* in which is a chapter that treats of the barbariſms and ſoleciſms found in St. Auſtin's writings. After all, he does not own that Camerarius's criticiſms are juſtly grounded : he leaves the judgment of this to unprejudiced readers. *Videor vaniſſimam & ineptiſſimam criminationem obtriviſſe multo pluribus quam neceſſitas poſtulabat. An verò Stylus ſcriptionum mearum, adeò vel jaceat, vel horreat, quam ſibi fingit*

(21) Guy Patin, *Letter* 328. p. 663, Tom. 2.

(22) Ibid. *Letter* 209. p. 230, of the ſame volume. See alſo the 245th *Letter*, p. 372, of the ſame volume.

(23) Ibid. 173. p. 65 of the ſame volume.

(24) Gallois, citat. (15), charges him with affecting to employ words borrowed from the Greek.

(25) Thomas Hurtado, *in duplic Antidoto*, p. 453.

(26) See Hurtado, ibid. p. 10.

(27) Leodegar Quintinus, *apud* Hurtado, *Antid.* p. 437.

(28) Idem, *apud eumdem*, p. 10.

(29) Meaning, *makes us afraid.*

(30) Meaning, *of the touch.*

(31) See Hurtado, *in duplici Antidoto*, p. 437.

(32) Ibid. p. 439.

(33) Ibid.

(34) Vigneul Marville, *Melanges d'Hiſt.* Tom. 2. p. 303. Rotterdam edit. 1700.

(35) In the foregoing remark.

* This Camerarius was a Scotchman, and named William Camerarius, Prieſt of the Oratory in France.] From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 979. col. 1. *N. B.* There is an error in this note of the Paris edition of Bayle's Dict. it referring to the rem. [*I*], inſtead of the rem. [*H*], of the art. of RAYNAUD.] Rem. by the Tranſl.

(36) Theoph. Raynaud. *Syntagm. de Libris propriis*, p. 6. *Apopompæi*, col. 2.

(37) Idem, ibid.

(38) Idem, ibid. p. 8. col. 2.

worn-out phraſes; faults of certain Authors, for which they have been juſtly cenſured by

fingit Camerarius cujus fuit hæc criminatio, pronuncient alij, affectu quo ille ducebatur liberi (39). I make uſe of the ſame method to defend myſelf againſt thoſe who ſhould imagine that I cenſured Patin unjuſtly. I appeal to all ſuch of my readers as are duly qualified, and ſhall peruſe, without prejudice, the writings of the Jeſuit: let theſe dip into different parts of his works, and read ſome pages here and there, and then I am ſure they will not ſay he has imitated Lipſius; but own that he may be put in parallel with Peter Gruterus, and Erycius Puteanus, as Patin affirms. I am indeed perſuaded, that they will not look upon his ſtyle as pure, ſmooth, and agreeable; but then they will not ſay that it is conciſe, rugged, filled with dark ellipſes, and obſolete forms, or affected. Any reader well ſkilled in the art of criticiſm may perceive that the Author in queſtion wrote with great rapidity; that he concerned himſelf very little with reſpect to the beauty of diction; that he did not correct his compoſitions; and conſequently that his words and his printed phraſes may be conſidered as a faithful copy of his rough copy; and that the firſt ſtrokes or effuſion of his pen were the firſt effuſions of his genius; and therefore that the bad Latin we meet with in his works, whether it be too obſolete or too modern, ought to be conſidered, not as affectation or artifice, but the native product of his genius. He was poſſeſſed of a vaſt memory; had read the claſſics in his youth; afterwards applied himſelf more aſſiduouſly to the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, the Philoſophers, and modern Divines. His memory which, as I ſaid, was vaſtly happy, was filled with phraſes of all that ſort of Authors, and readily ſuggeſted themſelves whenever he took up the pen; by which means he was able, without having recourſe to meditation, to call up at one time an expreſſion of Plautus, Lucretius, Petronius, Aulus Gellius, Apuleius or Macrobius; at another time an expreſſion from Tertullian, Arnobius, St. Hilary, or Sidonius Apollinaris; or laſtly, ſome phraſe of St. Bernard, the Commentators on Lombard, or of the angelical Doctor, &c. but the uſual and moſt common terms preſented themſelves oftenest, and he took that which firſt preſented itſelf; and conſequently his ſtyle is not affected; the mixture of old words and barbarous expreſſions introduced themſelves naturally in his writings, but did not take much place in them; and the Author did not take the pains to poliſh his ſtyle, nor make the leaſt corrections when we read his manuſcript over. In caſe I ſhould be miſtaken in this particular, ſtill the main part of my criticiſm would be indiſputable, in which Patin is concerned; no Authors having ever been more different, with regard to ſtyle, than Theophilus Raynaud and Juſtus Lipſius. The latter affected to end his periods at every line; and uſed to ſuppreſs ſeveral words, which obliged his readers to gueſs very often, and ſupply words. The Jeſuit is rather verboſe than laconic, and no ways obſcure for want of words, all his periods being long and full.

(39) Idem, ibid. p. 10. col. 1.

CENSURE of ſuch Writers as affect to employ obſolete words.

The compariſon between him and Gruterus is ſtill more unjuſt, for Gruter was not an Author, from whom obſolete words dropped now and then; he crowding them one upon another with a moſt ridiculous affectation; and took as much pains to get together this old rubbiſh, as Bembus and Manutius did to write politely. It is not eaſy to ſay, whether ſuch an affectation betrays more vanity or ill taſte; but it is certain that ſuch as affect this kind of ſtyle, are ſo ſilly as to imagine, that it will give their readers a high idea of their erudition; and the neceſſity they will be under of conſulting a dictionary perpetually, to ſearch for their meaning, will gain them admiration. This wrong turn of thinking has always been condemned by perſons of ſenſe. Favorinus ſneered in an admirable manner at a young man who was mighty found of obſolete words. If you do not care to be underſtood, ſays he, why do not you have recourſe to ſilence, which will be an infallible expedient? And if you are fond of antiquity, be contented with living as our anceſtors did, but I beſeech you to ſpeak as the moderns do at this time. *Favorinus philoſophus adoleſcenti veterum verborum cupidiſſimo, & pleraſque voces nimis priſcas & ignotiſſimas in quotidianis communibuſque ſermonibus expromenti, Curius, inquit, & Fabricius, & Coruncanius antiquiſſimi viri noſtri, & his antiquiores Horatii illi trigemini, planè ac dilucidè cum ſuis fabulati ſunt: neque Aurunconum, aut Sicanorum, aut Pelaſgorum, qui primi incoluiſſe Italiam dicuntur, ſed ætatis ſuæ verbis locuti ſunt: tu autem, proinde quaſi cum matre Evandri nunc loquare, ſermone abhinc multis annis jam deſito uteris, quod ſcire atque intelligere neminem vis, quæ dicas. Nonne, homo inepte, ut quod vis abunde conſequaris, taceres? ſed antiquitatem tibi placere ais, quòd honeſta & bona & ſobria & modeſta ſit: vive ergo moribus præteritis; loquere verbis præſentibus* (40). i. e. "The Philoſopher Favorinus perceiving a young "man to be extremely fond of employing, in com- "mon converſation, obſolete words, and ſuch as are "not known, ſpoke thus to him; Curius, ſays he, and "Fabricius, and Coruncanius, thoſe very ancient "Romans, and the three Horatii who were prior to "them, uſed to converſe with thoſe of the ſame age "with themſelves, in clear and plain language. "They did not employ the words uſed by the Au- "runci, the Sicani, or the Pelaſgi, who are related "to have been the firſt inhabitants of Italy, but "ſpoke the language of their contemporaries. But "you, as though you were converſing with the mo- "ther of Evander, ſpeak in a tongue that has been "diſuſed many years, becauſe you are not willing "that others ſhould underſtand you. Silly creature; "would it not be better for you to be ſilent, ſince "you will thereby gain your ends the ſooner? But "to this you ſay, that you are delighted with anti- "quity, becauſe the Ancients were honeſt, good, "ſober, and modeſt: live therefore after the manner "of the ancients, but ſpeak like your contemporaries." He concludes with referring him to a precept of Julius Cæſar, which was to ſhun old words as he would a rock (41). The Emperor Auguſtus was pretty nearly of the ſame opinion; he not pardoning Tiberius for affecting to uſe old words (42); and he called Mark Anthony a madman, for affecting alſo to be admired rather than underſtood (43). Aulus Gellius relates that a lawyer of his time uſed to be hiſſed, becauſe of his employing unintelligible words (44). There aroſe in the 16th century a certain faction of antiquaries with regard to grammar, who were ſtrongly oppoſed by the moſt ingenious and moſt learned men, to prevent its increaſing and corrupting the Latin tongue. Paſſerat made a ſpeech profeſſedly againſt this faction. *Exorti ſunt*, ſays he (45), *his annis viginti proximis, non diſſimili laborantes inſania, novi quidam Antonii, utinam minus multi, quorum cauſſa, ne quid diſſimilem, hanc præfatiunculam inſtitui. Si quidem me facturum operæ pretium putavi, ſi iſtum animi morbum vel arte aliqua perſanarem, quod in iis difficillimum eſt, qui ſic ægrotare malunt quàm valere, vel aliqua ex parte imminuerem: idque ſaltem aſſequerer ne hæc apud noſtros latius ſerpat contagio.* i. e. "There have "aroſe, within theſe twenty years, ſome new Anto- "nius's, who are fired with the like madneſs, (would "to God they had been fewer in number) for whoſe "ſake, to ſpeak the plain truth, I drew up this ſhort "Preface, to cure the diſtemper of the mind, which "it muſt be extremely difficult to do in perſons who "chooſe to be ſick rather than well; or I would "leſſen it in any manner; this I would do to pre- "vent that infection from ſpreading any farther a- "mong us." He ſays a little after, that the perſons he endeavoured to cure found nothing too antiquated for them; and ſought for words of a much older date than the verſes of the Salii. *Sordent nobis Tullius, Cæſar, Terentius: Valerii Antiatis, Cincii, Cælii, Piſonis, Fabii Pictoris, Quadrigarii, Siſennæ annales requirimus. Unde tam delicatum faſtidium. Cato, & Varro, vix ad ſtomachum faciunt: vix aviditatem noſtram explent primi Conſulum faſces, & faſtorum incunabula: Decemvirales tabulas, leges regias, Saliare carmen, icta cum Sabinis fœdera, Fecialium jura formulaſque tranſcendimus, ut penetremus in ſermonem Aboriginum, tanquam ſimus cum Egeria Numæ, aut cum Evandri Carmenta loquuturi* (46). i. e. "Tully, Cæſar, "Terence, are contemned by us; and we aſk for "the annals of Valerius Antius, Cincius, Cælius, "Piſo, Fabius Pictor, Quadrigarius, and Siſenna. "Whence

(40) Aul. Gellius, lib. 1. cap. 10.

(41) *Id quod à C. Cæſare excellentis ingenii ac prudentiæ viro, in primo de Analogia libro, ſcriptum eſt, habe ſemper in memoria atque in pectore, ut tanquam ſcopulum, ſic fugias inſolens verbum.* Idem, ibid.

(42) Sueton, *in* Auguſto, cap. 86.

(43) *Et quidem Antonium ut inſanum increpat; quaſi ea ſcribentem quæ imitentur potius homines quam intelligant.* Idem, ibid.

(44) Aul. Gell. lib. 11. cap. 7.

(45) Paſſerat. *Præf. in Ciceron. Epiſt. ad Hirtium & Cæſarem*, p. m. 171.

(46) Idem, ibid. p. 175.

(d) In the rem. [I].

by persons of taste. I give proofs of this (*d*). He wrote with great severity against the Jansenists, by whom he also was not spared [K]. His enemies spread strange reports concerning

" Whence this squeamishness? Cato and Varro are " scarce palatable to us; the ages of the first Con- " suls, and the infancy of the Roman Calendar, " scarce satisfy our cravings. We go more backward " than the tables of the Decemviri, the laws of the " Romish Kings, the verses of the Salii, the leagues " concluded with the Sabines, and the laws and for- " mularies of the Heralds; that we may penetrate as " far as the language of the Aborigines, as though " we were to converse with Numa's Egeria, or Evan- " der's Carmenta." Persons of this turn would willingly, in correcting their compositions, have blotted out a Ciceronian phrase, could they have substituted a phrase of Pacavius, or found *in*

Versibu' quos olim Faunus vatesque canebant,
Cum neque Musarum scopulos quisquam superarat,
Nec dicti studiosus erat (47).

(47) Ennius, *apud Ciceronem de Oratore*, folio 125, *D*; and in *Bruto*, folio 103, *C*.

" Such verses as old Bards and Faunus sung,
" When yet the muses heights were unexplored,
" And words not sought for to adorn the verse."

They desired to be called *mortuaria glossaria* (48). Horace had complained before of the like disease.

(48) *Mera estis, ut M. Cato ait, mortuaria glossaria. Nam qui colligitis lenidia, res tætras & inanes & frivolas, tanquam mulierum voces præficarum.* Aulus Gell. lib. 18. cap. 7.

Sic fautor veterum, ut tabulas peccare vetantes,
Quas bis quinque viri sanxerunt: fœdera regum
Vel Gabiis, vel cum rigidis æquata Sabinis:
Pontificum libros: annosa volumina vatum,
Dictitet Albano Musas in monte locutas (49).

(49) Horat. *Ep.* 1. lib. 2.

" Thus old-loves do admire the ancient laws,
" The Sabines leagues have their deserv'd applause;
" On musty leagues at awful distance look,
" Age makes it reverend and exalts the book;
" Give him the Bards old songs, oh rare! divine!
" I swear 'tis good, a muse sung ev'ry line.
CREECH.

I observe this to shew, that the same depraved taste arises from time to time. Passerat was not the only Author who exclaimed against these false antiquaries: we took notice above (50), of a satyrical piece in which they were ridiculed; and they are condemned in the due form in Father Caussin's rhetoric (51). I could name several more of the Literati (52), who could not bear the wild passion for old words, and who revived the complaints made against Sallust. If they did spare that ancient Historian, how angry must they be with the moderns? *Quid, quod è quibusdam Sallustianis verbis tanta solicitudine inter prisci sermonis maceriem & ruinas conquisitis, & in illa ipsa tam laudata compositione nonnulla prolatu & intellectu sunt nova, quædam putidiuscula & pumicata, quædam ita scrupea, ut in ea vox impingat se tanquam in saxeu fragmina vetustatis* (53). i. e. " What shall we say of " this, even that in the famous performance of Sal- " lust, amidst the words which were so industriously " sought for from among the rubbish of the old tongue; " some of these are new with regard to their pro- " nunciation and sense; some too affected and " smooth; and some so harsh and rugged, that the " voice strikes against them, as though they were so " many rocky fragments of antiquity." These are the words of every polite Writer. He had before observed, that a Writer ought not to introduce obsolete words into his compositions (54): *Pertimescunt* (verba humilis dicendi generis) *sociari verbis rubiginosis, spinosis, nimium reconditis & abstrusis, tum intermortuis & conclamatis:*

(50) Rem. [F] of the art. ACCURSIUS (Mari-Angelas).

(51) See *Caussinum de Eloquentia sacra & humana*, lib. 2. cap. 10 and 22. p. m. 95, 121.

(52) See Philip Pareus, *in Vita Davidis Parei*, p. m. 18.

(53) Craolus Paschalius, *de optimogenere Elocutionis*, p. 153.

(54) Idem, ibid. p. 129.

Quæ priscis memorata Catonibus, atque Cethegis
Nunc situs informis premit, & deserta vetustas *.

* *Horat. lib. 2. epist. 2.*

" They do not care to join words of a low style " with musty, harsh sounding words, nor with such " as are too obsolete and abstruse, or weak and bu- " ried as it were.

" Us'd by the ancients, tho' consum'd by rage
" Of eating time, and grown deform'd with age.
CREECH.

But it is to be observed, that this very polite Writer is too severe in his censure of Sallust the Historian; and we ought to be guided rather by Passerat, who has perfectly well distinguished the great affectation of the moderns from the liberty which Sallust took (55). I know very well that Asinius Pollio was of opinion that Sallust employed too many antiquated words (56): but perhaps, instead of criticising him with so much severity, he ought rather to have been thanked for reviving certain words, and for preventing their being entirely lost. It were to be wished, that our great Writers would do the like good office with regard to several French words, which are suffered to perish. If these would condescend to employ them, they would put a stop to prescription; they would encourage young writers to make use of them, a circumstance that would preserve the copiousness of our language. Virgil did this, and Horace advises writers to act in this manner.

(55) Passerat. *Præf. in Catilinam Sallustii*, p. 181.

(56) *Asinius Pollio in libro quo Sallustii scripta reprehendit, ut nimis priscorum verborum affectatione oblita.* Suet. *de illustr. Gram.* cap. 10.

Obscurata diu populo bonus eruet atque
Proferet in lucem speciosa vocabula rerum,
Quæ priscis memorata Catonibus (57).

(57) Horat. *Ep.* 2. lib. 2. ver. 115. See the sequal, in citat. * above.

" Good words, now grown obscure, bring gently " forth,
" Relieve 'em from the dark, and shew their " worth,
" Us'd by the ancients." CREECH.

That is, according to Mr. Dacier's version: " He " will be so good as to revive words, that have been " long dead with regard to the people; and to re- " vive those proper and emphatical words that were " used in the time of Collegus and Cato, but which " are now buried under the rust of time, and the " ruins of antiquity." See the margin (58).

(58) *Propriis* (verbis) *dignitatem dat antiquitas, namque & sanctiorem & magis admirabilem faciunt orationem quibus non quilibet fuerat usurus: eoque ornamento acerrimi judicii P. Virgilius unice est usus . . . sed utendum modo nec ex ultimis tenebris repetenda.* Quint. lib. 8. cap. 3. p. m. 364, 365.

I believe that very few persons, at this time of day, in France, have the defect which Passerat attempted to cure. I nevertheless met with the following passage in a work printed in 1685. " There " is a set of literati, whom I should suspect, as those " who intervened in the petition of the late Mr. " Blondel; persons who spend their days, in search- " ing for Archaisms in Seneca and Plautus, in order " to compose some fine theses of a moral and unin- " telligible kind, and such as are not to be explained " by any vocabularies (59)." This Blondel is one of the authors, whom Patin put in parallel with Theophilus Raynaud; but this is an unjust parallel; for a reader may very well understand the writings of this Jesuit, without being obliged to look every moment into Nonius Marcellus, Laurenbergius's *Antiquaries*, or even Calepin. Nor did he use to intersperse his compositions with Greek words. This was the custom of the most learned Philologers, of whom Casaubon was one, as is manifest from his epistles. Balzac does not approve of that custom (60).

(59) *Factum pour Maistre Nicolas Postel, ou Dissert. sur les Peripneumonies*, p. 203. See *Nouv. de la Republ. des Lettres*, January 1680. p. 34.

[K] *He . . . . was not spared by the Jansenists.*] His eighteenth volume *consists of pieces written by him against father Gibieuf, Mr. Arnaud, Mr. de Launoi and some other authors. It cannot be denied but that he has frequently wrote in too severe terms. And indeed it is said that he was determined to suppress a great many things in his compositions, had he not been snatched away by death* (61). These last expressions of the Journalist are no more than an officious untruth; it being very probable, that the last edition of father Raynaud's works was agreeable in all respects to his intentions. Read over the following passage (wrote by a Jansenist) wherein it is observed that this Jesuit died without making the least amends to those whom he had abused. " Father Theophilus Raynaud was a " Savoyard (62), who entering among the Jesuits at " sixteen years of age, died, being upwards of four- " score, in the society, which he was going to quit " for the ill usage he had met with in it: *inter as- " pera quæ subinde patiebatur*, &c. as the Jesuits them- " selves say in the list of their authors. He might " naturally expect this, as he had wrote several books " against the disorders of the society, such as that " entitled *, *Theophili Eugenii Protocataslasis, seu prima " Societatis Jesu institutio restauranda*, in which he " gives

(60) See his Latin Epistles, p. 170 & *seq.*

(61) *Journal des Savans*, of March 14, 1667, p. 124.

(62) This is not accurately expressed; he was born a subject of the Duke of Savoy, but not in Savoy.

* The book entitled, *Protocastasis Societatis*, was not writ by Theophilus Raynaud.] From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 979. col. 1.

concerning the manner of his death; a circumſtance that is taken notice of, and refuted by Monconys [*L*]. I have a word or two to ſay againſt Moreri [*M*]. By the way, I muſt

" gives a ſketch of the reformation he wiſhed to ſee " in the ſociety, in order for the reſtoring it to its " firſt purity: and another entitled by him *Hippar-* " *chus*, of the religious Merchant, in oppoſition to " the traffic which was carrying on univerſally in the " ſociety. They likewiſe diſown a treatiſe concern- " ing the diſpenſation from vows (*De exſolutione à* " *votis*) which, according to them, was not approved " by their ſuperiors, and contains ſome particulars " with regard to St. Ignatius that are not conform- " able to truth; as alſo, what he writes, in his book " againſt the quondam Jeſuit Julius Clemens Scotus, " an Italian, viz. that the declarations on the con- " ſtitutions of the Jeſuits were not wrote by St. Ig- " natius, but by father Lainez, the ſecond General. " It was probable for one of the two firſt books " that he was thrown into priſon by the Jeſuits, " and was kept in it ſome time. He was free and " bold in his ſentiments, biting and ſatyrical in his " manner of writing, and not a little opinionated; " witneſs his words, where he mentions the ap- " plauſe which was beſtowed on him by a Heretic, " who, he ſaid, *had never ſpoke truth except on that* " *occaſion*. What he did, in the ſociety, the year of " his jubilee, is alſo ſingular enough. He ſolem- " nized a magnificent Maſs, when a Jeſuit, getting " up into the pulpit, ſpoke his panegyric before him. " This father had doubtleſs read a prodigious deal. " He wrote 20 volumes in folio, which are a proof " of the eaſe with which he wrote. It were to be " wiſhed that he had wrote with judgment, pru- " dence, modeſty, charity; and prompted by no " other motive than a love for truth. He then " would not have publiſhed ſo many books, filled " with invectives, and the moſt extravagant ſlan- " ders, againſt many particular perſons, ſuch as the " infamous libel entitled, *Arnaud de Breſſe reſuſcité* " *dans Arnauld de Paris* (Arnauld of Breſſe revived in " Arnauld of Paris;) nor that ſtuffed with rancour " and gall publiſhed by him againſt the whole or- " der of St. Dominic, and entitled, *De Immunitate* " *Autorum Cyriacorum à Cenſura: Diatribæ Petri à* " *Valle clauſa S. T. D.* This work was condemned " in Rome, with ſeveral others, as the following, " *De la Communion pour les morts. Du Martyre par* " *la peſte. De la Cenſure des bons & des mechans* " *Livres.* i. e. *Of the Communion for the dead. Of* " *Martyrdom by the plague. Of the cenſure of good and* " *bad books.* And the 20th volume which his friends " printed after his death. . . . This father died at " Lyons, he being ſeized with an apoplectic fit the " laſt of October 1663, without having made the " leaſt ſatisfaction for the ſlanders with which a great " number of his compoſitions abound (63)."

(63) *Addition à la 3 Lettre du Prince de Conti au Pere de Champs*, p. 69. edit. of Cologne 1689.

[*L*] *His enemies ſpread ſtrange reports concerning the manner of his death, a circumſtance that is . . . refuted by Monconys.*] The paſſage I am going to tranſcribe is of a conſiderable length; but no matter; there are ſome particulars in it which the relator himſelf perhaps did not believe. " As I told him " (64), that I was a native of Lyons, he inſtantly " inquired of me concerning the death of father " Theophilus Raynaud. I told him, that I was at " Lyons when he died; and that my brother, who " was come from Paris when he was cut for the " ſtone, had often diſcourſed with him. He then " drew forth a letter ſent from father Henſchenius, " whoſe library I had ſeen in Antwerp; wherein he " wrote word to him, that the Dominicans have " ſpread a report in Flanders and Rome, that father " Theophilus died diſtracted; that the Jeſuits had " deprived him of the Sacraments; that he ran up " and down their monaſtery in Lyons, crying like one " of the damned, *Philiſtini ſuper me*; (the Philiſtines " are upon me;) and that having been buried *ſepul-* " *tura Aſini*, (with the burial of an aſs;) he was dug " up the next day, and his body all over livid, occa- " ſioned by his being beat by devils during the " whole night. I told him that this was mere " calumny, and a ridiculous report; the good father " in queſtion not having been able to ſay Maſs " during a fortnight, and having received the Sacra- " ment every day. That he had made three general " confeſſions to father du Lieu, the week he died. " Even the morning of the day on which he died, " which happened the eve of All-Saints laſt year, " after having had viſible warnings of it, he thrice " bid farewel to the Frier who aſſiſted him in put- " ting on his clothes, aſſuring him that this would " be the laſt time he ſhould give him any trouble; " and that, returning from the Chapel, where he " had heard Maſs and received the Sacrament, he " ſaid to a Frier he met with, that he had beſought " God to let him ſpend the feaſt of All-Saints in " Heaven; and a moment after, about half an hour " after the Communion, he expired as he was going " into his chamber, he died in the arms of another " good brother; and in this manner was fulfilled " his prophecy, viz. that he would die in his caſſock, " and in his chamber, both which he loved ſo well, " that no perſecution could force him from the ſtate " of life he had embraced in his infancy; he hav- " ing never quitted, during threeſcore years, the ſo- " litude of his cell, except to perform acts of cha- " rity, ſuch as, to confeſs the meaneſt peaſant, at " what time ſoever he might addreſs him. I told " him that the Church of Lyons had performed a " ſolemn ſervice to his memory, in St. Juſtus's Chapel, " where a Council was held; that the like ſervice " had been ſolemnized by the Carmelites and Car- " thuſians, at Lyons, as had their whole order; and " that the congregations of the Gentlemen of Lyons " had ſaid the office in their Chapel; and attended, " in a body, at his funeral. I told him that my " brother, who did not give credit too highly to " ſecret revelations, had often told me, that when " father Theophilus was greatly grieved, in Avig- " non, on account of his book *de Negotiatore reli-* " *gioſo* (of the religious Merchant) a bare-footed Car- " melite recommending him to the prayers of a " Carmelite nun, who was looked upon as a holy wo- " man in Avignon, without telling her his name; " this man anſwered, that the man for whom he " deſired her prayers was one of the moſt learned " men in the Church, and very acceptable to God; " but that, to exerciſe his virtue and heighten his " merit, our Lord had thought proper to mortify " him in that thing which he was moſt paſſionately " fond of, that is, his compoſitions, the whole glory " and reward of which was reſerved to him till af- " ter his death, and that then all the provinces of " the world would eagerly ſeek for them. Obſerv- " ing that he liſtened to me with extreme pleaſure, " I added what the Prior Jugeact of Lyons had in- " formed me concerning the modeſty of father Theo- " philus, whom his adverſaries ought to imitate, viz. " his having refuſed the Biſhopric of Geneva, after " the death of the nephew of the bleſſed Francis " de Sales; that Don Felix of Savoy, and the whole " Senate of Chamberri, having obtained the con- " ſent of Duke Charles Emanuel, father Theophile " was the only perſon who oppoſed it, and was ſo " urgent in this, that they were forced to deſiſt, " which circumſtance the ſaid Prior aſſured me he " knew to be fact; but that he himſelf had been " witneſs to an act of the moſt heroic virtue, for " that having been ordered, by the late Archbiſhop " of Bourdeaux, and ſome other perſons, to preſent " father Theophilus, in his adverſity, to ſome bene- " fices, and two thouſand livres a year, with a city- " ſecurity in Lyons, upon condition that he would " write in favour of a certain doctrine; father Ray- " naud made the following noble anſwer to Mr. " Jugeact, (kiſſing at the ſame time his caſſock) that " he would die under perſecution in that habit, " rather than live at eaſe, and be wanting in fide- " lity to God to whom he had devoted it (65)." If Friers did not ſcruple to ſpread ſuch reports againſt a Jeſuit, are we to wonder that they publiſhed ſuch fictions concerning the death of Luther, Calvin &c?

(64) *i. e.* To a Jeſuit of Lanſberg, in Bavaria.

(65) Moncony's, *Voyages*, part. 2. p. 386 *& ſeq.* Lyons edit. 1665. ad ann. 1664.

[*M*] *I have a word or two to ſay againſt Moreri.*] I. As all the beſt part of what he ſays is found in the very ſame words in the *Journal des Savans* (66), he ought to have informed his readers of the book whence

(66) It is the Journal of March 14, 1667. cited by me above, rem. [*G*].

must obſerve, that Father Theophilus Raynaud frequently diſguiſed his name in the title of his works [*N*]. He is greatly applauded by the Carmelites; and they paid him funeral honours in all the monaſteries of their Order, anno 1663 (*e*). The honours thus paid him were on account of his book concerning the Scapulary, which one of that Order publiſhed, with many alterations [*O*]. The catalogue he himſelf publiſhed of his own

(*e*) Papebroch. *Reſponſ. ad Exhibit. Error.* p. 117.

whence he borrowed that Article. This is ſuch an omiſſion that he deſerves to be called a plagiary on that account, and to have the following words of Pliny applied to him: *Obnoxii profecto animi & infelicis ingenii eſt deprehendi in furto malle, quam mutuum reddere* (67). i. e. "It is the indication of a "depraved mind, and an unlucky genius, to chooſe "rather to be catched in a theft, than to repay what "one may have borrowed." II. Father Theophilus had not *made choice, for the title of the collection of his works, of the word* Apopompæus, *the name which the Jews uſed to give to the victim they loaded with curſes, and abandoned in the deſert; but it was not thought proper to imploy ſuch a title.* The title *Apopompæus* was deſigned only for the particular collection of ſome pieces, which the author did not inſert in his XIXth volume. The reader has ſeen above the words of Abbé Gallois, which are ſo very clear, that it is ſurprizing Moreri ſhould not underſtand them. Muſt not this Jeſuit have been out of his ſenſes, had he deſigned to give this title to all his works? He muſt neceſſarily have reſerved this title for ſome prohibited treatiſes; and his intention was complied with, according to father Sotuel, which ſhews that Moreri was guilty of another omiſſion. III. Raynaud's works were not printed in 1667, the edition being completed in 1665. The circumſtance which miſled Moreri is, his finding the 14th of March 1667 mentioned in the *Journal des Savans*. This ſhould prompt the Journaliſts to mention always the year in which a book was printed; which they did not uſe to do at firſt, and particularly when they were afraid, that the mentioning the date would ſhew that they were writing on a book which had loſt the graces of novelty. IV. This Jeſuit did not live in the XVIth century. This error is found only in the ſecond Dutch edition.

(67) Plin. *in Præf.*

(68) In the catalogue annexed by him, to his work entitled, *Auteurs deguiſez* (Diſguiſed Authors).

(69) See Sotuel, *Bibl. Script. Soc. Jeſu*, p. 758.

(70) Placcius, *de Anonymis*, num. 602. p. 130.

(71) I am to obſerve, that this means a native of Cemelia. This was an epiſcopal city that has been long ruined. The epiſcopal See was united to that of Nice. See Theophilus Raynaud, *de Libris propriis*, p. m. 29.

(72) He was a Spaniſh Monk, of the Order of the Ciſtercians. He publiſhed this chronicle of Flavius Dexter, with commentaries, at Lyons, in 1627.

(73) Placcius, *in Pſeudonymorum Catalogo*, num. 294. p. 185.

[*N*] *Raynaud frequently diſguiſed his name in the title of his works.*] Baillet will have employment enough, in the noble collection, on diſguiſed authors, which the publick expects from him. He is in doubt (68) whether this jeſuit aſſumed the name of Anſelm Solerius, in the book *de pileo, cæteriſque capitis tegminibus*; but ſince this book is in the XIIIth volume of this father's works (69), we may be aſſured that it was wrote by him. Placcius (70) is miſtaken in ſuppoſing, that it was publiſhed without a name, in the Lyons edition of 1655, 4to, dedicated *ad Petrum de Macerat*: but that, in the Amſterdam edition 1671, 12mo, it was printed with the name of *Anſelmus Solerius Cimmelienſis*. It is certain that the author, in the Lyons edition of 1665, called himſelf, *Anſelmus Solerius Cemelienſis*, dedicating his work *ad Patrum de Maridat*. I therefore may affirm that Placcius was ignorant of a great many particulars in this article. He did not know the names that were printed in the firſt edition. Macerat is a mere chimæra; Maridat is the true name of a Counſellor of the great Council; Anſelmus Solerius Cemelienſis (71) was a maſk with which our Theophilus concealed himſelf. Placcius reproaches him, without a cauſe, with being guilty of a kind of contradiction (I obſerve this by the by) with regard to Flavius Dexter's chronicle. *Illud* (Chronicon) *ab ipſo* BIVARIO (72), vel VIVARIO *confictum credidere* Gabriel Pennottus & Matthæus Raderus, *contra quos ipſe tamen Apologiis ſeſe binis defendit quas approbant* Carolus Viſch *Bibl. Ciſtercienſis p.* 114. & Th. Ranaud. *de mal. & bon. lib. pag.* 139. *ſibi fere contrarius pag.* 164 (73). Theſe are Placcius's words. He declares that our Jeſuit having approved (page 139) the apologies of the Spaniſh Monk, diſapproves them in page 164. But this is far from being the caſe. He deſpiſes them evidently enough in page 164, and ſtill more ſo in page 139. *Flavii Dextri Chronicon nuper vulgatum, ſuppoſitum fuiſſe Dextro, latè contendit Gabriel Pennotus* in Canonicorum Regularium hiſtoria. *Quamvis enim, ipſo S. Hieronymo teſte ratum ſit, Flavium Dextrum ſcripſiſſe Chronicon quod eidem D. Hieronymo inſcripſerit; tamen hoc Chronicum nuper vulgatum, illud ipſum eſſe genuinum, cujus S. Hieronymus meminit, multa ſunt quæ diſſuadent. Nec quæ adversùs libri illius ſuppoſitionem, proferunt Bivarius commentator ac defenſor & Melchior Incofer* lib. pro epiſtola Deiparæ ad Meſſanenſes à cap. 42. ad 46. *explent revera legentis animum* (74). i. e. "Gabriel "Pennotus, in his hiſtory of the Canons regular, "argues very warmly, to prove that the work en"titled Flavius Dexter's chronicle, lately publiſhed, "was not written by Dexter. For though it is cer"tain, by the teſtimony of St. Jerom himſelf, that "Flavius Dexter wrote a chronicle which he in"ſcribed to the ſaid St. Jerom; nevertheleſs many "arguments might be produced to ſhew that this "chronicle in queſtion was not the genuine one men"tioned by that Saint: nor do the reaſons alledged "in favour of the genuineſs of that work, by Biva"rius his commentator and defender, and Melchior "Incofer in his work concerning the Bleſſed Virgin, "fully ſatisfy the reader." Theſe are his words in page 139, and in page 164 he ſpeaks as follows: *Flavii Dextri Chronicon quod nuper prodiit, magna excitavit diſſidia. Aliquod Chronicon verè fuiſſe à Dextro conſcriptum, conſtat, cum S. Hieronymus ejus ſibi à Dextro inſcripti meminerit; ſed an id quod nuper prodiit, ſit verum illud Dextri Chronicon, controverſia eſt. Multi hoc Chronicon eſſe ſuppoſitum ab aliquo, cui honor gentis ſuæ cordi eſſet, contendunt, & acriter Pennotus* in Canonicorum Regularium Hiſtoria (75). i. e. "The lately "publiſhed chronicle of Flavius Dexter has occaſioned "many diſputes. It is certain that Dexter really wrote "ſome Chronicle, ſince St. Jerom takes notice of "ſuch a work dedicated to himſelf, written by Dex"ter; but it is ſtill diſputed whether that lately pub"liſhed is Dexter's true Chronicle. Several Authors, "(and among others Pennotus, in his Hiſtory of the "Canons regular, who wrote with great warmth on "this occaſion) affirm, that this Chronicle was forged "by ſome Writer, who was ſtrongly deſirous of ad"vancing the honour of his native country." Our Jeſuit aſſumed the name of *Stephanus Emonerius*, when he wrote againſt Barnes, in favour of equivocations (76); that of *J. Heribertus Cemelienſis* in his Latin treatiſe concerning Eunuchs (77); that of *Leodegarius Quintinus Hæduus*, in writing againſt Hurtado, *&c.* This Hurtado was a Spaniſh Monk, who printed in Amſterdam the book mentioned by Patin (78); where (79) he laughs at ſome of the titles which Theophilus Raynaud gave to ſome of his books. But, by his favour, the titles in queſtion were ſometimes ingenious. Who would not be deſirous of reading *Heteroclita ſpiritualia & Anomala pietatis*, which is the title of the 15th and 16th volumes of this Jeſuit's works? So, will ſome ſay, there are heteroclites in religion as well as in grammar, and anomalies therein as in the moon.

(74) Theoph. Raynaud. *de malis ac bonis Libris*, num. 220. p. m. 139.

(75) Idem, ibid. num. 296. p. 164.

(76) See the art. BARNES, rem. [*D*].

(77) Printed at Dijon in 4to, anno 1655.

(78) Citat. (22) above.

(79) See the Preface to *Duplex Antidotus*, art. 1.

Some imagine that the pretended *Amadæus Guimenius*, whoſe works, on account of the looſe morality inculcated in them, have made ſo much noiſe, was really Theophilus Raynaud's. Father Baron ſuppoſes this in the ſecond part of his *Manuductio ad Moralem Theologiam* (80): *but afterwards diſcovering that* Amadæus's *work, which he was refuting, was writ by a Spaniſh Author, he retracted it in his Preface:* and it is certain, adds Abbé Gallois, *that the ſtyle and manner in which Guimenius's book is writ, is no ways like that of Father Theophilus Raynaud.* I am to obſerve, it was by other methods that the work in queſtion was found to have been writ by Moya the Jeſuit, confeſſor to the Queen of Spain; notwithſtanding the diverſity of ſtyle, which is one way of leading into error, Raynaud was publickly charged with it, nor did it clear him.

(80) Gallois, *Journal des Savans*, April 12, 1666. p. m. 39.

[*O*] A Carmelite *publiſhed* one of his pieces *with many alterations.*] Ye poſthumous writings and manuſcripts

own works, has been very acceptable to the curious. It is a very good piece in its kind. It had been publiſhed ſeparately; but it afterwards was prefixed to the 20th volume of his works, and which is entitled, *Apopompæus*. In this catalogue is ſhewn the occaſion and ſubject of each of that Writer's books; and the conſequences with which they were attended, I mean, who the perſons were that attacked them; the anſwers that were made to them, and other particulars of the like nature, very pleaſing to ſuch as love to read the hiſtory of books and authors. One circumſtance (a pretty important one) is wanting in it; I mean, that the chronological order is very imperfectly obſerved in it. In this catalogue we find, that ſuch a work was the firſt our Author publiſhed; that ſuch a work is the ſecond, the third, and ſo on; but we do not there find either the date of the year, the place where printed, nor the number nor date of the editions which followed the firſt. Thoſe who imagined that the Bookſeller, who undertook an edition of the works of this Jeſuit in 20 volumes in folio, would be ruined by that means, were greatly miſtaken [*P*].

nuſcripts that come from far diſtant countries, how can we rely upon you? Who can aſſure us that nothing has been added to, nor taken from them, ſince a manuſcript of Father Raynaud was ſo much altered by a Carmelite, during the Author's life, and almoſt at his door? Our Jeſuit had diſplayed all his learning in defenſe of the Scapulary of Simon Stock; but the parties whom this performance chiefly concerned were not ſatisfied with it. Hence they wretchedly mangled his book in many places, and foiſted ſome things into it. Raynaud was greatly offended at this, and expreſſed his indignation in the following manner. *Hoc opuſculum* (Scapulare Stochianum illuſtratum & defenſum) *quale Pariſiis è meo M. S. prodiit anno* 1654 *apud Antonium Padelore, abjudico tamquam ſpurium & alienum. Irruit enim in illud Leo; à quo miſerè deformatum eſt, dicam diſcerptum & laceratum. Reciſa pleriſque locis, me inconſulto, multa; addita ex mente interpolatoris alia, quæ planè improbo. Titulus ipſe libri, (ut ab ipſo limine fieret perverſionis exordium) immutatus eſt; ita ut quod Hincmarus ſenior juniori exprobrabat, admiſſa in ipſo aditu ceſpitatione, non potuerit expectari progreſſio felicior. Hiat paſſim oratio, ob prætermiſſionem vel reciſionem unius aut alterius voculæ, menda ubique denſa. Sic rependitur gratia* (81)? i. e. "This work "(the Scapulary of Simon Stock illuſtrated and "defended) as publiſhed at Paris by Anthony "Padelore in 1654, from my manuſcript, I reject "as ſpurious and corrupt; for the lion ruſhing in "defaced and mangled it in a wretched man-"ner. Many paſſages, without my being once con-"ſulted, were ſuppreſſed; and others added merely "according to the interpolator's fancy, all which I "utterly diſapprove. The very title of the book "(that they might begin the devaſtation at the en-"trance) is changed; ſo that I may make him the "ſame reproach as Hincmarus the elder did to the "younger, *viz.* that ſince they ſtumbled at their "firſt ſetting out, it might naturally be expected that "their journey would be proportionably unſucceſsful. "The ſenſe is often rendered imperfect, by the "omiſſion or retrenching of one or more words; "and there are every where a great number of errors. "Muſt my kindneſs be thus rewarded?"

(81) Theoph. Raynaud. *in Syntagm. de Libris propriis*, num. 72. p. m. 70, 71.

[*P*] *Thoſe who imagined that the bookſeller who undertook it, would be ruined, were greatly miſtaken.*] This edition ſold very well; and when it is found complete, in the auctions (of books) in Holland and Germany, it generally goes at a very high price *. The printer therefore did not deſerve to be ranked in a certain catalogue, mentioned by Catherinot. I "was ending this article, ſays he (83), when the re-"verend Father de Fourcroy, a Jeſuit of Paris, but "an inhabitant of Bourges for upwards of fifty years, "during all which time he has taught or writ books, "hinted to me that one might make a book, of a "tolerable ſize, only of ſuch Authors whoſe works had "entirely ruined their bookſellers: but this ſhall ſerve "for another occaſion." This brings to my memory the following paſſage of Stephen Paſquier (83). "I "cannot forbear to ſpeak my mind on this occaſion, "and to complain aloud of the calamity of this age, "which has given birth to ſo great a number of pre-"tended or half-formed Authors. The moſt wretched "ſcribler wants to have the firſt ſtarts of his fancy "made public; fearing, if they ſhould be too long "ſhut up, they ſhould grow muſty (84). Good Lord! "methinks the ſix following verſes of Jodelle are "very happy:

"*Et tant ceux d'aujourd'huy me faſchent,*
"*Qui dés lors que leurs plumes laſchent*
"*Quelque trait ſoit mauvais ou bon,*
"*En lumiere le vont produire,*
"*Pour ſouvent avec leur renom,*
"*Les pauvres Imprimeurs deſtruire.*

"The ſcriblers all my indignation raiſe;
"Scriblers, who when they hit upon a thought,
"Or good or bad, will publiſh it that inſtant,
"Thus whilſt theſe Elfs attempt to gain a name,
"Their bibliopoles are ruin'd and undone."

* The Printer who undertook this edition of Theophilus Raynaud's works, ruined himſelf.] From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 979. col. 1.

(82) Catherinot, *l'Art d'imprimer* p. 2. It is a pamphlet of 12 pages in 4to, dated at Bourges, March 10, 1685.

(83) Paſquier, *Lettres*, liv. 10. Tom. 1. p. m. 638.

(84) That is ruſty, muſty, *pædorem & ſitum.*

☞ RAYNOLDS or RAINOLDS (JOHN), an eminent Engliſh Divine in the 16th century, fifth ſon of Richard Rainolds of Pinho, near Exeter in Devonſhire, was born there in the year 1549 (*a*). He became Student of Merton college in Oxford, in 1562; and on the 29th of April the year following, was admitted Scholar of Corpus Chriſti college; and on the 11th of October, 1566, was choſen Probationer Fellow (*b*). October the 15th, 1568, he took the degree of Bachelor of Arts (*c*); and May the 17th, 1572, that of Maſter (*d*), being then Senior of the Act, and Greek Lecturer in his college (*e*). June the 24th, 1579, he took the degree of Bachelor of Divinity (*f*); and in June 1585 that of Doctor (*g*). In 1598 he was made Dean of Lincoln; about which time he lodged and ſtudied in Queen's College. But being unwilling to quit an academical life, he exchanged his Deanry the year following with Mr. Will. Cole for the Preſidentſhip of Corpus Chriſti College. Queen Elizabeth offered him a Biſhoprick, which he modeſty refuſed (*h*). He publiſhed ſeveral works [*A*]. Dr. Daniel

(*a*) Prince's *Worthies of Devon*, p. 524.

(*b*) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 339. 2d edit.

(*c*) Idem, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 102.

(*d*) Idem, ibid. col. 106.

(*e*) Idem, *Athen. Oxon. Ubi ſupra.*

(*f*) Idem, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 119.

(*g*) Idem, ibid. col. 129.

(*h*) Idem, *Athen. Oxon.* ubi ſupra.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral works.*] I. *Sermon of the Deſtruction of the Idumæans, on Obad. ver.* 5, 6. London 1584 in 8vo. II. *The Summe of a conference between* John Rainoldes *and* John Hart, *touching the head and faith of the Church. Wherein by the way are handled ſundrie points of the ſufficiencie and right expounding of the ſcriptures, the miniſterie of the Church, the function of Prieſthood, the ſacrifice of the Maſſe, with other controverſies of religion; but chiefly and purpoſely the point of Church Government, opened in the branches of Chriſte's ſupreme ſoverainty, of Peter's pretended, the Pope's uſurped, the Prince's lawful ſupremacie. Penned by* John Rainoldes, *according to the notes ſet downe in writing by them both; peruſed by* John

(i) *Orat. Funebr.* J. Rainoldi.

(k) *Epiſt.* 7. *Decad* 1.

(l) *Defenſ. Eccleſ. Angl.* c. 69.

(m) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* col. 340.

(n) Hakewill's *Apology of the Power and Government of God*, l. 3. c. 6. ſect. 1. p. 226. edit. London 1630.

Daniel Featly tells us (*i*), that he was a man of prodigious reading, and erudition. Biſhop Hall obſerves (*k*), that "he alone was a well furniſhed library, full of all faculties, of all ſtudies, of all learning. The memory, the reading of that man were to a miracle." And Dr. Crakanthorp ſays (*l*), "that for virtue, probity, integrity, and piety, he was ſo eminent, that as Nazianzen ſpeaks of Athanaſius, it might be ſaid of him, *to name* Rainolds *is to commend virtue itſelf*." He was indeed verſed in all kinds of learning, and had read over all writers, profane, eccleſiaſtical, and divine, all the councils, fathers, and hiſtories of the church; and was admirably ſkilled in a variety of languages, of an excellent genius, and ſound judgment (*m*). His memory was ſuch, that, "he excelled this way, to the aſtoniſhment of all that were inwardly acquainted with him, not only for St. Auguſtin's works, but almoſt all Claſſic Authors; ſo as in this reſpect it might truly be ſaid of him, which hath been applied to ſome others, that he was a *living Library*, or *third Univerſity* (*n*)". He had a hand in tranſlating part of the Old Teſtament, by command of King James I. Some time before his death, he was extremely afflicted with the gout, and at laſt fell into a conſumption, of which he died. All the time of his ſickneſs, except when he conferred with the tranſlators of the bible, who met at his lodgings, was ſpent in devotion or reading, to which he had ſo intenſely applied himſelf, that when ſome of his friends formerly endeavoured to perſuade him to abate ſomething of his ſtudies, which otherwiſe might encreaſe thoſe diſeaſes that would haſten his death, and that he ſhould not *perdere ſubſtantiam propter accidentia*, his reply was, *nec propter Vitam vivendi perdere cauſas*. He died on Thurſday May

John Hart, *and (after things ſupplied and altered, as he thought good) allowed for the faithfull report of that which paſt in conference betwene them. Whereto is annexed a treatiſe, entitled, Six Concluſions touching the holie Scripture and the Church, written by* John Rainoldes. *With a defenſe of ſuch things as* Thomas Stapleton *and* Gregorie Martin *have carped at there.* London 1584 in 4to. Reprinted there in 1588, 1598, and 1609 in 4to. This book was tranſlated into Latin by Henry Parry of Corpus Chriſti College. The dedication of Dr. Rainolds's *Conference* to the Earl of Leiceſter is dated at London July the 18th 1584. Mr. *Hart* in his epiſtle to the *indifferent Reader* acknowledges, that what Dr. Rainolds *hath ſet down is a true report of thoſe things, which paſt in conference between them*; "and as for that, ſays he, which he affirmeth in one place (1), that *I have told him, that my opinion is, the Pope may not depoſe Princes*; indeede I told him ſo much. And in truth I thinke, that although the ſpiritual power be more excellent and worthie than the temporall, yet they are both of God, neither doth the one depend of the other. Whereupon I gather as a certaine concluſion, that the opinion of them, who holde the Pope to be a temporal Lord over Kings and Princes, is unreaſonable and unprobable altogether. For he hath not to meddle with them civilly, much leſſe to depoſe them, or give away their kingdomes: that is no part of his commiſſion. He hath in my judgment the fatherhoode of the Church, not a Princehood of the world, Chriſt having taken no ſuch title upon him, nor giving it to Peter, or any other of his diſciples. And that is it, which I meant to defend in him, and no other Soveraintie." The *Six concluſions touching the holy Scripture and the Church*, ſubjoined to this work, were defended by our author in 1579, and were likewiſe printed in Latin. The preface of them is dated at Corpus Chriſti College February the 2d. 1580. They are as follow. 1. *The holy Scripture teacheth the Church all things neceſſary to Salvation.* 2. *The militant Church may err, both in manners, and in doctrine.* 3. *The authority of the holy Scripture is greater than the authority of the Church.* 4. *The holy Catholic Church, which we believe, is the whole company of God's elect and choſen.* 5. *The Church of Rome is not the Catholic Church, nor a ſound Member of the Catholic Church.* 6. *The Reformed Churches in England, Scotland, France, Germany, and other Kingdoms and Common-Weales, have ſevered themſelves lawfully from the Church of Rome.* III. *A Sermon preached to the publick Aſſembly of Scholars in the Univerſity of Oxford*, ult. Auguſt. 1586. *upon occaſion of their meeting to give thanks for the late detection and apprehenſion of Traytors, who wickedly conſpired againſt the Queen's Majeſty, &c. on Pſalm* xviii. 48, 49, 50, 51. Oxford 1586 in 8vo, IV. *Orationes duæ in Collegio Corporis Chriſti.* Oxford 1587 in 8vo. V. *De Romanæ, Eccleſiæ Idololatriâ, in cultu Sanctorum, Reliquiarum, Imaginum, &c. Libr.* 2. Oxford 1596 in 4to. VI. *The Overthrow of Stage-plays by way of controverſie betwixt Dr. Gager and Dr. Rainolds, wherein all the Reaſons that can be made for them, are notably refuted, &c.* Finiſhed in 1593, and ſaid to be printed at Middleburg in 1599 in 4to. Printed alſo at Oxford 1629 in 4to, to which are added ſeveral Latin letters between our author and Albericus Gentilis upon the ſame ſubject. VII. *Apologia theſium de ſacrâ Scripturâ & Eccleſiâ.* London 1602 in 8vo. VIII. *Epiſtle to* Thomas Pye, printed at the end of Robert Burhill's book intitled, *In controverſiam &c. in ſex commentationes.* Oxford 1606 in 4to written upon Mr. Pye's ſubmitting his Latin epiſtle againſt Dr. Howſon's Theſis, to his cenſure. It contains alſo ſeveral corrections of Mr. Pye's Epiſtle, before it went to the preſs. IX. *Defence of the Judgment of the Reformed Churches, that a man may lawfully, not only put away his wife for her Adultery, but alſo marry another. Wherein Robert Bellarmine, the Jeſuit's Latin treatiſe and an Engliſh pamphlet of a nameleſs author, maintaining the contrary, are confuted.* Printed in 1609 in 4to. X. *Cenſura Librorum Apocryphorum veteris Teſtamenti adverſus Pontificios, imprimis Robertum Bellarminum*, &c. Oppenheim 1611 in two tomes. Mr. Matthew Pole tells us (2), that this book is written *multijugâ & ſtupendâ Eruditione.* XI. *The Prophely of Obadiah opened and applied in ſundry learned and gracious Sermons preached at Allhallows and St. Mary's in Oxford.* Oxford 1613 in 4to. Publiſhed by Will. Hind of Queen's College. XII. *Letter to his friend, containing his advice for the ſtudy of Divinity*, dated July 4th 1577. London 1613 in 12mo. XIII. *Orationes duodecim, cum aliis quibuſdam opuſculis. Adjecta eſt Oratio Funebris in obitu ejuſdem habita à M. Iſaaco Wake, Oratore publico.* London 1619 in 8vo. Mr. Wood mentions an edition of the *Orationes duodecim* at Oxford 1614 in 8vo, and another in 1628. Among theſe are the two Orations printed in 1587. The reſt were publiſhed by Henry Jackſon, B. D. That, which was pronounced *poſt Feſtum Michaelis* 1573, and begins thus; *Si quis adſit in hoc Coventu, &c.* was tranſlated into Engliſh by John Leiceſter of Cheſhire, *for the uſe of all ſuch that affect the ſtudies of Logic and Philoſophy*, London 1638 in 12mo. There are publiſhed with theſe orations *Epiſtolæ ad Guliel. Rainoldum, Fratrem ſuum, Gulielm. Whitakerum, & Elizabetham Reginam.* And in the edition of 1619 are publiſhed, *Plutarchi Chæronenſis Libr. duo*; 1. *De utilitate ex hoſtibus capiendâ*, 2. *De morbis animi & corporis. D. Johanne Rainoldo interprete.* And *Maximi Tyrii Platonici Diſputationes tres:* 1. *Vitam activam contemplativâ*; 2. *Contemplativam activâ meliorem eſſe.* 3. *Qui morbi graviores, animi, an corporis, D. Johanne Rainoldo interprete.* XIV. *The diſcovery*

(1) In the 7th chapter, and 7th diviſion.

(2) *Synopſis*, vol. 3.

May the 21ſt 1607, in the fifty eighth year of his age, and was interred with great ſolemnity on the Monday following in the Chapel of Corpus Chriſti College, where a monument is erected to his memory. He was inclined to Puritaniſm, though with ſuch moderation, that he continued a Conformiſt to the Church of England [*B*].

of the man of Sin, a Sermon on 2 Theſſal. ii. 3. Oxford 1614 in 4to, publiſhed by Mr. William Hind abovementioned. XV. *A letter to Sir Francis Knollys concerning ſome paſſages in Dr. Richard Bancroft's Sermon at Paul's-croſs, 9 Febr.* 1588. London 1641 in 4to. XVI. *The Original of Biſhops and Metropolitans briefly laid down.* Oxford 1641 in 4to. This is but a ſmall piece, and included in Archbiſhop Uſher's diſcourſe upon that ſubject. Other titles have it thus: *Dr. Rainolds his Judgment touching the Original of Epiſcopacy more largely confirmed out of Antiquity by James Uſher Archbiſhop of Armagh.* XVII. *A Judgment concerning Epiſcopacy, whether it be God's ordinance. In a letter to Sir Francis Knollys Knt.* 19 *September* 1598. London 1641 in 4to. XVIII. *Propheſie of Haggai interpreted and applied in fifteen Sermons.* London 1649 in 4to. Publiſhed by Edward Leigh Eſq; who had the copy from Nath. Hind, a Miniſter of Staffordſhire, ſon of William Hind beforementioned, who had reviſed and perfected it. Our Author's manuſcripts mentioned by Mr. Wood are as follow. 1. *Commentarii in tres Libros Ariſtotelis de Rhetoricâ.* 2. *An Anſwer to Nich. Saunders's books* de ſchiſmate Anglicano, *in defenſe of our Reformation*, &c. 3. *A Defenſe of our Engliſh liturgy againſt Robert Browne's ſchiſmatical books.* This Browne, who was a Knight's ſon of Rutlandſhire, and educated at Cambridge, was Author of the ſect called *Browniſts*; but afterwards reconciled himſelf to the Church of England, and became Miniſter of Aychurch in Northamptonſhire. He died about the year of his age, in 1630, or, as ſome ſay, 1634 (3). 4. *A Treatiſe of the beginning and progreſs of Popiſh errors, and that for the firſt* 300 *years after Chriſt Biſhops ruled their own Dioceſes without ſubjection to the Pope.* 5. *Collectanea quædam, potiſſimè Theologica.* In the library of Dr. Tho. Barlow Biſhop of Lincoln. 7. *Collectanea continentia diverſa Rhetorica & Theologica*, MS. in 8vo in the ſame library. 8. Several *Orations* and *Declamations*, not yet printed, in the ſame library.

(3) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 341. 2d edit.

[*B*] *He was inclined to Puritaniſm, though with ſuch moderation, that he continued a Conformiſt to the Church of England.*] He was one of the managers for the Puritans at the Conference at Hampton Court in January 1603, at which he propoſed, I. *That the Doctrine of the Church might be preſerved in purity, according to God's word.* II. *That good Paſtors might be planted in all Churches to preach the ſame.* III. *That the Church-Government might be ſincerely miniſtred according to God's word.* IV. *That the book of Common Prayer might be fitted to the more encreaſe of Piety* (4).

(4) *The Summe and Subſtance of the Conference, &c. in his Majeſtie's Privy Chamber at Hampton Court, January* 14. 1603. *Contracted by William Barlow, D. D.* p. 23. edit. London 1604.

For the firſt he moved his Majeſty, that the book of *Articles of Religion* concluded in 1562 might be explained in places obſcure, and enlarged where ſome things were defective. For example, whereas *Art.* 16. the words are theſe, *After we have received the Holy Ghoſt, we may depart from Grace*; notwithſtanding the meaning may be ſound, yet he deſired, that becauſe they may ſeem to be contrary to the doctrine of God's Predeſtination and Election in the 17th *Article*, both theſe words might be explained with this or the like addition, *yet neither totally nor finally*; and alſo that the nine aſſertions *orthodoxall*, as he termed them, concluded upon at Lambeth, might be inſerted into that book of articles. Secondly, where it is ſaid in the 23d *Article*, that it is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of preaching or adminiſtring the Sacraments *in the congregation*, before he be lawfully called, Dr. Rainolds took exception to theſe words, *in the congregation*, as implying a lawfulneſs for any whatſoever, *out of the congregation*, to preach and adminiſter the Sacraments, though he had no lawful calling thereunto. Thirdly, in the 25th Article, theſe words touching *Confirmation, grown partly of the corrupt following the Apoſtles*, being oppoſite to thoſe in the Collect of *Confirmation* in the Communion-book, *upon whom after the example of the Apoſtles*, argue, ſaid he, a contrariety each to other; the firſt confeſſing Confirmation to be a depraved imitation of the Apoſtles; the ſecond grounding it upon their example, *Acts* viii. *and* 19. as if the Biſhop by confirming of Children, did by impoſing of hands, as the Apoſtles in thoſe places, give the viſible Graces of the Holy Ghoſt. And therefore he deſired, that both the contradiction might be conſidered, and this ground of Confirmation examined (5). Dr. Rainolds afterwards objected to a defect in the 37th *Article*, wherein, he ſaid, theſe words, *The Biſhop of Rome hath no authority in this land*, were not ſufficient, unleſs it were added, *nor ought to have* (6). He next moved, that this propoſition, *the intention of the Miniſter is not of the eſſence of the Sacrament*, might be added unto the book of *Articles*, the rather becauſe ſome in England had preached it to be eſſential. And here again he repeated his requeſt concerning the nine *orthodoxall aſſertions* concluded at Lambeth (7). He then complained, that the *Catechiſm* in the Common-Prayer-Book was too brief; for which reaſon one by Nowel, late Dean of St. Paul's, was added, and that too long for young novices to learn by heart. He requeſted therefore, that one uniform Catechiſm might be made, which, and none other, might be generally received (8). He next took notice of the profanation of the Sabbath, and the contempt of his Majeſty's proclamation for reforming that abuſe; and deſired ſome ſtronger remedy might be applied (9). His next requeſt was for a new tranſlation of the Bible, becauſe thoſe which were allowed in the reign of Henry VIII and Edward VI. were corrupt and not anſwerable to the original; of which he gave three inſtances (10). He then deſired his Majeſty, that unlawful and ſeditious books might be ſuppreſſed, at leaſt reſtrained, and imparted to a few. He proceeded now to the ſecond point, and deſired that learned Miniſters might be planted in every pariſh (11). He next went on to the fourth point relating to the *Common-Prayer*, and complained of the impoſing *Subſcription*, ſince it was a great impediment to a learned Miniſtry; and intreated, that "it might "not be exacted as formerly, for which many good "men were kept out, others removed, and many "diſquieted. To ſubſcribe according to the Sta"tutes of the Realm, namely to the Articles of Re"ligion, and the King's ſupremacy, they were not "unwilling. Their reaſon of their backwardneſs to "ſubſcribe otherwiſe was, firſt, the books *Apocryphal*, "which the Common-Prayer enjoined to be read in "the Church, albeit there are, in ſome of thoſe "chapters appointed, manifeſt errors, directly repug"nant to the Scriptures (12). . . . . The next ſcru"ple againſt ſubſcription was, that in the Common "Prayer it is twice ſet down, *Jeſus ſaid to his Diſciples*, when as by the text original it is plain, "that he ſpake to the Phariſees. . . . . The third "objection againſt ſubſcription were *Interrogatories in* "*Baptiſm*, propounded to infants (13)." Dr. Rainolds owned *the uſe of the Croſs to have been ever ſince the Apoſtles time; but this was the difficulty, to prove it of that ancient uſe in Baptiſm* (14). He afterwards took exceptions at thoſe words in the *Office* of *Matrimony. With my body I thee worſhip* (15); and objected againſt the Churching of women by the name of *Purification* (16). Under the third general head touching *Diſcipline* he took exception to the committing of Eccleſiaſtical cenſures to Lay-Chancellors. "His reaſon was, that the Statute made in King "Henry's time for their authority that way was "abrogated in Queen Mary's time, and not revived "in the late Queen's days, and abridged by the "Biſhops themſelves, 1571, ordering that the ſaid "Lay-Chancellors ſhould not excommunicate in mat"ters of *correction*, and *anno* 1584 and 1589 not in "matters of *inſtance*, but to be done only by them, "who had the power of the keys (17)." He then deſired, that according to certain provincial conſtitutions, they of the Clergy might have meetings once every three weeks: firſt, in Rural Deaneries, and therein to have the liberty of propheſying, according as Archbiſhop Grindal and other Biſhops deſired of her late Majeſty. Secondly, that ſuch things, as could not be reſolved upon there, might be referred

(5) Ibid. p. 24, 25.
(6) Ibid. p. 37.
(7) Ibid. p. 38.
(8) Ibid. p. 43.
(9) Ibid. p. 44, 45.
(10) Ibid. p. 45.
(11) Ibid. p. 51.
(12) Ibid. p. 58, 59.
(13) Ibid. p. 63.
(14) Ibid. p. 68.
(15) Ibid. p. 75.
(16) Ibid. p. 76.
(17) Ibid. p. 77, 78.

RECKHEIM, an Earldom or County, Fief, immediate or ſovereign State of the Empire, has a ſeat, and a right of voting in the College of Princes, as well to the general as the circular diets. It is in the circle of Weſtphalia, and comprehends a town and ſeveral villages. Its ſoil is very fruitful, and moſt delightfully ſituated, in a beautiful and very populous country, on the banks of the Maeſe, two leagues from Maeſtricht, between the territories of Juliers, Liege, and Fauquemont. It has a right of toll on the Maeſe, and coins gold, ſilver, and copper money. The Caſtle, which is the Manſion Houſe of the Counts, is one of the fineſt, largeſt, and moſt magnificent in all Germany. Thoſe who poſſeſs it at this time are of the Houſe of Aſpermont (*a*). Linden, a moſt illuſtrious and moſt ancient houſe, are deſcended from the Counts of Aſpermont in Lorrain, whoſe Earldom conſiſted of near three hundred villages. We ſhall give hereunder ſome little account of their genealogy, and the preſent ſtate of the branch of the Counts of Reckheim [*A*].

(*a*) The French Authors write it Aſpremont, which is a corruption of the true orthography.

from thence to the Epiſcopal Synods, where the Biſhop with his *Preſbyteri* ſhould determine all ſuch points, as before could not be decided (18). Notwithſtanding our author's conduct at this conference, Dr. Simon Patrick obſerves (19), that he profeſſed himſelf a Conformiſt to the Church of England, and died ſo. He remarks, that Dr. Richard Crakanthorp tells (20) the Archbiſhop of Spalato, that the Doctor was no *Puritan*, (as the Archbiſhop called him) but he himſelf a Calumniator. "For firſt, he profeſſed, "that he appeared unwillingly in the cauſe at "Hampton-Court, and merely in obedience to the "King's command. And then he ſpoke not one "word there againſt the Hierarchy. Nay, he ac"knowledged it to be conſonant to the word of God "in his *Conference* with *Hart*. And in an anſwer "to Sanders's book of the *Schiſm of England* (which "is in the Archbiſhop's library) he profeſſes, that "he approves of the book of *conſecrating and order*"*ing Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons.* He was alſo a "ſtrict obſerver of all the orders of the Church and "Univerſity both in public and his own College; "wearing the ſquare cap and ſurplice, kneeling at "the Sacrament, and he himſelf commemorating "their benefactors at the times their Statutes ap"pointed, and reading that chapter of *Eccleſiaſticus*, "which is on ſuch occaſions uſed. In a letter alſo "of his to Archbiſhop Bancroft (then in Dr. Crak"anthorp's hands) he profeſſes himſelf conformable "to the Church of England, *willingly and from his* "*heart*, his conſcience admoniſhing him ſo to be. "And thus he remained perſuaded to his laſt breath, "deſiring to receive *Abſolution* according to the man"ner preſcribed in our Liturgy, when he lay on his "death-bed; which he did from Dr. Holland, the "King's Profeſſor in Oxford, kiſſing his hand in "token of his love and joy, and within a few hours "after reſigned up his ſoul to God." T.

(18) Ibid. p. 78, 79.

(19) *Continuation of the Friendly Debate*, part 2. p. 207. edit. 1684.

(20) *Defenſio Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ, &c.* c. 69. p. 419. ann. 1529.

[*A*] *Some little account of their genealogy, and the preſent ſtate of the branch or family of Reckheim.*] The firſt Count of Aſpermont was SIGISFRIDT, and lived in the year 660. He was deſcended from the family of the Princes of Eſte, in Italy. A younger brother of that family, ſprung from this Sigisfridt, and whoſe name was ARNOUL, came and ſetled in Holland in 1120, and there poſſeſſed the Lordſhip of Linden, which his deſcendants have enjoyed during a long courſe of years. One of them, HERMAN by name, purchaſed the Earldom of Reckheim, about the year 1550. He was General of the forces of Erneſt of Bavaria, Elector of Colen, and father of Erneſt, Count of Aſpermont, and of Reckheim, who was born in 1583; and was Chamberlain and Colonel to the Emperors Mathias and Ferdinand II. He married Anne Antoinette, daughter of Henry Marquis of Gouffier-Bonnivet, who brought him a ſon called FERDINAND. The laſt mentioned, born in 1611, married Elizabeth daughter of Egon, Count of Furſtemburg, and of Anna Maria Princeſs of Hohenzolleren, and who brought him four ſons and eight daughters, and theſe are as follow.

FRANCIS GOBERT Count of Reckheim, Biſhop of Cheur (1), and Canon of the Metropolitan Churches of Colen and Saltzburg, and of the Cathedral of Straſburg (2).

FERDINAND, General of the armies of his Imperial Majeſty, who, by his firſt wife, Charlotte daughter of Lewis George, Prince of Naſſau Dilemburg, and of Anna Auguſta Princeſs of Brunſwick, had but one daughter, viz. CHARLOTTE GOBERTINE, Canoneſs of Munſterbilſen, whoſe eight deſcents are Aſpermont-Reckheim, Gouffier, Furſtemburg, Hohenzolleren, Naſſau, Sayn, Brunſwick and Denmark. His ſecond wife was Juliana, daughter of Francis Rakoczi, Prince of Tranſylvania, and grand-daughter of George the younger, George the elder, and Sigiſmond, all Princes of Tranſylvania. He had a ſon by her named JOSEPH GOBERT.

CHARLES, Canon of the Metropolitan of Colen, and of the Cathedrals of Straſburg and Liege.

FREDERIC Great-croſs of the Order of Malta, and Commander of Tobel, Steinfort, and Munſter.

ANNA MARIA wife to Count Wenceſlaus of Althann, Counſellor of his Imperial Majeſty. Great Judge of Moravia, Governor of the Province of Glatz, and Ambaſſador extraordinary in Sweden and Poland.

ELEONORA Princeſs Abbeſs of Monſterbilſen.

ANNE SALOME wife of Lewis Count of Souches, Major-General of the armies of his Imperial Majeſty, and his Counſellor of State.

ERNESTINE, firſt married to John George Count de Collonitch, Chamberlain to his Imperial Majeſty; afterwards to Octavus Count of Curiani, the Emperor's Chamberlain and Counſellor of State.

ANNE ANTOINETTE wife of Claude Count of Tilly, Lieutenant General of the armies of the United Provinces.

MARIA FRANCIS wife of Charles Count of Aſpermont Linden, Counſellor of State of the territory of Liege, and Governor of the Marquiſate of Franchimont.

ALEXANDRINA and PETRONILLA, firſt Canoneſſes at Remiremont, and afterwards Urſeline Nuns at Metz.

The Counts of Aſpermont-Reckheim bear quarterly, in the 1ſt and 4th gules, with a croſs Or, which is Aſpermont-Linden in the 2d and 3d Or, with a lion gules, which is Reckheim; and over all azure, with an eagle argent, which is the ancient Aſpermont or Eſte (3).

(1) Or *Choirs*, the French write and pronounce *Coirer*. This Biſhoprick is in the country of the Griſons, and Suffragan to the Archbiſhop of Mentz. The Biſhop is in alliance with the Swiſs; notwithſtanding which, he has a vote and ſeat in the College of the Princes of the Empire. See Heiſs's *Hiſtory of the Empire*, Tom. 2. p. 265. Hague edit. of 1685.

(2) See the art. TILLI.

(3) Extracted from a *Memoir* communicated to the Author; which muſt likewiſe be underſtood of the text of this article.

REFUGE (DU), a French Gentleman, Author of a book, ſeveral editions of which have been publiſhed [*A*], and entitled, *Traité de la Cour, ou Inſtruction des Courtiſans*, i. e. "A treatiſe of the Court, or Inſtructions for Courtiers," was well verſed both in the theory and practice of affairs; he having read a vaſt number of books, and had an *extenſive and long experience in Courts and the affairs of Kings, Princes, States, and Commonwealths,*

[*A*] *Author of a book ſeveral editions of which have been publiſhed.*] The firſt was printed in Holland, and the ſecond in Paris. They were followed by that which was publiſhed at Paris in the year 1618, 8vo, after the author's death, and from his laſt corrections. This third edition is augmented and diſtinguiſhed by

Commonwealths, in which the Kings of France *had uſefully employed him*; and in which he *had ſo prudently and happily behaved, that they never made the leaſt objection to his wiſe conduct.* He died in the reign of Lewis XIII. and there were found in his ſtudy, ſeveral manuſcripts relating to ſtate affairs, written by him, and of which his relations ſeemed to promiſe the publication. This is what we read in a ſmall Preface prefixed to the third edition of his treatiſe of the Court. This edition was printed at Paris in 1618.

(1) Extracted from the *Advertiſement to the Reader*, prefixed to the Paris edit. of 1618.

by Chapters with Summaries and Sections, but they left out the marginal notes and citations, with which the reſt had been *curiouſly enriched* (1). They reſtored them afterwards. I find them in the edition I make uſe of, which is that, for Stephen Loyſon, at Paris 1658, in 12mo. The author's name is publiſhed with it, and had been publiſhed before in that of Leyden 1649, in 12mo. It had not been inſerted in the edition of 1618, there being only, at the end of the book, the letters D. R after ſome verſes of Seneca which are not in the edition of 1658. There are a great number of very good things in this book. It was printed in Engliſh at London 1622, in 8vo.

REGIUS (URBAN), was one of the learned men in the 16th Century. He was born at Langenargen on the Lake of Conſtance, and having began his ſtudies at Lindaw, he continued them at Friburg, in Briſgaw, with ſo much the more advantage, as he lived with the famous Zazius, and was tenderly beloved by him [*A*]. He afterwards went and ſtudied in the Univerſity of Baſil, and then in that of Ingolſtad, in which city the fame of John Eccius drew a great number of ſcholars. He read private Lectures there; and ſhewed ſo much ability for inſtructing young people, that many Gentlemen truſted him with the whole conduct of their ſons, and even the direction of their whole expences. However, it was not poſſible for him to regulate the matter, thoſe young pupils run in debt with the vintners and ſhopkeepers (*a*); and as he was ſecurity for them, and their parents did not pay him, he became a kind of bankrupt. His creditors being very urgent with him, and he not having wherewith to pay, he endeavoured to eſcape; but ſome Captains coming to Ingolſtad at that time, to raiſe ſoldiers, he delivered up his books, clothes, *&c.* and enliſted himſelf. The new recruits being afterwards muſtered and reviewed, Profeſſor Eccius happening to be there, ſpied our Regius among the ſoldiers, when he went up to him, and being told the reaſon why he had enliſted himſelf, he promiſed to ſerve him, and was ſo zealous on that occaſion, that he reconciled him to the muſes; and threatened the ſcholars who had run in debt, to inform the Prince of them, if they did not pay him, and thereby free Regius, who continued to make ſo great a progreſs in the ſciences, that he received in Ingolſtad, from the hand of the Emperor Maximilian, the oratorial and poetical Crown. Some time after he was made Profeſſor of Rhetoric, and that of Poetry in the Univerſity of the above-mentioned city. He was in that quality, when in 1516 he wrote ſome letters (*b*) by the Duke of Bavaria's command, in order to engage Eraſmus to come to Ingolſtad; but theſe letters had not the deſired effect. Turning himſelf after to the ſtudy of divinity, he found it ſo engaging, that he applied himſelf entirely to it. He thereby imbibed ſome of Luther's principles, but was very much puzzled when Eccius his maſter and benefactor quarrelled with Luther. He at laſt reſolved to leave Ingolſtad, and retire to Auſburg, where he was of great ſervice againſt Popery. He there founded a Proteſtant Church, and from thence ſpread what were called the new opinions. He was a Zuinglian for ſome time, but afterwards declared himſelf a zealous Lutheran [*B*]. Eccius, who went to viſit him at Auſburg, and had a conference with him, in order to bring him back to the Church of Rome,

(a) *Modum in veſtitu & victu ubique excedere.* Melch. Adam. *in* Vitis Theolog. p. 22.

(b) See the 17th and 8th *Letters*, of book 2. among thoſe of Eraſmus. Eraſmus thanked and applauded him. See *Letter* 19. of book 2. and the 35th of 18.

[*A*] *He lived with the famous Zazius, and was tenderly beloved by him* (1).] He choſe out, in Zazius's library, all ſuch books as he imagined proper for the improvement of his ſtudies, and copied all the marginal notes written by that learned Profeſſor upon them. In this manner our young ſtudent uſed to ſpend a conſiderable part of the night. Zazius, who ſlept but little, and uſed to riſe ſometimes to walk about, in order to cheer himſelf for his want of ſleep, catched him copying theſe notes, and ſaid to him in a kind and loving manner, you are plundering me of the fruits of my Lucubrations. *Lucubrantem invenit in deſcribendis illis ſcholiis, Urbanum: cujus auriculam Zaſius blandiuſculè vellicans*, arte & ſcientia ſua ſe ab ipſo defraudari jocatus eſt (2). He ſometimes found him aſleep, on which occaſion he only laid ſome huge volumes on his ſhoulders till he was awake. *Aut ſi quando ſomno ad candelam oppreſſum & inclinato in menſam capite dormitantem offendiſſet: juris volumen grande unum atque alterum humeris impoſitum reliquit, donec excitaretur* (3). I relate theſe little circumſtances, becauſe I know many worthy perſons are delighted to hear of ſuch marks, either of the kindneſs of a profeſſor, or the diligence of a pupil.

(1) *Amavit eum Zazius ut filium.* Melch. Adam. *in* Vitis Theolog. p. 71.

(2) Melch. Adam. *in* Vitis Theolog. p. 71.

(3) Idem, ibid.

[*B*] *He was a Zuinglian for ſome time, but afterwards declared himſelf a zealous Lutheran.*] Zuinglius wrote to him as follows in 1526. *In Euchariſtiæ re gratulor vobis, te noſtrum eſſe factum. Verum gratiam meretur novitas: brevi enim ſpero omnes qui adhuc obſtrepunt tropum, qui nullo negotio videri vobis debebat, viſuros eſſe ac ſententiæ noſtræ ſimplicitatem ac claritatem* (4). i. e. "I congratulate you for being of "the ſame opinion with me concerning the Euchariſt. The novelty of the thing alſo deſerves my "thanks: for I hope, that all who inveigh ſo much "againſt the figure, which you muſt have eaſily com"prehended, will ſoon perceive how ſimple and "clear our opinion is." They diſcourſed together on original ſin the ſame year, and we have ſeen the letter (5) which Zuinglius wrote to Regius concerning this article. Luther was not ignorant of the conformity of opinions of theſe two perſons, and was extremely ſorry on that account. *Dolet mihi valde nobiliſſimum virum Oecolampadium tam ludicris & nihili cogitationibus in hoc barathrum prolapſum; pulſat eum Sathanas: Dominus eripiat eum. Urbanus Regius in idem malum vel inclinat, vel jam cecidit: Dominus ſervet ſuos* (6). i. e. "I am very much grieved that ſo "illuſtrious a man as Oecolampadius ſhould have "fallen into this pit, by ſuch filly, trifling thoughts. "Satan is buſy about him; may God reſcue him out "of his hands. Urban Regius is either included or "already fallen into the ſame evil; may the Lord "preſerve his own people." Luther tells him, in another letter, that he had heard that Regius was going to write againſt him. *Præterea Urbanus Regius minari*

(4) Zuinglius, *Epiſt.* lib. 1. p. 82. *apud* Melch. Adam. *in* Vitis Theolog. p. 73.

(5) p. 251 of Zuinglius's *Letters.*

(6) Luther. Tom. 2. *Epiſt.* p. 326. anno 1527. *apud* Melch. Adam. *in* Vitis Theolog. p. 73.

Rome, had no ſucceſs on that occaſion. A paper war even broke out between them, and Regius carried it on with vigour, though his antagoniſt might have reproached him with ingratitude. The Proteſtants had not always the ſuperiority in Auſburg, there being a time in which Regius was obliged to leave that city, and hide himſelf in many places; however, he afterwards was glorioufly recalled, and married into a good family of Auſburg. There was ſomething very ſingular in the diſpute he had with a female Anabaptiſt [C]. He lived in that city till the time the diet was held there in 1530, when he entered into the ſervice of the Duke of Brunſwick, who made him ſuperintendant of the Churches

minari dicitur in me ſcripta, ſcilicet Oecolampadium & Zwinglium tantos viros (ut ſentit) non vult offendere: ſic mutatus eſt ab illo (7). i. e. "It is farther ſaid "that Urban Regius threatens to write againſt me; "he being not willing to render himſelf obnoxious "to Oecolampadius and Zwinglius, thoſe great men, "as he is pleaſed to term them; ſo greatly is he "changed from what he was." By this we find that Regius had appeared at firſt what he appeared at laſt, I mean a good Lutheran. He quitted the principles of Zuinglius as early as the year 1528. See the letter (8) in which Luther declares his joy on that occaſion, and recommends him to the Marquis of Brandenburg. The converſation he had with Regius at Coburg in 1530, had a very happy effect; Regius, at the ending of it, highly admired Luther, which he himſelf declares in a letter. *Cum Saxoniam peterem Coburgi integrum diem ſolus cum Luthero, viro Dei, tranſegeram: quo die nullus mihi in vita fuit jucundior. Talis enim ac tantus Theologus Lutherus, ut nulla ſecula habuerint ſimilem. Hoc magis execror ſtultitiam & arrogantiam Caroloſtadianorum, qui ſibi placent, quaſi Luthero queant conferri, cujus umbram non aſſequuntur, cum omni eruditione quam jactant. Semper mihi magnus fuit Lutherus: at jam mihi maximus eſt. Vidi enim præſens & audivi, quæ nullo calamo tradi poſſunt abſentibus* (9). i. e. "When I was travelling "to Saxony, I paſſed a whole day, at Coburg, with "no other perſon but Luther, that man of God; "and no day in my life was ſpent more agreeably. "Luther is ſuch and ſo great a Divine, that no age "ever produced his parallel. This makes me deteſt "the folly and arrogance of the Caroloſtadians, "who flatter themſelves, as if they were wor"thy of being compared to Luther, though they "are not even his ſhadow, notwithſtanding all the "learning they boaſt. I always conſidered Luther "as a great man, but I now think him greater than "ever. I ſaw and heard ſuch things, when we were "together, as cannot be deſcribed by any pen." Luther, on the other hand, was extremely well ſatisfied with this converſation; and vaſtly well ſatisfied with the learning he found in Regius, whoſe converſion he conſidered as a piece of news very worthy of being made publick. He wrote as follows to Wenceſlaus Lincus, *Urbanum Regium quoque reſipuiſſe, credo te noſſe, & contra hoſtes Sacramentarios ſtrenue nobiſcum certare* (10). i. e. "I do not doubt but you "have heard of Urban Regius's repentance and con"verſion, and of his engaging valiantly with us, a"gainſt the Sacramentarians."

(7) Idem, Luther. ibid. p. 330. *apud* Melch. Adam. ibid.

(8) It is in Seckendorf, *Hiſt. Luther.* lib. 2. p. 122. num. 5.

(9) Melch. Adam. *in* Vitis Theolog. p. 78.

(10) Luther. Tom. 2. *Epiſt.* p. 311. *apud* Melch. Adam. ibid. p. 78.

[C] *There was ſomething very ſingular in the diſpute he had with a female Anabaptiſt.*] The Magiſtrates of Auſburg put in force, againſt the Anabaptiſts, the civil laws by which the Sectariſts are forbid to hold conventicles, and to exerciſe their Religions; they ſent them into baniſhment, or impriſoned them. Now a woman of a good family boaſting, when in priſon, that if ſhe had a conference with Regius, ſhe would ſhew him the truth and excellency of the Anabaptiſt principles, ſhe therefore was ſent for, to diſpute with him in full Senate. Accordingly ſhe was brought thither with all the equipage of a priſoner, that is, with chains both on her hands and feet; whilſt Regius ſeated himſelf among the Senators. She alledged a numberleſs multitude of paſſages of Scripture, which ſhe applied to the beſt of her power, in defenſe of her opinions. Regius anſwered her, and ſhewed very evidently the true ſenſe of thoſe paſſages. However, he was not able to convert her, ſhe perſiſting in her errors, and addreſſed the Proteſtant Miniſters in manner following. *This, brother Urban, is a ſtrange way of diſputing. You, ſeated on a ſoft chair with the Burgomaſters by your ſide, ſpeak like an oracle, and you pronounce decrees as from Apollo's tripod; whilſt I, proſtrate on the ground, am forced to plead my cauſe with chains on my feet. Siſter*, replied Regius, *you deſerve this, ſince as you have been delivered from the ſlavery of the devil, by Chriſt Jeſus, you have voluntarily ſubmitted yourſelf to an infamous yoke. A mad ſpirit ſhews you, with all theſe accoutrements of a captive, as an example to others.* The reſult of this affair was, that the woman was baniſhed from the city (11). If the reader is diffident with regard to the juſtneſs of my verſion, let him read what follows. *Ipſa tantùm abeſt, ut monitis locum dederit: ut pervicaciter etiam Urbanum hiſce fuerit adorta:* Egregia enim verò, Urbane frater, hæc diſputandi ratio eſt inter me & te. Tu in molli culcitra ad latera Conſulum adſidens, quaſi ex Apollinis tripode proloqueris: ego miſera humi proſtrata, ex duris vinculis cauſam dicere cogor. *Ad hæc Urbanus:* Nec verò, *inquit*, injuria, ſoror: ut quæ ſemel è ſervitute diaboli per Chriſtum in libertatem adſerta, tua ſponte iterum cervicem turpi jugo ſubmiſiſti; & iſtis te ornamentis veſanus oſtentat genius, aliis in exemplum. *Senatus itaque, cùm laterem ſe lavare videret; contagium illud exilio mulctavit, urbeque expulit* (12).

(11) Melch. Adam. ibid. p. 731.

(12) Idem, ibid.

This woman did not want ſenſe. She made a very judicious reflection and enlivened it with great ſmartneſs; but then ſhe had too much confidence, or rather was very raſh. She imagined, that appearing in the diſgraceful garb of a criminal, with a Miniſter of the eſtabliſhed Religion, and in preſence of Judges who had before condemned the principles of the Anabaptiſts, and impriſoned thoſe who inculcated them, ſhe ſhould perſuade the audience of the juſtneſs of her cauſe. However in order for a perſon to promiſe himſelf this, it is not ſufficient for him to have juſtice on his ſide, but he alſo muſt hope for an extraordinary aſſiſtance from the ſpirit of God; for, according to the uſual courſe of things, we do not find that a perſon impriſoned for the ſake of Religion, can confound adverſaries who ſpeak to him from an eminence; and who have, on their ſide, the pomp of outſide, not to mention that the audience are prejudiced in their favour. I am ſenſible that the cauſe which this woman defended was not a good one; but it is my opinion, that, though ſhe had maintained a doctrine as good, or even better, than that of Regius, ſhe would have been defeated, in the circumſtances to which the controverſy was reduced. The parties were not fairly matched, and the arms no ways equal. Regius was honourably ſeated, and ſurrounded with all the *inſignia* of favour; not to mention that he undertook the defenſe of a cauſe which the ſovereign had embraced, and againſt a cauſe which the ſovereign perſecuted. His antagoniſt was a woman loaded with chains, and in the poſture of a criminal who was already condemned. A very ſolid reaſon from her, would not have counterbalanced an indifferent one alledged by Regius, with all the weight and emphaſis of a man who is ſeated among the Burgomaſters, and on a kind of tribunal. Shall I quote Euripides, who declares that the words of a man in favour are more powerful than if uttered by an unhappy wretch?

Τὸ δ' ἀξίωμα κἂν κακῶς λέγῃ τὸ σὸν,
Πείσει· λόγῳ γὰρ ἔκ τ' ἀδοξούντων ἰὼν,
Κἀκ τῶν δοκούντων αὐτὸς, οὐ ταυτὸν θάνει (13).

That is, according to Ennius's verſion (14).

Hæc tu etſi perversè dices, facile Achivos flexeris.
Nam quum opulenti loquuntur pariter atque ignobiles,
Eadem dicta, eademque oratio æqua non æque valet.

(13) Hecuba ad Ulyſſem, *apud* Euripidem *in* Hecuba, ver. 293. p. m. 20.

(14) Aulum Gellium, lib. 11. cap. 4. p. m. 286.

" How

Churches in the territory of Lunenburg, and had an extraordinary eſteem for him [*D*]. He exerciſed his talents in favour of the cauſe, in ſeveral ſynods, and wrote ſeveral books [*E*]. He died at Zell in May 1541, in the manner he had often deſired to be taken out of the world [*F*], that is, almoſt ſuddenly (*c*). I muſt not forget that his wife was very well ſkilled in the Hebrew tongue (*d*). I muſt obſerve that he publiſhed a converſation he had with her, on the characters of the Meſſias applied to Jeſus Chriſt. She brought him thirteen children (*e*). I ſhall make a remark on the names of this Proteſtant Miniſter [*G*].

(*c*) Extracted from Melch. Adam. *in* Vitis Theolog. p. 70 *& ſeq.*

(*d*) Micrælius, *in* Syntagm. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* p. m. 778.

(*e*) Melch. Adam. *in* Vitis Theol. p. 74.

No

" How wrong ſoe'er you ſpeak, you ſtill will tri-
" umph ;
" For the ſame words, by rich and poor pronounc'd,
" Strike widely different on the hearer's ear."

Shall I quote the following verſes of Plautus ?

Centum doctum hominum conſilia ſola hæc devincit dea,
Fortuna, atque hoc verum'ſt proinde ut quiſque fortuna
utitur,
Ita præcellet, atque exinde ſapere eum omnes dicimus (15).

(15) Plautus *in* Pſeudolo, act. 2. ſcen. 3. ver. 12.

" Fortune, fantaſtic goddeſs, has alone
" More power and weight, than the united counſels
" Of ev'n an hundred ſages. And this is true,
" That as a man is ſmil'd upon by fortune,
" He's thought in all things to excel ; and thence
" The world conclude him to be fraught with
" wiſdom."

Shall I quote the following words of the younger Pliny ? *Quam multum intereſt, quid à quoque fiat, eadem enim facta claritate vel obſcuritate facientium, aut tolluntur altiſſime, aut humillime deprimuntur* (16). i. e. " It " is of great importance who the perſon is by whom " an action is performed ; for the ſame action ſhall " be greatly applauded, or very much diſcommend- " ed, according to the reputation or obſcurity of " thoſe by whom they are performed." Shall I produce an hundred more authorities of the ſame weight ? I will not, but will leave all theſe vulgar topicks, and ſhall only obſerve one thing that may ſeem relative to my ſubject. Had Regius diſputed at Ingolſtad with a Romiſh Prieſt, in quite different circumſtances from the diſpute at Auſburg, himſelf in chains, &c. and the Prieſt on a cuſhion in the midſt of the Senators, this controverſy would have ended either in his baniſhment or ſomething worſe. He would have been reputed a caviller, who wreſted the ſenſe of the Scriptures, and the Prieſt would have been conſidered as the faithful interpreter of the divine original.

(16) Plin. *Epiſt.* 24. lib. 6.

[*D*] *The Duke of Brunſwick . . . . had an extraordinary eſteem for him.*] Being aſked whether, in imitation of other Princes, he had purchaſed any thing of very great value, and in a new faſhion, he replied, *I have brought an ineſtimable treaſure, and which will be of ſervice to all my territories, and which I prefer to delights of every kind* (17). He meant Regius ; and when the city of Auſburg, in 1535, requeſted him to reſtore them that divine, he declared that he would as ſoon part with his eyes (18). He ſettled conſiderable penſions upon him, and gave him the ſuperintendency of all the Churches in his territories (19).

(17) *Allatum eſſe à ſe theſaurum toti ducatui incomparabilem quem omnibus anteponat deliciis.* Melch. Adam. *in* Vitis Theol. p. 78.

(18) *Perinde ut oculos ita & Urbanum ſe amittere nolle.* Idem, ib.

(19) Idem, ibid. and p. 79.

[*E*] *He wrote ſeveral books.*] They are collected into three volumes, the two firſt of which contain the pieces he publiſhed in Latin ; and the other, his German compoſitions (20). This laſt volume, if I miſtake not, has been tranſlated into Latin ; I finding, in the Bodleian catalogue, *Vita & Opera* (Urbani Regii) *Latine reddita per Erneſt. Regium.* Norib. 1562. Melchior Adamus obſerves that ERNEST REGIUS, the Author's ſon, collected all theſe compoſitions, and publiſhed them, divided into a certain number of tomes, at Nuremberg. He makes particular mention of the book in which our Urban had collected the harſh phraſes, and ſuch as are accurate. The former are fit for nothing but to create diviſions, but the latter may be conducive to piety and concord. He undertook this collection at the command of Prince Erneſt of Brunſwick, and it was an inſtance of his piety and wiſdom ; for too rough and poignant expreſſions are like the teeth of Cadmus's dragon, a ſeed of war among brethren. This is Melchior Adamus's reflection (21). *Exſtat inter alia liber ejus, in quo annotatæ ſunt* horridiores formæ loquendi : *& monſtrantur* propriæ ac concinnæ, *utiles pietati ac concordiæ. Has admonitiones ſcribi princeps Erneſtus Lunæburgicus voluit : qua in re ſapientiam & pietatem ejus agnoſcimus. Ut enim ex dentibus draconis, in Cadmæa hiſtoria, nata eſt ſoboles armatorum inter ſe dimicantium : ſic ex improprio ſermone diſſidia opinionum in docentibus & in populo naſcuntur.* This reflection does not occur to the compoſers of formularies, when theſe have more devotion than judgment ; or have more paſſion and vain glory than true devotion. They are abſolute ſtrangers to whatever has the appearance of prudence and moderation, and pride themſelves in ſeverity (22). It is to be obſerved that John Freder of Pomerania publiſhed, after the Author's death, a work of Regius entitled, *Loci Theologici ex patribus & ſcholaſticis neotericiſque collecti* (23).

(21) Melch. Adam. *in* Vitis Theolog. p. 79, 80.

(22) But obſerve, that general terms, and thoſe which are uſed out of condeſcenſion, are ſometimes uſeleſs. See the rem. [*G*] of the art. MUSCULUS.

(23) Melch. Adam. *in* Vitis Theol. p. 80.

[*F*] *He died . . . in the manner he had deſired to be taken out of the world.*] He was ſick but three hours, and he had always wiſhed not to die of a lingering ſickneſs (24). *Nactus eſt genus mortis, quale ſæpè in votis habuit, citum & placidum ; cum ſemper deprecaretur diuturnos languores & longas morborum periodos* (25). He is not the only perſon who deſired ſuch an end, and was gratified in his wiſhes (26).

(24) Idem, p. 79.

(25) Idem, ibid.

[*G*] *I ſhall make a remark on the names of this Proteſtant Miniſter.*] The name of his family was *Roi* (King) ; but thinking it too exalted, and that it afforded too much matter for joking, he changed it into that of *Regius* (27). With regard to the name *Urban*, it was given him at his baptiſm, becauſe the women, who preſented him to the pariſh Prieſt, had forgot the name the mother had told them. The good woman would have the child bear the name of that Saint, whoſe name was in the Calendar on that day on which he was born ; but the women in queſtion forgetting it by the way, and the Prieſt finding them heſitate about it, told them that St. *Urban*'s day was at hand, upon which the child was chriſtened *Urban*. I obſerve by the way that, among all nations, a great many families bear the name of a dignity, as King, Prince, Duke, Marquis, Count, Baron &c. They do not think of changing them, though it gives frequent occaſion to jokes and childiſh alluſions. However, I believe that our Lutheran Doctor is not the only perſon, who, to avoid this inconveniency, diſguiſed his name. We every where meet with people whoſe names are *Regis* or *Regius* : a diſguiſed name, if I miſtake not, for the ſame reaſon. I have ſaid elſewhere (28), that I was ſurprized that ſuch families as have a ridiculous or odious name do not change them ; and I add here, that ſome who formerly had an obſcene name are no longer called by it now. Read the following paſſage from Menage (29) : HAUTECLAIR, " the name of a family. " This name was given in the reign of Henry II. " to a Maſter of the Requeſts, whoſe name was *Couil-* " *lard*, upon a pleaſant occaſion. This Maſter of " the Requeſts uſed to go frequently to the Louvre. " One day as he was tapping gently at the door of " the King's or Queen's cloſet, the gentlemen uſhers " aſked him his name, but he did not dare to tell it " diſtinctly, becauſe of its obſcenity. The gentle- " men uſhers not underſtanding, or feigning not to " do it, bid him ſpeak his name *haut & clair* (loud " and clear) which gave occaſion to his being cal- " led *Hauteclair*. I was told this ſtory by Mr. du " Puy, who was informed of it by Thuanus, who " in the VIIIth book of his hiſtory, pag. 262 of the " Geneva edition, mentions his changing his name, " but occaſionally. *Negotium datum P. Altoclaro, Li-* " *bellorum Supplicum Magiſtro, qui pudendo alio cogno-* " *mine indigetabatur, ut negotium Regium*, &c." He had ſaid in the firſt edition of his *Origines*, that *the*

(26) See the art. VALLA (George).

(27) *Majores ejus Regum cognomine inſignes fuerunt : ſed cum id ſublime & jocis aptum ex Rege regius factus eſt, ut ipſe dictitare ſolitus.* Melch. Adam. *in* Vitis Theol. p. 70.

(28) Rem. [*A*] of the art. FEUARDENT.

(29) Menage, *Origines de la Langue Françoiſe*, p. 395. edit. 1694.

No perſon can doubt, after he has well examined ſeveral paſſages (*f*) in his books, that he is for having prayers offered up for the dead.

(*f*) They are in the *Calvino-Turciſmus*, book 4. chap. 8. p. m. 140 & *ſeq.*

Beauharnois of Orleans alſo changed their name Beauvit, becauſe of its obſcenity, to that of Beauharnois; but it is declared in the ſecond edition that this is a fiction.

I foreſee that thoſe, who ſhall call to mind a remark of de Vigneul Marville, in reading what I ſaid in the Article of Feuardent the Franciſcan, will object to me, that I ought not to be ſurprized at people's not quitting ſirnames of an odious or ridiculous kind. They will aſſert that men are not allowed that liberty, and alledge the following paſſage from the *Melange d'Hiſtoire & de Litterature* (30): *With regard to what Mr. de la Roque ſays, that, ever ſince the ordinance of Amboiſe, dated the 26th of March* 1555, *no one is allowed to change his name without the expreſs leave of the Sovereign: it muſt be obſerved, that long before this ordinance, no perſon was allowed to change his name without having an authority for it.* This is inſtanced in the barber of Lewis XI. and the very words of the Letters patents of this Prince are quoted, by which he wills and ordains that Oliver le Mauvais, (this was his barber's name) [*Le Mauvais*, or, as it was anciently ſpelt, *Ly Mauſtez*, or *le mal faiſant* (evil doer) is one of the words ſynonymous with devil, as the man is called in ſeveral books of that age. Lewis XI made him change this ſirname which was too viſibly odious, into that of *Dain*, and that perhaps out of a malicious complaiſance for a perſon of this ſtamp, who, with all his cunning, was ſo ſtupid as not to know, that in the uſual forms of ſpeaking, *le Dain* and *le Dannée* were alſo ſynonymous, or ſomething like it (α).] that this *le Mauvais, I ſay, and his poſterity, ſhould henceforward bear the ſirname of le Dain . . . and that it ſhall not be lawful for any perſon to give him any more the ſirname of Mauvais; which name we have taken away and aboliſhed, and by theſe preſents, do take away and aboliſh.* Theſe letters are dated in October 1474, and were regiſtered in the Parliament of Paris the 30th of January 1474 (31). If thoſe who would raiſe this objection imagine it to be ſolid, they know not how to form a right judgment of things. I anſwer as follows. I ſay, I. that my expreſſion ought to be taken in the ſame ſenſe with the following; *I am ſurprized that debauchees are not afraid of the injury they do to their health and reputation.* This is ſpeaking in the preſent tenſe, and yet, it regards as much paſt ages as that in which a writer makes ſuch a reflection; and thus, the manner in which I expreſſed myſelf, to denote my ſurprize, that people do not quit ſuch names as are of a ridiculous or odious kind, relates no leſs to the time which preceded the age when this ordinance publiſhed by Mr. de la Roque (32) is dated, than the times that followed it. Now it is certain that, before the date of the ordinance, ſome people laid aſide their names, or changed and diſguiſed them. Mr. de la Roque (33) cites Mr. Menage, who ſays, that *William le Rat, diſpleaſed, as one may ſuppoſe, at his bearing the name of an ugly animal, gave himſelf the ſirname of Leſrat*; and that *John Dorat, Regius profeſſor of the Greek tongue, changed his name Diſnemandy . . . the ancient name of his family, to that of Dorat or Daurat.* It would be abſurd to ſuppoſe that they obtained this permiſſion from the King; de Vigneul Marville does not ſay ſo. *I will ſuppoſe*, ſays he (34), *that before the ordinance of Amboiſe, ſeveral perſons took upon themſelves to change their names, without having recourſe to the Sovereign; and that poſſibly the phyſician named Sanſmalice, might have changed this name into that of Akakia without taking a patent from Francis I; but then it was only the tranſlation of a French word into a Greek one.* Here we have the ſame Author that is objected to me, who himſelf acknowledges, that people changed their names notwithſtanding the patent of Lewis XI, and indeed we ought to ſuppoſe, that it was granted to his barber, not that he might be permitted to change the name of his family, but only that people might not continue to call him by that name. This man was greatly hated in France; and conſequently his enemies would have been pleaſed to croſs the deſign he had of getting rid of a name he was aſhamed of. Such was the motive of the patent. It conſequently was no rule with regard to an hundred other caſes, in which the public was wholly unconcerned. Now if, upon pretence of a Greek tranſlation, a perſon might, without any danger, ſubſtitute the name *Akakia*, for that of *Sans-malice*; much more might it be permitted to ſubſtitute one name for another, when the difference between them conſiſted only in the inſertion, the tranſpoſition, or ſuppreſſion of ſome letters. I ſay II. that experience argues for me, becauſe a great many famous authors have taken up a new name, without any authority from their Prince (35). III. I add, that it is plain that the ordinance of the 26th of March, before Eaſter of the year 1555, was deſigned only to prevent the uſurpations of ſuch as might aſſume nobility to themſelves, or ſome other fraud; ſo that whenever a man had no other deſign than that of Regius, he was not reſtrained by this ordinance. IV. I likewiſe ſay, that in all probability it was not better obſerved than that of the States of Blois, of the year 1579, which forbid *all Gentlemen from ſigning in acts and contracts, any names, except that of their family, upon the penalty of being made void . . . . . This article had not all the wiſhed-for effect: for many perſons, inſtead of obſerving it, directly infringed it, which I obſerved*, adds Mr. de la Roque, *in authentic and public inſtruments* (36). V. I anſwer laſtly, that if the ordinance of Amboiſe was well obſerved, one might nevertheleſs wonder that perſons, who have ridiculous or odious names, do not lay them aſide; for the Sovereign will grant that leave to all who ſue for it (37); and we find among other inſtances, in Mr. de la Roque's book, that *James Miette* (Crumb) (which is a low and groveling name and ſuch as may give a handle to many ſilly jeſts) *had a patent from Henry IV. dated in March* 1603 . . . *by which he was authorized to quit his name, and aſſume that of Lauberie* (38). See the Bigarrures of *des Accords*, Book IV, Chap. II; and Baillet, *Auteurs Déguiſez*, Chap. V. and VI. We are told, in the *Menagiana*, that Father Commire's name was Commere.

(α) *Rem. Crit.*

(30) Vigneul Marville, *Melange*, Tom. 1. p. 259. 1ſt edit. of Roan.

(31) Had Vigneul Marville called to mind that the year then began at Eaſter, he would not have ſaid, *Melanges*, Tom. 1. p. 260. that there is an error in the date; becauſe thoſe letters dated in Octob. 1474, could not be regiſtered till the following year.

(32) Gilles Andrew de la Roque, Sieur of the Lontiere, in his treatiſe *Of the Origin of Names*, p. 182.

(33) Ibid. p. 96.

(34) Vigneul Marville, *Melange*, Tom. 1. p. 260.

(35) See the oration of Majoragius, cited in the rem. [*E*], of his article. See alſo the art. PAREUS (David), rem. [*A*].

(36) La Roque, *Traite de l'origine des Noms*, p. 100.

(37) Idem, ibid. p. 182.

(38) Idem, ibid.

REIHING (JAMES), Profeſſor of Divinity at Tubingen, was born in 1579 at Auſburg, and one of the ancient families called *Patrician*. He was ſent to Ingolſtad to purſue his ſtudies, and made ſuch a progreſs as gave great pleaſure to his maſters (*a*). When he was come to the age, in which the ancient Romans put on the *Toga virilis*, he made a vow to put on the Jeſuit's habit, in caſe he recovered from a dangerous indiſpoſition with which he was afflicted; and having recovered, he fulfilled his vow, notwithſtanding the oppoſition made by his mother (*b*). He went through his noviciat at Landſberg (*c*), and afterwards made a very great figure in the ſociety. He taught the claſſics at Inſpruck, and philoſophy and divinity at Ingolſtad; and diſcharged theſe functions ſo well, that he was thought worthy of a Doctor's Degree in Divinity by Aquaviva the General, and accordingly was admitted to it at Dillingen (*d*). From that time he found himſelf fired with a ſtronger zeal for the defenſe of the Romiſh Communion; on which account he was appointed by his ſuperiors aulick preacher to Wolfgang William

(*a*) He ſtudied in the Jeſuit's College.

(*b*) Extracted from Spizelius, *in Templo Honoris reſerato*, p. 93, 94.

(*c*) Rauſcherus, *in Laud. funebri Reihingi*, apud Witte, *Memor. Theolog.* p. 897.

(*d*) Idem, ibid. p. 898.

William Duke of Newburg, who had lately left the Proteſtant Religion [*A*], and who ordered him to write againſt that religion. He thought of nothing day and night but for arguments that might utterly deſtroy the confeſſion of the Lutherans; but as his adverſaries combated him perpetually with the holy Scriptures, he found himſelf obliged to conſult that divine book and to keep to it; to draw from thence, if poſſible, the arms which were neceſſary for him in that combat. He found, by this ſtudy, that he was engaged in the defenſe of a bad cauſe; upon which he left his employment, and retired to the Court of Wirtemberg [*B*], where he embraced the Lutheran Religion. He was made Profeſſor of Divinity in Tubingen, preacher in ordinary, and director of a College. He diſcharged all theſe functions with great applauſe, and wrote ſome books which met with a favourable reception. The Jeſuits made him the fineſt promiſes, and employed all the alluring arts poſſible to bring him back again [*C*]; but all to no purpoſe, he deſpiſing

[*A*] *The Duke of Newburg, who had lately left the Proteſtant Religion.*] Martin Rauſcherus, who made Reihing's funeral oration, ſays nothing that leads us to believe that this Jeſuit contributed to make the Duke of Newburg change his Religion. Theophilus Spizelius (1), and father Alegambe (2) have been equally ſilent on that head. They all three content themſelves with ſaying, that a little after this Prince had changed his Religion, father Reihing was appointed his Preacher. Some authors nevertheleſs affirm that to this Jeſuit wholly was owing the Duke of Newburg's converſion, and that he won him by worldly views. Here follow the words of a Journaliſt, in the extract of one of Leti's works (3): "The Princes of the houſe of Newburg were formerly Proteſtants; but a Jeſuit, *James Reyhing* by "name, found means to make one of them change "his Religion by ſome pretty good political reaſons "*, which may be ſeen in the author. But a ſurprizing circumſtance is, the converter himſelf afterwards embraced the Proteſtant Religion to repair "in ſome meaſure for the breach he had made in "it, by diſengaging the Duke of Newburg from its "body. Abbot *Pacichelli*, and *Baccati*, Secretary to "the then Pope's Nuncio at Colen, cited by the author, aſcribe this change to a hidden judgment of "God, *à un occulto giudicio de Dio*; but it is not very "difficult for Proteſtants to conceive, that a man who "ſtudies controverſy may change his opinions, and "finds that the Proteſtants are in the right; in like "manner as a Prince, who was a Proteſtant, turns "Roman-Catholic from ſelf-intereſted views. The "one is not more miraculous than the other; and "there is no reaſon to ſay on this occaſion, as one "of the characters in *la Filli di Sciro*:

"*Le vie de gli Dei*
"*Sono oſcure & ritorte*
"*Ch'il crederebbe? in ſomma*
"*E il cielo un Laberinto, in cui ſi perde*
"*Chiunque va per iſpiarne i fati.*"

"The way of God is dark and intricate,
"Surprizing thought! . . . For heaven's a labyrinth,
"Where every man who ſtrives to trace its paths
"In endleſs error's puzzled and bewilder'd."

(1) In *Elogio Reibingii*, in *Templo Honoris reſerato.*

(2) In *Bibl. Script. Societ.* p. 209.

(3) *Bibl. Univ.* Tom. 14. p. 24. in the extract of part 2. of *Ritratti Hiſtorici, overo Hiſtoria dell' Imperio Romano in Germania, ſcritta da Gregorio Leti.*

* p. 162.

[*B*] *He retired to the Court of Wirtemburg.*] Spizelius has been guilty of a great omiſſion on this occaſion, he not ſpecifying the year when he withdrew. This fault has not been committed in our Reihing's funeral oration; but the printers of de Witte's work falſified that date ſo much, that it is of no uſe to me. They ſay that Reihing, having fled from the Duke of Newburg's Court, arrived at that of Wirtemberg the beginning of the year 1601 (4). They doubtleſs forgot *vigeſimi*; for I learn from another author (5), that he retired ſecretly from the Duke of Newburg's the 5th of January 1620; and that he went to Hochſtett to that Prince's mother, whence he went to Ulm, afterwards to Stutgard, and laſtly to Tubingen, where he abjured Popery, and preached on the motives of his converſion, the 2d of January 1621, There appears to me ſome confuſion here, when I compare the relation of Paul Freherus with that of Rauſcherus; for, according to the latter, the new-comer was examined, during a fortnight, and afterwards ſent to Tubingen, where his name was regiſtered in the book of the Rector of the Univerſity. If he arrived at Stutgard in the beginning of January, and there underwent an examination during a week, before he went to Tubingen, as Rauſcherus affirms, he did not preach at Tubingen, on the motives of his converſion, the 2d of January, as Freherus affirms. I believe there are two typographical errors in Freherus's relation; and that, to rectify them, we muſt ſay that Reihing left the Duke of Newburg's Court the 5th of January 1621, and that he preached in Tubingen the 22d of January of the ſame year. The reader muſt not wonder to hear of his being obliged to undergo ſo long an examination. The Proteſtants are extremely miſtruſtful of a Jeſuit; and the condition they were then in in Germany, made ſuch a ſuſpicion neceſſary. Beſides, it is very rare to ſee a Jeſuit of reputation quit his order to turn Proteſtant; for this reaſon ſuch a ſingular thing is conſidered as a kind of prodigy, and ought to be carefully examined, in order to ſee whether it be a good omen, or the forerunner of ſome evil. The Duke of Wirtemberg hearing that father Reihing was come, in order to change his Religion, aſſembled his Divines, and ordered them to examine him very ſtrictly. They perſonated Roman-Catholicks; and propoſed to this father, during a week, the difficulties which are objected to the Proteſtants. He made ſuch an anſwer on that occaſion, as proved that he had compared the two Religions with great care and attention. *Juro vobis Auditores: toto illo, quo res ſeriò utrinque acta eſt, octiduo, ea in omnibus, & quidem cardinalibus fidei noſtræ articulis deprompſit & exhibuit fundamenta, ut neminem non in admirationem ſui converteret: Sacræ etiam Scripturæ teſtimonia, quibus noſtrorum ſententia firmari ſolet, ita in numerato habebat, ita illi præcipui textus erant in mundo* (6), *ac ſi totam ætatem in ſcholis noſtris inſumpſiſſet. Quæ profectò non rudem & novitium, ſed aliquem in hac militia veteranum arguebant* (7). After he had undergone this trial, he was judged worthy of being adopted; and he was addreſſed in the words which Priam addreſſed to Sinon (8). *Soluto conventu lætum ex aula carmen accipit.*

Quiſquis es, amiſſos hinc jam obliviſcere Grajos:
Noſter eris (9).

"The meeting being broke up, the Court compli-
"mented him with the joyful ſong following.

"Diſmiſs thy fears,
"Forget the Greeks, be mine as thou wert theirs.
DRYDEN.

[*C*] *The Jeſuits made him the fineſt promiſes, and employed all the alluring arts poſſible to bring him back again.*] The more the Proteſtants boaſted the converſion of ſo famous a man, the more grieved the Jeſuits were for having loſt him. He had gained the eſteem of the Society by his good life, his eloquence and erudition (10); for which reaſon his converſion was a great grief to the whole order, and a thouſand methods were employed to bring him back again. Father Keller promiſed him all the advantages he could poſſibly deſire; with full liberty, either to return to the Jeſuits, to be a Canon, or to lead a ſecular life. They gave him a *carte blanche*, and aſſured him that his ſuperiors ſhould ratify all the promiſes he ſhould make to him. *Quam lautus ille* (Kellerus) *fecit pollicitationes? quam pingues conditiones & propter quas vel vadimonium deſeri poſſet, Reihingo obtulit? videlicet*

(4) *Venerat ſub auſpicium ineuntis anni ſupra milleſimum ſexcenteſimum primi in aulam.* Martinus Rauſcherus, *in* Laudat. funebri Reihingi, *apud* Witte, *Memor. Theol.* p. 903.

(5) Paulus Freherus, *in Theatr. Virorum illuſtr.* p. 431.

(6) This is a phraſe of Plautus, which ſignifies the ſame as *in numerato*, or *in promptu.*

(7) Martin. Rauſcherus, *in Laud. fun. Reihingi, apud* Witte, *Memor. Theol.* p. 903.

(8) Virgil. *Æn.* lib. 2. ver. 148.

(9) Rauſcherus, ibid. p. 905.

(10) See the fragment of a Letter of the Jeſuit John Agricola, Chaplain in the army, to Count de Tilli. See, I ſay, this fragment in *Oratione funebri Reihingi, apud* Witte, *Memor. Theol.* p. 898, 899.

I

deſpiſing their inſidious flatteries, as likewiſe the ſlanderous reports they ſpread concerning him [*D*]. He grew dropſical the ſixth year of his converſion, and was ſuffocated by a catarrh

videlicet optionem illi permiſerat, utrum in Lojolæ familia manere, an verò in Canonicum aut Laicum ſe componere eligeret : dummodo ad ſinum Romanæ Eccleſiæ rediret. Proferebat hanc in rem chartam puram, quam Itali biancam vocant, cui inſcriberet, quicquid animo collibitum eſſet ſuo : nec de approbatione Superiorum dubitaret (11). Conrad Reihing the Jeſuit, who was Rector of the College at Auſburg, and the convert's brother, was perpetually writing to, and exhorting him to return into the boſom of the Church (12) ; and ſeveral other Jeſuits wrote to him to the ſame purpoſe. Chriſtopher Grenzing, his Provincial, was the firſt who endeavoured to bring him back ; promiſing that the ſociety would be merciful to him. *Quid dicam de literis Chriſtophori Grenzing Provincialis, qui primus ex omnibus à fuga illum retrahere tentavit cum hoc monito : quod* Societas redeunti viſcera miſerationis & benignitatis recludat (13) ? Even the General himſelf, Mutius Vitelleſchi, cauſed him to be informed, with a thouſand proteſtations of ſincerity, that he ſhould be received with open arms, and that he ſhould not have the ſame treatment as Mark Antonio de Dominis had met with, but the moſt favourable uſage poſſible. But yet Reihing would not truſt to theſe promiſes ; or rather was ſo firmly perſuaded, that the Church he had left was not the true one, that he perſevered inviolably in the Proteſtant. George Stengelius the Jeſuit owned, in ſome printed pieces, that their ſociety had received a deep wound by his leaving their ſociety : *Nec diſſimulavit hoc ipſum Georgius Stengelius, qui in ſcriptis ſuis hactenus publicatis, non uno loco conqueritur*, ingens diſceſſione Reihingi Societati ſuæ vulnus eſſe inflictum (14). There is ſcarce any Order of Friers, out of which the Proteſtants have gained ſo few Proſelytes as from that of the Jeſuits, a circumſtance that encreaſed their ſorrow rather than leſſened it. It will appear by the following words, how greatly the Proteſtants triumphed on account of ſo ſingular an accident (15). *Quod quidem factum, quàm illuſtre, quàm admirabile, quàm inſperatum rarumque nobis acciderit, ne commonere quidem vos opus eſt. Clericum Regularem, & Societatis Ignatianæ Patrem ad caſtra tranſire Evangelicorum, contra quos hactenus omni impetu ſteterat : ſive ut Latinè dicam,* Jeſuitam fieri Lutheranum, *res eſt imprimis memorabilis, & in tabulas æternitatis referenda. Res, cujus prædicatio, multorum adhuc ſeculorum ingenia, ipſamque poſteritatis memoriam fatigabit. Res, quam nemo hodie* (16) *aut fando acceperit, aut oculorum fide fuerit arbitratus.* i. e. " I need not inform you, how " great, how wonderful, how unexpected and ſin- " gular this incident was. For a regular Prieſt, a fa- " ther of the ſociety of Jeſus, to go over to the " camp of the Proteſtants, whom he before had com- " bated with all his ſtrength : or to ſpeak plainly, " *for a Jeſuit to turn Lutheran*, is a moſt remarkable " event, and worthy of being inſcribed in the re- " giſters of eternity : an event, the applauſes where- " of ſhall employ the genius of many ſucceeding " ages, and even tire the memory of poſterity : an " event, which no man of the preſent age ever heard " of, or had been an eye-witneſs to." Such examples have been rare in France ; however, there was one there in 1647, when Jarrige turned Proteſtant.

(11) Rauſcherus, ibid. *apud* Witte, *Memor. Theol.* p. 912.

(12) Idem, ibid. p. 913.

(13) Rauſcherus, *in Laud. funebri Reihingi, apud* Witte, *Memor. Theol.* p. 913.

(14) Ibid. p. 899.

(15) Idem, ibid. p. 904.

(16) This Author had doubtleſs forgot the converſion of Haſenmullerus. I mention this in the rem. [*E*], of the art. JARRIGE.

[*D*] *He deſpiſing . . . the ſlanderous reports they ſpread concerning him.*] Some verſes in the German tongue were made againſt him, in which he was ſlandered in the moſt horrid manner ; and letters were ſpread in the cities or courts of Germany, in which he was deſcribed as a finiſhed villain. He was called a Paraſite, who had preferred good eating, and rich wines, to ſolitude and prayer. He was accuſed of having been too great a lover of the fair ſex ; to have been ſo far ſmit with a girl that he debauched her, and got her with child ; and that her protuberancy having diſcovered her crimes, he was obliged to fly in order to avoid an ignominious puniſhment. *Circumvolitarunt vernacula lingua infames rythmi, & calumnioſæ literæ, aulas, urbes, oppida perniciosiſſimè pererrarunt. Narrarunt aulæ Palatinæ paraſitum : gynæcei aſſeclam : argenteos orbes, exquiſita fercula, & liquorem illius Dei, qui olim Indos expugnavit, præ lectione, præ oratione, præ ſolitudine amaſſe : vitæ cœlibis quietem deliciis prætuliſſe : Floræ & Veneris, non Societatis Sacerdotem fuiſſe : ſalacitatis lubidine pruriiſſe : ſpecioſam puellam impudicè deperiiſſe : inclinaſſe virginem, & infami compreſſu gravidaſſe : cumque illa uteri bulgam plus æquo intumeſcentem celare non poſſet, deſerto vadimonio, mali facinoris infamiam, & pœnas metuentem erupiſſe* (17). Reihing refuted theſe ſlanders by a beautiful apology, which he ſent to the Court of Wirtemberg (18). A thing happened which evidently diſcovered his innocence. The Duke of Bavaria ſent three deputies to the Court, *viz.* Henry of Stein, Faber the Civilian, and Father Keller the Jeſuit, Rector of the College of Munich. Theſe were ordered to requeſt the delivering up of this deſerter, and they enumerated all the crimes that were laid to his charge. The Duke of Wirtemberg anſwered, that if Reihing was guilty of thoſe crimes, they had no more to do but to proceed againſt him according to law ; that he would appoint ſuch men for Judges as were men of integrity, who ſhould pronounce ſentence upon him impartially : but that if the Proſelyte was innocent, it would be but juſt to let him follow, undiſturbed, that religion which appeared to him the beſt (19). If it ſhould happen, added the Duke, that my two Chaplains ſhould quit their religion, I would not ſtir out of my chamber on that account. " *Subjunxit hoc mantiſſæ loco gene-* " *roſiſſimus Princeps :* Quod ſi fors hodie eveniret, " utrumque Aulæ meæ Concionatorem à Religione " ſua deficere : eorum cauſa, ne pedem quidem uni- " cum extra limen promoverem (20)." Upon this Father Keller had a conference with him, on which occaſion he reproached him with the great number of irregularities, which had given occaſion to ſo many ſongs and ſatyrical letters. Reihing vindicated himſelf on all theſe points, with great vigour, and even took an oath for his juſtification before the Duke of Bavaria's three deputies (21). " *Memores reſponſi* " *iſtius, quod tibi comitibuſque tuis, in præſentia virorum* " *honoratiſſimorum, manu pectori admota, & ſublatis in* " *cœlum oculis catapultæ inſtar retorſit.* Ego, *inquie-* " *bat ille*, in conſpectu Cœleſtis illius Arbitri hic con- " ſiſto, qui quæ nos gerimus, auditque & videt. Co- " ram divina ejus Majeſtate agnoſco me peccatorum " non infimum : ſed hunc teſtem invoco, vacare me " culpa omnium, quæ imputantur, probrorum : fal- " lentem vindicet, qui nunquam fallitur." i. e. " Re- " membring that anſwer, which he darted back, " like a battering engine, upon you and your com- " panions ; in the preſence of ſome moſt honourable " men, with eyes uplifted, and laying his hand on " his breaſt. *I here ſtand*, ſays he, *before that celeſtial* " *Judge, who hears and ſees every thing we do. I* " *acknowledge myſelf, in preſence of his divine Majeſty,* " *not the leaſt of ſinners. However I call upon him to* " *witneſs, that I am guiltleſs of all thoſe crimes which* " *are laid to my charge : and may that Being, who never* " *errs, take vengeance of me, in caſe I tell an un-* " *truth.*" Keller not being able to make any impreſſion on his quondam brother Jeſuit, withdrew, ſaying at the ſame time, *Eve has made you fall.* His meaning on this occaſion was, that Reihing was prompted to quit the ſociety of the Jeſuits and Popery, from a deſire of getting a wife. All the accuſations were at laſt reduced to this ; the reſt vaniſhed ; but they perſiſted in aſſerting, that the only motive of his leaving the Romiſh Communion was, his having an amorous attachment. It is added, that after he had married, and had had many children, he found himſelf loaded with ſo many clogs, that he had not ſtrength enough to return into the boſom of the Church ; and that at his leaving the world he went to hell. Such is the reproach which Alegambe caſts at him. *Prolapſus in turpes amores, ordinem, fidemque tranſfuga deſeruit, factus errorum magiſter : ductâ dein domum pellice pro uxore, ſuſceptis compluribus liberis, ita miſer implicatus eſt, ut ad veritatis confeſſionem redire not ſuſtineret. Sic in æternam mortem occubuit* (22). This is ſo trite, ſo thread-bare a common place, that I am ſurprized writers are not weary of employing it. It has been turned a thouſand different ways ; and ſome warm men have choſe to employ it

(17) Rauſcherus, *in Laud. funebri Reihingi, apud* Witte, *Memor. Theolog.* p. 905.

(18) Idem, ibid. p. 906.

(19) *Si hæc crimina, quorum rèum poſtularent, deferrentque, veritate niterentur : fas eſſe, & poteſtatem ipſis in Aula adverſus eum lege ac judicio experiri : habiturosque judicem neutri parti obnoxium, ſed ex æquo & bono jus dicentem. Sin autem, &c.* Idem, ibid. p. 908.

(20) Idem, ibid.

(21) Idem, ibid. p. 906. Theſe are the words of the Orator, addreſſed to Father Keller.

(22) Alegambe, *Bibl. Script. Societ.* p. 209. It is to be obſerved, that Father Sotuel has ſuppreſſed the whole article of James Reihing.

a catarrh ſome time after (*e*) [*E*]. Several new falſities were ſpread concerning his death [*F*]. Here follows a catalogue of his writings [*G*].

(*e*) Extracted from Spizelius, *in Templo Honoris reſerato*, p. 95 & *ſeq.*

REINESIUS

it againſt all the Proteſtants in general, than againſt the Proſelytes. They ſay, that the firſt care the Proteſtants have with regard to a Monk or a Prieſt, who goes over to their Communion, is to look out a wife for him: this is a comment they employ in order to incorporate him into their ſect, and to keep him firmly attached to it (23). They are perſuaded that ſuch birds of prey as theſe cannot be better allured, nor ſo over-tamed, than by that bit of fleſh. But how groſs is all this! I relate it only as an inſtance of the brutal expreſſions, which controverſial writers often make uſe of. *Quinetiam auſim dicere eos ſtudioſius multò laborare in quærenda quamprimùm, & fucati conjugii glutino alliganda unicuique transfugæ concubina, quàm in indaganda vitæ præteritæ ratione ac moribus. Illud quippe certò credunt non poſſe id genus accipitres vel efficaciùs accerſiri, vel meliùs cicurari, quam ſi ejuſmodi carnis illicio ineſcentur* (24). Father Reihing doubtleſs foreſaw, that they expected he would do the ſame, and that he ſhould be expoſed to thoſe ſevere jokes, in caſe he married; but he paid a great regard to the tenet of the great Apoſtle of the gentiles, who orders Biſhops to marry; and who has ranked among the doctrines of Satan, the prohibition with regard to marriage. He therefore married the year following; and made choice in his native country, of a wife whom he had never ſeen (25). She was an excellent woman, and of a very good family; beautiful, prudent, and adorned with virtues of every kind. *Altero, poſtquam in hanc urbem venit, anno, cum Tarſenſis Apoſtoli mandatum animo ſecum verſaret,* quo EPISCOPUM unius Uxoris Virum eſſe juſſit, *& quo nomine ipſe ille Gentium Doctor doctrinam matrimonio interdicentium appellaret, animum ad conjugium appulit, exemploque ſuo vetus illud Euripidis comprobavit:* Fatalem viro fœminæque torum eſſe (26).

(23) Compare this with the *Nouvelles Lettres de la Critique generale de Maimbourg*, p. 497, 498.

(24) Jacob. Gualterius, *Tabula Chronographica*, ſæc. 11. cap. 6. p. m. 636.

(25) Her name was Mary Velſer, and ſhe was the daughter of Anthony Felix Velſer, *Morum & virtutum & formæ ornamentis conſpicua lectiſſimaque Virgo.* Rauſcherus, *in Laudat. funebri Reibingi, apud* Witte, *Memor. Theol.* p. 909.

(26) Idem, ibid.

A REFLEXION on the paſſage in which St. Paul ſeems to command Biſhops to marry.

It is to be obſerved that Reihing, and the author of his funeral orations explain St. Paul's words as a precept: theſe declare that the Apoſtle commands the Miniſters of the Goſpel to marry, and to have but one wife. This doubtleſs would be the true interpretation of St. Paul's words, was it to be underſtood literally, I mean according to the rules of Grammar; for the words which denote the Biſhop's marriage with one wife, are as much governed by the word *muſt* (27), as thoſe which denote the Biſhop's blameleſs life, his ſobriety, prudence, gravity, modeſty, equity, moderation and diſintereſtedneſs. Now as it would be abſurd to pretend, that St. Paul leaves Miniſters at liberty to be ſober, modeſt, blameleſs, &c. or to be otherwiſe; it is abſurd to pretend, that he leaves it to their choice to marry a woman or not to marry with any; this, I ſay, is abſurd, if we ſtick to the literal ſenſe, and ſuppoſe that St. Paul adhered ſtrictly to the Grammar rules. I do not ſpeak of ſuch a rigorous accuracy as is obſerved in articles of a treaty of peace, in which all the expreſſions are weighed, to prevent any abuſe that might ariſe from an ambiguity, or the omiſſion of a particle. Nor do I ſpeak of the ſevere accuracy of thoſe ſcrupulous, pedantic Grammarians, who had rather employ three hours in correcting a period, than to let the leaſt negligence eſcape them. I ſpeak of a clear and unconfuſed way of expreſſion, as perſons of good ſenſe would uſe in a letter, in which they ſhould give ſome orders to a tutor. Should a parent write as follows: *I will have my children ſay their prayers twice a day; to go to Church twice a week; to forbear ſwearing and quarrelling; to be obedient to their mother, and to go to the Play-houſe every Monday*; the tutor would look upon all theſe as precepts; and not conclude that it was left to his diſcretion, either to take his pupils to the Play-houſe every Monday, or not take them; for, in this caſe, he would have ſuppoſed that the parent would not have connected *I will*, with *have them go to the Play-houſe*; and that the parent of his pupils would have changed the verb; that he ſhould ſay, for inſtance, *and I give you leave to take them to the Play-houſe every Monday*. It therefore muſt be granted, that if a ſophiſt ſhould perſiſt obſtinately in maintaining, that whatever St. Paul ſays of the qualities of a Biſhop is obligatory, it would not be eaſy to refute it; and that a perſon would be forced humbly to beg his leave, to permit him to depart from the ſtrictneſs of the Grammar rules (28): ſince it is not likely, that the Apoſtle in queſtion would exclude from epiſcopacy thoſe, who had the gift of continency, and were adorned with all the talents requiſite for a Biſhop. By this we ſee, that too ſcrupulous an adherence to the literal ſenſe of the Scripture, would frequently lead into error; and that the axiom, *ſummum jus ſumma injuria*, ought to be often obſerved and conſidered by the interpreters. We ſee, at the ſame time, that we muſt do, not what the Apoſtles ordain according to the grammatical ſenſe; but what good ſenſe tells us they intend to ordain. St. Paul, according to the laws of Grammar, commands Biſhops to marry; but reaſon ſuggeſts to us, that he intended only to forbid their having a plurality of wives. We muſt therefore adhere to this. Reihing, and thoſe of the ſame opinion with him, are in the wrong to ſuppoſe that an order is here given to marry; all we rationally find in it is leave for that purpoſe; but their error deſerves much more to be excuſed, than the abominable boldneſs in forbidding the Clergy to marry. Chriſtians will never be able to juſtify themſelves before God, for their baſe weakneſs in ſuffering the annulling of the laws of St. Paul, than which none were ever more clear, deciſive and intelligible. They have been ſeverely puniſhed for this by the horrid flood of impurities that have polluted their families, and which ſtill pollute them. I will obſerve by the way, that the Scriptures have been treated by the Chriſtians in much the ſame manner as the Code of Juſtinian. They are very glad when the common law agrees with the written law; but if they find their account better in the common, than in the written law, they diſpenſe with the want of conformity. The Chriſtian Religion, during many ages, was not a country, as it were, governed by written laws.

(28) It is here we ſhould apply the rule of Grammar, *Grammaticæ leges plerunque Eccleſia ſpernit.*

[*E*] *He was ſuffocated by a catarrh ſome time after.*] Here follows a freſh omiſſion of Spizelius. He does not ſet down either the day or the year of Reihing's death. To ſupply this defect, I ſhall obſerve that this quondam Jeſuit died the 5th of May 1628 (29). He went to a bath, by the advice of Phyſicians, and having laid down to take ſome reſt, he fell aſleep and never waked. His Panegyriſt calls this a happy death (30), ſuch a one as Auguſtus wiſhed might befall himſelf and his friends. *Ultimum maximumque mortalium votorum nactus, εὐθανασίαν, quam ille orbis Regnator Auguſtus olim ſibi ſuiſque exoptavit* (31).

(29) Rauſcherus, *in Laud. funebri Reibingi, apud* Witte, *Memor. Theol.* p. 916. Micrælius, *Synt. Hiſt. Eccleſ.* p. m. 778, fixes his death at 1624, which is wrong.

[*F*] *Several new falſities were ſpread concerning his death.*] He was reported to be dead before he really was; his dropſy was aſcribed to the vengeance of heaven; his dying without receiving the Communion occaſioned many ſevere reflections; they affirmed that he was tortured, in his expiring moments, by the ſtings of conſcience (32); at laſt they gave out that, juſt as he was dying, he recanted in preſence of his neighbours. It is very proper to take notice of ſuch particulars, as they ſhew the blindneſs and fury of paſſions, and the deſtruction of good ſenſe. *Vidimus volantes è vicinia chartas, immò ab Allobrogibus uſque in manus noſtras pervenerunt literæ, quæ eum in ſuprema vitæ meta poſitum, Evangelium ejeraſſe, & in præſentia Vicinorum, ipſiuſque D. PREGITZERI palinodiam ceciniſſe loquerentur. O linguæ! ô calami! ô animorum effrons nequitia! Pudor & verecundia quò receſſiſtis? Aliter tu loqueris Reverende Pregizere* (33). i. e. " We have ſeen papers, from the neighbourhood, " ſpread among us; nay letters, from the South of " France, have come to us, which declare that he, " in his expiring moments, abjured the Goſpel; and " recanted, in preſence of his neighbours and of " Pregitzer himſelf. O tongues! O pens! O impu- " dent wickedneſs! Shame and modeſty, to what re- " gions are you withdrawn? Thou, O reverend Pre- " gizer, will ſpeak in a different ſtrain."

(30) Compare this with rem. [*F*] of the art. REGIUS.

(31) Rauſcher. *in Laud. funeb. Reibingi, apud* Witte, *Memor. Theolog.* p. 916.

(32) *Horrentis conſcientiæ morſibus mortalitatis lineæ jam vicinus infeſtari cœpit.* Ibid. p. 917.

(33) Idem, ibid.

[*G*] *Here follows a catalogue of his writings.*] His firſt work was printed at Colen in 1615, under the

(27) Δεῖ οὖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίλημπτον εἶναι, μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα, νηφάλεον, σώφρονα, &c. *Oportet ergo epiſcopum irreprehenſibilem eſſe, unius uxoris virum, ſobrium, prudentem, &c.* 1 Timoth. cap. iii. ver. 2.

REINESIUS (THOMAS), one of the moſt learned men of the 17th Century, was born at Gotha (a) a city of Thuringia in Germany, the 13th of December 1587 [A]. He was a Phyſician, but applied himſelf with prodigious aſſiduity to the ſtudy of polite literature, in which part of learning he chiefly excelled. He had practiſed phyſic in other places (b), when he ſettled at Altemburg, to be Phyſician of that city, where he reſided ſeveral years, and was made a burgomaſter. At laſt, after having been raiſed to the employment of Counſellor to the Elector of Saxony, he went and lived at Leipſic, and died there the 14th of February (c) 1667 (d). He had often refuſed to be a Profeſſor from the fear he was under of meeting with inſupportable Collegues [B], and it is highly probable, that, had he accepted of any academical employment, he would have been involved

(a) And not at Altemburg, as it is ſaid in Moreri.

(b) Witte, *in Diario Biographico*, ad ann. 1667. Vide the rem. [B], citat. (10).

(c) And not in 1657, as we are told in Konig's *Bibliotheque*, in Moreri, and other Authors.

(d) *Ex eodem* Witte, *in Diario Biographico*, ad ann. 1667.

title of *Muri civitatis ſanctæ*, hoc eſt *Fundamenta* XII *Religionis Catholicæ quibus inſiſtens Sereniſſimus Princeps Neoburgicus, Lutheraniſmo abdicato in Eccleſiam pedem intulit*. He was at that time a violent Papiſt. Balthazar Meiſnerus, Fabrice Baſſecourt, and Matthias Hoe wrote againſt him. *Meiſnerus è theſibus ſcalam centum & quadraginta gradus altam fabricavit, qua MUROS BABYLONIS ROMANÆ, ET CONFICTA PAPISTICÆ RELIGIONIS FUNDAMENTA demoliebatur. Baſſecourtus TUBA DEI armatus, AD SUBVERTENDOS MUROS Eccleſiæ Romanæ progreſſus, eos velut illa Hierichuntis mœnia uno clangore diffiare & ſolo æquare eſt aggreſſus. Ultimus Matthias Hoe* Enchiridion *oppoſuit, in quo Romanæ fidei nebulæ clariſſima Scripturarum luce diſcutiebantur* (34). He publiſhed an anſwer to the two firſt, and it was printed at Newburg in 1617. The title of it is as follows: *Excubiæ Angelicæ Civitatis Sanctæ pro defenſione* XII *Fundamentorum Catholicorum Balthaſari Meiſniro præconi Lutherano, & Fabricio Baſſecourt, Tibicini Calviniano oppoſitæ*. He anſwered Matthias Hoe in German, and the title of his reply anſwers to what follows: *Enchiridium Catholicum Manuali D. Hoe oppoſitum*. See the title of the works he publiſhed, after he had embraced the confeſſion of Auſburg. *Laquei Pontificii contriti; quibus, adjuvante DOMINO, liberatus, Liberatori ſuo Ter Opt. Max. libenter meritò publicas gratias in Academia Tubingenſi dicere voluit.* Tubingæ 1622 in 4to. Germanicè, ibidem *eodem anno* in 4to. *Diſſertatio de vera Chriſti in terris Eccleſia, adverſus larvatum Jeſuitam Dillinganum*, ibid. 1622 in 4to. *Araneorum operæ, quas contra laqueos Pontificios contritos texturam improbam ſuſpenderunt Georgius Stengelius, Simon Schaitenreiſſer, & Laur. Forerus, Stylo Reihingi dejectæ*, ibid. 1623 in 4to. *Apologeticus pro Diſſertatione ſua, de Eccleſia Chriſti*, ibid. 1624, in 4to. He publiſhed in German (35), a recantation of the book written by him againſt Doctor Matthias Hoe.

(34) Rauſcher. *in Laud. funebri Reihingi*, apud Witte, *Memor. Theol.* p. 900.

(35) At Tubingen, in 1623.

[A] *He was born . . . the 13th of December* 1587.] Though I ſaw this date in large letters under the print of Reineſius prefixed to one of his books (1), I nevertheleſs was a little diffident about it, when I conſidered that the Authors of *Acta Eruditorum* ſay that he died the 14th of February 1667, aged ſeventy years (2). Theſe Journaliſts are very accurate; and no one had a better opportunity than they had of knowing the true age of this learned man. I alſo ſaw that Andrew Charles Abbot of St George in the territory of Wirtemberg obſerves that he lived upwards of ſeventy years, *obiit* Thomas Reineſius *ſeptuagenario major* (3). Writers do not ſpeak in this manner of a man who dies in his eightieth year. But I was no longer uncertain when I found a letter of Reineſius, in which it is affirmed, that it was near ſeventy years that his maſters had adviſed him to conſult Dictionaries often (4). He wrote this the 10th of February 1665. This is a very ſtrong confirmation of the date we find under the print.

(1) His Letters *ad Hoffmannum & Rupertum*, printed at Leipſic in 1660.

(2) *Acta Eruditorum*, Leipſ. 1682. p. 92.

(3) Andreas Carolus, *Memor. Eccleſ.* lib. 7. ad ann. 1667. p. 409.

(4) Reineſ. *Ep.* 29. *ad Joannem Vorſtium*, p. 61.

[B] *He had often refuſed to be a Profeſſor, from the fear he was under of meeting with inſupportable Collegues.*] His firſt letter (5), to Gaſpar Hoffman Profeſſor of Phyſic in Altorf, informs me of this particular. This Profeſſor had informed him by letter, that, during thirty years, he had been expoſed to the noiſe and ſlanders of thoſe who envied him, and that he had been attacked with great violence (6). Reineſius replied, that he alſo was perſecuted by certain jealous wrong-headed people; that there was ſo little true friendſhip left in the world, and ſo little order and juſtice among the learned, that, in order to avoid the ſtorm, he had concealed himſelf the greateſt part of his life. *Me quoque circumſtrepunt & adfligunt turbæ æmulorum, invidorum ſuſurri, ſemidoctorum impudentia judicia. His enim heu! execrandis moribus hodiè vivitur, ut de Bonis judicent peſſimi, de artibus imperiti, in literis dominentur thraſones; omnia ſint fucata, & genuinarum amicitiarum nihil ferè reſtet; quas intemperies ſeriò deploravi ſemper, & ut declinarem iſta paſſiva, βιώσας maximam partem λέληθα* (7). Having been frequently invited to accept of academical Profeſſorſhips, adds he, I refuſed them; I believing that it would not be poſſible for me to bear with the ill humours of certain perſons with whom I ſhould have been obliged to aſſociate; and I choſe rather to live here though I had a very eaſy life. He was then Phyſician to the city of Altemburg. *Nominatus toties ab Academicis, vocatuſque à Principibus ad munus docendi publicum; repugnavi, ſocio uno alteroque è noſtratibus (non enim ſum πολύφιλος) conſilii, voluntatibus utrorumque, quòd mores incommodos nonnullorum, cum quibus vivendum eſſet, tolerare poſſe non confiderem, & manſi in ſtatione, nec ipſa ſatis commodâ* (8). Here follows part of the inconveniencies the particulars of which he enumerates. Theſe are not improper in this place, as they are ſo many circumſtances relating to the hiſtory of his life (9). *Quid enim hoc decennio* Altenburgi (Curienſia & Gerana (10) *tranſmittam, etſi & illic ſat fuerit nubilorum) non expertus ſum, in quo non tentatus? Poſt triſte ſpectaculum expilatæ domûs amiſi intra ſemeſtre tres jucundiſſ. filios, ſuaviſſimam conjugem, incomparabilem fœminam; ſolum animus DEO nixus & invictus mihi ſupereſt, cum tantillo boni nomini, & quantum ſatis eſt frugali opum.* Λιτῶς μὲν ἀλλ' ἐν ἐλευθερίᾳ. *Trinâ vice, me Phyſico, τὸ λοιμῶδες ἐπιδήμιον hanc urbem adflavit . . . Conjugium, quod ante triennium ſecundum inivi, eſt incommodius, quàm ſperaveram, & multis rei familiaris tricis, quas tamen deprecatus fui, me involvit, &, quod caput eſt, ſterile; quò malo triſtius nihil obvenire poterat antè liberis orbato, ᾧ ὅλῳ ἀπιφιφάτῳ.* i. e. "What trials have I not undergone, what difficulties "have I not met with, during theſe ten years, at "Altenburg, not to mention Hoff and Gera where I "ſuffered very much? After the melancholy acci"dent of having my houſe plundered, I was ſo un"happy as to loſe, in leſs than half a year, three "delightful boys, with a moſt engaging and in"comparable wife. The only thing now left me is "a mind which, relying entirely upon God, cannot "be overcome; with a little reputation, and as "much wealth as is ſufficient for a frugal perſon. "I choſe for my motto *plainly but freely*. Since my "being Phyſician in this city, it has been thrice "afflicted with the Plague. My ſecond wife, whom "I married about three years ago, has involved me "in more inconveniencies than I was aware of; and "encumbered me with many petty domeſtic cares, "I had always wiſhed to be free from; and, which "is the moſt grievous circumſtance of all, ſhe is bar"ren, than which nothing more calamitous could "have happened to a man, who, before, had loſt all "his children, and is entirely deſtitute as it were."

(5) It is dated at Altemburg, Octob. 10. 1638.

(6) See Reineſius's Letters, *ad Hoffmannum & Rupertum*, p. 2.

(7) Idem, ibid. p. 6.

(8) Ibid.

(9) Ibid. p. 7.

(10) He underſtands by *Curienſia*, the employment of Phyſician to the city of Hoff (in Latin *Curia*) in Voitgland; and by *Gerana* a like employment at *Gera*, a city in the ſame country belonging to the Lords of Plaven, whoſe family name is *Reuſſen*, in Latin *Rutheni*.

I am to obſerve, that many deſigning perſons had ſent to Hoffman ſeveral ſheets of the three books of Reineſius's *Variarum Lectionum* whilſt it was at preſs. They did this in hopes of making Hoffman write againſt that work (11); but they were diſappointed in their views; for Hoffman finding himſelf applauded in that part of the book which was ſent to him, forgave the affront he imagined he had received from Reineſius, and wrote a very obliging letter

(11) Reineſ. *Epiſt. ad Hoffmannum & Rupertum*, p. 5.

volved in many quarrels; for he could not avoid falling out with a Profeſſor at Leipſic, though they lived at ſo great a diſtance from one another. This at firſt was a literary conteſt, but afterwards roſe to a law-ſuit (e). I cannot ſay whether Reineſius left any children; but I know that in 1638 he complained of having loſt his firſt wife, as well as the children ſhe had brought him; and had then been married three years to a ſecond wife, who was barren (f). This was the chief, but not the only inconveniency he found in theſe ſecond nuptials. He partook of the liberality, which Lewis XIV. indulged the moſt famous learned men in Europe. At the ſame time that the preſent was ſent him, he received a very obliging letter from Mr. Colbert, for which favour he ſhewed his gratitude, by dedicating to him his obſervations on the fragment of Petronius in 1666. Such as are able to judge of a literary ſubject, have no ſooner read a few pages of his writings, but they take him from among the number of thoſe Philologers whoſe only talent is memory; and rank him among ſuch critics who go beyond what they read, and know more than their books taught them. Their penetration makes them draw a great many conſequences; and ſuggeſts conjectures, which lead them to the diſcovery of hidden treaſures. By this means they dart a light into the moſt gloomy places of literature, and extend the limits of the knowledge of antiquity. Reineſius was in this claſs of critics; and he made it his utmoſt endeavours to diſcover things which had not been obſerved by others. Should his Supplement to Voſſius *De Hiſtoricis Græcis* be publiſhed, the world will wonder that Voſſius, who had drawn up ſo beautiful and ample a collection, ſhould have omitted a great number of particulars. We learn by Reineſius's printed letters, that he was conſulted as an oracle; that he anſwered very learnedly whatever queſtions were brought to him; that he was extremely well ſkilled in the families of ancient Rome, and in the ſtudy of inſcriptions. A very fine elogium is given of his merit, as well as of his learned

(e) See the rem. [B].

(f) See the ſame rem.

letter to him (12). I fancy I ſhall not be miſtaken, if I venture to ſay, that the ſharpeſt quarrel in which Reineſius was ever engaged, was that he had with Rivinus profeſſor in Leipſic. Reineſius declares that he himſelf was not the aggreſſor; and that he had only replied to the injurious expreſſions of that antique. Nevertheleſs, the latter made his complaints to the Magiſtrates; and endeavoured to the utmoſt of his power to prevent Reineſius's anſwer from being publiſhed. Can any thing be more unjuſt? *Nunquam odio habui hominem; ſed calumniatorem & projectiſſimæ proterviæ accuſatorem ferre non debui tamen. Etiamnum hodie crepant nutantque ſubſellia Judicum apud Nos, ad quos me, ſtulte querens de injuriis quas Ipſe prior intuliſſet, deferebat, neque ſuæ famæ ſatis cavens, dum meam maculare intenderet μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας καὶ ὑψηλ. ληγορίας. . . . .* Defenſionem *meam, quàm à provocantis impudentia impoſita mihi neceſſitas excuſat, in amicorum ſinu depoſui* (13) . . . *Dixit, quæ voluit; æquum eſt ut audiat quæ nolet. . . . Ex eo vero, quod* apologiam *meam tot adhibitis machinis, mendaciis etiam, ſupprimere anniſus fuit, malam cauſam fovere judicatus eſt dudum, & deſignaſſe facinus, quod æternam nomini ejus inuſſit notam. Voluit nimirum ut ipſe de me cenſor ſedere poſſet, ſed ἀνυπεύθυνος; voluit ut liceret ſibi in me quidvis; mihi ne quidem hiſcere contrà* (14). i. e. "I never "bore hatred to the man; but then I did not think "myſelf obliged to bear with his calumnies and moſt "impudent accuſations. Our Law Courts, even to "this day, echo with his ſilly complaints againſt me, "though for injuries which I had received from "him. He does not value how much he injures his "own reputation, provided he can but injure mine, "with his odd inſinuations and inflated expreſſions. "I have put into the hands of my friends the de"fenſe I drew up for myſelf, which his inſolence "rendered excuſable in me. He indulged his incli"nation in ſaying whatever he pleaſed; it is there"fore juſt he ſhould hear things that will be ungrate"ful to him. . . . But, from his endeavouring, by "ſo many artifices and lies, to ſuppreſs my Apolo"gy, it has been long ſince concluded that he was "engaged in a bad cauſe; and alſo proved that "he had wicked views, which have branded his "name with eternal infamy. He deſired truly to "ſit as cenſor over my actions, without being called "to account for it; he would have had the liberty "to do what he pleaſed with me, and not ſuffer me "to make the leaſt complaint againſt him." Reineſius's Apology was printed, in ſpite of the oppoſition made by the aggreſſor. I have extracted this from a letter written the 7th of Auguſt 1653. See alſo the letter which Reineſius wrote to Boſius the 18th of January of the ſame year (15).

(12) Reineſ. *Ep. ad Hoffmannum & Rupertum*, p. 1.

(13) Reineſ. *Ep.* 44. *ad Daumium*, p. 122.

(14) Ibid. p. 123.

(15) *Epiſt.* Thomæ Reineſii, & Jo. Andr. Boſii, p. 13.

A REFLECTION on the imperfections of men of learning, and the difficulty of acquiring tranquillity of mind.

What I have here related, with regard to the misfortunes which Reineſius complained of, ſeems to be the common fate of the learned. The hiſtory of their lives and letters ſhew almoſt always, that they have been engaged in troubleſome conteſts, in which jealouſy, calumny, paſſion, ſatyrs, a ſpirit of faction, fraud, and a thouſand other ſhameful paſſions diſperſe all their venom. Men of learning ſeem to be thoſe who conſpire moſt againſt their own repoſe, and that of their neighbours. This muſt needs create a contempt and hatred for the Sciences; or at leaſt make people no longer entertain the good opinion they otherwiſe might have of them. Ignorant perſons imagine, that had they devoted their whole time to reading, they would have learnt to bridle their paſſions, and to root up a great many faults which prompt them to behave with injuſtice towards their neighbour. But would it be poſſible for them to continue in this way of thinking, did they hear in what manner the moſt learned men abuſe and perſecute one another, and complain of their unhappy fate? Hence we may draw this inference, that nothing is more difficult to acquire than peace and tranquillity of mind. An uninterrupted ſtudy of good books ſeem to be a very natural way of obtaining this treaſure, and yet it ſeldom procures it, and is often productive of the contrary vice. Horace had no manner of notion of this when he wrote as follows: *It is enough that I beſeech God to preſerve my life, and give me riches; I myſelf will be able to procure to myſelf peace of mind.*

Quid ſentire putas? quid credis, amice, precari?
Sit mihi, quod nunc eſt, etiam minus: ut mihi vivam
Quod ſupereſt ævi, ſi quid ſupereſſe volunt Dî:
Sit bona librorum & proviſæ frugis in annum
Copia: ne fluitem dubiæ ſpe pendulus horæ.
Sed ſatis eſt orare Jovem, qui donat, & aufert,
Det vitam, det opes: æquum mî animum ipſe parabo (16).

(16) Horat. *Ep.* 18. lib. 1. *in fine.*

"What thoughts d'ye think thoſe eaſy joys inſpire?
"What do you think I covet or deſire?
"'Tis that I may but undiſturb'd poſſeſs
"The little I have, and if heav'n pleaſes, leſs;
"That I to nature and myſelf may give
"The little time that I have left to live;
"Some books in which I ſome new thoughts may
find,
"To entertain and to refreſh my mind;
"*Some horſes, which may help me to partake*
"*The lawful pleaſures which the ſeaſons make*;
"An eaſy plenty, which at leaſt may ſpare
"The frugal pains of a domeſtic care;
"*A friend, if that a faithful friend there be,*
"*Who can love ſuch an idle life and me*;

"Then

learned and political works, in the dedication (g) to the ſecond edition of Caſaubon's Epiſtles. Some Divines have accuſed him of forming to himſelf a particular religion, compoſed of what he judged the beſt in all others [C]. Hereunder is a catalogue of the greateſt part of his works [D].

(g) Writ by Grævius, and dated at Amſterdam the 31ſt of Auguſt 1655. It is cited in Moreri, and nothing elſe is cited in it, though this Letter makes ſcarce any mention of the particulars related here.

RELAND

" Then heav'n give me but life and health, I'll
" find
" A grateful ſoul and a contented mind."
POOLY, in the tranſlation of Horace, by ſeveral hands.

But Horace was greatly miſtaken; the very thing for which he imagined he ſhould leaſt want the aſſiſtance of God, was what he ought to have leaſt expected from his own abilities and ſtrength, and the firſt he ought to ſue for from Jupiter; for it is much eaſier for a man by his induſtry, to acquire riches and honours than tranquillity of mind. If it be ſaid that honours and riches depend on a thouſand particulars which are not in our diſpoſal; we therefore ought to pray that God may turn them to our advantage; to this I anſwer, that the ſilence and obedience of the paſſions, tranquillity of ſoul, and peace of mind, depend on a thouſand things which are not in our power. The ſtomach, the ſpleen, the lymphatic veſſels, the fibres of the brain, and an hundred other organs neither the ſeat nor figure whereof are known to Anatomiſts, give riſe to many uneaſineſſes, jealouſies and griefs. Is it in our power to change thoſe organs (17)?

(17) Thoſe words of Horace, *Epiſt.* 1. lib. 1. ver. *ult. præcipue ſanus*, (He ſpeaks of the wiſe men of the Stoicks) *niſi cum pituita moleſta eſt*, i. e. " But chiefly " well, except " when vext " with phlegm." (*Creech*) may be very well applied to the ſoul, ſuppoſing *ſanus* to ſignify tranquillity of mind.

[C] *Some Divines have accuſed him of forming to himſelf a particular religion, compoſed of what he judged the beſt in all others.*] A Divine of Wirtemberg, whom I quoted above, affirms that Reineſius, who uſed to go to the Lutheran Churches, and received the Communion with him, ſpoke ſo ill of their Divines, of their Doctrine, and their Liturgies, that a profeſſed enemy ſcarce equalled him. From thence it was concluded, that he was of the religion of the prudent, or favoured it: ſince he had openly declared, that he followed one religion in certain points, and another in another. *Tam ſiniſtrè ſenſit, tam ſcabiosè locutus eſt, de Doctoribus & Profeſſoribus harum* (Lutheranarum) *partium, imò de ipſa doctrina, de ſymbolicis libris, de dogmatibus in iiſdem contentis, ut vix quiſquam ex manifeſtis adverſariis taliter fecerit. Probari hæc poſſunt ex Epiſtolis, quas an.* 1654 *vel circiter, Coloniæ Brandeburgicæ publicavit, ubi contemptim* Formularios *vocat Theologos F. C. amplexos; D. Majorem Seniorem,* Grandionem, *qui applauſores nullos in N. habeat; alios nominat* Archiperecidas, *& ita conſeq. Religioni Prudentum procul ambiguo addictus erat Sycophanta, vel eidem certè favebat apertè faſſus, hoc ſe in una Religione, aliud in alia ſequi* (18). This Divine had explained in another place, what he underſtood by the religion of the prudent. The ſubſtance of his diſcourſe is as follows. A Dutchman ſaid one day, that Grotius's religion was that of learned men. What religion is that, ſays ſome one to him? They believe as they pleaſe, replied he (19). Hulſeman (20) aſks, whether Grotius's meaning is, that one ought to follow the determination or opinion of prudent men; and he thinks that this is the religion of the prudent which is known to few perſons, and is very much cried up in France, and chiefly in Holland. Upon this Mullerus, a Hamburg Divine (21), and Kromaier a Divine of Leipſic (22), looked upon it as certain, that Grotius had followed the religion of the prudent, which is a mixture of ſeveral religions; and borrows, ſometimes from one, and at other times from the other, whatever they pleaſe, and ſuits it to their intereſt. It is called the religion of the prudent, becauſe the wiſe men of this world chooſe it with great prudence, as they imagine, and keep it as long as they pleaſe; it is alſo called the political and philoſophical religion. The former of theſe names is given it, becauſe it is choſen by politicians; they being men who ſeek for freedom in that point, and turn to every ſide. The epithet *philoſophical* is alſo given, becauſe it frees a man from the obligation of believing; and it is well known that a Philoſopher never ſubmits to the authority of any perſon, he being a man who boaſts the utmoſt freedom, and will not ſwear to the words of any maſter; *liber homo Philoſophus nullius addictus jurare in verba Magiſtri.* The Author mentions two other names: he ſays that this religion of the prudent is called *Ecclectic*, or *Eclogiſtic* (23). I am ſurprized that he did not make ſome mention of the ſect of Ecclectic Philoſophers founded by Potamon of Alexandria, who lived in the time of Auguſtus. Theſe people were neither Platoniſts, Stoicks, nor Peripateticks, nor of any particular Sect; but they ſelected whatever they thought good in every one of them and left the reſt. Such is the ſketch of the religion aſcribed to Reineſius. It was a religion of choice, a moſaic work, a work formed of inlaid pieces. More people, than the world are aware of, form, in this manner, a religion to themſelves, without telling the world of it. They might be called in Latin, *Miſcelliones* (24), i. e. Thoſe who hold a variety of opinions.

(18) Andreas Carolus, *Memorabil. Eccleſ.* ſæc. 17. lib. 6. cap. 32. p. 97.

(19) Idem, lib. 5. cap. 53. p. 1088. He cites Burgold. *Not. rer. Imp.* part. 2. 11.

(20) *In Diatr. Schol. de Auxil. Grat.* p. 479.

(21) *Atheiſ. devict.* p. 459.

(22) *Loc. Antiſyncret.* p. 271 *& ſeq.*

(23) Andreas Carolus, lib. 6. cap. 32. p. 97.

(24) *Miſcelliones appellantur qui non certæ ſunt ſententiæ, ſed variorum mixtorumque judiciorum.* Feſtus Pompeius.

[D] *A catalogue of the greateſt part of his works.*] Here follow thoſe in phyſic: *De vaſis umbilicalibus eorumque ruptura obſervatio ſingularis*, Leipſic 1624 in 4to. *Chimiatria, hoc eſt Medicina nobili & neceſſaria ſui parte, Chimiâ, inſtructa & exornata*, Gera in Voigtland 1624 in 4to. The following books relate to Literature: *De Deo Endovellico*, Altemburg 1637. Ἰσορούμενα *linguæ Punicæ contra Vitum Wolfrum*, Altemburg 1637. *Variarum Lectionum libri tres*, ibid. 1640 in 4to. *Defenſio variarum Lectionum*, Roſtoch 1653 in 4to. *Epiſtolæ ad Caſparum Hoffmannum, & Chriſt. Ad Rupertum*, Leipſic 1660 in 4to. After his death were printed, *Epiſtolæ ad Johannem Vorſtium*, at Coln in Brandenburg 1667 in 4to. *Epiſtolæ ad Neſteros patrem & filium*, Leipſic 1670 in 4to. *Epiſtolæ ad Chriſtianum Daumium*, Jena 1670 in 4to. *Epiſtolæ ad Jo. Andream Boſium*, Jena 1700 in 12mo. *Syntagma Inſcriptionum antiquarum cum primis Romæ Veteris quarum omiſſa eſt recenſio in vaſto Jani Gruteri opere, cujus iſthoc dici poſſit Supplementum, cum Commentariis abſolutiſſimis* (25), Leipſic 1682 in folio. *Diſſertatio Critica de Sibyllinis Oraculis* (26), Jena 1685, in 4to. I cannot ſay any thing certain with regard to ſome other books which Konig aſcribes to him; for I am afraid he has confounded thoſe which have been printed with ſuch as have not. He aſcribes to him, *Gloſſarium vocum barbaricarum: cenſuram nonnullorum in Salmaſii Exercitationibus Plinianis. Commentarium in Inſcriptiones Gruteri. Variarum Lectionum libros ſex.* Ἰσορέμινα *Medicinæ, vel ſucceſſiones & vitas Medicorum*, and ſeveral other works. Moreri ſays, that Reineſius *made himſelf known by the ſix books he publiſhed* of various readings; *that he alſo wrote a cenſure on Salmaſius's Exercitations on Pliny or Solinus, and Commentaries on Gruter's inſcriptions* (27). I cannot agree with him in this, there being only three books of various readings publiſhed; and I do not know of Reineſius's book, entitled, *Cenſura Exercitationum Plinianarum Salmaſii.* I find no mention of this in the Prefaces to his poſthumous works. I do not doubt but he was very able to write ſuch a book; and to cut out a work for Salmaſius no leſs than for Barthius (28): but I do not know that he had any ſuch deſign; and if he had, I am firmly of opinion that he never publiſhed ſuch a performance. The cenſure on Salmaſius's Exercitations was not publiſhed; the inſcriptions which Reineſius illuſtrated are different from thoſe of Gruter. Laſtly, Moreri makes no mention of ſeveral works that were certainly printed. Were his article of Reineſius to be corrected, ſcarce more than two or three words of it could be preſerved.

(25) See *Acta eruditor.* 1682. p. 89 *& ſeq.*

(26) See *Nouv. de la Repub. des Lettres*, July 1685. art. 5.

(27) See *Jugem. des Savans, ſur les Critiques*, num. 525.

(28) See rem. [R] of the art. BARTHIUS.

I am to inform my readers, that the bookſellers prefixed Reineſius's name to a book, though he did not write a ſingle line of it. Witte mentions this to prevent Reineſius from being taken for a plagiary: *Exiit quoque Lipſiæ an.* 1679 *ſub ejus nomine*, Schola Jure-Conſultorum Medica, Relationum libris aliquot comprehenſa, quibus principia Medicinæ in jus tranſſumta ex profeſſa examinantur. *Verus autem Auctor & titulus iſte eſt; Fortunati Fidelis de Relationibus Medicorum libri IV. in quibus ea omnia, quæ in forenſibus*

☞ RELAND (HADRIAN), one of the moſt learned Writers of the 18th Century [*A*], was born July the 17th 1676, in the Village of Ryp between Alkmaar and Purmerend in North-Holland. His father John Reland, was Miniſter of that village, whence he afterwards removed to Alkmaar, and at laſt to Amſterdam. It was in this laſt city that young Reland was ſent to ſchool, and at eleven years of age having paſſed through the uſual courſe of ſtudies there, was placed in the College of Amſterdam under Peter Francius and William Surenhuſius; and during the three years, which he ſtudied under theſe Profeſſors, made a vaſt progreſs in the Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldee, and Arabic languages; and at his leiſure hours applied himſelf to poetry, in which he had great ſucceſs (*a*). At fourteen years of age he was ſent to Utrecht, where he ſtudied under Grævius and Leuſden, perfected himſelf in the knowledge of the Latin and Oriental tongues, and applied himſelf likewiſe to philoſophy, in which he took the Degree of Doctor. At ſeventeen years of age he began to ſtudy Divinity under Melchior Leidekker, Gerard van Maſtricht, Herman Witzius, and Herman van Halen, and maintained ſeveral Theſes with great applauſe. He did not however abandon the Oriental languages, which were always his favourite ſtudy. Mr. Henry Syke of Bremen, who was extremely well ſkilled in the Arabic, was then at Utrecht; and Mr. Reland made uſe of that opportunity to make himſelf a complete maſter of that language. After he had reſided ſix years at Utrecht, his father ſent him to Leyden, to continue his divinity-ſtudies under Spanheim, Trigland, and Marck; and he went through a courſe of experimental philoſophy under Walferd Senguerd (*b*). Soon after he came to Leyden he was offered a Profeſſorſhip at Linden, either in Philoſophy or the Oriental languages; and he would have accepted it, though he was then but juſt two and twenty years old, if he had not been prevented by his father's ill ſtate of health, which would not allow him to remove to ſo great a diſtance from Amſterdam. At that the Earl of Portland was deſirous of having him for a tutor to his ſon, the Viſcount Woodſtock. Mr. Reland's father, at the requeſt of his friends, gave him leave to accept of this place; but when it was expected that he ſhould accompany his pupil into England, his friends would not conſent. Some time after (in 1699) he was invited to be Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Harderwik, though he was then but twenty four years old. But that Univerſity did not enjoy him long; for King William having recommended him to the Magiſtrates of Utrecht, he was offered the Profeſſorſhip of the Oriental Languages and Eccleſiaſtical Antiquities; and his genius being more inclined to polite learning than philoſophy, he readily accepted the place, which

(*a*) Joſephi Serrurier, *Oratio Funebris in Obitum Viri Celeberrimi Hadriani Relandi, recitata ipſis Nonis Martiis* 1718. p. 8——12. edit. Trajecti ad Rhenum 1718, in 4to.

(*b*) Idem, p. 12—19.

ac publicis cauſis Medici referre ſolent, pleniſſimè traduntur, ſtudio D. Pauli Ammanni, Lipſiæ 1674. *Hoc indicare volui, ne Vir C L. præter meritum Plagiariis adſcribatur* (29). Witte forgot one eſſential circumſtance, *viz.* that the work entitled *Fortunati Fidelis, &c.* was printed at Paris in 1602 in 4to (30). This edition is quoted in the *Lindenius Renovatus*, pag. 275, under the name of *Fortunatus Fidelis*; but he did not know that the *Schola Juriſconſultorum, &c.* printed at Leipſic in 1679, is the ſame as that of Fortunatus Fidelis, it being aſcribed to Reineſius, pag. 1023. I fancy that the Leipſic edition of 1674 differs from that of 1679 only in the title; and that not meeting with any purchaſers, the bookſellers put Reineſius's name to it, to put it off (31).

(29) Witte, *in Diario Biographico*, ad ann. 1667, folio Yyy 3.

(30) I found this by a Letter of Bourdelot, firſt Phyſician to the Ducheſs of Burgundy.

(31) Compare this with citat. (3) of the art. PINEAU.

[*A*] *One of the moſt learned writers in the XVIIIth century.*] His writings are as follow: I. *Notæ ad Othonis Hiſtoriam Doctorum Miſchnicorum.* Our author was a Student at Leyden, when he wrote this work, but he did not prefix his name to it. II. *Galatea, Luſus Poeticus.* This piece was printed in 1701 at Amſterdam in 8vo, without the knowlege of the Author, and reprinted in 1710, and a third edition of it was publiſhed at Utrecht in 1718. Though it is a ſmall piece, it ſhews what might have been expected from him, if he had continued his application to Poetry. III. *Remarques ſur les Vies des Poëtes Grecs en abregé.* Amſterdam 1700 in 8vo. Theſe are notes, which he added to Tannegui le Fevre's lives of the Greek Poets for the uſe of the Viſcount Woodſtock his pupil. IV. *Ode in Poeſim Lucretianam:* printed at the end of the preceding book. V. *Oratio de incremento, quod Philoſophia cepit hoc ſæculo, dicta publicè ad diem VII. iduum Octobris* 1690, *cum Philoſophiæ docendæ provinciam ſuſciperet.* Amſterdam 1700 in 4to. VIII. *Oratio pro Linguâ Perſicâ & cognatis literis Orientalibus, dicta.* IX. *Kalend. Mart.* 1701. *cum Linguarum Orientalium Profeſſionem Ordinariam in Academiâ Ultrajectinâ ſuſciperet.* Utrecht 1701 in 4to. VII. *Analecta Rabbinica, in quibus continentur Gilberti Genebrardi Iſagoge Rabbinica; Chriſt. Cellarii Rabbiniſmus, inſtitutio Grammatica; Druſii de particulis Chaldaicis, Syriacis, & Rabbinicis; Index Commentariorum Rabbinicorum; Bartolocci Vitæ celebriorum Rabbinorum; denique D. Kimchi in decem primos pſalmos Davidis Commentarius.* Utrecht 1702 in 8vo. VIII. *Diſſertationes quinque de nummis veterum Hebræorum, qui ab inſcriptarum literarum formâ Samaritani appellantur. Accedit Diſſertatio de Marmoribus Arabicis Puteolanis.* Utrecht 1709 in 8vo. The firſt of theſe Diſſertations had been already printed in 1701 at Amſterdam in 8vo. and the ſecond and third in 1704. IX. *De Religione Muhamedicâ libri duo.* Utrecht 1705, in 8vo. The ſecond edition with great additions was printed at Utrecht 1717 in 8vo. This book contains in the firſt book a ſhort account of the faith of the Mahometans tranſlated from an Arabian manuſcript; and in the ſecond the accuſations and reproaches falſely caſt upon them. The firſt edition was tranſlated into German, but it is very imperfect in compariſon of the ſecond, which has been tranſlated into French with additions, which enhance the merit of this book, though excellent in itſelf. X. *Diſſertationum Miſcellanearum Partes tres.* Utrecht in 8vo. Theſe three diſſertations were printed at different times; the firſt in 1706; the ſecond in 1707, and the third in 1708. All of them treat of curious Subjects. XI. *Oratio in Obitum Pauli Bauldri.* Utrecht 1706 in 8vo. XII. *Decas Exercitationum Philologicarum de verâ pronuntiatione nominis Jehovah, quarum quinque priores Joannis Druſii, Sixtini Amamæ, Lud. Cappelli, Joann. Buxtorfii, & Jac. Altingii lectionem nominis Jehovah impugnant; poſteriores quinque Nic. Fulleri, Th. Gatakeri ſingulæ, & ternæ Joh. Leuſden tuentur.* Utrecht 1707 in 8vo. XIII. *Antiquitates ſacræ veterum Hebræorum.* Utrecht 1708 in 8vo. Reprinted with conſiderable additions at Utrecht 1712 and Leipſic 1714, and with new additions at Utrecht 1717 in 8vo. This is only a ſhort account of the Jewiſh Antiquities, the firſt edition of which was very imperfect. XIV. *Oratio de Galli Cantu Hieroſolymis audito, habita die 26. Martii* 1709. Utrecht in 8vo. XV. *Enchiridion ſtudioſi Arabicè conſcriptum à Borhaneddino Alzerneuchi, cum duplice verſione Latinâ*

which was offered him in the year 1701. After he had been two years Profeſſor at Utrecht he married Joanna Catharine, daughter of John Telingius, a man of eminent rank at Zirizee in Zeland; by whom he had one ſon and two daughters, one of whom and the ſon ſurvived him. In 1713 there was eſtabliſhed in England *a Society for the advancement of Chriſtian Knowledge*, and the year following another *for the propagation of the Goſpel in foreign Parts*; of both which Societies Reland became a Member. He died [*B*] of the ſmall pox at Utrecht February 5 1718 in the forty ſecond year of his age. He was a man of an excellent diſpoſition, and of great modeſty and humanity. He had a correſpondence with the moſt eminent ſcholars of his time; as in France with Huetius, Abbé Bignon, Montfaucon, and Monſieur Galland; in Germany with John Albert Fabricius, John Gregory Pritius, John Bernard Menckenius, John Frederic Homberg, Godfrey Olearius, and Job Ludolphus; in Swiſſerland with John Baptiſta Ottius, and John Henry Otho; in Italy with Count Dominico Paſſionеo, Jacomo Vignoli, Antonio Magliabecchi, and Abbé Fontanini; and in England with Ezekiel Spanheim, Joſhua Barnes, and Dr. Richard Bentley.

Latinâ, altera Frederici Roſtgaard, alterâ Abrah. Echellenſis. Utrecht 1709 in 8vo. Mr. Reland only procured a new edition of this work, to which he added a preface. XVI. *Elenchus Philologicus, quo præcipua, quæ circa textum & verſiones ſacræ ſcripturæ diſputari inter Philologos ſolent breviter indicantur, in uſum ſtudioſæ Juventutis.* Utrecht in 12mo. XVII. *Brevis Introductio ad Grammaticam Hebræam Altingianam. Accedit Liber Ruth cum Commentario Rabbinico, & obſervationibus Maſoreticis Hebr. & Lat.* Utrecht 1710 in 8vo. XVIII. *Epicteti Manuale & ſententiæ, quibus accedunt tabula Cebetis & alia ejuſdem argumenti, Græcè & Latinè.* Utrecht 1711 in 4to. Marcus Meibomius had begun the edition of this work, but dying before it was finiſhed, Reland completed it. XIX. *Lettre à ſon Excellence Monſeigneur le Comte de Kniphuyſen ſur une piece d'or trouvée ſur ſes Terres.* Utrecht 1713 in 8vo. XX. *Paleſtina ex monumentis veteribus illuſtrata, & Chartis Geographicis accuratioribus adornata.* Utrecht 1714, two tomes in 4to. This is undoubtedly the moſt conſiderable work of our author, though there are ſome places, which ought to be retouched, as he deſigned to have done in a ſecond edition. It was reprinted at Nuremberg 1716 in 4to; but this edition is much inferior to that of Utrecht with reſpect to the paper, character, plates, and correctneſs. XXI. *Petri Relandi Juriſconſulti & Judicis Faſti Conſulares ad illuſtrationem Codicis Juſtinianæi & Theodoſiani, ſecundum Rationes temporum digeſti, ad quos appendix additur Adriani Relandi, quâ Faſti ex Cod. MSS. deprompti & Conſules in Pandectis memorati continentur.* Utrecht 1715 in 8vo. Reland publiſhed this work of his brother, who was a Magiſtrate at Harlem, and died after he had finiſhed it. XXII. *Oratio de uſu antiquitatum ſacrarum.* Utrecht in 8vo. XXIII. *De ſpoliis Templi Hieroſolymitani in Arcu Titiano Romæ conſpicuis Liber, cum fig.* Utrecht 1716 in 8vo. XXIV. *The life of Ebn Jokden*, in High-dutch, in 8vo. XXV. *Diſputatio Philologica de Tryphone Judæo, Juſtini Martyris Antagoniſtâ, in quâ probatur eum à Tarphone diverſum fuiſſe.* Publiſhed in the *Bibliotheca Bremenſis, Claſſis* 1. *Faſcic.* 2. *p.* 86. Druſius, Lightfoot and ſeveral other writers after them had aſſerted, that *Tarpho*, who is ſo often mentioned in the *Miſhna*, and lived in the time of Juſtin Martyr, was the ſame with *Trypho*. Reland had been of the ſame opinion; but being convinced, that it was a miſtake, confutes it in this Diſſertation. XXVI. *Diſputatio Philologica de uxore Domiſedâ: in Epiſt. ad Titum, cap.* 2. *v.* 5. Publiſhed in the *Bibliotheca Bremenſis, Claſſ.* 1 *Faſcic.* 3. *p.* 314. In this piece he endeavours to ſhew, that the Greek word, which the Vulgate tranſlation has rendered *Domûs curam habentes*, is falſely tranſlated, and ought to be *Domi manentes*. XXVII. He publiſhed likewiſe ſeveral maps, particularly of Japan and Perſia.

We ſhall add here a letter of his communicated to us by the Reverend and learned Mr. Joſeph Waſſe, Rector of Aynho in Northamptonſhire.

" Clariſſimo Viro *Joſepho Waſio Hadr. Relandus* S.

" Codices duos *Saluſtii* in Angliam rectè perveniſſe ex Literis tuis intelligo; at non ego is ſum, qui " illa encomia merear, quibus me honoras. Non " dubito quin jam acceperis exemplum primæ Partis " Diſſertationum mearum miſcell. Alteram prælo " paro. Verum de Codicibus Voolii deſpero. Ipſe " ante paucos dies obiit magno rei literariæ damno, " & quæ fundi noſtri calamitas eſt, quum bona, quæ " reliquit, non ſufficiant expungendis debitis, & multa lis tum de iis, tum de bonis Parentis ejus nuper " defuncti moveatur, tota ſupellex domeſtica una " cum Bibliothecâ publico ſigillo obſignata eſt, ſic ut " nulli aditus concedatur. Quæ lites forte per annos aliquot protrahentur. Tu tamen mentionem " ejus facere poteris, & collectionis quam poſſedit, " cujus indicem ejus manu ſcriptum tibi miſi, & ſi " velis, epiſtolam, qua tibi illorum uſum conceſſit, " mittam. Fuit Judex & Senator Urbis Amisfurtanæ. Gudianorum Codicum Manuſcriptorum nullus eſt divenditus. Saluta Cl. *Bentlejum*, *Sikium*, " *Barneſium*, & ſi qui alii apud vos me noverint. " Vale, Vir amiciſſime, & me ama. Trajecti ad Rhenum ad XXVII Octob. CIↃICCVI.

" *P. S.* Markius ille, cujus Codices ſunt, & cujus " mentionem injicies, qualis ſit, Cl. *Sikius* optimè tibi " dicet. Nomen ei eſt Henricus Hadrianus à Mark, " & laudari poteſt ab inſigni Bibliothecâ, quam poſſidet. Cl. *Kuſterus* ante triduum heic apud me " fuit, nec ipſe mecum inter pocula tui immemor."

[*B*] *He died.*] He wrote the following epitaph for himſelf.

Terra tegit Cineres, quæ cunas præbuit olim,
Principium Curſûs metaque facta mei.
Quiſquis es, incertæ ſtadium decurrere vitæ
Dum licet, ante oculos meta ſit uſque tuos.
Conficitur ſpatium diſpar, verum exitus omnes
Unus, & hac horâ te quoque forte manet.
Ergo vive Deo, præpone æterna caducis,
Atque animi potior ſit tibi cura tui.
Quicquid agis paterisve, tuis Chriſti exprime mores:
Non aliâ fas eſt ſcandere ad Aſtra viâ. T.

REMOND (*a*) (FLORIMOND DE), Counſellor in the Parliament of Bourdeaux, about the end of the 16th Century, diſtinguiſhed himſelf by ſome books, which he wrote with great animoſity againſt the Proteſtants [*A*]. He had been a Huguenot in his youth; but if he himſelf may be credited, he was reſcued from *the jdws of Hereſy* (*b*) by a miracle, to which

(*a*) He ſpelt his name *Ræmond*; but in ſome of his books he calls himſelf *Ræmound.*

(*b*) Florimond de Ræmond, *Hiſt. de la naiſſance & progres de l'Hereſie*, liv. 2. chap. 12. p. m. 204.

[*A*] *He diſtinguiſhed himſelf by ſome books which he wrote with great animoſity againſt the Proteſtants.*] He publiſhed a book, entitled, *Erreur populaire de la Papeſſe Jeanne*, (a vulgar miſtake with regard to Pope Joan). I have the Bourdeaux edition of 1594 before me. The Author puts his name to it, which informs me, that it was not the firſt, the firſt having been anonymous. *As I never deſigned*, ſays Florimond de Remond (1) *to gain any reputation by ſuch inconſiderable productions of my brain, (which would be like attempting to*

(1) p. 303. of his *Erreur populaire*, Bourdeaux edit. 1594.

which he himſelf was an eye-witneſs in 1566. Moreri who mentions it, did not know the place where that comedy was acted. He ſays that Nicholas Obri, a native of Vervins, was exorciſed at Loudun (*c*), in which he is miſtaken, it being at Laon; and I obſerved elſewhere (*d*) that father Labbe committed the ſame error. There is reaſon to believe that Florimond de Remond ſtudied under Peter Ramus in the College of Prele at Paris. I take notice of this merely that I may have occaſion to mention a thing related by him concerning the book *de tribus Impoſtoribus* [*B*]. Boterius has fixed his death to the year 1602 (*e*), and Moreri under the year 1600. Some people declare that he was not Author of the works which are aſcribed to him [*C*], the moſt conſiderable of which

(*c*) Moreri, under the word Florimond de Raymond.

(*d*) In the art. LOUDUN, rem. [*C*].

(*e*) Rodolph. Boterius, *Comment. de Rebus in Gallia geſtis*, lib. 9. p. 91.

to build a ſolid glory on ſand) ſo I have endeavoured to keep myſelf from ſhame. This conſideration made me conceal my name, which did not deſerve to be ranked among the many learned men with which France abounds. But ſince that Author has put a quite different interpretation on the laudable fear by which I was reſtrained, I thought proper to draw the curtain, and reveal myſelf to the publick: and yet I will have ſo much favour for him as to ſuppreſs his own, ſince he has made ſuch weak anſwers to my arguments. Thus he ſpeaks of a Miniſter of Bearn (2), who had writ againſt the anonymous piece, entitled, *Erreur populaire de la Papeſſe*; which prompted the Author to publiſh a ſecond edition of it, carefully reviſed, and undertook a *longer and more ſerious work*, concerning Anti-chriſt. Vignier declares that he made uſe of the ſecond edition of the Anti-chriſt, and Anti-pope Joan, *reviſed, corrected, and enlarged by the Author, and printed at Paris for Abel l'Angelier* 1599 (3). He is miſtaken with regard to Anti-Pope Joan; the Paris edition of 1599, being the fourth, at leaſt; one being printed at Lyons, by Benedict Rigaut, in 8vo, anno 1595 (4). Cook is ſtill more miſtaken, ſince he ſays that this work was firſt writ in French in 1602 (5). Mr. Sagittarius takes notice only of the Bourdeaux edition of the ſame year (6). Remond's third work was not publiſhed till after his death; and it is entitled, *The Hiſtory of the Birth, Progreſs, and Decay of the Hereſy of this Age; divided into eight Books.* The ſixth of theſe eight books, was to contain an account of the ſchiſm (the reformation) of England. But they found only the title of it among his papers; he working rather at *the 7th and 8th book which were more neceſſary, becauſe he there ſpoke of France* (7). Francis de Remond his ſon, who took care of the impreſſion of that work, and dedicated it to Pope Paul V. ſupplied the 6th book (8). Sagittarius obſerves, that Florimond de Remond, or rather Richeome the Jeſuit, wrote, in three volumes, the hiſtory of the birth, progreſs, and decay of hereſy; and he quotes the French Paris edition of 1605, and that of 1624 (9): but this is not accurate. The edition of 1605, conſiſts but of one volume, and is the only one writ by Remond; the two others being compoſed by Claude Mallingre, Hiſtoriographer of France, and printed at Paris in 1624. This work of Remond, and Mallingre's continuation have been often reprinted (10), both in French and in Latin. The other two works of Remond have alſo been tranſlated into Latin. It is to be obſerved that he publiſhed at Bourdeaux, in 1594, his French verſion of Tertullian's treatiſe *de corona militis*, and of that father's diſcourſe *ad Martyres*. It is alſo to be obſerved that Baronius, and ſome other writers of the ſame perſuaſion, beſtow great commendations on his controverſial writings.

(2) He denotes himſelf only by theſe letters, *R. T.*

(3) Vignier, *Theatre de l'Anti-chriſt*, in the Index of Authors.

(4) Blondel made uſe of this, where he takes notice in his *Examen Quæſt. de Papa fœmina*, of Florimond de Remond's errors.

(5) Cook's treatiſe upon Pope Joan.

(6) Sagittar. *Introduct. in Hiſt. Eccleſ.* p. 683.

(7) See the preface to the *Hiſt. of the birth, &c. of Hereſy.*

(8) I was obliged to work hard, and to write very faſt, in order to get it publiſhed as ſoon as poſſible. Ibid.

(9) Sagittar. *Introduct. in Hiſt. Eccleſ.* p. 820.

(10) I make uſe of the Roan edit. of 1648.

[*B*] *A thing related by him, concerning the book* de tribus Impoſtoribus.] "Have we not ſeen a deteſtable "book forged in Germany (though printed in ano- "ther country) at the ſame time that hereſy played "its part in this manner, which ſpread this doctrine, "with the following horrid title, *Of the three Im- "poſtors, &c.* ridiculing the three chief Religions, "which alone acknowledge the true God, the Jewiſh, "Chriſtian, and Mahomedan. The title only ſhew- "ed that it came from hell; and what that age muſt "be which was to give birth to ſo formidable a "monſter. I ſhould not have made the leaſt men- "tion of it, had not Hoſius and Genebrard ſpoke "of it before. I remember, when I was a boy, to "have ſeen the copy of it in the College of Prele, "in the hands of Ramus, a man pretty conſpicuous "for the greatneſs and eminence of his learning; "who confounded himſelf amid ſeveral reſearches "into the ſecrets of Religion, which he uſed to "ſtudy at the ſame time with Philoſophy. This "wicked book was handed about among the moſt "learned men, who were deſirous of ſeeing it (11)." Theſe are Florimond de Remond's words. Had he known that this wicked book was ſpoke of under the reign of Frederic II (12), would he have preſumed to aſcribe, to the XVIth century, the production of ſuch a monſter? Perhaps he would; his only view being to make the Lutheran principles odious *per fas & nefas*. Moſt perſons father the pretended book *de tribus Impoſtoribus* upon Aretin (13); and conſequently they charge it upon Italy, and not Germany.

(11) Remond, *Hiſt. of the birth of hereſy*, book 2. chap. 16. p. m. 236.

(12) See the art. ARETIN (Peter) rem. [*G*].

(13) See the ſame rem.

[*C*] *Some people declare, that he was not Author of the books which are aſcribed to him.*] Let us go back a little. Sagittarius, in a work printed in 1694, furniſhes me with two paſſages. *Florimundus Ræmundus, Vaſco, ſenator parlamenti Burdegalenſis, ſub cujus nomine Ludovicus Richeomus, Jeſuitici Sodalitii Theologus, Gallice ſcripſit* Errorem popularem de Johanna Pſeudo-pontifice, dicta Papiſſa, *Latine poſtea verſum*, (14). This is what he ſays in page 683. See alſo what he ſays in page 820. *Florimundus Ræmundus* ſive potius cujus ſtylo uſus eſt, *Ludovicus Richeomius* Soc. J. qui *de ortu, progreſſu, & interitu hæreticorum hujus temporis*, Tomis III. commentatus eſt. I now proceed to a book printed in 1688. "It has been "doubted whether the books that paſs under Flo- "rimond's name, were really writ by him. Many "perſons ſay that father Richeome a Jeſuit was Au- "thor of them; and that he borrowed the name of "a Counſellor of the Parliament of Bourdeaux, to "give them the more credit. Perhaps it was thought "proper to oppoſe to Thuanus, whoſe ſincerity did "not ſuit with the Jeſuits, a Writer of ſome repu- "tation. Peter Matthieu ſays poſitively in his Hiſ- "tory, that it was thought father Richeome was "Author of the books that paſs under the name of "Florimond de Remond. Vignier in his Theatre "of Anti-Chriſt; and Rivetus in his anſwer to the "Jeſuit ſay the ſame; and thoſe Authors wrote a "little time after that Florimond's books had "been publiſhed. Blondel was alſo of this opinion "(15)." Theſe are the words of a Doctor, who is now an illuſtrious Prelate in England. It is certain that the following words are found in a work of Vignier. *Matthieu, Hiſtoriographer to the King, in ſome part of the Hiſtory of his Majeſty is of opinion that the book of Anti-Chriſt was writ by Richeome the Jeſuit, and not by the ſaid Remond* (26). It is no leſs certain that Rivetus, having related what Florimond de Remond acknowledges in praiſe of Calvin, in his hiſtory of the birth of Hereſy, adds as follows (27). *I was willing to introduce here this relation of an enemy (and perhaps of Richeome the Jeſuit, to whom Peter Matthieu aſcribes Remond's* Anti-Chriſt). I have found the paſſage of Peter Matthieu on which this is grounded, and it is as follows. "The aſſembly opened with "declaring that the Biſhop of Rome was the Anti- "Chriſt, foretold by the word of God. The Pro- "teſtant Clergy have long ſince preached this, and "the Romiſh Doctors the contrary. Florimond de "Remond, or as I believe, Richeome the Jeſuit "under that name, has writ on this ſubject more "than any body; and collected, by way of Anti- "theſis, whatever belongs to the true and the fabulous "Anti-Chriſt (18)." I leave the reader to judge, whether this be a foundation ſolid enough to eſtabliſh, as a fact, that all the controverſial writings that were publiſhed under the name of Florimond de Remond,

(14) Sagittar. *Introduct. in Hiſt. Eccleſ.* p. 683.

(15) Burnet, *Defence of the reflexions on Varillas.*

(16) Nicholas Vignier, *Theatre de l'Anti-chriſt*, in the table of the Authors. I make uſe of the Geneva edit. of 1613, 8vo, before which (in 1610) the folio edition was publiſhed.

(17) Rivet, *Sommaire des Controverſes* (it is an anſwer to the controverſial catechiſm, publiſhed by Will. Baile, the Jeſuit) p. 16. of the 2d edit. which is of Geneva, 1609, 8vo.

(18) Matthieu, *Hiſt. de Henry IV.* liv. 6. *Narration* 5. p. m. 628. ſpeaking of the national Synod of Gap.

which is the *History of the birth, progreſs, and decay of the hereſy of this age.* No Writer could be leſs qualified than he was to ſucceed in this work [*D*], becauſe of the hatred he bore againſt the religion wherein he had been brought up; and which, as he pretended,

Remond, were writ by Richeome. But here follows another teſtimony of one of the Authors who refuted father Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm. *I am far from giving any credit,* ſays he (19), *to* Florimond de Remond, *having heard from a Counſellor of Bourdeaux, one Lewis de Maſſip (a man of probity, and with whom I had contracted an intimate friendſhip, having lodged at his houſe in Bourdeaux in* 1650, *where I attended on the Court; and having correſponded with him by letter, during ſome years) that it was a conſtant tradition in this country, that Remond, who had been a Member of their Parliament, had, when living, enjoyed there very conſiderable and remarkable advantages:* 1. To grow old without being gray hair'd: 2. To build without money: 3. To have writ without having any learning; the Jeſuits having furniſhed and ſuggeſted to him all he has ſtuffed into his hiſtory of the birth and decay of hereſy.

(19) John Baptiſt de Rocolles, *Hiſt. veritable du Calviniſme*, p. 285.

QUALITIES requiſite in an Hiſtorian.

[*D*] *No man could be leſs qualified than he was to ſucceed in ſuch a work.*] Hiſtory, generally ſpeaking, is either the moſt difficult kind of compoſition an Author can undertake, or one of the moſt difficult. It requires a man of great judgment, a noble, clear, and conciſe ſtyle: a juſt conſcience, a perfect rectitude of mind; a great number of excellent materials, and the art of diſpoſing them with propriety; and eſpecially a ſtrength of mind that may enable him to reſiſt the inſtinct of religious zeal, which prompts perſons to exclaim againſt what they judge to be falſe, and to embelliſh what they imagine to be true. By this ſhort and very juſt deſcription of the talents which form the character of a good Hiſtorian, one may eaſily perceive that Florimond de Remond was not qualified to ſucceed in writing a hiſtory of the birth and progreſs of Lutheraniſm and Calviniſm. This was the ſubject of one of the greateſt revolutions that happened in the Chriſtian world. State reaſons had crept into it, and were combined with the intereſts of religion. This formed a mixture, which heightened the labour of the Hiſtorian, required a ſtrong application, and a great freedom from prejudice. I do not enquire whether our Remond was ſufficiently qualified as to learning, judgment, genius, and beauty of ſtyle, to treat in a proper manner ſo important a ſubject as this; and I will take it for granted, that, in this reſpect, he was infinitely leſs contemptible than his cenſors ſuppoſe him: but then, had he had no other imperfections than thoſe which his zeal for the Romiſh Religion, and his hatred to that of the Proteſtants, produced in him, he ought to have perceived that he was going to engage in a work that was above his ſtrength. He ſtumbled in the threſhold; he imitated thoſe, who attempt to build a houſe before they calculate the expence, to ſee whether they ſhall be able to ſupport it (20). He neglected the precept, which the greateſt maſters have ſo wiſely recommended, *viz.* to chooſe a ſubject proportionate to their abilities, and to make a long time trial of themſelves on the meaſure of that proportion.

(20) St. Luke, chap. xiv. 28.

Sumite materiam veſtris, qui ſcribitis, æquam
Viribus, & verſate diu, quid ferre recuſent
Quid valeant humeri (21).

(21) Horat. *de Arte Poetic.* ver. 38.

" Let Poets match their ſubject to their ſtrength,
" And often try what weight they can ſupport,
" And what their ſhoulders are too weak to bear.
Lord ROSCOMMON.

The chief thing he ought to have been careful about, was the examining his conſcience thoroughly, and probably this is what he neglected moſt. He was not leſs ſolicitous about any thing, than to ſound his own heart, and to enquire of himſelf very ſeriouſly, *Shall I be able to prevail upon myſelf to write truths, that would be diſadvantegeous to the Romiſh Religion, and advantageous to the Huguenots? I am odious to them, and they are ſo to me. They have uſed me ill, and I have treated them after the ſame manner. I have writ controverſial pieces which they refuted, and I replied: ſhall I have ſtrength of mind enough not to yield in any manner to paſſion, to zeal, to reſentment, to the intereſt of my cauſe, and never tell an untruth out of partiality to ſo many ſubjects which affect me ſtrongly* (22)? Thoſe who have read with ſome attention, his work, may ſay, without being thought raſh, that he did not queſtion himſelf on that head, or that he did not follow the dictates of his conſcience. He throws, into the ſcale of the Proteſtants injuſtice of every kind; and in the other ſcale, wiſdom and innocence of every kind. He relates very few things without employing injurious epithets, and outragious words againſt hereſy and hereticks. His citations are very inſignificant; he alledging either perſons of his own party, with moſt of whom he had either had perſonal diſputes (23) with the Proteſtant Miniſters; or he alledges Proteſtants as he had found their paſſages in the writings of thoſe Romaniſts. It is impoſſible but that an hiſtorian who acts in this manner muſt be either a ſlave to pious frauds, or deluded by himſelf, and conſequently the worſt qualified of all men to write a hiſtory of the birth and progreſs of the Proteſtant Religion, and the moſt apt to tranſgreſs the two great laws of his profeſſion (24); there being ſome falſities, he does not ſcruple to publiſh, and ſome truths he does not dare to divulge. He could not ſet about this hiſtory without wanting the admonition given to Phaeton.

(22) See rem. [*L*] of the art. TIMÆUS.

(23) *i. e.* verbal diſputes, or in writing.

Magna petis, Phaëton, & quæ non viribus iſtis
Munera conveniunt, nec tam puerilibus annis (25).

" Too vaſt and hazardous the taſk appears,
" Nor ſuited to thy ſtrength, nor to thy years.
ADDISON.

(24) *Quis neſcit primam eſſe Hiſtoriæ legem, ne quid falſi dicere audeat, deinde ne quid veri non audeat, ne qua ſuſpicio gratiæ ſit in ſcribendo, ne qua ſimultatis?* Cicero, *de Orat.* lib. 2. folio m. 74, *A.*

(25) Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 2. ver. 54.

I know ſome perſons, who wiſh there were hiſtories of that important revolution, which might not be compoſed either by a Roman Catholic or a Proteſtant. They imagine that party intereſt, and a zeal for the cauſe to which a Writer is attached, and much more, a hatred for the oppoſite religion, engage a Writer to amplify, ſuppreſs, extenuate, or diſguiſe things, according as they may either ſerve or injure the honour of his party. They therefore wiſh that Thucydides, or a Livy, could have given us the hiſtory of the events, which Florimond de Remond promiſes in the title of his work. They would wiſh for the pens of thoſe illuſtrious hiſtorians, not ſo much on account of their eloquence and good ſenſe, as becauſe they were heathens; and could have been neuter with regard to the various ſects into which the Chriſtian world is divided; ſo that they would have related, without partiality, the good and bad of the conduct of the Papiſts, Lutherans, and Calviniſts. However, I do not know whether it would have been poſſible for them to have obſerved a perfect neutrality; for as Popery is more conformable to Paganiſm than the Proteſtant Religion, they might have been prejudiced againſt Luther and Calvin. It is impoſſible for a hiſtorian to be too much upon his guard, and it is ſcarce poſſible for him to eſcape the ſnares of prejudice. There are ſome forms of government, ſome maxims of morality and politicks, which pleaſe or diſpleaſe him. This prejudice prompts him to favour one party more than another, even where he writes the hiſtory of an ancient people, or of a far diſtant country. Suppoſe that a man of this age was to draw up the hiſtory of a King of India, who had been dethroned two or three hundred years ago, one would conclude that no intereſt could prompt him to write with inſincerity; nevertheleſs, if he is an enemy to monarchy, and one who approves of the rebellions of ſubjects, he will ſearch for a thouſand ſhifts and diſguiſes, to throw an odium on the memory of that Monarch, and juſtify the civil wars which occaſioned his being dethroned. An hiſtorian, who was an enemy to rebellion, would act the counterpart of the former. This is the reaſon why we have ſo few hiſtories writ in which

pretended, a miracle had obliged him to forſake. But how bad ſoever this hiſtory may be, a great number of other Authors borrow from it (*f*). It is very ſurprizing to find, in many books, ſome very remarkable and important incidents, which did not refer to authentic records, but to the teſtimony of Florimond de Remond. Some relate that he did not diſcharge, in a juſt manner, the functions of the employment he had in the Parliament of Bourdeaux [*E*]; the Proteſtants accuſing him of believing with extreme partiality

(*f*) See the rem. [*Y*] of the art. OCHINUS.

which the naked truth appears; or that are free from ſome marks of the hiſtorian's anger or diſcontent, or from ſome ſatyrical ſtrokes againſt living perſons. Theſe he introduces in the Indian Hiſtory he is writing. All readers do not gueſs who it is he aims at: but ſome do, and he is ſenſible that ſome will do this. Hence the reader may judge how much we ought to be upon our guard with reſpect to modern hiſtorians, ſince Livy himſelf, becauſe of a certain general conformity, could not be totally impartial between the Proteſtants and Romaniſts. The beſt advice that could have been given to Florimond de Remond, would have been for him to continue to write controverſial pieces, in which paſſion is allowed; and not to ſet up for an hiſtorian, an employment that no ways became ſo zealous a Catholic as himſelf, and that he ſhould leave this to lukewarm and indifferent perſons. I alſo believe that it would be proper to adviſe a zealous Huguenot, never to undertake to write the hiſtory of Calviniſm, of Lutheraniſm, of the edict of Nantz, nor any of that kind. You are exaſperated, (ſhould it be ſaid to him) you harbour an animoſity againſt the perſecutors, you are fired with an ardent zeal for your cauſe; you would give us not a hiſtory, but an advocate's plea; you would only blame your adverſe party, and applaud or juſtify your own: now you could not do this without committing ſome little errors either of omiſſion or commiſſion. Set yourſelf therefore about ſome other book, in caſe that you deſire your pens ſhould be of any emolument to the publick.

But here follows a new reaſon why ſo few people are capable of writing a good hiſtory. Thoſe, who could be capable of ſurmounting all prejudices, and to reject all artifices in hiſtory-writing, could not manifeſt all their candour, and be entirely impartial, without expoſing themſelves to the indignation of the people, (the word people is of great extent, and comprehends many perſons of rank and title) they would cauſe themſelves to be conſidered as falſe brethren, prevaricators and perfidious men. Had not Popeliniere like to have had his brains daſhed out, for relating certain particulars, in his hiſtory of the troubles under Charles IX. in a different manner from what it was thought he ought to have told them in? I ſhall ſpeak of this in his article in the ſupplement to this dictionary. Many perſons wiſh that an Hiſtorian of their party would imitate perſons that play at piquet, who keep only the good cards, and throw out the bad ones.

The reaſon why I ſaid that probity ought to be one of the characteriſticks of an Hiſtorian.

The Reader will perhaps wonder at my ſaying, that rectitude of mind, and a perfect probity, are neceſſary qualities for an Hiſtorian; and it may be objected, that an ingenious man, without poſſeſſing thoſe qualities, may write a good hiſtory, in the ſame manner as he may a good oration or a good tragedy. I therefore will make good my aſſertion. For this purpoſe I ſhall obſerve, that truth being the ſoul of hiſtory, it is eſſentially neceſſary with regard to hiſtory, that no falſity be introduced into it; and therefore though it ſhould boaſt every other perfection, it would not be a hiſtory, but a fiction and a romance, in caſe truth has not been obſerved in it. But it is not ſo with reſpect to a piece of poetry or eloquence. I conclude from thence, that a perſon, in order for his being qualified to write a good hiſtory, muſt have a conſcience ſo abhorrent to faſhood, that it muſt not allow him to tell a lie, though it were even to the advantage of his religion, his beſt beloved friends, nor to the diſadvantage of an impious ſect, or of his moſt implacable perſecutors. I underſtand by falſhood or lying, not only the entire invention of a falſe tranſaction, but likewiſe the ſuppreſſion or addition of certain circumſtances which may ſerve to juſtify perſons, or lay ſome things to their charge. Thoſe who are not endued with this rectitude of mind, this perfect probity, commit a fraud as Hiſtorians, ſometimes to ingratiate themſelves with perſons who might do them ſervice; and, at other times, to prevent their diſobliging others who might be an obſtacle in their way to poſts and preferments. What has been ſaid (26) of an Orator, is ſtill more requiſite in an Hiſtorian, who ought to be defined, *vir bonus narrandi peritus*, i. e. "a good man, who is ſkilful in "relating tranſactions," and nevertheleſs, we ſcarce hear any perſon enquire, whether the Author of a hiſtory is a good man. People only aſk whether he is a man of genius and judgment? Whether his ſtyle be beautiful, and if he affects his Readers? and according to the anſwers they receive on theſe occaſions, they either buy the book or leave it. However, they ought at leaſt to imitate thoſe, who, enquiring the character of witneſſes, began with their riches, and ended with their manners (27).

(26) Citat. (203) of the art. PERICLES.

Protinus ad cenſum, de moribus ultima fiet
Quæſtio: quot paſcit ſervos, quot poſſidet agri
Jugera, quam multa magnaque paropſide cænat (28)?

"The queſtion is not put, how far extends
"His piety, but what he yearly ſpends:
"Quick to the bus'neſs; how he lives and eats;
"How largely gives; how ſplendidly he treats;
"How many thouſand acres feed his ſheep,
"What are his rents, what ſervants does he
"keep? *Dryden.*

(27) It is uſual to ſay, to denote a covetous age, that a father who looks out for a wife for his ſon, firſt asks whether a young woman is rich; ſecondly, if ſhe is handſom; and laſtly, if ſhe be virtuous.

(28) Juven. ſat. 3. ver. 140.

In fine, a perſon ought to aſk, whether the Author is an honeſt man. Mr. * * * makes that his firſt queſtion, when a Bookſeller ſhews him a new voyage, Memoirs of ſuch a one, &c. The Bookſeller ſaying to him, this is a very curious book; it is finely writ, and ſells extremely well: but do you know the Author of it, ſays he? Is he vain and ambitious? Does he love pleaſure? Could he dreſs himſelf handſomly without drawing three or four hundred crowns from his Bookſeller? I ſhould be glad to know all this firſt; for the Author of a relation, if he be a vain man, and wants to ſell his copy at a high price, blends it with any falſhoods that may give a favourable idea of the Writer, and divert the Reader?

[*E*] *Some ſay that he did not diſcharge, in a juſt manner, the functions of the employment he had in the Parliament of Bourdeaux.*] Conſult Dr. Burnet's defence of the reflexions on Varillas, where the following paſſage is read. *Florimond de Remond was as little eſteemed in his judicial capacity, as in that of a Writer; and the judgment that has been paſt upon him, is no leſs diſadvantageous than whimſical: Judicat ſine conſcientia, libros ſcribit ſine ſcientia, & ædificat ſine pecunia*, i. e. "He "judges without conſcience, he writes without know-"ledge, and builds without money (29)." If the Reader looks into the laſt pages of the French edition, he will there find the extract of a letter (α), with a preamble that is very worthy of being copied. Here follows both of them: *Such heavy complaints were made of his malice and injuſtice towards the Proteſtants, in his life-time, that his account concerning them ought not to be credited. The tranſition, from an unjuſt Judge to a partial Hiſtorian, is very eaſy; and a perſon muſt even be more hard-hearted, to commit an unjuſt action in quality of a Judge, than to write a falſity in quality of an Hiſtorian. But here follows the extract in queſtion* (30).

(29) Burnet's *Defence of the reflections on Varillas*, p. 28.

(30) Ibid. p. 146, 147.

"There is a book entitled, Plaintes des Egliſes Ré-
"formées au Roi, ſur pluſieurs injuſtices qui leur
"ſont faites. (The complaint of the Proteſtant
"churches to the King, concerning the injuſtice, of
"various kinds, they have ſuffered). *It is an anony-*
"*mous book, and was printed in* 1597. *Complaint is*
"*there made, among other particulars, that the ſieur*
"*Florimond de Remond, who, during the commotions in*
"1572, *having been taken, as he was travelling, by a*
"*party of the Proteſtants, who forced him to pay a*

(g) See the rem. [E].

tiality againſt them (*g*). Varillas was a little mortified, when he was obliged to own that he had copied from that Author [*F*].

" *thouſand livres for his ranſom, took every opportunity,*
" *from that time, to reimburſe himſelf, and was paid*
" *that ſum ten or twelve times over, as he himſelf boaſt-*
" *ed. Being afterwards appointed to report the caſe*
" *of a Proteſtant widow, whoſe huſband had been killed*
" *in cool blood by a Roman-catholick, he gave the crimi-*
" *nal an opportunity of eſcaping, by which means the mur-*
" *ther remained unpuniſhed. We alſo find, about the end*
" *of the book in queſtion, that a Proteſtant maiden having*
" *been buried in the church-yard belonging to the Ro-*
" *man-catholicks in Bourdeaux, an order was publiſhed,*
" *at the requeſt of the Sieur de Raymond, commanding to*
" *dig up the body of this young woman, and throw it*
" *into the fields, with all the bodies of the Proteſtants*
" *that had been buried there within ten years* (31).

(31) See *Notes ſur la Confeſſion de Sanci*, p. 444, and it will appear that the extract ſent to Dr. Burnet was not quite correct.

§ (*a*) This letter written from Paris in 1688, by the Author of the Notes on the Confeſſion of Sanci, was addreſſed to Mr. Jurieu. Some time after, he ſent him the piece itſelf, to rectify thereby ſome inaccuracies which had crept into that letter, for want of having that piece before him when he was writing. See the rem. on the Confeſſion of Sanci, p. 443, of the 2d edition. REM. CRIT.

[*F*] *Varillas was a little mortified, when he was obliged to own, that he had copied from that Author.*] Dr. Burnet criticiſed him (32), for denying that the Prince of Wales's (33) marriage, with the Infanta of Spain had been conſummated; and he repreſented to him, *that he might have impoſed the more eaſily upon his Readers, had he quoted, in the margin, ſome letter or relation; or had he feigned, according to his uſual cuſtom, that proofs might be found with regard to what he aſſerted.* In his anſwer are the following words, among others; *that though he had poſitively affirmed that* this marriage *was not conſummated*, he would not have been the inventor of that circumſtance; and *that he could alledge a good authority for this* (34); and who ſhould this authority be, but Florimond de Remond? Varillas declares, that the Engliſh, German, Italian and Spaniſh Authors, had wrote with ſo much partiality on the ſchiſm (reformation) of Henry VIII. that he had been *obliged to have recourſe to a French Author, and that Florimond de Remond was pitched upon for this purpoſe. He was a Counſellor in the Parliament of Bourdeaux; had a wife and children, and was not induced by any motive to corrupt the truth. The Calviniſts were, in his time, in the height of their power; he had no reaſon to be diſſatisfied with them; and he ſpent ſo many years in writing his hiſtory of the birth, progreſs and decay of Hereſy, that he died before it was printed. His children took care to have it printed, and the publick beſtowed great applauſes on it. It has born ſeveral impreſſions; and as, during fourſcore years, (for ſo long it has been publiſhed) no Proteſtant ſeems to have attempted to refute it, any more than the book concerning Antichriſt and Pope Joan, written by the ſame Author, I had reaſon to believe, that if they did not approve it, it was at leaſt indifferent to them* (35). Dr. Burnet eaſily invalidated the authority of this teſtimony; he obſerving, that Florimond de Remond *lived at a conſiderable diſtance from England, and the knowledge of what was tranſacted in that country* (36); and that, *as appears from every period in his hiſtory, he bore ſo much hatred to the reformation, that this circumſtance alone may juſtly prejudice any perſon againſt every thing he ſays concerning it . . . . farther, that part of the hiſtory which relates to England, was not writ by him* (37), as is expreſsly declared in the preface; *and his ſon ſeems to aſcribe the honour of it to himſelf.* Nay, it is very much doubted, whether he *wrote the whole work*, and if we are not to aſcribe it to Richeome the Jeſuit. He adds (38), that Florimond de Remond was never conſidered, in France, *as an Author who deſerved to be ranked among the Hiſtorians, either in point of judgment or ſincerity*; and that he was conſidered as an unjuſt Judge. Mr. Varillas, continues he, would poſſibly have made a great clamour a year ago, *as the higheſt injury that could have been done him, had he been accuſed of tranſcribing from ſo bad an Author, and of being merely his echo. But he is now glad to have recourſe to ſo poor a ſhift; for which he nevertheleſs was ſo ſtrongly cenſured in Paris, that it perhaps would be treating him with too much ſeverity, to inſiſt any farther on this matter.* He ridicules him for obſerving, that Florimond de Remond had a wife and children. *It is not very eaſy to ſee,* ſays Dr. Burnet (39), *in what the ſtrength of this argument conſiſts; but indeed a perſon muſt ſoar above the vulgar, to be affected with Mr. Varillas's ſublime eloquence. If a man, in order to his being a good author, muſt have a wife and children, we may conclude that Mr. Varillas has neither. Here we have a new argument for the marriage of Prieſts, which no one ever thought of before. But I muſt confeſs that, for a perſon of a vulgar capacity as I am, I cannot comprehend why this ſhould have made Florimond de Remond a good author, and not Thuanus.* The Critic, at the concluſion of the book, tells him of the complaints which the Proteſtants made with regard to the furious animoſity which Florimond de Remond vented againſt them (40); which circumſtance alone might prejudice him in writing their hiſtory; not to mention that he remembered he had been their priſoner, and had been obliged to pay a ranſom: is it therefore not ſhameful for Varillas to aſſert, that *he had no reaſon to be diſſatisfied with them?* But if ever writer ought to bluſh, to have no other authority to alledge but that of this Magiſtrate of Bourdeaux, in relating the hiſtory of the ſchiſm (reformation) of England; it is particularly a prodigious ſhame to Varillas, he who ſet up for a writer who drew, from the moſt curious, authentic, and ſecret manuſcripts, anecdotes, thoſe pure and little known ſources of truth.

(32) Burnet's *Reflexions on the ninth book of Varillas*, p. 41.

(33) Arthur, ſon to Henry VII.

(34) Varillas, *Reponſe à la Critique de Mr. Burnet*, p. m. 97.

(35) Ibid. p. 98.

(36) Burnet, *Defence of the Reflections*, p. 24.

(37) Burnet, ibid. p. 25.

(38) Idem, ibid. p. 28.

(39) Idem, ibid. p. 39.

(40) I have given that paſſage from Dr. Burnet, citat. 31.

I muſt obſerve that one falſity in Varillas was ſuffered to paſs uncenſured. He affirms that the books concerning Anti-chriſt and Pope Joan, wrote by Florimond de Remond, were never refuted; but he would have found the contrary, had he caſt an eye on the title of *Theatre de l'Anti-chriſt* (41), and the dialogue of Alexander Cook (42). But it alſo muſt be obſerved, that the reaſon he alledges, grounded on his being a married man, is not a contemptible one; for it is more natural to ſuppoſe, that a layman was not guided by prejudice, in writing the hiſtory of the enemies to his Church, as it is natural to expect ſuch a thing from a Miniſter. Varillas might therefore have ſuppoſed, that Florimond de Remond was leſs to be ſuſpected than a Frier or a Prieſt. I own that this reaſon is equally good with regard to Thuanus; but as he did not write any thing on the ſchiſm made by Henry VIII, could Varillas have made uſe of him? This author might conſequently have defended himſelf as to that particular.

(41) Written by Nicholas Vignier, a Proteſtant Miniſter, and printed in 1610. A book alſo was publiſhed, entitled, *l'Anti chriſt Romain*, (the Roman Anti-chriſt) in which our Remond was refuted.

(42) It was tranſlated out of Engliſh into French, by John de la Montagne.

(*a*) See the dedication to the French tranſlation of his works.

(*b*) See his preface.

RENOU (JOHN), in Latin *Renodæus*, Counſellor and Phyſician in Paris about the beginning of the 17th Century, was a Norman (*a*). He was particularly well ſkilled in Pharmacy, as appears from the pieces he compoſed in Latin [*A*], and which Lewis de Serres tranſlated into French. The tranſlator (*b*) declares that he was as much ſuperior in this part of phyſick to Fernelius and Sylvius, and all who had hitherto writ on that ſubject,

[*A*] *The pieces he compoſed in Latin.*] Here follow the titles of them: *Diſpenſatorium Galeno-Chymicum continens Inſtitutionum Pharmaceuticarum libros V; De Materia Medica libros III; & Antidotarium varium & abſolutiſſimum* Mention is made in *Lindenius renovatus* (1), of the Paris editions 1608, and 1623, 4to; that of Frankfort 1609, 8vo; that of Hanau 1631, 4to; and that of Geneva, reviſed by Peter Uffenbach, and enlarged with ſome pieces 1631, 8vo. But the Frankfort edition of 1615, from which Lewis de Serres made his firſt tranſlation, is omitted. He afterwards was informed that the author had made

(1) p. 666. edit. of 1686.

ſubject, as Fernelius and Sylvius ſurpaſs Mirepſus and Præpoſitus. One eaſily perceives that John de Renou was not a friend to la Riviere, Phyſician to Henry IV. he not ſcrupling to call him even a quack (*c*). I obſerved, that he rejects a great number of popular errors with reſpect to the virtue of plants, minerals, &c. but he ſometimes gives quarter to very childiſh traditions [*B*]. He criticiſed ſomewhat in Bauderon's diſpenſatory (*d*), which gave occaſion to his being called plagiary; the ſon of the Author who was cenſured, aſſerting, that John de Renou *had enriched his antidotary with a vaſt number of thefts from the diſpenſatory of the late Mr. Bauderon his father* (*e*); but Renou anſwered, that the charge was equally falſe and ridiculous (*f*).

(*c*) Renou, liv. 3. *de la Matiere Medicinale*, chap. 34. p. m. 465.

(*d*) Renou, liv. 4. *de l'Antidotaire*, chap. 6. p. 739.

(*e*) Ibid.

(*f*) Ibid.

made his work one third larger in the Paris edition of 1623; which ſupplement he alſo tranſlated, and added it to the ſecond edition of his verſion. This ſecond edition is of Lyons 1626, printed by Anthony Chard. The copy I have ſeen, ſays in the title, that it was printed at Lyons in 1637, by Nicholas Gay. The work is in folio, and contains fourteen books; five for the *Inſtitutiones Pharmaceuticæ*, three for the *Materia Medica*, and ſix for the *Antidotarium*. There are a numberleſs multitude of typographical errors in them. Lewis de Serres was a native of Dauphiné, Fellow of the College of Phyſicians in Lyons, and has been omitted by Mr. Allard, in his *Bibliotheque de Dauphiné*. [Lewis de Serres lived forty years after this; and, in 1669, printed at Lyons, *La veritable Medecine oppoſée à l'Errour*, &c.]

[*B*] *He ſometimes gives quarter to very childiſh traditions.*] He gives but one inſtance of this. *It is ſaid there is ſuch great virtue in the emerald, that it not only preſerves, from the falling ſickneſs, all thoſe who wear it on their fingers ſet in gold; but likwiſe ſtrengthens the memory, and powerfully reſiſts the effects of carnal concupiſcence. For it is related that a King of Hungary, being engaged in the amorous congreſs with his Queen, felt a beautiful emerald, which he wore on his finger, break into three pieces during their dalliance; ſo great a friend is this ſtone to chaſtity. This being ſo, methinks the interpreter of the Meſue was in the right to ſubſtitute the emerald inſtead of the turquoiſe* &c (2).

(2) Renou, liv. 2. *de la Matiere Medicinale*, chap. 1. p. 406.

RESENIUS (PETER), Counſellor and Profeſſor in Copenhagen, was born there the 17th of June 1625. His father and his grandfathers, both by the father's and mother's ſide, were Biſhops of Sealand. He was appointed Sub-Principal of the College of Copenhagen in 1646; and having quitted that employment the following year, he ſet out to viſit foreign countries. He ſtudied, during four years, polite literature, and the law in the Univerſity of Leyden, after which he went into France, and then into Spain and Italy. He ſtay'd a whole year in Padua, where he applied himſelf chiefly to the ſtudy of the civil law. He was elected Counſellor of the German nation in that city; and Vice-Syndic of the Univerſity, in which quality he made a ſpeech in the Senate of Venice, and obtained a privilege for that Univerſity. It was in his power to have received the Order of Knighthood of St. Mark. He did not leave Padua till after having taken his Doctor's Degree in Law there, the 11th of September 1653. He returned to Denmark by the way of Germany, and married the 18th of July 1655. He was appointed Profeſſor of moral Philoſophy in the Univerſity of Copenhagen, the 25th of November 1657, afterwards Conſul of that city, Counſellor of the ſupreme Council; and laſtly, Preſident of Copenhagen, and Counſellor of Juſtice. He was ennobled the 18th of January 1680, and created Counſellor of State the 6th of May 1684. He formed a very fine library, which he left to the Univerſity of Copenhagen, and the catalogue of it was printed (*a*) in 1685. He alſo publiſhed ſeveral books (*b*) [*A*].

(*a*) At Copenhagen, in 4to.

(*b*) Extracted from the *Journal of his Life*, written by himſelf, and prefixed to the catalogue of his library.

[*A*] *He alſo publiſhed ſeveral books.*] Here follows a *liſt of them: Edda Snorronis Sturleſonii triplici linguâ Iſlandicâ & Latinâ: quarum Iſlandica primitiva eſt, reliquæ autem interpretationes. Præfixa etiam prolegomena de triplici ratione docendi Ethicam: Item de Eddæ Scriptoribus, partibus & aliis ſimilibus. Impreſſum eſt hoc opus in quarta quam appellant forma, Anno M. DC. LXV. Eddæ Sæmundianæ pars dicta HAVAMAAL, complexa Ethicam Odini: eſque & Iſlandicè & Latinè impreſſa, in quarto, ut vocant, anno M. DC. LV. Eddæ Sæmundianæ VOLUSPA, continens Philoſophiam Danorum, Norvegorumque antiquiſſimam: eſque impreſſa in quarto, anno M. DC. LXV. item anno M. DC. LXXIII. additis Gudmundi Andreæ Iſlandi annotationibus. Inſcriptiones Havnienſes, Amagrienſes, & Uraniburgicæ, Latinæ, Danicæ, & Germanicæ; una cum addita narratione de Tychone Brahco diverſiſque ipſius et ſororis ipſius Sophiæ Brahcæ epiſtolis, editæ in quarto, anno M. DC. LXVIII. Jus aulicum vetus Regum Norvegorum, dictum HIRDSKRAA: Item Jus aulicum vetus Regum Danorum dictum VITHERLAGSRET, linguâ triplici, originali Iſlandica, interpretibus Danica, atque Latina, additæ quoque annotationes, Impreſſio facta Havniæ anno M. DC. LXXIII. Havniæ delineatio topographica in ære expreſſa, unà cum brevi partium & locorum enarratione, Danicè & Germanicè impreſſa Havniæ, anno M. DC. LXXIV. Samſoæ deſcriptio & delineatio cum figuris. In folio, Havniæ anno M. DC. LXXV. Friderici II. Hiſt. Danicè in folio cum figuris, Haf. anno M. DC. LXXV. Lexicon Iſlandicum Gudmundi Andreæ Iſlandi, cum præfatione de ejuſdem vita: in forma quarta Havnæ, anno M. DC. LXXXIII. Leges Cimbricæ Valdemari ſecundi Regis Donici, Germanicè, interprete Erico Krabbio, equite Danico. In præfatione addita eſt narratio de ordine equeſtri Dannebrogico: item de novo corpore Juris Danici: nec non de genealogia ejuſdem Erici Krabbii. Havniæ in quarto, anno M. DC. LXXXIV. Leges civiles & eccleſiaſticæ Chriſtiani Secundi in quarto, Havniæ anno M. DC. LXXXIV. Havniæ & Riparum jus urbicum. In 12. Havniæ, eodem anno M. DC. LXXXIV* (1).

(1) *Vita Reſenii*, folio D ij *verſo*.

REVEREND-DE-BOUGY (JOHN), Marquis of Bougy, and Lieutenant General of the French armies in the reign of Lewis XIV. diſtinguiſhed himſelf on a numberleſs multitude of occaſions, by his great bravery and conduct, and by an inviolable adherence to the ſervice of his Sovereign, at a time when ſo many others went even to the rebels, during the time of the laſt civil war (*a*). He was a Proteſtant; of an ancient and noble family of Lower Normandy [*A*], and the younger of ſixteen brothers or ſiſters.

(*a*) Anno 1649 & *ſeq.*

[*A*] *He was . . . of an ancient and noble family of lower Normandy.*] He was ſon to MICHAEL REVEREND-DE-BOUGY, and grandſon of OLIVER REVEREND-DE-BOUGY, and great grandſon of MICHAEL REVEREND-

(b) A Memoir communicated to the Author.

(c) Ibid.

(d) Ibid.

(e) Ibid.

(f) His Majeſty's patents for the creation of the Marquiſate of Bougy.

(g) Ibid.

(b) From the Memoir communicated.

ſifters (b). At twelve years of age he entered as a Cadet in the Regiment of Guards, and afterwards roſe from one poſt to another; he being ſucceſſively a Cornet, Captain of the Life-Horſe, Colonel, &c. (c). He was Cornet of the Gendarmes of Marſhal de Gaſſion (d), who had ſuch great friendſhip and eſteem for him [B], that this circumſtance alone proves his bravery, and other military accompliſhments. He was not of an ungrateful diſpoſition, he adhering ſo very zealouſly to the Marſhal, that Cardinal Mazarine could never win him over to his intereſt. His eminence was very urgent with him in that particular, when he went to the Court in order to make up for what the Marſhal's vivacity and boldneſs had ſpoiled (e). The Cardinal was more ſucceſsful, with regard to Mr. de Bougy, after Gaſſion's death [C]. His ſervices during the civil wars were great and important; and ſo advantageous an idea was entertained of his fidelity and conduct, that he was *appointed chief Commander of the troops which were to continue* with the King; *which he did ſo ſucceſsfully, that after having beat* the rebels, *who would have prevented his paſſing the Loire at la Charité, and marching into Berri, he forced their Commander to abandon the city of Bourges; which, not long after, opened its gates* to the King (f). Before this he had been *chief Commander* at the ſiege of Chateau Portien, *which engaged* his Majeſty, *after he had taken that place, to beſtow the government of it upon him. . . . He ſignalized himſelf by taking Mas d'Agenois . . . at the retreat of St. Andras*, and on many other occaſions, *in one of which, being Lieutenant General, after having fought valiantly to the laſt extremity, he was taken priſoner* (g) in 1653. He was permitted to go to Court upon his parole (b); and having been exchanged, he returned to Guienne, where in 1654 he married Mary de la Chauſade de Callonge, a very rich heireſs, by whom he left but one ſon [D]. The Queen-mother and Cardinal Mazarin concerned themſelves in the moſt obliging manner in that marriage [E]; and did not forget to mention the good ſervices of the Lady's father [F]. He ſerved in Catalonia the ſame year, under the Prince of

(1) From the Memoir communicated to me.

(2) Mezerai, *Hiſt. de France*, Tom. 3. p. 776. edit. of 1685.

REVEREND-DE-BOUGY. The two laſt are mentioned in Mezerai's hiſtory, as will ſoon appear. We do not meet with any thing relating to their predeceſſors in printed books; but the records of the family go higher, though they are pretty imperfect; the houſe having been once plundered, and another time burnt, during the civil wars of the XVIth century (1). Mezerai mentions one Bougy (2) among the Lords who went to meet, in Caen, the Duke of Montpenſier, whom Henry III had ſent into Normandy, to prevent the Leaguers from corrupting that whole province. This Bougy was father of Oliver Reverend-de-Bougy, of whom Mezerai ſpeaks as follows: "Caen would have been loſt, had not "the reſolution and judgment of Oliver Reverend of "Bougy, a Gentleman of the country who happened to be there, checked the incurſion. But he "flew valiantly into the ſtreet, ſummoned his friends, "rouzed the inhabitants; but foreſeeing, in the "mean time, that the enemy would ſhut the gate "of the bridge, he diſpatched immediately one of "his men to nail a piece of wood to it. By this "means, when they attempted to ſhut it, the more "haſte they made, the leſs they perceived the obſtacle; when immediately he himſelf arrived, "with fifteen or twenty men who were animated by "his example. His arrival aſtoniſhed and confounded them; and as they could not ſhut the gate "cloſe, one of his followers, la Riviere-Renouf by "name, forcing himſelf into the gap with equal "boldneſs and courage, ſhot la Motte-Corbiniere "through the head with a piſtol, and by his death "defeated his deſign and that of his party. The "citizens were more ſenſible of the greatneſs of the "danger when it was over; and the King gave afterwards the following teſtimony of du Bougy; "that his fidelity, which he had already experienced "on other occaſions, had, on this, ſaved him all "lower Normandy (3)."

(3) Ibid. *Vie de Henry IV.* p. 1097, 1098.

(4) L'Abbé de Pure, *Vie du Marechal de Gaſſion*, Tom. 4. p. 309. ad ann. 1647.

(5) Extracted from the ſame Memoir.

(6) It is ſtill in the family.

[B] *Marſhal de Gaſſion had ſuch great friendſhip and eſteem for him.*] It is known that he died of the wound he had received in the ſiege at Lens, *as he was endeavouring to move one of the ſtakes* of a paliſado (4). *He received a muſket ſhot in his head which ſtruck him down, and was immediately raiſed from the ground by his couſin de Gaſſion, and Marquis de Bougy, who only had followed him.* Theſe carried him back into the trenches, after which he got himſelf convoyed to Arras, whither he was accompanied by Mr. de Bougy, at that time Marſhal of Battalia (5). *The Marſhal, as he was dying, gave him his ſword* (6). *with this compliment, that he thought no man in all France ſo worthy of wearing it after him.* The Marſhal's regiment was divided between Mr. de Gaſſion his couſin, and the Marquis de Bougy.

[C] *The Cardinal was more ſucceſsful, with regard to Mr. de Bougy, after Gaſſion's death.*] Having ſent for him to Court, the inſtant he had been informed of Marſhal de Gaſſion's death, he ſaid to him, *I offer you a friend in the room of him you have loſt. The fidelity you always diſcovered for this Marſhal pleaſes me to ſuch a degree, that I intreat you to have the ſame for me, and offer you my friendſhip.* Mr. de Bougy replied in ſuch a manner as was agreeable to the Cardinal; and was ſo true to his word, that when his eminence left France he attended him to the frontiers; when I come back, ſays the Cardinal to him, I will make your fortune; but when he was returned, he told him, that his being a Proteſtant was an obſtacle to it (7).

(7) Extracted from the Memoir in queſtion.

[D] *He left but one ſon.*] This was JOHN JAMES REVEREND-DE-BOUGY, born in 1655, and who, during nine years, commanded the regiment as Colonel, and left the ſervice only on account of his Religion, after which he retired to Holland. He now lives at the Hague, where he is greatly reſpected, as he juſtly deſerves. He has loſt his only ſon ſince he left France. There ſurvive only two daughters by his marriage, in 1674, with Elizabeth of Bar de Camparnau, deſcended, on the mother's ſide, from the famous Reniers, whoſe quarrel with Veiſius was attended with ſuch particular circumſtances, as are related by Thuanus (8) and Mezerai (9). This laſt hiſtorian relates, that he was Lieutenant of the Princes in Querci. The family of Bar de Camparnau is a very noble one; it is mentioned in many books, and particularly in the hiſtory of the ſiege of Montauban (10).

(8) Thuan. lib. 52. p. 1079. ad ann. 1572.

(9) Mezerai, *Hiſt. de France*, Tom. 3. p. 259.

(10) From the above-cited Memoir.

[E] *The Queen mother, and Cardinal Mazarin concerned themſelves in the moſt obliging manner, in that marriage.*] The Marquis de Bougy was the bearer of a letter which that Queen wrote to Mademoiſelle de Callonge, in which her Majeſty deſired her to receive him as one coming from her. She added, *As the ſervices of your late father oblige me to ſee you ſettled, I imagined I could not procure you a better huſband* (11).

(11) Ibid.

[F] *The good ſervices of the Lady's father.*] This was James de la Chauſade, Baron de Callonge. He was Governor of Montpellier during the wars of Duke de Rohan, whoſe near relation he was. It was he who ſpoke in the name of the Proteſtants, when the peace was concluded before Montpellier. See du Pleix's hiſtory, and Girard's life of Duke d'Epernon, Baſſompierre's Memoirs, the life of Duke de Montmorenci, and ſeveral other authors. His Majeſty's letters patents, for the raiſing the Barony of

of Conti, and the following years till 1657, when he was obliged to aſk leave to go to Montpellier, that he might be cured of a defluxion which was fallen upon his lungs. He got this diſtemper by paſſing a whole night upon the mountains, where, in his ſleep, he had been quite covered with ſnow. He could not find any eaſe in Montpellier, and meeting with no better ſucceſs in Bourdeaux, he went to his houſe at Callonge, and died there in 1658, aged forty, being univerſally regretted. The King, the Queen, and Cardinal Mazarin, did his widow the honour to ſend her letters of conſolation. He would have advanced higher in point of fortune, had he been a Roman Catholick. The Queen and the Cardinal had deſired him ſeveral times by letter, to change his religion, and to remove, by that means, the obſtacle to his advancement, and offered him a Marſhal's ſtaff, and any Government he might make choice of, provided he would turn Papiſt: but he anſwered, *that if he could be prevailed upon to betray his God for a Marſhal of France's ſtaff, he might betray his King for a thing of much leſs conſequence; that he could not do either of them, but was contented to find that his ſervices were acceptable, and that the only obſtacle to his being rewarded was the religion he profeſſed* (*i*). The King had made the Lordſhip of Bougy, in Lower Normandy, a Marquiſate; but as it is held of ſeveral Lords, ſuch a variety of oppoſitions were formed to the regiſtring of the patents, that they proved ineffectual. For this reaſon the erection was transferred to the Barony of Callonge, which holds immediately of the King. The patent was iſſued in November 1667, and regiſtred in the chamber of accounts the 9th of September 1669. I have read it, and found there an ample account of the ſervices, which Marquis de Bougy had done the King; they conſiſting not only of warlike exploits, but likewiſe of negotiations (*k*). Hereunder are related ſome of the moſt glorious circumſtances of his life [*G*]. He

(*i*) Extracted from the Memoir above.

(*k*) The words of the patent are as follow: *Having, during all that time, as good an opinion of his prudence as of his valour, we employed him alſo in ſeveral important negotiations, and particularly with regard to the Duke of Modena, when he declared for us, and joined his army to ours in* 1648.

of Callonge to a Marquiſate, declare, that this James de la Chauſade had been *Colonel of a regiment of foot, in his Majeſty's ſervice, in Holland; that he had gained great reputation by his valour and experience in war, and by a great number of glorious actions atchieved by him, particularly during the commotions in Guienne under the government of Duke d'Epernon, during which, on two different occaſions, he led a conſiderable number of volunteers, among the gentry, to the King, a circumſtance that contributed not a little to ſupport his* Majeſty's *authority, and to curb the factious; that at the battle of Avein he took the enemies cannon, after he had broke through and routed them with his regiment of twenty companies; and, that his glory might not be bounded by the frontiers of this Kingdom, he followed Duke de Candale to Turkey, to wage war with the enemies of the Chriſtian name, where he blew up the gates of Agliman with a petard; and was one of the firſt who entered that place ſword in hand, after having ſignalized himſelf on ſeveral other occaſions* (12). Mademoiſelle de Callonge, his other daughter, died at the Hague ſome months ago (13) in a very advanced age, unmarried. She was a lady of exemplary piety and virtue, and very well ſkilled in the Hebrew tongue (14). She left France, for the ſake of her Religion, when the edict of Nantz was repealed. Mezerai mentions, in his hiſtory, one Callonge, among the Proteſtant Lords of the province of Guienne, who took up arms againſt Charles IX (15).

(12) Extracted from the patent.

(13) I writ this in April 1701.

(14) See Colomeſius, p. 271 of *Gallia Orientalis*.

(15) Mezerai, Tom. 3. p. 93.

[*G*] *Hereunder are related ſome of the moſt glorious circumſtances of his life.*] He commanded, at the battle of Rocroi, the company of Gaſſion's Gendarmes; and though one of his feet was ſhattered with a muſket ball, he nevertheleſs broke through one of the enemies battalions, where his horſe was killed under him by thruſts of pikes or ſwords (16). Theſe are the expreſs terms of the patent cited above. In 1650 *he threw himſelf into the town of St. Quentin with* 500 *horſe* and by that means defeated *the deſign the Spaniards had on this place which was in great danger.* And after, *when they beſieged the city of Guiſe, the counſel he gave, for poſting twelve hundred muſqueteers in the wood, to cut off the proviſions from the beſiegers, and the happy manner in which he himſelf conducted that enterprize*, was one of the cauſes of raiſing the ſiege (17). The Court being determined to leave Paris in 1651, after the Prince of Conde had diſcovered his ill deſigns, the Queen ſent immediately for Mr. de Bougy in Flanders, and ſeeing him come into her chamber with his boots on, her Majeſty cried, *Here is Bougy; I am not afraid now.* Then directing herſelf to him, ſhe ſaid, that ſhe had ſent for him, to intruſt him with the King's perſon and her own, and accordingly, he conducted them to Fontainebleau. It is to be obſerved, that he was at that time only Marſhal de Camp, and that there were ſeveral officers at Court in higher poſts (18); but the Queen did not truſt to every one, or rather ſhe almoſt miſtruſted every one. Mr. de Bougy (19), at his leaving Flanders, had ordered a detachment of horſe to follow him, he himſelf having rid poſt thither. He was informed, as ſoon as he had brought the Court to Fontainebleau, that the Prince's forces were advancing towards Gien, in order to ſeize it. He then diſpatched a courier to the troops in Flanders, which had been commanded to follow him; and intreated them, for his ſake, to make all the diſpatch poſſible. The courier came up with them as they were marching into their quarters; and being ſhewn the orders, they did but juſt bait, and mounted their horſes again. Mr. de Bougy, the inſtant of their arrival, put himſelf at their head; and marching into Gien, he ordered the gate which ſtood towards the Prince's troops to be opened, when charging them with great briſkneſs, he defeated them, and took three general officers priſoners. As he was purſuing the routed enemy, he obſerved a young man who betrayed fear in his face; when aſking him his name, and being told that he was ſon to one of the chief Magiſtrates of Bourges; *will you*, ſays he to him, *carry a letter to your father, whom her Majeſty looks upon as one of her moſt zealous ſervants?* The young man promiſed to give the letter to his father; immediately after which Mr. de Bougy wrote to inform the Magiſtrate in queſtion, that he had juſt before defeated the Prince's troops, and was marching directly to Bourges. During this interval, the Prince of Conti had got into the town, and aſſembled the Magiſtrates, to oblige them to declare for him. Upon the arrival of the youth, the Prince of Conti laughed at the letter, and taking it for an artifice, went into another room, to draw up ſuch an anſwer, as he thought proper to be made to de Bougy's letter. Whilſt he was writing it, ſome wounded men arrived, who confirmed the truth of that news, upon which the Magiſtrates told him, that he might retire, for that they were determined to remain faithful to the King (20). The Prince then withdrew to Mouron, and from thence to Guienne (21). Mr. de Bougy was *commanded to go with five hundred horſe, to croſs the river Né in Xaintonge, and over a very wide and very dangerous moraſs, behind which lay* the forces of the rebels, *conſiſting of four thouſand horſe and five thouſand foot; he diſlodged them from two of their beſt quarters, and brought back, priſoners, near five hundred troopers or officers.* Being Lieutenant-General of the day, at the ſiege of Capdequiers in Catalonia, and the troops which attempted the ſtorm having been repulſed from the

(16) The patent.

(17) The patent.

(18) From the Memoir quoted above.

(19) Ibid.

(20) Ibid.

(21) The patent.

(*l*) Letters patents of the creation or erection.

He had received among other wounds, five muſket ſhots (*l*).

the breach, he ſeized a Serjeant's halbard, got firſt upon the breach, and brought back the ſoldiers by his example. He there was ſhot with a muſket-ball; and yet fought with great bravery till the town was taken, whereof he was made Governor, though it was no longer the cuſtom to reward Huguenot officers in that manner (22).

(22) From the patent.

REYNIER (PETER DE), Knight of the Order of St. John of Jeruſalem, was of the illuſtrious family of Reyniers of Toulouſe. He was killed anno 1311, in the iſland of Rhodes, to which Othoman King of the Turks laid ſiege that year. This Knight diſplayed the utmoſt bravery at that ſiege. This family has given birth to ſeveral perſons of the moſt diſtinguiſhed merit; and among the reſt, to ELIAS DE REYNIER, Counſellor in the Parliament of Languedoc in 1523, who was very remarkable for his great fidelity to his Prince; and whoſe ſon, who alſo was a Counſellor of Parliament, married Martha de Minut, daughter to Meſſire James de Minut, firſt Preſident in the above-mentioned Parliament: FRANCIS DE REYNIER, Seneſchal of Lauragois; JOHN DE REYNIER, Colonel of a Regiment. The ſurvivors of this family now are CHARLES DE REYNIER, Knight of the Order of St. Lewis, Lieutenant to his Majeſty, and Commander of the town and government of Brouage (*a*). He has a brother who is a Counſellor in the Parliament of Toulouſe (*b*).

(*a*) He died in Dec. 1705. See *Mercure Galant*, for Jan. 1706. p. 223, 224.

(*b*) *Etat de la France.*

REZ (ANTHONY DE), Eſq; Advocate in the Parliament of Paris, was ſon to ANTHONY DE REZ, Counſellor and Secretary to the King, and was born in Paris anno 1650. His merit will beſt appear, by inſerting two panegyricks which have been ſent me (*a*). I am perſuaded that all perſons of taſte will look upon them as well drawn up, and very worthy of ſerving as models. The firſt is more extenſive, and contains a greater number of particulars [*A*]. The ſecond is of great weight; it being extracted from a ſpeech ſpoke by an Attorney General, in the Parliament of Paris [*B*].

(*a*) By Mr. Marais, Advocate in the Parliament of Paris.

RHODOMAN

[*A*] *The firſt* elogium *is more extenſive, and contains a greater number of particulars.*] I ſhall tranſcribe it here in the very words I received it; it being my opinion, that the leaſt alteration in it, or ſuppreſſion would ſpoil it. " Anthony de Rez devoted himſelf, " from his youngeſt years, to the bar; and was but " ſixteen when he pleaded his firſt cauſe. After " continuing ſome time in the lower Courts to learn " their forms of proceeding, he appeared with diſ- " tinguiſhed luſtre, though but very young, in the " Parliament. The ſeveral talents by which he af- " terwards diſtinguiſhed himſelf were preſently diſ- " covered in him; an eaſy, lively and penetrating " genius; a noble, ſimple and natural eloquence; " a polite and happy delivery; a fund of Ciceronian " raillery; a certain inſinuation that was irreſiſtible; " a truth, which every feature in his face, and his " pleaſing countenance diſcovered before he ſpoke; " a probity that was proof to the moſt ſeducing " temptations; an agreeable and ſolid fund of eru- " dition reſulting from good ſenſe, juſtice and hu- " manity, rather than from books; in fine, all the " qualities that conſtitute the good and great man. " Immediately perſons of all ranks reſorted to him. " No man pleaſed perſons of diſtinction ſo well as " he did, becauſe of his good mein, his affability, " and his very genteel behaviour: and perſons of " low rank were deſirous of having him for their " defender, becauſe of his well known honour, his " kindneſs, and regard for every one. He diſcharged " his duty to both, by an exactneſs in the ſmalleſt " things, and the greateſt fidelity. Magiſtrates of " all ranks, firmly perſuaded that nothing but truth " could come from his lips, liſtened to him with com- " plaiſance, were delighted to ſee him, and honoured " him with the moſt ſingular affection. Though " quite crowded with buſineſs, his great regularity " and order enabled him to go through with it: " he was engaged in all cauſes of any importance: " he defended, with the utmoſt eloquence, that of the " Princes of Lorrain, with regard to the donation " of Madamoiſelle de Guiſe, and he afterwards de- " fended the validity of her laſt will. He was per- " petually engaged in conteſts, and always came off " victorious. If a client wanted an advocate, the " Court uſed to nominate him by a ſuperior order, " and entruſted him with ſuch cauſes as were given " over. Affairs of the greateſt conſequence increaſ- " ed and became eaſy in his hands. The moſt " knotty difficulties diſappeared the inſtant he un- " dertook them; and the Judges being put in a clear " and certain method by him, pronounced their " ſentences without any fear of being miſtaken. " Such he appeared at the bar; ſuch, and ſtill more " amiable if poſſible, he appeared in ſociety and " converſation. There never was a kinder, more " ſincere, and obliging friend; a better father, or " a better huſband. He led a life of purity, virtue " and innocence, which at the ſame time was " heightened by ſprightlineſs and gaiety. His ge- " nius ſuggeſted to him, at will, a thouſand inge- " nious amuſements, to unbend himſelf after his " great fatigues. None in his company ever grew " tired, nor was he ever tired with himſelf. He was " that univerſal man, whoſe picture Mr. Peliſſon has " drawn, in his preface to Sarrazin's works: an " excellent orator at the bar: a judicious chamber- " counſellor, a tender father and huſband in his family; " an uſeful and agreeable friend; in a word, adorned " with all the qualities, as well natural as acquired, " as can ſatisfy the mind of man. Nothing was " wanting but a longer life; he being ſnatched " away, in the middle of a moſt ſhining career, and " the moſt promiſing hopes, by a malignant fever, " the 7th of February 1694, at forty three years of " age, after ſeven days illneſs; leaving two children, " a ſon and a daughter, whom Magdelain du Four " his wife had brought him."

[*B*] *The ſecond* elogium *is of great weight, it being extracted from a ſpeech, ſpoke by an Attorney-General, in the Parliament of Paris.*] What follows is the continuation of the paſſage given in the remark above. " Mr. de Harlay then Attorney-General, " making a ſpeech at the opening of the Parliament " the ſame year, did not forget him, though he had " been dead ten months; and propoſed him as a " pattern to all his brethren in expreſſions that re- " flect the higheſt honour on his memory. They " are as follow: (*) *To moderate the true liberty of* " *your profeſſion, we again repeat that it is not an eaſy* " *undertaking, nor of ſmall labour: it is the reſult of* " *a ſtudy, or rather a perpetual attention to our own* " *minds, and of an exact practice of ſeveral virtues.* " *It is thus one of your brethren, of whom an immature* " *death deprived us, not long ſince acquired the eſteem of* " *the public, and the friendſhip of all who were ac-* " *quainted with him; and had attained, in an age not* " *far advanced, the reputation and practice of the* " *greateſt*

(*) *Diſcours prononce à la S. Martin 1694, ſur la Liberte.*

RHODOMAN (LAURENCE) was born anno 1546, in the village of Saſſowerf (a), belonging to the Counts of Stolberg in Upper Saxony. The happy genius for learning, which he had diſcovered from his moſt tender years, induced thoſe Counts to maintain him in the College of Ilfeld (b). He continued there ſix years; and made ſo great a progreſs under Michael Neander (c), that he afterwards was qualified to be principal teacher in the moſt eminent publick ſchools, and moſt flouriſhing Univerſities [A]. He was eſpecially well ſkilled in the Greek tongue. He compoſed ſome Greek verſes, which have been admired by the beſt Judges (d), but Scaliger did not like his Latin poetry [B]. He was very ſucceſsful in his Latin tranſlation of Diodorus Siculus. He at laſt was appointed Hiſtory Profeſſor in the Univerſity of Wittemberg, and died there the 8th of January 1606. I ſhall give a catalogue of his principal works [C]. He had had the honour to be made Poet Laureate. NICHOLAS RHODOMAN his ſon has publiſhed ſomething (e).

(a) Rhodomanus, Epiſt. Dedicat. *Quinti Smyrnæi. Quenſtedt, de Patriis Illuſtr.* p. 219.

(b) Their anceſtors had founded it in the monaſtery of that name, by the advice of Luther and Melanchthon. See Rhodoman's *Dedication* to Quintus Calaber.

(c) See the ſame dedication, and the preface to his verſion of *Diodorus Siculus.*

(d) See the rem. [B].

(e) Konig, *Bibl.* p. 689.

" *greateſt advocates. Adorned with thoſe exteriour* " *graces, which nature alone can beſtow, he diſplayed in* " *his countenance, the characteriſticks of probity and* " *modeſty which were conſpicuous in his whole conduct.* " *You have ſeen him, at his firſt ſetting out, ſuſtain glo-* " *rioufly the weight of the greateſt actions, and defend* " *the moſt difficult cauſes, with equal politeneſs and ſo-* " *lidity. Attentive to all his duties, zealous for his* " *clients, courteous to his brethren, reſpectful to the Ma-* " *giſtrates, he has given the moſt ſhining proofs, that* " *if ſometimes the neceſſity of your employment, or the ex-* " *preſs orders of your ſuperiours,* oblige you to ſpeak " in favour of impoſture or calumny, you may undertake the defenſe of guilt without ſtaining your " honour, and conſcience; and even ſay the moſt " ungrateful things, without breaking the ſtricteſt " rules of decorum and civility. *But it is not enough* " *to pay interiorly this ſad duty to his memory; nor take* " *a pleaſure in hearing the elogiums he has ſo juſtly de-* " *ſerved. His example ſhould excite you to imitate his* " *virtues; and continue to force us, by your regular con-* " *duct, to ſpend theſe ſolemn days in publiſhing your praiſ-* " *es; without being put under a neceſſity of cenſuring* " *ſuch faults as are contrary to the duties of your pro-* " *feſſion, and which we are proud to ſee are ſo rarely* " *found among you.*"

[A] *He afterwards was qualified to be principal Teacher in the moſt eminent publick ſchools, and moſt flouriſhing Univerſities.*] Here follows what he himſelf tells us (1): *Eoſque in his, σὺν Θεῷ καὶ μούσαις, progreſſus feci, ut nobilium inde puerorum, & illuſtriſſ. principum informationi neque immature neque infructuoſe applicarer; Scholarum etiam bene conſtitutarum adminiſtrationi dehinc præficerer.* i. e. " By the aſſiſtance of God " and the Muſes, I made ſuch advances in theſe ſtu- " dies, that I was employed, from that time, both " ſeaſonably and propitiouſly, to inſtruct the children " of the Nobility, and the moſt illuſtrious Princes. I " afterwards was appointed to preſide over ſome well " regulated ſchools." The places where he taught, are thus mentioned in his funeral programma: *Docuit* Walcerodi, *docuit* Jenæ, *docuit* Straleſundi, *docuit denique* Wittebergæ, *atque ita docuit ut eruditione, ſedulitate, ac dexteritate ſecundus haberi nemini debeat* (2). We are here told, that he diſtinguiſhed himſelf ſo well by his learning, aſſiduity and ſkill in teaching, in the abovementioned cities, that he was excelled by none. He was Greek Profeſſor ſeven years in Jena, and four years Hiſtory-Profeſſor in Wittemberg (3).

(1) *In Epiſtola dedicatoria* Quinti Calabri.

(2) Daniel Sennertus, *in Programmate, apud* Henningum Witte, *Memor. Philoſoph.* p. 24.

(3) Ibid. p. 25.

[B] *Scaliger did not like his Latin poetry.*] Here follows what he ſaid in converſation: *Rhodomanus doctiſſimus in Poeſi Græca, ſed in Latina imperitus & infelix. . . Bonum Diodorum Siculum edidit*; i. e. " Rho- " domanus is extremely well ſkilled in Greek poetry, " but ignorant and unhappy in that of the Latin . . . " He publiſhed a fine Diodorus Siculus." . . . . . *A pretty man,* qui latuit, *like Leopardus, who was a ſkillful Grecian. I wrote ſo many letters, into Germany, about Rhodomanus, that they were ſhewn to the Duke of Saxony, who called him, from a trifling ſchool in Pomerania, to Wittemberg. He is very ugly and clowniſh. . . He is a Poet and a good Grecian. . . . . He drew up a chronology, in which he reſolved to contradict every body, and me alſo. There are the moſt trifling things in the world in his book. Chronologers have committed a great number of errors. Rhodoman doats in his old age; he pronounces like Vulcanius. Rhodomanus carmina Latina non benè ſcribit, ſed Græca bona; bonus eſt Græcus in Poetis* (4).

(4) Scaligerana, *Voce* Rhodomanus, p. m. 204.

I am to obſerve, that Scaliger confounded our Laurence Rhodoman with one Laurence Codoman (5), Author of four books of chronology, which he annexed to his annals of the holy ſcriptures, publiſhed at Wirtemberg in 1581. The moſt learned men often commit ſuch faults in converſation; which they may eaſily do, when there is but about the difference of a letter in the names of Authors. This is what Scaliger did.

(5) See Mollerus, p. 716 of his *Homonymoſcopia.*

[C] *I ſhall give a catalogue of his principal works.*] He made a Latin tranſlation of the Greek poem of Cointus Smyrnæus, or Quintus Calaber, concerning the taking of Troy, and added ſome corrections to it. I am of opinion, that the commentaries he wrote on that Author were never printed; and it is at random that Moreri and others affirm, that *they are greatly eſteemed.* I make uſe of an edition of that work (6), in which there are two Greek and Latin poems of Rhodoman: the one entitled ΙΛΙΑΣ ΜΙΚΡΑ, containing an abridgment of the Iliad, and of Quintus Calaber; and the other entitled ΤΡΟΙΚΑ, contains an epitome of the Trojan war, *ex variis auctoribus decerpta.* There likewiſe is inſerted the ſpeech, in which Dion Chryſoſtom aſſerts that Troy was not taken, with a Latin verſion by Rhodoman, and ſome Scholia. Here follow the titles of ſome other works (7). *Hiſtoria vitæ & doctrinæ Martini Lutheri carmine heroico deſcripta.* (8) *Deſcriptio Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiæ, ſive populi Dei Politiæ ejuſdem & rerum præcipuarum, quæ in illo populo acciderunt, Græco carmine, cum verſione Latina è regione textus Græci,* Francof. 1581, in 8vo. *Poeſis Chriſtiana, id eſt, Paleſtinæ ſeu Hiſtoriæ ſacræ Græco-Latinæ libri* 9. Marpurgi 1589. Francof. 1590, 1630, in 4to. *Argonautica, Thebaica, Ilias parva.* Lipſ. 1588, in 8vo. *Tabulæ Etymologiæ Græcæ.* ibid. 1590, 8vo. *Memnonis Hiſtoria de Republica Heraclienſium, & rebus Ponticis Eclogæ: ſeu excerptæ & abbreviatæ narrationes in Sermonem Latinum tranſlatæ.* Helmſtadii 1591, in 4to. *Epithalamia ſacra.* Jenæ 1594, in 4to. *Ex Memnone, de Tyrannis Heracleæ Ponticæ Cteſia & Agatharchide excerptæ Hiſtoriæ Græcè & Latinè partim ex Laur. Rhodomani interpretatione.* Geneva 1593, 8vo. *Theologiæ Chriſtianæ tyrocinia, carmine Heroico Græco-Latino in* 5 *libros digeſta.* Lipſ. 1597, 8vo. His *Germanis* was not printed at his death, and it is greatly applauded in his funeral programma. *Imprimis opus illud auro contra æſtimandum, quod de origine, moribus ac rebus geſtis veterum Germanorum Græcè ſcripſit, & Germanidem inſcripſit. Quod opus unicum tale eſt, ut animum atque ingenium hominis excellentem, charitateque patriæ inſigniter flagrantem, abundè oſtendat* (9). Witte (10) ranks it in the catalogue of the printed works of Rhodoman, but does not mention the year in which it was publiſhed at Wittemberg.

(6) That of 1614.

(7) Witte, *Mem. Philoſoph.* p. 28.

(8) Idem, ibid. p. 27.

(9) Sennertus, *in Programmate, apud* Witte, p. 24.

(10) *Ubi ſupra.*

RHODOPE, a famous Courtezan, contemporary with Æſop, and a ſlave in the ſame houſe with him, was born in Thrace (a). Xanthus the Samian took her into Ægypt, where Charaxus a Merchant of Mitylene (b), and brother of Sappho, was ſo ſmit with her, that he purchaſed her for a very conſiderable ſum of money. By this means ſhe obtained her liberty; and being a woman of great beauty, and as the city of Naucratis

(a) Herodot. lib. 2. cap. 134.

(b) A city of the iſland of Lesbos.

cratis where ſhe fixed her abode abounded with wealthy perſons, of a ſenſual turn of mind, ſhe amaſſed great riches by turning courtezan (*c*). However, we muſt not ſuppoſe that ſhe got ſo much money by that profeſſion, as enabled her to build one of thoſe pyramids [*A*], which have been ranked among the ſeven wonders of the world. Herodotus rejects this as fabulous; and the ſame muſt be ſuppoſed of what we are told concerning her ſhoe [*B*]. Athæneus is of opinion, that Dorica the Courtezan, miſtreſs to Sappho's brother, was confounded by Herodotus with Rhodope (*d*).

(*c*) Extracted from Herodot. lib. 2. cap. 135.

(*d*) *Athen.* lib. 13. p. 596.

[*A*] *Enabled her to build one of thoſe pyramids.*] Pliny does not ſpeak of this in a doubtful manner; but perhaps he did not believe any thing of it; and that the only reaſon of his writing in that manner was, to have an opportunity of ſhewing his wit. He obſerves, that the dimenſions and magnificent ſtructure of the pyramids is not the moſt ſurprizing circumſtance in this wonder of the world; the greateſt miracle, continues he, is, that a Courtezan ſhould have amaſſed ſuch treaſures, as to be able to defray the expences of that pyramid, which is moſt admired. *Hæc ſunt pyramidum miracula: ſupremumque illud, ne quis regum opus, miretur minimam ex his, ſed laudatiſſimam, à Rhodope meretricula factam. Æſopi fabularum Philoſophi conſerva quondam & contubernalis hæc fuit, majore miraculo tantas opes meretricio eſſe conquiſitas quæſtu* (1). This tradition was one of the romantick tales invented by the Grecians. Herodotus, who was credulous enough of ſtories, does nevertheleſs refute this. He aſſerts (2), that the pyramid which Rhodope was ſaid to have built, was built ſeveral years before the reign of Amaſis, under whom that Courtezan lived. He adds (3), that though ſhe had acquired great riches, it yet would not have been poſſible for her to defray the immenſe ſums, which that building would have coſt. He proves it by a very ſtrong reaſon. We know very well, ſays he, the amount of this woman's riches; for the iron ſpits which ſhe conſecrated at Delphi, and which coſt her the tenth part of her ſubſtance, are ſtill in that temple. Theſe ſpits were to roaſt oxen. The Prieſts under the heathen ſyſtem were not over nice; they thinking the ſmell that iſſued from profit or gain very ſweet, though the thing from which it aroſe was ever ſo ſtinking; and it is from them that Veſpaſian might have learned this maxim of Juvenal.

(1) Plin. lib. 36. cap. 12. p. m. 302.

(2) Herodot. lib. 2. cap. 134.

(3) Idem, ibid. cap. 135.

Lucri bonus eſt odor ex re
Qualibet (4).

(4) Juven. ſatyr. 14. ver. 204. See Suetonius, *in* Veſpaſiano, cap. 23.

" He that grows rich by ſcow'ring of a ſink,
" Gets wherewithal to juſtify the ſtink.
J. DRYDEN, Jun.

They uſed to receive with joy the offerings made by Courtezans, and conſecrated them amid the moſt celebrated monuments of the devotion of people; this was immortalizing the guilt of thoſe Courtezans in the manner they deſired. The only motive, which prompted Rhodope to devote the tenth part of her plunder to the making of ſpits, was, to raiſe an eternal monument to herſelf in Greece. Ἐπεθύμησε γὰρ Ῥοδῶπις μνημεῖον αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι καταλοπίσθαι, ποίημα ποιησαμένη τοῦτο. τὸ μὲν τυγχάνει ἄλλῳ ἐξευρημένον, καὶ ἀνακείμενον ἐν ἱρῇ, τοῦτο ἀναθεῖναι ἐς Δελφοὺς μνημόσυνον ἑωυτῆς. τῆς ὧν δικάτης τῶν χρημάτων ποιησαμένη ὀβελοὺς βοῶν ὁσίρῖνς, ὅσον ἐνεχώρει ἡ δικάτη οἱ, ἀπέπεμπε ἐς Δελφούς. οἱ καὶ νῦν ἔτι συνεσταται, ὀπισθεμὲν τοῦ βωμοῦ τὸν Χῖοι ἀνέθεσαν, ἀντίον δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῦ νηοῦ (5). i. e. " Rhodope being deſirous of tranſmitting her name to " poſterity among the Greeks, cauſed things to be " made, which no one had ever thought of before, or " made a gift of; and preſented them to the Temple " of Delphos, as a monument left by her. She " cauſed as many iron ſpits for roaſting of oxen to " be made, as the tenth part of her ſubſtance could " buy, and ſent the ſpits to Delphos. They are " ſtill depoſited behind the altar raiſed by the Chians, " and oppoſite to the Temple itſelf." The Jewiſh laws did not allow any ſuch unhallowed thing (6).

(5) Herodot. lib. 2. cap. 135.

(6) *Non inferes mercedem meretricis, aut pretium canis in domum Dei tui in quocunque voto, quia abominatio eſt utrumque apud Dominum Deum tuum.* Deuteron. xxiii. 18.

[*B*] *What we are told concerning her ſhoe.*] One day as ſhe was bathing, and her maids were looking after her clothes, an eagle came down, ſeized one of her ſhoes, carried it to Memphis, and dropped it in the lap of King Pſammitichus, who was then ſitting on his tribunal, adminiſtring juſtice. He admired the beauty of the ſhoe, and the eagle's action; and commanded an enquiry to be made throughout all Egypt, for the Lady, who had been plundered of her ſhoe in this manner. Accordingly ſhe was found; and being brought to him, he made her his Queen (7). As to myſelf, I do not believe a word of this, though fortune ſometimes takes a pleaſure in ſuch pranks. ἡ τὰ παράδοξα καὶ τὰ ἀδόκητα φιλέοντα ἐργάζεσθαι τύχη, *inopinatorum atque inexpectatorum amans fortuna* (8). Rhodope, who was a captive along with Æſop, would willingly have married this monſtrous man. What a change would this have wrought! She would have been wife to an auguſt Monarch, and ranked among thoſe perſons,

(7) Extracted from Ælian, Var. *Hiſt.* lib. 13. cap. 33. See alſo Strabo, lib. 17. p. 556.

(8) Ælian. ibid.

Quales ex humili magna ad faſtigia rerum
Extollit, quoties voluit fortuna jocari (9).

(9) Juven. ſatyr. 3. ver. 39.

" Whom for her pleaſure, fortune can advance;
" And toſs them topmoſt on the wheel of chance.
Dryden, a little altered.

We may obſerve by the way, that wit and good ſenſe may get the better in a girl's mind, of the effects of deformity. Æſop, though the ugliеſt of mortals, made an impreſſion on Rhodope's heart (10).

(10) Herodot. lib. 2. cap. 34.

RICCI (MICHAEL ANGELO) raiſed to the purple by Pope Innocent XI. the 1ſt of September 1681, was born at Rome in 1619. He was fond of the mathematicks, and made great progreſs in them, as appears from his treatiſe *de maximis & minimis*, which has borne two or three impreſſions. He wrote two diſſertations, one of which is inſerted in Cardinal Brancaccio's works; and the other in Carlo Dati's Epiſtle *ad Philalethos*. He afterwards applied himſelf with prodigious aſſiduity to the ſtudy of Divinity. He has been applauded by very famous Authors, ſuch as Gaſſendi, Renatus Francis Sluſius, Cardinal Pallavicini, Fabretti, *&c.* He collected a very fine library (*a*). He had been raiſed to ſeveral employments before he was created Cardinal; and among others, to that of ſecretary of the congregation of indulgences and of relicks, and that of conſultor of the holy office. He was in thoſe employments in 1678, when he gave his approbation to the Biſhop of Condom's book, entitled, *l'Expoſition de la Doctrine Catholique.*

(*a*) Extracted from Proſper Mandoſius, *Bibl. Rom.* Cent. 5. p. 344, 345.

RICHER, or RICHIER (PETER), *a Carmelite and Doctor of Paris* (*a*), turned Proteſtant, and withdrew to Geneva, where he was admitted into the miniſtry anno 1556, to be ſent into America, to the Sieur de la Villegagnon (*a*). He was then above fifty (*c*). He embarked at Honfleur the 19th of November of the ſame year, with Mr. Chartier, a Miniſter alſo, and with ſome perſons whom the Church of Geneva thought proper for Villegagnon's deſign (*d*). He arrived at the iſland of Colligni the 10th of March

(*a*) Thevet, *Coſmogr. Univerſelle*, liv. 21. ch. 2. folio 909.

(*b*) Jean de Leri, *Hiſt. d'un Voiage de l'Amerique*, chap. 1. p. m. 6.

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) Ibid. chap. 2. p. 8.

March 1557 (e), where he preached that very day in Villegagnon's Preſence, *who was* perpetually *lifting up his hands, turning his eyes to Heaven, venting deep ſighs, and ſuch like* (f), which filled the whole company with admiration. They adminiſtred the ſacrament a few days after, and John Cointa, formerly a Doctor of Sorbonne, abjured the Romiſh errors (g). Villegagnon made admirable prayers, *and received on his knees, the bread and wine from the Miniſter's hand* (h). The hopes that were grounded on theſe outward teſtimonies of zeal ceaſed very ſoon; he and Cointa diſputing ſoon after about the Anti-chriſt, with Richier and Chartier (i). The laſt mentioned was ſent to Geneva to carry the ſtate of the diſpute to Calvin; Villegagnon declaring that he would ſubmit to his deciſion (k). However, he pulled off the maſk before Calvin's anſwer was come (l). He declared himſelf a Papiſt a little after the Communion of Whitſuntide (m): and had he been powerful enough, he would have dealt roughly with Peter Richier, and the reſt of the Genevois (n). However, he only commanded them to depart, and they obeyed his orders. I have ſpoke more largely of this matter elſewhere (o). They imbarked the 5th of January 1558 (p); and after having ſuffered prodigiouſly (q), they arrived at the port of Blavet in Britany the 26th of May following (r). Richier was afterwards Miniſter of the Church of Rochelle [A], and publiſhed a piece againſt the Sieur de Villegagnon [B]. Nothing can be more ridiculous than to make him chief of the ſect of the Richerians; and to affirm that this pretended faction was tainted with the Neſtorian hereſy; and nevertheleſs a celebrated Jeſuit has preſumed to do this [C]. He adds that

(e) Jean de Leri, *Hiſt. d'un Voiage de l'Amerique*, chap. 6. p. 55.

(f) Ibid. p. 56.

(g) Ibid. p. 59.

(h) Ibid. p. 66.

(i) Ibid. p. 67.

(k) Ibid. p. 68.

(l) Ibid. p. 76. See alſo Beza, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* liv. 2. p. 160.

(m) Leri, ch. 6. p. 76. See alſo Theod. de Beze, *ubi ſupra.*

(n) Leri, ibid. p. 83.

(o) In the art. VILLEGAGNON.

(p) Leri, chap. 21. p. 341.

(q) John de Leri, one of them has deſcribed them, ibid. chap. 21 and 22.

(r) Ibid. p. 373.

[A] *Richier was afterwards Miniſter of the Church of Rochelle.*] "At this time Peter Richier returning "from America, where he had greatly ſuffered under the tyranny of Villegagnon, a very wicked "and moſt villainous apoſtate, came to Rochelle, "where he found about fifty perſons, who had been "gathered together in the Lord, by the miniſtry of "la Fontaine and la Place, whom he ſpoke of in "the hiſtory of the preceding year. He ſtrengthened this little flock ſo greatly in a ſhort time, that "a conſiſtory, and the reſt of the eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, was eſtabliſhed there. And this firſt beginning was ſo much favoured by the Lord, that a "conſiderable part of the citizens came over in a "ſhort time to the Church of the Lord, quitting the errors of the Romiſh church. The "Lord preparing for himſelf this place at that time, "in order that it might one day oppoſe the ſtrongeſt "efforts of its adverſaries (1)." He was living when John de Leri printed his relations, I mean in 1577; he ſpeaking as follows of the ſufferings they met with during their voyage, "As to Mr. Peter Richier, "now Miniſter of the church of Rochelle; this worthy man will tell you, that being ſtretched along, "through weakneſs, in his little cabin, he was not "able to lift up his head, to offer up his prayers to "God, whom nevertheleſs, in the poſture he lay in, "he called upon with great fervour (2)." I muſt obſerve, that Moreri is miſtaken, when he ſays that Richier, after his return from America, was Miniſter of Geneva. I alſo muſt obſerve, that Mr. Vincent (3), who quotes Beza's words, and adds that they *gave occaſion to Poupeliniere* * *call* Richier *the father of the church of Rochelle*, obſerves that what Beza ſays concerning the *eſtabliſhment of the conſiſtory in that year* 1558, *is proved by the regiſters of records of the church*; but ſo far was he from ſaying that Richier was appointed Miniſter of that place, he declares (4) that the Paſtor eſtabliſhed at the firſt creation of the conſiſtory, was named Fayet. I own he ſays that in 1561, this church had two Paſtors, who were the Sieurs Fayet and de l'Iſle, the laſt of whom was our Richier (5).

(1) Theod. de Beze, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſtiq.* liv. 2. p. 139, 140. ad ann. 1558.

(2) Leri, *Hiſt. du Voiage de l'Amerique*, chap. 22. p. m. 368.

(3) Vincent, *Recherches ſur les commencemens & les premiers progres de la Reformation de la Ville Rochelle*, p. 27, 28.

* *Poupel. l.* 5. *au commencement.*

(4) Vincent, &c. p. 44.

(5) Pierre Richer, *Sieur de l'Iſle*, ibid. p. 27.

[B] *He publiſhed a piece againſt the Sieur de Villagagnon.*] The book entitled, *A refutation of the idle dreams and falſhoods of Nicholas Durand, called Chevalier de Villegagnon*, printed in 1562, in 8vo, was not written by James Spifame, *under Peter Richier's name*, as is affirmed by du Verdier Vau-Privas (6), it being writ by the perſon whoſe name is prefixed to it. We find the following title in Geſner's Bibliotheque: *Petri Richerii Apologetici libri duo, contra Nicolaum Durandum qui ſe Vilagagnonem vocat, quibus illius in pios Americanos tyrannidem exponit, & negotium Sacramentarium tractat.* Genevæ 1561, in 4to (7). Add to this the following words of John de Leri: "But becauſe "when *Villegagnon* was returned to France, not only "Peter Richer painted him in his genuine colours; "but others have ſince curried and bruſhed him * "ſo handſomly, that he did not dare to open his "mouth; I ſhall ſay no more of this for fear of "tiring my Readers (8)." A glaring inſtance that Moreri did not well examine the things he advanced, is, that after having ſaid a great many handſom things of Villegagnon, he refers us to his life (9), written by Richier; a work in which Villegagnon muſt neceſſarily appear in the blackeſt colours.

(6) Du Verdier, *Bibl. Franc.* p. 620.

(7) *Epitom. Bibl.* Geſn. p. m. 682.

* *L'Eſtrille*, (Curry-comb) and *l'Eſpouſſette* (Bruſh), are two little pieces printed againſt Villegagnon.

(8) Leri, *Hiſt. du Voiage de l'Amerique*, chap. 6. p. 74.

(9) Moreri, under the word Villegagnon.

[C] *A celebrated Jeſuit has preſumed to do this.*] If the Reader looks into Father Gaultier's chronological tables, he will find that the 63d chapter of the 16th century, is entitled, DE RICHERIANIS, DUCE *Petro Richerio*, (concerning the RICHERIANS, Peter Richer being their chief). He affirms (10) that this Peter Richer taught in America, in Villegagnon's preſence, that Chriſt, as man, ought not to be worſhiped. This is one of the proofs which this Jeſuit alledges, where he aſſerts that the Calviniſts revived the impious tenets of Neſtorius. *Calvini veſtigiis*, ſays he (11), *inſiſtit Petrus Richerius in Americam ab eo miſſus anno* 1557. *quùm & præſente Domino Villagagnono prædicat, & coram Notario publico Franciſco Alberico mordicus tuetur*, Jeſum Chriſtum in carne humana non eſſe adorandum. *Tuetur, inquam, dum reſpondet ad interpellationem ſibi per eum factam ejuſdem D. Villagagnoni nomine, utpote cauſam exigentis cur Jeſum Chriſtum adorare nolit. Horum nobis omnium fidem facit tum Epiſtola ejuſdem Villagagnoni ad Eccleſiam Chriſtianam data, tum ea quam octavo Julii anno* 1560 *ad Magiſtratum Genevenſem ſcripſit, tum annexa ejuſdem Notarii teſtificatio, quam diei decimæ quartæ Maii anni* 1559. *nota obſignavit; tum altera teſtificatio die octavo Junii* 1558. *data ſubſcriptaque à D. Petro à Falcilla, quem D. Villagagnonus ad Miniſtrum Richerium* 27 *Decembris* 1557 *miſerat, rationem ejuſmodi doctrinæ ſciſcitaturum: ubi aſſerit ſe, dum à Miniſtro Richerio quæreret, cur inter orandum non dicerit*, Gloria Patri & Filio & Spiritui Sancto, &c. *reſponſum planè nullum accepiſſe: dum autem denuntiaret, conqueri D. Villagagnonum, quod nullam unquam ad Jeſum Chriſtum precationem dirigeret, hoc ſe à Miniſtro reſponſum habuiſſe, hæreticum illum arbitrandum eſſe, qui neceſſe duxerit orare Jeſum Chriſtum* *. *Num hac loquendi formula uti potuiſſet Miniſter Richerius, ſi credidiſſet in carne humana Jeſu Chriſti aliam non eſſe hypoſtaſim, ſubſiſtentiam aut perſonam, niſi Verbi Divini?* i. e. "Peter Richer treads in the ſteps of Calvin, "who ſent him into America in 1557; ſince he "preaches up in preſence of Villegagnon, and obſtinately maintains before Francis Albericus a public notary, *that Jeſus Chriſt muſt not be worſhipped, as man.* He aſſerted, I ſay, this doctrine very "obſtinately, in the anſwer made him in the name "of the ſaid Villagagnon, who put the queſtion to "him, why he refuſed to worſhip Jeſus Chriſt. The "truth of all this is evident, from the ſaid Villagagnon's letter directed to the Church of Chriſt; from "his letter, dated the eighth of July 1560, and directed to the Magiſtrates of Geneva; as alſo from "the certificate of the ſaid notary annexed to it, "ſigned

(10) Gaulterius, *Tab. Chron.* p. m. 802.

(11) Ibid. p. 376. col. 2. See alſo Maimbourg, *Hiſt. du Calviniſme*, liv. 2. p. 103. Dutch edit.

* *Extant hæc omnia inter controverſias Villagagnoni.*

(s) Rem [A] of the art. LERI.

that Richier infected, with his errors, the inhabitants of Annonai in Vivarez [D]. I ſpoke elſewhere (s) of a letter which this Miniſter wrote from America.

" ſigned May the 14th 1559; and from another certi-
" ficate dated the 8th of June 1558, and ſigned by
" Peter Falcilla, whom Villegagnon had ſent to
" Richer the Miniſter the 27th of December 1557,
" to enquire the grounds and reaſons why he main-
" tained that Doctrine. He aſſerts in the writing in
" queſtion, that when he aſked Richer, why he did
" not ſay, in his prayers, *Glory be to the Father, and*
" *to the Son, and to the Holy Ghoſt*, &c. he made no
" anſwer: but upon his being told, that Villegag-
" non was offended, becauſe he did not addreſs any
" prayer to Chriſt, he replied as follows, that that
" man ought to be conſidered as a heretick, who
" thought it abſolutely neceſſary for Chriſt to be ad-
" dreſſed in prayer. Now could Richer the Miniſter
" have ſpoke in this manner, had he believed that
" there is no other hypoſtaſies, ſubſiſtence or perſon,
" in Chriſt's human nature, but that of the Word?"
The reader may apply to the pretended ſect of the Richerians, what I ſaid in the Article BEZANITES. Spondanus affirms that, among the followers of Richer, ſome were ſo impious as to deny the reſurrection (12). But when I call to mind, that Vincent, in the above cited work, makes ſcarce any mention of Peter Richier, I cannot forbear laughing at the boldneſs of thoſe writers, who declare that a perſon, who made ſo little a figure, was the head of a ſect. By the way, many Divines among the Calviniſts are of opinion that Chriſt's humanity, in *abſtracto*, ought not to be worſhipped (13). If Peter Richier aſſerted only this, he was in no danger of paſſing for a heretick among thoſe of his community.

(12) Spondan. ad ann. 1555. num. 15.

(13) See Saurin's *Examen de la Theologie de Mr. Jurieu*, p. 738 & *ſeq.*

I am to obſerve that Varillas went farther than Spondanus; he affirming that Richier taught, that the life to come is promiſed only to the ſouls of Chriſtians; that they would be happy only with regard to the ſoul; and therefore, that as the Lord's Supper was not inſtituted to ſupply their wants; it ought to be but rarely frequented (14). I am of opinion that he taught only this; that as the Sacrament of the Euchariſt was not inſtituted for the ſupport of the body, it was not neceſſary that Chriſt's fleſh ſhould be contained in it. All the reſt was a ſuperſtructure which his enemies raiſed on this foundation.

(14) Varillas, *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie*, liv. 21. p. 18, 19.

[D] *He adds that Richier infected with his errors, the inhabitants of Annonai in Vivarez.*] He does not inform us when this was; but doubtleſs it was before he went to America. *Probè novi hunc Petrum Richerium fuiſſe illum ipſum, qui urbi Annonæenſi in Vivarienſi provincia malorum plurimorum author fuit. Cum enim in eam, ſe Catholicum ſimulans, eſſet ingreſſus, imò & menſes aliquot in concionibus ea ſimulatione uſus, tandem ubi ſe in præcipuorum civium, qui illum ſæpe convivio exceperant, amicitiam inſinuatum vidit, cordis ſui peſtem aperuit; primùm quidem privatim, deinde verò è pulpito pleno ore in Sacramenta invectus, ac nominatim in Realitatem Euchariſticam. Quod ubi animadvertunt Magiſtratus, dum in eum inquirunt, ecce evaneſcit homo nequam, majorem tamen urbis partem erroribus illaqueatam relinquens* (15). i. e. " I very well know, that
" this Peter Richer is the individual perſon, who oc-
" caſioned many evils in the town of Annonai in
" Vivarez. For being gone thither upon the pre-
" tence of being a Roman-Catholick, and having
" preached in the pulpits for ſome months under that
" diſguiſe; finding, at laſt, that he had ingratiated
" himſelf into the friendſhip of ſome of the chief
" inhabitants, at whoſe houſes he had often been
" entertained, he diſcovered the malignity of his
" heart; he inveighing, firſt of all privately, and
" then loudly in the pulpit, againſt the bleſſed Sa-
" crament. As ſoon as the Magiſtrates ſaw this,
" they began to make an enquiry into the affair;
" when immediately the worthleſs wretch ſtole away;
" but had firſt infected the moſt part of the towns-
" people with his errors." It was proper for me to relate this incident, as belonging to the hiſtory of our Richier.

(15) Gaulterius, *Tab. Chron.* p. 802. col. 1.

RICIUS (PAUL), a converted Jew, was a German, and flouriſhed in the 16th Century. He was Profeſſor of Philoſophy in Pavia, by which means he acquired great reputation, and won the eſteem of many learned men, who recommended him ſo advantageouſly to the Emperor Maximilian, that this Monarch prevailed with him to come into Germany, and made him one of his phyſicians. He publiſhed ſeveral books againſt the Jews, and on ſome other ſubjects [A]. He is greatly applauded for his candour, civility, moderation, and learning (a). See his elogium in a letter of Eraſmus [B], that will be cited hereunder. The famous John Eckius was among the number of his adverſaries;

(a) Extracted from Melch. Adamus, *in Vitis Medicorum*, p. 9, 10.

[A] *He publiſhed ſeveral books againſt the Jews and on ſome other ſubjects.*] Here follow the ſubjects of ſome of them. *Philoſophica, prophetica ac thalmudiſtica pro Chriſtiana veritate tuenda, cum juniori Hebræorum Synagoga diſputatio. De ſexcentis & tredecim Moſaicæ ſanctionis ſeu pentateuchi edictis. Farrago ex Thalmudæorum, codice excerpta, ad petitionem Maximiliani Cæſaris. Iſagoge in Cabaliſtarum ſeu allegorizantium eruditionem cum epiſtola contra Stephani Preſbyteri Cabalæ obtrectatoris epiſtolam. De modo orandi in nomine tetragrammato. De novem doctrinarum ordinibus, & totius peripatetici dogmatis nexu compendium. Statera prudentum. Concluſiones, quibus Ariſtotelem triplicem doctrinæ ordinem exercuiſſe, & totius ejus dogmatis nexum dijudicare poteris.* He did not forget the uſual topicks of declamations at that time; he making a ſpeech to animate the Germans to wage war againſt the Turks; *in virulentam immaniſſimamque Turcarum rabiem, ad principes, magiſtratus, populoſque Germaniæ oratio* (1).

(1) Extracted from Geſner's *Epitome*, p. 659.

[B] *See his elogium in a letter of Eraſmus.*] It is the laſt of the firſt book, and dated the tenth of March 1516, and the following paſſage is contained in it. *Paulus Ricius ſic me proximo colloquio rapuit, ut mira quædam me ſitis habeat, cum homine ſæpius ac familiarius conferendi ſermonem. Præter Hebrææ linguæ peritiam, quantum ille tenet philoſophiæ, quantum Theologiæ: tum quæ animi puritas, qui diſcendi ardor, qui docendi candor, quæ diſputandi modeſtia? Mihi ſanè vir ille primo ſtatim guſtu placuit olim Papiæ, cum illic philoſophiam profiteretur: nunc propiùs intuito magis etiam placet. Is demùm verè mihi videtur Iſraelitam agere, ſuoque cognomini pulchrè reſpondere: cujus omnis voluptas, omnis cura, omne otium ac negotium, in divinis eſt literis. Dignus nimirum animus, cui otium contingat quàm maximè honorificum* (2). i. e. " I was ſo vaſtly delighted
" with the laſt converſation I had with Paul Ricius,
" that I have a ſtrong deſire of enjoying his com-
" pany more frequently and familiarly. Not to
" mention his great ſkill in the Hebrew tongue, his
" knowledge in Philoſophy and Divinity; how great
" is his rectitude of mind, how ardent his thirſt
" after knowledge, how great his candour in teach-
" ing, and his modeſty in diſputations! I was charm-
" ed with him the very firſt time I ſaw him for-
" merly at Pavia, where he was Profeſſor of Philo-
" ſophy; and I am ſtill more delighted with him,
" now I have an opportunity of ſeeing him nearer at
" hand. In a word, he appears to me a true Iſraelite,
" and to anſwer admirably well to his name; ſince
" his only pleaſure and care are in the ſtudy of the
" ſacred writings, and in them his buſy and leiſure
" hours are employed. His caſt of mind is ſuch as
" deſerves the moſt honourable leiſure." Ricius ſent him his treatiſe on the Cabala, and received ſuch thanks for it as reflect the higheſt honour on him; for

(2) Eraſm. *Epiſt.* ult. lib. 1. p. 88.

saries; and the subject of their dispute was, whether the Heavens are animated. Ricius maintained the affirmative; and advanced some sentiments that were thought paradoxical [C].

for he shews that this proselyte, in defending one of his friends who had been grievously slandered, had not proceeded beyond the bounds of moderation, nor employed any injurious expressions. *Arrisit animus iste Gratiis & amicitiæ natus, qui tanto studio tuetur hominis eruditissimi innocentiam, adversus impudentissimos sycophantas. Arrisit denique te, hoc est absoluto veroque philosopho, digna moderatio: quâ sic fortiter patrocinaris amico, ut à convitiis in adversarium temperes, magis reputans quid te, quàm quid illo dignum esset* (3). i. e. "I was vastly pleased with that happy spirit, "born for friendship, which supports with so much "zeal the innocence of a very learned man, against "the most impudent slanderers. Lastly, I was vastly-"pleased with your moderation, so worthy of a true "and complete Philosopher, that is of yourself; for "you defend your friend with so much bravery, that "you refrain from railing at his adversary; consi-"dering with yourself what is fit for you to say, ra-"ther than what he deserves to hear."

(3) Erasm. *Epist.* 39. lib. 13. p. 642. It was writ in 1520.

[C] *Whether the heavens are animated. Ricius maintained the affirmative; and advanced some sentiments that were thought paradoxical.*] A Protestant Divine observes, that the opinions of Ricius favoured the principles of magic; and that nevertheless his books *de cœlesti agricultura* had been approved and applauded by the faculty of Divines of Bologna, Padua, Ferrara and Pavia. *Paulus Ritius dum cœlorum animationem & Cabalisticam suam Arithmantiam per decem enumerationes tradit, magiæ principia non parum promovet in commentariis suis ad librum R. Joseph Castiliensis qui* porto lucis *dicitur, & tamen libros illos de cœlesti agricultura magnifico elogio approbarunt Academiæ Theologicæ Bononiensis, &c* (4). John Eckius did not imitate those Divines of Italy; he asserting that the doctrine, which asserts that the heavens are animated, is ridiculous, execrable, and contrary to the faith (5). Claudius Espensæus, who informs me of this particular, did not know the reasons on which this censure of John Eckius is grounded; he not having seen Eckius's book, and knew it only by its refutation by Ricius, an extract of which he gives us. He says (6), that this writer asserted three things; 1. That the doctrine, which declares that the heavens are animated, does not concern faith; for it cannot be either proved or refuted by the principles of Religion, and for this reason the Doctors are divided on this problem. 2. That the affirmative suits better than the contrary doctrine with the words of the Prophets. 3. That reason suggests to us that the heavens are not inanimate beings (7). Espencæus examines Ricius's proofs, and criticizes them; and at last declares it his opinion, that it is safer to deny than to affirm that the heavens have a soul. The reader will perhaps be pleased to find in this place the occasion, which prompted him to publish his work *de Cœlorum animatione* (8). There was a design of printing, in Paris, an edition of all Cardinal Contarinus's works; but the Divine who was to give them his approbation, did not dare to do it upon finding the opinion with regard to the soul of the heavens in it (9). He thereupon consulted Claudius Espencæus, who answered that he thought it an inconsiderable difficulty; and who remembring, a little after, that he had collected several matters on that question, digested them in a proper form (10).

(4) Gisb. Voetius, *desperata Causa Papatus*, lib. 1. sect. 4. p. 36. He cites *in compend. de anima cæli et cælesti agricultura*, lib. 4.

(5) *Joannes Eckius positionem hanc ludicram prorsus & exoticam, execrabilem, & à fide exorbitantem esse censuit in tractatu de prædestinatione.* Claudius Espensæus, *in Tractatu de cœlorum animatione*, cap. 5. p. m. 49.

(6) Idem, ibid.

(7) Idem, ibid. chap. 8. p. 70.

(8) It was printed at Paris in 1571.

(9) In book 1. of *Contarinus de animæ immortalitate*, printed at Venice in 1525.

(10) See the preface to this treatise of Claudius Espensæus.

It is to be observ'd; that, among the school Divines and Philosophers, the question is chiefly to know, whether the immediate mover of the celestial spheres is a soul properly so called, and *forma informans*. This is the opinion of some, and it is commonly rejected; but as for the opinion of such persons as admit of moving intelligences, as assisting forms, it is almost universally received; and to speak my thoughts, it is my opinion that one cannot do without them; and I fancy that the followers of Copernicus will be forced to adopt it, with regard to their planets, one time or other. Father Daniel (11) and Mr. le Clerc (12) have proposed some difficulties to their system, which puzzle them very much. Mr. Newton (*) and some others have so strongly attacked the opinion of the vortices, that the general laws of motion are not alone sufficient to account for the phænomena. The peculiar direction of an intelligent being would come in very seasonably here.

(11) In his *Voiage du Monde de Des Cartes.*

(12) In his *Physicks.*

* *Sir Isaac Newton.*

RIGORISTS is the name given in the Spanish Low Countries to the Jansenists, to the fathers of the oratory, and in general to all those whose maxims are most opposite to a loose morality (*a*). A person of Prateolus's turn would form a sect of those casuists, to insult the Church of Rome with regard to the divisions that reign in it. They are falsely accused of *enjoining their penitents to eat hay; and young maidens to put on wet shifts* [A], *a circumstance which is said is the death of some of them* (*b*).

(*a*) The way or method of these people is called *Rigorism.*

(*b*) See *Difficultez proposées à Mr. Steyaert*, part. 1. p. 33.

RIMINI

[A] *They are falsely accused of enjoining . . . . young maidens to put on wet shifts.*] I believe no casuist of good sense, how severe soever he might be, would ever enjoin such a penance to a maiden, though it should be in order to suppress very violent temptations to lewdness; but there are some people whose judgment is so greatly depraved by a rigid system of morality, that it is not altogether improbable that some young creatures may have been treated in this manner, who discovered too many frailties at confession; and since Francis d'Assisi thought it proper for himself to have a wife of snow (1), he might have prescribed a wet shirt to others.

(1) See article FRANCOIS *d'Assisi*, rem. [B].

I read a memorial printed at Delft in 1696, and containing *a succinct answer to the three charges of Jansenism, Rigorism, and Innovation.* The Author there sets forth the maxims of Christ Jesus, and afterwards speaks as follows (2): "If those who are "called Rigorists lay down to themselves more rigo-"rous maxims, conduct themselves in a manner that "is harder to flesh and blood, and practise such a "severity as goes beyond that wholesom severity, "they deserve to be punished. But if it be true, on "the contrary, as it is certain and manifest, that the "tenderness and softness of most Christians oblige "them to content themselves with much less, and to "submit to the infirmity of human nature, in the "application of these holy rules; it is highly un-"just, and a calumny which deserves to be punished, "to exclaim against them as persons who establish "cruel and excessively severe maxims. And it is yet "truer, that those who oppose in their own persons, "what is called rigorism, oppose in reality the Gos-"pel itself. It is therefore certain, that rigorism is "merely a phantom, by which some would scare the "world, in order to destroy good people, and the "true servants of CHRIST JESUS. Mr. Steyaert "owns this himself, in his theses on the rituals, pub-"lished a few years since; he therein giving the fol-"lowing testimony, which ought not to be suspected, "*that those who endeavour to practise the injunctions of "the Church, in the direction of their souls, are those "who are called rigorists, and that he does not know of "any others* . . . . (3). It is certain, on the con-"trary, that the loose morality contrary to this rigo-"rism is but too real (4). Mr. Steyaert acknow-"ledges this in his thesis *concerning moral Divinity "corrected*; for after having proved it by the words "of Pope Alexander VII. cited above, he adds: "what would certain persons do, or rather what "would they not do, had they something like this "to alledge against rigorism; whereas, in order to "prove it, they can offer nothing but a parcel of "idle stories, as about hay, wet shifts, prescribed by "way of penance?"

(2) A memorial printed at Delft, 1696. in 4to. p. 11.

(3) Memorial, p. 14.

(4) Ibid.

[A] *He*

RIMINI (GREGORIO DE), is known by that name, and by that of Arimini, becauſe he was of Arimini a city of Italy. He taught in the Univerſity of Paris with very great applauſe (*a*). He was one of the moſt ſubtle ſchool-men of the 14th century; and the acuteneſs of his genius made him addict himſelf much more to the party of the Nominaliſts than to the ſect of the Realiſts (*b*). He was an Auſtin Frier, and was created General of the Order, at Montpellier in May 1357. He had been their chief Profeſſor in the Convent of Arimini in 1351, and died at Vienna in Auſtria in 1358. His chief works are, Commentaries on Peter Lombard, called the maſter of the ſentences, and on St. Paul's Epiſtles. He was no leſs diſtinguiſhed for the ſanctity of his life, than for his learning and genius; and he is ranked among thoſe who have been beatified (*c*). I muſt take ſome notice of his opinions. He diſputed ſtrongly againſt thoſe Divines who affirm that, by the Almighty Power, it may happen that two contrary propoſitions, concerning one and the ſame thing, may be true at the ſame time (*d*). I cannot conceive how he dared to doubt of a doctrine like that, which is an unavoidable conſequence of the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation. He came much nearer to the orthodox doctrine of St. Auſtin, with regard to Free-will, than moſt of the Divines of his time (*e*): and he even aſſerted, that an invincible ignorance does not juſtify a man [*A*], but he inculcated

(*a*) Elſius, *in Encomiaſtico Auguſtiniano*, p. 247.

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

(*c*) *Ex eodem*, ibid.

(*d*) See Fonſeca, on Ariſtotle's *Metaphyſicks*. lib. 4. chap. 3. p. m. 651.

(*e*) See the *Scholaſticus Orthodoxus* of Paul Ferri, p. 304, 447.

[*A*] *He even aſſerted, that an invincible ignorance does not juſtify a man.*] Arnauld makes this remark in the ninth part of the difficulties propoſed to Mr. Steyaert, on occaſion of a decree of Pope Alexander VIII. which condemns thirty one propoſitions, the ſecond whereof is this: *Tametſi detur ignorantia invincibilis juris naturæ; hæc in ſtatu naturæ lapſæ operantem ex ipſa non excuſat à peccato formali.* i. e. "Notwithſtanding there is ſuch an ignorance of the "law of nature as is invincible, nevertheleſs that "ignorance, in the ſtate of corrupt nature, does not "excuſe from the commiſſion of a formal ſin, thoſe "who commit what the law of nature forbids (1)." Arnauld afterwards mentions three opinions: 1. that *a human action is not a formal ſin, if he who commits it does not know that he ſins* (2). He aſcribes this opinion to the Jeſuits, and affirms that *they declare that they aſſert nothing but what is reaſonable; becauſe it is univerſally agreed, as they ſuppoſe, that invincible ignorance juſtifies a man; and that a man is ſuppoſed to be invincibly ignorant that what he does is ſin, when he has no ſuch thought in doing it* (3). The ſecond opinion is that of "ſeveral Divines, who, to prevent the over-"turning, by thoſe falſe ſubtleties, the following im-"portant maxim, that the ignorance of the law of "nature does not juſtify a man with regard to the "committing of a ſin, which has been acknow-"ledged by the Heathens themſelves; and laid "down in the canon law, in the following words: "*Ignorantia juris omnibus adultis damnabilis eſt*, i. e. "Ignorance of the law is damnable in all adult per-"ſons; maintain, that it ought not to be conſidered "as invincible, abſolutely ſpeaking, becauſe that law "is ſuch, that man has been created capable of "knowing it, and that he would have known it had "he continued in the ſtate in which God placed him. "That in the ſtate in which he now is, it is one of "the conſequences of original ſin, that he ſcarce "knows any thing but the firſt principles of it, and "that he is ignorant of the reſt, which he neverthe-"leſs may know when aſſiſted by the divine grace; "which, according to St. Thomas, is ſufficient to ob-"lige men to do what they cannot do without grace, "though this grace, without which they cannot do "it, is given to ſome out of mercy, and denied to "others out of juſtice, as a puniſhment of a preced-"ing ſin, though it were but original ſin. Nothing "can be more expreſs than what the angelical Doc-"tor teaches on this ſubject, 2, 2. q. 2. art. 5. (4)." According to the ſecond opinion, *which is that of almoſt all the ancient Divines*, the ignorance of the law of nature *never juſtified any perſon with regard to ſin, becauſe it ought not to be conſidered as invincible* (5). "The third opinion is of Gregorio de Rimini, Eſ-"tius, and other Divines, who, taking the word *in-"vincible* in another ſenſe, do not ſcruple to aſſert, "that the ignorance of the law of nature does not "excuſe from the commiſſion of a ſin, even when it "might be conſidered as invincible. For it may be "called, ſay theſe, *invincible*, with reſpect to hu-"man means, ſuch as inſtruction, which many per-"ſons have failed of, particularly among the infi-"dels (6). . . . Thoſe who, in taking the word *in-"vincible* in this ſenſe, have acknowledged that an "infinite number of Heathens have been invincibly "ignorant of ſeveral duties of the law of nature, "ought neceſſarily to ſay, that the ignorance of the "law of nature does not juſtify a perſon with regard "to the committing of ſin, even when it may be "called invincible with regard to the want of human "and even divine means, when God does not give "thoſe which would be immediately neceſſary to "overcome that ignorance. There are ſtill ſome "theſes publickly maintained at Rome in this age, "in the ſchool of the Auguſtins at Rome, in which "is the following propoſition: *Ignorantia invincibilis "juris naturalis non excuſat à peccato. Ex Gregorio in "2. Sent. diſp. 29. qu. 1. art. 2. in reſp. ad arg. "ubi ait. Ad probationem: Secundùm omnes Doctores "non imputantur homini quæ ex ignorantia ſimpliciter "invincibili committuntur: dico quod iſtud eſt intelligen-"dum de ignorantia quæ non eſt peccatum nec pœna pec-"cati, cujus ille ſit vel fuerit reus. Quod probat ex "S. Aug. in Ep. ad Sixtum. Ignorantia enim invin-"cibilis eſt pœna peccati Originalis, cujus omnis homo "naſcitur reus.* It is therefore not long ſince, that it "was not thought amiſs to have it publickly aſſerted "in Rome, that an invincible ignorance of the law "of nature did not juſtify a perſon with reſpect to "ſin; nor that it was thought to impoſe upon St. "Auſtin, to aſcribe this ſentiment to him, as well "as to Gregorio de Rimini, one of his moſt faith-"ful diſciples among the ſchoolmen. This was alſo "expreſly taught by Eſtius (7)." Arnauld adds (8), that the difference between the two laſt opinions is *only a diſpute about words; and that both of them, in the main, agree perfectly with the general maxim of the Canon-law, and the doctrine of St. Auſtin againſt the Pelagians, and of St. Bernard againſt Abelard, that whatever is done againſt the law of Nature is a ſin, in what manner ſoever a perſon may be ignorant of it, becauſe it is always by way of puniſhment for ſome ſin, as St. Auſtin obſerves in the letter to Sixtus. But as to the firſt, which is that of the Jeſuits, it abſolutely overthrows the maxim of the Canon-law, and the doctrine of the Saints, by aſſerting, in general, on one hand, that invincible ignorance always juſtifies with regard to ſin; and, on the other, by ſtretching ſo far, whenever they pleaſe, the word invincible, that to ſpeak ſincerely, they ought to ſay that ſins committed through ignorance are not formal, but only material ſins.*

I was willing to quote all theſe particulars, not only becauſe they afforded us a ſhort and uſeful inſtruction on a very difficult and moſt important ſubject, but alſo becauſe they may ſhew that our Gregory of Arimina did not ſeek for evaſions and ſubterfuges. He dived to the bottom of a tenet or doctrine, he ſaw the moſt juſt conſequences of a principle, and owned them boldly, without ſeeking for any equivocal or ſoftening expreſſions. I do not ſay this, as tho' I condemned thoſe who endeavour to ſoften what they think might ſhock a Reader. They may mean well; and ſome ſubjects are ſo difficult and intricate, that thoſe perſons ought to be excuſed, who ſometimes take a different way in explaining them. The queſtion with regard to ſins of ignorance, is of this

(1) *Difficultez propoſées a Monſieur Steyaert*, part. 9. p. 234.

(2) Ibid. p. 235.

(3) Ibid. p. 236.

(4) Ibid.

(5) Ibid. p. 241.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Ibid. p. 242.

(8) Ibid. p. 243, 244.

inculcated a principle that was objected to Des Cartes, and which would be very ſcandalous, if a favourable interpretation was not put upon it; he teaching that God may lie or deceive [*B*]. In Holland, a Proteſtant Miniſter was greatly inveighed againſt, for making

kind, and is ſurrounded with precipices on all hands. We therefore muſt not wonder that thoſe who walk in ſuch a road, ſometimes turn aſide or go back. They grant a thing, and afterwards they themſelves combat it. What they give with one hand, they take away with the other. They will own, that *an invincible ignorance excuſes men both with regard to fact and right* (9), and then they will alledge a numberleſs multitude of examples, borrowed from the ſcriptures, to ſhew that ſins of ignorance do not excuſe or juſtify; and the neceſſary reſult of the examples they quote will be, either that the ignorance of moral duties was never invincible, or that, though it be invincible, it does not excuſe or juſtify the ſinner. If we follow all their proofs, we ſhall find, that after having ſuppoſed that the ignorance of the right and ignorance of the fact are criminal only, when they are invincible (10), they do not leave, properly ſpeaking, any caſe in which this ignorance is invincible (11); for they ſay, it may be overcome with reſpect to the paſſion of Jeſus Chriſt (12), even with regard to perſons who never heard of it. They ſay, that if an American ſavage is ignorant of the facts contained in the New Teſtament, it is his fault; becauſe he did not put himſelf in a diſpoſition, that may incline God to reveal to him the myſteries of ſalvation, and has rendered himſelf unworthy of that celeſtial favour. Put this queſtion to them, was it poſſible for him to have the good diſpoſitions you ſpeak of? Could he make a good uſe of the light of nature? To this they will reply, that he could, if he would. In caſe you aſk, whether it was poſſible for him to have ſuch a will, I believe they will anſwer, he could not; but that it was only *a moral impotency, which is no other than the depraved diſpoſition of his will* (13), and a conſequence of the corruption in which the children of Adam are born. It is, in the main, the ſame doctrine as that of our Gregory; and it probably would be better to ſay plainly, as he does, that invincible ignorance does not excuſe or juſtify, when it proceeds from original ſin, and that it is a puniſhment of it. It muſt be confeſſed, that this doctrine muſt be liable to ſome inconveniencies, for it ſeems to lead one, ſtep by ſtep, to the following aſſertion, *neither frenzy, nor madneſs, can excuſe or juſtify, ſince they ought not to be excluded from the number of evils which ſin has introduced, and which ſerve as a puniſhment to ſin.* But is not the firſt opinion mentioned by Arnauld attended with many inconveniencies (14)? Is the queſtion to chooſe between an opinion free from all intricacy, and one that is very intricate? Is not the queſtion to chooſe between two extremes, one of which is repugnant to philoſophical notions, and the other to theological ſyſtems?

(9) See the preface to the ſupplement of *Commentaire Philoſophique ſur contrain les d'entrer*, folio ** 4 *verſo & ſeq.*

(10) See *Reflexions de Mr. Saurin ſur les Droits de la Conſcience*, p. 16.

(11) *i. e.* as to the doctrines of right and fact relating to religion.

(12) Saurin, *Reflexion ſur la Conſcience*, p. 15.

(13) Idem, ibid. p. 16.

(14) See *Difficultez propoſees à Mr. Steyaert*, part. 9. p. 244 *& ſeq.*

[*B*] *He teaching that God may lie or deceive.*] Des Cartes eſtabliſhed, as the only foundation of human knowledge, the perſuaſion, which mankind ought to have, that God cannot deceive nor be deceived. It was objected to him that (15), according to Gregory of Arimini, and ſome other ſchoolmen, God may ſay or advance ſome things, which are contrary to his intention and decrees, as when he commanded Jonas to declare in Niniveh, that it ſhould be deſtroyed in forty days. If he hardened and blinded Pharaoh; if he ſent a lying ſpirit into ſome Prophets, how do you know (was Des Cartes aſked,) whether he is not capable of ſeducing us? May he not behave to us, as a phyſician does with regard to his patients, and a father towards his children? Theſe are very often impoſed upon, with great wiſdom, and for their good. Could we be able to behold truth, ſhould God preſent it to us naked? *Si Deus puram nobis oſtenderet veritatem, quis eam oculus, quæ mentis acies ſuſtinere valeat* (16)? Des Cartes anſwered (17), that a diſtinction ought to be made between God's manner of ſpeaking adapted to man's capacity, and to the truths relative to human nature, and the forms of ſpeaking which relate to abſolute truths. The firſt forms of ſpeaking are frequent in the ſacred writings, but the laſt ought to be thoſe of Philoſophers. The hardening of Pharaoh's heart, and ſuch like, do not denote a poſitive effect of God, that being only a privation of grace. It is plain, added he, that I did not mean ſuch lies as conſiſt in words, but the inward and formal malice which conſiſts in deceit. The decree againſt Niniveh was merely comminatory, and depended on a condition. However, I do not blame thoſe, continued he (18), who ſay that God, by the miniſtry of his Prophets, give out lies free from all malicious deceit; and like to thoſe Phyſicians, who, to cure their patients, impoſe falſhoods upon them. I confeſs much more, that the natural inſtinct which God has given us, really deceives us ſometimes; for the nature which God has given us, to preſerve our bodies, poſitively prompts dropſical perſons to do a thing that is prejudicial to them, I mean, to drink. But I have explained, (continues Des Cartes) in my ſixth meditation, how this may be conſonant to the goodneſs or veracity of God.

(15) See *Secondes Objections contre les Meditations de Mr. Des Cartes*, p. m. 66.

(16) *Object. ſecundæ contra Meditat. Carteſii*, p. m. 66.

(17) See Des Cartes's *Anſwer to the ſecond Objections*, p. m. 75, 76.

I ſhall obſerve, by the way, that notwithſtanding this anſwer of Des Cartes, the objection continues ſtill victorious; for the inſtant a perſon is obliged to own, that a general maxim, which had been given for the foundation of a certain and demonſtrative doctrine, admits many exceptions; it is thereby ſo much ſhaken, that it is no longer capable of fixing our uncertainty; and there is no caſe, in which a ſceptic may not employ Des Cartes's diſtinction. If I was deceived, will he ſay, by the ideas which repreſent matter to me as an extended ſubſtance, this would be a falſity exempt from all maliciouſneſs; and poſſibly too it might be of advantage to my preſent ſtate, which, in certain reſpects, is a true ſtate of infancy or ſickneſs, whilſt my ſoul continues united to my body. A verbal lie is not better than an ideal lie, and cannot be abſtracted from it; for the deſign of ſpeaking is only to excite ideas in the mind of the hearers; and cannot ſuppoſe that all ideas relate, not to abſolute truths, but to truths relative to human nature?

I alſo will obſerve, by the way, that there are in ſcripture certain facts and phraſes, that will always confound the deepeſt metaphyſicians. We have an example of this here. See how Des Cartes was run down by the hypotheſis, which Gregorio Arimini pretended to ground on the ſcriptures. We may natually ſuppoſe, that his ſurprize was great, when he found that the thunder which fell upon his work came from the place where he leaſt expected it. He imagined that he had built on a rock, for his edifice was built upon God's infallibility. He doubtleſs had flattered himſelf with having the approbation of the Divines, with regard to that fundamental part of his hypotheſis; and he at leaſt was firmly perſuaded, that he would not be attacked with paſſages from ſcripture. Nevertheleſs the ſtorm came upon him from that quarter; and the ſtorm was ſo violent, that he was forced to fly. So vain are the thoughts and hopes of man. However, we may be ſurprized on the other hand, that Des Cartes ſhould make no greater oppoſition to that attack. The eaſineſs, with which he ſubmitted, is a proof that he was no ways acquainted with books of divinity. Had he been uſed to ſtudy them, he would have known a great number of explications and ſolutions of paſſages of ſcripture, which ſerved as a foundation to Gregory de Rimini, and had there found a method of diſputing which would have brought him off. Some will probably anſwer, that I am miſtaken, and that he could ſcarce have made uſe of this method; for he allowed of nothing but evident reaſons, and always preferred what is more clear, to what is leſs ſo. Now the texts of ſcripture that were objected to him are infinitely clearer, than the ſolutions and gloſſes of the Commentators, and this was the reaſon why he laid down his arms ſo ſoon. If this objection ſhould be made to me, I have a reply ready; and ſhall begin with obſerving, that this great Philoſopher ought, at leaſt, to have inſiſted more than he did on the nature of the expreſſions, which the ſacred Writers have employed, to adapt themſelves to the underſtanding of the

(18) *Nolim tamen reprehendere illos, qui concedunt Deum per Prophetas verbale aliquod mendacium (qualia ſunt illa medicorum, quibus ægrotos decipiunt ut ipſos curent hoc eſt in quo deſit omnis malitia deceptionis) proferre poſſe. Quinimo etiam, quod majus eſt, ab ipſo naturali inſtinctu qui nobis à Deo tributus eſt, interdum nos realiter falli videmus, ut cum hydropicus ſitit, &c.* Carteſius, ibid. p. 76. I am to obſerve that Vogelſang, *Neceſſaria Reſponſio ad Præfat. Ludovici Wolzogii*, cap. 2. p. 59 *& ſeq.* inveighs with great vehemence againſt this paſſage of Des Cartes, as tho' it overthrew the ſcriptures, and even the whole Carteſian ſyſtem.

making the like assertion, but with some restrictions which took away all the evil of it [C].

RINUCCINI

the common people. As the mind of these are incapable of raising themselves to the sublimity of the supremely-perfect Being, the Prophets were obliged to bring God down to man, and make him stammer with us, as a nurse stammers with the child to whom she gives suck. To this is owing so many expressions of scripture, which declare that God repents, that he is angry, that he will enquire if a thing happened; will change his intention according as man obeys or does not obey him, and a thousand such things, inconsistent with sovereign perfection. Des Cartes did not fail to represent the difference there is between this way of speaking and that of a true metaphysician; but he touched too lightly upon it, and deprived himself of the several advantages he might have gained from it; he yielding nevertheless to Rimini's pretensions. However, he ought not to have done this, but should have affirmed constantly and invariably, that the passages of scripture, in which it is asserted that God sometimes deceives, ought never to be understood literally; but ought to be explained in the same manner as those which ascribe to him repentance, or some other human quality or frailty. He should have gone on to shew, that a Philosopher ought not to have regard to such passages in the word of God when the greatness of the supreme Being is to be represented. Mr. Regis was perfectly sensible of this. "I will lay it down as a "maxim, says he (19), that whenever I intend to "speak of God in an accurate manner, I must not "consult myself, nor speak in the usual forms; but "raise my mind above all creatures, to consult the "vast and immense idea of the infinitely perfect Be"ing: so that I may be allowed to say, in a moral "treatise, that *God has repented, is angry*, &c. But "these or such like expressions must not be permitted "in a treatise purely metaphysical, in which a Wri"ter must express himself with accuracy."

(19) *Regis, Systeme de Philosophie*, Tom. 1. p. 168. Lyons edit. 1691, 12mo.

It also must be remembered, that if the scripture very often represents God under popular or vulgar and consequently very false notions, to adapt itself to the capacity of those minds to whom God designed revelation; it furnishes us elsewhere with the corrective we may want, I mean the description of the infinite Being, in his immutable and infinitely perfect Majesty.

[C] *In Holland a Protestant Minister was greatly inveighed against, for making the like assertion, but with some restrictions which took away all the evil of it.*] The person I mean is Mr. de Wolzogue. He was Professor and Minister of the Walloon Church at Utrecht, in 1666, when a book was published entitled *Philosophia S. Scripturæ Interpres, Exercitatio paradoxa*. The orthodox Divines thought it a pernicious work, and worse than those of the Socinians. Mr. de Wolzogue was one of those who refuted him, but in so unlucky a manner, that his refutation (20) was as much, or more inveighed against, than the book he attempted to refute. Here follows one of the passages that gave the greatest offence, which I shall quote from the author's translation (21). "It follows, in the third "place, that I prove that God will not even deceive "or impose upon any one, though I need not take "much pains to prove it. It is sufficient that God "said a thing, to induce us to believe that he will "not impose upon us. I say that he will not im"pose upon us, that no one may suppose but that "he could do this if he pleased. For as any one, "who endeavours to impose upon another, is suppos"ed, in some measure, to be superior to him in "that particular; and to surpass him either in ge"nius, strength, or any faculty whatsoever; and be"cause God's wisdom as well as his power, and all "the rest of his attributes are infinite; it is plain "that, even the most perfect creatures may, because "they are finite as being creatures, be led into "error by the Creator who is infinite. However, "I deny that he will do it. For we can scarce "figure to ourselves an intention of deceiving, but "we must suppose, either that some malice is joined "to it, whereby we endeavour to impose upon a per"son whom we dare not attack without cunning "and deceit; or that there is some weakness of "mind, which makes such a person doubt that he "otherwise would not be able to succeed. Now as "both these things denote a great imperfection, they "must not be ascribed in any manner to him whom "we consider as a most perfect Being, because all the "perfections imaginable are comprehended in his "person (22)." Those who attacked Mr. de Wolzogue (23), inveighed very strongly against the following proposition, *God might deceive if he thought proper to do it*. It certainly sounds ill; and though the explication, which the author added to it, reduced it to the common opinion of the orthodox Divines, *that it is impossible God should deceive any person*, he nevertheless had better have refrained from using those offensive words, which in the main had nothing to do with the affair in question, and only formed a needless parenthesis. In my opinion, persons who wrote with temper, would have carried their censure no farther; except that they, perhaps, might have added the following criticism, that an author who seems to adhere so strongly to des Cartes ought not to employ circumlocutions, to say that God cannot deceive, but should say this in two words, and not in circumlocutions that require explanation. Those who express themselves thus, *the reprobate might love God, if they would; but their corruption is so great, that they cannot be willing to love God*, say, in the main, the same thing, as such who roundly affirm, that it is impossible a reprobate should love God. As this last proposition is shorter, it is therefore better. In like manner, since it is shorter to say, *God cannot deceive*, than to say, *he might deceive if he pleased; but his Holiness is so great that he cannot have an inclination to deceive*; why did Mr. de Wolzogue search for so many windings and turnings? However this be, he has more reason to be surprized that the criticism was not confined within those bounds, than to see that Mr. de Labadie, who, in the name of the Walloon Church of Middleburg, prosecuted Mr. de Wolzogue in the Walloon Synod, dared to accuse him of heterodoxy, for saying that God could not have an intention to deceive us. "Mr. de Labadie has objected to me, in his "Latin piece, as an error contrary to the Scrip"ture; not because I say that God could deceive "us if he would, but because I add, that God can"not deceive us if he would. He accuses me, as "not having said enough on this matter; and as"serts that God will deceive, and can deceive. He "objects the Scripture itself to me and puts this ques"tion to me, *What will Wolzogue say to the history "related in Chap.* xxii, *of the first book of Kings? and "particularly to these words of verse* 22? and the "Lord said, thou shalt persuade him, and prevail "also: go forth, and do so. Now therefore be"hold in the mouth of all these thy Prophets, and "the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee. *When "God willed and commanded that Ahab should be "seduced, and put a lying spirit (for in this manner Ju"nius and Tremellius speak) ought he to be charged, in "any manner, with weakness of mind, or malice* (24)?" See the margin (25). I will cite another passage, by which we find, that the adversaries of Mr. de Wolzogue were not offended at this temerity of Mr. de Labadie. It is a very long passage; but since it contains a doctrine which clears up, in a very solid manner, the proposition censured, the reader must not wonder at my citing it. It will inform him, both as to the right and the fact. Mr. de Wolzogue therefore writes as follows in the preface to a collection of judgments published by him in 1669 (26).

(22) Wolzogue, *Apologie pour le Synode de Naerden*, part. 4. p. 160.

(23) See Vander Waeyen, p. 19 of his work, *pro vera & genuina Reformatorum sententia præsertim in negotio de Interprete Scripturæ*. Mr. Vogelsang, chap. 2. of *Necessaria Responsio ad Præfationem Ludovici Wolzogii*. John Brown, a Scotch Minister, p. 61. of his *Volzogius causæ proditor*, and several others.

(24) Wolzogue, *Apologie pour le Synode de Naerden*, part. 4. p. 154, 155.

(25) It is to be observed, that Mr. de Wolzogue says, *that he gave Mr. de Labadie notice, in the Synod of Naerden, of this blunder; and afterwards*, added he, *he corrected himself; having observed, that it was impious to say God will deceive, and that he really deceives mankind.*

(26) That is, *Jugemens de plusieurs Professeurs & Docteurs en Theologie qui prononcent Orthodoxe le Livre de Loys de Wolzogue de l'Interprete de l'Ecriture.*

"(27) The first objection, and which makes the "greatest noise, is my saying that God can deceive "if he will; for one would conclude from thence, "that I assert that God can deceive. But I believe "that nothing can be so innocent as what I said; "and if it be carefully examined, it will be found "very

(27) Wolzogue, *Avant-propos des Jugemens*, &c.

(20) It is entitled, *De Scripturarum Interprete adversus Exercitatorem paradoxum Libri duo*, and was printed in 1667.

(21) The Latin is in p. 24, of the 1st edit. of his book, and p. 11. of the second.

RINUCCINI (OTTAVIO), a Florentine Gentleman (*a*), followed Mary of Medicis, with whom he was in love, into France [*A*], and gained the esteem of King Henry

(a) Crescemberi, *l'Istoria della volgar Poesia*, p. 149.

" very orthodox. For if any thing can be objected " to it, it must be either in the sense or the words. " With regard to the sense, I take it for granted " that it is impossible God should ever deceive, as " it is impossible that he should lie, or forswear him- " self. I say this expressly in several parts of my " book; I make it the foundation of my whole " dispute; and I look upon this truth as so important " that I believe, without it, we cannot have any " assurance of any thing in the world, nor of our " salvation. Nevertheless, to explain the nature of " deceit, I distinguish between a will to deceive, " from the qualities, necessary to execute that deceit. " A will to deceive is always criminal, and properly " contains the imperfection that is in deceit; but " the qualities which might be subservient to the " executing of that deceit are good, and always con- " tain some perfection (28). Let us image to our " selves two men, the one stupid and malicious, " and the other a virtuous and able man: we may " say of the former, that he has a strong desire to " deceive some body, but that he has not wit enough " for it; it is not for want of inclination, but the " power to do it. On the contrary, it would be said " of the second, that he has more than wit sufficient " to impose upon silly people, but that he is too " good a man to do it. Now if we apply this to " God, it is very certain he has no will to deceive; " he cannot have it; he is too perfect to do it, he " being perfection itself; but with regard to the " qualities requisite for executing a deceit, such as " wisdom and power, doubtless God possesses them: " not that he can ever employ his wisdom and " power to execute deceit, for this would always " presuppose a will to deceive; but he nevertheless " possesses that wisdom and power which are requi- " site for the execution of a deceit. And it is in " this sense that I say that God can deceive if he " will; but that he cannot will it; that is to say, " that God cannot deceive, not from any defect of " wisdom or power, but by the perfection of his " will. So that these words, God may deceive if " he will, ought to be paraphrased thus: God is " possessed of all the qualities requisite for deceiving; " he has wisdom, power, constancy; he is possessed " of every thing that might be subservient to the " executing of some deceitful design, in case he had " the will to deceive; but it is impossible for him to " have such a will to deceive; it is also impossible " for him to endeavour to employ his power for the " execution of a deceit, whence I conclude that it " is impossible for him to deceive. The meaning " of this is only, that God is all powerful and all " wise. And who will deny this? But perhaps it " may be said, that there is something harsh in these " words. Supposing this, this could not be so great " a crime as to deserve so much noise to be made " about it. Were all harsh and offensive words to " be struck out from the books of our Divines, there " would be a vast number of rasures. Calvin him- " self could not be free from censure in the article " of Predestination. But with regard to the doctrine " in question, I assert that the Scriptures say more " than I. These say, 1 Kings xxii, that *the Lord* " *has put a lying spirit in the mouth of the false Prophets.* " In the xxth of Jeremiah 7, *O Lord thou hast de-* " *ceived me, and I was deceived*; for thus it is in the " English translation of the Bible; and has not our " version the following words, Ezekiel xiv, 9. *And* " *if the Prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a* " *thing, I the Lord have deceived that Prophet?* Have " I advanced any thing that seems so strange at first " sight? I nevertheless know what meaning is a- " scribed to these passages; but I wish they also " would have admitted that which I give to my " book, without reproaching me with the appearance " of harshness which is found in the expression. And " a surprizing circumstance is, Mr. de Labadie has " asserted, that God can deceive, that he will de- " ceive, that he has deceived. He charges me with " not saying enough, in asserting that God can de- " ceive if he will, but that he cannot have the will " to do it, and that none of our zealots censure him " for it."

(28) Compare this with rem. [*A*] of the art. RANGOUZE.

Mr. Wolzogue's adversaries were not satisfied with this explication. Mr. de Vogelsang refuted it in the most indignant and contemptuous manner; and observed, among other particulars, and it is plain Des Cartes stole from the Schoolmen the distinction between the power of deceiving and the will to deceive; as if that power was a kind of perfection, whereas a will to deceive is an imperfection. He declares that Des Cartes was eager to get the fame of being an inventor by raking into the filth of the schoolmen; and he alledges a passage of Ch. V, Book IV of Aristotle's Topicks, in which it is said that the faculty of doing moral evil is in God and in a good man (29). He instances likewise the following words of Thomas Aquinas, which serve as an explication to this passage of Aristotle. *Deus peccare non potest, quia est omnipotens. Quamvis Philosophus dicat in quarto Topicorum, quod potest Deus & studiosus* (vir probus) *prava agere. Sed hoc intelligitur vel sub conditione, cujus antecedens sit impossibile, ut puta, si dicamus quod potest Deus prava agere si velit. Nihil enim prohibet conditionalem esse veram, cujus antecedens & consequens est impossible; sicut si dicatur, si homo est asinus, habet quatuor pedes. Vel, ut intelligatur, quod Deus potest aliqua agere, quæ nunc prava videntur, quæ tamen si ageret, bona essent. Vel loquitur secundum communem opinionem Gentilium, qui homines dicebant transferri in Deos, ut Jovem & Mercurium* (30). i. e. " God cannot sin because he is " omnipotent: although the Philosopher (Aristotle) " asserts, in the fourth book of his Topicks, that " God and a good man may do evil. But we must " understand this under a condition whose antecedent " is impossible, as for instance, if we should say that " God can do evil if he will. For nothing hinders " a conditional proposition from being true, though " the antecedent and consequent part of it should be " impossible; as if we should say, if man be an ass, " he has four feet. Or else the Philosopher means, " that God may do some things that now seem evil, " which yet, should he do them, would be good. Or " lastly, he expresses himself agreeably to the com- " mon opinion of the Gentiles, who declared that " men were turned into Gods as Jupiter and Mer- " cury." He asserts that Thomas Aquinas is ridiculous, in endeavouring to justify that reflection of Aristotle. He is vastly severe upon him; but I shall take notice only of what he says on the last point. *Quod ultimo loco hariolatur, Aristotelem forte sic locutum fuisse* juxta communem opinionem Gentilium, qui homines dicebant transferri in Deos, ut Jovem & Mercurium; *quam hoc plane frivolum est? Etenim juxta communem Gentilium opinionem, Dii non modo facultatem habebant mala vel turpissima perpetrandi, sed & promptam sane voluntatem. Quapropter eorum Poëtæ furta Numinum & impostruras, & rixas, & pugnas, & mutuorum odiorum rancores, & libidines, & adulteria vulgo decantavere. Quod plane contra Philosophi scopum & mentem est, qui mala perpetrandi voluntatem Deo penitus abrogat, etsi facultatem prava faciendi concesserit* (31). i. e. " *As to what he conjectures in the last place, viz.* " *that* perhaps *Aristotle expresses himself* agreeably to " the common opinion of the Gentiles, who declared " that men were turned into Gods as Jupiter and " Mercury; *how frivolous is all this! For, according to* " *the common opinion of the Gentiles, the Gods were not* " *only indued with the power, but had also the will to* " *commit the most shameful actions.* This was the rea- " son why their Poets chose, for their common To- " picks, the thefts of their Deities, their cheats, con- " tests, combats; their reciprocal hatred, their lewd- " nesses and adulteries. Now this is directly repug- " nant to the scope and meaning of Aristotle, who " entirely takes from God the will of doing evil, " though he acknowledges that he is indued with " power for that purpose." He adds (32) other passages of Scripture to those which Mr. de Wolzogue had alledged, and shews in what manner they ought to be understood. See the margin (33).

(29) *Solet Cartesius e putidissimis antiquorum Peripatheticorum atque Scholasticorum liberalius ineptientium sordibus excrementa præcipue fœdiora sæpenumero deligere, uti de placitis obsoletis, & merita sepulturæ oblivione, subtilitatis insolitæ miser gloriolam subripiat.* Reinerus Vogelsangius, *Vianensis V. D. M. & S. S. Theologiæ Professor in Ecclesia & Gymnasio Sylvaducensi, ad Præfation. Lud. Wolzogii necessaria Responsa.* P. 49.

(30) Thomas Aquin. 25. quæst. art. 3. *apud* Vogelsang. ibid. p. 51.

(31) Vogelsang. ibid. p. 52.

(32) Ibid. p. 69.

(33) It is to be observed, that the Walloon Synod pronounced Mr. de Wolzogue's book orthodox.

[*A*] *He followed Mary of Medicis, with whom he was in love, into France.*] We learn this particular

Henry IV. who appointed him one of the Gentlemen of his Bed-chamber (*b*). He was a man of wit and genius, handſome, polite, eloquent, and a very good Poet, and with the advantages of theſe ſhining qualities, he attached himſelf very much to the Ladies (*c*). His inventions enriched the Italian poetry in a very ſingular manner, he being the firſt who wrote poems in Anacreon's manner, and compoſed pieces that were ſet to muſic, and played on the ſtage (*d*) [*B*]. It muſt indeed be owned, that all Authors are not univerſally agreed that he was the inventor of thoſe two things; ſome affirming that Giabriele Chiabrera gave riſe to Anacreontic ſongs (*e*), and Æmilio Caveleri, a Gentleman of Rome, had writ Operas before Rinuccini (*f*). However this be, it cannot be denied but that the dramatic pieces of the latter greatly ſurpaſſed whatever had been done in that kind, with regard to the pomp of the machinery, the decoration of the ſcenes, and

(*b*) *Fu Gentiluomo della Camera del Re Criſtianiſſimo.* Jacobo Rilli, *Notizie Letterarie ed Iſtoriche intorno a gli Uomini illuſtri dell' Accad. Fiorent.* part. 1. p. 258.

(*c*) Nic. Erythræus, *Pinac.* 1. p. 61, 62.

(*d*) Creſcembeni, *Iſtor. della volgar Poeſia*, p. 149.

(*e*) Idem, ibid.

(*f*) Nic. Erythræus, *Pinac.* 1. p. 62.

ticular from Nicius Erythræus.] *Mariam' Mediceam*, ſays he (1), *Galliæ Reginam, non majori ambitione quàm vanitate adamavit: quam etiam honoris gratia, proſecutus eſt euntem in Galliam. Sed poſtea reverſus in Italiam, omiſſis amatoriis nugis, ad quas erat mirè propenſus, tandem ad ſe rediit, quæque ratione non perſpexerat, ſatietate abjecit, experiendo contempſit, totumque ad pietatis amorem & ſtudium animum contulit: in quo demum Florentiæ diem obiit extremum.* Here follows Baillet's paraphraſe of this Latin paſſage. "Ottavio Rinuccini . . . is known, in France, on "a very bad account, he having been ſo ſilly and "indiſcreet as to diſcover the motives which engaged him to put himſelf in the retinue of Queen "Mary of Medicis (2). . . . We muſt add, for his "reputation, that he changed his life and practice "in the latter part of his days; that the virtue and "wiſdom of our Queen, which had greatly mortified him, opened his eyes; and being returned to "Italy with a ſincere repentance and a very ſalutary "ſhame, he devoted himſelf to pious exerciſes, which "he did not forſake till his death (3)."

(1) Nic. Eyrthræus, *Pinac.* 1. p. 62.

(2) Baillet, *Jugement ſur les Pietes*, num. 1375.

(3) Ibid.

[*B*] *He being the firſt who . . . compoſed pieces that were ſet to muſic, and played on the ſtage.*] Nicius Erythræus aſcribes four Operas to him, that of Daphne (4), of Eruydice, of Arethuſa, and of Ariadne (5); but Mr. Rilli makes no mention of Arethuſa, tho' he had made many reſearches concerning this great Poet. He informs us (6) that the Daphne, repreſented before the great Dutcheſs by James Corſi, was printed in Florence in the year 1600 in 4to. That Eurydice, repreſented at the marriage of Mary of Medicis, with Henry IV, was printed in the ſame city in the year 1600, 4to. That the Ariadne, repreſented at the marriage of the Prince of Mantua with the Infanta of Savoy, was printed in the ſame city in the year 1608, 4to. That the *Maſcherata dell' Ingrate*, an interlude or ballet-dance at the marriage of the Prince of Mantua, was printed at Mantua in the year 1608, in 4to. That the *Verſi Sacri cantati nella Cappella della Sereniſſima Arciducheſſa d'Auſtria Granducheſſa di Toſcana*, and the Ode *in lode de' Giuocatori di pallone*, were printed at Florence in 1622, 4to, under the direction of Peter Francis Rinuccini, the Author's ſon. That others are printed in ſingle ſheets, beſides ſonnets, ſongs, &c. inſerted in other people's works; and that there are a very great number of his pieces in manuſcript, that deſerve to be publiſhed. He quotes (7) a paſſage of Peter Francis Rinuccini (8), by which we are told that Ottavio Rinuccini deſerved great commendations for his *Verſi Sciolti*, in his panegyric on the birth of Lewis XIII, and that he intended to tranſlate the ſix books of St. Catharine into this kind of verſe; but that he tranſlated only the firſt of it; and that they were reſolved to publiſh it, though the Author had not put the laſt hand to it. This is what Rilli ſays concerning Ottavio's works. Could he be ignorant of what related to this Orpera of Arethuſa which Erythræus mentions (9)?

(4) It is *Daphnem*, inſtead of *Daphnem*, *in* Nic. Erythræus.

(5) Nic. Ery- *Pinac.* 1. p. 101.

(6) Jacobo Rilli, *Notizie intorno a gli Uomini illuſtri dell' Accademia Fiorentina*, part. 1. p. 258, 260.

(7) Idem, ibid. p. 259.

(8) Extracted from a letter of the academy *de gli Alterati*.

(9) Obſerve, that in page 145 of the *Pinacotheca tertia*, he mentions the three others, but not the Arethuſa.

But to come to the point, here follows a long paſſage from the dedication of Eurydice (10). It ſays, that Rinuccini imagined he was the firſt among the moderns, who attempted to introduce muſic on the ſtage; however, he is miſtaken, and did not know what I have related elſewhere (11). We there alſo find that James Peri (12) ſet the Paſtoral entitled Daphne to muſic, and afterwards the Opera of Eurydice. *E' ſtata openione di molti, Criſtianiſſima Regina, che gli antichi Greci e Romani cantaſſero ſulle Scene le Tragedie intiere; ma sì nobile maniera di recitare, non che rinnovata, ma nè pur che io ſappia fin quì è ſtata tentata da alcuno; & ciò mi credev' io per difetto della Muſica moderna, di gran lunga all' antica inferiore; ma penſiero sì fatto mi tolſe interamente dall' animo Meſ. Jacobo Peri, quando udito l'intenzione del Sig. Jacopo Corſi, e mia, miſe con tanta grazia ſotto le note la Favola di Dafne, compoſta da me, ſolo per fare una ſemplice prova di quello, che poteſſe il Canto nell' età noſtra, che incredibilmente piacque a que' pochi che l'udirono; onde preſo animo, e data miglior forma alla ſteſſa Favola, e di nuovo rappreſentandola in Caſa il Sig. Jacopo, fu ella non ſolo dalla Nobiltà di tutta queſta Patria favorita, ma dalla Sereniſſ. Granducheſſa, e dagl' Illuſtriſſimi Cardinali dal Monte e Montalto, udita, e commendata; ma molto maggior favore, e fortuna ha ſortito l'Euridice meſſa in Muſica dal medeſimo Peri, con arte mirabile, e da altri non più uſata, havendo meritato dalla benignità e magnificenza del Sereniſſ. Granduca d'eſſere rappreſentata in nobiliſſima Scena, alla preſenza di V. M. del Cardinal Legato, e di tanti Principi, e Signori d' Italia e di Francia; la onde cominciando io a conoſcere quanto ſimili Rappreſentazioni in Muſica ſiano gradite, ho voluto recare in luce queſte due, perchè altri di me più intendenti s'ingegnino di accreſcere, e migliorare sì fatte Poeſie di maniera, che non abbiamo invidia a quelle antiche tanto celebrate da' Nobili Scrittori* (13). i. e. "It has been the opinion of many perſons, moſt "Chriſtian Queen, that the ancient Greeks and Romans uſed to ſing their Tragedies throughout; "but ſo noble a way of ſpeaking has not been revived, nor that I know of, yet attempted by any "one, which circumſtance I imagined was owing "to the defects of the modern muſic, which is vaſtly "inferior to that of the ancients. However, Signior "Jacobo Peri made me quite alter my opinion, "when upon hearing Signior Jacobo Corſi's deſign, "as well as mine, he ſo gracefully ſet to muſic the "Paſtoral of Daphne, written by me, merely to "make a trial of what vocal muſic could do in our "age, and it gave inexpreſſible pleaſure to thoſe "few who heard it. Being encouraged by this, and "working up this Paſtoral into a better form, and "repreſenting it anew in Signior Jacobo's houſe, it "was favoured not only by all the nobility of the country, but heard and commended by the moſt Serene "Archducheſs, and the moſt illuſtrious Cardinals dal "Monte and Montalto. But Eurydice has met with "more favour and ſucceſs, the aboveſaid Signior "Peri having ſet it to muſic with wonderful art, "which he himſelf only is maſter of; and having "been thought worthy, by the bounty and great generoſity of the moſt ſerene grand Duke, to be re"preſented in the moſt ſplendid manner on the "ſtage, in preſence of your Majeſty, the Cardinal "Legate, and ſo many Princes and Gentlemen of "Italy and France; from whence, beginning to "find the applauſe which ſuch muſical repreſentations met with, I was determined to publiſh theſe "two, thereby to excite others, who are better ſkilled in theſe things than I am, to carry and improve "this ſpecies of poetry in ſuch a manner, that we "may have no reaſon to envy ſo much thoſe ancient "performances, which noble Writers have ſo much "praiſed." To this I ſhall add a curious paſſage from father Meneſtrier. "Theſe muſical Dramas "were preſerved in carouſals and ballets, the overtures whereof generally conſiſted of dialogues and "narrations of muſicians, who ſung in chariots or "other machines. At laſt Ottavio Rinuccini, a Florentine Poet, having a particular genius for expreſſing in his verſes all kinds of paſſions, endeavoured

(10) To Mary of Medicis, Q. of France.

(11) In the rem. of the art. SULPITIUS (John).

(12) Nic. Erythræus, *Pinac.* 1. p. 61. calls him Jacobus Pera, but p. 144, of *Pinacotheca tertia*, he calls him Jacobus Perius.

(13) Ottavio Rinuccini, *apud* Jacobum Rilli, *Notizie intorno a gli Uomini illuſtri dell' Accademia Fiorent.* p. 258, 259.

and the ſkilfulneſs of the actors (*g*). I am of opinion it ſhould not have been affirmed, that he firſt brought *ballets* or interludes into France [*C*]. Being returned to Florence, he at laſt grew tired of the follies of love, to which he once had a very ſingular propenſion (*b*). That which reaſon was not able to effect, was at laſt done by ſatiety and experience, by giving him a contempt for thoſe things in which he had formerly indulged himſelf too much. He turned his eyes inward; and thereupon devoted himſelf entirely to piety, and died in that frame of mind at Florence (*i*). Several of his Poems were printed there after his death, under the direction of PETER FRANCIS RINUCCINI his ſon, who dedicated them to Lewis XIII. in 1624.

(g) Nic. Erythræus, *Pinac.* 1. p. 62.

(b) See the rem. [*A*].

(i) Nic. Erythræus, *ubi ſupr.*

" voured to adapt muſic and ſinging ſo well to them, " that theſe ſhould not eclipſe any of the beauty of " his verſes, nor prevent their being underſtood, " which are often drowned by the windings, turn- " ings, and quavers of the voice. He diſcourſed on " this ſubject with Giacomo Corſi, a Gentleman of " Florence, who was ſkilled in muſic, and a great " lover of all things in a polite taſte, when both " ſending for Giacomo Cleri (14), and Giulio Cac- " cini, excellent maſters of muſic, they contrived " together a piece (drama) which was repreſented in " Signior Corſi's houſe, in preſence of the great " Duke and Ducheſs of Tuſcany, and Cardinals " Monte and Montalto with ſo much ſucceſs, that " this piece, the ſubject of which was the loves of " Apollo and Daphne, ſerved as the model to Eu- " rydice, which was repreſented not long after in the " ſame place. Claude de Monteverde, an excellent " muſician, compoſed the Ariadne (15) from theſe two " originals; and being appointed maſter of the mu- " ſic of St. Mark in Venice, he there introduced " thoſe Dramas which have become ſo famous, by " the magnificence of the theatres and habits, the " delicacy of the voices, the harmony of the con- " certs, and the learned compoſitions of this Mon- " teverde, Soriano, Giovanelli, Teofilo, and ſeveral " other great maſters (16)."

(14) I fancy there is an error of the preſs here, *Cleri* for *Pleri*.

(15) I don't know whether we ought not to have ſaid, that Claude de Monteverde compoſed, not the Ariadne, but the muſic of the Ariadne of Rinuccini. However, this laſt piece ought to have been quoted as well as Daphne and Eurydice.

(16) Meneſtrier, *Repreſentat. en Muſique*, p. 163 *& ſeq.*

Any perſon, who is deſirous of knowing the original and progreſs of every art, will read theſe citations with pleaſure. It muſt be obſerved that Rinuccini was not a player (17).

[*C*] *I am of opinion it ſhould not have been affirmed, that the firſt brought ballets or interludes into France.*] His ſon applauds him for this: *qua fu*, ſays he (18), *ne' ſuoi Verſi la facilità, quale la dolcezza veramente nata all' armonioſa melodia? Quindi acque, che i Balli, quali egli ancora primiero conduſſe in Francia, accompagnati dalla Muſica piacquero mirabilmente.* i. e. " How " eaſy was his verſe, and how great the ſweetneſs, " which was truly adapted to harmonious melody! " To this was owing that the ballets, accompanied " with muſic, which he alſo firſt introduced in " France, met with vaſt applauſe." He came to France with Mary of Medicis in 1600. Now we know that ballets were eſtabliſhed there before that time; and I will give a proof of this which will be very agreeable to thoſe who love to be acquainted with the hiſtory of inventions. Beaujoyeux was " an Italian named Balthaſarini, and was one of the " fineſt fiddles in Europe, whom Marſhal de Briſſac, " when Governor of Piedmont, ſent to the Queen " (19), with the whole band of violins at whoſe head " he was. The Queen appointed him her valet-de- " chambre; and this Balthaſarini, changing his " name to Beaujoyeux, gained ſo much fame by " his inventions of ballads, concerts, feſtivals, and " dramas, that no one was ſpoken of but him. It " was he who compoſed the ballet for the marriage " of Duke de Joyeuſe with Mademoiſelle de Vau- " demont, the Queen's ſiſter, and this ballad was " publiſhed under the following title, *Ballet comique* " *de la Reine, fait aux Noces de Monſieur le Duc de* " *Joyeuſe & Mademoiſelle de Vaudemont ſa Sœur, par* " *Baltaſar de Beaujoyeux Valet de Chambre du Roi &* " *de la Reine ſa Mere.* One of the Court Poets wrote " the following verſes in his praiſe:

(17) He was a Player in great reputation at Florence. Baillet, *Jugem. ſur les Poetes*, num. 1375.

(18) In his letter to the academy *de gli Alterati*, *apud* Rilli, *Notizie intorno a gli Uomini illuſtri dell' Accademia Fiorentina*, p. 259.

(19) *i. e.* Catharine of Medicis.

Beaujoyeux, qui premier des cendres de la Grece
Fais retourner au jour le deſſein & l'addreſſe
Du Balet compaſſé en ſon tour meſuré,
Qui d'un eſprit Divin toy-méme te devance,
Geometre inventif, unique en ta ſcience;
Si rien d'honneur s'acquiert le tien eſt aſſuré.

" Fam'd Beaujoyeux, who firſt from Grecia's aſhes,
" Has caus'd the ballad now to ſhine in France:
" The ballad, form'd by art's moſt pleaſing rules,
" Where in juſt harmony all the parts combine.
" Thou, heavenly genius, who thyſelf excell'ſt:
" Geometrician, who doſt all invent,
" And ſhew'ſt a ſcience known to thee alone.
" If great performances can honour gain,
" Remain aſſur'd that thine will laſt for ever.

(20) Meneſtrier, *ubi ſupra.*

" Beaulieu and Salmon, maſters of the muſic to his " Majeſty, aſſiſted him in the compoſition of the re- " citatives and ballad airs; part of the verſes were " writ by la Cheſnaye, Chaplain to the King; and " James Patin, King's Painter at that time, painted " the Janes (20)." This ballad was danc'd in 1582 (21). Father Meneſtrier (22) has given a deſcription of the machine with which it was introduced.

(21) Vide the rem. [*C*] of the art. GOUDIMEL.

(22) In the *Traite des Ballets anciens & modernes*, p. 267, 268.

RITIUS (MICHAEL), in Italian *Riccio*, a Neapolitan Civilian, and Author of ſeveral books [*A*], flouriſhed in the beginning of the 16th Century. He was baniſhed from his native country *by the faction which oppoſed France*, and withdrew to the Court of Lewis XII. *who raiſed him to the employment of Counſellor in the Parliament of Paris* (*a*). La Croix du Maine calls him Michael de Ris, and affirms that he was *Counſellor to the King, in his great Council, and in the Parliament of Paris anno* 1505, and that he *was commonly called the Advocate of Naples* (*b*). When Cardinal d'Amboiſe entered Milan, after Lewis Sforza had been taken priſoner, he appointed Michael Ritius to anſwer the ſpeech made by the inhabitants of Milan, to beg pardon for their diſobedience (*c*). Lewis XII. ſent our Ritius to Genoa in 1506, to offer the rebellious inhabitants a free pardon (*d*), but all the arguments of this orator were of no effect.

(a) Baudier, *Hiſt. du Cardinal d'Amboiſe*, p. 44.

(b) La Croix du Maine, *Bibl. Franc.* p. 331.

(c) See Gaguin, book 11, of *l'Hiſt. de France*, folio m. 308 *verſo*.

(d) Guicciardin, liv. 7. folio m. 192.

[*A*] *Author of ſeveral books.*] He wrote at Blois in 1505, *a Treatiſe of the duty of Soldiers, and their privileges, which was printed at Paris the ſaid year*, dedicated by him to King Lewis XII. (1). He wrote three books, *De Regibus Francorum*, three *de Regibus Hiſpaniæ*, one *de Regibus Hieroſolymarum*, four *de Regibus Neapolis & Siciliæ*, and two *de Regibus Hungariæ*, which John Frobenius printed at Baſil in 1517 in 4to. We there meet with a Preface written by the Author at Rome in 1505; and a Preface of Janus Parrhaſius, who affirms that the diction is pure, unaffected, and natural, *purus, candidus, illaboratus* (2). Ludovicus Vives declares that there are a great many errors in the proper names in theſe hiſtories of Ritius. *Michael Ritius Reges aliquot Chriſtianos collegit, in quo opere multa ſunt locorum, hominum, & familiarum corrupta nomina, vitio credo deſcribentium* (3). His Hiſtory of the Kings of France extends from Pharamond to Lewis XII. and was printed at Rome in 1505, and dedicated to Guy de Rochefort, Chancellor of France (4). That of the Kings of Spain begins at Gargoris, and ends with Philip I. father to Charles V. (5).

(1) La Croix du Maine, *Bibl. Franc.* p. 331. I muſt obſerve, that du Verdier Vau-Privas does not mention this book.

(2) Taken from Geſner, *Bibl.* fol. 513.

(3) Ludovicus Vives, *de tradendis Diſciplinis*, lib. 5. p. 359. edit. Ludg. 1551, 8vo.

(4) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 667.

(5) Vaſæus, *Chron. Hiſp.* cap. 4. p. 21. edit. Colon. 1577, 8vo.

[*A*] *He*

RITTANGELIUS (JOHN STEPHEN), a converted Jew, was a native of Bamberg in Germany, and lived in the 17th Century. He was Profeſſor of the Eaſtern languages in the Univerſity of Koninſberg, and publiſhed ſome books [*A*], which prove that he was ſincerely zealous for the Chriſtian Religion, and a learned man. He intended to publiſh ſome others, and went for that purpoſe to Amſterdam; but he had the horrid mortification to ſee his manuſcripts torn to pieces by privateers, who took the ſhip he was on board of, a particular he himſelf informs us of in the dedication to his *Jezirah*. Some ſay that he was born a Jew, and this the Journaliſts of Utrecht declare as a certain fact (*a*); but others ſay, that he was a *Roman Catholick, and afterwards turned Jew, and then turned Proteſtant.* Theſe are the words of the Author of *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for Auguſt 1699, p. 212. But ſome perſons think he never profeſſed the Jewiſh Religion [*B*]. He was living the 31ſt of May 1652, that being the

(a) *Bibl. Librorum novorum*, Menſ. Sept. and Oct. 1698, p. 684.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome books.*] He had ſaid in his notes on the book *Jezirah* (1), that the Chaldaic paraphraſe of the ſcriptures furniſhes ſtrong arguments againſt the Jews and Antitrinitarians, upon which he was attacked by a Socinian, who printed a work under the name of *Irenopolita*. He defended himſelf in a treatiſe, entitled, *Libra veritatis*, dedicated to John Caſimir King of Poland. Vander Wayen (2) reprinted it at Franeker 1698, with another treatiſe of the ſame Author concerning the ceremonies of Eaſter. He likewiſe reprinted in the ſame place in 1699, Rittangelius's book, *De Veritate Religionis Chriſtianæ*, wherein are inſerted a great number of paſſages, which ſhew that the ancient Jewiſh Church believed in the myſtery of the Trinity, and the eternal divinity of the Meſſiah (3). Mr. Wagenſeil (4) publiſhed ſome letters written by Rittangelius to a Jew, and which appeared to him excellent in their kind. Vander Wayen (5) is of opinion, that du Voiſin, who wrote a refutation of the book of the pretended *Irenopolita*, did not ſucceed ſo well in it as the Proſelyte to Chriſtianity. I muſt add, that ſome of thoſe who are not ſatisfied with Rittangelius's principles, no ſooner knew that a new edition was made of his *Libra veritatis*, but they publiſhed a manuſcript which had been written many years, and entitled, *Bilibra veritatis & rationis, &c.* They added to it the diſſertation *De Verbo Dei*, which had occaſioned Rittangelius's anſwer. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (6).

(1) This is a book which the Jews aſcribe to the Patriarch Abraham, and others to Rabbi Akiba. Rittangelius gave a verſion of it with notes, which was printed at Amſterdam, in 1642.

(2) Profeſſor of Divinity in Franeker.

(3) See the preface of Vander Wayen to *Libra veritatis*.

(4) In *Lipmanni Confutatione*. See the preface in queſtion.

(5) See the ſame preface.

(6) For Auguſt 1699. p. 214.

Rittangelius printed at Koniſberg in 1652, his German tranſlation of the Prayers, which the Jews offer up in their Synagogues the firſt day of every year. He dedicated this work to the Elector of Brandenburg; and the dedication dated May the 31ſt 1652, informs us, that he had been indiſpoſed for near a twelve month, and entertained little hopes of a recovery; that he had often deſired to have ſome choice diſciples put under his care, that the talent which God had beſtowed upon him might not die with him, but that he had not been able to obtain that favour; and therefore, notwithſtanding the violence of his indiſpoſition, he had applied himſelf to the German tranſlation of ſome Jewiſh prayers. In his Preface he criticizes ſeveral errors committed by Kircher, Capel, Scaliger, Vechner, Vorſtius, Conſtantine l'Empereur, Slevogtius, Schickard, in their verſions from the Hebrew (7). The Journal which I cited gives us an idea of his infatuation. *In eo merito à cordatioribus Theologis reprehendendus, quod ubique ferè jactat, ne apicem quidem ullum vel literam in Novo Teſtamento reperiri, quem non ex Hebræorum antiquitatibus deſumtum demonſtrare ipſe poſſit, & quidem, ut ipſe loquitur*, non opinionibus, (quia opinio verſatur circa illa, quæ ſe aliter habere poſſunt) ſed auctoritatibus omnium ſeculorum, tam Judaicæ, quam Chriſtianæ Eccleſiæ & Antiquitatis (1). He affirmed, that there is not a tittle or jot in the New Teſtament but what is borrowed from the Jewiſh Antiquities.

(7) Extracted from the *Utrecht Journal*, for Sept. and Oct. 1698, p. 675, 677.

(8) Extracted from the *Utrecht Journal*, for Sept. and Oct. 1698, p. 678.

[*B*] *Some perſons think he never profeſſed the Jewiſh religion.*] A manuſcript letter was communicated to me, dated 10 Sept. 1701, out of which I will extract ſome particulars, which, I am perſuaded, will pleaſe the curious.

The Author of this letter was particularly well acquainted with our Rittangelius. He obſerves, 1ſt, that Hornius, Wagenſeil, and ſeveral other Writers affirm, that our Author had been a Jew, and perhaps was born one. 2d, That the anonymous *Bilibra veritatis* affirms *, that Rittangelius having been brought up in the Romiſh communion, embraced the Jewiſh faith, and was circumciſed, as it is ſaid, at Hamburg; that afterwards he was baptized at Dantzick by Mr. Nigrinus, and devoted himſelf to the Chriſtian belief. 3d, That Chriſtopher Hartknoch, Profeſſor at Thorn, relates †, that Rittangelius was born, as it is ſaid, a Chriſtian, and baptized into the Chriſtian church, afterwards turned Jew, and was circumciſed at Hamburg: that after this he turned Papiſt, then Calviniſt, and laſtly Lutheran; that he was created extraordinary Profeſſor, (contrary to the uſual cuſtom) of the Hebrew tongue, in the Univerſity of Koninſberg, without having diſputed previouſly for it; that he was favoured by the Grand Marſhal on this occaſion; and that a quarrel breaking out between Latterman and Miſlenta, he ſided with the former.

* p. 69.

† *In his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Pruſſia*, p. 641. edit. 1686.

The Author of this letter makes, in the firſt place, a remark on the uncertainty which is found in theſe Writers, and on their variations, which are of ſuch a nature, that if ſome of them are not miſtaken, the reſt muſt neceſſarily tell a falſity. He afterwards takes notice of the extract of a letter, which a Senator of Dantzick wrote to him the 22d of April 1700. It is ſaid in this extract, that Hartknoch, ſpeaking no doubt of the ſame Nigrinus, whom he declares to have baptiſed Rittangelius, relates ** that Nigrinus was a Lutheran, then a Calviniſt, and Preacher at Dantzick, and afterwards a Papiſt, at the ſolicitation of Valerius Magni the Capuchin, and that, before this happened, he had advanced ſeveral particulars, agreeably to the principles of the Socinians, concerning Chriſt's nativity. This Senator had been deſired to enquire, if there was any monument of this pretended baptiſm of Rittangelius, at Dantzick, by Nigrinus; and he was told, that this ceremony had been performed with pomp, and regiſtered in the moſt publick manner in the archives of the church, becauſe of the merit and erudition of the new Chriſtian. He anſwered, that Nigrinus was invited in 1630, to be Miniſter of the Proteſtant church (St. Peter's) in Dantzick; and that the office of baptiſing being appropriated, in that city, to the Deacons, excluſively of the Paſtors, it was not poſſible for Nigrinus to have baptiſed Rittangelius. He had not had time to enquire, whether he contributed to the converſion of this proſelyte. The Author of this letter concludes, from all theſe particulars, that Rittangelius had not been baptiſed or re-baptiſed in Dantzick, which proves, ſays he, that thoſe are miſtaken, who ſay that he was born a Jew, or turned ſuch. I am ſurprized, continues he, that ſo many famous Writers ſhould have neglected to enquire into the truth of this ſtory, which would not have been difficult for them to do in the life-time of Rittangelius, who had a great number of friends as well as enemies. But they contented themſelves with copying from one another, by publiſhing random reports, without taking the trouble to make any exact enquiry, whether it was well grounded or not.

** Ibid. p. 824.

He ſays, that living in Pruſſia in 1649, and the two following years, and having lodged for ſome months at Mr. Ahaſuerus Brand's, Great Marſhal, and one of the four Counſellors of the Regency, he had an opportunity of getting acquainted with Rittangelius

the date of the dedication to one of his books (*b*).

(*b*) See the close of the rem. [*A*].

lius, and contracting a very intimate friendſhip with him. The Great Marſhal was his Patron, and uſed to invite him pretty often to dine with him. He, and ſeveral other perſons of honour and probity, told the Letter-writer, that Rittangelius was born a Roman-Catholick in the fortreſs of Frocheim in Franconia, in the dioceſe of Bamberg; that having ſtudied claſſical learning, he went to Conſtantinople, where he was very converſant with the Rabbins for twelve years; that at his return he turned Proteſtant, and went afterwards to Konigſberg, where the Elector of Brandenburg appointed him Profeſſor extraordinary of the Hebrew language; the Lutherans only being allowed to be ordinary Profeſſors in that Univerſity; that no perſon imagined him to be born a Jew, but that it nevertheleſs was ſuſpected he had been one.

The Letter-Writer relates, that one day, Baron d'Eulenburg, ſon-in-law to the Great Marſhal, bantered Rittangelius about circumciſion, at the table of his father-in-law, who was diſpleaſed with him for it. That Rittangelius, who was in the utmoſt confuſion, made a very modeſt excuſe on that occaſion; and complained, that he was very falſely ſuppoſed to have been circumciſed. The Letter-Writer, after dinner, expreſſed his ſorrow at his having been ſo groſsly affronted. Rittangelius, melting into tears, and venting the deepeſt ſighs, proteſted that he had never been circumciſed. The Letter-Writer affirms, that a Miniſter of Elbing, venerable for his probity and knowledge, gave him a good proof of this. This Miniſter had taken inexpreſſible pains to reſtore a good harmony in Rittangelius's family. This unhappy man was married to a woman who uſed him very ill (9), at the ſame time that ſhe was ſupported in her fantaſtical humours by her relations who lived in Elbing. The Miniſter in queſtion did all that lay in his power to calm theſe feuds; was witneſs to the wife's violent paſſion, and drew from thence a ſolid argument, *in* oppoſition to the common opinion of her huſband's having been circumciſed. He reaſoned thus: this woman, in her paſſion, uſed to throw out, in the moſt impudent manner, whatever ſhe thought could turn to her huſband's loſs and diſhonour, and yet ſhe never charged him with having been circumciſed, and conſequently he never was.

(9) The Letter-Writer informs me, that the cauſe of this woman's ill humour, was, becauſe Rittangelius, either by conſtitution, or by reaſon of his advanced age, was indued with the gift of continency more than his wife deſired.

The letter writer adds another reaſon. I do not find, ſays he, that any of Rittangelius's adverſaries reproached him with ſuch a thing, during his lifetime, in any book. Nevertheleſs ſeveral were wrote, and ſome of them with great rancour. He did not ſpare them, but attacked, very ſeverely, ſeveral famous writers; and particularly Miſſlenta (10), the pillar of Lutheraniſm in Konigſberg; and the Buxtorfes, whom he accuſed of being groſsly ignorant in Hebrew.

(10) Doctor of Divinity.

To conclude, the Letter-writer is of opinion, that the ſuſpicions were grounded on Rittangelius's having frequented none but Jews during his abode in Conſtantinople, and becauſe he had quite the air and manner of a Rabbin. But theſe are no proofs of his having certainly embraced the Jewiſh faith. He poſſibly might have flattered the Jews, that he would go over to them, in order to prompt them to inſtruct him in the moſt refined and abſtruſe parts of their learning, and afterwards might have withdrawn himſelf from them, and forfeited his promiſe (11).

(11) Extracted from a letter, *ſcripta a Medico Germano T L. K. ad Medicum Hollandicum P. B.*

ROBERT (JOHN), Profeſſor of the Civil Law in the Univerſity of Orleans, the place of his birth, in the 16th Century, gained reputation by his works [*A*]. ANNE (*a*) ROBERT, his ſon, Advocate in the Parliament of Paris, publiſhed ſome law-books which are eſteemed [*B*]. See the letter which Paſquier wrote to him (*b*). Lewis Robert, his ſon, Advocate in the ſame Parliament, died very young, and had gained great reputation

(*a*) And not *Andrew*, as Konig ſays.

(*b*) It is in book 19. p. 522 & *ſeq.* Tom. 2.

[*A*] *He gained reputation by his works.*] He publiſhed *Sententiarum Juris libri IV*, Paris 1557. *Receptæ Juris civilis Lectiones libri II*, Orleans 1567. *Animadverſionum Juris civilis libri III*, Paris 1580. Cujas, under the name of Mercator, wrote againſt this work; and Robert anſwered him and entitled his piece, *Notarum libri III ad Jacobi Cujacii Mercatoris notarum libros III*, at Orleans 1583. He alſo wrote a book againſt Robert Maſſon a Proteſtant Miniſter, which work, being tranſlated out of Latin into French, was printed at Paris in 1569. See du Verdier's *Bibliotheque Françoiſe* (1).

(1) p. 753.

[*B*] *Anne Robert . . . . publiſhed ſome Law-books which are eſteemed.*] His four books *Rerum judicatarum* are greatly eſteemed. Theſe are a collection either of arrets of the Parliament of Paris, or of the great Council &c. in remarkable caſes. The reaſons or arguments of the advocates are there deduced learnedly and at large; the whole being a perpetual ſeries of erudition and ſelect quotations. I would have made no farther mention of them, but that I call to mind that, among thoſe who declare that the paſſages of Tagereau, cited by me in the Article QUELLENEC, give offence, ſome of them go on the falſe ſuppoſition that this writer was of no weight; that he was univerſally unknown, and that no man but himſelf had preſumed to write in this manner. But I hope they will be no longer offended, if I ſhew them that this offence is grounded on an error with regard to a matter of fact; and this was one of the reaſons which prompted me to ſhew, in the ſecond edition of the Article QUELLENEC, I. that Tagereau's diſcourſe is not unknown (2): II. That another advocate of the Parliament of Paris (3) expreſſed himſelf as freely as he did. I add here in the ſame view, that is for the edification of the perſons ſo ſcandalized, that Anne Robert, one of the moſt famous advocates of that Parliament, has improved upon both of them; and that in a work dedicated to the great Achilles de Harlay, firſt Preſident of that auguſt Aſſembly. The Xth chapter of his IVth book *Rerum judicatarum* relates to a ſuit for impotency, brought, by way of appeal, to the Parliament of Paris. This Parliament confirmed by a decree (4) the ſentence of the eccleſiaſtical judges, who had commanded an inſpection to be made, and the Congreſs; which not being approved by the huſband, he had appealed to the Parliament. His advocate repreſented the abomination of ſuch a procedure; he did, in ſome meaſure, the ſame as happens in mighty revolutions of States, where, in order to give a very long duration, they are overturned for a little time (5). He diſpenſed with the laws of modeſty for the ſake of modeſty. He deſcribed in the moſt barefaced and impudent manner the ceremonies of the ſearch, in order to create an abhorrence to it; and to endeavour to extirpate a moſt impudent abuſe. Tagereau was animated by the ſame ſpirit; but as Robert did not write in a living language, he gave himſelf a much freer ſcope. *Vultis ad perpetuam rei deteſtationem, quam à foro & judiciis explodi convenit, viſitationem (ſpectaculum odio publico dignum) verbis repræſentari? Parcite pudicæ aures, ſi quid in re obſcœna labatur verecundi ſermonis modeſtia. Puella reſupina jacet cruribus hinc inde diſtentis. Proſtant pudendæ corporis partes, quas natura ad delicias generis humani velavit. Has & matronæ (quæ obſtetrices anus ſunt) & medici inſpiciunt, pertractant, diducunt: Magiſtratus vultu compoſito riſum diſſimulat: Matronæ præſentes venerem dudum oblitam refricant: Medici pro ætatis diſcrimine, hic vires priſtinas reminiſcitur, ille animo æſtuante inanis ludicri ſpectaculo paſcitur: Chirurgus aut ferramento fabrefacto (id ſpeculum matricis vocari ſolet) aut cereo & fictitio Priapo aditus Venereos tentat, aperit, reſerat: Puella jacens titillatione veſana prurit: Ut etiam ſi virgo viſitari cœperit, inde tamen non incor-*

(2) It was inſerted in the *Bibli. du Droit Franc.* a work reprinted at Paris in 1667.

(3) Sebaſtian Roulliard.

(4) The 20th of January 1587.

(5) An old Roman uſed to ſay, *Leges ſemper ut eſſent, aliquando non fuerunt.*

tation. See James Gutherius's *Choartius major, vel de orbitate toleranda.* This treatiſe is annexed to the book *De Jure Manium:* it is addreſſed by the Author to Anne Robert, whom he comforts to the beſt of his power. I have ſpoken before (*c*) of PETER ROBERT, one of the moſt illuſtrious Advocates of the Parliament of Paris in the reign of Henry II. and ſhall alſo ſpeak of him hereunder [*C*]. I know not whether the Orleans Profeſſor and he were of the ſame family.

(*c*) Citat. (10) of the art. MARILLAC (Charles de).

His ſon Anne had a daughter named Anne, who was married to a brother of Andrew du Laurens the Phyſician (*d*). His family is ſtill in being, and makes a conſpicuous figure in Paris. Mr. Robert, the King's Attorney at the Chatelet, deſcends from it. *He has a ſon who is Preſident in the Chamber of Accompts; and a brother, Grand Vicar of the Dioceſe of Niſmes*; and another brother who, quitting the Intendancy of Canada, was appointed Intendant of the Navy at Breſt in January 1703. The late Mr. Robert, Canon and great Penitentiary of *Notre Dame* at Paris, was their brother (*e*).

(*d*) See rem. [*E*] of the art. LAURENS (Andrew du).

(*e*) From the *Mercure Galant*, for Jan. 1703, p. 271.

[" Robert (John) died at Nevers in 1590, leaving eleven children. He was " Counſellor in the Preſidial at Orleans, and ſon of James Robert, who alſo was Counſellor and Profeſſor of Law in the ſame city. With regard to Anne Robert, he was " living in 1617, and died of the gout very ſoon after, his epitaph being inſerted in the " *Feriæ Forenſes*, a work of Anthony Mornai's, printed in 1619. Lewis Robert, his " ſon, who alſo was an Advocate of reputation, died very young in 1613. James Gu- " therius, mentioned above by Bayle, was called in French Goutiere, and there is an arti- " cle of him in Moreri, under the word *Guthieres* *".]

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayles's Dict. vol. 4. p. 982. col. 2.

ROBERVAL,

rupta recedat (6). Modeſty, continues he, will not ſuffer me to proceed farther (7). He afterwards obſerves, that notwithſtanding the immodeſty of this cuſtom, it might be tolerated, if it was a certain way of diſcovering the proofs that are ſought for; but he affirms that theſe are altogether inſidious, and thereupon he introduces a vaſt deal of obſcenity. The whole chapter is filled with ſuch thoughts and expreſſions; and nothing can be more laſcivious than that part where the wife's advocate challenges the poor huſband to the combat; and deſcribes to him the ſweets that may be found in the field of battle. [" Bayle does not give a proper account of the ſequel " of this proceſs. The eccleſiaſtical judge had or- " dered the ſearch only to be made, and it was from " this ſentence that the huſband appealed. The two " advocates, Bernard for the huſband, and Garnier " for the wife, (who was but eighteen) who ſued for " a divorce, ſpoke a great deal for their reſpective " clients; the one juſtifying and the other condemn- " ing *viſitationem & congreſſum*. The Court, by a " decree of the 20th of January 1587, transferred " the parties to the eccleſiaſtical judge, to have the " firſt ſentence executed *."] There had been ſuch another cauſe in the Parliament of Paris ſome years before. I obſerve this, only to have occaſion of ſaying, that Anthony Hotman, brother to the famous Francis Hotman, declared againſt the Congreſs, and that he was extremely free in his expreſſions (8). The book publiſhed by him on this ſubject, is entitled, *Traitté de la diſſolution du mariage par froideur de l'homme ou de la femme.* i. e. " A Treatiſe concerning " the diſſolution of marriage, by the *frigidity* of the " huſband or wife." It has been ſeveral times reprinted. I believe that the firſt edition was that of 1581 (9); and that this year one of his relations was ſued, upon pretence of impotency, in order to get the marriage diſſolved. It is certain Rouillard (10) ſaid, that Anthony Hotman drew up this treatiſe, only to promote the divorce of one of his relations. The reader will pleaſe to obſerve, that this Francis Hotman's brother made a conſpicuous figure among the advocates, and was appointed Attorney General in the parliament of Paris by the leaguers. I therefore would not have any perſon imagine, that Tagereau is the only perſon I could have alledged on this occaſion. I would have it remembered, that the greateſt perſons at the bar might have been mentioned. I muſt not omit that a certain advocate (11) tranſlated and publiſhed a French tranſlation of Anne Robert's work. I have not got that verſion; but I fancy that the Latin paſſage quoted above, and many others, are not ſo natural, or rather ſo naked, as the original; and yet they are very obſcene.

(6) Annæus Robertus, *Rerum judicatarum*, lib. 4. cap. 10. p. 730. Geneva edit. 1620, 8vo.

(7) *Plura dicere vetat pudor.* Idem, ibid.

* From the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. vol. 4. p. 982. col. 2.

(8) See the rem. [*H*] of the art. QUELLENEC.

(9) See du Verdier, *Bibl. Franc.* p. 891.

(10) In the capitulary quoted above, at the beginning of the rem. [*F*], of the art. QUELLENEC.

I have read in Beza's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, that the wife of an advocate at whoſe houſe, in Paris, the Proteſtants had aſſembled ſeveral times, ſurrendered herſelf priſoner to the Chatelet, with her two daughters, to convince the world of the falſity of the reports which had been ſpread, viz. that thoſe aſſemblies were unchaſte (12). " The Court . . . . " cauſed the young women to be ſearched ſeveral " times by many ſurgeons and midwives. But all the " ſearchers, one old matron excepted, judged them " to be virgins: nor did ſhe herſelf dare to affirm " poſitively that they had been vitiated by men; " and at laſt, ſhe begged their pardon, after they " were ſet at liberty; and declared how, and in " what manner, ſhe had been ſuborned (13)." Beza does not ſeem to condemn the trial to which they ſubmitted; and, to ſay the truth, there were ſuch circumſtances in this affair, as might excuſe them for ſubmitting to be ſearched, notwithſtanding the dictates of modeſty, and the danger they ran, becauſe the ſearchers might be ſuſpected of unfair dealing. I ſhall ſay nothing of the uncertainty of this kind of procedure; but will obſerve, that had theſe young women refuſed to be ſearched, they would have confirmed the depoſitions of the falſe witneſſes. The buſineſs was, to confute the informations, which preſident St. André had cauſed to be drawn up, in which two witneſſes affirmed, that in the Aſſembly on Holy Thurſday, conſiſting of a *great number of men, women and girls, about midnight . . . . after their ſermon was over, and a great noiſe was made, and they had eat a pig inſtead of the Paſcal lamb; and put out the lamb which had lighted them, each male coupled with his female; and that he diſcovered, among other men's wives, that of the ſaid advocate, and her two young, beautiful daughters, one of whom coming in the way of one of theſe* deponents, *he enjoyed her two or three times* (14). Theſe informations made great noiſe, and were ſhewed to the Queen-mother (15).

(11) One Tournet. I was informed of this by Mr. Marais, (mentioned citation 88, of the art. HENRY III. and elſewhere) with ſome other particulars.

(12) Beze, *Hiſt. Eccleſ. des Egliſes*, liv. 3. p. 238. ad ann. 1560.

(13) Ibid.

(14) Extracted from Beze, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* liv. 3. p. 235.

(15) Ibid.

[*C*] *I ſhall alſo ſpeak of him hereunder.*] This Peter Robert was a native of Paris (16): See what is ſaid about him in the decalogue concerning the advocates of Parliament. " He had gained greater eſteem " than the abovementioned; not that I believe he " was more learned than they, I rather thinking that " he did not know ſo much; but his perſon, voice " and action were graceful; and was more valued " for his natural parts than for his erudition. He " acquired his fame chiefly by two pleadings; the " firſt was that he made in favour of Preſident Oppede, with regard to Cabrieres and Merindol, the " hiſtory of which is ſo well written by Thuanus, " that I need not make farther mention of it to you. " The late Mr. Clement du Puy had been firſt entruſted with that cauſe; but being afterwards afflicted with the ſickneſs of which he died, Preſident Oppede applied himſelf to Robert, whom he " every day informed of the things he was to ſay. " The other cauſe of Robert's advancement was, that " turning Proteſtant, he was employed by the late " Prince of Conde, grandfather to the Prince, to " ſhew his innocence. Since this time he was always employed by the Proteſtants, which coſt him " his life, he falling a victim in the maſſacre on St. " Bartholomew's day (17)."

(16) Loiſel, *Dialogue des Avocats*, p. 517, 556.

(17) Ibid. p. 519.

[*A*] *The*

ROBERVAL, Profeſſor of the Mathematicks at Paris, contemporary with Des Cartes, and his great enemy. See the *Sorberiana*, and Baillet *(a)*. [" His name was " Gilles Perſonne, Sieur de Roberval. See Moreri under the article PERSONNE *".] * From the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. vol. 4. p. 982. col. 2.

(a) Baillet, *Vie Des Cartes*, Tom. 1. p. 304, where he ſays that there are two errors in the laſt volume of Moreri. See alſo his *Traite des Auteurs deguiſez*, part. 2. chap. 6.

ROCABERTI (JOHN THOMAS DE), Archbiſhop of Valentia, in the 17th Century, was one of the ornaments of the Dominican Order. He was Profeſſor of Divinity in Valentia, provincial of the Dominicans in the Province of Arragon; afterwards General of the Order; twice Viceroy of Valentia, and laſtly Inquiſitor General of Spain. He employed his utmoſt endeavours to maintain the Pope's authority; and not contented with having written ſeveral volumes on this ſubject, in oppoſition to the deciſions of the Clergy of France, he employed both his labour and money to collect, in one body, the ſeveral treatiſes which others have employed on the ſame ſubject. This collection printed at Rome, and entitled, *Bibliotheca maxima Pontificia*, contains twenty volumes in folio. Rocaberti died the 13th of January 1699, aged ſeventy four years.

ROCCO (GIRALOMO), was ſo great a maſter of the art of fine writing, that it is juſt to take notice of him. He was born in Venice, and lived in the beginning of the 17th Century. The reader will ſee hereunder the teſtimonies which the Duke of Savoy gave him of his favour [*A*].

[*A*] *The teſtimonies which the Duke of Savoy gave him of his eſteem.*] I met with the following particulars, in a book entitled, *La ſage & delectable folie*, written by J. Marcel. " I ſhould employ a great " deal of writing, ſhould I enumerate all the Mo- " narchs, who have indulged their favour and libera- " lity to the virtuoſi; I ſhall only content myſelf " with obſerving what I myſelf ſaw in the perſon " of the Sieur Rocco Girolami of Venice, a very " good accomptant, and ſo beautiful a writer, that I " am of opinion none of his contemporaries exceeded " him in that particular. He dedicated a book en- " graved on copper plates, to his Highneſs of Sa- " voy, in 1603, adorned with various ſorts of letters, " cyphers, and very fine flouriſhes or ſtriking; which " this great Prince ſeeing, he, to reward the Author's " genius and induſtry, put, with his own hand, a " gold chain about his neck, valued at 126 crowns " (1)." The Author ſpeaks of the ſame recompence, in another part of his book, I mean the chapter on *la folie des eſcrivains* (the folly of writing-maſters) (2). The reader will perhaps not be diſpleaſed to meet there with the names of ſome perſons, who, he affirms, excelled in this art. " We have " had, ſays he (3), a great number of fine writers, " who have publiſhed books of various ſorts of " hands, as, in France, le Gagneur, Lucas, Joſſerand, " and others: in Italy, D. Auguſtin of Sienna, M. " Martin de Romagna, Camillo Buonadio of Pia- " cenza, Creſci of Milan, Curio of Rome, Pala- " tin, Verrue, and others, with Sieur M. Antonio of " Genoa, who, in 1606, compoſed a book of vari- " ous letters and characters, dedicated to the Prince " of Mantua and Montferrat."

See La Croix du Maine, Bibliotheque Francoiſe, pag. 424, 425.

(1) Marcel, *Sage & delectable folie*, liv. 1. p. 106. It appears by the approbation of the Doctors, and the King's licence, that this work was printed in 1628. I make uſe of the Lyons edit. of 1650, in 8vo.

(2) The 6th of book 2.

(3) Ibid. lib. 2. p. 80.

ROCHEFOUCAUD (ALEXANDER DE LA), Abbot of St. Martin *(a)*, brother to that Count of Randan killed at the battle of Iſſoire, and to Francis Biſhop of Clermont, who was afterwards Cardinal, joined very unluckily in the impoſture of Martha Broſſier, who pretended to be poſſeſſed with the Devil. I obſerved in the article of this Martha, that at laſt the Parliament of Paris having cauſed her to be conveyed to Romarantin by the Provoſt, commanded her father not to permit her to leave that place, without the expreſs permiſſion of the Judge. But the father and his daughter, notwithſtanding this prohibition, went with our Abbot to Auvergne, and afterwards to Avignon. Though the Parliament of Paris ſummoned this Abbot twice to appear; and at the laſt, the revenues of his benefices were ſeized for his contempt of the Court *(b)*; this crew proceeded nevertheleſs in their journey, and went to Rome, *imagining that this* woman, who was ſuppoſed to be poſſeſſed with the Devil, *would play her part better on that great ſtage, and would meet with more credulity in a place which is the ſource of belief* *(c)*. The Biſhop of Clermont was ſo ſtrongly ſuſpected of having ſuggeſted to his brother this ſilly deſign, that he alſo was ſentenced to forfeit his eccleſiaſtical revenues *(d)*. Henry V. being well informed of the wicked deſigns, which were hatching under this cover, ordered Mr. de Silleri his Embaſſador, and Cardinal d'Oſſat, to diſcover the plot; and to prepoſſeſs the Pope before this company of players could act their farce. They executed this order with care; beſides, Cardinal d'Oſſat won over the Jeſuits [*A*], ſo that the Abbot of St. Martin, upon his arrival into Rome, found himſelf abandoned by the principal aſſiſtance on which he had depended. The Jeſuits abandoned him; and the Pope, who was forewarned, did nothing in oppoſition to the decree of the Parliament, pronounced againſt the pretended demoniac. The Abbot was obliged to addreſs in moſt humble ſupplications, both for himſelf and his brother, King Henry IV. *He fell ſick a little after, and died for grief, as it was reported, to have undertaken ſo long a journey, only to be laughed at. Martha and her father, being abandoned by every one, were forced to go to an hoſpital, as their laſt aſylum (e).*

(a) Mezerai, *Abregé Chronol.* ad ann. 1599. p. m. 205, 206.

(b) Thuan. lib. 133. *circa init.*

(c) Mezerai, *Abregé Chronol.* ad ann. 1599. p. 206.

(d) Thuan. lib. 123. *circa init.*

(e) Mezerai, *Abregé Chronol.* ad ann. 1599. p. 206. Thuanus ſpeaks as follows of this. *Ita fabula de Martha à Spiritu obſeſſa omnino evanuit, ipſo Sanmartino qui ſpe ſua falſus in aula illa deſpectus eſſe cœperat, ex mœrore mox mortuo, & Martha patreque ejus ex xenodochiorum ſtipe miſeram vitam vix tolerantibus.*

RODON

[*A*] *Cardinal d'Oſſat won over the Jeſuits.*] He ſpoke privately to father Sirmond, their General's (1) Secretary; and after ſhewing him the King's orders, he obſerved to him, that there was juſt cauſe to fear that this Abbot's attempt would be an obſtacle with regard to the recalling of the Jeſuits, becauſe both he and the Biſhop of Clermont had ſtudied among them. He afterwards repreſented to him the raſhneſs of ſuch an attempt; and how prejudicial it would be to the Church, ſhould the ſupreme Courts of the kingdom quarrel again with the Pope, which arguments had a very good effect.

(1) His name was *Aquaviva*.

RODON (DAVID DE) or rather DERODON (DAVID), Profeſſor of Philoſophy, firſt at Die, afterwards at Orange, and laſtly at Nîmes, was born in Dauphiné. He was one of the moſt acute Logicians at that time in France; and few Spaniſh or Iriſh ſchoolmen exceeded him in what concerns Univerſals, and *Entia rationum*, and the airy and abſtracted ſpeculations of categories, and the dependencies of the ſyllogiſtical forms. But if he equalled, in this particular, the Logicians of the moſt refined ſchools, he ſurpaſſed them greatly in phyſicks; he embracing the opinions of the moderns, and the hypotheſis of atoms; for he explains, like Gaſſendus, ſeveral natural effects by mechanical principles. His body of philoſophy ſold very well; the bookſeller gained very conſiderably by it, and particularly by the abridgment of it; the former diſheartening the reader, by the too great length of the ſcholiaſtic diſputes. Derodon wrote a book *De Suppoſito*, wherein he declared publickly for Neſtorius, in oppoſition to St. Cyril; not by admitting two perſons, but by aſſerting that Neſtorius did not admit them; and that St. Cyril confounded the two natures of Chriſt. Herein he did but follow the footſteps of a Gentleman of Provence [*A*], with whom he doubtleſs had been acquainted; and who forſook the Church of Rome and turned a very zealous Proteſtant. This opinion of the Sieur Derodon is an incident or epiſode of the famous diſpute that aroſe between two Proteſtant Divines in Holland [*B*], and which is not yet ended (*a*). I ſhall take ſome notice

(*a*) I wrote this in 1696, when I was about the firſt edition of this work. But I muſt now obſerve, that this diſpute was ended ſoon after.

[*A*] *Herein he did but follow the footſteps of a Gentleman of Provence.*] This was Giles Gaillard. He turned Proteſtant about the year 1630, and retired to Orange, where he wrote a panegyric on Prince Frederic Henry. He did not omit the motives of his converſion. See the book he entitled, *Le Proſelyte Evangelique*. Here follows what we find concerning his book *De Suppoſito*, in a letter which Sorbiere wrote to Voſſius in 1646, in ſending him the copy which the Author had given him. *Illi* (Ægidio Gaillardo nobili Gallo) *nuper venit in mentem neſcio quid circa Neſtorium, quaſi perperam in Epheſina Synodo fuerit livore Cyrilli hæreſeos inſimulatus damnatuſque; eaque de re edidit librum, cui titulus eſt* De Suppoſito (1). i. e. "It is "Giles Gaillard, a French Gentleman, who entertained "not long ſince an odd notion with regard to Neſto"rius; as though he, by the ſpite of Cyril, had "been unjuſtly charged with hereſy, and condemned "in the Council of Epheſus. This Gentleman pub"liſhed a book, entitled, *De Suppoſito*, on that ſub"ject." The poſtſcript to this letter is remarkable; it thereby appearing, that one of the moſt learned Miniſters held the ſame opinion (2).

(1) See the 432d of the letters writ to Voſſius, p. 285.

(2) *Audio Job. Croium in eadem eſſe ſententia in qua Gaillardus noſter.*

[*B*] *The opinion of the Sieur Derodon, is an incident or epiſode of the famous diſpute that aroſe between two Proteſtant Divines in Holland.*] This will appear from the following long paſſage, extracted from Mr. Saurin, one of the two diſputants. "This Mr. Jurieu is a "wonderful man! Errors are all purified by paſſing "through his channel; and what is hereſy in others, "is orthodoxy in him, by virtue of his impetuous "and over-bearing zeal. In his firſt apology, pub"liſhed by him after the Synod of Leyden, he gives "the hiſtory of the birth and progreſs of that per"nicious cabal of Socinian (or having a tendency "that way) hereticks: perſons to whom all religions "are equally indifferent, and half Atheiſts, among "whom he ranks all thoſe whom he would make "the object of the publick hatred. He relates ſeveral "particulars concerning that cabal, to have a plau"ſible opportunity of giving the catalogue of his "virtues, and heroic acts. Among the characteriſ"ticks of hereſy, which he diſcovers among ſome "Divines, he includes the approbation they gave to "the late Mr. Derodon's book, entitled, *De Suppo"ſito*, which he calls twice, in the ſpace of half a "page, the *wicked book De Suppoſito*: he obſerves "that this wicked book was burnt in Toulouſe; a "mighty proof of the wickedneſs of a book. I "own that the Author was ſuſpected to have com"mitted ſome errors; but probably theſe ſuſpicions "were owing to his having departed from the re"ceived opinion; and perhaps, by his extending his "philoſophical liberty a little too far. He was "brought into trouble, more than once, by his doc"trine, but came off with honour. I ſaw him in "1664 at Geneva, whither he had fled, after his be"ing baniſhed from France, for writing a book, "entitled, *Le Tombeau de la Meſſe*. I had frequent "converſations with him on various ſubjects, and he "always appeared perfectly orthodox to me. He "died at Geneva the ſame year 1664, to the beſt "of my memory, a little after I left that place and "went for Holland. I was informed that he made "a very pious end, and that the confeſſion he made "of his faith gave great ſatisfaction. But whatever "may be the ſecret opinions of this philoſopher, and "the words he may have ſpoke in converſation, or "writ in other books, the treatiſe *De Suppoſito* ought "not to anſwer for them, he being anſwerable only "for the errors contained in them. When a man "is ſuſpected, people ought to guard themſelves a"gainſt them, and ſift all his words, *ne lateat an"guis in herba*, for fear a ſnake ſhould be lurking "in the graſs. But then his orthodox opinions muſt "not be changed into errors, nor all his errors into "hereſies. The deſign of this reflection is not en"tirely to juſtify the treatiſe *de Suppoſito*, but to apo"logize for it in the mind of a man, who himſelf "ſtands in need of being pardoned and excuſed. "One can hardly conjecture what Mr. Jurieu diſap"proves in this book, unleſs it be the ſame liberty "of anſwering the title of mother of God, aſcribed "to the bleſſed Virgin, which he himſelf takes in "one of his paſtoral letters. The Philoſopher in "queſtion explains the word *Suppoſitum* in a manner "altogether orthodox, both with regard to the hu"man and divine perſons. In his explication of the "perſon of Chriſt, after his incarnation, he made "choice of an opinion which was moſt generally re"ceived, and leaſt expoſed to ill conſequences and "the cavil of the hereticks. He indeed declares for "Neſtorius againſt Cyril, and againſt the fathers of "the Council of Epheſus, whoſe hereſy he ſuppoſes "Eutyches imbibed. But if this is an error, it is "only with regard to matter of fact, and a book "ſhould not be conſidered as deteſtable upon that ac"count. Where then is the poiſon of that ill fated "book? It is only in the averſion, which the Author "ſhews againſt the title of Θεοτόκος, mother of God; "and the ill humour he diſcovers againſt Cyril, and "the Divines of his party, whom he conſiders as "the Patriarchs of idolatry (3). The cenſurer of "this Philoſopher is not ſo ſevere againſt their per"ſons; but then he entertains the ſame opinions as "he did with reſpect to their doctrine. He ſpares "theſe, who have introduced the term in queſtion "into the Church, but he has no mercy upon the "term itſelf. His opinion is, that Cyril himſelf "was not an idolater; all his fault being, according "to him, a miſtaken zeal. But this fatal word "Θεοτόκος was the foundation of idolatry and even "the occaſion of the Neſtorian hereſy. I will once "more ſet down the expreſs words of our zealous "defender of orthodoxy, and particularly of the "Anti-Neſtorian orthodoxy (4)."

(3) See the rem. [*M*] of the art. NESTORIUS, whether the expreſſion, mother of God, is the figure and foundation of the worſhip of the bleſſed virgin.

(4) Saurin, *Examen de la Theologie de Mr. Jurieu*, p. 867 & *ſeq.*

Here the Author preſents us with a long extract of his adverſary's paſtoral letters, in which the title of mother of God is condemned, as the ſource of idolatry, and then proceeds thus (5). "The Author of the work "entitled, *De Suppoſito*, has not ſaid any thing, in "the main, ſtronger than this: for if Mr. Jurieu "pretends,

(5) Ibid. p. 870.

notice of this in the remarks; and will not omit the ſpecious accuſations brought againſt this Philoſopher, as being extremely ignorant in matters relating to eccleſiaſtical hiſtory [C]. He engaged in controverſy, and exaſperated his adverſaries to ſuch a degree, that they

" pretends, that this Philoſopher has abſolutely re-
" fuſed the bleſſed Virgin the glorious title of *mother*
" *of God*, it will be ſaid that he did it in the ſame
" ſenſe as Mr. Jurieu does it himſelf. The contrary
" cannot be proved by his book. And ſince this
" Author acknowledges in Chriſt a ſingle perſon as
" well as two natures; and that according to the
" principles of his philoſophy, *actiones & paſſiones*
" *ſunt ſuppoſitorum*, which maxim he very often re-
" peats; we have reaſon to believe that he did not
" deny that the bleſſed Virgin was the mother of
" him who is God, of him who is a divine per-
" ſon. And indeed he gives her the title of mother
" of Chriſt, after having acknowledged that Chriſt
" is a ſole perſon, God and man together; and even
" a divine perſon, whoſe perſonality reſides properly
" in the Word. What mighty difference is there
" then between the delicacy of this Philoſopher, and
" that of our Divine? Why is the former a heretic
" and the latter orthodox, ſince they both think and
" ſay the ſame thing on the ſame ſubject? . . . .
" With regard to myſelf, I have publickly declared
" againſt the delicacy both of the Divine and the
" Philoſopher. I perſiſt in this aſſertion; I diſap-
" prove their boldneſs, and the ſingularity of their
" opinions; I condemn their miſtakes and errors; I
" blame both, but I do not pronounce an anathema
" againſt either of them. . . . . I have ſometimes ad-
" mired the zeal of Mr. Derodon, a zealous Pro-
" teſtant, Anti-Papiſt, and Anti-Idolater. He con-
" ſiders all the Miniſters of the Proteſtant Church as
" Angels of Laodicea, and lukewarm Miniſters;
" becauſe we will not excommunicate Cyril and the
" Fathers of the Council of Epheſus, ſuch a zeal is
" pretty extraordinary in a Philoſopher; but Mr.
" Jurieu is too indulgent, in pardoning Cyril and
" the Fathers of the Council of Epheſus, for having
" introduced idolatry. Mr. Derodon's ſyſtem is more
" conſiſtent than that of Mr. Jurieu. Mr. Derodon
" ranks Cyril and the Fathers of the Council of
" Epheſus among the idolaters, whoſe parents they
" are. Mr. Jurieu would ſeparate parents from
" the children, after having accuſed the former of
" being the cauſe of the crime of the latter. The
" only difference between Mr. Derodon and Mr. Ju-
" rieu, is, that, according to Mr. Derodon, Cyril,
" and the Fathers of the Council of Epheſus, acted
" and reaſoned conſequentially; they were idolaters,
" and eſtabliſhed idolatry; and that, according to Mr.
" Jurieu, theſe Fathers, who formed a general Coun-
" cil, have eſtabliſhed the greateſt of all idolatries,
" and at the ſame time were not idolaters themſelves."

Mr. Jurieu's reply is very long, and conſiſts of many pieces; of which I will extract only ſuch as relate to Derodon (6). " De Rodon's book *de Suppoſito*
" is ſcarce, and I had not ſeen it when I publiſhed
" a very ſmall pamphlet, entitled *Idée des ſentimens de*
" *Mr. Saurin*, (a tranſient view of Mr. Saurin's ſen-
" timents;) and therefore whatever I ſaid about it in
" that little work, ought to paſs for nothing. Since
" that time, an illuſtrious friend put De Rodon's book
" into my hands. After examining it, I did not find
" any expreſs hereſy in it, but an unaccountable raſh-
" neſs, a furious deſire to bring an odium upon Cy-
" ril, and to blacken the Council of Epheſus. I did
" not find him faithful in his citations; leſs ſo in his
" interpretations, and his proofs entirely ſophiſtical.
" I therefore think this work worthy of being ſen-
" tenced to the flames, as it was by the Parliament
" of Toulouſe: for the endeavouring to make thoſe
" paſs for Hereticks who defended the holy myſte-
" ries, is the infallible way to bring them into con-
" tempt. The Author was one of thoſe Latitudina-
" rians, who appeared about forty years ago in the
" ſouthern provinces; and whom Petit, Profeſſor of
" Divinity at Niſmes, ſeems to have favoured. This
" at leaſt appears by the extracts which the Sieur
" d'Huiſſeau, a great Latitudinarian, gave of them,
" in juſtification of his book *de la Reunion de Chriſti-*
" *aniſme* (for the union of Chriſtians) De Rodon, in
" order to promote the common intereſt of the ſect
" of which he is a member, does all that lyes in his
" power to make the ancients odious and contempti-
" ble . . . (7). De Rodon, the greateſt, and per-
" haps the firſt enemy, among the moderns (8), of
" St. Cyril, was a trifling ſophiſt, unſkilled in anti-
" quity. He was a Profeſſor in Philoſophy, and
" prided himſelf very much in his ſubtlety. Now
" the learned and the wiſe know what a ſubtle man
" is, who is ſubtle in the peripatetic way. Such a
" one is a ſophiſt, and ſuch a one was Rodon. He
" attempted to diſtinguiſh and immortalize himſelf
" by declaring war againſt Cyril and the Council of
" Epheſus. And his book is written purpoſely to
" ſhew that he was an Eutychian, that is, to have
" confounded the two natures, and to have compoſed
" a ſingle one out of the two; and to prove, on the
" contrary, that Neſtorius was very orthodox. The
" work in queſtion is greatly cried up by our Latitu-
" dinarians. I firſt ſaw it in Mr. Pajon's hands, and
" he applauded it to me as an excellent work; and
" Mr. Saurin has often beſtowed no leſs encomiums
" on it in my preſence. A judgment highly worthy
" of two perſons who are totally ignorant in matters
" of antiquity. Rodon is of the ſame character. He
" concerned himſelf in an affair he did not under-
" ſtand. He had either borrowed or ſtole all he ſays
" againſt St. Cyril, from a friend whom he often
" mentions, and who (he ſays) had drawn up a
" complete hiſtory of the diſputes between Cyril and
" Neſtorius, a circumſtance he does not conceal . . . .
" He was not only ignorant but malicious; for no-
" thing can ſhew more malice or inſincerity than this
" man's diſpute againſt Cyril (9)."

I ſhall not make any reflections on what the reader has here ſeen; for in all probability Mr. Saurin's anſwer will be printed before I ſhall have finiſhed this work; and it is in this anſwer (10) that the reader may ſee the raſh judgments, and other faults of Mr. Jurieu. I only ſay, that it is no ways probable that Derodon intended to favour the pretended Latitudinarian faction; he defending Neſtorius not by conſidering him as the defender of the moral union of the word with the human nature (11), but by conſidering him as orthodox with regard to the hypoſtatic union; and he abuſes Cyril, only becauſe he conſiders him as the Author of the Eutychian confuſion of the two natures. Doubtleſs his only view was to vex the Papiſts; and to make them aſhamed of their oppreſſing the memory of innocent men, at the ſame time that they raiſe to the ſkies a heretic, who was aſſiſted by the ſecular power, had the Emperor's favour, and the predominant faction of a Council. If we would extend our charity a little, it might be affirmed that his only view was to ſuccour innocence, by ſhewing that Neſtorius is unjuſtly conſidered as a heretic. A man who exclaims againſt St. Cyril, cannot be ſaid to be neceſſarily prompted by a ſpirit of malice. Perhaps no party leader ever deſerved leſs to be uſed with tenderneſs. He behaved with ſo much violence and fury, that he does not deſerve thanks for maintaining the truth, in caſe he did maintain it; if he found it, it was merely by chance. A mettleſome horſe, who runs away with the bit in his teeth, that eſcapes breaking his head againſt the walls of a ſtable, becauſe his impetuoſity hurried him towards a door that was half open, is the image of certain Doctors who hit upon orthodoxy, in ſpite of an hundred impetuous paſſions that fire them, and make them infringe all rules. All the common places alledged by Mr. Jurieu to juſtify St. Cyril and condemn Neſtorius, may ſerve to juſtify the latter and condemn the former. A ſpecimen of this might eaſily be given.

[C] *The ſpecious accuſations brought againſt this Philoſopher, as being extremely ignorant in matters relating to eccleſiaſtical hiſtory.*] " He very probably had
" never ſeen the acts of the Council of Epheſus,
" which indeed is ſufficiently evident from the bare
" title of his book. *Diſputatio de ſuppoſito; in quâ*
plurima

(6) Jurieu, *Religion du Latitudinaire*, p. 270.

(7) Ibid. p. 278.

(8) Had Mr. Jurieu known what relates to Giles Gaillard, (See the rem. [A]) he would not have ſpoke thus.

(9) Jurieu, *Religion du Latitudinaire*, p. 281, 282.

(10) It was publiſhed in 1697, and entitled, *Juſtification de la Doctrine du Sieur Saurin . . . contre deux Libelles de Mr. Jurieu l'un intitule* Idée des Sentimens, *&c.* & l'autre *la Religion du Latitudinaire.* See chap. 13. p. 342 *& ſeq.*

(11) It is to be obſerved, Mr. Jurieu declares, P. 277, *that the reaſon of the hatred of the Latitudinarians againſt St. Cyril, was owing to his cauſing to be condemned the moral union of the word, which is their idol.*

they obtained a decree from the King, whereby he was baniſhed the Kingdom in 1663 (*b*). He withdrew to Geneva, and died there two years after, or thereabouts. Thoſe of his party were not always ſatisfied with his doctrine, and he was brought into trouble on that account, but he extricated himſelf with honour (*c*). I cannot ſay whether the ſynods or conſiſtories were offended at his denying, that the preſervation of the creatures was a perpetual creation [*D*].

(*b*) It was for his having publiſhed a book, entitled, *Tombeau de la Meſſe*. See *l'Hiſtoire de l'Edit de Nantes*, Tom. 3. p. 563. He had publiſhed a diſpute concerning the Euchariſt, at Geneva, in 1655, 8vo.

(*c*) See the rem. [*B*].

He had been a Roman Catholick, on which account Theophilus Raynaud calls him a deſerter of the faith; it being he whom he hints at in the paſſage I quote from his *Hoplotheca* [*E*].

ROHAN

" *plurima hactenus inaudita de Neſtorio tanquam Ortho-*
" *doxo, & de Cyrillo Alexandrino, aliiſque Epiſcopis in*
" *Synodum Epheſi coactis tanquam hæreticis*; and page
" 71 of his book are the following words: *Rem no-*
" *vam & hactenus inauditam jam demonſtrandam ſuſ-*
" *cipimus, &c. ſcilicet Cyrillum Alexandrinum & alios*
" *Epiſcopos qui tertio Concilio Oecumenico interfuerunt*
" *fuiſſe hæreticos, & Authores hæreſis Eutychianæ.*
" What a prodigious boldneſs and ignorance do we
" ſee here! If this man had but juſt looked into
" the Authors of the fifth century, and particularly
" into the acts of the Council of Epheſus, could he
" ſay that the accuſation brought againſt Cyril, as
" being the Author of the Eutychian hereſy which
" confounds the two natures, was unheard of? He
" was accuſed of this by all the Neſtorians, and by a
" great number of Authors who were not ſo; by
" John Biſhop of Antioch, by whom Cyril was ex-
" communicated as confounding the two natures,
" and aſcribing to the divine nature of Chriſt all
" the infirmities, which are relative only to his hu-
" man nature (12)." The Author exhibits many more ſuch proofs, which ſhew that St. Cyril was charged with this hereſy, and concludes as follows: *To advance after this his accuſation againſt Cyril, as a mere diſcovery, and an unheard of thing, ſhews the moſt inſupportable folly, ignorance, and vanity. Several more ſuch proofs of Rodon's ignorance in that ſubject might be found* (13).

(12) Jurieu, p. 279.

(13) Idem, ibid. p. 281.

Had I Derodon's book, I would give my opinion on this matter; but not having it by me, I ſhall only ſay, that the words, which his cenſurer cited from it, do not prove what he pretends. They declare that Derodon engaged himſelf to prove, as a thing unheard of, not that Cyril was accuſed of being the Author of Eutyches's errors; but that Cyril, and the reſt of the Fathers, who aſſiſted at the third general Council, were Hereticks, and gave riſe to Eutychianiſm. This weakens the proofs of what is alledged concerning this Philoſopher's ignorance (14), and ſhews that his Cenſurer either perverted, or did not know the ſtate of the queſtion. If it is a miſtake, we ought to excuſe it, conſidering the perplexity he muſt have been in, ſince he was to act as an Advocate for thoſe very perſons whom he had cenſured. Let the Reader figure to himſelf a man, who, to anſwer the Biſhop of Meaux, gave a moſt hideous picture of the primitive Fathers; and who, to anſwer Mr. Saurin, muſt make an elogium of thoſe very fathers: can ſuch an Author know what he ſays? How is it poſſible for a Writer to be maſter of his thoughts in ſuch a double abyſs? An Author, who is beat with his own weapons, and cannot make his defenſe but by refuting, and contradicting himſelf in the moſt pitiful manner; can ſuch an Author, I ſay, who bewilders himſelf in ſo ſtrange a manner, be anſwerable for a blunder? Neceſſity has no law; this is, what he may plead in his own favour: but then ſuch an apology does not juſtify the juſt complaints made by the publick, every Reader having a right to ſay, *Whom do you take us for? Ought we to be ſo ſhamefully impoſed upon? when you are not able to anſwer an enemy, but by ſuppoſing that the Fathers are Hereticks, you charge them with hereſy; and becauſe, at the years end, you want to have him orthodox, in order to rid yourſelf of another enemy, you declare that their doctrine is ſound? Is not this a very unfair and ſhameful way of proceeding* (15)?

(14) There is a wide difference between aſſerting that a whole Council is heretical, and aſſerting that a particular perſon was formerly accuſed of being an Heretick. The firſt aſſertion may be advanced as an unheard of thing, without ſuppoſing that the charge brought againſt a particular perſon, is a matter of fact unknown before.

(15) Compare this with the cloſe of the rem. [*B*], of the art. PETAVIUS.

Here follows what Saurin anſwered, with regard to Derodon's being reproached with ignorance. " Mr.
" Jurieu ſhews, that he has not looked into the treatiſe
" *De Suppoſito*, or that he hopes no one will look into
" it; for the Author collects a great number of
" teſtimonies and hiſtorical incidents to ſupport his
" accuſation againſt Cyril and the Council of Ephe-
" ſus. He quotes Ibas, Biſhop of Edeſſa; Gennadius,
" Patriarch of Conſtantinople; Theodoret, Biſhop of
" Cyr; John, Archbiſhop of Antioch, and above
" forty eaſtern Biſhops, who charged Cyril as being
" infected with Apollinaris's hereſy; and reproached
" him with making Chriſt's divine nature paſſible,
" by confounding it with his human nature. The
" Author conſequently was not ignorant of this: and
" when he ſpeaks of Cyril's hereſy, and Neſtorius's
" orthodoxy, as an unheard of thing, he meant
" with reſpect to the two laſt ages, and not with re-
" gard to the age of Cyril and Neſtorius: and he
" even conſiders, as an unheard of thing, not the
" queſtion, which of theſe two Patriarchs was he-
" retick or orthodox; but the deciſion he gives with
" reſpect to the queſtion, by juſtifying Neſtorius, and
" condemning Cyril (16).

(16) Saurin, *Juſtification de ſa Doctrine contre deux Libelles de Mr. Jurieu*, p. 346.

[*D*] *He denied that the preſervation of the creatures was a perpetual creation.*] This was denying a doctrine, which, though very common among the Spaniſh and Iriſh ſchoolmen, is not the leſs evident on that account. We either muſt reject the moſt evident notions, or acknowledge that a Being formed out of nothing by the infinite power of a Creator, cannot have, within itſelf, any cauſe of its exiſtence. It conſequently cannot continue to exiſt but by the ſame power which produced it at firſt; it conſequently is created every moment of its duration; that is to ſay, that it exiſts every moment only, becauſe God continues to have the ſame will he had, when that Being firſt began to exiſt. This act of the divine will cannot ceaſe to create whilſt it ſubſiſts, ſince it did create at the firſt inſtant that the creature began to exiſt. Derodon's objections may be eaſily refuted, and are much the ſame with thoſe propoſed by Bernier (17). A Profeſſor of Philoſophy in the Academy of Puylaurent (18) wrote a treatiſe againſt Derodon on that ſubject, and refuted it ſolidly. That Philoſopher had had ſeveral conteſts with him in Niſmes; and I have been told that he was concerned in a book entitled, *L'Impieté decouverte* (Impiety diſplayed), written againſt Derodon. I have even been told that Mr. Claude, then Miniſter of Niſmes, lent his pen to the enemies of that Philoſopher, for the drawing up, or correcting of that work. How abſurd is it to ſay that God, according to Gaſſendi and David Derodon, contributes to the preſervation of creatures by preventing their deſtruction? Who ſhould deſtroy them, ſince there are but two ſorts of things in the univerſe, God and the creatures? Such an employment would be as idle as the watchfulneſs of a Shepherd againſt wolves, in a country where there are no ſuch beaſts, nor could be any. Let it not be objected that one body deſtroys another; that fire deſtroys wood, that one man kills another, &c. for this is not a deſtruction of creatures, but only a change of modifications. Modes or accidents are not conſidered as the ſubject of creation, but the ſubſtances they reſide in.

(17) See Mr. Bernier's book, printed at Amſterdam in 1685, and entitled, *Traite du libre & du volontaire.*

(18) It was John Bon, a Phyſician. His body of Philoſophy was printed.

[*E*] *It being he whom Theophilus Raynaud hints at, in the paſſage I quote from his* Hoplotheca.] After ſaying, that the ſubtle Scotus is falſely accuſed of admitting a kind of real diſtinction between the divine eſſence and its attributes, he adds, that he had lately, converſed in Orange with an apoſtate, who made uſe of Scotus's authority in ſupport of a new blaſphemy. *Placuit hanc crambem obiter hic recoquere, quia his ipſis diebus Araufficæ, murcus* FIDEI DESERTOR, *blaſphemiam novam, Scoti autoritate tegere eſt auſus* (19). This blaſphemy was, that the three perſonalities of the Trinity are modes of the divine eſſence properly ſo called. He obſerves that this innovator,

(19) Theoph. Raynaud, *Hoplotb.* ſect. 2. ſerie 1. cap. 6. p. 89. This book was printed at Lyons in 1650.

ROHAN (RENATA DE), daughter of Lewis de Rohan IV. of that name, Lord of Guemené (*a*), was accidently the cauſe of a murder, which had like to have excited great diſorders in the Court of France, a little after the death of Francis II. [*A*]. She was widow to Francis de Rohan, Lord of Gié, and was courted by Count de Laval (*b*). The baſtard de Bueil, ſon to Count de Sancerre, and *one of the moſt ſignal friends and champions* of the Duke of Guiſe, reſolving to oppoſe that courtſhip, *not ſatisfied with being this* Counts's *rival, had inſolently given out that this widow, after having written a promiſe of marriage and ſigned it with her own hand, had indulged him the laſt favour. Poſſibly he had no other view in this but to divert Laval and the reſt of his rivals from courting that Lady; but Laval looked upon it as one of thoſe affronts, which nothing but blood can atone for* [*B*]. *But not having ſo much regard to the baſtard, as to do him the honour to fight with him, he took him at an advantage, and killed him in Orleans* (*c*). The conſtable of Montmorenci approved this action, and endeavoured to procure a pardon for Laval (*d*): but the Guiſes ſolicited to have this murderer puniſhed; and their credit was ſo ſuperior in the Council, that the King of Navarre, *whoſe palace was Laval's ſanctuary*, was obliged *to ſend him away privately in the night*. His eſtate was afterwards ſeized (*e*). Thoſe Writers, who affirm, that the reaſon why the Conſtable favoured the murderer was, that he was related to him, are not miſtaken [*C*]. Our Renata married Renatus de Laval (*f*); and for her third huſband, John de Laval, Marquis of Neſle.

(*a*) Father Anſelme, *Hiſt. des grands Officiers*, p. 536.

(*b*) Renatus de Laval, Lord of Loire.

(*c*) Varillas, *Hiſt. de Charles IX.* Tom. 1. p. 8.

(*d*) Ibid.

(*e*) Ibid.

(*f*) Father Anſelme, *Hiſt. des grands Officiers*, p. 537.

vator, who had quoted Scotus to him, had not employed his authority in the diſpute *de Suppoſito*. This is an indication that he ſpeaks of Derodon. Here follows another proof. *Perperam tam craſſus error*, continues he, *ſimplicitatem divinam & puriſſimam actualitatem exſcindens tanti viri* (Scoti) *ſuffragio calumnioſè captato munitus eſt ab eo, quem retuli ſpurco fidei deſertore male Rotundo* (20). i. e. "So groſs an error "as this, which deſtroys the ſimplicity of the divine "nature, and the purity of its eſſence, ſhould not "have been ſaid to be grounded on the authority "of ſo great a man as Scotus; as is unjuſtly inſinuat-"ed by that ſhameful deſerter of the faith whom I "ſpoke of before, and who cannot be called round "in a good ſenſe." This laſt word is a manifeſt illuſion to the name of the perſon he intends to point out, I mean Derodon. He employed the ſame play of words in another book three years after, wherein he refuted Derodon, who aſſerted, that S. Cyril did not write the work entitled *Theſaurus* aſcribed to him. *Eidem S. Cyrillo ſuppoſitum eſſe opus quod inſcribitur* Theſaurus *contendit ſpurcus hæreticus, autor diſputationis de ſuppoſito, quam nuperrime ementito nomine loci ſuoque ſuppreſſo, homo male teres atque* ROTUNDUS *edidit Arauſicæ. In ea diſputatione, quæ eſt una jugis hæreſeon & atrociſſimarum calumniarum lepra, nebulo qui in S. Cyrillum maxime rabit abjudicat ei opus Theſauri* (21). i. e. "That filthy heretic, who wrote his diſpute *de* "*Suppoſito*, publiſhed by him lately, in Orange, with-"out his name, and the fictitious name of the town "where printed, affirms, that the book entitled *The-*"*ſaurus* is erroneouſly aſcribed to S. Cyril. In the "courſe of this diſpute, which is one uninterrupted "ſcab of hereſies, and the moſt abominable ſlan-"ders; the knave, who inveighs in a moſt vile man-"ner againſt St. Cyril, declares that the work en-"titled *Theſaurus* was not wrote by him."

(20) Theo. Raynaud, ibid. p. 90.

(21) Idem, *Erotemat. de malis ac bonis Libris*, num. 209. p. m. 134. See Father Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſ.* Tom. 1. p. 243.

[*A*] *A little after the death of Francis II.*] Varillas ſays (1), it was three days after that Prince's death; but he miſtook, for want of duly attending to Thuanus's Latin. *Triduo poſt de Vicedomini Carnutum morte allatum eſt . . . in idem tempus incidit Buellii . . . . cædes* (2). Had he attended to the preceding words, he would have found that *triduo* relates to Decemb. 21 (3), the date of a reſolution, the ſubſtance of which had been given by the hiſtorian. According to this account, the Vidame's death muſt have been known at Orleans the 24th of December. Now Francis II died the 5th of that month; conſequently there muſt have been an interval of more than three days between the King's death and the murder of the baſtard de Bueil. At the ſame time that I take notice of this error, I am ſenſible that it is not of any conſequence; but it is fit a reader ſhould know, what it is that leads writers into miſtakes. By the way, I do not pretend to affirm, that the Vidame of Chartres died fifteen or ſixteen days after the King: I only mean, that if we follow Thuanus's account, we muſt judge pretty nearly of it in this manner; however, I would not adviſe any perſon to truſt to it. My reaſon is, Thuanus has followed Preſident de la Place, who is no ways accurate, with regard to chronology, in this place; the account he gives being as follows: Francis II died the 5th of December 1560; the King of Navarre gives up the regency to the Queen-mother; a regulation is made the 21ſt of December, news is brought, three days after, of the Vidame de Chartres's death; the principal difficulties being removed by this regulation, a reſolution was taken to hold the eſtates; notwithſtanding the Proteſts of part of the Deputies; the Cardinal of Lorrain endeavours to obtain a commiſſion for addreſſing, in a ſpeech, the three eſtates of the kingdom, but this is not granted him; during this interval Sancerre's baſtard is killed; laſtly, the eſtates met the thirteenth day of December. Such is the plan Thuanus followed; ſo that one cannot fix, from thence, either the day that the Vidame died, or the day that the baſtard was killed.

(1) In the two editions of the *Life of Charles IX.*

(2) Thuan. lib. 25. p. 525.

(3) 12 Kalend. Januar.

[*B*] *Laval looked upon it as one of thoſe affronts which nothing but blood can atone for.*] We cannot form any other judgment, according to the wretched maxims of the point of honour, conſidering how indulgent Judges are towards thoſe who preſume to ſlander a woman's reputation. If an arrant ſlanderer, or an indiſcreet bragging fellow, was to be proſecuted for this, would they not be acquitted by their denying the charge, or by begging pardon, which yet cannot prevent ſuſpicions, nor evil tongues. This circumſtance prompts Dueliſts to do themſelves juſtice (4). Sancerre's baſtard doubtleſs expected a challenge; and he no doubt truſted to his courage and dexterity more than to the juſtice of his cauſe; for what juſtice can there be in a perſon's aſſerting, even tho' no lie is told on ſuch an occaſion, that he has obtained a favour of this kind? But the manner in which he was attacked rendered his defenſe of no ſervice to him.

(4) *Buellius, qui earum* (nuptiarum) *ſpe ſe dejectum dolebat, ut impedimentum offerret à Renata ſibi datem fidem diceret, & ut erat pugnacitatis fama arrogans, parum honeſte de illuſtri fœmina loqueretur.* Thuan. lib. 25. p. 525.

[*C*] *Thoſe writers are not miſtaken who affirm it.*] Preſident de la Place is one of theſe (5). Loué, ſays he, was ſupported by the Conſtable, *becauſe he was great uncle to the ſaid Lady; and the ſaid Loué deſcended in a direct male line, from the Conſtable Matthew de Montmorency, as well as the ſaid Conſtable.* Thuanus makes the ſame remark with reſpect to Renatus de Laval; *Unde magna rurſus irarum ſeges inter Guiſianos & Momorantios orta eſt, cum illi Sancerræ Comiti adeſſent, hi Lavallum uti ex Matthæi Momorantii Equitum Magiſtri ſtirpe profectum tutarentur* (6). i. e. "This "occaſioned another great conteſt between the houſes "of Guiſe and Montmorency; the former whereof "ſtood up for Count de Sancerre, and the latter for "Laval, as being deſcended from Matthew Mont-"morency the Conſtable." I cannot comprehend why Varillas, who had ſaid in the firſt edition of the life of Charles IX (17), that *Count de Laval was of the houſe of Montmorency*, expunged it in the ſecond. I eaſily conceive why he expunged, that this Count *was brother-in-law to the Chatillons*; this being a manifeſt falſity; whereas the other circumſtance agrees with the genealogy, of the houſe of Montmorency, publiſhed by du Cheſne (8).

(5) *De l'Etat de la Relig. & Republiq.* liv. 2. towards the end.

(6) Thuan. lib. 25. p. 525.

(7) Tom. 1. p. 8. Dutch edit.

(8) Anſelme, *Hiſt. des grands Officiers de la Couronne*, p. 19.

[*A*] *The*

ROHAN (ANNE DE), daughter of Renatus de Rohan, and Catharine de Parthenai, heireſs of the Houſe of Soubiſe, was as illuſtrious for her genius and piety, as for her birth. She was ſiſter to Duke de Rohan, the main ſupport of the Proteſtants, during the civil wars under Lewis XIII. I have ſaid elſewhere (*a*), that ſhe bore, with an heroic reſolution, the calamities of the ſiege of Rochelle, which grew to ſuch an height, that ſhe was forced, during three months, to live on horſe-fleſh, and four ounces of bread every day. The Hiſtorian (*b*), who informs me of this, adds, that ſhe and her mother refuſed to be included in the capitulation, and remained priſoners of war. He beſtows the following encomium upon her; that *ſhe was famous for her exemplary piety, among all the Proteſtants, as well as for her learning, in which ſhe ſurpaſſed all her ſex.* She was a fine poeteſs, of which the excellennt Poem ſhe wrote on the death of Henry IV. [*A*] is a proof. What is ſaid concerning her ſkill in the Hebrew tongue is extraordinary [*B*]. She died unmarried in Paris the 20th of September 1646, in the ſixty ſecond year of her age. Madam Schurman wrote ſome letters to her, which are inſerted in the collection of her works.

(*a*) In the art. of Catharine de PARTHENAI.

(*b*) *Hiſt. du Duc de Rohan*, Paris 1666.

[*A*] *The excellent poem ſhe wrote on the death of Henry IV.*] D'Aubigné, who was not laviſh of his applauſe, has introduced part of it at the concluſion of his hiſtory, and introduced it with theſe words: *I ſhall make uſe of the words of Anne de Rohan, Princeſs of Leon, and of all thoſe who write well in this age, becauſe her expreſſions are better than mine: this heavenly genius delivering herſelf as follows:*

Quoi? faut-il que Henri, ce redouté Monarque,
Ce dompteur des humains, ſoit dompté par la Parque?

" Alas! muſt Henry, that far-dreaded Monarch,
" Victor of men, be vanquiſhed by the fates?

I would not have quoted theſe two verſes, but that they furniſh me with a ſubject for criticiſm. Peliſſon having ſaid (1), that *Malherbe looked upon it as a maxim, that adjectives which terminate in* e *maſculine, ought never to be placed before the ſubſtantive, but after, whereas ſuch as have a feminine termination may be placed either before or after, as the Poet might think proper; that one might ſay, for inſtance,* the redoutable Monarque, or *ce* Monarque redoutable; *and on the contrary, that one might ſay,* ce Monarque redouté, *but not* ce redouté Monarque; Peliſſon, I ſay, having expreſſed himſelf thus, continues as follows: *I did not take this example, without juſt reaſon and at random, I having often heard Mr. de Gombaud ſay, that before this remark had been made, Malherbe and he walking one day together, and ſpeaking of certain verſes of Mademoiſelle Anne de Rohan, in which was the following,*

(1) *Hiſt. de l'Academie Franc.* p. m. 178.

Quoy faut-il que Henri, ce redouté Monarque,

Malherbe declared ſeveral times, that he did not like the cloſe of that verſe, but why he could not tell; that this obliged him at laſt to conſider it attentively, and that having immediately diſcovered the reaſon of it, he informed Malherbe of it, who was as overjoyed as if he had found a treaſure, and afterwards formed this general rule from it. Now here follows Menage's obſervation which is not very well grounded. *Mr. de Gombauld,* ſays he (2), *has alſo often informed me of this converſation he had with Malherbe, but not directly in the ſame manner as related by Pelliſſon; he having always told me, that it was he who took notice that* redouté Monarque *was bad. However it be, this rule whether it be of Malherbe or Mr. Gombaud . . . . is abſolutely falſe.* He proves (3) it by example, and ſhews that Malherbe himſelf did not obſerve it, ſince he has ſaid in two places *aſſeuré ſecours.* But this is not what I would be at. I affirm that Menage underſtood theſe words of Peliſſon, as if they ſignified that it was Malherbe, and not Gombaud, who had found the reaſon of the fault in the verſe in queſtion; for had he not underſtood them in that manner, he could not have expreſſed himſelf thus; *this rule, whether of Malherbe or Gombaud.* It is plain the meaning of this is, that it is Malherbe's rule, according to Peliſſon's account, and that Gombaud found it out, if we may believe what Menage himſelf ſays he heard from Gombaud's own mouth; but it is ſtill plainer, that Peliſſon aſcribes the diſcovery to this latter, and no ways to Malherbe. Who now will wonder, that perſons do not underſtand a Latin paſſage for want of proper attention, ſince we here perceive that Menage does not underſtand a French Author, though this latter expreſſed himſelf in the moſt intelligible manner?

(2) *Obſervations ſur les Poeſies de Malherbe*, p. 302.

(3) Idem, ibid.

[*B*] *What is ſaid concerning her ſtill in the Hebrew tongue is extraordinary.*] She read the Old Teſtament in that language; and, inſtead of ſinging the Pſalms, at Church, in French verſe, as the reſt of the congregation did, ſhe meditated upon them in Hebrew: *Hanc illuſtriſſimam & ſapientiſſimam Principem Hebraicis Literis haud leviter fuiſſe tinctam teſtis fuit αὐτόπτης Rev. Parens, dum Pariſiis degeret; quotieſcunque enim ipſam adiret, Vet. Teſtamenti caput aliquod Hebraicè legentem inveniebat, &, quod mirere, ne in Eccleſia quidem hocce ſtudium deſeruit, cùm etiam illic, dùm Hymni Davidici decantarentur, ipſa interim Hebraico idiomate mente pſalleret* (4). i. e. " My father, during his abode in Paris, was an eye-witneſs how well ſkilled that moſt illuſtrious and moſt wiſe Princeſs was, in the Hebrew tongue; for ſo often as he waited upon that Lady, he always found her reading a chapter in the Hebrew Bible; and, a circumſtance which will raiſe your wonder is, ſhe did not leave this ſtudy, even when at Church; for there, whilſt the reſt of the congregation were ſinging David's Pſalms, ſhe ſung them over, in Hebrew, to herſelf." Colomeſius, from whom I borrow this account, gives an authority that deſerves to be copied (5).

(4) Colomes, *in Gallia Orientali*, p. 165.

(5) *Hujus in Hebraicis peritiam firmat Phil. Aquinas Epiſtola Præfat. in capitula Patrum, a ſe ex Hebræo in Gallicum ſermonem verſa.* Idem, ibid.

RONSARD (PETER DE), a French Poet, of a noble family [*A*], was born in Vendomois, the ſame year that Francis I. was taken priſoner before Pavia. This circumſtance

[*A*] *Of a noble family.*] Lewis de Ronſard, his father, was Knight of the Holy Ghoſt, and ſteward to Francis I, who made choice of him, *to accompany Francis, Dauphin of Viennois, and Henry Duke of Orleans, his ſons, into Spain, whilſt they were hoſtages there, for the King their father* (1). He married Jane de Chandrier, whoſe family was related to that of Trimouille, and conſequently to that of Craon; *from whom the Kings of England are deſcended, by the marriage of the Empreſs Maud* (2) *ſo that he* (3) *made it evident, that Ronſard was related, in the ſixteenth or ſeventeenth degree, to Elizabeth Queen of England.* It is ſaid that Lewis de Ronſard ſprung from a Baldwin, younger brother of a great family (4), *on the confines of Hungary and Bulgaria,* who had brought a company of Gentlemen to King Philip of Valois (5). Nay, it is pretended *that there is a Lordſhip called the Marquiſate of Ronſard* (6) in that part *where the Danube flows neareſt to Thrace* (7); but I am of opinion that we may rank all this among the great number of chimerical

(1) Binet, in *Ronſard's Life*, Tom. 9. of *Ronſard's works*, in 12mo, p. 113. It is to be obſerved, that du Perron, in the funeral oration of Ronſard, p. 189, of the ſame vol. does not ſay that Lewis de Ronſard was Steward to Francis I. but to Henry II.

(2) Binet, ibid. p. 112.

(3) That is, the Sieur du Fauz of Angero, in his Memoirs. In my edit. it is the Sieur de Faur; but I am informed by La Croix du Maine, that this Author's name was Paſcal Robin du Fauz.

(4) Binet, *Vie de Ronſard*, p. 112.

(5) Ibid. p. 113.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Ibid. p. 112.

cumſtance of time has given occaſion to ſome injudicious reflections [*B*]. He had like to have loſt his life on the day he was born; and the danger he was in gave riſe to ſome conceits as injudicious as the reflections in queſtion [*C*]. He put himſelf at the head of ſome

merical ſtories, which moſt noble families relate concerning their founders (8). They are paſſionately fond of declaring themſelves deſcended from the moſt diſtant countries; and from ſome younger brother of noble extraction, a valiant adventurer, whoſe noble exploits deſerved infinite reward from the Prince he came to ſerve. If ſuch particulars were related only by three or four families, people would not be ſo much inclined to laugh. By the way, the Author I quote only turned into proſe, what Ronſard had related concerning his extraction in one of his elegies (9). Du Perron (10) told the ſame ſtory, but put Moravia inſtead of Bulgaria. The collection of the fineſt pieces of the French poets, printed in 1692, contains (11) a life of Ronſard, in which he is ſaid to come originally from Hungary and Bulgaria. If this is not an abſurdity, it is at leaſt a falſification; for the tradition of this family does not aſcribe two native countries to his anceſtors, but only one, on *the confines of Hungary and Bulgaria*. Theſe are Claudius Binet's words; and theſe are the miſtakes which writers are apt to fall into, when they attempt to change the words of the original, whether to ſhorten them, or to modernize the ſtyle. The word *confines* ought not to have been ſuppreſſed here.

(8) Vide rem. [C] of the art. PINET.

(9) It is in the 22d, and is inſcribed to Belleau.

(10) *Ronſard's funeral oration*, p. 188.

(11) Tom. 1. p. 239.

[*B*] *Some injudicious reflections.*] "From the marriage of Lewis and John de Chandrier, ſprung "Peter de Ronſard, in the Caſtle of la Poiſſonniere ". . . . on Saturday the 11th of September 1524, "on which day King Francis I was taken before "Pavia. It may be made a queſtion whether France "received more injury by this unhappy capture, than "advantage by this auſpicious birth of Ronſard, "which was ſignalized, like that of other great "men, by ſo memorable an incident. Thus the "birth of Alexander the Great was ſignalized, and "illuminated, as it were, by the burning of the tem"ple of Diana in the city of Epheſus (12)." This muſt needs be a noble compenſation! and the French muſt have been ſufficiently indemnified for the impriſonment of their King, an incident which brought the King down to the brink of ruin, and was the cauſe of a long ſeries of loſſes, ignominious and fatal to the nation; the French, I ſay, muſt have been ſufficiently indemnified, ſince a man of wit was born that day among them, who has enriched them with the Lord knows how many thouſand verſes in ſonnets, madrigals, ſtanzas, hymns, odes, &c. This thought of Claudius Binet would be tolerable only only in ſome panegyrical poem; and even there it would call for indulgence, and be conſidered as a cold hyperbole by perſons of good taſte. This doubtleſs was the reaſon why du Perron did not introduce it in Peter Ronſards's funeral oration (13). What ſhall we ſay, when we ſee it in proſe, in a hiſtory, I mean in Ronſard's life? But what ſhall we ſay of Thuanus, that grave, that venerable Magiſtrate, who relates the ſame thought with a very ſerious air, in a general hiſtory that is a maſter-piece in its kind? *Natus erat* (Petrus Ronſardus) ſays he (14), *eodem, quo infeliciter à noſtris ad Ticinum pugnatum eſt, anno, ut ipſe in Elegia ad Remigium Bellaqueum ſcribit, quaſi Deus jacturam nominis Gallici eo prælio factam & ſecutum ex illo veluti noſtrarum rerum interitum tanti viri ortu compenſare voluerit.* i. e. "Peter Ronſard was "born, as he himſelf informs us in an elegy he "inſcribes to Peter Belleau, the ſame year that our "Countrymen met with ſo ſignal a defeat before Pa"via; as though providence had been deſirous of "compenſating, by the birth of ſo illuſtrious a man, "the great wound which the honour of the French "nation received by that battle, and the ſad calamities "which were thereby brought upon them." It is to be obſerved, that Thuanus does not fix the birth of the Poet, and the battle of Pavia, on the ſame day, but ſays only that they happened the ſame year; but Claudius Binet thinking there was not enough of the marvellous in this idea, affirmed that both thoſe incidents happened on the ſame day. But he betrays himſelf, and diſcovers the falſity of his own making; for he declares that this Poet was born the 11th of September 1524; and all the world knows that Francis I was beat before Pavia the 24th of February 1525: however, Ronſard was born the ſame year, according to the way of calculating at that time; for the year did not then begin on the firſt of January in France; it not beginning till Eaſter, and conſequently the battle of Pavia was included in the year 1524. Let it not be objected that there is an error of the preſs in Binet's book, for this cannot be; for when this Author ſays that Peter Ronſard died the 27th of December 1585, he declares his age to be ſixty one years, three months, and ſixteen days (15). He therefore imagined that he was born the eleventh of September 1524, whence, by the way, we will take notice of an error of Sammarthanus (16). However, I muſt not omit that there is ſome uncertainty in the matter which might render him excuſable. We know only, from a paſſage of Ronſard, that he was born the ſame year that Francis I was taken priſoner; at leaſt it is certain that du Perron brought no other proof, in oppoſition to ſuch as were not of that opinion. "As to the "time of his birth, ſays he (17), people differ in "their opinion. Some think he was born in the "year one thouſand, five hundred and twenty two; "and conſequently that he died in the great cli"macteric, a circumſtance that has been obſerved of "many great perſons. Others depend on what he "himſelf ſays; he having ſignalized the year of his "birth by the taking of the great King Francis, as "the birth of eminent perſonages is often diſtin"guiſhed by ſuch remarkable incidents. We here "may alſo obſerve by the way, that the taking of "this King priſoner before Pavia, by which inci"dent Ronſard denotes the year of his birth, falls "on the very day on which we celebrate the memory "of his death, viz. the feaſt of St. Mathias (18)." But this proof of du Perron will be found weak, when the reader is informed that Ronſard, in one of his poems, declares himſelf to be of an age which does not ſuit with a man born in 1524 or 1525. Here follow his words, which border a little on obſcenity, and are not well ſuited to the ſubject; but he was replying to ſome ſevere and ſneering adverſaries, who, among other particulars, accuſed him of leading a voluptuous life.

(12) Binet, *Vie de Ronſard*, p. 113.

(13) See citat. 18 hereunder.

(14) Thuan. lib. 82. *ſub fin.* p. m. 43. ad ann. 1585.

Tu dis que je ſuis vieil, encore n'ay-je atteint
Trente & ſept ans paſſez & mon corps ne ſe plaint
D'ans ny de maladie, & en toutes les ſortes
Mes nerfs ſont bien tendus, & mes veines bien fortes;
Et ſi j'ay le teint palle & le cheveu griſon,
Mes membres toutesfois ne ſont hors de ſaiſon (19).

"You ſay I'm old, and yet I've not attain'd
"My thirty ſeventh year; nor does my body
"Complain of ill effects from age or ſickneſs.
"My nerves are ſtretch'd, and all my veins ſhew
"vigour;
"And tho' I'm pale, and ſilver-hair'd my locks,
"Yet all my limbs exert a wiſh'd for ſtrength."

(15) Binet, *Vie de Ronſard*, p. 156.

(16) *Neque ſexageſimum ætatis annum exceſſit* (Ronſardus) *articulari morbo ſæviſſimo vexatus.* Sammarthan. *Elogior.* lib. 1. p. m. 80.

(17) Du Perron, *Oraiſon funebre de Ronſard*, p. m. 190.

(18) I quoted the whole paſſage, to ſhew what I ſaid above, citat. 15, that Du Perron did not make uſe of the pretended compenſation for the impriſonment of Francis I.

(19) Ronſard, *Reponſe à quelque Miniſtre*, p. 86. Tom. 9. of his works, in 12mo.

The poem, in which he ſpeaks thus, was wrote ſome weeks after the Duke of Guiſe's death (20), and conſequently, in the ſpring of the year 1563. A man, who was then but thirty ſeven years of age, muſt have been born in 1526, and at this rate Scævola Sammarthanus ought not to blamed. It is ſomething ſurprizing that our Poet himſelf did not know exactly the year he was born.

(20) See the epiſtle prefixed to this poem.

[*C*] . . . . *Conceits as injudicious as the reflections in queſtion.*] "The day of his birth had like to have "been that of his burial; for as he was carrying to "be chriſtned, from the country-ſeat of la Poiſſon"niere, to the Church of the place, the woman who "carried him, as ſhe was croſſing a meadow, hap"pened to let him fall down, but it was on the graſs "and flowers, ſo that he had a very gentle fall. "Another accident happened on this occaſion, viz. "a Gentlewoman, who carried a veſſel filled with "roſe-water, and various herbs and flowers, accord"ing

ſome ſoldiers in Vendomois in 1562, and made all the ſlaughter in his power of the Proteſtants [*D*] ; a circumſtance that gave occaſion to the publiſhing ſome vaſtly bitter ſatyrical pieces againſt him at Orleans, and in which it was ſuppoſed he was a Prieſt : but

" ing to the uſual cuſtom, going to take the child, " ſpilt on its head ſome of that odoriferous water, " which was an omen of the fragrancy from his " learned writings, which would be ſpread over the " kingdom (21)." This is called *concetti* by the Italians. Mr. le Pays did not forget to make ſome verſes on this thought, when he wrote the hiſtory of Ronſard's muſe. *He was the ſon of a knight of the Holy Ghoſt, and came into the world on the day that Francis I. was taken priſoner at the battle of Pavia. It has been ſaid, to his glory, that France would have been always inconſolable for ſo unfortunate a day, had not ſo great a man been born that day in it. The day of his birth had like to have been that of his death. A Gentlewoman who carried him* (22) *from the Caſtle of la Poiſſonniere, where he was born, to the pariſh Church where he was baptized, was ſo heedleſs as to let him fall : but happily this was in a meadow, and upon flowers ; and the only hurt he met with, was, to be quite wetted with the roſe water, which was carrying, according to the uſual cuſtom, for that chriſtning.*

(21) Claude Binet, *Vie de Ronſard*, p. 114.

(22) Binet does not ſay that the Gentlewoman carried the child ; he ſaying that another carried him.

Ce ne fut point ſans doute un effet du hazard,
Je croi qu'on peut ſans badinage,
Dire que ce fut un preſage
De la fortune de Ronſard ;
Un preſage certain qui fit alors comprendre,
Combien de bonne odeur Ronſard devoit répandre,
Un preſage certain que les neuf doctes Sœurs,
Dont il devoit chanter la gloire,
Pour éterniſer ſa memoire
Luy feroient quelque jour des couronnes de fleurs (23).

" It, doubtleſs, was not the effect of chance ;
" Methinks it may, without a joke, be ſaid,
" To ſpeak the heaven-born Ronſard's future for-
" tune.
" An omen, which declar'd, that very inſtant,
" The charming fragrance he muſt one day ſhed :
" A certain omen that the tuneful nine,
" Whoſe glory he muſt ſing, to eternize him,
" Wou'd one day weave a chaplet for his head."

(23) Le Pays, *Titres de Nobleſſe de la Muſe Amourette*, p. 182, 183. part 2. of *Nouvelles Oeuvres*, Dutch edit. 1687.

[*D*] *He put himſelf at the head of ſome ſoldiers .... againſt the Proteſtants.*] Here follows the account, which Beza gives of this. " The moſt grievous " circumſtance was, that among the images which " were broke by the populace, they demoliſhed ſome " Sepulchres of the houſe of Vendoſme, now head " of the houſe of Bourbon, which was very juſtly " thought a very bad action. The Roman Catho- " licks ſeeing this, and as ſome of the nobility of " the Province were gone to meet the Prince of Or- " leans, and others had thrown themſelves into the " town of Mons, they began to exerciſe a heavy " hand over the Proteſtants. Among the reſt Peter " Ronſard, a Gentleman who poſſeſſed all the graces " of French Poetry, in a greater degree than any of " his contemporaries, but who, at the ſame time, " let out his muſe to hire, not only to write on the " moſt obſcene ſubjects, but likewiſe to calumniate " our religion and all who profeſſed it, having turned " Prieſt, was determined to engage in thoſe quarrels " with his companions. Accordingly having aſſem- " bled, for this purpoſe, ſome ſoldiers in the village " of Evaille, of which he was Paſtor, he made ſeve- " ral excurſions, on which occaſion he got plunder " and committed ſome murders (24)." Spondanus ſays, that the nobility of Vendôme made choice of Ronſard the Prieſt for their leader : but I had rather follow the account given us by Beza. However, I will cite the words of the above-mentioned Annaliſt, and we ſhall find ſome other particulars in them that want to be corrected. *Arma quoque ſumens nobilitas, ducem ſibi elegit Ronſardum, qui inſolentiam profanorum non ferens, multos ex iis malè mulctavit : quamquam curionatum Evalliæ tenebat, loci amœnitate aut commoditate captus. Neque enim is erat, qui libertatem ſuam, atque adeò licentiam poëticam, ſacerdotalis muneris neceſſitate tamquam compede ad gravitatem eâ functione dignam vellet adſtringere : ſed homo generoſus, & à teneris annis inter nobiles pueros Caroli Ducis Aureliani Franciſci I. filii in aulâ, & poſteà militaribus ſtudiis in Angliâ & Scotiâ innutritus, antequàm literis ſub Io. Aurato operam daret, & divinum ingenium ad poëticam appelleret, inter pacatæ vitæ oblectamenta etiam armorum curam & amorem retinuerat* (25). Theſe words give us to underſtand, that Ronſard undertook a cure of ſouls only for his pleaſure, and that he diſcharged the ſacerdotal functions in a very blunt manner. If this Author had known, that this pretended Pariſh Prieſt had had the ſame place under the King of Scotland, as under the Duke of Orleans, would he have employed ſuch a diſtinction as he has done ? Would he have ſaid that Peter Ronſard was a page under that Duke, and learnt the military art under the King of Scotland ? Let us therefore rectify this ; and inform the reader that this young man was appointed page to the Dauphin in 1536, three days before that Prince's deceaſe (26). *He afterwards entered into the ſervice of Charles Duke of Orleans, the King's ſecond ſon, and continued in it ſeveral years to the great ſatisfaction of his maſter* . . . who in order *that he might ſee the world, got him to be page to James Stuart, King of Scotland, who was come to marry* (27) *the Lady Magdalen, daughter to King Francis.* The King of Scotland *took him into his Kingdim, and he reſided there two years* (28) *and ſix months in England*, after which he returned to France, and *retired to his maſter the Duke of Orleans, who made him page of his ſtables*, and *ſent him upon ſome affair to Flanders and Zealand, with expreſs orders to proceed as far as Scotland, which he did* . . . *Being returned from this voyage, and not above fifteen or ſixteen years of age ; having lived five years with the Duke of Orleans till his death, and being next in the ſervice of Henry who was afterwards King, in* 1540 *he went in the retinue of Lazarus de Baif* . . . *who was ſetting out as his Majeſty's Embaſſador, for the Diet of Spire* (29). It appears from this relation, 1. That Ronſard did not learn the art of war in Scotland, any otherwiſe than in the Duke of Orleans's ſervice, or as all the pages of Princes learn it. 2. That Spondanus expreſſed himſelf improperly ; and did not know that our Poet, when in Scotland, was but thirteen or fourteen ; and that, at his return to France, he was appointed page to the Dauphin's brother. It perhaps may be objected to me, that I ought not to refute that Annaliſt, by the account given by Claudius Binet, as this abounds with errors. I will take it for granted that this is a difficulty ; but nevertheleſs I may ſtill ſuppoſe that Claudius Binet is not miſtaken, with regard to the time when Peter Ronſard was appointed page to the King of Scotland. He nevertheleſs is groſsly miſtaken in his calculation ; for had Ronſard lived in the Duke of Orleans's ſervice *five years, and till his death*, he muſt have lived with that Prince till the year 1545 ; and if he was afterwards in the ſervice of the Dauphin Henry, how could he poſſibly have afterwards been put into the retinue of Lazarus de Baif in 1540 ? But it is true that Lazarus de Baif, going as the King's Embaſſador to Germany in 1540, took with him our Ronſard who was then no longer under the diſcipline of his tutors (30). Be this as it will, Varillas has fallen into the ſame miſtake into which Spondanus leads his readers. " New puniſhments were invented, " to chaſtiſe the Calviniſts of Vendôme, becauſe the " moſt violent among them had ranſacked the Se- " pulchres of the anceſtors of the King of Navarre. " And the famous Poet Ronſard, a Gentleman of that " country, who, grown weary of the Court, and of " the narrow circumſtances in which he lived at " home, had accepted of the living of Evailles, took " up arms again, as he had formerly done in Eng- " land and Scotland. He afterwards made an excuſe " for it, with this merry ſaying, that as he had " found it impoſſible for him to defend his pariſhioners " with St. Peter's keys, which the Calviniſts neither " dreaded nor reſpected, he therefore had taken up " the ſword of St. Paul ; when putting himſelf at " the

(24) Beze, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* liv. 7. p. 557, 558.

(25) Spondanus, *Annal. Eccleſ.* ad ann. 1562. num. 16. p. m. 621, 622.

(26) Binet, *Vie de Ronſard*, p. 115.

(27) He married her at Paris the 1ſt of January 1537.

(28) Du Perron, *Oraiſon funebre de Ronſard*, p. 193, declares, that he lived two years and a half in Scotland.

(29) Extracted from Claudius Binet, p. 115 & *ſeq.*

(30) See Anthony Baif's verſes, in Menage's *Remarques ſur la Vie d'Ayrault*, p. 196.

but he defended himſelf in verſe, and denied his being an Eccleſiaſtic [*E*]. A certain circumſtance is, that he had ſome benefices *in commendam*; and among others, the Priory of St. Coſmus near Tours. He died the 27th of December 1585, and was buried in that

" the head of the nobility in the neighbourhood, he " had preſerved the village and Church to which he " belonged from being plundered (31)." We here find that he falſely ſuppoſes that Ronſard had carried arms in England and Scotland. [" Bayle declares " this article, that Ronſard was not Paſtor of Evaille; " but this is ſuppoſing a falſe fact, *viz.* that a per- " ſon cannot be the Paſtor or Rector of a Pariſh " without being a Prieſt. See alſo the following " remark *."]

(31) Varillas, *Hiſt. de Charles IX.* Tom. 1. p. 171. Dutch edit. ad ann. 1562.

* From the rem. to the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 893. col. 2.

[*E*] *He defended himſelf in verſe, and denied his being an Eccleſiaſtick.*] Chandieu and Florent Chretien (both Proteſtant Miniſters) wrote the pieces that were publiſhed againſt him in Orleans. The former diſguiſed himſelf under the name of *A. Zamariel B. de Mont-Dieu*, and the ſecond under that of *François de la Baronnie* (32). Father Garaſſe ſpeaks of this as follows. " Theſe two men made him a moſt ſevere repri- " mand, entitled, *La Metamorphoſe de Ronſard en " Preſtre, ou le Temple de Ronſard*, (The Metamor- " phoſis of Ronſard into a Prieſt, or Ronſard's Tem- " ple;) in which they charge him, in particular, " with having taught atheiſm.

(32) See *Doctrine Curieuſe du Pere Garaſſe*, p. 126, and 1022; and La Croix du Maine, p. 88.

" *Je t'ay veu diſcourir tout ainſi qu'Epicure*
" *Qui attacheois au ciel un Dieu qui n'a la cure*
" *De ce qu'on fait en bas, & en parlant ainſi*
" *Tu monſtrois que de luy tu n'avois grand ſoucy, &c.*

" I've heard you argue, juſt as Epicurus;
" And fix, in Heaven, a God who diſregards
" Whatever's done below; and ſpeak I thus,
" You plainly ſhew'd how little you eſteem'd him.

" But Ronſard made a ſolid anſwer to their ſcurrili- " ties and impertinences, in the poem entitled, *Des " miſeres du temps*, in which he proteſts, &c (33)." Garaſſe is miſtaken. The poem entitled *Des miſeres du temps* was not writ in anſwer to Zamariel & la Baronnie; but the piece which Ronſard wrote in his own defenſe againſt them, is entitled, *Reponſe aux injures & calomnies de je ne ſçai quels Predicantereaux & Miniſtreaux de Geneve*. The reaſon, which excited the Proteſtants to write verſes againſt this Poet, is related imperfectly both by Binet and Varillas. One of them ſays, that they abuſed him, in revenge of the poems he had writ againſt him; the other affirms that they ſatyrized him on account of his military exploits. Now theſe two reaſons ſhould have been joined together; it being certain that they attacked him, becauſe he had employed both the ſword and the pen againſt them with great fury. Binet's words are as follow: " This " gave Ronſard an occaſion of oppoſing that new " opinion, and of arming the Muſes in defenſe of " France; he publiſhing remonſtrances, which were " judged ſo proper to combat the enemies of the " Catholick religion, that the King, and the Queen " his mother rewarded him for it; as likewiſe did " Pope Pius V. who thanked him for it by letters " written expreſsly for that purpoſe. For this rea- " ſon thoſe of the new opinion (the Proteſtants) be- " gan to attack him; and wrote a very ſharp ſatyri- " cal poem againſt him, entitled by them, Ronſard's " Temple, in which they painted his life in tapeſtry, " as it were. They alſo wrote ſome anſwers to his " remonſtrances, with the following remonſtrance, " *La Metamorphoſe de Ronſard*, the Authors of " which were one A. Zamariel, and B. de Mont-dieu, " both Proteſtant Miniſters, the laſt of whom he " points out plainly enough, in the verſes he wrote to " him by way of anſwer, comparing him to Siſy- " phus.

(33) Garaſſe, ibid. p. 126, 127.

" *Qui remonte & repouſſe aux enfers un rocher*
" *Dont tu as pris ton nom* (34).

" Who, deep in Hell, for ever heaves a rock
" (Which ſtill falls back,) whence thou thy name
" haſt borrowed.

(34) Binet, *Vie de Ronſard*, p. 138, 139. See alſo *l'Oraiſon funebre par du Perron*, p. 197, where no other reaſon is found but that alledged by Binet.

Here Binet makes two Authors of one, A. Zamariel B. de Mont-dieu, being but one man. I now proceed to Varillas's words. *This* (35) *gave occaſion to the horrid ſatyr, which Florent Chretien, at that time a violent Calviniſt, and Preceptor to the Prince of Navarre, wrote under the name of la Baronie the Proteſtant Miniſter, againſt Ronſard; and the anſwer of this latter, in which he ſhewed that indignation was capable of making him write finer verſes than nature, though he had a wonderful genius for Poetry* (36). He ſhould not have ſaid that Florent Chretien *wrote under the name of a Proteſtant Miniſter*, nor to ſuppoſe that he was the only perſon who ſatyrized Ronſard. We have ſeen that he aſſerts, after Beza and Spondanus, that our Poet had a cure of ſouls; but we ſhall find that he was miſtaken.

(35) That is, becauſe Ronſard took up arms againſt the Proteſtants.

(36) Varillas, *Hiſt. de Charles IX.* liv. 3. p. 171, 172.

Or ſus mon frere en Chriſt, tu dis que je ſuis Preſtre:
J'atteſte l'eternel que je le voudrois eſtre,
Et avoir tout le chef & le dos empeſché
Deſſous la peſanteur d'une boune Eveſché:
Lors j'auroy la couronne à bon droit ſur la teſte,
Qu'un raſoir blanchiroit le jour d'une grand' feſte,
Ouverte, large, longue, allant juſques au front.
En forme d'un Croiſſant qui tout ſe courbe en rond (37).

(37) Ronſard, *Reponſe à quelque Miniſtre*, p. m. 80.

" You tell me, brother, that I am a Prieſt;
" I ſwear, by Heaven, I gladly would be ſuch;
" And only wiſh my ſhoulders were weigh'd down
" With a fat Biſhoprick. I juſtly then
" Should wear a crown, made by the razor's edge;
" A crown, long, broad and wide, extending quite
" Around my forehead, in a creſcent's form.

Does not Ronſard expreſsly deny, in theſe verſes, his being a Prieſt? And would he have denied this, had he really been one? What follows, however, will excuſe the Proteſtant Miniſter who beſtowed that title on him. He had been ordained; and he diſcharged the functions of an Eccleſiaſtic, in the choir, with ſacerdotal veſtments, as he himſelf informs us.

Mais quand je ſuis aux lieux, où il faut faire voir
D'un cœur devotieux l'office & le devoir,
Lors je ſuis de l'Egliſe une colonne ferme,
D'un ſurpelis ondé les eſpaules je m'arme,
D'une haumuſſe le bras, d'une chape le dos,
Et non comme tu dis faite de croix & d'os:
C'eſt pour un Capelan, la mienne eſt honorée
De grandes boucles d'or & de frange dorée (38).
. . . . . .
Je ne perds un moment des prieres divines:
Dés la pointe du jour je m'en vais à matines,
J'ay mon breviaire au poing, je chante quelquefois,
Mais c'eſt bien rarement, car j'ay mauvaiſe vois,
Le devoir du ſervice en rien je n'abandonne,
Je ſuis à Prime, à Sexte, & à Tierce, & à Nonne,
J'oy dire la grand' Meſſe, & avecques l'encent
(Qui par l'Egliſe eſpars comme parfum ſe ſent,)
J'honore mon Prelat des autres l'outrepaſſe,
Qui a pris d'Agenor ſon ſurnom & ſa race.
Apres le tour finy je viens pour me r'aſſoir (39).

(38) Ibid. p. 94.

(39) Ibid. p. 95.

" But when I am in ſacred places, where
" It is my duty to have great devotion,
" I then am ſeen a pillar of the church.
" A wavy ſurplice overſpreads my ſhoulders;
" My arm an ameſs bears, my back a cope;
" And not, as you do hint, of croſs and bones.
" 'Tis for a church-man; therefore 'tis adorn'd
" With large gold buckles, and a golden fringe.
. . . . . .
" At hours of prayer, I never loſe an inſtant;
" But go to mattins at the early dawn.
" My breviary in my hand, I ſing ſometimes;
" Yet very rarely, for my voice is bad.
" In ſervice time I'm ſure not to be abſent,
" Whether at prime, at terce, or ſexte or none.
" High-maſs I hear, with heavenly frankincenſe,
" (Which ſpreads delicious fragrance round the
" church)
" I greet my Prelate, all the reſt excelling,
" Who

that place in a very private manner; but a noble monument was erected there to his memory four and twenty years after [F]. He was afflicted in a dreadful manner by the gout, which, it is ſaid, was owing to his debauched way of life [G]. There are a great number of amorous Poems in his works; by which we find that he had three principal miſtreſſes (a), the laſt of whom ſerved him only as an amuſement, and a ſubject for his poetry [H].

(a) See the rem. [H].

It is even true that he often wrote verſes in an amorous ſtrain, at the deſire of ſome Lords of the Court; theſe conſequently were a deſcription, not of his paſſion but of theirs. When he recollected this it uſed to give uneaſineſs; for he remembered, that theſe

" Who comes from Agenor; thence takes his
" name.
" Theſe rites perform'd, I ſit me down again.

This made the Proteſtants ſuppoſe him to have had a cure of ſouls. I muſt obſerve, that Menage imagines that a Proteſtant Miniſter, whoſe name was *Mont-dieu*, wrote againſt Ronſard (40); but he is miſtaken, this being the feigned name which Chandieu the Miniſter aſſumed, when he publiſhed that piece. Baillet (41) is of opinion, that Florent Chretien made uſe of that fictitious name. Colomeſius had no reaſon to ſay, that La Croix du Maine did not know *in his Biblioth.* p. 88, that Florent Chretien *wrote againſt Ronſard, under the name of Francis de la Baronnie* (42). I have related elſewhere (43) the anſwer Ronſard made, to the charge brought againſt him, with regard to an heatheniſh act.

(40) Menage, *Anti-Baillet*, ch. 145.

(41) Baillet, in the catalogue *des Auteurs deguiſez.*

(42) Colomies, *Bibl. Choiſie*, p. 202.

(43) Rem. [D] of the art. JODELLE.

[F] *A noble monument was erected there to his memory.*] Joachim de la Chetardie, Counſellor Clerk in the Parliament of Paris, being Prior-commendatory of St. Coſmus, twenty years after Ronſard's death, was grieved to find that there was no mauſolæum, nor even ſo much as an inſcription, to ſhew where the aſhes of ſo great a Poet had been depoſited (44). For this reaſon, when he repaired the monaſtery, he cauſed a marble tomb to be made there, on which an epitaph (45) was engraved; and a fine ſtatue of Ronſard made by an excellent Sculpture erected. *Cum magni Ronſardi cineres populari loculo, muto & illiterato jacere videret, melior æquiorque illis qui ejus opimis exuviis ditati ſunt, tamdiu manes eſſe neglectos non tulit, ac Ronſardum illum. . . . Chetardius marmoris alta ſtrue, ſtatua ad viventis ſimilitudinem veriſſime expreſſa, à Phidia Lutetiano donavit, brevi nota & elogio* (46). A reflection is here caſt on Ronſard's relations, for not paying, in any manner, the tribute due to his memory. It is nevertheleſs certain, that Gallandius cauſed a ſplendid funeral ſervice to be made in his honour in the college of Boncourt, of which he was Principal. *Teſtamento condito, quo hæredem ſcripſit Johannem Gallandium juventutis Pariſienſis optimum moderatorem, cujus hoſpitio cum Lutetiæ eſſet, familiariſſime utebatur qui dignam tanti viri memoriæ gratiam rependens ei exequiis perhonorificis poſtea in ſchola Becodiana ſua parentavit* (47). Here follows a deſcription of his funeral. " The " Sieur Galland, whoſe affection for him not being " buried in the ſame grave, acting the part that " France ought to have done, cauſed pompous pre- " parations to be made in the chapel of Boncourt, " where his funeral obſequies were ſolemnized on " Monday the 24th of Feb. 1586. The ſervice being " ſet to muſick, and accompanied with inſtruments of " every kind, was ſung by the fineſt ſingers; thoſe " belonging to his Majeſty being there, by his expreſs " command; the King juſtly lamenting the death of " a perſon, who had been ſo great an ornament to " his Kingdom. I ſhould never have done, was I to " tranſcribe all the funeral orations, elogiums, and " verſes which were conſecrated that day to his me- " mory; and how many perſons of high diſtinction, " with that generous Prince Charles of Valois, ac- " companied with Duke de Joyeuſe, and the moſt " reverend Cardinal his brother, to whom Ronſard " belonged, honoured this funeral ſolemnity; at " which the moſt worthy Members of the auguſt Se- " nate at Paris, as at a publick ceremony, were pleaſed " to aſſiſt; theſe being followed by the greateſt wits " in France. Mr. du Perron, after dinner, ſpoke the " funeral oration with ſo much eloquence, and to " hear which, there was ſo vaſt a concourſe of audi- " tors, that the Cardinal of Bourbon, and ſeveral " other Princes and perſons of high diſtinction, were " obliged to go back, the crowd being ſo great they " could not get in (48)."

(44) See in what manner Paſquier ſhews his indignation, in his *Recherch.* book 7. ch. 11. p. 648. ſeeing ſo mean a ſepulchre.

(45) It is in Botereius, *ubi infra*, p. 567.

(46) Rodolphus Botereius, *Commentar. de rebus in Gallia geſtis*, lib. 16. p. 566. ad ann. 1609.

(47) Thuanus, *Hiſt.* lib. 80. *ſub fin.* p. m. 43. col. 1.

(48) Binet, p. 159, 160.

[G] He was afflicted . . . . . *with the gout, which, it is ſaid, was owing to his debauched way of life.*] He was handſom in his perſon, very robuſt; and as he was extremely witty, and vaſtly fond of pleaſure, we may naturally ſuppoſe that he improved every opportunity of being in company with the fair ſex, and that he ſeldom failed of ſuch opportunities. Thus he deſtroyed the vigour of his conſtitution by his ſenſual way of life, as Thuanus obſerves. *Verum homo ut ingenio ſic forma & corporis robore inſignis cum vita ſoluta licentioſe nimis genio indulgeret, valetudinem firmiſſimam debilitavit, acerbiſſimis arthritidis doloribus extrema ætate conflictatus* (49). He was very deaf; and it is confeſſed in his life, that one of the cauſes which brought that infirmity upon him was, *that during his ſtay in Germany, he was obliged to drink ſuch wines as that country affords, moſt of which are ſophiſticated* (50). But this is a miſtake; there being excellent wines in Germany; and had Ronſard drank moderately of them, they would not have hurt him. The Authors of the pieces publiſhed in Orleans reproach him with being a great debauchee.

(49) Thuan. lib. 83. p. 43. col. 1.

(50) Binet, p. 118.

Tu m'accuſes, Cafard, d'avoir eu la verolle :
Un chaſte Predicant de fait & de parole
Ne devroit jamais dire un propos ſi vilain :
Mais que ſort-il du ſac ? cela dont il eſt plein (51).
. . . . . .
Tu te plaints d'autre part que ma vie eſt laſcive,
En delices, en jeux, en vices exceſſive :
Tu mens meſchantement, ſi tu m'avois ſuivy
Deux mois, tu ſçaurois bien en quel eſtat je vy (52).

(51) Ronſard, *Reponſe à quelque Miniſtre*, p. 86.

(52) Ibid. p. 93.

" Bigot, thou chargeſt me with being pox'd :
" But, let me tell thee, a juſt, virtuous preacher
" Shou'd never utter ſuch obſcene expreſſions :
" But man will ſpeak oft as his heart ſuggeſts.
. . . . . .
" Again you tell me, that my life is lewd ;
" That vices, pleaſures, games, are my delight :
" But O thou lieſt ! and hadſt thou only liv'd
" Two months with me, the contrary thou'dſt prov'd.

(53) See what is ſaid concerning Malherbe, in the rem. [B] of his article.

[H] *The laſt of his* miſtreſſes *ſerved him only as an amuſement, and a ſubject for his poetry* (53)]. I will firſt ſpeak of the former two (54). " Ronſard fall- " ing in love with a beautiful young woman at Blois " named Caſſandra, the twenty firſt day of April, " in a journey he made to Blois, where the Court " then was, being then twenty years of age (55), " reſolved to celebrate her in verſe, as well for the " beauty of the ſubject, as of the name. He was " ſtruck the inſtant he ſaw her, as though it had " been by a divine inſtinct, which he ſeems to hint at " ſufficiently, by the following motto he then took, " ΩΣ ΙΔΟΝ ΩΣ ΕΜΑΝΗΝ (55)." The verſes he wrote on that miſtreſs were thought too obſcure, for which reaſon *he reſolved to deſcribe, in a more eaſy ſtyle, the amours of Mary, who was a beautiful maiden of Anjou: and whom he frequently ſhadows under the name of Pin de Bourgeuil, that being the place of her abode, and where he firſt ſaw her, happening to be there with Baif his friend. He was extremely fond of her, after having made love to Caſſandra, during ten years, and left her out of jealouſy* (57). Here follows the ſtory of his third paſſion. " He reſolved to end " and crown his works by the ſonnets of Helen, " whoſe virtues, beauties, and rare perfections were " the laſt and moſt worthy object of his muſe: the " laſt

(54) Binet, p. 129.

(55) This was therefore in 1544. Nevertheleſs Binet had juſt before ſaid, that Ronſard had publiſhed an Epithalamium on the marriage of Monſ. de Vendome, with Jane d'Albert, Queen of Navarre; and afterwards writ two poems before he fell in love with Caſſandra. This marriage was ſolemnized in 1548. In the *Life of Ronſard*, in *the Collection of the fineſt Pieces of the French Poets*, printed in 1692, it is affirmed that he fell in love with Caſſandra at Blois, when he was in the Duke of Anjou's family. But there was no Duke of Anjou at that time.

(56) Theſe words are from Theocritus, which Virgil, Eclogue 8, tranſlates as follows, *ut vidi ut perii*, i. e. " I was " wounded by " the firſt " glance."

(57) Binet, p. 133.

theſe verſes had not produced him any emolument [*I*]: but that the reward was beſtowed on others. But he was not ſo unſucceſsful with regard to thoſe poetical pieces which he addreſſed to Charles IX. he being paid pretty liberally for them [*K*]. He commenced a ſuit againſt Joachim du Bellai, to recover ſome odes that had been artfully ſtole

" laſt, becauſe he had not the good fortune to ſee her " but in his old age; and the moſt worthy, becauſe " this Lady, by her quality, virtue, and fame, excelled " the former ſubjects of his juvenile paſſion We may " naturally ſuppoſe that he loved the two firſt with " greater familiarity; he rather honouring and " praiſing this Lady, than courting her. This ap- " pears from the title he gave to his encomiums, in " which he imitated Petrarch, who being one day " applauded before the Queen-mother, for the chaſt- " neſs and modeſty of his muſe, her Majeſty ad- " viſed him to write in the ſame ſtrain, as more " ſuitable to his age, and the gravity of his learning. " In this manner Ronſard imagining he had an op- " portunity of devoting his muſe to an excellent per- " ſon, he looked upon the Queen's permiſſion as " leave, or rather a command to addreſs himſelf to " ſo excellent a perſon, who was one of her maids " of honour, of a very ancient and noble family in " Saintonge. He continued to praiſe her till his " death; and end, as it were, his life in applaud- " ing her. And becauſe her wit gave him fre- " quent opportunities of exerciſing his pen, he con- " ſecrated to her memory a fountain or ſpring in " Vandoſmois, which ſtill goes by her name (58)."

(58) Binet, *Vie de Ronſard*, p. 142, 143.

In the collection of the moſt beautiful pieces of the French Poets, ancient and modern, printed at Paris in 1692, is a life of Ronſard, wherein I met with an error, which it may be proper to correct in this place. *He celebrated the fame of Helen de Sugeres, who was one of the Queen's maids of honour; and deſired Cardinal du Perron to write a Preface for this collection of Love Poems, in which he beſought him to declare, that he had entertained a virtuous paſſion for that young Lady. The Cardinal anſwered, that inſtead of a Preface, he need only put Helen de Sugeres's picture * in the front of his book* (59). As du Perron was young when Ronſard died, ſo great a Poet as he was would not have deſired him to favour him with a Preface. The truth is, he did not requeſt ſuch a favour of any perſon; the Lady herſelf deſiring Cardinal du Perron to draw up ſuch a Preface. If the reader looks in the *Perroniana*, he will find the following paſſage under the word GOURNAY (60): *This I one day ſaid to Mademoiſelle de Surgeres, who deſired me, at Mr. de Rets's, to prefix a letter to Ronſard's works, to inform the world that he had not an unchaſte paſſion for her. Inſtead of ſuch a letter, ſays I, we need but inſert your picture.*

* Becauſe ſhe was ugly.

(59) Recueil, *des plus belles Pieces*, Tom. 1. p. 241, 242. Dutch edit.

(60) See rem. [*B*] of the art. GOURNAI.

[*I*] *It uſed to give him uneaſineſs, when he remembered that thoſe verſes had not produced him any emolument.*] I ſhall prove this by a paſſage from Claudius Binet (61). " He has often told me, that one of his love " verſes and interludes have been invented and writ- " ten at the requeſt of a perſon of diſtinction; " meaning that he had often forced his genius, and " not found great pleaſure on thoſe occaſions, other " perſons having run away with the reward; for " which reaſon he put under thoſe pieces the verſes " of Virgil, *Sic vos non vobis, &c.* It is known for " whom he wrote the amours of Callyrea, who was " a moſt beautiful Lady of the Court, of the noble " family of Atry (62), ſirnamed *Aquaviva*, as he " explains it ſufficiently in the ſonnet which begins " thus, *La belle eau vive*, (the beautiful running " ſtream). It is likewiſe known for whom he " wrote theſe verſes on Aſtrea (63), who alſo was a " handſom Lady of the Court, whoſe name is greatly " embelliſhed, by the changing of a vowel." We may infer from theſe words, that this great Poet was not ſo much diſintereſted as a man of honour ought to be. It would have redounded greatly to his reputation, had he ſhewn a greater averſeneſs to that mercenary temper, ſo common among the friends of the muſes; and I am ſurpriſed Binet ſhould have been ſo ingenuous, to inform us of the complaints made by Ronſard, upon his not being recompenſed. Be this as it will, we here have a proof, that a man may write amorous verſes, without being in love with the perſon who is the ſubject of them. It is my opinion that this is an eaſier taſk when ſuch a perſon has a miſtreſs of his own (64).

(61) Binet, *Vie de Ronſard*, p. 141, 142.

(62) I ſpoke of this Lady, at the cloſe of the text of the art. JACCETIUS.

(63) She was a Lady of the D'Eſtrée family.

[*K*] *He being paid pretty liberally for . . . thoſe poetical pieces, which he addreſſed to Charles IX.*] This Prince, " beſides his ordinary penſion, made him " ſome preſents. He indeed uſed to ſay frequently, " in a jeſting way, he was afraid of loſing his Ron- " ſard; and leſt too great affluence ſhould make " his muſe grow lazy; and that a good Poet ought " not to be fattened too much any more than a good " horſe; that he ſhould be kept in good plight, but " not fattened. Nevertheleſs he was always very " generous to him; he knowing that Poets have I " know not what ſympathy with the greatneſs of " Kings, and are very apt to take fire; ſtrongly af- " fected when they are not rewarded according to " their merit, and the pains they may have taken, " as he himſelf complained in ſeveral places (65)." The laſt part of this paſſage confirms what has been ſeen above (66) with regard to our Ronſard's mercenary temper, for which reaſon I have not ſuppreſſed it, as I ſhould otherwiſe have done. It is to be obſerved that Brantome ſpeaks of this policy of Charles IX. (α), as may have been ſeen in the article DAURAT (67). This is the moſt certain way of keeping Poets buſy; for were they to be very rich, they poſſibly might deſpiſe their profeſſion. We therefore may conclude, that Charles IX. had reaſon to behave as if the Poets had offered up the ſame prayer to him as Agur did to God, *Give me neither poverty nor riches, feed me with food convenient for me* (68). The medium he obſerved is perhaps the greateſt bleſſing that could be wiſhed for the Commonwealth of Letters; for ſome Authors, had they been very rich, would not have publiſhed the fine works, with which they have favoured the publick; and others would have given their compoſitions in greater perfection, had they been in better circumſtances. It is the too great indigence of ſome Authors, that has given occaſion to the vaſt multitude of bad books, with which the world has been peſtered. Had they poſſeſſed a decent competency, this would have given them an opportunity to poliſh, with ſome patience, their works; but the very urgent wants of a man, who has a large family, and is dunned by a creditor whom he puts off till the time he may have gathered the fruit of a dedication, and been paid for his copy, forces him to go with poſt haſte; and will not allow him time to lick his cubs, before he exhibits them to the publick. I will obſerve, that there are ſome ſuch works, which it is better to have, than be entirely deprived of them. It was of greater advantage, for inſtance, to the publick, to have poſſeſſed du Ryer's tranſlations, than not to have had any of the Authors tranſlated by him: and therefore, in caſe that worthy man would have led an idle life, had he been very rich, it were better he had had but juſt ſufficient to maintain him, than to have abounded. See what Eraſmus ſays with regard to Sigiſmund GELENIUS (69). A Writer, who propoſes to raiſe himſelf in the world, exerts his utmoſt endeavours to write well; but the inſtant he has obtained what he ſought, he grows negligent. This is obſerved with reſpect to preachers; theſe always preach better, before they have obtained an Epiſcopal See they have in view, than after they are made Biſhops (70). This puts me in mind of a very ingenious repartee, as it has been thought. A great Prince of this age, intending to beſiege a certain city, heard that it would be defended by a Marſhal of France, and did not change his reſolution on that account: but it is affirmed that he made this reply to thoſe who would have repreſented to him the conſequences of that circumſtance; *a Governor, who is not yet raiſed to the poſt of Marſhal of France, is more to be dreaded than a Governor who is ſo already.*

(64) It is only figuring to one's ſelf, that the Lady one is deſired to write upon, is our own miſtreſs.

(65) Binet, p. 143.

(66) In the preceding rem.

(67) Citat. 21.

(68) Proverbs of Solomon, chap. xxx. ver. 8.

(69) Citat. 10. of his art.

(70) Vide rem. [*C*] of the art. ZEUXIS.

§ (α) Theſe

ſtole from him [*L*]; but they afterwards were reconciled, and lived as good friends. He would have writ amorous verſes with greater beauty, had he not taken the ancient Poets for his model; he being harſh and obſcure, by having recourſe too frequently to their fables [*M*]. He even ſometimes took the ſame liberties they did, of introducing ſome obſcene expreſſions in his works [*N*]; and in general, he introduced ſeveral profane ſtrokes, and too many heathen touches in his Poems, which nevertheleſs were paid with ſacred things [*O*]. People are greatly divided with reſpect to the merit of his performances

§ (*a*) Theſe words of Brantome are extracted from Papirius Maſſo's life of Charles IX. reprinted at the end of the additions to Memoires de Caſtelnau: *Poetas generoſis equis ſimiles eſſe dicens, quos nutrire, non ſaginari oportet.* REM. CRIT.

[*L*] *He commenced a ſuit againſt Joachim du Bellai, to recover ſome odes that had been artfully ſtole from him.*] This is a very whimſical kind of law-ſuit. I do not doubt but that Ronſard proſecuted it with as much warmth, as others would do to recover an inheritance left them by their fathers. The writer of his life touches very gently on this ſubject, he being afraid to injure the reputation, either of the plaintiff, or defendant, The latter made a moſt odious figure before the Judges, and the former made them a little merry. But it may be proper to give the whole paſſage in Claudius Binet. "When there was a great "talk of the loves of Caſſandra, and of four books "of Odes, in imitation of thoſe of Pindar and "Horace, which Ronſard had promiſed to publiſh, "as wits are often jealous of one another; du Bellay, who likewiſe had celebrated his Oliva in an "amorous ſtrain, was deſirous of writing ſome odes "on the plan and deſign of thoſe of Ronſard, "which he found means to procure without the Author's privity. He accordingly wrote ſome, which, "together with ſome ſonnets, he privately ſent to "preſs, in order to publiſh them, and by that means "be before hand in reputation with Ronſard. Theſe "were publiſhed and entitled a Collection of Poems, "which conduct raiſed a natural jealouſy, if not envy, in Ronſard againſt du Bellay; inſomuch that "he commenced a ſuit againſt him for the recovery "of his manuſcripts. The Court decreeing that "they ſhould be given to him, they not only laid "their animoſity aſide, but Ronſard exciting du Bellay to go on with his odes, they became greater "friends than ever; concluding that ſuch a little ambition is very frequent in generous ſouls; and that "as perſons who are fond of glory are eaſily fired, "they are as ſpeedily reconciled (71)."

(71) Binet, p. 129, 130.

COMMENTARIES made on Ronſard.

[*M*] *He being harſh and obſcure, by having recourſe too frequently to their fables.*] This was complained of in his time, for which reaſon the lovers of his poems wrote commentaries on them. The amours of Caſſandra were commented on by Muretus. Remi Belleau and Nicholas Richelet wrote a commentary on his paſſion for Mary: the firſt book by Remi Belleau, and the ſecond by Nicholas Richelet: Richelet alſo commented his ſonnets in praiſe of Helen, the five books of his odes, and his hymns. All the pieces in the IXth part of his works have had the ſame honour done them by Claudius Garnier. Peter de Marcaſſus, *beſides ſeveral pieces of the firſt part, has commented the* Franciad, *which makes the third*; *le Rocage royal, which makes the fourth*; *the eclogues, Maſcarades, and Cartels, which form the fifth*; *the elegies which form the ſixth*; *and the poems which make the eighth* (72). John Beſſi, the King's Attorney at Fontenai le Comte, wrote a commentary on the hymns (73). Poor Ronſard has been ſtrongly attacked in *le Parnaſſe Réformé*, where his writings are ſaid to be impenetrably obſcure without the aid of a good commentary. The following poem is particularly objected to him.

(72) Baillet, *Jugem. ſur Poetes*, num. 1335.

(73) Colomies, *Obſervat. Sacræ*, p. 54.

Je ne ſuis point ma guerriere Caſſandre, &c.

"Martial Caſſandra's not by me purſued."

(74) *Parnaſſe Reformé*, p. 91, 92. Dutch edit.

Do you really imagine, ſays the Author (74), *that your Caſſandra, in whoſe applauſe you wrote that Sonnet, had ſo good an opinion of it? Can we ſuppoſe that ſhe knew this brother whom you aſcribe to her; Do you imagine that* le Dolope ſoudart, le Myrmidon, le Coreb inſenſé, *and* le Gregeois Penelée, *were names ſhe eaſily underſtood; and muſt it be an eaſy taſk for a young Lady to be obliged to explain all the fables of the ſiege of Troy?*

Ronſard's harſhneſs and obſcurity would be more excuſable, had he been the firſt who improved the French poetry; but he might, if he had pleaſed, have ſeen it in all its charms and natural beauties, and very near perfection in Marot's writings. What great help might theſe have been to him? Here follows la Bruyere's opinion. "Marot's turn and ſtyle of "his compoſitions is ſuch, that he ſeems to have "wrote after RONSARD: there is hardly any difference, except in a few words, between Marot and "us. Ronſard, and the Authors his contemporaries, "did more diſſervice than good to ſtyle; they checked its courſe in the advances it was making towards perfection, and had like to have prevented "its ever attaining it. It is ſurprizing that MAROT, "whoſe works are ſo eaſy and natural, did not "make Ronſard, who was fired with the ſtrong enthuſiaſm of poetry, a greater Poet than either "RONSARD and MAROT (75)." But how was it poſſible that the works of the latter ſhould produce ſo happy an effect on a man, who had ſo little taſte, that he conſidered them only as a heap of dirt with ſome grains of gold in it? *He was for ever reading*, as we are told by the Author of his life (76), *ſome French Poet, . . . and particularly . . . John le Maire de Belges*, the *Romance of the Roſe*, and *Marot's works, which he afterwards called, as we are told Virgil ſaid of thoſe of Ennius, the dunghill, from which he drew, by induſtrious waſhing, rich grains of gold.* La Bruyere would not have looked upon this waſhing as very induſtrious; he would have ſaid, that Ronſard took the earth, and threw away the gold.

(75) La Bruyere, *Caracteres*, in the chapter *des Ouvrages de l'Eſprit*, p. m. 82.

(76) Binet, p. m. 121.

[*N*] *Some obſcene expreſſions in his works.*] I will quote but one inſtance of this mentioned by Menage, in that part where he reproaches him with employing obſcene fable. *We ought*, ſays he (77), *to employ ſuch fables only as are univerſally known. Ronſard, by making uſe of ſome which are known only to the learned, and found no where but in the ſcholiaſts, as that taken notice of in the following verſes of Ode* XXI, *Book* II, *and which he borrowed from the Scholiaſt on Nicander,*

(77) Menage, *Obſervat. ſur Malherbe*, p. 531.

Ny les fleurons que diffama
Venus, alors que ſa main blanche
Au milieu du Lis renferma
D'un grand Aſne le roide manche,

inſtead of acquiring the fame and reputation, as a ſcholar, has been conſidered as a pedant. Here follows Nicholas Richelet's note on theſe four verſes of Ronſard. "We read this in Nicander's Alexipharmaca. One "cannot comprehend how this can be underſtood of "the lily, which Nicander, in another place, calls "the delight of Venus. And indeed our author "ſeems to entertain ſome doubt of this himſelf, ſince "he again ſpeaks of the lily in that ode, and it "would be ſuperfluous to ſpeak twice of the ſame "flower. Now Nicander ſays, that this flower, whatever it was, was one day ſo bold as to contend "for beauty with Venus, who out of ſpite, and "to revenge herſelf, ſtuck an aſſe's yard into the "middle of its leaves.

"——Τότ' ἀπίσυγεν, ἀφρὼ
"Οινεκ' ἐριδμαίνεσκε χροῒς ὕπερ, ἐν δὲ νυθρίοις
"Αργαλέην μεσάτοισιν ὀτειδίην ἐπέλασσε
"Δεινὴν βρωμήεντ' ἐναλθήσασα κορύνην (78)."

(78) Richelet, *ſur le 2 Livre des Odes de Ronſard*, p. m. 306.

This Commentator does not complain of the obſcurity of the text.

[*O*] *Which nevertheleſs were paid with ſacred things.*] See Sorel, who ſays that "Ronſard's Odes, written in "praiſe of ſome perſons, are an imitation of Pindar; and

mances, as appears from Baillet (*b*). See alſo Sorel's remarks on *le Berger Extravagant* (*c*): in which many curious and juſt criticiſms are made on this Poet.

(*b*) Baillet, *Jugemens ſur les poetes*, num. 1335.

(*c*) On book 13. p. 647 & *ſeq.*

I muſt not omit, that it has been obſerved he was not ſucceſsful in correcting his Poems [*P*], he eraſing the beſt things in them. This is a very troubleſome imperfection, and which

" and that the reſt, which are but indifferent, are moſtly borrowed from Anacreon, ſo that we ſcarce meet with any reflections but the following; perhaps we to-morrow may be nothing but duſt; that we ought to make the moſt we can of life, and devote our time either to wine or women; which, to me, ſeem the precepts of a man who did not believe in the immortality of the ſoul. Nor do his hymns inculcate much more the precepts of virtue: ſome of them are only ſo many repetitions of what we meet with in Homer and the reſt of the Poets, as the hymns of Calais and Zethes, and of Caſtor and Pollux, which is not very proper; there being no occaſion to ſing praiſes to thoſe imaginary perſonages. As to the hymn of Hercules compared to Chriſt, both in his birth and labours, this cannot inſpire the leaſt devotion; for ſuch foreign applications prompt one to laugh, rather than repent of our faults (79)." After giving the ſubſtance of the hymn, he adds: " I would chooſe to baniſh the heathen fables, rather than to think of rectifying them, by applying them in ſuch a manner to ſacred myſteries. It is dangerous to let Poets work upon theſe ſubjects. It is plain that ſhould we dive a little into matters, the myſteries of our Religion would be profaned, the relations being only in the ſuperficies or outſide. How infamous is it to refer the adultery of Jupiter to the Incarnation of the eternal Word? One muſt alſo ſay that the Virgin is repreſented by Alcmena; and then the angel Gabriel who declared the conception, and the Holy Ghoſt who operated on that occaſion, Mercury muſt repreſent this. Wretched Poet! before you explain in this manner the whole fable of Hercules, conſider what you are about; there being ſuch abominable ideas couched under it, that my pen drops from my hand at the bare reflection on them. You will anſwer that you have not treated about it; but if a reader has ever ſo little penetration, will he not be deſirous of ſeeing the ſeveral relations of their fables; and then, is not the compariſon between Hercules and Chriſt ſhameful in all reſpects (80)?" I muſt obſerve that he excuſes our poet a little. " I alſo have ſeen ſome moral reflections on the Romance of the roſe, where the moſt laſcivious touches in it were explained for our creation, redemption, and eternal life; but there are alſo ſome execrable ideas there, which, however, I believe the Author introduced innocently, and agreeably to the ſimplicity of the age in which he lived. I indeed do not doubt but that Ronſard's intention was very good in his Chriſtian Hercules; but his performance did not anſwer his expectation. With regard to his other hymns, in thoſe on eternity, juſtice, the devils, and ſuch like, he introduces ſeveral deities, which he ſhould have left to the Greeks (81)." In criticiſing the hymns on the four ſeaſons, this Poet's maſter-piece, according to the Author of his funeral oration (82), and Paſquier (83), he points at a greater number of falſities, and even a groſs contradiction. *Though fictions are voluntary and depend on the fancy, nevertheleſs a Poet muſt not have two different opinions in the ſame work; and yet, in a following hymn which ought to be dependent on the firſt, ſince the four are connected, Ronſard ſays, that nature ſeeing it was to no purpoſe ſhe laid her hand on her huſband's (time) belly, and intwined her leg with his, tickling his fleſh at the ſame time; he not being any longer fit for the amorous congreſs, ſhe fell in love with the ſun, and lay with him, and had by him the four ſeaſons.* Here we have another birth (84). Had he not great reaſon to condemn ſuch indecent inventions? Should he have pardoned him for ſaying, to his *Helen, that ſhe muſt not forget, on Aſh-wedneſday, to come and take ſome aſhes from his heart, which the fire of love had burnt* (85)? Had he not juſt reaſon to condemn ſeveral other profane touches of our Poets, and the rewards which were beſtowed upon them.

(79) Sorel, *Remarques ſur le* 13 *Livre du Berger extravagant*, p. 648.

(80) Ibid. p. 650.

(81) Ibid. p. 652.

(82) Thoſe who have ſeen the hymns on the four ſeaſons, which I believe moſt in this aſſembly have had the curioſity to do, will confirm my opinion pretty well; and affirm, that it is ſcarce poſſible to caſt one's eyes upon them, without being charmed with them; and without confeſſing, that there muſt neceſſarily be ſome ſoul, ſome genius therein, which animates and tranſports either the Readers or Auditors. Du Perron, *Oraiſon funebre de Ronſard*, p. 198, 199.

(63) Paſquier, *Recherches*, liv. 7. ch. 11. p. 646.

(84) Sorel, *Remarques ſur le* 13 *Livre du Berger extravagant*, p. 653, 654. He had before mentioned another of Ronſard's fictions with regard to the birth of the four ſeaſons.

(85) Ibid. *Remarques ſur le* 14 *Livre*, p. 733.

" The worſt circumſtance, ſays he (86) is, that no " perſons have wrote ſo looſely in this age, on theſe " matters, as the Clergy; as though it were more " lawful for them to ſport with ſacred things, be" cauſe they have the diſpoſal of them. They were " conſidered as men, who were not ſo much the paſ" tors of the people as of their own belly, to feed " which was their only care; and as they were heard " to ſpeak profanely, the laity had the boldneſs to " do as much, a circumſtance that proved very preju" dicial to Religion. I am acquainted with ſeveral " others, who have not yet any Church preferment, " but are deſirous of obtaining ſome, though they " have no other merit than the being authors of lewd " and impious pieces. Theſe are Court-flies, who " hum about the palaces of Princes, and are inceſ" ſantly importuning them; it being thought, that " the beſt reward which can be given to Poets, is " the beſtowing benefices on them. A moſt abomi" nable cuſtom! to beſtow the revenues of the Church " on perſons, who are recompenſed only for having " been pimps to their maſters, as is manifeſt from " their love-verſes, made to foment the diſorderly " paſſions of Princes and Kings. St. Gelais indeed " was a Biſhop Deſportes an Abbot, and Ron" ſard had a benefice (87); that he even intreat" ed the King to add a croſier to his lyre; as tho' " the juſt reward of his different poems would have " been a Biſhop's See, which ought to be beſtowed " only on a man whoſe words and works are holy. " However, I will not preſume to blame all theſe " writers on that account; it being piouſly my opi" nion, that their looſe poems were wrote in their " youth; and that they ſince repented of what they " had done, and thereby made themſelves worthy of " the preferment they were raiſed to."

(86) Ibid. p. 738, 739, 740.

(87) He was Prior of Croix-val and St. Coſmus.

The laſt part of this paſſage agrees, with reſpect to our Poet, with what Baillet ſays of him. " It is " doing a good office to Ronſard's memory, to in" form the public that he condemned, in his later " years, the immoral and lewd verſes, which he had " wrote in the heat of his paſſion. He had even " begun to reform his muſe; and had formed a " reſolution to write nothing but Chriſtian poetry " during the remainder of his days. Not ſatisfied to " take care of his conſcience, with regard to the " world to come, he thought alſo of expiating for " what he had done, by ſuppreſſing ſeveral entire " compoſitions of his youth; and ſtriking out all " ſuch paſſages not approved by him in his perform" ances, the whole of which was not quite vicious. " But we may ſay, that he behaved on this occaſion, " rather like a father who cannot diveſt himſelf of " the tenderneſs he had for his children, than as an " incorruptible judge (88)." Againſt this Menage (89) oppoſes the following words of Binet to this: *Perſiſting in the reſolution* to love and addreſs one of the Queen's maids of honour, *to the laſt, he ended, as it were, his life in applauding her* (90). Thuanus obſerves, that Ronſard wrote ſome pious verſes, and well enough turned, in his expiring moments (91). I have read in Brantome, that Chatellard, a French Gentleman, who was beheaded in Scotland for entertaining a paſſion for the Queen, and, what is more, made an attempt againſt that Princeſs's honour, had no other *viaticum* and preparation for death, but a poem of Ronſard; an evident proof that he conſidered it as a very pious piece. *Being brought, the day appointed for the execution, on the ſcaffold, he took up Mr. Ronſard's hymns; and, for his eternal conſolation, read the whole hymn on death; this being a fine hymn, and proper to leſſen the fear of death; he not having any other ſpiritual book, Miniſter or Confeſſor* (92).

(88) Baillet, *Jugem. ſur le Poetes*, num. 1335.

(89) *Anti-Baillet*, chap. 145.

(90) Claude Binet, *Vie de Ronſard*, p. 143.

(91) *Etiam dum animam ageret aliquot piis verſibus non pœnitendis factis, qui poſtea cum cæteris ejus operibus editi ſunt.* Thuan. lib. 83. *ſub fin.*

(92) Brantome, *Memoirs des Dames illuſtres*, p. m. 173.

[*P*] *He was not ſucceſsful in correcting his poems.*] The following long note of Menage (93) will prove a very inſtructive commentary. " The ſecond thoughts " of Poets are often not ſo good as the firſt, as Binet " has obſerved very judiciouſly (94) with regard to " Ronſard's verſes. *Some*, ſays he, *think that ſome of the places*

(93) Menage, *Obſervat. ſur Malherbe*, p. 385, 386.

(94) In Ronſard's *Life*, p. m. 169.

which ſome other writers unhappily fall into. I muſt alſo obſerve, that the common place for this jeſt, *viz.* that Poets have poor habitations has been employed with regard to Ronſard [Q]. [" Bayle is of opinion that Ronſard was born the 11th of September " 1524, but I am perſuaded he ſhould have ſaid 1526. In the firſt place, Ronſard " himſelf, quoted by Bayle at the cloſe of the remark [B], ſays *that he was not paſt* " *thirty ſeven years in the ſpring of anno* 1563, and conſequently he was not born till " after the ſpring of 1526. Secondly, James Veillard of Chartres, Ronſard's friend, " wrote, at the ſame time with Binet and du Perron, two elogiums of Ronſard in Latin, " which were printed the 1ſt of February 1586, and entitled, *P. Ronſardi Poetæ Gallici* " *Laudatio funebris.* He there ſays, page 10. that Lewis de Ronſard was ſent into " Spain, to convey the two ſons of Francis I. who in conſequence of the treaty concluded " at Madrid the 14th of January 1526, were to continue as hoſtages in that city for their " father. He adds, that Peter de Ronſard was not born till after his father Lewis de " Ronſard was returned from his journey above-mentioned into Spain. *Lodoicus Ron-* " *ſardus regiam prolem . . . . in Hiſpaniam comitatus . . . . pro tot meritis, inde reverſus,* " *ornatus fuit à Rege ampliſſimis muneribus, auctus autem à Deo hoc Petro Ronſardo.* " Thirdly, Scævola Sammarthanus, quoted by Bayle, ſays that Ronſard (his friend) " did not *live to above threeſcore years of age*, which proves that he was born but in 1526. " The

" *places he has corrected in his works, not ſo agreeable* " *as his firſt conceptions. For it happens, particularly in* " *poetry, that the firſt fury is more natural; and that* " *the too frequent applying of the file, inſtead of bright-* " *ning and poliſhing, only wears away and ſpoils the tem-* " *per of the metal.*" Paſquier, in his Recherches, makes the ſame obſervation. " *Ronſard*, ſays he (95) Lib. 7. ch. 7. p. m. 623. " (95), *was a great Poet, but a very bad critick with* " *regard to his own works. For two or three years be-* " *fore his death, being weakened through age, afflicted* " *with the gout, and tortured with perpetual uneaſineſs* " *and ſickneſs, his poetical vein, which till then had* " *been a charming companion to him, having almoſt for-* " *ſaken him, he printed all his poems in a large volume,* " *the general order of which he changed; ſuppreſſed many* " *ſmart and fine pieces invented by him, quite changed* " *ſome entire verſes, and in ſome introduced other words,* " *which are far from being ſo ſtrong as the firſt; by* " *this means he deſtroyed the beauty which was in many* " *of them; he not conſidering, that though they were his* " *offspring, and conſequently that he might have all au-* " *thority over them, it yet did not become peeviſh old* " *age to judge of the flights of vigorous youth.* But " nothing proves this aſſertion ſo well, as the exam- " ple of Taſſo, who changed his *Gieruſalemme* for " the worſe." Taſſo has long been reproached with this. I have a book entitled, *Il duello dell' ignoranza, e della ſcienza*, (The combat between ignorance and knowledge) printed at Milan in 1607; and I there- in find, that this great Poet is blamed for ſuppreſſing ſeveral beautiful paſſages, in his *Gieruſalemme conqui- ſtata*, and ſubſtituting other ridiculous ones in their ſtead. The Author points out ſome of theſe places, after which he ſpeaks thus: *a' quali tutti gratiſſimi, e giocondiſſimi auvenimenti ſuſtituiſce il Taſſo coſe tali, che ſe con ſemplice intelligenza debbono prenderſi, ſono ſi frivole, che niente più, e ſe ci è dentro qualche miſtero, egli ci è involto con tante ambagi, ch'à ſottrarnelo non baſterebbe l'iſteſſo edippo* (96). i. e. " Taſſo, inſtead (96) *Duello dell' Ignor. & della Scienza*, lib. 4. cap. 3. p. 183. " of thoſe moſt delightful incidents, publiſhed ſuch " things, that if we are to underſtand them literal- " ly, nothing can be more trifling; but if they in- " clude ſome myſtery, it is wrapped up in ſuch deep " obſcurity, that Oedipus himſelf would not be able " to diſcover the meaning of them." The Author from whom I tranſcribed this paſſage is entitled, *Don Conſtantino de' Notari Nolano della Congregatione Caſſinenſe.* I have taken notice elſewhere (97) of the faults, which authors may fall into, by correcting their works too much. (97) See rem. [F]. of the art. LINACRE.

[Q] *The common place for this jeſt, viz. that Poets have poor habitations, has been employed againſt Ronſard.*] His condition, in this reſpect, was worſe than that of lodging in a garret, it being ſaid, that he was placed like a great lanthorn at the top of a tower; or like centinels who watch all night to prevent a houſe from taking fire. It is added, that there ſtill remains a monument of his ſad habitation; the tower in which he lived ſtill going by his name. Ronſard doubtleſs did not expect this. Poets do not care to be immortalized by ſuch incidents; and would be very ſorry, could the following thought of Horace be juſtly applied to them.

Exegi monumentum ære perennius
Regalique ſitu pyramidum altius (98). (98) Horat. Od. 30. lib. 3.

" —— I have rais'd a monument
" More ſtrong than braſs, and of a vaſt extent:
" Higher than Egypt's ſtatelieſt pyramid,
" That coſtly monument of kingly pride."

CREECH.

The teſtimony I am to produce ſays as follows. *Ron- ſard, who, we are told, did not dare to attack Rabelais, when living, in writing, though they frequently uſed to wrangle at Meadon, in the palace of the Princes of the Lorrain family, attacked him only in an epitaph, in which he ſpeaks very injuriouſly of him, becauſe Ra- belais conſidered him only as a poor, penyleſs Poet, in- ſomuch that he thought himſelf very happy to lodge in a watch tower, ſtill called Ronſard's tower, in Meudon, whence he uſed to go and pay his court at the caſtle, and where he uſed often to meet Rabelais, who never ſpared him. After all, if he was not ſo famous a Poet as Ronſard, he yet was born a Poet as well as Phy- ſician*; being infinitely more learned than that Prince of Poets of his age, and had a much better talent at raillery* (99). The book whence theſe words are ex- tracted was printed at Paris in 1697. The author did not put his name to it; but he diſcovered him- ſelf enough in his dedication (100). Though he had practiſed Phyſic fifty years, he yet was poor. His ill fortune had given his mind a ſatyrical turn; and he, at laſt, ſpent all his leiſure in criticiſing others. This appears from his ſupplement to the hiſtory of Phyſic, from his *Anti-Menagiana*; and the little book he publiſhed under the fictitious name of *Pepinacourt*, and entitled *Réflexions, Penſées, & Bons- mots anecdotes.* He died at Paris the 18 of May 1698. [" Many perſons are miſtaken in aſſerting that Ron- " ſard in ſeeing du Bartas's *work of the creation*, or " *firſt week, was ſo ſtruck with admiration*, and *con-* " *ceived ſo great an eſteem for it*, as Baillet ſays, art. " 1339, ſpeaking of du Bartas, that he made that " Poet a preſent *of a golden pen*, confeſſing that he " had done more in *a week*, than himſelf *(Ronſard)* " *had made in all his life.* Nevertheleſs this ſtory " has been adopted by the learned. Baillet extracted " it from Teiſſier's additions to Thuanus's account " of learned men, in the article du Bartas. Teiſſier " does not ſay where he had that ſtory, which, on " his bare teſtimony, ſeconded by Baillet, has paſſed " in moſt of the editions of Moreri, and even in " that of 1725, in Mr. de la Croix's *Art of Poetry*, " pag. 366. printed in 1694; in *the Hiſtory of the* " *French Poetry*, by Abbé Merveſin, p. 292. printed " in 1706. I do not know where Teiſſier borrowed " the

* *Ex utroque Apollo.*

(99) *Jugement & nouvelles Obſervations ſur les Oeuvres de Rabelais*, p. 52, 53.

(100) John Bernier, born in Blois, was the Author.

" The only circumſtance that can be objected to all this is, that Ronſard ſays, in his " verſes to Remi Belleau, that he was born the ſame year that Francis I. was taken pri- " ſoner. Now this is but a random date; and he might have ſuppoſed that this Prince had " been taken priſoner, and ſet at liberty the ſame year. Generally ſpeaking, when a man " ſays, I am not yet ſo old, he is ſuppoſed to be more certain of what he declares, than " when he ſays, I was born the ſame year when ſuch an incident happened. Nothing indeed " may more eaſily happen, than to forget or be ignorant of the exact year, in which an " incident, though otherwiſe very remarkable, happened * †."]

* From the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. Tom. 4. p. 983. col. 2.

† See rem. [B] of this art.

" the particular relating to the *golden pen*, nor re- " member any Author who mentioned it before him. " The other part of the ſtory is found in Goulart, " cited by Mr. de la Monnoye, in article 1339 of " Baillet, in Colletet, &c. I fancy that it was the " Calviniſts, who, even in Ronſard's life time, ſpread " a report, that he had reſigned the poetical ſceptre " to du Bartas, after having read *his week*. But " Ronſard being informed of this, ſtrongly denied " the truth of theſe falſe Newſmongers of Parnaſſus. " This was in a pretty ſharp ſonnet, addreſſed to " John d'Aurat (Dorat) *his maſter*, and is as follows:

Ils ont menti, d'Aurat, ceux qui le veulept dire,
Que Ronſard, don la Muſe à contenté les Rois,
Soit moins que le Bartas, & qu'il ait par ſa voix
RENDU CE TEMOIGNAGE *ennemi de ſa Lyre.*
Ils ont menti, d'Aurat, ſi bas je ne reſpire:
Je ſçay trop qui je ſuis; et mille & mille fois
Mille & mille tourmens pluſtot je ſoufrirois
QU'UN AVEU SI CONTRAIRE *au nom que je deſire, &c.*

" D'Aurat, they lie, who ſay that known Ron- " ſard,
" Whoſe fruitful muſe has oft delighted Kings,
" Stoops to du Bartas; and that Ronſard him- " ſelf,
" Confeſs'd what ſurely wou'd diſgrace his Lyre.
" D'Aurat, they lie, if there be faith in man.
" I know myſelf too well: and I wou'd ſuffer
" Unheard of tortures, rather than ſubmit
" To what would caſt eternal odium on me."

This ſonnet is in page 1601, of Ronſard's works, of the Paris edition, in two volumes folio in 1623. It is followed by ten verſes more, addreſſed to Scævola Sammarthanus, in which Ronſard declares the contempt he had for du Bartas's Poems *."]

* From the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. vol. 4. p. 984. col. 1.

ROQUETAILLADE (a) (JOHN DE LA), in Latin *De Rupeſciſſa*, a Franciſcan Frier in the Convent of Aurillac (a), in the Convent of St. Flour, was very famous in the 14th Century, as well for the liberty he took to exclaim againſt the vices of the Clergy, and the oppreſſion of the people, and to vent menacing predictions [A], as for his long

(a) See the cloſe of the rem. [A], and citation (26).

(a) Rabelais, book 1. chap. 6. ſpeaks of one *Roquetaillade*, who, according to I know not what tradition, ſprung from his mother's heel. What does he mean by this? *Rem. Crit.*

[A] *To exclaim againſt the vices of the Clergy ... and to vent menacing predictions.*] I believe the beſt Commentary I can give upon theſe words will be to quote a long paſſage from Froiſſard. *There was, in the city of Avignon, a Franciſcan Frier of great judgment and erudition, called Frier John de Roquetaillade, whom the Pope kept in the caſtle of Baignoux, becauſe of the wonderful things which he propheſied would come to paſs; and particularly of the evils which would befal the Prelates and Preſidents of holy Church, on account of their great luxury and pride; and alſo on the kingdom of France, and the great Lords of Chriſtendom, becauſe they ſo grievouſly oppreſſed the common people. And the ſaid Frier John attempted to prove his aſſertions, by the Revelations, and by the ancient books of the holy Prophets, which were opened to him by the grace of the Holy Ghoſt, ſo that he ſaid many things which it was difficult to believe. Some of them came to paſs in the time foretold by him, which he did not foretel as a Prophet, but as taken out of the ſacred writings, and by the grace of the Holy Ghoſt, which had given him underſtanding to declare all theſe antient prophecies, to proclaim to all Chriſtians the year and the time they ſhould come to paſs. He wrote, with great learning and knowledge, ſeveral books, one of which was compoſed in 1346, and therein told many marvellous things, difficult to be believed, ſeveral of which have come to paſs* (1) *... In my young days, Pope Innocent reigning in Avignon, kept impriſoned a Franciſcan, a very learned man, named John de Roquetaillade. This Franciſcan, as he uſed to ſay, and as I have been informed, (in many places privately, but not in publick) had put forth, and continued to put forth, many prophecies of great and remarkable events, and particularly that were to happen, and accordingly have happened in his time, in the Kingdom of France; he ſpoke very clearly of the taking of King John; and ſhewed that the Church would ſtill ſuffer many hardſhips, becauſe of the great luxury of thoſe who had the government of it. And at the time I ſaw him in priſon, I was once told in the Pope's palace at Avignon, of an example he had given to the Cardinal of Oſtia, called otherwiſe of Arras, and to the Cardinal of Auxerre, who had been to ſee him, and reaſon with him about his words* (2). This example is the apologue or fable related below (3). *Why do not you read*, continued he (4), *the life of St. Sylveſter, &c. how the Emperor Conſtantine gave him the Church tithes, and on what condition: he did not uſe to ride up and down with two or three hundred horſes; but continued privately in Roma, and there led a life of ſobriety with his Clergy*, &c. This Frier declared to them, that the change he propheſied in his apologue would ſoon come to paſs: *Inſomuch*, adds the Hiſtorian, *that the Cardinals were often aſtoniſhed at it, and would gladly have ſentenced him to die, could they have found any juſt cauſe for it, which they could not. So they let him live as long as nature would let him, and did not dare to ſet him at liberty, leſt he ſhould lead mankind into error, by his profound predictions, drawn from the interpretations he himſelf gave of the ſcriptures. Nevertheleſs many things (as thoſe ſay who have taken greater notice of his predictions than I did) foretold by him, and which he wrote in priſon, and endeavoured to prove by the Revelations, have come to paſs. The true proofs, with which he armed himſelf, ſaved him ſeveral times from the flames; and beſides, ſome Cardinals took pity on him, and did not proſecute him with ſo much ſeverity as they might have done.*

I ſhall make an obſervation on the diſtinction mentioned by Froiſſard. He ſays that this Franciſcan did not predict futurity as a Prophet, but only as a perſon whom the Holy Ghoſt had permitted to underſtand the prophecies. This is only a queſtion about a name, or a diſpute about words; and be this as it will, methinks this Frier's privilege equalled or ſurpaſſed that of the Prophets; for theſe did not always know what God intended to denote under images expreſſive of futurity; and conſequently a perſon to whom God reveals the true ſenſe of theſe prophetical ſigns receives a more peculiar favour. And therefore neither ſuch a man, nor his followers ought to ſcruple, upon pretence of modeſty, to call this favour a prophetical gift. If a man ſhould pretend to expound the Revelations of St. John, only by the aſſiſtance of the knowledge he might have attained by ſtudying the ſcriptures, that would be another thing; but when a perſon is perſuaded, that he underſtood the Revelations only by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt; when, I ſay, a perſon addreſſes his readers as follows: *I can affirm, that God in the way opened my eyes in ſuch a manner, as has given me inexpreſſible conſolation; for after having conſulted a hundred*

(1) Froiſſard, vol. 1. ch. 211. quoted by Du Pleſſis Mornai, *Myſtere d'Iniquité*, p. 449.

(2) Ibid. vol. 3. chap. 24. cited ibid. p. 450.

(3) In the rem. [D].

(4) Froiſſard, quoted by Du Pleſſis, *Myſtere d'Iniquité*, p. 450.

long impriſonment by way of puniſhment for his boldneſs [*B*]. Some relate that his predictions were juſtified by the event; but others affirm that the very contrary happened to what he had propheſied [*C*]. He did not properly boaſt of his being a Prophet, but that God had indulged him the ſecrets of the Revelations and the reſt of the Scripture prophecies.

times eternal truth, with the moſt profound humility, and the deepeſt attention, it at laſt anſwered (5); does not ſuch a one ſet himſelf up for a perſon raiſed in an extraordinary manner by Heaven, to predict futurity? is not this really calling one's ſelf a Prophet, or more than a Prophet? This is my firſt obſervation, and here follows the other. All Hiſtorians are not agreed that John de la Roquetaillade owned his not being a Prophet. Read the following paſſage from an Author who wrote the life of Innocent VI. *Circa idem tempus*, (that is anno 1356) *inſurrexit quidam frater ordinis Minorum de conventu Aureliaci dioceſis ſancti Flori, dicens ſe habere* SPIRITUM PROPHETIÆ, *qui de futuris dicebat & in ſcriptis redigebat multa, vocatus frater Joannes de Rupeſciſſa qui quia potius vaticinator quam* PROPHETA *merito erat cenſendus, ad dictum Innocentium fuit adductus, &c.* (6). i. e. "About the year 1356, "there aroſe a certain Franciſcan Frier, belonging "to the Convent of Aurillac, in the Dioceſe of St. "Flour, declaring himſelf to have a ſpirit of pro- "phecy, who ſpoke of things to come, and wrote "many things. This man was called Frier John "de Rupeſciſſa, (Roquetaillade) who, becauſe he was "to be looked upon as a Diviner, rather than a Pro- "phet, was brought before the ſaid Innocent, *&c.*" It is certain our Franciſcan Frier declared very expreſsly in his writings, that he was not a Prophet. Read what I ſhall quote hereunder (7) from a Journaliſt.

[*B*] *His long impriſonment by way of puniſhment for his boldneſs.*] Froiſſard had juſt before informed us, that the Monk kept this Frier in priſon in the Caſtle of Bagnols. Another writer affirms, that about the year 1356, this pretended Prophet was ſent to Pope Innocent VI. who impriſoned him, and never ſuffered him to be releaſed (8). But this was not the firſt time of this Frier's being impriſoned; he being confined anno 1345 in the Convent of Figeac, by order of Frier William Farmena, Miniſter of the Franciſcans of the Provence of Aquitain, as appears from the beginning of the Revelations of this Prophet. We alſo find there, that he committed them to writing at the requeſt of Cardinal William Curti. His words ought to be cited. *Ego frater Johannes de Rupeſciſſa ordinis fratrum Minorum provinciæ Aquitaniæ, provinciæ Ruthenenſis, & conventus Aurelhiaci, ad mandatum veſtrum deſcripſi ſeriem notabilium eventuum futurorum mihi in carceribus apertam, prout meliùs & veriùs potero recordari. Modus revelandi fuit iſte. Cùm anno Domini milleſimo trecenteſimo quadrageſimo quinto multis diebus flerem, vinctus ferro in carcere luti in conventu Figiaci ſtupens & mirans quare cum tanta crudelitate miſſus eſſem per fratrem Guillermum Farmena tunc miniſtrum Aquitaniæ in carcerem, &c.* (9). i. e. "I "John Francis de Roquetaillade, a Franciſcan, of "the Province of Aquitain, in the Province of Rou- "ergue, and Convent of Aurillac, have com- "mitted to writing, at your command, a ſeries of "remarkable events that will come to paſs, (revealed "to me in priſon) which I have ſet down to the beſt "of my memory. The manner of the Revelation "was as follows. When in the year of our Lord one "thouſand three hundred and forty five, I had be- "wailed myſelf for many days, being bound in "chains in the priſon belonging to the Convent of "Figeac; aſtoniſhed and wondering why I ſhould "be ſo barbarouſly ſent thither by Frier William "Farmena, at that time Miniſter in Aquitain, *&c.*" One would imagine it might be inferred from theſe words, that he did not begin to be favoured with the gift of Revelation till he was thrown into priſon; and this would naturally give one a curioſity to enquire the reaſon why his ſuperiors bound him in chains. Some relate that it was on account of his heretical principles; but the Writers who are the neareſt to that age ſay, that the only reaſon of his being ſent to priſon was, becauſe he pretended to foretel the near approach of Anti-chriſt; and aſſerted many particulars diſpleaſing to the Popes and ſovereign Princes; he declaring, that to their ambition, pride, and avarice, was owing all the calamities foretold by him (10). Alciatus ranks him among thoſe perſons, who had involved themſelves in great troubles, by a certain method employed by them to maintain and ſupport religion. Theſe give out prophecies; and this is the principal inſtrument they employ, in order to frighten thoſe perſons whom they could not prevail upon to ſerve God: *Sunt & qui vaticinia ſe ſcire profiteantur, hocque potiſſimum modo, quos verbis ad cultum & pietatem inducere neſciunt, terrere conantur, quod merito Hercule in malam rem Johanni de Rupeſciſſa Symmiſtæ veſtro vertit. Cum enim ſe à Deo admonitum univerſalis judicii affirmaret, cumque mundi finem adeſſe conclamaret, quia dictis ejus res non reſponderunt, Avinione ab Urbano quinto captus in cuſtodia manſit* (11). i. e. "There are ſome, who "pretend to be endued with the gift of prophecy; "and by this means principally, they endeavour to "frighten into religion and piety, thoſe whom "they cannot prevail upon by exhortations; which "indeed proved juſtly fatal to John de Roquetaillade, "your fellow-labourer in the miniſtry. For when "he declared aloud, that he was warned by Hea- "ven of the approach of the general Judgment, "and affirmed that the world would ſoon be at an "end; Pope Urban V. becauſe the event did not "happen according to his prediction, cauſed him to "be ſeized, and kept him in priſon." Alciatus has been guilty of an error in chronology on this occaſion, Roquetaillade being impriſoned by Pope Innocent VI. predeceſſor to Urban V.

[*C*] *Some relate that his predictions were juſtified by the event; but others affirm, that the very contrary happened to what he had propheſied.*] The reader has ſeen that Froiſſard declares, that ſeveral things foretold by this Franciſcan, came to paſs. The author of the life of Innocent VI does not deny this circumſtance; but he adds, that the predictions of our Frier had been falſe, whence he juſtly concludes that he was not a Prophet. *Licet in dictis & ſcriptis ſuis reperta fuerint multa, quæ proceſſu temporis contigerunt, propter quæ plures ſibi fidem dabant, tamen etiam multa defuerunt, & ſic apparebat quia non erat verè Propheta, quia in illis, ſi talis fuiſſet, nullus fuiſſet defectus* (12). i. e. "Al- "though many things ſpoke and written by him, "were juſtified, in proceſs of time, by the event, for "which reaſon ſeveral gave credit to him; yet many "did not come to paſs. This ſhewed evidently that "he was not a true Prophet; becauſe, had he been "ſuch, there would have been no defect in any of "his prophecies." I do not wonder at its being believed, that he had foretold the truth in ſeveral particulars; for firſt, thoſe who exclaim againſt public irregularities, and affirm that God will ſoon revenge an oppreſſed nation, will chaſtiſe avarice, luxury, and the pride of the great, coincide in that reſpect ſo well with the judgment of the multitude, that theſe take a pleaſure in aiding the prediction, and interpret, in its favour, every thing they ſee happen. Secondly, the world has, in all ages, been afflicted with ſuch great calamities, wars both inteſtine and foreign, with plagues, famine &c. that any perſons in any age, who ſhall propheſy fatal events, and dreadful chaſtiſements of God's wrath, will certainly hit upon the truth. But to ſilence at once all the partizans of la Roquetaillade, we need but make one obſervation, which is, that the chief points in his prophecy proved falſe. He foretold the entire ruin of the Clergy; the coming of an angel, who, in quality of Chriſt's vicar, would introduce a Reformation in all things, and convert all the infidels; a peace that ſhould continue about a thouſand years throughout the whole earth (13). He ſaid that all theſe things ſhould ſoon happen, and conſequently he told an untruth two ways; for nothing like this happened, either in the age he lived in, or in the following till this time (14). Here follows a paſſage from a pretty good chronicle. *Joannes de Rupeſciſſa Minorum*

(5) Jurieu, Preface to *Accompliſſement des Prophéties*, folio ***.

(6) *Autor. primæ Vitæ Innocentii VI* vulgatæ *à Baluzio*, p. 332. Tom. 1. *Vitarum Paparum Avenionenſium.*

(7) In the rem. [*F*].

(8) *Ad dictum Innocentium Papam fuit adductus, per quem fuit carceribus mancipatus, in quibus permanſit per totum tempus ipſius.* Idem, Ibid.

(9) Joh. de Rupeſciſſa, *init. Revelationum*, apud *Baluzium Not. ad Vitas Paparum Avenion.* p. 942.

(10) *Quod autem ſunt nonnulli recentiores qui ob hæreſim in vincula conjectum dixerunt, non ita antiquiores qui nonniſi ob prophetias de Anti-chriſto proximè venturo . . . captum volunt.* Spond. ad ann. 1356. num. 20. p. m. 540.

(11) Andreas Alciatus, *Epiſt. contra vitam Monaſticam*, p. 65, 66.

(12) *Autor. primæ vitæ Innocentii VI.* apud *Vitas Paparum Avenionenſium.*

(13) Spond. ad ann. 1356. num. 20. p. m. 540.

(14) I write this in April 1701.

prophecies. See a paſſage from Froiſſard in the remark [A]. Great notice was taken of the apologue or fable employ'd by him, to ſhew that the ſame Princes, who had enriched the church of Rome, would reduce it to its primitive poverty [D]. He wrote ſeveral books [E], part of which only are printed. Two of them are inſerted in the Appendix to *Faſciculus rerum expetendarum & fugiendarum* [F]. It is aſſerted (b) that he was a great Divine and a good Philoſopher. I know not whether he died in priſon; but I believe that thoſe who ſay he was burnt are miſtaken [G]. James Fodera relates, that he was buried at Villefranche, in the dioceſe of Lyons, in the convent of the Franciſcans (c). Raynaldus, who endeavoured to take advantage of a prophecy of this Monk, was very ſolemnly

(b) Trithemius, *de Script. Eccleſ.*

(c) Jacob. Fodera, *in Hiſt. Provinciæ Sancti Bonaventuræ*, p. 318, 322. apud *Baluzium Not. ad Vitas Paparum Avenionenſium*, p. 943.

Minorum ordinis inſignis Theologus tempeſtate hac præter ea, quæ in ſententiarum libros accurate docteque ſcripſerat, in carcerem truſus multa de futuris tanquam Propheta ſcribere præſumpſit, videlicet de duobus Antichriſtis, & de eccleſiæ conciliatione & de converſione omnium gentium ad fidem Chriſti, & alia multa, quæ in januis adeſſe affirmabat. Et hæc a domino Jeſu Chriſto ſibi revelata fuiſſe conteſtabatur, quæ non modo non evenere, ſed oppoſitum in omnibus fuiſſe conſtat. Hujuſmodi autem prognoſticatores multi ab initio decepti fuere. Quibus ſatius fuiſſet ſilere, quam talia temere loqui (15). i. e. "John de Roquetaillade, a Franciſcan, and famous "Divine at this time, beſides thoſe things which he "had learnedly and accurately wrote on the books "of the Sentences, being impriſoned, preſumed to "write many things concerning futurity, in quality "of a Prophet; viz, on the two Antichriſts, on the "union of the Church, and the converſion of all "nations to the Chriſtian Faith; and a great many "other things which he ſaid would ſoon come to "paſs. And he ſolemnly affirmed that thoſe parti-"culars had been revealed to him by Chriſt, which "not only never happened, but the very contrary to "them. A great number of ſuch prognoſticators "have been deceived from the beginning. It were "much better that they continued ſilent than to "give out, raſhly, ſuch things."

(15) Jacobus Philipus Bergomas, ad ann. 1375.

[D] *Great notice was taken of the apologue or fable employed by him, to ſhew that the ſame Princes, who had enriched the Church of Rome, would reduce it to its primitive poverty.*] He employed it when the Cardinals of Arras and Auxerre, went to viſit our Frier in priſon, in order to cenſure him. Du Pleſſis Mornai draws a proof from thence, of the oppoſitions which were made to Antichriſt. Let us ſee in what manner he abridges the long relation given by Froiſſard. "The ſubſtance is as follows; that the Church would "be like to a very beautiful bird, which ſhould be "hatched unfledged; and, not being able to fly, "ſhould be in danger of ſtarving. That the other "birds ſhould have taken pity on her, ſhould have "covered her with their feathers; that Kings and "Princes ſhould have enriched her with their de-"meſnes, and honoured her above meaſure. That "upon this ſhe ſhould have grown proud; or ſeeing "herſelf grown up, and imagining ſhe now had "no farther occaſion for them, ſhould peck at them, "and to quarrel with Emperors and Princes. That, "upon this, the birds would reſolve to reſume their "feathers; and in this manner the Princes would "take back their gifts and demeſnes, till at laſt ſhe "would be forced to implore their ſuccour: and the "Emperor and the reſt of the Chriſtian Princes "would ſtrip her of all, in caſe ſhe grew proud "again (16)." Du Pleſſis adds, *that this apologue of the birds is manifeſtly grounded on the XVIIth chapter of the Revelations, where it is ſaid* *, that Kings ſhall give their power and authority to the beaſt or harlot; *but they afterwards* ſhall hate her, make her deſolate, eat her fleſh, and burn her with fire. Wolfius has inſerted, in his firſt tome, all theſe paſſages of Froiſſard, and added to it a figure of the bird of the apologue (17). I am to obſerve that Roquetaillade declared, that *it would not be long before the Church would be impoveriſhed*, but he is greatly miſtaken. See Coeffeteau's anſwer to du Pleſſis (18). The ſame thing is ſtill predicted about the end of the XVIIth century.

(16) Du Pleſſis Mornai, *Myſtere d'Iniquité*, p. 450.

* *Apoc. c.* xvii. 7. *v.* 13. & 16.

(17) Joh. Wolfius, *Lectionum memor. & reconditarum*, Cent. 14. p. m. 623 & *ſeq.* Tom. 1.

(18) Coeffeteau, *Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité*, p. 1076.

[E] *He wrote ſeveral books.*] Beſides his prophecies, he wrote a book *de conſideratione quintæ eſſentiæ*, one *de familiatu philoſophiæ*, one entitled *Vade mecum in tribulatione*, and a commentary *ſuper prophetiam Cyrilli eremitæ preſbyteri*. Baluze (19) ſpeaks of this laſt work as being in manuſcript in the King's library; and ſays that the others are in manuſcript in that of Mr. Colbert (20). I am to obſerve that the book *de conſideratione quintæ eſſentiæ rerum omnium*, was printed at Baſil in 1561 (21). It is affirmed, in Geſner's epitome (22); and it is there ſaid, by an error of an hundred years, that the author lived about the year 1240. I have quoted elſewhere (23) Naudæus, who has mentioned this book of *Joannes de Rupeſciſſa*. There is extant a book, under the name of this apocalyptical Frier, entitled *de confectione veri lapidis philoſophorum*, printed at Baſil in 1561.

(19) Baluz, *Not. ad Vitas Paparum Avenion.* p. 1434.

(20) Idem, p. 942.

(21) The Bodleian catalogue mentions the Baſil edit. of 1597.

(22) *Epit. Bibl. Geſneri*, p. m. 492.

(23) Rem. [E], of the art. ALBERTUS MAGNUS.

[F] *Two are inſerted in the Appendix to* Faſciculus rerum expetendarum & fugiendarum.] This book was printed in London, in the year 1690; and the Author of the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle* made very ample mention of it in his XIXth volume (24). Here follows what he ſays concerning our author. "(25) "Two books of this Frier have been inſerted here, "the one whereof is entitled, *A copy of the prophecy "of Frier John de la Roquetaillade, a Franciſcan, of "the province of Guienne, Guardian of Rhodes, and Ad-"vocate of Orleans* (26); *priſoner at Avignon in the "eighth year of the pontificate of Clement VI, in the "priſon called Soldan, in November, the year of the in-"carnation MCCCXLIX.* . . (27). Roquetaillade's "other work is entitled *Vade mecum in tribulatione*. "In this book, called by him *librunculus*, he declares "that he is not a Prophet, as thoſe who had re-"ceived immediate revelations from God; and who "uſed to ſay, in declaring, *Thus ſaith the Lord*; but "that God had given him the talent of ſeeing, by "the Scripture, what was to happen (28). He "points out ſome of his books, in which he takes "notice, that he had foretold ſome events very ex-"actly; and he ſeems to have written this in "MCCCLVI. He afterwards propoſes twenty ex-"plications of the Revelations, which he calls *inten-"tiones*. In the firſt, he propheſies that the Pope "ſhall one day ſubdue the whole earth, which will "conſider him as its Paſtor; a prediction quite con-"trary to that of our Proteſtant interpreters, of the "Revelations, who are not much more happy, in "their predictions, than John de la Roquetaillade; "and ſome of whom are, perhaps, more blame-"worthy, becauſe they endeavour to make Princes "engage in endleſs wars, in order to give ſucceſs "to their conjectures. Our Frier at leaſt, *non erat "intentionis faciendi guerras* (had no deſign to make "war) and would make uſe of none but ſpiritual "arms; whereas ſome of our Roquetaillades of this "age would employ forcible methods, to oblige "*erroneous conſciences* to make profeſſion of their ſen-"timents, without believing them."

(24) From page 331, to p. 363.

(25) *Bibl. Univ.* Tom. 19. p. 348.

(26) In the Latin, p. 492, *Appendicis Faſciculi*, it is *Cuſtodis Ruthenenſis ac Cauſidici Aureliaci*. This laſt word ſignifies of *Aurillac* and not of *Orleans*. As to *Cauſidicus*, it denotes ſome employment which anſwers to that of Frier-Attorney of the Benedictines, or Carthuſians; but I don't know how it is called among the Mendicant Friers. I believe it is not called Advocate. ["The Latin a-"bove, *Cauſidici "Ruthenenſis ac "Aureliaci*, "muſt certainly "be erroneous. "It ought to be "*Cuſtodiæ Ru-"thenenſis*, that "is of the *Cuſ-"todie* (or part) "of Rhodez; "the provinces "among the "Franciſcans "being divided "into *Cuſtodies*. "With regard to "the word *Cau-"ſidici*, which "puzzled Bayle, "this is another "error, ariſing, "perhaps, from "there being in "the MSS. only "a *C*, or a *C* "with ſome o-"ther letters, by "way of abbre-"viation, ſigni-"fying *Conven-*

[G] *I believe that thoſe who ſay he was burnt are miſtaken.*] "Some ſay that he was burnt at laſt (29)." Theſe are du Pleſſis's words, who writes in the margin, *Petrus Premonſtratenſis in Chronico quod inſcribitur Biblia pauperum*. Baluze rejects this, and ſays (30), he cannot

(29) Du Pleſſis, *Myſtere d'Iniquité*, p. 450.

(30) Baluzius, *Notis ad Vitas Paparum Avenion.* p. 942.

"*tualis* or *Conventus*. In Baluze, p. 942, it is *Provinciæ Ruthenenſis & conventus Aureliaci.*"] From the Paris edit. to Bayle's Dict. p. 984. col. 1 and 2. (27) *Bibl. Univerſ.* Tom. 19. p. 349. (28) The ſecond continuator of William de Nangis, cited by Dacheri Specileg. Tom. 11. p. 822. relates, that this Monk, being conſulted, by the Archbiſhop of Toulouſe, in order to know futurity, in 1356, anſwered, *Ego ſicut unus vilis & abominabilis peccator ea quæ dico, non dico de capite meo, nec ſum propheta, ſed tantum per intelligentias Prophetarum*, i. e. "I, as a vile and abominable ſinner, "do not ſpeak, out of my own head, what I ſay; nor am I a Prophet, but only by underſtanding the Prophets." He anſwered many things, the greateſt part of which did not come to paſs. See Brown's Preface, in the Appendix to *Faſciculus Rerum expetendarum*.

ſolidly refuted by Baluze [*H*].

tell whence Cæſar Noſtradamus (31) was told, that this Frier was burnt publickly, by the Pope's order, at Avignon, in 1362. The paſſages in Froiſſard would be a ſtrong refutation of this falſity, though we had not the teſtimony of thoſe, who ſay (32), that Rupeſciſſa was buried at Villefranche, in a Convent where he had taken the habit of St. Francis.

(31) Cæſar Noſtradamus, *in Hiſt. Provinciæ*, p. 411.

(32) Jacobus Fodera, *apud* Baluzium, ibid.

[*H*] *Raynaldus, who endeavoured to take advantage of a prophecy of this Monk, was ſolidly refuted by Baluze.*] He applied it to the election of Pope Urban VI. *Odoricus Raynaldus an.* 1379 *n.* 12. *refert inſigne, ut ille vocat, vaticinium viri religioſi Joannis è Rupeſciſſa inventum inter monumenta Avenionenſia, ex quo multum adjuvari putat cauſam Urbani* (33). i. e. "Odoricus "Raynaldus, ann. 1379. n. 12. takes notice of a fa- "mous prophecy, as he calls it, of Frier John de "Roquetaillade, found at Avignon, among other "writings; which prophecy, he is of opinion, was "of great ſervice to the promoting of Urban's cauſe." The prophecy is (34), that the See of Rome will be vacant eighteen months, and that at the time of the conclave, ſo mighty a battle will be fought between the ſeveral nations and the Tyrants of Italy, and ſo great an effuſion of blood, that it will be thought the end of the world is at hand. Then, by a juſt judgment of God, an Anti-pope ſhall be choſe, by the ſuggeſtions of a double-tongued impoſtor, *ad ſuggeſtionem unius bilinguis falſarii*; which impoſtor, according to Raynaldus, is the Cardinal of Amiens. But Baluze ſhews two things (35), firſt, that the prophecy does not relate to the time in which Urban VI. was elected Pope; ſecondly, that if it is referred to thoſe times, it would be more contrary to Urban VI. than to the pretended Anti-pope, Clement VII. He ſhews, by Roquetaillade's Commentary on Cyril's prophecy, that the vacancy of the papal chair, during a year and an half, refers to the time that the Anti-chriſt will appear. Now here are the characteriſticks of this time: the Kings of France and England will then fight againſt the Infidels in the eaſt. Now this does not coincide in any manner with the time of the ſchiſm of Pope Urban VI. and Clement VII. I am to obſerve, that this Franciſcan owns that the Anti-pope will be elected to the diſhonour of Chriſt Jeſus, and of the true Pontiff (36), and that the Anti-chriſt will maintain the Anti-pope's cauſe. *Illud ſcandalum erit majus quia Anti-chriſtus partem Anti-papæ ſuſtinebit* (37). Hence it is manifeſt, that he did not look upon the Pope as Anti-chriſt.

(33) Baluz, ibid. p. 1160, 1161.

(34) See Baluze, ibid.

(35) Idem, ibid. and p. 1459.

(36) *In contumeliam Chriſti & veri Pontificis*, Joh. de Rupeſciſſa, *apud* Baluz. p. 1161.

(37) Idem, *apud eundem*, p. 1459.

RORARIUS (JEROM), Nuncio of Pope Clement VII. at the court of Ferdinand King of Hungary (*a*), wrote a book which deſerves to be peruſed. He undertook to ſhew therein, not only that beaſts are rational creatures, but alſo, that they make a better uſe of their reaſon than man. The circumſtance which prompted him to write this book is curious and extraordinary. He happened to be in a converſation, wherein a learned man maintained, that Charles V. was not equal to the Othos nor to Frederick Barbaroſſa. This alone made Rorarius conclude that brutes are more rational than men, and immediately he ſet about writing a treatiſe on this ſubject [*A*]; and this was at the time that Charles V. was engaged in war againſt the league of Smalcalde. This book is not ill writ; and contains a great number of ſingular particulars with regard to the ingenuity of beaſts, and the perverſity of man. Thoſe, which relate to the capacity of brutes, puzzle very much both the followers of Des Cartes, and thoſe of Ariſtotle [*B*]: the former declare

(*a*) Rorarius, *quod animalia bruta ratione utantur melius homine*, lib. 1. p. 57. Amſt. edit. 1654.

[*A*] *Immediately he ſet about writing a treatiſe on this ſubject.*] There are two dedications to this work; the firſt to the Biſhop of Arras, dated the 1ſt of March 1547, and the other to Cardinal Chriſtopher Mandrucio, Biſhop of Trent. This work lay buried near an hundred years in the dark receſſes of libraries; but at laſt Naudæus printed it in France, and dedicated it to Meſſieurs de Puy; and his dedication is dated from Paris the 9th of April 1645. It has been reprinted in Holland more than once (1). I know not why it has been inſerted in the books of Phyſick, in *Lindenius renovatus*. I am firmly perſuaded, that I ſhall be accuſed of producing proofs ſometimes, without any neceſſity for it; but it would be unjuſt to aſſert this, with regard to what I advanced concerning the motive which engaged Rorarius to compoſe the book in queſtion. If I did not quote his own words, the Reader might naturally ſuppoſe, that I had framed to myſelf the idea of a chimerical Writer, merely to divert him; for what can be more whimſical and extravagant, than for a man to take up the pen, in order to rank mankind below brutes, only becauſe a learned man is diſpleaſed, that the Emperor Charles V. aſpires to univerſal monarchy, without having the qualities of Otho the Great, or Frederick Barbaroſſa? It therefore will be highly incumbent on me to prove what I aſſerted above. *Eram, illuſtriſſime Princeps*, (ſays Rorarius) *paucis ante diebus, ubi de Cæſare ſermo habeatur; & fuit doctiſſimus alioqui vir, qui diceret, neſcire quo odore olens Chriſtianum orbem ditionis ſuæ facere niteretur. Haberet in ſe ſaltem quo cum Othonibus, aut Federico Ænobarbo conferri poſſet. Movit (fateor) mihi ſtomachum, dignum immortalitate Principem illis poſtponi: qui licet inſignes fuerint, ſi tamen in unum omnes congerantur, hujus magnitudini non ſufficiant. Itaque in mentem mihi venit animalia bruta ſæpe ratione uti melius homine, idque duobus libellis oſtendi* (2). i. e. "Moſt illuſtrious Prince, I was, a few "days ſince, in a place, where the Emperor was the "ſubject of the diſcourſe. In this company was a "perſon, in other reſpects of great learning, who "ſaid, that he could not conceive on what grounds "that Monarch ſhould attempt to ſubdue the Chri- "ſtian world; and that he ought, at leaſt, to poſſeſs "the qualities, which might make him worthy of "being compared to Otho or Frederic Ænobarbus. "I will own that I was exaſperated, to hear a "Prince, worthy of immortality, poſtponed to them, "who, though very illuſtrious, nevertheleſs, were "both their qualities united, yet would be in- "ferior to his greatneſs. This ſuggeſted to me an "opinion, that brutes frequently make a better uſe "of their reaſon than men, and I have attempted "to prove it in two books." But he was not contented with making this ſingle declaration; he having before declared this in another dedication. *Scripſeram libellos duos, in quibus oſtenderam animalia bruta ſæpè ratione uti melius homine; idque feceram, ut quorundam impudentiam, anne potius dementiam, retunderem; qui maximi omnium Imperatorum Caroli Quinti ſplendorem intueri non valent* (3). i. e. "I had wrote two "little books, wherein I ſhewed, that brutes fre- "quently make a better uſe of their reaſon than "men: and this I was prompted to, in order to re- "preſs the impudence or rather madneſs of ſome "perſons, whoſe eye is not ſtrong enough to be- "hold the glories of Charles V, the greateſt of all "Emperors." If the reader peruſes the reſt of this dedication, he will find that the author of it was ſtrongly prejudiced in favour of Charles V, and a great flatterer. There have been, and ſtill are, many people like him.

(1) I make uſe of the Amſterdam edit. of 1654, in 12mo.

(2) Rorarius, *Epiſt. dedicat. ad Madrutium Cardinalem.*

(3) Idem, *Epiſt. dedicat. ad Epiſcopum Atrebatenſem.*

[*B*] *The particulars . . . relating to the capacity of brutes, puzzle both the followers of Des Cartes, and thoſe of Ariſtotle.*] This does not require any proof with regard to the Carteſians; every one knows how difficult it is to explain, how it is poſſible for mere machines to effect what animals perform. I will there-

declare that beaſts have no ſouls; whilſt the latter aſſert they have a ſoul, endued with ſenſation, memory and paſſion, but not with reaſon. It is pity Des Cartes's opinion ſhould be ſo difficult to maintain, and ſo very improbable; it being, otherwiſe, of vaſt advantage to the orthodox faith [C], which is the only reaſon why ſome perſons will not quit

therefore only prove, that a peripatetic muſt be greatly puzzled, whenever he is to account for their conduct. Every peripatetic, who is told that brutes are only *automata*, or machines, immediately objects, that a dog who has been beat, for touching a diſh of meat, leaves off eating the inſtant his maſter threatens to cudgel him again. But to ſhew that this phænomenon cannot be explained by him who propoſes it, it is ſufficient to obſerve, that if this dog's action be attended with knowledge, the dog muſt neceſſarily reaſon; he neceſſarily muſt compare the preſent with the paſt, and draw a concluſion from it. He muſt remember, both the blows he has received, and the reaſon why he received them; he muſt know, that if he flew to the diſh of meat which ſtrikes his ſenſes, he would commit the ſame action for which he was beat; and muſt conclude, that, in order to eſcape being beat again, he ought to abſtain from that meat. Now is not this certainly reaſoning? Can we explain this circumſtance by barely ſuppoſing, that a ſoul is indued with ſenſation, but without reflecting on its actions; without calling to mind paſt tranſactions; without comparing two ideas, and without drawing any inference or concluſion? If we examine the examples that are collected (4), and objected to the Carteſians, it will appear that they prove too much; they proving that brutes compare the end with the means; and prefer, on ſome occaſions, what is honeſt to what is profitable; in a word, that they are guided by the rules of equity and gratitude. Rorarius relates, that ſome horſes have refuſed to leap the mares they ſprung from; or having done this unknowingly, deceived by the artifices of a groom, threw themſelves down a precipice, after they knew what they had done. *Teſtantur litterarum monumenta, fuiſſe gregis cuſtodem, qui equum ut matrem iniret, nunquam inducere potuerit; & quoniam ambo eximia ſpecie erant, fraude tamen illuſiſſe, velatis oculis, ne matrem videret: detracto poſtmodum operimento, & agnito cum matre concubitu, petiiſſe prærupta, & ſe patrati ſceleris reum peſſundediſſe. Maris hæc virtus; alibi fœminæ, ſiquidem in Reatino agro equa lacerato priùs auriga, qui flagitii auctor fuerat, eundem exitum habuit* (5). i. e. "It is recorded, that a certain herdſman, "though he employed his utmoſt endeavours, could "never prevail with a horſe of his to cover its dam; "and as both were extremely beautiful, he was obliged to have recourſe to fraud, he hoodwinking its "eyes, that the dam might not be ſeen; but the "bandage being afterwards taken off, by which "means the horſe diſcovered what he had done, "he flew to a precipice, and plunged headlong, conſcious of the guilt he had committed. Such was "the virtue of a male; and now follows the like "inſtance of a female. In the territory of Reate, a "mare, after tearing to pieces a coachman who "was the cauſe of its guilt, made the like exit." What he relates, as well as other authors, how eagerly ſome dogs had endeavoured to ſuccour their maſters, to revenge their deaths, &c. cannot abſolutely be explained according to the doctrine of the Peripateticks; ſo that all their diſputes againſt Des Cartes's diſciples is loſt labour; and there is no need of any thing but the dextrous management employed by Pereira. You acknowledge, uſed he to ſay to his antagoniſts (6), that brutes do many things like what is done by a reaſonable ſoul, and nevertheleſs think that they are not performed with a reaſonable ſoul. Why therefore do you forbid me to aſſert, that they perform ſeveral things which are like to thoſe done by a ſenſitive ſoul, though theirs is not ſo. I am not ſurprized that neither Des Cartes, nor his followers, have not taken advantage of a paſſage in the Code of Juſtinian, in which it is ſaid that brutes are incapable of doing an injury, becauſe they are not endued with ſenſe (7). It is plain that the word *ſenſus*, in this place, ought to be taken for deſign and underſtanding.

(4) See in Lipſius, *Ep.* 1. *Cent.* 1. *Miſcellan.* ſeveral ſurprizing actions performed by elephants. This letter is a commentary, by way of example, on the words of Pliny, quoted in the rem. [D]. See, with regard to horſes, Lipſius, *Cent.* 3. *ad Belgas, Epiſt.* 56. and alſo concerning dogs, *Cent.* 1. *ad Belg. Epiſt.* 44.

(5) Rorarius, lib. 2. p. 72.

(6) See citat. 55 of the art. PEREIRA.

(7) *Nec enim poteſt animal in juria feciſſe quod ſenſu caret.* See Grotius, Flor. Sparſ. *ad Jus Juſtinianeum*, p. 324. edit. Amſtel. 1643. 12mo.

[C] *Des Cartes's opinion . . . is of a vaſt advantage to the orthodox faith.*] The circumſtance, which prompts the Carteſians to ſay that beaſts are *automata*, is becauſe according to them, all matter is incapable of thinking. They are not ſatisfied with ſaying, that none but ſpiritual ſubſtances are capable of reflecting, and forming a long chain of reaſoning; but they aſſert that every thought, whether it be called reflection, meditation, inferring from principles; whether it be called ſenſation, imagination, inſtinct; is of ſuch a nature, that the moſt ſubtle and moſt perfect matter is incapable of it; and that it can be found only in incorporeal ſubſtances. According to this principle, there is no man but may be convinced of the immortality of his own ſoul. Every man knows that he thinks; and conſequently, if he reaſons after the Carteſian manner, he cannot doubt that what, in him, is the ſubject of thought, is diſtinct from the body: whence it reſults that, in this reſpect, he is immortal; for the mortality of creatures conſiſts only in this, that they are compoſed of ſeveral parts of matter, which detach themſelves one from the other. This is a great advantage to Religion; but it will be almoſt impoſſible to preſerve it by philoſophical reaſons, if it be granted that brutes have a material ſoul which periſhes with the body; a ſoul, I ſay, whoſe ſenſations and deſires are the cauſe of the actions which we ſee them do. See the remark [F]. The theological advantages of Des Cartes's opinion, with reſpect to beaſts being *automata*, do not ſtop there: they extend to many important principles, which cannot be maintained with any ſtrength, if we admit that brutes have a ſenſitive ſoul. If St. Auſtin maintained theſe principles, tho' he allowed this ſort of ſoul in beaſts; and if he was not much puzzled about the connexion of theſe two things, he was more fortunate than wiſe. *From the principles which he carefully examined, and ſolidly eſtabliſhed, it manifeſtly follows*, that brutes have no ſoul, *as Ambroſius Victor* (8) *ſhews, in his ſixth volume of Chriſtian Philoſophy* (9). The Author from whom I borrow theſe words ſuppoſes, *that this holy Doctor*, knowing *too well how to diſtinguiſh the ſoul from the body, to imagine that there are corporeal ſouls*, admitted a ſpiritual ſoul in brutes (10). Now here follows a ſpecimen he gives us of the principles St. Auſtin maintained, and which are incompatible with that ſoul of brutes. *Some of St. Auſtin's principles are, that a creature which has never ſinned can never ſuffer any evil; now, according to him, pain is the greateſt of evils, and brutes ſuffer pain. That the more noble thing cannot have for its end the leſs noble; now, according to him, the ſoul of brutes is ſpiritual and more noble than the body, and nevertheleſs they have no other end than the body. That what is ſpiritual is immortal; and the ſoul of brutes, though ſpiritual, is ſubject to death. There are many more ſuch principles in St. Auſtin's works, whence it may be inferred, that beaſts have no ſuch ſpiritual ſoul as he admits in them* (11). I am not apt to think that St. Auſtin believes the ſoul of brutes to be an incorporeal ſubſtance; but however this be, the ſecond opinion, which is given us here by way of example, is inconſiſtent with the opinion of this great father; for that which knows is more noble than that which does not know; now St. Auſtin aſcribed ſenſation, at leaſt, to the ſoul of brutes; he therefore believed it to be much more noble than the body; he therefore maintained, on the one hand, that the more noble cannot have for its end the leſs noble; and, on the other, that the ſoul of brutes, more noble than the body, has no other end than their body. This, will it be ſaid, is of little concern to Religion. You miſtake, will it be anſwered; for all the proofs of original ſin, drawn from diſeaſes and death, to which young children are ſubject, fall to the ground the inſtant we ſuppoſe the brutes are indued with ſenſation: they are ſubject to pain and death, and yet they have never ſinned. Thus you argue wrong when you ſay, *young children ſuffer evil, and die: they conſequently are guilty*; for you ſuppoſe a falſe

(8) This is a fictitious name, aſſumed by one of the Fathers of the Oratory.

(9) Mallebr. *Eclairciſſemens ſur le 6 Livre de la Recherche de la Verité*, p. m. 380, 381.

(10) It is certain that St. Auſtin, whatever Father Mallebranche may ſay, believed the ſouls of beaſts to be ſenſitive and corporeal. *Vita brutorum*, ſays he, chap. 4. Of the Knowledge of true Life, *eſt ſpiritus vitalis conſtans de aere & ſanguine animalis, ſed ſenſibilis, memoriam habens, intellectu carens, cum carne moriens, in aera evaneſcens.* See alſo chap. 23. *de Spiritu & Anima.*

(11) Malleb. *Eclairciſſemens, &c.* p. 381, in the margin.

quit it. It is not liable to the very dangerous conſequences of the common opinion. It has long been aſſerted, that brutes have a rational ſoul [*D*]. The Philoſophers of the ſchools

a falſe principle, and which is contradicted by the condition of brutes, viz. *that what has never ſinned cannot ſuffer evil.* This nevertheleſs is a moſt evident principle: it reſults neceſſarily from the ideas we have of the juſtice and goodneſs of God; it is agreeable to the immutable order; to that order which we clearly conceive God never departs from. The ſoul of brutes confounds this order, and overthrows thoſe very diſtinct ideas. It muſt therefore be granted, that the *automata* of Des Cartes greatly favour the principles by which we judge of the infinite Being, and maintain orthodoxy. Read the following paſſage.

(12) Viz. the diſpute with Des Cartes, concerning the ſoul of brutes.

" Religion was immediately drawn into this cauſe " (12), the Anti-Carteſians hoping thereby to deſtroy " the machines of Des Cartes; but it would be im- " poſſible to expreſs the advantage which thereby " accrued to the followers of this Philoſopher. For " they think they have demonſtrated, that by aſcrib- " ing to brutes a ſoul capable of knowledge, all the " natural proofs of the immortality of our ſoul are " deſtroyed. They have ſhewed, that none are more " obſtinate enemies to their opinion than the impious " and Epicureans; and that no greater ſpite can be " done theſe bad Philoſophers, than, by diſarming " them of all the falſe arguments they borrow from " the ſoul of brutes, to conclude that there is only " more or leſs difference between them and us. It is " a certain fact, that no ſet of people affect more " than the impious do, to make brutes come near, " in perfection, to man. In this manner the fol- " lowers of Des Cartes have intereſted Religion in " their cauſe; but they are not ſatisfied with this " reaſon. They have ſoared to the nature of God, " there to ſeek for unanſwerable arguments againſt " the knowledge of brutes, and one cannot deny but " they have found ſome pretty good ones. The " Author of *la Recherche de la Verité* (the ſearch after " truth) has given us the plan of it in ſome parts of " his works. Father Poiſſon of the oratory has " treated fully of that which is grounded on the " following principle of St. Auſtin, *that as God is juſt,* " *miſery is a neceſſary proof of ſin*; whence it follows, " that as beaſts have not ſinned, they are not ſub- " ject to miſery; but they would be ſubject to it, " were they indued with ſenſation, and conſequently " they have no ſenſation (13)." After this paſſage follows the extract of a book (14), in which it is ſhewn, that if brutes are indued with a knowing ſoul, *it follows*, I. *That God does not love himſelf*; II. *That he is not conſtant*; III. *That he is cruel and unjuſt* (15). He would not love himſelf; for he would have created *ſouls ſuſceptible of knowledge and love, without obliging them to love and know him:* he would have created them to be in a ſtate of ſin; and conſequently he would have diſcharged them from the law of order, which is nevertheleſs the ſupreme and indiſpenſible law. The ſtate of ſin is to fix upon or ſtop at creatures, as the ultimate end; and this is what the ſoul of brutes do, according to the common opinion. According to the ſame opinion, theſe ſouls are annihilated, the inſtant that brutes ceaſe to live; where then is God's conſtancy? He creates ſouls, and annihilates them ſoon after; but he does not do the ſame with regard to matter, for this he never deſtroys; he therefore preſerves the leſs perfect ſubſtances, and deſtroys the moſt perfect. But is this acting like a wiſe agent? The ſoul of brutes has not ſinned, and yet it is ſubject to pain and miſery; it is ſubject to all the irregular deſires of creatures who have ſinned. In what manner do we treat brutes? we make them tear one another to pieces for our diverſion; we kill them to nouriſh ourſelves; we pierce their entrails, whilſt they are living, to gratify our curioſity; and we do all this in conſequence of the empire, which God has given us over brutes. How ſtrangely irregular is it, that the innocent creature ſhould be ſubjected to the capricious temper of a criminal creature! No caſuiſt believes that man ſins, by ſetting bulls and maſtiffs together by the ears &c. and by employing a thouſand ſtratagems, and violent expedients, in hunting, fiſhing &c. to deſtroy animals; or by diverting themſelves with killing flies, as Domitian did. Now is it not cruel and unjuſt to ſubject the innocent ſoul to ſo many evils? But all theſe difficulties are removed by Des Cartes's opinion. I will here give a catalogue of ſome books publiſhed in favour of this opinion.

A Preface of Mr. Schuyl, prefixed to his Latin verſion of Des Cartes's treatiſe *De Homine*. A treatiſe of Anthony le Grand (16), *De carentia ſenſus & cognitionis in brutis*. A letter from Mr. de Cordemoi, *to a learned Jeſuit*, printed in 1668 (17). A treatiſe on the ſoul of brutes, printed at Lyons in 1676, and writ by one Dilly, a Prieſt of Ambrun. Converſations in philoſophy by Rohault. Father Poiſſon's notes on Des Cartes's method. Arnoldus Guelinck's *Brutum Carteſianum*. This was a poſthumous work, and publiſhed in 1688, by Mr. Langenhert, an able Carteſian, but not in what relates to the ſoul of beaſts (18); though he has thrown into a geometrical form the reaſons which prove that beaſts have no ſenſation. Several of Des Cartes's followers have ſtopt there; and forſake him with regard to the doctrine of *Automata*. Mr. Craanen, profeſſor of philoſophy, and afterwards a phyſician at Leyden, was a great ſtickler for this philoſopher, even ſo far as to ſuffer for him; and what perhaps may be ſtill more ſurprizing, to go ſo far as not to abandon his doctrine about the pineal gland; but he laughed at all thoſe who aſſert that brutes have no ſenſation. Mr. Regis, one of the moſt famous Carteſians of this age, did not go ſo far; he contenting himſelf with ſaying, that *how much ſoever he may be inclined to aſcribe to brutes, a ſoul diſtinct from the body, he chooſes rather to ſuſpend his judgment in that reſpect* (19). We might rank father Pardies's book on the knowledge of brutes, among thoſe which have been writ in favour of Des Cartes; for we there find the arguments of the Carteſians propoſed with great ſtrength, and refuted in a very weak manner. I yet think, that he was not negligent in the ſecond part of his work, and that he aſſerted the ancient opinion to the utmoſt of his power; but as he alſo did the utmoſt in his power to repreſent faithfully, the bright ſide of the modern one, this gave ſome perſons an opportunity of ſuſpecting, that he did not really deſign to oppoſe Des Cartes. Here follows the judgment of one of his brethren. *Nothing can be more apt to miſlead people, than the expoſitions made by father Pardies, in his book, entitled,* De la connoiſſance des bêtes (of the knowledge of brutes) *wherein giving the Carteſian principles all the ſtrength they can have in that point; he goes ſo far as almoſt to convince his readers, that there is no reaſon for a ſoul to walk, drink, eat, complain; but alſo to ſpeak; and to ſpeak as long as a preacher in a ſermon of an hour long, or a Counſellor in a long plea. The Author, on account of his work, has been looked upon by the Peripateticks, as a prevaricator, who was a Carteſian internally, notwithſtanding the pains he took to refute the Carteſian ſyſtem, in the ſecond part of his book; and to defend the ancient philoſophy with regard to the ſoul of brutes* (20).

(16) See, concerning this Author, Deckherrus's book, *de Scriptis Adeſpotis*, p. 321, 387. edit. 1686. In a letter of Arnauld to Father Mallebranche, it is ſaid that Anthony le Grand is a Franciſcan Frier.

(17) This letter was publiſhed without a name; but I find by Baillet, *Vie de Des Cartes*, Tom. 2. p. 544. that it was writ by Mr. de Cordemoi.

(18) See *Acta eruditorum*, Nov. 1688. p. 624.

(19) Pierre Sylvain Regis, *Syſteme de Philoſophie*, lib. 7. part. 2. p. 126. Tom. 5. Lyons edit. 1691, 12mo.

(20) *Suite du Voiage du Monde de Des Cartes*, p. 9 and 10. Amſt. edit. 1696.

(13) *Nouvelles de la Repub. des Lettres*, for March 1684. p. 26, 27.

(14) Entitled, *La Bete transformée en machine.* The Author's name is Darmanſon.

(15) *Nouv. de la Republ. des Lettres*, March 1684. p. 28.

[*D*] *It has long been aſſerted that brutes have a rational ſoul.*] All I might have ſaid on this ſubject, would have been introduced in the remarks of the article PEREIRA, if I had not been deſirous of avoiding perplexity in that place. We may rank Strato and Æneſidemus among thoſe, who have aſſerted that brutes have a rational ſoul; for they taught that ſenſation could not ſubſiſt without underſtanding (21). *Idem eſſe αἴσθησιν, καὶ διανοίαν *, ſenſum & cogitationem opinio fuit tum Stratonis Phyſici, qui Theophraſti auditor † fuit; tum Æneſidemi: qui ** in Pyrrhonia introductionem conſcripſit. De utroque teſtis nobis Sextus Empiricus adverſus Mathematicos* ††. i. e. " That ſenſation and " thinking are the ſame, was the opinion of Strato " the Naturaliſt, who was a Diſciple of Theophraſ- " tus, as alſo of Æneſidemus, who wrote an intro- " duction to the Pyrrhonia; which Sextus Empiricus, " in his book againſt the mathematicians, teſtifies of " both." Voſſius would doubtleſs have cited Plutarch on this occaſion, had he remembered the following paſſage. Καίτοι Στράτωνός γε τῦ φυσικῦ λόγος ἰσὶν, ἀπο-

(21) Voſſius, *de origine & progreſſu Idololatriæ*, lib. 3. cap. 41. *init.* p. m. 938, 939.

* *Senſus & cogitatio mentis.*

† *Laert. lib. 5. ſive in Stratone.*

** *Laert. in Pyrrho.*

†† *Cap. de homine, ſive p. 201. edit. Aurelian.*

ſchools are greatly miſtaken, if, by rejecting that, they fancy they ſhall avoid the ill conſequence

ἀποδικνύων ὡς οὐδ' αἰσθάνεσθαι τοπαράπαν ἄνευ τοῦ νοῦ ὑπάρχει. *Stratonis etiam Phyſici exſtat oratio, qua ſine intelligentia ſentiri omnino nihil poſſe demonſtrat* (22). It is ſaid that Parmenides, Empedocles, Democritus, and Anaxagoras taught, that all beaſts are endued with underſtanding. *Ab hac opinione qua beſtiæ ſenſus creduntur expertes, ad alteram venio: ſecundum quam, ut Sextus Empiricus* * *ait*, οὐδὲν ἐστι ζῶον ἄλογον, ἀλλα καὶ νοῦ, καὶ ἐπιστήμης δεκτικά ἐστι πάντα, nullum eſt animal rationis expers; ſed omnia ſunt intelligentiæ, & ſcientiæ capacia. *Hanc ſententiam Parmenidi, Empedocli, & Democrito, tribuit Stobæus in Eclogis Phyſicis* †. *Anaxagoras quoque interdum in hanc opinionem inclinavit; teſte Ariſtotele, lib.* 1. *de anima, cap.* 11. ** *: ubi agnoſcit quidem, non uno loco dicere, mentem eſſe ejus cauſſam, quod rectè, & pulchrè ſe habet: ſed addidit, alibi tradere,* τὸν νοῦν εἶναι τὸν αὐτὸν τῇ ψυχῇ, ἐν ἅπασι γὰρ ὑπάρχειν αὐτὸν τοῖς ζώοις καὶ μεγάλοις καὶ μικροῖς, καὶ τιμίοις, καὶ ἀτιμοτέροις. Idem eſſe mentem, & animam: mentem enim omnibus ineſſe animalibus, tam parvis, quam magnis; tam vilioribus, quam honeſtioribus (13). i. e. "From this opinion, that brutes are ſuppoſed not to be endued with ſenſe, I proceed to "the other; according to which, as Sextus Empiricus declares, *no criminal is void of reaſon; but all "are ſuſceptible of underſtanding and knowledge.* Stobæus, in his phyſical eclogues, aſcribes this opinion "to Parmedines, Empedocles, and Democritus. Anaxagoras was like ſome, ſometimes inclined to "this opinion, as appears from Ariſtotle, *book* 1. *de "anima*, cap. 11. where he acknowledges, in more "places than one, that the mind is the cauſe of what "is right and beautiful; but adds, that he elſewhere "inculcates, that the ſoul and mind are the ſame; "that there is a mind in all animals, as well great as "ſmall, of a contemptible or a noble kind." I omit the opinion which was ſo common among the ancients, *viz.* that living bodies included a ſoul which is part of the ſoul of the world. I own that the natural conſequence of this doctrine is, that the ſoul of brutes is of the ſame nature with that of man; but this does not prove that brutes are actually rational: for it might be aſſerted, that ſuch parts of the ſoul of the world as are united to certain bodies loſe the ſtrength or power of reaſoning; and ſince the ſticklers for the ſoul of the world did not maintain that plants were endued with a rational ſoul, they muſt have thought, that their doctrine did not oblige them to maintain that beaſts are endued with reaſon. I therefore will paſs over this opinion, tho' Virgil inſtanced it, as the beſt method of explaining all he had before ſaid concerning the qualities of bees.

His quidam ſignis, atque hæc exempla ſecuti,
Eſſe apibus partem divinæ mentis, & hauſtus
Æthereos dixêre: Deum namque ire per omnes
Terraſque, tractuſque maris, cœlumque profundum:
Hinc pecudes, armenta, viros, genus omne ferarum,
Quemque ſibi tenues naſcentem arceſſere vitas.
Scilicet huc reddi deinde, ac reſoluta referri
Omnia: nec morti eſſe locum; ſed viva volare
Sideris in numerum, atque alto ſuccedere cælo (24).

"Endu'd by ſuch examples, ſome have taught
"That beaſts have portions of æthereal thought;
"Endu'd with particles of heavenly fires:
"For God the whole created maſs inſpires;
"Thro' heaven, and earth, and ocean's depth he throws
"His influence round, and kindles as he goes.
"Hence flocks, and herds, and men, and beaſts, and fowls,
"With breath are quickn'd, and attract their ſouls.
"Hence take the forms his preſcience did ordain,
"And into him at length reſolve again.
"No room is left for death. *Dryden.*

I had better ſpeak of Philo, who wrote a book in which he aſſerted that brutes are rational, Περὶ τοῦ λόγου ἔχειν τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα, *de eo quod bruta animalia ratione ſint prædita* (25). I have ſpoke elſewhere (26) of Galen's opinion; but here follows a more expreſs proof. *An animantia quæ dicuntur bruta, prorſus expertia ſint rationis, nondum ſatis liquet. Fortaſſis enim, tametſi non habeant eam Rationem, quæ juxta vocem intelligitur, nobiſcum communem, quam vocant enuntiativam; certe eam, quæ ſecundum Animam accipitur, quam Rationem appellant affectuum capacem, habent nobiſcum communem, licet alia magis, alia minus* (27). i. e. "It "does not yet appear ſufficiently, whether animals "called brutes are utterly void of reaſon. For al"though they, poſſibly, are not endued, in common "with us, with that ſpecies of reaſon which is call"ed diſcurſive; yet they certainly have, in common "with us, that reaſon, which is ſuppoſed to belong "to a ſoul, and is ſuſceptible of paſſions, though in "a greater or leſs degree." Though Lactantius declares ſomewhere, that God has not endued beaſts with a rational ſoul (38), he nevertheleſs aſſerts, in his treatiſe *de ira Dei*, that brutes imitate men, and partake of the advantages of the human ſpecies, in all things except religion. *Solus* (homo) *ſapientia inſtructus eſt ut religionem ſolus intelligat, & hæc eſt hominis atque mutorum vel præcipua, vel ſola diſtantia, nam cætera quæ videntur hominis eſſe propria, etſi non ſint talia in mutis, tamen ſimilia videri poſſunt . . . . . Quid tam proprium homini quam ratio, & providentia futuri? Atqui ſunt animalia, quæ latibulis ſuis diverſos, & plures exitus pandant, ut ſi quod periculum inciderit, fuga pateat obſeſſis; quod non facerent, niſi ineſſet illis intelligentia, & cogitatio. Alia provident in futurum* (29). i. e. "Man alone is endued with reaſon, "that he may only underſtand wiſdom; and this is the "chief difference, if not the only one, betwixt "man and brutes; for other things which ſeem to be "peculiar to man, though they are not the ſame in "brutes, they yet may ſeem like . . . . . What can "be ſo peculiar to man as reaſon and foreſight? "And nevertheleſs ſome animals make many and "various ways of retiring from their haunts; in or"der that if, at any time, they ſhould be threatened "with danger, they may have an opportunity of "eſcaping; but this they could not do if they were "devoid of underſtanding and thought. Others "provide for the future." But notwithſtanding this, we are not to ſuppoſe that he meant to infer, that the ſoul of brutes is ſpiritual and immortal; for in that age, the connexion between thought and ſpirituality was not clearly known. Does not Arnobius evidently teach, that the human ſoul is mortal in its own nature; that it will be totally deſtroyed in hell, by the activity of the torments; and will not exiſt for ever in paradiſe, but merely by the favour of God? Does not he aſſert that an immortal and ſimple nature is incapable of feeling pain? But he himſelf felt pain, and conſequently he did not believe that his ſoul was a ſpiritual, immaterial, and immortal Being. *Homo prudentiæ non pravæ*, ſays he (30), ſpeaking of Plato, *& examinis judiciique perpenſi, rem inenodabilem ſuſcipit, ut cum animas dicat immortales, perpetuas, & corporali ſoliditate privatas, puniri eas dicat tamen, & doloris afficiat ſenſu. Quis autem hominum non videt, quod ſit immortale, quod ſimplex, nullum poſſe dolorem admittere? quod autem ſentiat dolorem immortalitatem habere non poſſe? Nec tamen ejus auctoritas plurimum à veritate declinat . . . . . Non eſt abſonè ſuſpicatus jaci eas in flumina torrentia flammarum globis, & cœnoſis voraginibus tetra. Jaciuntur enim, & ad nihilum redactæ, interitionis perpetuæ fruſtratione vaneſcunt. Sunt enim mediæ qualitatis, ſicut Chriſto auctore compertum eſt, & interire quæ poſſint Deum ſi ignoraverint, vitæ & ab exitio liberari, ſi ad ejus ſe minas atque indulgentias applicarint.* i. e. "Plato, a "man of great wiſdom, and conſummate judgment, "undertook a thing that is inexplicable, when he "affirmed that ſouls, tho' immortal, perpetual, and in"corporeal, are yet liable to be puniſhed, and ob"noxious to pain. But who does not know, that "whatever is immortal and uncompounded cannot "ſuffer pain; and that whatever ſuffers pain cannot "be immortal? Nor is this aſſertion of his very "wide from truth . . . . . He ſuppoſes, and not abſurdly, that they are caſt into torrents of fire, "and

(22) Plutarch. *de ſolertia Animalium*, p. 961, *A.*

* *Pyrrhoniarum Hypotypoſ. lib.* 2. *c.* 5.

† *p.* 93. *edit. Plantin.*

** *Cont.* 24.

(23) Voſſius, *de origine & progreſſu Idololatriæ, lib.* 3. *cap.* 41. *init. p. m.* 940.

(24) Virgil. *Georg. lib.* 4. *ver.* 219.

(25) Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib.* 2. *cap.* 18. *p. m.* 59.

(26) Citat. 38 of the art. PEREIRA.

(27) Galen. *in Exhortat. ad Art. lib. ſiud.* init. apud *Ant. le Grand de carentia ſenſus, p.* 10.

(28) *Cæteris animantibus quoniam rationalem iſtam vitam non attribuit.* Lactant. *de opificio Dei, cap.* 2. *p. m.* 574.

(29) Idem, *de ira Dei, cap.* 7. *p.* 529.

(30) Arnobius, *adverſus Gentes, lib.* 2. *p. m.* 52.

" and black horrible whirlpools. They indeed are " thrown into them, and annihilated by a perpetual " deſtruction; there are ſome of a middle kind, as " appears from Chriſt, of ſuch a nature that they " may periſh, in caſe they are ignorant of God; " and be freed from deſtruction, if they make a " proper uſe of his menaces and promiſes." He refutes the Platoniſts, in their ſaying that the ſoul of man is of celeſtial origin; that it is immortal and incorporeal (31); he refutes them, I ſay, among other reaſons, by the following, *viz.* that there is but very little difference between our ſoul and that of brutes. *Nihil eſt quod nos fallat, nihil quod nobis polliceatur ſpes caſſas, id quod nobis à quibuſdam dicitur viris, immoderata ſui opinione ſublatis, animas immortales eſſe, Deo, rerum ac principi gradu proximas dignitatis, genitore illo ac patre prolatas, divinas, ſapientes, doctas, neque ulla corporis attrectatione contiguas.* i. e. " We ought not to deceive, or feed ourſelves " with empty hopes, becauſe of what is told us by " certain men, who puffed up with too favourable an " opinion of themſelves, aſſert, that our ſouls are im- " mortal; next to God in dignity, and of the higheſt " order in the ſcale of Beings, proceeding from, and " begot by him; divine, wiſe, learned, and unſullied " by any corporeal imperfections." *Vultis tumore depoſito cogitationibus tacitis pervidere animantia nos eſſe, aut conſimilia cæteris, aut non plurima differitate diſtantia? Quid eſt enim, quod non ab eorum indicet ſimilitudine diſcrepare? vel quæ in nobis eminentia tanta eſt, ut animantium numero dedignemur adſcribi* (32)? i. e. " Will ye, diveſting yourſelves of all proud thoughts, " conſider within yourſelves that we are brutes, ei- " ther reſembling them very much, or not differing " widely from them? For what is there to ſhew " that we are not different; or what excellency do " we poſſeſs, that ſhould make us diſdain to be rank- " ed in the number of the brutes?" He examines the preheminence, which man has over brutes, and pretends to ſhew that it is very trifling. He affirms particularly that men are not ſuperior to beaſts, as to reaſon. *Sed rationales nos ſumus, & intelligentia vincimus genus omne mutorum. Crederem iſtud veriſſimè dici, ſi cum ratione & conſilio cuncti homines viverent, ſervarent officiorum tenorem, abſtinerent ab illicitis ſeſe, negotia turpia non adirent, neque quiſquam pravitate conſilii, atque ignorantiæ cæcitate contraria ſibimet atque inimica depoſceret. Vellem tamen ſcire quænam ſit hæc ratio, per quam ſumus potiores animalium generibus cunctis: quia nobis domicilia fecimus, quibus poſſimus hyemalia frigora, & æſtatis flagrantia evitare? Quid? animantia cætera hujus rei providentiam non habent* (33)? i. e. " But we are rational creatures, and ſurpaſs all mute a- " nimals in underſtanding. I would conſider this as ve- " ry true, if all men would live in a rational and pru- " dent manner, would diſcharge their ſeveral duties; " would refrain from things unlawful; would not " engage in ſhameful actions; and if no man, " through wicked advice and ignorance, did earneſt- " ly deſire ſuch things as are prejudicial to him. I " would fain know what this reaſon is, by which we " ſurpaſs all kinds of animals. What! is it becauſe " we build ourſelves houſes, to ſecure us from the " ſeverity of the winter ſeaſon and the violent heat " of ſummer? But are not the reſt of animals as " provident in this particular?" Arnobius may therefore be ranked among thoſe, who have taught that beaſts are informed with a rational ſoul. It is doubtleſs from him that Lactantius had learnt to eſtabliſh no other difference between them and men, but the worſhip of God. Some Philoſophers have envied man this privilege, they ſaying that brutes had a religion. Xenocrates the Carthaginian did not deny but that God was known to them: Democritus muſt have believed the ſame thing, if he reaſoned conſequentially; at leaſt Clemens Alexandrinus ſays ſo. Καθόλυ γ' ὃν τὴ περὶ τ῀ Θείυ ἔννοιαν Ξενοκράτης ὁ Καρχηδόνι῝ οὐκ ἀπελπίζει, κ᾽ ἐν τοῖς ἀλόγοις ζώοις. Δημόκριτ῝ δὲ, κᾶν μὴ θέλῃ, ὁμολογήσει διὰ τὴν ἀκολυθίαν τ῵ν δογμάτων, τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ πεποίηκεν εἴδωλα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις προσπίπτοντα, κ᾽ τοῖς ἀλόγοις ζώοις ἀπὸ τ῀ Θείας οὐσίας. *Ut ſummatim quidem dicam, Xenocrates Carthaginienſis non ſpem omnium abjicit, quinetiam in rationis expertibus animantibus ſit Dei notitia. Democritus autem, etſi nolit, confitebitur per dogmatum conſequentiam: fecit enim eaſdem imagines in homines incurrentes, & in animantes rationis expertes, ex divina eſſentia* (34). i. e. " In ſhort, Xenocrates the Carthaginian is not " quite without hope, but that animals who are en- " tirely devoid of reaſon have a knowledge of God. " But Democritus, whether he will or not, muſt con- " feſs it in conſequence of his doctrine; he aſſerting, " that the like images which are in men, and in " animals void of reaſon, reſult from the divine " eſſence." Pliny ranks religion among the moral virtues of the elephants. *Maximum eſt elephas*, ſays he (35), *proximumque humanis ſenſibus: quippe intellectus illis ſermonis patrii, & imperiorum obedientia, officiorumque, quæ didicere, memoria: amoris, & gloriæ voluptas: imo vero (quæ etiam in homine rara) probitas, prudentia, æquitas: religio quoque ſiderum, Soliſque ac Lunæ veneratio. Auctores ſunt, in Mauritaniæ ſaltibus ad quendam amnem, cui nomen eſt Amilo, miteſcente Luna nova, greges eorum deſcendere: ibique ſe purificantes ſolenniter aqua circumſpergi, atque ita ſalutato ſidere in ſilvas reverti, vitulorum fatigatos præ ſe ferentes. Alienæ quoque religionis intellectu, creduntur maria tranſituri non ante naves conſcendere, quam invitati rectoris jurejurando de reditu. Viſique ſunt feſſi ægritudine, (quando & illas moles infeſtant morbi) herbas ſupini in cælum jacientes, veluti tellure precibus allegata.* i. e. " Of all animals the elephants are of the largeſt ſize, " and approach neareſt to the human ſenſe: for they " are ſkilled in the language of their country, pay " obedience to commands, remember any good office " that may have been done them, and are pleaſingly " affected with love and glory. To this I muſt add " (circumſtances that are ſeldom found even in men) " that they have probity, prudence, equity; that they " pay a religious regard to the ſtars, and worſhip the " ſun and moon. We are told, that whole troops of " them go, when the moon is in the wane, to a cer- " tain river called Amilo, in the foreſt of Mauri- " tania: that being ſolemnly purified there by ſprink- " ling of water, they, after worſhipping the moon, re- " turn to the foreſts, carrying their wearied young " ones. It is thought that when they are to croſs " the ſeas, they will not go on board a ſhip, till the " maſter who invited them promiſes, with an oath, " to bring them back. They have been ſeen, when op- " preſſed with ſickneſs, (even theſe huge animals be- " ing ſubject to it) lying with their face upwards, caſt- " ing up herbs towards the Heavens, hoping by their " prayers, *&c.*" Dion relates part of theſe particulars (36). Would one imagine that the followers of Plato, who imagined that brutes were very probably endued with an immortal ſoul, as Paganinus Gaudentius obſerves, ſhould deny them the faculty of reaſon? *Quod ſi dicas apud Platonicos ſolas animas rationales eſſe immortales, reſpondebit Alcinous non eſſe id prorſus exploratum. Nam poſtquam dixit animas rationales ſecundum Platonem eſſe immortales, mox ſubjungit* *: Utrum verò & irrationales, ambiguum eſſe videtur: & *quamvis ipſe ſentiat eſſe probabile eas eſſe mortales, indicat tamen id inter Platonicos non fuiſſe certum* (37). i. e. " But " ſhould you ſay, that the Platoniſts hold, that none " but rational ſouls are immortal, Alcinous will an- " ſwer, that it is not very certain. For after ſaying, " that Plato declares rational ſouls to be immortal, " he preſently adds; *it is doubtful whether irrational* " *ſouls are ſo:* and though he himſelf looks upon it " as probable, that they are mortal, he nevertheleſs " declares that the Platoniſts were not certain in their " belief as to this matter." I ſay nothing of Solomon, who ſeems to ſay expreſsly (38), that the ſoul of man and that of brutes are of the ſame nature; for we muſt not take his words in a literal ſenſe, but put a better conſtruction upon them (39); but we may very well be allowed to believe, that ſeveral Rabbi's have aſcribed a rational ſoul to brutes.

There is no doubt but the famous Maimonides believed that they are endued with reaſon, he aſcribing to them a kind of free-will. Arnauld has reaſon to object to him, that it follows from thence they may be puniſhed or rewarded after death. If I relate, pretty much at length, what preceded that reflection of Arnauld, it is becauſe of certain incidents, which inform us of the opinion of ſome Jews concerning brutes. This great Rabbi *explains five opinions with regard to providence, all which, he thinks, are as old as the*

(31) Arnobius, *adverſus Gentes*, p. 53.

(32) Idem, ibid. p. 54.

(33) Idem, ibid. p. 55.

(34) Clemens Alexand. *Strom.* lib. 5. p. 590, C.

(35) Plin. lib. 8. cap. 1. *init.*

(36) Dio. lib. 39. p. m. 12.

* *Cap.* 25.

(37) Pagan. Gaudentius, *de tranſmigratione Pythagor.* p. 76.

(38) Chap. iii. of Eccleſiaſtes.

(39) See the 9th and 10th chap. of the book entitled, *A religious treatiſe againſt Atheiſts, Deiſts, and the modern Scepticks*, printed at Paris in 1677.

ſequence of the opinion which aſcribes a ſenſative ſoul to brutes [*E*]. The perſons in queſtion

the Prophets (40). The fourth of theſe opinions extended God's providence to all things, and did not deny man's free-will (41). Maimonides objects ſeveral inconvenient particulars, to the followers of this opinion. *They ſaid that it was the effect of God's wiſdom, that there were men who, though they had never ſinned, were born with many imperfections; and that it was better to be ſo than not to be at all.* We do not comprehend, ſays this Jewiſh Doctor, *what goodneſs there can be in this; ſed nos iſtam bonitatem non intelligimus* (42). "When they were aſked, what juſtice "there could be in the death of brutes; what ſin "they had committed; and why God, ſince his "providence extended to all things, would have an "innocent mouſe killed by a cat? to this they "anſwered; that God had decreed it ſo: but that "he would recompence this mouſe in another world. "Nothing could be more ridiculous than to aſcribe a "ſoul to brutes. But this Rabbi himſelf gives ſome "occaſion to this idle fancy, when he aſcribes a will "to irrational animals, as well as to men. *Omnia "pariter animantia irrationalia moventur voluntate ſua.* "For had they a will, it would be difficult to con- "ſider why they ſhould not be capable of good and "evil, of rewards and puniſhments (43)."

The Socinians do not go ſo far as Maimonides: they do not aſcribe to brutes a will properly ſo called, nor a free-will properly ſo called; they do not allow them to be ſuſceptible of vice and virtue, nor of rewards and puniſhments properly ſo called. They nevertheleſs ſay that reaſon, liberty and virtue are found in them imperfectly and analogically; and that they render themſelves worthy in ſome meaſure, of rewards and puniſhments. If the reader will not believe me, let him read the following paſſage. *Quia homo inter animantia ſolus ratione proprie dicta præditus eſt, in illum etiam ſolum tum voluntas, tum virtus & vitium, tum denique præmium & pœna cadit. In bruta tamen animalia cadit aliquid ſingulis iſtorum analogum, in ea præſertim, quæ ſunt perfectiora, & diſciplinæ alicujus capaciora. Eſt enim in illis primum aliqua facultas rationi reſpondens, quam nonnulli rationem inferiorem vocant, qua non de rebus modo jucundis, ac utilibus quodammodo ratiocinantur, & de ratione illorum adipiſcendorum diſpiciunt; ſed etiam viam ſibi à Deo præſcriptam, ſeu rectam quandam vivendi rationem naturæ ſuæ conſentaneam, quæ honeſtati analoga eſt, agnoſcunt. Inde ſequitur facultas altera, voluntati quodam modo reſpondens, in qua nonnihil eſt libertatis. Hinc aliquid etiam virtuti & vitio ſimile, ſeu rectè & prævè factum: quorum illud eſt, cum bruta naturæ ſuæ ductum ſequuntur, hoc cum à naturali via exorbitant. Unde tandem etiam aliquid præmio aut pœnæ, & huic quidem maximè ſimile. Unde beſtias etiam à Deo punitas* (44), *aut pœnas certas lege illis conſtitutas, cernimus: qua de re legatur Socinus in Anti-Puccio. Quemadmodum ergo rationem humanam κατ' ἐξοχὴν, & propriè hoc nomine appellamus, & brutis eam adimimus (dicimus etiam irrationalia ſeu ratione carentia) ita & cætera omnia. Rurſus quemadmodum impropriè & per analogiam rationem brutis tribuimus, ita & cætera omnia* (45). i. e. "As man "is the only animal who is indued with reaſon, pro- "perly ſo called; he therefore, only, is informed "with a will, and is capable of virtue and vice, "rewards and puniſhments. Nevertheleſs ſomething "analogous to each of theſe may likewiſe be found "in brutes; particularly in ſuch as are of a more "perfect kind, and capable of being taught. Firſt, "they are indued with a certain faculty that anſwers "to reaſon, called by ſome an inferior reaſon, by "which they not only reaſon in ſome meaſure on "what is pleaſant and profitable, and endeavour "how they may beſt attain them; but likewiſe ac- "knowledge a certain manner of living, adapted "to their nature, which is analogous to honeſty. "This muſt ſuppoſe another faculty, anſwering in "ſome meaſure to the will, wherein there is ſome "liberty. Hence there is alſo ſomething reſembling "vice and virtue, or good and bad, when brutes "follow the impulſe of nature, or depart from it: "whence they are made capable of rewards and "puniſhments, and particularly of the laſt mention- "ed. Hence we find that brutes alſo are puniſhed "by heaven, and that certain puniſhments are enacted "againſt them by the law, for which ſee Socinus's "*Anti-Puccius*. As therefore we give the name of "reaſon, by way of eminence, to that which is "found in man, and will not allow brutes to be poſ- "ſeſſed of it, and deny it to brutes, (we calling them "irrational or void of reaſon) we likewiſe do ſo with "reſpect to all other things. Again, as we aſcribe, "improperly and analogouſly, reaſon to brutes, we "do the ſame with regard to all other things." I know not whether Gulielmus Pariſienſis, one of the greateſt genius's of his age, could help going a little below this opinion; for it is ſaid that he taught that brutes have a ſpiritual ſoul, and it is not agreed that he ever recanted that opinion (46). See citation 48 of this page.

To come to the moderns, I ſhall obſerve that Valla (47) and Anthony Cittadinus (48) have acknowledged brutes to be endued with reaſon. Paſquier has wrote a beautiful letter on this opinion, and it is the firſt of book X. Montagne has declared in favour of this opinion, and maintained it with ſo much care, that one would conclude he imagined that the apology of Raimundus Sebundus was partly that of brutes. Charron has followed him in this particular, as well as in a great many others. A Phyſician of Rochelle (49) having wrote againſt Charron, was refuted by one of the beſt pens that has wrote, in French, on philoſophical ſubjects, I mean Mr. de la Chambre, Phyſician to Mr. Seguier, Chancellor of France. The Phyſician of Rochelle wrote an anſwer (50), which his antagoniſt did alſo, and entitled his work, *A treatiſe on the knowledge of animals, in which all that is ſaid for and againſt the reaſoning of brutes is examined.* I ſhall obſerve by the way, that Iſaac Voſſius is of opinion, that the condition of animals is much better than ours, with regard to ſpeech; becauſe they communicate more ſpeedily, and perhaps more happily, their thought than we do (51); on which occaſion he is criticiſed by a German (52). The reader may ſee the opinion of Sennertus in the remarks [*D*] and [*E*] of his article. I ſhall there take notice of ſome moderns, who imagined that the ſoul of beaſts is ſpiritual.

[*E*] *The ill conſequence of the opinion, which aſcribes a ſenſitive ſoul to brutes.*] Nothing can be more diverting, than to ſee with what authority the ſchoolmen take upon themſelves to preſcribe bounds to the knowledge of brutes. They declare, that they know only particular and material objects, and that they only love what is uſeful and agreeable; that they cannot reflect on their ſenſations and deſires, nor infer one thing from another. One would conclude, that they had ſearched more ſucceſsfully into the faculties and acts of the ſouls of brutes, than the moſt expert anatomiſts into the entrails of dogs. Their temerity is ſo great, that ſhould they, by chance, have found the truth, they would be unworthy of praiſe, and even of excuſe. But if we grant them all this, and whatever they lay down, what advantage will they reap by it? Do they imagine they ſhall, by this means, prevail with any perſon who is able to argue, to grant, that the ſoul of man is not of the ſame ſpecies with that of brutes? This pretenſion is altogether chimerical. It is evident to any perſon who is able to judge of things, that every ſubſtance which has any ſenſation knows that it is indued with it; and it would not be more abſurd to maintain, that the ſoul of man knows actually an object without knowing that he knows it, than it is abſurd to ſay, that the ſoul of a dog ſees a bird, without perceiving that it ſees it. This ſhews that all the acts of the ſenſitive faculties are, by their own nature and eſſence, reflective on themſelves. Father Maignan, who, notwithſtanding all his knowledge, has given into the errors and groſs ignorance of the ſchools, with regard to the ſouls of brutes, owns nevertheleſs, that, in order to perceive a thing, we muſt know the perception we have of it. *Id quod vocamus ſentire*, ſays he, *non eſt ſine cognitione ejus rei quæ dicitur ſenſibilis: cum autem nihil externum ſit per ſe ſenſibile; ſed tantum per ſuam actionem; adeoque actio ejus ſit primario ſenſibilis: & cum inſuper nos non dicamur*

(40) Arnauld, *Reflexions ſur le Syſteme du P. Mallebranche*, liv. 1. ch. 13. p. 241. He quotes chap. 17. p. 2. of *More Nevochim, Doctor perplexorum*, of *Maimonides*.

(41) Arnauld, ibid. p. 245.

(42) Ibid. p. 246.

(43) Idem, ibid.

(44) See in citat. 60, what I quote from Franzius. It is there ſaid, that God commands brutes to be puniſhed.

(45) Joan. Crellius, *Ethicæ Chriſtianæ*, lib. 2. cap. 1. p. m. 65, 66.

(46) In the little diſſertations prefixed to Tom. 2. of his works, edit. 1676, it is diſputed whether ever he recanted the opinion he was accuſed of advancing, with reſpect to the ſpirituality of the ſouls of brutes; where it is compared with the opinion of Des Cartes, and that of the Philoſophers who have treated of this queſtion in particular. *Journal des Savans*, 18 Jan. 1677. p. m. 28.

(47) Valla, *Dial.* cap. 9. *apud* Voſſium, *de orig. & progr. Idol.* lib. 3. cap. 41. p. 940.

(48) In lib. 1. *Poſt. Analyt.* cap. 3. *apud eumd.* ibid.

(49) Chanet, in his *Conſiderations on Charron.*

(50) His reply is entitled, *Concerning the inſtinct and knowledge of Animals*, Rochelle 1646, 8vo.

(51) Iſaacus Voſſius, *de Poematum cantu & viribus rithmi*, p. 65.

(52) Joh. Cyprianus, *in Hiſtoriæ Animalium Continuatione*, p. 20.

queſtion are not wanting either in diſtinctions, exceptions, or boldneſs, to affirm that the acts of this ſoul never paſs certain bounds preſcribed them; but all this confuſed and unintel-

camur alicujus agentis actionem ſentire, ſi ea dum in nobis fit, omnino lateat nos; conſequenter id quod vocamus ſentire, non eſt ſine cognitione actionis, quæ fit in nobis ſentientibus; imo quia ſentire nihil aliud ex parte ſentientis dicit, præter eam cognitionem; conſequens eſt ipſum ſentire, quatenus ſe tenet ex parte ſentientis, conſiſtere in eo quod eſt agnoſcere ſe pati; quod coincidit cum eo quod eſt agnoſcere actionem in ſe receptam, ſeu paſſionem ſuam (53). i. e. "That which we call ſenſation, is not "without the knowledge of that thing which is "called ſenſible; but as nothing external is ſenſible "in itſelf, but only by its action, this muſt conſe- "quently be principally ſenſible. And, moreover, "as we cannot be ſaid to feel the action of any "agent, if, at the time that it is performed in us, it "is entirely unknown to us; conſequently that thing "we call ſenſation, is not without the knowledge "of the action, performed in us at the time we feel. "Nay, becauſe ſenſation implies, in thoſe that feel, "nothing beſides that knowledge; conſequently, "ſenſation itſelf, conſidered as in the being that "feels, conſiſts in its perceiving what it feels; which "is the ſame as to know that an action is received "in itſelf, or its paſſion." The memory of beaſts muſt therefore be an act, that makes them remember what is paſt, and which informs them that they remember it. How therefore can any one aſſert, that they have not the power to reflect on their own thoughts, nor to draw an inference? But once again, let us not diſpute on this ſubject; let us permit theſe Philoſophers to build their ſuppoſitions very erroneouſly, and only make uſe of what they teach. They ſay that the ſoul of brutes perceives all the objects of the five external ſenſes; that it judges that, among theſe objects, there are ſome which ſuit it, and others hurtful to it; and that, in conſequence of this judgment, it deſires thoſe which ſuit it, and abhors the reſt; and that, in order to enjoy the object it deſires, it carries its organs to the place where ſuch an object is; and that, in order to ſhun ſuch as they abhor, they take away their organs from the place where it is. I conclude from all this, that if it does not produce other acts as noble as thoſe of our ſoul, it is not its fault, or becauſe it is of a nature leſs perfect than the ſoul of man; it is only becauſe the organs are not like ours. I would aſk the Gentlemen in queſtion, whether they ſhould like to have it ſaid, that the ſoul of man, at the age of five and thirty, is of another ſpecies than at the age of a month; or that the ſoul of a madman, an idiot, or of an old man who returns to infancy, is not ſubſtantially as perfect as the ſoul of a man of abilities. They doubtleſs would reject this as an altogether groſs error, and with great reaſon; for it is certain that the ſame ſoul, which, in children, is only indued with ſenſation, meditates and reaſons, in a ſolid manner, in a grown perſon; and that the ſame ſoul, whoſe reaſon and wit are admired in a great man, would only doat in an old man, talk wildly in an idiot, and be indued with ſenſation in a child. Now it would be a moſt groſs error, ſhould it be aſſerted that the ſoul of man is ſuſceptible only of ſuch thoughts as are known to us. There are a numberleſs multitude of ſenſations, paſſions, and ideas, of which that ſoul is very capable, or ſuſceptible, though it be never affected with them during this life. If it were to be united to organs different from ours, it would think otherwiſe than it does now; and its modifications might be far nobler than thoſe we experience. If there were ſubſtances which, in organized bodies, had a train of ſenſations, and other thoughts much more ſublime than ours, could we ſay that they are of a nature more perfect than our ſoul? Doubtleſs no; for if our ſoul ſhould be tranſported into thoſe bodies, it would have that ſame train of ſenſations, and other thoughts much more ſublime than ours. This may eaſily be applied to the ſoul of brutes. It is confeſſed that it has a ſenſation of bodies, that it perceives them, wiſhes for ſome of them and abhors others. Now this is enough; it therefore is a thinking ſubſtance, and conſequently is capable of thought in general: it conſequently can receive all ſorts of thoughts; it conſequently can reaſon; it conſequently can know what is honeſt; the univerſals; the axioms of metaphyſicks; the rules of morality &c. For as becauſe wax can receive the impreſſion of a ſeal, it manifeſtly follows that it is capable of receiving a figure from any ſeal; it muſt likewiſe be granted that the inſtant a ſoul is capable of one thought, it is capable of any thought. It would be abſurd to argue as follows; *This piece of wax received the impreſſion only of three or four ſeals, conſequently it cannot receive the impreſſion of a thouſand ſeals. This piece of pewter never was a plate, it therefore cannot be a plate; and is of a very different nature than that pewter-plate which I ſee there.* They reaſon no better who ſay; *the ſoul of this dog never had any thing but ſenſations &c. conſequently it is not capable of moral ideas or metaphyſical notions.* Why does one piece of wax bear the image of the ſovereign, and another does not? It is becauſe the ſeal was applied to one, and not to the other. This piece of pewter, which was never made into a plate, will be one when thrown into the mould in which plates are caſt. In like manner, caſt that ſoul of a brute into the mould of univerſal ideas, and of the notions of arts and ſciences; I mean, unite it to a well choſen human body, it will be the ſoul of a man of abilities, and no longer that of a brute.

We therefore ſee, that the Philoſophers of the ſchools are not able to prove that the ſoul of man and the ſoul of brutes differ in their nature. Tho' they aſſert and repeat ten thouſand times, the *ſoul of man reaſons, and knows univerſals and virtue, but that of brutes know nothing of all this*; we ſhall anſwer, *theſe differences are only accidental, and are no marks of a ſpecific difference in ſubjects. Ariſtotle and Tully, when but a year old, were not indued with more ſublime thoughts than thoſe of a dog; and had they lived in a ſtate of infancy 30 or 40 years, the thoughts of their ſoul would have been only ſenſations, and diminutive paſſions for playing and eating; they therefore ſurpaſſed beaſts only by accident; it was becauſe their organs, on which their thoughts depend, acquired ſuch and ſuch modifications, to which the organs of brutes never arrive. The ſoul of a dog, in the organs of Ariſtotle or Tully, would certainly have acquired all the knowledge of thoſe two great men.*

But the following conſequence is a very falſe one; ſuch a ſoul does not reaſon, and is unacquainted with univerſals, it conſequently is of a different nature from the ſoul of a great Philoſopher; for were this conſequence juſt, it muſt be aſſerted, that the ſoul of little children is not of the ſame ſpecies with that of grown perſons. What therefore are the peripateticks thinking of, when they preſume to ſay, that if the ſoul of brutes does not reaſon, it is ſubſtantially leſs perfect than ſuch ſouls as do reaſon? It muſt firſt be proved, that the defect of reaſoning in brutes proceeds from a real and internal perfection of their ſouls, and not from the organic diſpoſitions on which it depends. But this can never be proved; for it is plain, that a ſubject which is capable of thoſe thoughts, which they aſcribe to the ſoul of brutes, is capable of reaſoning, and of all other thoughts; whence it reſults, that if it does actually reaſon, it is becauſe of certain accidental and external obſtacles; I mean, becauſe the Creator of all things has fixed every ſoul to a certain train of thoughts, by making it dependent on the motions of certain bodies. This alſo is the reaſon why children at the breaſt, fools and madmen do not reaſon.

We therefore cannot think without horror on the conſequences of this doctrine, *man's ſoul, and that of brutes do not differ ſubſtantially; they therefore are of the ſame kind; one acquires more knowledge than the other; but theſe are only accidental advantages, and depend on an arbitrary inſtitution.* This doctrine reſults neceſſarily and inevitably from what is taught in ſchools, with regard to the knowledge of brutes. It follows from thence, that if their ſouls are material and mortal, the ſouls of men are ſuch; and that if the ſoul of men is a ſpiritual and immortal ſubſtance, the ſoul of beaſts is the ſame; theſe are horrid conſequences in which light ſoever we view them; for

(53) Emanuel Maignan, *Philoſophia naturæ*, cap. 24. num. 2. p. m. 527. See alſo Caſimire of Toulouſe, *Atomi Peripateticæ*, Tom. 4. p. 70. where he relates, in few words, Father Maignan's definition, and that of Caſſerius, *Senſus eſt objecti in organo formaliter ſuſcepti dignotio*, (ſenſe is the knowledge of an object, formerly received in the organ) and approves them.

intelligible jargon is of no uſe towards eſtabliſhing a ſpecifick difference between the ſoul of man and that of brutes [*F*]; and it is not poſſible they will ever be able to invent a better

if, in order to avoid the immortality of the ſoul of beaſts, we ſuppoſe that the ſoul of man dies with the body; we thereby overthrow the doctrine of another life, and undermine the foundations of Religion. But if, on the other ſide, to preſerve to our own ſouls the privilege of immortality, we extend it to that of brutes, into what an abyſs ſhall we fall? what ſhall we do with ſuch a number of immortal ſouls? Will there be a paradiſe and hell for them? Will they migrate from one body to another? Will they be annihilated in proportion as beaſts die? Will God inceſſantly create a numberleſs multitude of ſpirits, to plunge them back again ſo ſoon into a ſtate of non-entity? How many inſects live only a few days? Let us not imagine that it is ſufficient to create ſouls for ſuch beaſts only as we know. Thoſe we are not acquainted with are ſtill more numerous. A microſcope diſcovers thouſands to us in a ſingle drop of liquid: and a thouſand more might be diſcovered, had we more perfect microſcopes. Let it not be ſaid that inſects are only machines; for we ſhould better explain, by this hypotheſis, the actions of dogs, than the actions of ants and beaſts. There perhaps may be more genius and reaſon in inviſible animals, than in thoſe of the largeſt ſize (54). We will now ſee how vainly the ſchools attempt to eſtabliſh a ſpecific difference between the ſoul of brutes and that of men.

(54) See the quotation from Pliny, cited in citation 1 in the art. MENAGE.

[*F*] *A ſpecifick difference between the ſoul of man and that of brutes.*] They ſay that the ſoul of brutes is of a material form, but that the ſoul of man is a ſpirit created immediately by God. But how do they prove this? I ſuppoſe them to reaſon only on the principles of the light of nature, without having recourſe to ſcripture or the tenets of religion; and would aſk them a good proof, why the ſoul of brutes ſhould be corporeal, and ours not ſo. They will alledge the beauty and extent of human knowledge; and the ſmallneſs, groſsneſs, and obſcurity of the knowledge of brutes; and conclude, that a corporeal principle will be able to produce the knowledge of brutes, but not reflections, reaſonings, univerſal ideas, the idea of honour and honeſty, which are found in the ſoul of man; and conſequently that this ſoul ought to be of a rank ſuperior to matter, that it muſt be a ſpirit. I will not now obſerve to them, that it is raſh in them to affirm, that the ſoul of brutes does not reaſon, and has no idea of what is honeſt: I will wave this objection, and only ſay, that it is a thouſand times more difficult to ſee a tree, than to know the act by which we ſee it: ſo that if a material principle is capable of knowing a numberleſs multitude of external things, it will be much more capable of knowing its own thoughts, of comparing them together, and multiplying them; conſequently the reflections, concluſions, and abſtractions of many do not require a more noble principle than matter. A very able Peripatetic grants this. Let us hear him ſpeak; his confeſſion will perſuade more than my objections. "If we once admit, that whatever is moſt wonderful in the actions of beaſts, may be effected alſo "by the means of a material ſoul; ſhall we not "ſooner go greater lengths, and ſay, that whatever "man does, may alſo be effected by means of a "material ſoul? .... If we once grant that brutes, "without any ſpiritual ſoul, are capable of thinking, "of acting to ſome end, of foreſeeing what is to "come, of remembering what is paſt, of gaining "experience, by the particular reflections they make "on it; why may we not ſay that men are capable "of performing their functions without any ſpiritual "ſoul? After all, the operations of men are not "different from thoſe which we aſcribe to brutes. "If there be any difference, it is only of more or "leſs; and therefore all that could be ſaid is, that "the ſoul of man is more perfect than that of brutes, "becauſe he remembers better than they do, thinks "with more reflection, and foreſees with more certainty: but in fine, it cannot be ſaid but that their "ſoul is ſtill material. It will perhaps be ſaid, that "certain operations are found in men, which cannot "ſuit with brutes, nor proceed from any principle "but a ſpiritual ſoul; and theſe principles are univerſal knowledge; that ratiocination, by which "we infer one thing from another; the idea we "have of infinitude and ſpiritual things, which do "not fall under the ſenſes. But thoſe who deny there "is any knowledge in brutes, do not therefore deny "but that thoſe thoughts and ratiocinations are in us, "ſince we ourſelves are conſcious of them. They "therefore have the ſame right that we have, to "prove the exiſtence of the rational ſoul. But beſides, "they add, that all theſe operations, we which think "ſo extraordinary, differ only in degrees from the "operations which we aſcribe to brutes; and certainly one would conclude, that to act for one end, "to take advantage by experience, to foreſee futurity (which, according to us, ſuits with brutes) "ought no leſs to proceed from a ſpiritual being, "than what is found in men. For in fine, what is "univerſal knowledge, but knowledge which ſuits "with many things, like as the picture of a man "would be like all the faces which ſhould reſemble "him? What is reaſoning, but a knowledge produced by another knowledge, as we ſee that one "motion is often produced by another? Certainly if "we once admit, that thought, intention, and reflection, may ariſe from a body animated by a "material form, it will be very difficult to prove, "that reaſoning and the ideas of men cannot ariſe "but from a body animated alſo by a material "form (55)."

(55) Pardies, *de la Connoiſſance des Bêtes*, num. 49. p. 100 & *ſeq.*

I intreat all my readers to take notice of the unhapy ſituation the ſchoolmen are in, with regard to the doctrine of the ſenſitive ſoul. They alledge, in oppoſition to Des Cartes, the moſt ſurprizing actions of animals; they make choice of them purpoſely, the better to confound him; but after all, they find they have gone too far; and furniſhed weapons to their adverſary, to deſtroy the ſpecific difference which they wiſh to eſtabliſh between our ſoul and that of animals. They would have one forget all thoſe examples of artifice, precaution, docility, and knowledge of futurity, which they have diſplayed with ſo much pomp, in order to ſhew that beaſts are not machines: they would have one conſider only the groſs actions of an ox, which does nothing but feed; but it is too late to deſire this: the ſame weapons are employed to confound them; and to prove, that if a material ſoul is capable of performing all thoſe things, it may produce all that the ſoul of man does. One muſt only aſcribe to the ſouls of brutes various degrees of refinement: muſt we not ſuppoſe, that the ſoul of a dog or of an ape is leſs groſs than the ſoul of an ox? In a word, if nothing but a ſpiritual ſoul can produce the groſs actions of a dull heavy peaſant, I will aſſert that nothing but a ſpiritual ſoul can produce the actions of an ape; and if it be ſaid, that a corporeal principle is capable of poducing all that apes perform, I will aſſert that a corporeal principle is capable of cauſing whatever is done by ſtupid perſons; and that provided we ſubtilize matter, and diſengage it from whatever is called groſs particles, *&c.* it will be the cauſe of whatever perſons of abilities do.

A QUESTION with regard to the liberty of the ſoul of brutes.

Some Authors inſinuate, that ſince the ſoul of man has free-will, and that that of brutes is deſtitute of liberty, there muſt be a ſpecific difference between them; that the one muſt be ſpiritual and the other corporeal. Theophilus Raynaud, the Jeſuit, publiſhed in 1630, a little treatiſe which he entitled *Calviniſmus Beſtiarum Religio* (56). His chief view was to prove, that the doctrine of the Dominicans reduces men to the level with brutes, by depriving him of free-will (57). *Præcipuè ex eo capite pronunciavit Catholicus, cenſendum eſſe, Calviniſmum eſſe religionem beſtiarum, quòd juxta placita Calviniana, homo redigatur in ordinem beſtiarum, & hominis gradu ac dignitate excidat. Ad quod ſolidè probandum, duæ propoſitiones viſæ illi ſunt ſtabiliendæ. Una eſt, hominem in ratione hominis, conſtitui per libertatem: altera eſt Libertatem everti per Calviniſmum* (58). i. e. "The Catholic pronounced that Calviniſm ought to be "looked upon as the religion of brutes, chiefly on this "account, becauſe according to the Calviniſtical principles

(56) See Baillet, *Vie de Des Cartes*, Tom. 1. p. 224.

(57) He diſputes indeed againſt Calvin; but it is in order to infer againſt the Dominicans (whom he pretends to agree with Calvin in that doctrine) what he infers againſt Calvin.

(58) Calviniſmus, *Beſtiarum Religio*, Diatriba 2. p. m. 25.

better explication than that they have hitherto given. The Author, who has beſt refuted Des Cartes concerning the ſoul of brutes, would have done us a great favour, could he have removed the difficulties with which the common opinion is attended [*G*]. Mr. Leibnitz,

" ciples man is degraded to a level with brutes, and " diveſted of the degree and dignity of man. To " the proving of which in a ſolid manner, he " thought proper to lay down two propoſitions; one " is, that to man, conſidered as ſuch, liberty of act- " ing is neceſſary; the other, that liberty is deſtroyed " by Calviniſm." He ſuppoſes that the characteriſtic of man, I mean the characteriſtic that diſtinguiſhes him from brutes, is the liberty of indifference; for as to the liberty, which conſiſts only in being free from conſtraint, or in ſpontaneouſneſs, no ſchoolman can deny but that it is found in animals. But I will ſhew that it is abſolutely falſe to aſſert, that a ſoul indued with free-will differs from a ſoul who is not poſſeſſed of it. The ſoul of children and that of madmen is deſtitute of free-will; and yet they are of the ſame ſpecies with the ſoul that is moſt amply poſſeſſed of liberty. Add to this, that the advocates for the liberty of indifference own that it will ceaſe after this life; and nevertheleſs they acknowledge, that the ſoul of man is, upon earth, the ſame ſubſtance as in Heaven or Hell. It is therefore evident, that the liberty of indifference is not an attribute eſſential to the creature, but a conceſſion, or an accidental favour which the Creator indulges it; and conſequently ſuch ſouls, as do not obtain that conceſſion, are not, on that account, of another kind than thoſe which receive it. It is therefore a very wrong way of arguing, to employ the following argument; the ſoul of brutes is deſtitute of free-will, and the ſoul of man is not deſtitute of it; therefore the ſoul of brutes is corporeal, and the ſoul of man ſpiritual. Let us go farther, and ſay, that ſuch, as admit a ſenſitive ſoul, cannot, for any ſolid reaſon, diveſt brutes of liberty. Do not they ſay, that brutes take prodigious pleaſure in doing certain things; and that they are directed to it, in conſequence of the judgment they have made of the utility of objects; a judgment which excited in them a deſire of uniting themſelves to thoſe objects? If liberty conſiſts only in a freedom of conſtraint, and in a ſpontaneouſneſs which muſt be preceded by a diſcernment of the objects, is it not abſurd to deny that animals are free? Has not a dog, when hungry, the ſtrength to abſtain from a piece of meat, when he is afraid of being beat, in caſe he does not abſtain from it? Is not this the being inveſted with a power to act, and to not act? His abſtinence doubtleſs proceeds from his comparing hunger with blows, and his judging that theſe are leſs eaſy to be born than hunger. If we obſerve all the human actions which are aſcribed to the liberty of indifference, it will appear that man never ſuſpends them, or chooſes one of the contraries, but becauſe having compared the reaſons *pro* and *con*, he ſeems more inclined to ſuſpend his action than to act; or has more motives for one action than another. I will again tranſcribe from the Jeſuit, who wrote againſt the Carteſians. " It is no eaſy matter thus to ſepa- " rate reaſoning from thought; and methinks it is " very eaſy to prove, that when a ſubſtance is capa- " ble of thinking, it is alſo capable of reaſoning; " that it is indued with will, and liberty or free- " will; in a word, that it can act like men. The " ancient Philoſophers, and even the Fathers of the " Church, have proved that we were indued with " free-will from this general argument; that every " thing that is capable of knowing, may know good " and evil, that is, whatever is good or bad for it; " that conſequently, by conſidering theſe two ob- " jects, he can compare them together, can delibe- " rate, can determine to make choice of one and " reject the other, in which the uſe of our liberty " conſiſts. And this is ſo true, that the definition " we ſtill retain of liberty in general is this, *Facultas* " *agendi cum ratione*, the faculty of acting with " knowledge, this being the ſignification of *cum ra-* " *tione* (59).

One of the ſtrongeſt proofs brought for the liberty of man is taken from the puniſhment of malefactors. All ſocieties are agreed to puniſh them in an exemplary manner; and even, in certain caſes, to extend publickly the puniſhment to their dead bodies: they are deprived of burial, and expoſed as a ſpectacle on wheels and gibbets. If man did not act freely; if a fatal and unavoidable neceſſity determined him to have a certain train of thoughts, theft and murther ought not to be puniſhed, and no benefit could be expected from puniſhing the guilty; for thoſe who ſhould ſee the body of a malefactor upon a wheel, would not be leſs ſubject than before to that ſuperior force which makes them act, and does not allow them any uſe of their liberty. But the proof of free-will is not ſo ſtrong as it appears; for though men are perſuaded that machines have no feeling, they nevertheleſs give them a hundred blows with the hammer, when they are out of order, when they think that they may be ſet right, by flatting a wheel, or another piece of iron. They therefore would cauſe a pick-pocket to be whipped, though they ſhould know he had no liberty, if experience had taught them, that certain perſons, by whipping, are made to refrain from continuing certain actions. However, if this argument for free-will has any force, it ſerves evidently to ſhew, that brutes are not deſtitute of liberty (60). They are puniſhed every day, and by that means they amend their faults. Ochinus, in the beginning of his Labyrinths, examines all the reaſons which induce us to think that we act freely; and ſays, among other particulars, in oppoſition to that drawn from the puniſhment of malefactors; that were Magiſtrates certain, that by hanging a horſe who had killed a man, and letting him hang a long time in the high-way, other horſes would thereby be kept from doing evil, they would employ that puniſhment every time a horſe ſhould have maimed or killed any perſon by his kicking or biting (61). In all probability he did not know that this kind of ſpectacles are employed in ſome countries, to intimidate wild beaſts. Rorarius was an eye-witneſs to this; he ſeeing two wolves hung up upon a gibbet in the Dutchy of Juliers; and he obſerves, that this makes a ſtronger impreſſion on the other wolves, than the branding with a red hot iron, the loſs of ears, &c. does on thieves. He likewiſe ſays, that in Africa, lions are hung upon a croſs, to frighten the reſt, and that the inhabitants find it of advantage. *Solent in Africa crucifigere leones, ſi qui deprehendantur urbes obſidere, quod in ſenectâ faciunt: quoniam ad perſequendas feras vires non ſuppetunt; cujus pœnæ metu, licet urgeat fames, deſinunt: & nos ab Agrippina Colonia Duram verſus equitantes, in illa vaſta ſylva, vidimus duos caligatos lupos, non ſecus quam duos latrones furcæ ſuſpenſos: quo ſimilis pœnæ formidine à maleficio reliqui deterreantur. At inter homines quotidie reperiuntur, quibus cò admiſſa furta tergus virgis cæſum, abſciſſæ auriculæ, ſignatæ genæ, truncata altera manus, erutus oculus, nec adhuc à furtis ſe continere poſſunt, donec laqueus vitæ finis extiterit* (62), *i. e.* " It is uſual for the Africans to crucify lions, " whenever any of them approach towns, which they " do, when thoſe animals are arrived to an old age, " becauſe they then have not ſtrength to hunt wild " beaſts; the dread of which puniſhment, though " they are pinched with hunger, makes them refrain. " As I myſelf was travelling on horſe-back from Co- " logn to Duren, through that wide-extended foreſt, " I ſaw two wolves truſſed up, like two thieves, " hanging on a gibbet; to deter others, by the " dread of the like puniſhment, from doing ſuch " miſchief. But there are every day ſeen among " men, ſome, who for their guilt, have been whip- " ped, had their ears cut off, been burnt in the " cheek, had a hand cut off, an eye pulled out, and " yet would not leave their wicked courſes, till a " halter put an end to their lives."

[*G*] *Could he have removed the difficulties, with which the common opinion is attended.*] The publick very much eſteems, and with great reaſon, a book entitled, *Le Voyage du Monde de Des Cartes* (63). We there ſee very

(59) Pardies, *de la Connoiſſance des Animaux*, num. 52. p. 104, 105. Obſerve that he cites, p. 113, the example of a dog, who had learnt to ſing his part with his maſter. He cites *Vide Rorarium oratione peculiari de ratione brutor.* But he ſhould have cited Rorarius, *quod animalia bruta utantur ratione melius homine*, lib. 1. p. 2.

(60) Obſerve, that this queſtion which Franzius propoſes, *Hiſt. Animal. Sacra*, part. 1. cap. 2. p. m. 16. *Quæri autem poſſet* an non ponenda ſit rationalis anima in brutis ... *cum* Geneſ. ix. ver. 5. *Deus ipſe vindicare velit ſanguinem hominis in brutis, ſi quando effuderunt ſanguinem humanum.* He alſo cites Exod. x. ver. 28. and Levitic. xx. 15, 16. where God enacts puniſhments againſt brutes.

(61) I have not this book of Ochinus now by me; I quoting from memory what he ſays; and perhaps I do not exactly tranſlate his words; but I'm ſure I give his meaning.

(62) Rorarius, *quod animalia bruta utantur ratione melius homine*, lib. 2. p. 109.

(63) Father Daniel, the Jeſuit, is thought to have writ that book.

Leibnitz, one of the greateſt genius's in Europe, being perfectly ſenſible of thoſe difficulties,

very great difficulties, agreeably and ſtrongly objected to the Carteſians, and very well urged. Thoſe, which relate to the ſouls of brutes conſidered as machines, are, in my opinion, the beſt that could be propoſed. The Author ingenuouſly confeſſes the little ſkill which the peripateticks at firſt ſhewed, in oppoſing that famous paradox of Des Cartes, and the advantage which the followers of the latter drew from it. He takes advantage dexterouſly of the ill conſequences, which may be inferred from this paradox; he ſhewing, that the arguments of the Carteſians lead us to judge that other men are machines. This is, perhaps, the weakeſt ſide of Carteſianiſm; and this confirms a very judicious thought we may entertain with reſpect to the nature of human knowledge. One would imagine that God, who is the diſtributer and diſpoſer of them, acts like a common father of all ſects; that is, that he will not ſuffer one ſect to triumph entirely over the reſt, and ſink them irrecoverably; a ſect though defeated, put to the rout, and almoſt ſpent, always finds means to recover, the inſtant it leaves off ſtanding upon the defenſive, in order to act defenſively. The combat of ſects is always like that between the Greeks and Trojans (for ſome time) the night that Troy was taken.

Nec ſoli pœnas dant ſanguine Teucri:
Quondam etiam victis redit in præcordia virtus,
Victoreſque cadunt Danai (64).

(64) Virgil. Æn. lib. 2. ver. 366.

" Nor blood alone the thirſty ſword diſtains,
" Stream'd from our ſide, and pour'd from Teu-
" crian veins;
" By turns, our breaſts re-kindling virtue warms;
" And the proud victor ſinks beneath our arms."
Dr. Theobald's beautiful tranſlation of Virgil.

They vanquiſh one another alternately, accordingly as they change their manner of fighting. A Carteſian has no ſooner overthrown and deſtroyed the opinion of the Schoolmen with reſpect to the ſoul of brutes, but he finds that he may be defeated with his own weapons, and be ſhewn that he proves too much. That if he reaſons conſequentially, he will renounce opinions, which he yet cannot quit without becoming an object of ridicule, and admitting the moſt palpable abſurdities; for what man will preſume to ſay, that he himſelf is the only thinking being, and that all others are machines? Would not ſuch a man be conſidered as more diſtracted, than ſuch as are put into mad-houſes, or ſuch as are denied all converſe with their fellow creatures? This conſequence of the Carteſian doctrine is a terrible mortification: It is like the peacock's feet; it is an uglineſs that mortifies the vanity, which the ſplendor of the plumage had inſpired. But be this as it will, it muſt be confeſſed that the whole advantage which Father Daniel has againſt Des Cartes's opinion, conſiſts in the objections he ſtarted; and no way in the anſwer he made to the objections of the Carteſians. He does not deny but that their queſtions are very puzzling; but he aſſerts that they, in their turn, are ſtrangely puzzled by the queſtions put to them, and *that good repriſals* may be made (65). It would be to no purpoſe to ſearch, in his book, for the ſolution of ſuch phyſical, moral and theological duties, as are propoſed to the peripateticks with regard to the ſouls of brutes; he contents himſelf with anſwering, that if there are ſome things of their opinion which cannot be underſtood, there are alſo ſome things of the ſame kind in Des Cartes's hypotheſis. The definition of the ſoul of brutes, *a ſubſtance capable of ſenſation*, that is, of ſeeing, underſtanding, &c. is as clear as the Carteſian definition of a ſpirit, *a thinking and reaſoning ſubſtance* (66). Theſe are Father Daniel's words, which he afterwards proves as well as can be. He had ſaid a little before (67), that the ſoul of brutes is neither material nor ſpiritual, but *a middle being between both*, which is *incapable of reaſoning or thinking, and only of perception and ſenſation*. We muſt not blame him for writing no better on this ſubject, but the ſubject itſelf.

(65) *Suite du Voiage du Monde de Des Cartes*, p. 75.

(66) Ibid. p. 84.

(67) Ibid. p. 82, 83.

He will give me leave to ſay, that his hypotheſis cannot be maintained, nor can ſolve any difficulty. Theſe two words, *matter*, *ſpirit*, ſeem, at firſt ſight, to be oppoſed in ſuch a manner, as to admit of a medium; but when we examine them more attentively, we find that they may be reduced to a contradictory oppoſition. For this purpoſe we need only aſk, whether ſubſtance, which is neither body nor ſpirit, is extended or not? If it has extent, it ought not to be diſtinguiſhed from matter: if it has not extent, I would fain know why it ſhould be diſtinguiſhed from a ſpirit; for it ſuits with a ſpirit, in the notion of a ſubſtance that has no extenſion, and we cannot comprehend that this notion is diviſible into two kinds; ſince the ſpecifick attribute which may be given to one, will never appear inconſiſtent with the other. If God can join thought (68) to a being, that has no extenſion, he alſo can join it to another unextended being; there being nothing but extenſion, that ſeems to make matter incapable of thinking. At leaſt we plainly conceive, that an unextended ſubſtance, which has ſenſation, is capable of thinking; and conſequently, if the ſoul of brutes is an unextended ſubſtance capable of ſenſation, it is capable of reaſoning: it is therefore of the ſame ſpecies with the ſoul of man, and conſequently is not a middle ſubſtance between body and ſpirit. Here follows a queſtion ſtarted by Father Daniel; *Will the Carteſians deny the poſſibility of there being ſuch a kind of being, as is capable only of ſenſation? And what is become of that awe and reſpect, with which their maſter endeavoured to inſpire them for the almighty power of a God, who, according to him, can order it ſo, that a triangle ſhall not have three angles, and that two and two ſhall not make four; and who nevertheleſs was not able to make a being, which was indued only with ſenſation* (69)? This queſtion would puzzle a man, who ſhould have formed a reſolution never to deviate from Des Cartes's words; but we do not meet with any Carteſians who ſubject themſelves to ſuch ſlavery; and we are ſure that Des Cartes would not have aſſerted ſeriouſly, that God is able to make two foot of wax ſuſceptible of three or four figures, and not ſuſceptible of any other. Whatever opinion Des Cartes may have entertained on this head, his Diſciples will think they are no ways wanting in the reſpect they owe to God, if they aſſert, that *a Being capable only of ſenſation* is not more poſſible, than a piece (70) of wax is ſuſceptible only of *a ſquare figure*. As to what relates to *a being that had only ſenſations*, they will believe this very poſſible; in like manner as it would be poſſible for a certain piece of matter to be always round, in caſe God would eternally prevent the particles of it to be tranſpoſed or change their places. Father Daniel will give me leave to ſay, he did not perceive, that it is not the ſame thing to ſay, *a being, capable only of ſenſation*, and afterwards, *a being that had only ſenſations*. The poſſibility of the former is incomprehenſible, but that of the ſecond is manifeſt. But as a piece of wax, in which God would perpetually prevent the particles from being tranſpoſed, would be of the ſame kind with a piece of wax, the change of whoſe extremities would inceſſantly produce a new figure; in like manner let us ſay that a ſubſtance, which God ſhould always confine to ſenſations, would be of the ſame kind with a ſubſtance that ſhould arrive to ſo high a pitch as reaſoning.

(68) I take this word in the ſenſe of the Carteſians, that is, for a generic modification, which includes ſenſations, reflections, reaſonings, &c. as ſo many different kinds.

(69) *Suite du Voiage du Monde de Des Cartes*, p. 84.

(70) By a piece here is meant an aſſemblage of different particles. This I obſerve to prevent the difficulty of an Atomiſt, who imagines that the figure of an atom is eſſentially immutable.

It remains that I ſhew the inſufficiency of this Jeſuit's Hypotheſis. I. We want a ſyſtem, which ſhould ſuppoſe the ſouls of beaſts to be mortal; but this we do not find in a middle being between body and ſpirit; for ſuch a being has no extenſion: it is therefore indiviſible; it can be deſtroyed only by *annihilation*; neither diſeaſes, fire, nor the ſword can hurt it: it is therefore, in this reſpect, of the ſame nature and condition with ſpirits, with the ſoul of man. II. We want a ſyſtem that may eſtabliſh a ſpecific difference between the ſoul of man and that of brutes: now we do not find it by this middle being; for if the ſoul of beaſts, being neither body nor ſpirit, is nevertheleſs indued with ſenſations, man's ſoul may yet reaſon, though it be neither body nor ſpirit, but a being between both. It is more difficult for a be-

culties, has thrown into certain lights which deſerve to be improved [*H*]. I ſhall mention ſome particulars of what he propoſes, though it was only to take notice of my own doubts.

ing deſtitute of ſenſation, to arrive at the perception of a tree, than for a being indued with ſenſation to acquire the faculty of reaſoning. III. We want a ſyſtem, which may account for the ſurprizing ſkill we ſee in bees, dogs, apes, elephants; and you ſpeak of ſuch ſouls in brutes as is indued only with ſenſations, that does not think (71), nor argue. If this matter is duly weighed, it will be found that ſuch a ſoul is not ſufficient to explain the phœnomena. Father Daniel owns this in another part of his work, in which he ſeems to allow the Peripateticks no other advantage but that of poſſeſſion; for after having touched upon the difficulties found in the Carteſian principles, with reſpect to brutes, he adds (72): *The Peripateticks have alſo, doubtleſs, their difficulties to ſolve: but yet, were they much more conſiderable than they are, yet ſo long as the Carteſians have nothing to ſay that is more ſatisfactory or intelligible, we ought to keep to the former, and argue on this particular point, as a great Miniſter did five and twenty years ago, on the whole body of philoſophy. He was adviſed not to let his eldeſt ſon learn the ancient philoſophy, becauſe (as it was ſaid to him) it is all trifling and ſilly. I alſo have been told, ſays he, that there are a great many idle, chimerical things in the new; and therefore, continued he, ſince I am to chooſe between the ancient and new fooleries, we ought to prefer the former to the latter. Perhaps* Nihuſius reaſoned after this manner.

(71) I here employ the word *thinking*, for a kind of perception, and not according to the general notion of Des Cartes.

(72) *Suite du Voiage du Monde de Des Cartes*, p. 105, 106.

[*H*] *Mr. Leibnitz . . . . . has thrown in certain lights which ought to be improved.*] He approves (74) the ſentiment of ſome moderns, that animals are organized in the ſeed; and he alſo believes (75), that matter alone cannot conſtitute a true unity; and therefore that every animal is united to a form, which is a ſimple, indiviſible, and only true ſingle being. Farther he ſuppoſes (76) that this form never leaves its ſubject; whence it reſults, that, properly ſpeaking, there is neither death nor procreation in nature. He excepts (77) the ſoul of man on this occaſion, he putting it apart, *&c.* This hypotheſis (78) delivers us from part of the difficulties. The buſineſs is not any longer to anſwer the mighty objections which are made to the ſchoolmen. The ſoul of brutes, ſay their adverſaries, is a ſubſtance diſtinct from the body; it therefore muſt be produced by creation, and deſtroyed by annihilation. Heat (79) muſt then have the power to create ſouls, and to annihilate them (80); and can any thing be more abſurd than ſuch an aſſertion? The anſwers, which the Peripatetics make to this objection do not deſerve to be anſwered, nor to be brought out of the obſcurity of the ſchools, where they are taught to young ſcholars; they can only convince us, that the objection, with regard to them, is invincible. They do not come off better, when they are deſired to find out ſome ſenſe, and ſome ſhadow of reaſon, in the continual production of an almoſt numberleſs multitude of ſubſtances which are totally deſtroyed a few days after; though they are much nobler and much more excellent than matter which never loſes its exiſtence. Leibnitz's hypotheſis removes all this, by inducing us to believe, I. That God, at the beginning of the world, created the forms of all bodies, and conſequently the ſouls of all beaſts. II. That theſe ſouls have exiſted ever ſince that time, united inſeparably to the firſt organized body in which God has fixed them. This frees us from the neceſſity we ſhould otherwiſe be reduced to, of having recourſe to the tranſmigration of ſouls which we otherwiſe ſhould be obliged to do. However, that the reader may ſee whether I have taken his meaning, I ſhall tranſcribe a paſſage from him (81). "Here the *tranſformations* of Swammerdam, Malpighi, and Leeuwenhoeck, who have made the moſt excellent obſervations of any in our age, came to my aſſiſtance; and made me more eaſily admit, that animals, and all other organized ſubſtances, do not begin at that time we ſuppoſe; and that their ſeeming generation is only an unfolding, and a kind of augmentation. And indeed I obſerved, that the Author of the *ſearch after truth*, Mr. Regis, Mr. Hartſoeker, and other learned men, have not deviated very far from this opinion. But the greateſt queſtion ſtill remained, *viz.* what becomes of thoſe ſouls or forms when the animal dies, or when the individuum of the organized ſubſtance is deſtroyed. And this puzzles the more, becauſe it does not appear very rational, that ſouls ſhould remain uſeleſs in a chaos of confuſed matter. This made me at laſt ſuppoſe, the only reaſonable opinion I could embrace, was that of the preſervation, not only of the ſoul, but alſo of the animal itſelf, and its organized machine; though the deſtruction of its groſs particles has reduced it to ſmalneſs, which is as imperceptible to ourſelves, as it was before birth was given to it. And indeed, no perſon can fix the true time of his death, which, for a long time, may paſs for a ſimple ſuſpenſion of viſible actions; and in the main, is nothing elſe in mere animals, as is manifeſt from the *ſuſcitations* of flies drowned, and afterwards buried in pulverized chalk, and ſeveral inſtances of the like nature, which ſhew plainly enough, that there would be many more *reſuſcitations*, and much higher, were men able to put the machine in order again. It is therefore natural to ſuppoſe, that as the animal was always living and organized (as ſome perſons of great penetration begin to acknowledge) it always continues ſo. And ſince there thus is no new birth, nor an entirely new generation of the animal, it follows that there will not be any final extinction, nor entire death, in a ſtrict metaphyſical ſenſe; and conſequently that, inſtead of the tranſmigration of ſouls, there is only a transformation of the ſame animal, according as the organs are differently bent or folded, or more or leſs unfolded."

(73) See the rem. [*H*] of this art.

(74) See Mr. Leibnitz's piece, inſerted in the *Journal des Savans*, for June 27. 1695. p. 449. Dutch edit.

(75) *Journ. des Savans*, for June 27. 1695. p. 446.

(76) Ibid. p. 447.

(77) Ibid. p. 448, 450.

(78) Bernier, in his *Relation of the Heathens of Indoſtan*, p. m. 200. ſpeaks of an opinion of the Philoſophers of that country, very like this.

(79) Chickens are hatched by putting eggs into ovens, which are heated by degrees. This is practiſed in Egypt.

(80) Many ſorts of animals may be deſtroyed, by putting them into an oven a little too much heated.

(81) *Journ. des Savans*, 27 June, 1695. p. 449.

I will obſerve by the way, that ſome perſons are of opinion, that the primitive ſubject to which our ſoul is united, iſſues with it from our bodies, when we die. Poiret is almoſt of this opinion; and even believes that Moſes appeared the day of the tranſmigration, with the true body which accompanied his ſoul when he quitted this life; that is, as he explains it, when that bleſſed ſoul only left the cover or caſe, which enwrapped the ſubtile body to which it was united. He calls the carcaſe by the name of caſe, or ruſt, with reſpect to the true ſubject which is united to the ſoul. His words are as follow: *Cùm Deus ſit conſtans in ſuis operibus, maxime in præcipuis, & quoad fundamentaliora, condideritque mentes quaſdam, humanas nempe, corporibus annexas; probabile non eſt, id opus vel per aliquod tempus ex toto interrumpi atque deſtrui: & ex hiſtoriis ſacris habemus, Moſen, cujus cadaver omnino cecidit, cum Elia apparuiſſe Apoſtolis Chriſtum in transfiguratione radiantem ſpectantibus: id quod ſine corpore, cui mens fuerit juncta, fieri non poterat. Nonnulli ad corpus ex aëre aſſumptum recurrunt: at quid ni id ex ipſo Moſis corpore (& ſic de cæteris) eſſet, portio nempe materiæ illius internæ ſpiritualioris, ſubtilioris & purioris, quæ depoſito cadavere, ſeu tegmine vel cortice aut ſcabie vel rubigine quadam, exhalaret, & menti adhuc unita, ejus regimine, ſecundum Dei placitum, dirigeretur* (82)*?* i. e. "Since God is conſtant in all his works, particularly in ſuch as are the chief and fundamental, and has formed certain minds, *viz.* thoſe of men, joined to bodies; it is no ways probable, that ſuch a work is totally interrupted or deſtroyed, though but for a time. And we are told in Scripture, that Moſes, whoſe body died, appeared with Elias to the Apoſtles, beholding Chriſt ſhining glorioufly in the tranſmigration; which could not be done without a body to which a mind was joined. Some have recourſe to a body of air (an airy vehicle) but why might it not be from the body of Moſes itſelf (and ſo of others) *viz.* a portion of that internal, more ſpiritual, ſubtile, and purer matter, which the carcaſe, cover, bark, being put off, as a cruſt, or ruſt, exhaled; and being yet united to the mind, was thereby directed and governed, as God thought proper?" He publiſhed ſome objections, that were ſent him from Sedan. It was objected to him, among other inſtances (83), that the example of Moſes

(82) Poiret, *Cogitat. rational. de Deo, anima, & malo*, in *Appendice*, num. 1. p. 611. edit. Amſterdam 1685.

(83) Idem, *Reſponſ. ad primas Object.* p. 696.

doubts. But to return to Rorarius; I fancy I am not miſtaken, in declaring it my opinion, that he was born in Pordenone in Italy [*I*]. I wiſh I could have ſeen the ſpeech he made in favour of rats (*b*), which was printed in the country of the Griſons, in 1548. There is ſomething like this in the writings of Preſident Chaſſanée (*c*). I ſhall here (*d*) preſent my Readers with the remainder of the collection, the chief part of which was in the article PEREIRA.

(*b*) *Oratio pro muribus adverſus Nicolai Boſtii edictum. Auguſtæ Rheticæ ap. Phil. Ulhard.* Draudius, *Bibl.* p. 1093.

(*c*) Vide Thuan. lib. 6. p. 126.

(*d*) See the rem. [*D*].

I have heard from ſeveral hands, that many perſons who delight in the hiſtory of opinions, have approved the collections which I publiſhed in the remarks of this article. They even declared their deſire of my publiſhing others, in caſe any new ones ſhould come

Moſes proves nothing, becauſe that this great Prophet could not be ſeen by the Apoſtles, unleſs a great deal of matter had been added to that, which iſſued out of his body when his ſoul quitted it. But if it was neceſſary to give him above half a new body, we may very well ſuppoſe, that all the matter, which was ſeen about him that day, was new. Poiret anſwered (84), that the ſubtile matter, which iſſues out of the body with the ſoul, is too delicate to ſtrike our groſs ſenſes; but yet that we can ſee it, when we are aſſiſted, in an extraordinary manner, by Heaven. He was told, that ſome ſchoolmen admit a quinteſcence, to tie or join the human ſoul with the organs formed of the four elements; and to ſerve as a vehicle to it, when death makes it leave the body. They alſo ſay, that this vehicle feels the torments, which the reprobate endure, before the reſurrection. *Obſervo opinionem viri docti non multum diſcrepare à quorundam Scholaſticorum placitis, qui præter quatuor elementa neſcio quam quintam eſſentiam venire in compoſitum humani corporis opinantur, quæ ſit veluti medium quoddam vinculum, quo incorporeus & immortalis animus cum terreno ac mortali corpore copuletur: aliter enim ſi res eſſet, nulla videretur eſſe proportio & convenientia inter corpus & animam rationalem: & illam quidem quintam eſſentiam naturæ cœleſtis eſſe volunt, eamque ferre animum, quando per mortem à corpore migrare cogitur, & in ea pœnas apud inferos luere ſceleribus ſuis promeritas* (85). i. e. "I obſerve that the opinion of the learned man "is not very different from the principles of ſome "ſchoolmen, who think, that, abſtracted from the "four elements, there is I know not what fifth "eſſence in the compoſition of the human body, "which is a ſort of middle band, whereby the incorporeal and immortal ſoul is joined to the terreſtrial and mortal body; for was this otherwiſe, there would not appear any proportion or "agreement between the body and the rational ſoul: "and they are of opinion that this fifth eſſence is of "a celeſtial nature; and that it carries this ſoul "whenever it is obliged, by death, to leave the "body; and therein ſuffers in Hell the torments "which its crimes deſerved." Poiret anſwered (86), that he had nothing to do with the notions of the ſchoolmen. See the margin (87).

(84) Poiret, *Reſponſ. ad primas Object.* p. 697.

(85) Ibid. p. 696.

(86) Ibid. p. 197.

(87) The anonymous Platoniſt, Author of *Philoſophia vulgaris refutata*, printed in 1690, ſays that Ockham, Maironi, Antonius Mirandulanus, Garbius, Licetus, declare the ſoul of man to be compoſed of two ſubſtances, *alia immateriali quæ à Deo creatur, alia materiali quæ ex traduce propignatur, &c.*

Some things in Leibnitz's hypotheſis are liable to ſome difficulties, though they ſhew the ſtrength and compaſs of his genius. He is of opinion, for inſtance, that the ſoul of a dog acts independently on bodies; *that he has every thing from within himſelf, by a perfect ſpontaneouſneſs with regard to itſelf, and nevertheleſs with a perfect conformity to external things. . . . . That its internal perceptions ariſe from its original conſtitution, that is repreſentative (capable of expreſſing the beings out of itſelf with regard to its organs) which was beſtowed upon it from the time of its creation, and which forms its individual character* (88). Whence it follows, that it would be ſenſible to hunger and thirſt at ſuch an hour, though there ſhould be nobody in the Univerſe; *though nothing ſhould exiſt but God and that ſoul.* He explains (89) his thoughts by the example of two pendulums, which ſhould agree perfectly: that is, he ſuppoſes, that according to the particular laws which put the ſoul in action, it muſt have the ſenſation of hunger at ſuch an hour; and that, according to the particular laws which regulate or direct the motion of matter, the body, which is united to the ſoul, muſt be modified at the ſame hour; as it is modified when the ſoul is hungry. I ſhall not prefer this ſyſtem to that of occaſional cauſes, till its able author has improved it. I cannot comprehend a concatenation of internal and ſpontaneous actions, which would cauſe the ſoul of a dog to feel pain, immediately after having felt pleaſure, though it were ſingle and alone in the univerſe. I comprehend why a dog paſſes immediately from pleaſure to pain, when, being very hungry, and eating a piece of bread, he is immediately after beaten with a ſtick; but that his ſoul ſhould be formed in ſuch a manner, that at the inſtant he is ſtruck he ſhould feel pain, though he were not ſtruck, though he even ſhould continue to eat bread unmoleſted, this is what I cannot comprehend. I alſo think the *ſpontaneouſneſs* of this ſoul quite inconſiſtent with painful ſenſations; and, in general, with all ſuch perceptions as ſhould be unpleaſing to it. Beſides, the reaſon why this learned man does not like the Carteſian ſyſtem ſeems to me a falſe ſuppoſition; for we cannot ſay that the ſyſtem of occaſional cauſes brings in God acting by a miracle (90), *Deum ex machina*, in the reciprocal dependance between ſoul and body; for as God intervenes there only according to general laws, he does not act in an extraordinary manner. Does the internal and active virtue, communicated to the forms of bodies, according to Leibnitz, know the ſeries of actions it muſt produce? In no manner; for we know by experience, that we are ignorant whether we ſhall have ſuch and ſuch perceptions in an hour: the forms muſt therefore be directed by ſome external principle, in the production of their acts. But would not this be *Deus ex machina*, as in the ſyſtem of occaſional cauſes (91)? To conclude, as he very juſtly obſerves, that all ſouls are ſimple and indiviſible, one cannot conceive how they can be compared to a pendulum; that is, that they, by their original conſtitution, can diverſify their operations, by making uſe of the ſpontaneous activity they ſhould receive from their Creator. We clearly conceive, that a ſimple being will always act in an uniform manner, if it be not hindred by ſome external cauſe. If it was compoſed of ſeveral pieces, like a machine, it would act different ways; becauſe the particular activity of each piece might change, every inſtant, the progreſs of the reſt; but where ſhall we find the cauſe of a change of operation in a ſimple ſubſtance?

(90) Ibid.

(91) See the objections made to Leibnitz, by Mr. S. F. (Mr. Foucher) in the *Journ. des Savans*, for Sept. 12. 1695. p. 639 *& ſeq.*

[*I*] *I fancy I am not miſtaken, in declaring it my opinion, that he was born in Pordenone in Italy.*] The ground I go upon is this. He ſays that he was born not far from Sacillum. *Proximum eſt patriæ meæ Sacillum oppidum (in quo doctiſſimus Franciſcus Amaltheus publico ſtipendio humaniores litteras profitetur, cujus ſub ductu pueritiæ meæ rudimentum depoſui) amœnum flumine.* i. e. "Not far from the place of my birth is Sacil-"lum, (in which the moſt learned Francis Amal-"theus is public profeſſor of polite literature, and "under whom I purſued my juvenile ſtudies) whoſe "beauty is very much heightned by a river." This parentheſis is not uſeleſs here, as it informs us where Rorarius carried on his firſt ſtudies; and that the three brothers, who have made the name of Amaltheus (92) ſo famous, were not the only perſons of that name who were men of learning. It is certain that Sacillum is not far (93) from *Portus Naonis*, or Pordenone as the Italians, or Portenau, as the Germans call it (94). The dedication of Rorarius's book to the Biſhop of Arras is dated from *Portus Naonis*: and there is a Phyſician of the ſame city, and whoſe name was NICHOLAS RORARIUS. He wrote a book printed at Venice in 1566, and 1572, and entitled *Contradictiones, Dubia, & Paradoxa in Libros Hippocratis, Celſi, Galeni, Aetii, Æginetæ, Avicennæ, cum eorundem conciliationibus.* Here follows what is ſaid of this writer in *Lindenius Renovatus. Nicolaus Rorarius Utinenſis Medicus vixit circa A. C.* 1563. *Renatus Moreau de V. S. in Pleurit.* This does not mean that he

(92) Hieronymus, Joannes Baptiſta, and Cornelius Amalthei. Their Latin poems were printed at Amſterdam in 1689, with a preface by Grævius.

(93) See Leandro Alberti, *in Deſcriptione Italiæ*, p. m. 750.

(94) See Baudrand, under the word *Portus Naonis*.

come in my way; for which reaſon I ſhall take the liberty to introduce ſome ſupplements [*K*], though I am ſenſible that many of my Readers will not be pleaſed with, and

he was born in Udina, but only that he practiſed Phyſick there. Konig has therefore committed an error where he ſays, *Rorarius* (Nicol.) *de Portunnone, Utinenſis, collegit conciliationes contradictionum in ſcriptis Medicorum anno* 1566. The omiſſion of the word *Medicus* after *Utinenſis* miſleads us; it making us ſuppoſe that this Phyſician was a native of Udine, and that *de Portunnone* was a ſirname of his family. Doni dedicated one of the chapters of his *Ramo della Zucca* (95) to Gregorio Rorario of Pordonnone.

(95) It is the *Chiachera ultima*, fol. m. 64. *verſo.*

AUTHORS who thought that brutes are indued with a rational ſoul.

[*K*] *For which reaſon I ſhall take the liberty to introduce ſome ſupplements.*] I will begin by mentioning ſuch authors as think that brutes are indued with a rational ſoul. I believe no perſon has exaggerated more on this occaſion than the Philoſopher Celſus; for, attempting to oppoſe the aſſertion of the Chriſtians, viz. that all things were made for man, he endeavours to ſhew, that brutes are as excellent as man, and even that they ſurpaſs him. He declares (96) that they have a form of government, and that they follow the dictates of juſtice and charity (97). He pretends that ants converſe with one another. *When they meet*, ſays he, *they talk together, by which means they never loſe their way. They therefore are indued with reaſon in all its gradations; they have naturally the ideas of certain univerſal truths; they have the faculty of ſpeech; they have the knowledge of fortuitous things, and are able to expreſs them* (98). He affirms that there are beaſts (99) who are acquainted with the ſecrets of Magic (100): for which reaſon mankind cannot boaſt of it, as an advantage they poſſeſs ſuperior to brutes. He expreſſes himſelf on this occaſion as follows. *If man is vain of his knowing the ſecrets of Magic, yet ſerpents and eagles are better acquainted with it than he is. For they have ſeveral antidotes againſt poiſons and diſeaſes; and they are acquainted with the virtues of certain ſtones, by which they cure their young; which men value ſo much, that when they have found them they imagine they have fallen upon a treaſure . . . . .* (101). After this, attempting to ſhew at large, that men, upon pretence of knowing the deity, ſhould not therefore pretend to be ſuperior, on that account, to all mortal beings; ſince there are ſome beings devoid of reaſon, who have a pure and diſtinct idea of it; at the ſame time that the moſt ſubtle, whether Greeks or Barbarians, have in all countries ſo many diſputes about it, he adds: *If any one pretends to rank man above the reſt of the animals, becauſe he is capable of knowing the Deity, and to receive the idea and impreſſion of it; let him know that there are ſeveral, among them, who may boaſt the ſame advantage, and with ſome foundation. For what can be more divine, than to foreſee and foretel things to come? Now, the reſt of the animals, and birds in particular, are in that reſpect the inſtructors of men; and the art of our ſoothſayers conſiſts only in underſtanding what thoſe animals teach them. Birds therefore, and the reſt of the animals qualified for divination, to whom God reveals futurity, ſhew it us by ſigns and ſymbols; which is a proof that they have naturally more correſpondence, and a more intimate one, with the Deity than we have; that they ſurpaſs us in knowledge, and are dearer to God than we. The moſt learned men ſay likewiſe, that theſe animals converſe together in a much more holy and nobler manner than we do: and that they themſelves underſtand their language, as they prove it, when, after telling us that birds ſay they will go to ſuch a place, and will there do ſuch a thing, they ſhew us, that they really go and perform ſuch things. With regard to elephants, no creature ſhews a more religious reſpect for oaths* (102), *or who are attached with a more inviolable fidelity to God: which doubtleſs muſt proceed wholly from their knowing him.* I ſhall not tranſcribe what Origen anſwers to all theſe particulars. It is enough that I inform my readers, that he refutes them in the work he wrote againſt Celſus.

(96) To bees and ants.

(97) See *Origen* againſt *Celſus*, lib. 4. p. m. 180.

(98) Ibid. p. 181, 182. This is according to Bouhereau's tranſlation.

(99) Ibid. p. 182.

(100) He means natural magic.

(101) Ibid. p. 183, 184.

(102) See citat. 35 above.

(103) See Oſiander, *Annotat. in Libr. Grotii de Jure Belli & Pacis*, p. 213.

Salmaſius muſt be ranked amongſt ſuch of the moderns, as imagined that animals are indued with reaſon; and ſays that the inſtances which might be given of this would fill a book (103). Oſiander diſapproves of this opinion. See his notes on Grotius's book *de Jure Belli & Pacis*, in the chapter wherein he rejects the definition of the law of nature adopted by Juſtinian, Book 1. of the *Inſtitutes* (104). According to this definition men and beaſts have the knowledge of the law of nature. Moſt of thoſe who approve it, go upon this hypotheſis, that they are not deprived of the uſe of reaſon; but the greateſt part of thoſe, who reject that notion of the law of nature, build upon the contrary hypotheſis. Oſiander is of the former (105), and he is pleaſed with Grotius for not approving Juſtinian's definition, in which, ſays he, Laurentius Valla, Franciſcus Conanus, Dominicus Sotus, and many others had ſerved him as guides. We ſhall ſee below (106) a doctrine of Grotius, which he has cenſured, with regard to the principle of ſome actions, which ſeem reaſonable, in brutes. James Antonius Cappella, a Neapolitan Phyſician, publiſhed in 1641 *Opuſculum paradoxicum quod ratio participetur à brutis* (107). I have not ſeen this book, and therefore cannot tell in what manner the author goes about to prove it. I am better acquainted with the doctrine of Dr. Willis, who ſays that the ſoul of brutes is compoſed of organs; and is of the ſame form, or ſhape, and of the ſame ſize, with the body it animates; but that it is not ſo thick; and that the particles of it are ſo delicate as to be inviſible; and that they would be eaſily ſcattered or diſſipated, did not the animal's body keep or hold them together. *Iſta particularum ſubtilium congeries, ſive anima, quæ ſeſe latiùs explicans, & particulas ſuas aliis craſſioribus inſinuans, & intertexens corpus fabricat, juxta figuram & dimenſionem iſtius corporis exactè conformatur, ipſi coextenditur, & tanquam capſulæ, aut vaginæ ad amuſſim adaptatur, totum ac ſingulas partes ejus actuat, vivificat, ac inſpirat; porrò invicem, ipſamet anima, ex ſe ſtatim diſſolvi, tenueſque in auras evaneſcere apta, à corpore continenti, in ſubſiſtentiâ ſuâ & actu conſervatur. Ità quidem Anima, tenuiſſima licet, corporea, corporis quaſi ſpectrum, ſive larva umbratilis videtur: Porrò hæc ſimul cum corpore ex materiâ ritè diſpoſitâ emergens, hypoſtaſin, ſive ſubſiſtentiam ſuam, non minùs quàm corpus, juxta Ideam, ſive Typum ipſimet ex naturæ lege præſtitutum accipit; quamvis autem corpore intimè uniatur, ejuſque velut ſubtegmen exiſtat, attamen texturâ ſubtiliſſimâ, & quaſi filo admodum prætenui conſtans, ſenſibus noſtris percipi nequit, at ſolummodo ab effectis & operationibus ſuis dignoſcitur* (108). i. e. "That aſſemblage of ſubtile particles, "or the ſoul, which ſpreading itſelf, and inſinuating or blending its particles with others of a more "groſs kind, forms the body, is exactly ſuited or "conformed to the ſhape and dimenſions of that "body; is co-extended with it; and directly fitted "to it as a caſe or ſheath; actuating, giving life and "ſpirit to all and every part of it. Moreover, the "ſoul itſelf, being apt ſoon to diſſolve, and to va"niſh away in air, is preſerved in its ſubſiſtence and "office by the body's containing it. And ſo in"deed the ſoul, though extremely ſubtile, yet ſeems "to be corporeal, as it were the phantom of the "body, or a ſhadowy ghoſt. Farther, the ſoul ariſ"ing together with the body, from matter properly "diſpoſed, receives its hypoſtaſies or ſubſiſtence, no "leſs than the body, according to the idea or type "allotted to it by the law of nature; but tho' it be "intimately united to the body, and is as it were "its woof, yet being compoſed of a moſt delicate "texture, and of a very fine thread, it therefore eſ"capes the perception of our ſenſes, and is only "known by its effects and operations." He aſcribes a kind of reaſon to this ſoul, of which he himſelf gives the analyſis (109). He is of opinion, that man is poſſeſſed of a ſoul exactly like this, and what is more, a ſpiritual ſoul; and he pretends to explain, by this duplicity of ſouls, the ſtruggle we feel in our ſelves, and which the other Philoſophers explain by the ſuperior and inferior faculty of a ſimple and ſingle ſpiritual ſubſtance, which they call the rational ſoul (110). With ſubmiſſion to him, this way of explaining the ſtruggle between reaſon and the ſenſitive

(104) *Jus naturale eſt quod natura omnia animalia docuit. Nam jus iſtud non humani generis proprium eſt, ſed omnium animalium quæ in cœlo quæ in terra quæ in mari naſcuntur... Videmus enim cætera quoque animalia illius juris peritia cenſeri.* Inſtitut. lib. 1. Tit. 2.

(105) Oſiander, *Annotat. in Libr. Grotii de Jure Belli & Pacis*, p. 206 *& ſeq.*

(106) See citat. 119.

(107) Nicol. Toppi, *Bibl. Napoletan.* p. 124.

(108) Thomæ Willis, *de Anima Brutorum*, part. 1. cap. 2. p. m. 14, 15.

(109) Idem, ib. cap. 7. p. 91, 92.

(110) Idem, ib. cap. 7.

and look upon them as mere excreſcences. But they will have no reaſon to give that name

ſenſitive ſoul is not capable of giving ſatisfaction; for every one knows by experience, that the principle, which is ſolicitous for ſenſual pleaſures, is numerically the ſame with the principle which oppoſes that deſire; which ſometimes overcomes it, but is oftner ſurmounted by it. Now we ſhould not obſerve this unity of principle, had we really two ſpecies of ſouls, really diſtinct from one another. Should he anſwer, that one of them produces its ſenſations and paſſions in the other, I would anſwer, that here then would be, in every man, two ſubſtances, which ſhould deſire the ſame thing. But no man ever obſerved two ſuch diſtinct principles. Farther, could a material ſoul communicate a ſenſual deſire to the ſpiritual ſoul of man, the body would do it alſo; and conſequently things are multiplied without any neceſſity, by aſcribing to man a body, a ſenſitive ſoul, and a rational ſoul. But to omit theſe diſputes I ſhall take notice of another particular. Dr. Willis obſerves, that Sir Kenelm Digby was of the ſame opinion with Pereira and Des Cartes, with reſpect to the ſoul of brutes. *Pereira . . . . beſtias omni cognitione, ſeu perceptione carere affirmavit; quem in nupero hoc ſeculo καθ' ὁδὸν ſequuti ſunt Viri Clariſſimi*, Carteſius, Digbeius, *cum aliis, qui* brutorum animas, *quantum fieri poſſit, ab humana diſcriminare præ ſe ferentes, eas non modò corporeas, & diviſibiles, ſed etiam merè* paſſivas *aſſerucrunt* (111). i. e. "Pereira . . . . affirmed, "that beaſts are entirely deprived of all knowledge "or perception; and he, in this age, has been cloſely followed by the moſt illuſtrious men, Des Cartes, "Sir Kenelm Digby, and others, who, uſing their "utmoſt endeavours to diſtinguiſh the ſouls of brutes "from that of men, declared that they were not only "corporeal and diviſible, but likewiſe merely paſſive." A little after he explains the difference there is between Des Cartes and Sir Kenelm Digby, and ſhews that the latter does not take from beaſts either ſenſation or memory. He conſequently did not follow Pereira and Des Cartes: why therefore did he ſay he does? *Digbeius . . . . inſuper adjecit, effluvia quædam tenuiſſima è corpore ſenſibili delibata, non modò ſenſoria exteriora afficere, verùm & interiores receſſus ſubingredientia, ſeſe ſpiritibus immiſcere, eoſque in varias fluctuationes agendo, & ſenſus & motus locales diverſimodos producere; porrò ex his atomis extrinſecis ita partes nervoſas, ac cerebrum ipſum ſubeuntibus, haud tantùm actiones extemporaneas procedere; verùm ex iiſdem in corpore ſentiente relictis, ac intra cerebri loculos reconditis, prioreſque configurationes retinentibus, rerum anteactarum ideas in* memoriâ *reſiduas conſtitui* (112). i. e. "Sir Kenelm Digby . . . . . added "farther, . . . that ſome extremely ſubtile effluvia, "from the body perceived by ſenſe, did not only "affect the external organs, but entring into the "inward receſſes, blending with the animal ſpirits, "and raiſing different motions in them, produce, in "various manners, *ſenſation* as well as *local motion*. "Beſides, from theſe external atoms, thus entring "into the nervous parts and the brain itſelf, not "only ſudden actions, but from the ſame being "left in the ſenſitive body, and the receſſes of the "brain, and retaining their former figures, the ideas "of things paſt continuing in the memory are "formed." I will conclude, that Sir Kenelm Digby ought not to be ranked among thoſe who look upon brutes as machines. Mr. Locke has oppoſed thoſe, who will not allow brutes to be indued with reaſon. Here follows the diſtinction, according to him, between men and brutes. "This, I think, I may be "poſitive in, that the power of abſtracting is not "at all in them; and that the having of general "ideas, is that which puts a perfect diſtinction be"tween man and brutes; and is an excellency "which the faculties of brutes do by no means at"tain to. For it is evident, we obſerve no foot"ſteps in them, of making uſe of general ſigns for "univerſal ideas; from which we have reaſon to "imagine, that they have not the faculty of abſtract"ing, or making general ideas; ſince they have no "uſe of words, or any other general ſigns (113): "and therefore I think we may ſuppoſe, that it is in "this, that the ſpecies of brutes are diſcriminated "from man; and it is that proper difference wherein "they are wholly ſeparated, and which at laſt wi"dens to ſo vaſt a diſtance. For if they have any "ideas at all, and are not bare machines, (as ſome "would have them) we cannot deny them to have "ſome reaſon. It ſeems as evident to me, that they "do ſome of them in certain inſtances reaſon, as that "they have ſenſe; but it is only on particular ideas, "juſt as they received them from their ſenſes. They "are, the beſt of them, tied up within thoſe narrow "bounds, and have not (as I think) the faculty to "inlarge them by any kind of abſtraction (114)."

There is in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (115) the extract of a book, entitled, *Eſſais nouveaux de Morale*. It was printed at Paris in 1686. The Author, denying on one hand that brutes are indued with a ſoul capable of reaſoning, confeſſes, on the other, that their actions are directed by an *external reaſon; and that this reaſon and this wiſdom, which guides them, is a more excellent and more certain wiſdom and reaſon than that of man* (116). *The reaſon*, continues he (117), *which operates in brutes, is not in them. . . . It is, as St. Thomas ſays, after all the ancient Fathers, the ſovereign and eternal reaſon of the ſupreme architect, who preſerves his works, and directs them to the ends for which he had created them, by ſecret ſprings he put in them, which are differently determined according to the occurrences, to produce a thouſand different motions, according to their reſpective wants.* Add to this the following paſſage from Mr. Bernard. "Such Philoſophers as are moſt inclined to believe, "that brutes are mere machines, muſt frankly con"feſs, that they perform diverſe actions, the mecha"niſm of which it is impoſſible to explain. It would "be much ſhorter to content one's ſelf with ſaying in "general, that God, who was willing that their ma"chine ſhould ſubſiſt for ſome time, has diſpoſed, "by his infinite wiſdom, their parts agreeably to "that intention. I believe I have read ſomewhere "the following poſition, *Deus eſt anima brutorum* "(God is the ſoul of brutes). The expreſſion is "ſomething harſh, but a very rational explanation "may be made of it (118)." Grotius ſays, that certain acts, in which brutes abandon their particular intereſts in favour of another, proceed from an external principle. *Cæterarum animantium quædam utilitatum ſuarum ſtudium, partim fœtuum ſuorum partim aliorum ſibi congenerum reſpectu, aliquatenus temperant: quod in illis quidem procedere credimus ex principio aliquo intelligente extrinſeco, quia circa actus alios, iſtis neutiquam difficiliores, par intelligentia in illis non apparet* (119), *i. e.* "Some of the other animals abſtain, in ſome "meaſure, from what is of advantage to themſelves, "partly out of regard to their own young, and part"ly of thoſe of others of the ſame ſpecies; which "we ſuppoſe to proceed from ſome external intelli"gent principle, becauſe the like underſtanding is "not ſeen, with regard to other actions not more "difficult than theſe." Gaſpar Ziegler in his note on this paſſage, is diſpleaſed with Grotius, for not explaining clearly his thought concerning the nature of this external principle: if it be divine providence, continues he, he expoſes himſelf to the ſevere ſtrokes of Doctor Huarte (120), who ſhews that a Philoſopher ought not to explain phænomena by the immediate operation of God. He quotes two Writers, who have aſcribed to a natural inſtinct all the ſkill of brutes, and approves their opinion (121). Oſiander has taken great pains to confute Grotius, and ſays, among other particulars, that this external principle ought to be God, or an Angel, or the univerſal form of Averroes, but that none of theſe three principles ought to be admitted (122). My mentioning Averroes, puts me in mind of his admitting an external principle of human knowledge common to all particular underſtandings, and which likewiſe influences brutes and ſtones; but ſince he acknowledged that this influence had no effect on brutes and inſenſible creatures, becauſe it falls on matter ill diſpoſed, we cannot conclude, that he aſcribed more perfection to brutes than the Schoolmen. *Averroes lib. 3. de anima cap. 5. unum facit omnium hominum intellectum, re ab animæ ſubſtantia ſeparatum, ſed ſingulis conjunctum per*

(111) Thomas Willis, ib. cap. 1. p. 5 and 6.

(112) Idem, ib. p. 7.

(113) Locke's *Eſſay on Human Underſtanding*, vol. 1. book 2. chap. 11. p. 120. This is an excellent work, and deſerves to be as beautifully tranſlated as it has been done by Mr. Coſte.

(114) Ibid. p. 121.

Authors who have aſcribed the actions of brutes to an external principle.

(115) For Octob. 1686. p. 1196 & ſeq.

(116) *Nouveaux Eſſais de Morale*, p. 30.

(117) Ibid. p. 32.

(116) *Nouv. de la Republ. des Lettres*, Octob. 1700. p. 419, 420.

(119) Grot. *de Jure Belli & Pacis*, Proleg. n. 7.

(120) Chap. 7, of the *Trial of Wits*.

(121) *Nos omnem brutorum induſtriam ad inſtinctum referrimus naturæ, cum Sperlingio noſtro*, lib. 1. Inſtit. Phyſ. cap. 6. qu. 3. *& eum ſecuto Joh. Frid. Hornio* de ſubject. jur. nat. c. 6. *Ziegler in Prolegomena Grotii*, p. 5.

(122) Oſiander, p. 48 & ſeq.

name to the remarks I ſhall make on Mr. Leibnitz's reflections [*L*], publiſhed in Baſnage's

per inſidentes phantaſiæ imagines; etiam equo, & aſino, lapidi, & metallo, aſſiſtentem, ſed citra fructum, quia materies ſit inepta (123), i. e. "Averroes, in chap. 5. "book 3. of the ſoul, declares that the underſtanding of all men is one and the ſame, really diſtinguiſhed or ſeparated from the ſubſtance of the ſoul, "but joined to each individual man by the images "remaining in the fancy; it is likewiſe aſſiſtant to "horſes, aſſes, ſtones and metals; but has no effect, "becauſe of the unfitneſs of the ſubject." De Vigneul Marville relates (124), that there was a Philoſopher, who, in order to explain, in Rohault's conferences, how it was poſſible for brutes, being only machines, *yet to act as if they had a ſoul*, made uſe of Count de Gabalis's hypotheſis; and, by way of accommodation, made it ſubſervient to his purpoſe, that is, he ſuppoſed that certain elementary ſpirits make it their buſineſs *to put in motion all the machines* of animals, *according to the laws of Mechanicks*. So very ingenious a turn is given to his diſcourſe, that Mr. Pequet told the Author, that "if this agree-"able ſyſtem is not true, that at leaſt the in-"vention was pretty (125)." I don't doubt but it will pleaſe ſome perſons; but was I to diſpute upon it here, I could eaſily ſhew that it is not capable of accounting for the phænomena; and that, in certain reſpects, it is more puzzling than that of Des Cartes. The circumſtance, which perplexes the Carteſians moſt, is not to ſay that brutes move with great readineſs a thouſand different ways; but in ſaying that they give various tokens of friendſhip, hatred, joy, jealouſy, fear, grief, &c. The ſyſtem of theſe elementary ſpirits is of no uſe towards explaining this, ſince it is pretended that the only motive of their ſetting the ſprings of brutes in motion, is to amuſe themſelves agreeably. They therefore would not be ſo ſtupid as to render themſelves obnoxious to the ſenſations of hunger or cold, or to the pain which ariſes from the blow of a ſtick, &c. One muſt therefore ſuppoſe, that none of theſe paſſions are found in brutes, in which caſe all the difficulties would again occur; or one muſt ſay, that theſe ſpirits are ſentenced to direct the machines of brutes, to expiate their ſins, by ſuffering all the paſſions which the Peripateticks aſcribe to brutes, which is contrary to the ſuppoſition of Count de Gabalis. I paſs over ſeveral other difficulties as conſiderable as theſe, which may be objected to this ſyſtem, *whoſe invention was ſaid to be pretty*.

(123) Voſſius, *de origine & progreſſu Idol.* lib. 3. cap. 42. p. m. 952.

(124) *Melanges d'Hiſtoire & de Litterature*, Tom. 1. p. 100 *& ſeq.* Roan edit. 1700.

(125) Ibid. p. 106.

Authors who have aſſerted, that brutes are but machines, or have aſſerted the contrary doctrine.

We find by the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (126), that Mr. Vallade, Author of a philoſophical diſcourſe on the creation and diſpoſition or frame of the world, has explained, by mechanical laws, the moſt ſurprizing actions of animals. We find by the ſame journal (137), that Mr. de la Bruyere has been cenſured for aſſerting, that *brutes are nothing but matter*. In a beautiful work of Father Francis Lami (126) on the knowledge of man's ſelf, is an illuſtration (129), *in which the Author ſhews, that we have no ſolid reaſon to aſcribe knowledge or immortality to the ſoul of brutes; whereas we cannot reaſonably deny either of them to the ſoul of man*. This illuſtration is worth reading; and particularly becauſe we therein find the ſolution of the moſt perplexing difficulty in the ſyſtem of machines; for the Author ſhews, that every man may prove to himſelf, by very ſtrong reaſons, that the reſt of mankind are not mere machines; and yet this is what the Anti-Carteſians endeavour to infer, from this poſition, *viz.* that brutes would conſiſt of ſuch well diſpoſed organs, that they might do, without knowledge, all we ſee them do. If God (is it replied) could frame ſuch a machine, he alſo could frame others which would perform all the actions of man; and conſequently we could be certain of nothing but our own thought, and ſhould doubt whether any other perſons but ourſelves think. Father Giſbert, Regius Profeſſor in the Univerſity of Toulouſe, is one of thoſe who publiſhed books againſt the opinion of the Carteſians, with regard to the ſoul of brutes (130). I am to obſerve that this opinion was maintained in a courſe of philoſophy taught (131) at Paris in the College *of the four Na-*

(126) For Octob. 1700. p. 419.

(127) For April 1701. p. 433 *& ſeq.*

(128) A Benedictine, of the congregation of St. Maur.

(129) Tom. 5. p. 526 *& ſeq.* Paris edit. 1698.

(130) See *Journ. des Savans*, January 16, 1690. p. 49. Dutch edit.

(131) By Mr. Pourchot.

tions, and afterwards printed in the ſame city in 1695, with this title, *Inſtitutio Philoſophica ad faciliorem veterum ac recentiorum Philoſophorum lectionum comparata*; and conſiſts of four volumes in 12mo. The third tome from page 271 to page 292 relates to the ſenſitive ſoul. I do not doubt but Mr. Bayle, Doctor of Phyſic and Profeſſor of the Liberal Arts at Toulouſe, has embraced, on this head, the Carteſian ſyſtem, in his Phyſicks lately publiſhed by him in three volumes in 4to. (132).

I could write a long Supplement concerning what I ſaid (133) of the opinion of Mr. Poiret, but I chooſe rather to omit it, and only point out a Writer (134), who has collected a great number of learned particulars, with regard to the Platonic doctrine concerning the æthereal ſubſtance, which attends ſouls when they enter, as well as when they leave the body.

[*L*] *To the remarks I ſhall make on Mr. Leibnitz's reflections.*] I ſhall begin by declaring, that I am extremely pleaſed with myſelf, on account of the little difficulties I propoſed againſt the ſyſtem of that great Philoſopher, ſince they occaſioned anſwers, which have made that ſubject clearer to me; and given me a more diſtinct idea of what ought to be admired in it. I now conſider this new ſyſtem as an important conqueſt, which enlarges the bounds of philoſophy. We had but two hypotheſes, that of the Schools and that of the Carteſians; the one was *the way of influence* of the body on the ſoul, and of the ſoul on the body; and the other, *the way of aſſiſtance*, or occaſional cauſality. But here we have a new acquiſition, which we may call, with Father Lami, *a pre-eſtabliſhed way of harmony* (135) We owe it to Mr. Leibnitz; and nothing can be thought on, which gives ſo exalted an idea of the underſtanding and power of the Author of all things. This, added to the advantage of ſetting aſide all notions of miraculous conduct, would induce me to prefer this new ſyſtem to that of the Carteſians, could I conceive ſome poſſibility in the way of *pre-eſtabliſhed harmony*. I deſire it may be obſerved, that though I confeſs that this way removes all notions of a miraculous conduct, I yet do not recant what I formerly ſaid, that the ſyſtem of occaſional cauſes does not bring in God acting after a miraculous way (136). I am as much perſuaded as ever, that an action cannot be miraculous, unleſs God produces it as an exception to the general laws; and that every thing he is immediately the Author of, according to thoſe laws, is diſtinct from a miracle properly ſo called. But being willing to cut off from this diſpute as many things as I poſſibly can, I will agree to have it ſaid, that the moſt certain way to remove all the notions which include a miracle, is, to ſuppoſe that the created ſubſtances are immediately the cauſes of the effects of nature. I therefore ſhall omit what I might reply to that part of Mr. Leibnitz's objection. I alſo ſhall wave all the objections which are not more repugnant to his opinion, than to that of ſome other Philoſophers. I therefore ſhall not take notice of the difficulties, which oppoſe the ſuppoſition, that a creature may receive from God the power of moving itſelf. Theſe difficulties are great, and almoſt inſurmountable (137); but the ſyſtem of Mr. Leibnitz does not lye more open to them than that of the Peripateticks; and I cannot, ſay whether the Carteſians would preſume to aſſert, that God cannot communicate to our ſoul a power of acting. If they ſay it, how can they confeſs that Adam ſinned? And if they dare not ſay it, they weaken the reaſons by which they attempt to prove, that matter is not ſuſceptible of any ſort of activity. I alſo do not believe, that it would be more difficult for Mr. Leibnitz, than for the Carteſians or other Philoſophers, to free himſelf from the objection of a fatal mechaniſm, which overthrows human liberty. Waving therefore this, I ſhall ſpeak only of what is peculiar to the ſyſtem *of pre-eſtabliſhed harmony*.

I. My firſt obſervation is, that it raiſes, above the utmoſt height of our conceptions, the power and underſtanding of the divine art. Figure to yourſelf a ſhip,

(132) See the extract of the I, in the *Nouv. de la Republ. des Lettres*, Feb. 1701. p. 209 *& ſeq.* which gives a great character of this work.

(133) Rem. [*H*] above.

(134) Renatus Vallinus, *ad Librum 3 Boetii de Conſolatione Philoſophiæ*, p. 62 *& ſeq.*

(135) Dom Francis Lami, *Traite 2 de la Conoiſſance de ſoi-meme*, p. 226. edit. of 1699.

(136) See the piece inſerted by Leibnitz, in *l'Hiſt des Ouvrages des Savans*, July 1698. p. 334.

(137) See Sturmius, Tom. 1. of his *Phyſica electiva ſive hypothetica*, (an extract of which is given in the *Acta eruditorum*, 1697. p. 474 *& ſeq.*) and in the little piece he inſerted in the *Acta eruditor.* 1699. p. 208 *& ſeq.* by way of anſwer to a piece of Mr. Leibnitz, inſerted in the *Acta eruditor.* 1698. p. 427 *& ſeq.*

nage's Journal; theſe remarks being a natural and neceſſary conſequence of a paſſage of

ſhip, which, though devoid of any ſenſation or knowledge, and without being directed by any created or increated Being, has the power of moving itſelf ſo very ſeaſonably, that it ſhall always have the wind favourable, ſhall ſhun ſwelling ſeas and rocks, ſhall caſt anchor whenever it be neceſſary, and retire into the harbour whenever it may be proper: ſuppoſe that ſuch a ſhip ſails in this manner ſeveral years together, for ever turned and ſituated in a due manner with regard to the change of the air, and the different ſituation of ſeas and lands; you will confeſs that God's infinity is not too great to communicate ſuch a power to a ſhip, and will even ſay, that the nature of the ſhip is ſuch as not to be capable of receiving ſuch a virtue from God. Nevertheleſs, what Mr. Leibnitz ſuppoſes concerning the mechaniſm of the human body, is more wonderful and ſurprizing than all this. I will now apply to Cæſar his ſyſtem of the union of body and ſoul.

II. It muſt be ſaid, according to this ſyſtem, the body of Julius Cæſar exerciſed its moving faculty in ſuch a manner, that, from his birth to his death he went through perpetual changes, which anſwered with the utmoſt exactneſs to the perpetual changes of a certain ſoul, which he did not know, and which made no impreſſion upon him. We muſt ſay that the rule, according to which that faculty of Cæſar's body was to produce its acts, would go to the Senate on ſuch a day, at ſuch an hour, that he would there have ſpoke ſuch and ſuch words, *&c.* even though it had pleaſed God to annihilate Cæſar's ſoul, the day after it was created. We muſt ſay that this moving faculty changed and modified itſelf perpetually, according to the volubility of the thoughts of that ambitious ſpirit; and gave itſelf directly ſuch a ſituation rather than another, becauſe Cæſar's ſoul paſſed from a certain thought to another. Can a blind power modify itſelf ſo exactly in conſequence of an impreſſion communicated thirty or forty years before; which was never renewed before, and which is abandoned to itſelf, without its ever knowing what it has to do? Is not this much more incomprehenſible than the voyage I mentioned in the preceding paragraph?

III. A circumſtance which increaſes the difficulty is, that the human machine contains an almoſt numberleſs multitude of organs, and is perpetually expoſed to the ſhock of the bodies that ſurround it (138); and which, by a numberleſs multitude of ſhakings, excite in it a thouſand ſorts of modifications. How will it be poſſible to conceive, that there will never happen any diſorder or confuſion in this *pre-eſtabliſhed harmony*; but that it ſhall always go through its courſe, during the longeſt life of man, notwithſtanding the infinite varieties of the reciprocal action of ſo many organs on one another, ſurrounded on all ſides with a numberleſs multitude of particles, ſometimes hot, and at other times cold, ſometimes wet, and at other times dry; always active, and for ever ſtimulating the nerves one way or other. I will take it for granted, that the multiplicity of organs and external agents, may be a neceſſary inſtrument of the almoſt infinite variety of changes in the human body; but can that variety have ſuch an exactneſs as is required here? Will it never diſturb the correſpondence between theſe changes and thoſe of the ſoul? This ſeems to be quite impoſſible.

IV. It will be to no purpoſe to have recourſe to God's power, to maintain that brutes are mere machines; it would be in vain to repreſent, that God was able to contrive machines ſo artfully, that a man's voice, the reflected light of an object, *&c.* will ſtrike them exactly where it is neceſſary, in order that they may move after a certain manner. All people, part of the Carteſians excepted, reject this ſuppoſition; and no Carteſian would admit it, ſhould it be extended to man; that is, ſhould it be aſſerted that God could form bodies, to ſet bounds to the power and knowledge of God; I only mean, that the nature of things does not admit that the faculties communicated to the creature, ſhould neceſſarily be without certain limitations. The actions of creatures muſt neceſſarily be proportioned to their eſſential ſtate, and performed agreeably to the character that ſuits with every machine; for according to the axiom of the Philoſophers (139), whatever is received is proportioned to the capacity of the thing which receives it. We conſequently may reject Mr. Leibnitz's hypotheſis as impoſſible, ſince it is ſurrounded with greater difficulties than that of the *Automata*. It ſuppoſes a perpetual harmony between two ſubſtances which do not act upon one another. But were ſervants machines, and ſhould punctually obey all their maſter's commands, it could not be ſaid that they did it without a real action of the maſter upon themſelves; for he would ſpeak ſome words, and make ſigns, which would really ſhake the organs of the ſervants.

V. Let us now conſider the ſoul of Cæſar, and we ſhall find it ſurrounded with ſtill greater impoſſibilities. This ſoul was in the world without being expoſed to the influence of any ſpirit. The ſtrength it had received from God was the only principle of the particular actions it produced every moment; and if thoſe actions differed from one other, it was not becauſe ſome were produced by the concourſe of ſome ſprings, which did not contribute to the production of the reſt, for the ſoul of man is ſimple, indiviſible, and immaterial. Mr. Leibnitz owns this; and in caſe he did not own it, but on the contrary ſuppoſed with moſt Philoſophers, and with ſome of the moſt excellent Metaphyſicians of the age (140), that a being compoſed of ſeveral material particles, diſpoſed after a certain manner, is capable of thinking; I ſhould conſider his hypotheſis as abſolutely impoſſible upon that very account; and I could refute it a great many other ways, of which I have no occaſion in this place, ſince he acknowledges the immateriality of our ſouls, and builds upon it. To return to the ſoul of Julius Cæſar, let us call it an immaterial *Automata* (141), and compare it with one of Epicurus's atoms, I mean an atom ſurrounded with a vacuum on all ſides, and which ſhould never meet with any other atom. The compariſon is very juſt; for on one hand, this atom has a natural power of moving itſelf; exerts it without any foreign aid, and without being retarded or traverſed by any thing; and on the other hand, Cæſar's ſoul is a ſpirit, which has received a faculty of producing thoughts, and exerts it without the influence of any other ſpirit or body. Nothing either aſſiſts or oppoſes it. If we conſult the common notions, and the ideas of order, we ſhall find that this atom muſt never ſtop; and that being moved the preceding moment, it muſt move in the preſent moment, and all the following ones, and that the manner of its motion muſt always be the ſame. This is the conſequence of an axiom approved by Mr. Leibnitz; *Since a thing always remains in the ſtate it is once in, if nothing happens which obliges it to change* (142), ... *we conclude*, ſays he (143), *not only that a body which is at reſt will be always ſo; but alſo that a body which is in motion, will always keep that motion or change, that is the ſame celerity or direction, if nothing intervenes which may prevent it.* Every one knows very clearly, that this atom, whether it moves by an innate power, as was affirmed by Democritus and Epicurus, or moves by a power with which the Creator indued it, will always advance in an uniform manner, and equally in the ſame line, and never turn to the right or left, or go back. Epicurus was laughed at, when he invented the motion of declination (144); it was a needleſs ſuppoſition, to extricate himſelf from the labyrinth of the fatal neceſſity of all things; and could not aſſign any reaſon for this new part of his hypotheſis. It claſhed with the moſt evident notions of our mind; for it is plain that an atom, which ſhall have deſcribed a right line during two days, cannot divert its way at the beginning of the third, unleſs it meets with ſome obſtacle, muſt have a mind to go out of its way, or contain ſome ſpring, which begins to play that inſtant. The firſt of theſe reaſons cannot be admitted in a vacuum. The ſecond is impoſſible, ſince an atom has not the power of thinking; and the third is abſolutely impoſſible in a particle or atom that is a perfect

(138) Obſerve, that, according to Leibnitz, that which is active in every ſubſtance, is a thing that ought to be reduced to a true unity. As therefore the body of every man is compoſed of ſeveral ſubſtances, every one of them muſt have a principle of action, really diſtinct from the principle of every one of the reſt. He declares that the action of every principle muſt be ſpontaneous. Now this muſt vary their effects infinitely, and confound them; for the ſhock of neighbouring bodies, muſt put ſome conſtraint on the natural ſpontaneity of each.

(139) *Quidquid recipitur, ad modum recipientis recipitur.*

(140) Mr. Locke, for inſtance.

(141) Mr. Leibnitz employs this expreſſion, in his piece inſerted *in l'Hiſt. des Ouv. des Savans*, for July 1698. p. 338. The ſoul, ſays he, is a moſt perfect immaterial automaton.

(142) *Memoire*, inſerted in *l'Hiſt. des Ouv. des Savans*, for July 1698. p. 331.

(143) Mr. Leibnitz declares he aſſents to the axiom; nay, I aſſert, adds he, that it is favourable to me, as indeed it is one of the things I build upon.

(144) See the art. EPICUR. rem. [*U*].

of the firſt edition of this article. I hope they will prove an occaſion of clearing up a ſubject

a perfect unity. I muſt now make ſome uſe of all this.

VI. The ſoul of Cæſar is a being to which unity belongs in a ſtrict ſenſe. The faculty of producing thoughts is a property of its own nature (145); and it received this faculty from God, both with regard to poſſeſſion and exertion. If the firſt thought it gives itſelf is a ſenſation of pleaſure, I do not ſee why the ſecond thought ſhall not alſo be a ſenſation of pleaſure; for when the total cauſe of an effect continues the ſame, the effect cannot change. Now the ſoul, the ſecond inſtant of its exiſtence, does not receive a new faculty of thinking, only retains the faculty it was indued with the firſt inſtant, and is as independent from the concourſe of any other cauſe, in the ſecond inſtant as the firſt; it muſt therefore reproduce the ſecond inſtant or moment the ſame thought it had before produced. If it be objected, that it muſt be in a ſtate of change, and would not be ſo in the caſe I ſuppoſed, I anſwer that its change will be like the change of an atom; for an atom, which moves continually in the ſame line, acquires every inſtant a new ſituation, which however is like to the preceding ſituation. A ſoul may therefore continue in its ſtate of changing, if it gives itſelf a new thought like to the preceding. But if we do not ſuppoſe it to be ſo much confined, and allow it a change of thoughts, it yet muſt be granted, at leaſt, that the tranſition from one thought to another includes ſome reaſon of affinity. If I ſuppoſe that, on a certain inſtant, Cæſar's ſoul ſees a tree with fruits and flowers, I can conceive (146), that it may immediately wiſh to ſee one that has only leaves, and afterwards one that has only flowers; and in this manner, that it will form to itſelf ſeveral images, which will ariſe one from the other; but we cannot apprehend the poſſibility of ſuch odd thoughts as are ſo common in the mind of man; thoughts which have ſo little affinity to, and are ſo very contrary to one another. We cannot conceive that God could indue the ſoul of Julius Cæſar with the principle I am going to take notice of. He doubtleſs pricked himſelf more than once with a pin whilſt he was ſucking: and therefore, according to the hypotheſis I am here examining, his ſoul muſt have produced a ſenſation of pain, immediately after the agreeable ſenſations ariſing from the ſweetneſs of the milk, which it had enjoyed two or three minutes together. By what ſpring was it determined to interrupt its pleaſures, and to give itſelf up on a ſudden to a ſenſation of pain, without receiving any intimation of preparing itſelf for change, and without receiving any new alteration in its ſubſtance? If we read the life of this firſt Roman Emperor, a ſtronger objection than this will occur every inſtant.

VII. This would be more comprehenſible, if we ſuppoſed that man's ſoul is not a ſpirit, but rather a legion of ſpirits, every one of which has its functions, which begin and end exactly as the changes wrought in a human body declare. In conſequence of this we muſt ſay, that ſomething analogous to a great number of wheels and ſprings, or of matters which ferment, diſpoſed according to the changes of our machine, awakes or lulls to ſleep, for a certain time, the action of each of thoſe ſpirits; but in this caſe, the ſoul of man would no longer be one ſubſtance, but *ens per aggregationem*, a heap and collection of ſubſtances, like to material beings. We here ſeek for a ſingle being, which may form, at one time, joy, at another time, grief, &c. We do not ſearch for ſeveral beings, one of which may produce hope, another deſpair, &c.

In the above-mentioned obſervations, I have only explained thoſe, which Mr. Leibnitz did me the honour to examine. I ſhall now make ſome reflections on his anſwers.

VIII. He ſays (147), that *the law of the change, which happens in the ſubſtance of the animal, tranſports it from pleaſure to pain, the inſtant that a ſolution of continuity is made in its body; becauſe the law of the indiviſible ſubſtance of that animal is to repreſent what is done in its body, in the manner we experience it; and even to repreſent, in ſome meaſure, and with reſpect to that body, whatever is done in the world.* Theſe words are a very good explication of the foundations of this ſyſtem: they are, as it were, the unravelling of, and key to it; but, at the ſame time, they are the very things, to which all the objections, made by thoſe who look upon this new hypotheſis as impoſſible, are levelled. The law we ſpeak of ſuppoſes a decree of God, and ſhews wherein this ſyſtem agrees with that of occaſional cauſes. Theſe two ſyſtems unite in the following point; that there are laws, according to which the ſoul of man muſt *repreſent what is done in the body of man, as we experience it.* But they diſagree as to the manner of executing theſe laws. The Carteſians ſay, that God puts them in execution; but Mr. Leibnitz affirms, that the ſoul itſelf executes them. But I look upon this as impoſſible; the ſoul not having the inſtruments neceſſary for ſuch an execution. Now, how infinite ſoever the knowledge and power of God may be, he cannot perform, by a machine deſtitute of a certain piece, what requires the concourſe of ſuch a piece. He muſt be obliged to ſupply that defect; and, in this caſe, it would be himſelf, and not the machine, which had produced that effect. I will now ſhew, that the ſoul is not indued with the inſtruments neceſſary for the execution of the divine law mentioned to us, and will employ a compariſon for that purpoſe.

Let us figure to ourſelves an animal created by God, and appointed by him to ſing continually. It is certain he will always ſing; but if God allots him a certain muſick-book, he muſt neceſſarily either ſet it before his eyes, imprint it on his memory, or give ſuch a formation to his muſcles, that, according to the laws of Mechanicks, one certain note will always come after the other, exactly, purſuant to the order of the muſick-book. We cannot conceive, without this, that the animal in queſtion will ever be able to follow the whole ſeries of notes, as ſet down by the Creator of all things. Let us apply the like plan to man's ſoul. Mr. Leibnitz is of opinion, that it not only received the faculty of induing itſelf inceſſantly with thoughts, but likewiſe the faculty of following always a certain order of thoughts, which may correſpond to the perpetual changes of the machine of the body. This ſeries or order of thoughts is like the muſick-book ſet before the ſinging animal abovementioned. Can the ſoul change its perceptions every inſtant, or its modifications according to this tablature or book of thoughts, without knowing the ſeries of the notes, and thinking actually on them? Now experience ſhews that it knows nothing of them. Were it not neceſſary, at leaſt, that in default of ſuch a knowledge, there ſhould be a ſeries of particular inſtruments, each of which might be a neceſſary cauſe of ſuch and ſuch a thought? Muſt they not be diſpoſed in ſuch a manner, as that one might operate exactly after the other, according to the correſpondence *pre-eſtabliſhed* between the changes of the machine of the body, and the thoughts of the ſoul? But it is very certain, that an immaterial, ſimple and indiviſible ſubſtance cannot be compoſed of ſuch a numberleſs multitude of particular inſtruments, placed one before the other, according to the order of the tablature in queſtion; and conſequently the human ſoul cannot poſſibly execute that law.

Mr. Leibnitz (148) ſuppoſes, that the ſoul does not diſtinctly know its future perceptions, *but that it perceives them confuſedly; and that there is in every ſubſtance, traces of every thing that have happened, and will happen to it* (149): *but this numberleſs multitude of perceptions prevents our diſtinguiſhing them. . . . . The preſent ſtate of every* ſubſtance is a natural conſequence of its preceding ſtate. . . . (150) *The ſoul, notwithſtanding its ſimplicity, has always a ſenſation compoſed of ſeveral perceptions at one and the ſame time; which anſwers our purpoſe, as well as if it was compoſed of parts, like a machine. For every preceding perception influences thoſe which follow, agreeable to a law of order, which is in perceptions as well as in motions. . .* (151) *As the perceptions which are found together in the ſame ſoul, at the ſame time, include a numberleſs multitude of ſmall undiſtinguiſhable ſenſations, which muſt afterwards be unfolded,*

(145) This is according to Mr. Leibnitz's ſyſtem.

(146) I ſpeak of this by way of conceſſion, that is, I will not take even advantage of the reaſons which prevent our believing, that a created ſpirit can give itſelf ideas.

(147) Leibnitz, *Memoire* inſerted in *l'Hiſt. des Ouv. des Savans*, July 1698. p. 332.

(148) Leibnitz, ibid. p. 337.

(149) We cannot conceive this in an indiviſible, ſimple and immaterial ſubſtance.

(150) Ibid. p. 339, 340.

(151) Ibid. p. 340.

ject equally difficult and important.

folded, we muſt not wonder at the infinite variety of what is to reſult from it, in time. This is only a repreſentative conſequence of the ſoul, which muſt expreſs what paſſes, and even what will happen in its body; and, in ſome meaſure, in all the reſt, by the connexion and correſpondence of all the parts of the world. I have not much to reply to this. I only ſay that this ſuppoſition, when once well explained, will be the true way of reſolving all theſe difficulties. Mr. Leibnitz, by means of the penetration of his exalted genius, has very well conceived the whole compaſs and force of this objection, and in what manner the chief inconveniency ought to be remedied. I am perſuaded that he will ſmooth the rougheſt parts of his ſyſtem, and inform us of ſome excellent particulars concerning the nature of ſpirits. No man is able to travel to more advantage, or more ſafety than he in the intellectual world. I hope his noble illuſtrations will remove all the impoſſibilities, which hitherto have occurred to my imagination; and that he will ſolve, in the moſt ſolid manner, my difficulties, as well as thoſe of Father Francis Lami (152); and it is theſe hopes that made me ſay, without a compliment, that his ſyſtem ought to be conſidered as an important conqueſt (153).

He will not be much puzzled by this, viz. that whereas, according to the ſuppoſition of the Carteſians, there is but one general law for the union of all ſpirits with bodies; he will have it, that God gives to every ſpirit a particular law; the reſult of which ſeems to be, that the primitive conſtitution of every ſpirit is ſpecifically different from all others (154). Do not the Thomiſts ſay, that there are as many ſpecies as *individuums* in the nature of angels?

(152) They are in treatiſe 2, of *la Conoiſſance de ſoimeme*, from p. 225, to p. 243, Paris edit. 1699.

(153) Beginning of the rem. [*L*] above.

(154) No two men ever had the ſame thoughts; I don't ſay for a month together, but not even for two minutes. The principle of thought muſt therefore have a particular rule and nature in each.

(*a*) See Jean Leger, *Hiſt. des Egliſes Vaudoiſes*, part 1. p. 144. and p. 173, where he ſays the memoirs were printed in 1645.

(*b*) See the rem. [*A*].

RORENCO ((MARCO AURELIO), one of the joint Lords of the Valley of Lucerne, and Grand Prior of St. Roc at Turin, was a great perſecutor of the Waldenſes in the 17th Century [*A*]. He alſo wrote the following books againſt them [*B*], *Narratione dell' introduttione delle Hereſie nelle Valli de Piemonte*, printed at Turin in 1632, and *Memorie Hiſtoriche dell' introduttione delle Hereſie*, printed in the ſame city anno 1649, and dedicated to the Duke of Savoy (*a*). He was born in the Valley of Lucerne, was ſon to Count John Baptiſt Rorenco (*b*), and was living in 1668 (*c*).

(*c*) See the ſame rem.

ROS-

[*A*] *Was a great perſecutor of the Waldenſes in the 17th century.*] Peter Gilles, in his hiſtory of the Proteſtant churches of Piedmont, having ſpoke of the famine in 1628, adds as follows. *The adverſaries of the Proteſtant churches in the Vallies, who are always watching for ſome opportunity to perſecute them, choſe that of the famine, hoping it would ſerve them as a net to fiſh, and draw into them the poor famiſhed people; and among thoſe who exerted themſelves in a particular manner, were the abovementioned Monk Bonaventure, and Marco Aurelio Rorenco, Prior of Lucerne, ſon to one of the Gentlemen of the Valley, who, having ſtudied the law, turned Prieſt, and travelling to Rome, was appointed Prior of Lucerne, and poſſeſſor of the revenues of the ſaid priory: but this (as was publiſhed even by thoſe of his own party) was for his having promiſed at Rome and elſewhere, to uſe all his power and abilities to promote the Romiſh religion in the Vallies; and there aboliſh, at leaſt reſtrain, that of the Proteſtants; and even before he was returned from his journey to Rome, ſome of the Proteſtants were credibly informed, that the Prior, for the aforeſaid purpoſe, had propoſed, and concluded to build new convents in the Valley of Lucerne, and in ſome other places; and, in others, to build manſions for ſome Friers, and to perform other matters of this kind, which he a little after endeavoured, to the utmoſt of his power, to bring about. In the firſt place, he prevailed with Count John Baptiſt Rorenco his father, living at la Tour, to ſell his houſe, and the adjoining buildings, to turn them into a monaſtery, there to lodge a ſeminary of Monks called Franciſcans, reformed minims. And the 23d of June of the aboveſaid year 1628, he conducted them thither, accompanied by Frier Bonaventure, and ſeveral other Monks and Prieſts; and immediately after they ſent thither all ſuch proviſions as the Monks might have occaſion for themſelves, and to purchaſe the conſciences of the poor famiſhed people; and they began to beſtow very liberally to ſuch few Papiſts as remained at la Tour, even to ſome who had little need of them, to make the neighbouring Proteſtants deſirous of going to them, and ſaying, what will you give me, and I will do whatever you deſire. But ſeeing none come, they invited them by their Papiſts, wherein was particularly diligent Lady Catharine, the ſaid Prior's mother, who uſed to go from houſe to houſe, exhorting the poorer and weaker ſort of people, to go and accept the great charity which the neighbouring Fathers had prepared for them* (1).

(1) Peter Gilles, *Hiſt. Eccleſ. des Egliſes Vaudoiſes*, p. 473, 474.

Another Hiſtorian of the churches of the Vallies ſays, that *the great Prior Rorenco is their great perſecutor, and member of the Council* de extirpandis hæreticis (2), *for extirpating Hereticks, ... being looked upon, by the Court of Rome, as the moſt diligent, the moſt ſubtle, and the moſt effectual inſtrument they could have met with in this age, to haraſs thoſe poor people of the Vallies; and the man who was beſt ſkilled in contriving deſigns, and other methods to ruin them, as being grown old in this ſtudy, for he is now decrepit* (3).

(2) Jean Leger, *Hiſt. des Egliſes Vaudoiſes*, part. 1. p. 155. He ſays that Rorenco is ſtill living; and the dedication of his book is dated the 1ſt of May, 1669.

(3) *Hiſt. des Egliſes Vaudoiſes*, p. 173.

[*B*] *He alſo wrote . . . . books againſt them.*] Peter Gilles having told us (4), that in 1610, a book was publiſhed, entitled, *Vittoria triomphale*, written by Samuel de Caſſini, a Franciſcan, and which aſperſed the Waldenſes, adds, "We find much to the ſame "purpoſe, in the book entitled, *Breve narratione*, of "the preſent Prior of Lucerne, printed in 1632; and "calculated purpoſely to aſperſe the religion and "manners of the Proteſtants of the Vallies, and filled "with falſities and impudent calumnies, with the "following preamble, *You ſay, you do; and there are "ſtill ſome perſons living, who remember that your fa-"thers did ſuch and ſuch things.* But finding afterwards that violent complaints were made of his "ſlanders; and that he was aſked in good earneſt "the proofs of what he had writ; and particularly "to produce the living witneſſes of certain iniquities "committed in paſt times; as he did not know "where to have them, he printed another piece in "1634, entitled, *Lettre Apologetique*, (an Apologeti-"cal Letter) in which he declares, *that he never in-"tended to aſperſe the Proteſtants of the Vallies; and "that what he had writ down in his book were only "relations of what ſome Authors had writ concerning "certain vices, which had prevailed, in times paſt, in "many places.* But to prevent his being again ſurpriſed, he was very careful not to name the pretended Authors, and places and times." The Churches of the Waldenſes appointed Valere Gros, Miniſter of the church of Villar, to anſwer this Prior's firſt book (5), which anſwer was not publiſhed; but as to the anſwer made to the ſecond book, it was publiſhed; and a general account of it is given in the Hiſtorian whom I quoted (6). See the art. GILLES (PETER).

(4) Ibid. p. 13.

(5) Ibid. p. 539.

(6) Ibid. p. 540 & *ſeq.*

§ (*a*) He is no leſs ſo with reſpect to Dr. Francis le Picart, who alſo is one of his heroes, if it be true what we are told concerning this man, viz. that being in the pulpit the 25th of November 1553, after having railed, according to cuſtom, againſt the newly converted Lutherans, he proceeded ſo far as to ſay, *that the King ought, for ſome time, to feign himſelf to be a Lutheran among them, in order that they, being thereby emboldened to aſſemble publickly in all places, they might be cut to pieces, and the Kingdom be at once purged of them.* See the *Anatomy of the Maſs*, &c. tranſlated from the Italian of Antonio Adamo, page 538, printed by J. Martin, 1562. By the way, who knows whether ſome of thoſe had not been at this ſermon, who, nineteen years after, adviſed Charles IX. to the Paris maſſacre? REM. CRIT.]

[*A*] *Son*

☞ ROSCOMMON (WENTWORTH DILLON, EARL OF), was deſcended of an ancient family in Ireland, and was ſon of James Dillon Earl of Roſcommon in that Kingdom [*A*], where his ſon Wentworth, who is the ſubject of this article, was born, when that Kingdom was under the Adminiſtration of the firſt Earl of Strafford, to whom his Lordſhip's mother (deſcended from the Boyntons of Bramſton in Yorkſhire) was nearly related; and when he was baptiſed, the Lord Lieutenant gave him the ſirname of his own family Wentworth (*a*). He paſſed the firſt years of his infancy in Ireland, and was educated in the Proteſtant Religion. The Earl of Strafford afterwards ſent for him over into England [*B*], and placed him at his own ſeat in Yorkſhire, under the tuition of Dr. Hall, afterwards Biſhop of Norwich, a perſon of eminent learning and piety. By him he was inſtructed in Latin, and without learning the common rules of Grammar, which he could never retain in his memory, he attained to write in that language with claſſical elegance and propriety, and with ſo much eaſe, that he choſe it to correſpond with thoſe friends, who had learning ſufficient to ſupport the Commerce. When the cloud began to gather over England, and the Earl of Strafford was impeached, by the advice of the Lord Primate Uſher he was ſent to complete his education at Caen in Normandy under the famous Monſieur Bochart. After ſome years he travelled to Rome, where he grew familiar with the moſt valuable remains of antiquity, applying himſelf particularly to the knowledge of medals, which he gained to perfection, and ſpoke Italian with ſo much grace and fluency, that he was frequently miſtaken for a native. Soon after the Reſtoration he returned to England, where he was graciouſly received by King Charles II. and made Captain of the Band of Penſioners. In the gaieties of that age he was tempted to indulge a violent paſſion for gaming, by which he frequently hazarded his life in duels, and exceeded the bounds of a moderate fortune. A diſpute with the Lord Privy Seal, about part of his eſtate, obliging him to reviſit his native country, he reſigned his poſt in the Engliſh Court; and ſoon after his arrival at Dublin, the Duke of Ormonde appointed him Captain of the Guards (*b*). Mrs. Katharine Phillips in a letter to Sir Charles Cotterel dated at Dublin Oct. 19 1662 (*c*), ſtyles him *a very ingenious perſon, of excellent natural parts, and certainly the moſt hopeful young Nobleman in Ireland.* However, he ſtill retained his exceſſive paſſion for gaming, which engaged him in the following adventure. As he returned to his lodgings from a gaming-table, he was attacked in the dark by three ruffians, who were employed to aſſaſſinate him. The Earl defended himſelf with ſo much reſolution, that he diſpatched one of the aggreſſors, whilſt a Gentleman, accidentally paſſing that way, interpoſed, and diſarmed another; the third ſecured himſelf by flight. This generous aſſiſtant was a diſbanded officer of a good family and fair reputation, but whoſe circumſtances were ſuch, that he wanted even a plain ſuit of clothes to make a decent appearance at the Caſtle. But his Lordſhip on this occaſion preſenting him to the Duke of Ormonde, prevailed with his Grace that he might reſign his poſt of Captain of the Guards to his friend; which for about three years the Gentleman enjoyed, and upon his death the Duke returned the Commiſſion to his generous benefactor. The pleaſures of the Engliſh Court and the friendſhips he had there contracted, were powerful motives for his return to London. Soon after he came, he was made Maſter of the Horſe to the Dutcheſs of York, and married the Lady Frances, eldeſt daughter of Richard Earl of Burlington, who before had been the wife of Colonel Courtney. Here he diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his writings [*C*], and about this time, in imitation of thoſe learned and polite aſſemblies with which he had been acquainted abroad, he began to form a ſociety for the refining and fixing the ſtandard of our language, in which his great friend Mr. Dryden was a principal aſſiſtant. This project was entirely defeated by the religious commotions, which enſued on

(*a*) *Mr. Fenton's Obſervations on ſome of Mr. Waller's Poems*, p. 133, 134. edit. London 1730.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 134, 135.

(*c*) See *Letters of Orinda to Poliarchus*, p. 79. edit. Lond. 1705.

[*A*] *Son of James Dillon, Earl of Roſcommon, in that Kingdom.*] This Nobleman, when he was very young, was converted from the Roman Catholick religion by Dr. Uſher, Archbiſhop of Armagh, and was ſent to England, and committed to the care of Dr. George Hakewell, who, finding him to be a youth of excellent parts, placed him in Exeter college in Oxford, in the beginning of the year 1628, under the care of Laurence Bodley, B. D. nephew to Sir Thomas Bodley. In this college he continued ſeveral years, and afterwards returned to his own country (1).

(1) Wood, *Faſti Oxon*, vol. 2. col. 223. 2d edit.

[*B*] *The Earl of Strafford afterwards ſent for him over into England.*] Mr. Fenton tells us (2), that Lord Roſcommon's *father having been converted by Archbiſhop Uſher, from the communion of the church of Rome, the Earl of Strafford, apprehending, that his family would be expoſed to the moſt furious effects of religious revenge, at the beginning of the Iriſh rebellion ſent for his godſon into England.* But this paſſage contains a very groſs miſtake, ſince the Earl of Strafford was beheaded on the 12th of May 1641, whereas the Iriſh rebellion did not break out till the latter end of October following.

(2) *Obſervations on ſome of Mr. Waller's Poems*, p. 134.

[*C*] *His writings.*] I. *An Eſſay on tranſlated verſe*, London 1680 and 1684, 4to. To which are prefixed commendatory verſes by Mr. Dryden, and his ſon Charles Dryden, and others. To ſeveral editions of this *Eſſay* is added *a ſpecimen of blank verſe*, being the Battle in Heaven, taken out of *Milton's Paradiſe Loſt*. II. *Horace's Art of Poetry*, tranſlated into Engliſh blank verſe. London 1680, in 4to. To which is prefixed, a copy of verſes by Mr. Waller. III. *A Paraphraſe on the 148th Pſalm.* IV. *Silenus*, being *Virgil*'s ſixth Eclogue tranſlated. V. *Ode on Solitude.* VI. *The 22d Ode of the firſt Book, and the 6th Ode of the third Book of Horace*, tranſlated. VII. *On Mr.* Dryden's Religio Laici. VIII. *The Dream.* IX. *The Grove*; being a tranſlation of part of the 5th ſcene of the 2d act of *Guarini's Paſtor Fida.* X. *The Ghoſt of the old Houſe of Commons to the new one, appointed to meet at Oxford.* XI. *On the death of a Lady's Dog.* XII. *A Prologue ſpoken to the Duke of York at Edinburg*, and a *Prologue* and *Epilogue* to two of Mrs. *Katharine Philips*'s plays. XIII. *On the Day of Judgment.* XIV. *Roſs's Ghoſt.* XV. He tranſlated into French, Dr. William *Sherlock's Caſe of Reſiſtance*

on King James's acceſſion to the throne; at which time the Earl took a reſolution to paſs the remainder of his life at Rome [*D*], telling his friends, that *it would be beſt to ſit next to the chimney when the chamber ſmoked.* Amidſt theſe reflections he was ſeized by the gout; and being too impatient of pain, he permitted a bold French pretender to phyſic to apply a repelling medicine, in order to give him preſent relief, which drove the diſtemper into his bowels, and in a ſhort time put a period to his life (*d*), about January the 17th 1684 (*e*) at his houſe near St. James's Weſtminſter. The moment in which he expired, he cried out with a voice, that expreſſed the moſt intenſe fervour of devotion (*f*),

My God, my Father, and my Friend,
Do not forſake me at my end (*g*).

He was interred in Weſtminſter Abbey. He was ſucceeded in his honours by his uncle Cary Dillon, who was Colonel of a Regiment in Ireland in the war between King James II. and King William III. from which Kingdom returning to England he died at Cheſter in November 1689 (*b*).

(*d*) Fenton, *ubi ſupra.*

(*e*) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 234.

(*f*) Fenton, *ubi ſupra.*

(*g*) See his tranſlation of the Church's Hymn, *Dies Iræ, Dies illæ.*

(*b*) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(3) Ibid. p. 136. *of Supreme Powers.* Mr. Fenton obſerves (3), that in our author's writings "we view the image of a mind, "that was naturally ſerious and ſolid, richly fur-"niſhed and adorned with all the ornaments of art "or ſcience, and theſe ornaments unaffectedly diſ-"poſed in the moſt regular and elegant order. His "imagination might have probably been more fruit-"ful and ſprightly, if his judgment had been leſs "ſevere; but that ſeverity (delivered in a maſculine, "clear, ſuccinct ſtyle) contributed to make him ſo "eminent in the didactical manner, that no man "with juſtice can affirm he was ever equalled by "any of our own nation, without confeſſing at the "ſame time, that he is inferior to none. In ſome "other kinds of writing his genius ſeems to have "wanted fire to attain the point of perfection; but "who can attain it?" Mr. Pope likewiſe in his *Eſſay on Criticiſm* (4) ſpeaks of our Author in theſe terms:

——Roſcommon, *not more learn'd than good,*
With manners gen'rous as his noble blood;
To him the wit of Greece and Rome was known,
And ev'ry Author's merit but his own.

(4) Ver. 727 *&* *ſeq.*

[*D*] *The religious commotions which enſued on King James's acceſſion to the throne, at which time the Earl took a reſolution to paſs the remainder of his life at Rome.*] Theſe are the words of Mr. Fenton (5); but there is a miſtake in them, ſince according to that Writer himſelf, the Earl died in 1684, or according to Mr. Wood (6), January the 17th, 1684-5; by which it appears, that he did not ſurvive the reign of King Charles II. who died February the 6th, 1684-5.

T.

(5) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 135, 136.

(6) *Ubi ſupra.*

ROSE (WILLIAM), preacher to Henry III. and Biſhop of Senlis, the moſt furious of all the Leaguers in France. See the notes on the *Catholicon* (*a*): but add the following circumſtance, that having refuſed to lay aſide his pontifical veſtments, when the Parliament of Paris obliged him to make *amende honorable* (a kind of penance) the 5th of September 1598, he made it in his epiſcopal dreſs (*b*). Mr. de Launoi ought to be highly blamed for beſtowing ſo many elogiums on this Prelate (*c*), without interſperſing it with one ſingle cenſure. This is really ſcandalous.

(*a*) Notes on the *Catholicon d'Eſpagne*, p. 196 *&* *ſeq.* edit. of 1696. See alſo p. 91.

(*b*) Thuan. lib. 120. p. 827.

(*c*) Launoius, *in Hiſt. Collegii Navarr.* p. 1019 *&* *ſeq.*

ROSE (TOUSSAINT), Marquis of Coye, Secretary of the King's Cabinet, Preſident of the Chamber of Accompts, and one of the forty Members of the French Academy, had been Secretary to Cardinal Mazarin. He died the 6th of January 1701, in his fourſcore and ſixth year (*a*). His poſterity is ſtill ſubſiſting [*A*]. The ſeat in the Academy which became vacant by his death, and in which he had ſucceeded Mr. Conrart in 1675, was filled by Mr. de Saci, the 17th of March 1701. We find by the *Menagiana*, that he was of *a good family of Provins*; that he had been *Secretary to Cardinal de Retz*, and had writ ſome *extremely beautiful letters in his name* (*b*).

(*a*) *Mercure Galant*, for Jan. 1701. p. 104.

(*b*) *Menagiana*, p. 297, of the 1ſt Dutch edit.

[*A*] *His poſterity is ſtill ſubſiſting.*] Louis de Roſe, his ſon, Lord of Coye, Counſellor of the Parliament of Mentz, and Secretary of the King's Cabinet, died in 1688, and left, by Magdelen de Bailleul his wife (1), a ſon and daughter. The daughter married, the 28th of April, 1699, Anthony Portail, Attorney General in the Parliament of Paris (2).

(1) Daughter to Mr. de Bailleul, Preſident à Mortier. She afterwards married Marquis de Vatan.

(2) Extracted from the *Mercure Galant*, for Jan. 1701. p. 105.

ROSEN (*a*) (REINHOLD), a Gentleman of Livonia [*A*], ſerved under the Duke of Weimar, afterwards in the French armies, and had the reputation of being a brave warrior [*B*]. He married in Alſatia, and *was ſettled to very great advantage there* (*b*) He went and paid his compliments to the King, at the Siege of Dole in 1668, on which occaſion "he was mounted on a horſe aged thirty eight years, which he ſaid had "ſaved

(*a*) The Latin hiſtorians call him *Roſa*, and the French *Roſe.*

(*b*) *Mercure Galant*, for Feb. 1703. p. 332.

[*A*] *A Gentleman of Livonia.*] He was of a family of which *there have been Knights of the Order of Sword-bearers* (1); and we know that Mr. Roſen, Marſhal of France, had records brought from Livonia, *which prove that the nobility of his houſe is of great antiquity. He has the honour to be related to the royal family of Sweden; and there was a Marſhal of his family* (2).

[*B*] *He had the reputation of being a brave warrior.*] He muſt neceſſarily have been a valiant man, and ſkilled in war, ſince the Duke of Weimar gave him the command of the horſe (3), and appointed him, by his will, one of the Directors of the Army (4). It would be endleſs to particularize all the battles he was in, and wherein he gave proofs of his courage. I therefore had better refer my Readers to the relations of that time. He is often mentioned in them under the title of *Colonel Roſe*: but I muſt not omit that he was not always victorious, he being taken priſoner at Mariendal in 1645 (5), when Marſhal de Turenne's army was beat there. He would have met with the ſame ill fate at the defeat at Darlingen (6), had he not fled with the utmoſt ſpeed (7). Marſhal de Turenne was not ſatisfied with his conduct at the battle at Mariendal (8); and was leſs ſo, two years after, when

(1) *Mercure Galant*, for Feb. 1703. p. 331.

(2) Ibid. p. 335.

(3) *Cum ſub Bernardi Saxonis auſpiciis magiſtrum equitum egiſſet.* Franckenſteinius, *in Indice Hiſt. Benjam. Prioli.*

(4) Pufendorf, *Rerum Suecic.* lib. 11. p. 374.

(5) Franckenſ. *in Indice Hiſt. Prioli.*

(6) The 14th of Nov. 1643.

(7) *Appendix Hiſt. Univerſ. Joh. Cluveri*, p. m. 759.

(8) See Turenne's *Life*, by the pretended Mr. du Buiſſon, book 3. p. 195. Hague edit. 1688.

"saved his life at the battle of Rocroy (*c*)." He died some time after, *and settled a pension on his horse, with a meadow, and gave him his liberty* (*d*) [*C*]. *Having no male issue, he resolved to promote* one of his relations, *who had prevailed with him to quit Livonia; accordingly he got him a wife, and left him all his possessions.* This kinsman was created Marshal of France in January 1703. *He has a great estate in Alsatia, which is settled upon him in fee* (*e*). He has a son who is Major-General, and a daughter married to Marquis de Rottemberg (*f*).

(*c*) *Mercure Galant*, for Feb. 1703. p. 333.

(*d*) Ibid. p. 334.

(*e*) Ibid. p. 336.

(*f*) Ibid. p. 334, 335.

when he thought him the chief promoter of the rebellion meditated by the Swedes in his army, insomuch that he put him under a guard (9): but he afterwards received an order from Court, to set him at liberty (10).

Priolo observes, that a brother of our Rosen was killed at the battle of Rhetel, in December 1650 (11). Mention is made, in the Mercure François (12), of Colonel JOHN ROSE, cousin to Colonel Reinhold Rose. In page 899, volume 5, of the *Theatre de l'Europe*, mention is made of one VOLMAR ROSA, who was killed for having given a box o'the ear (13).

[*C*] *He settled a pension on his horse, with a meadow, and gave him his liberty.*] A man, who was desirous to lay hold of every opportunity of communicating his collections, would have a large field here. For though he even should not speak of all such animals, to whom testimonies have been given of affection and gratitude (14), but only of such as relate to horses, he might mention a vast number of instances. I know some, besides those which I took notice of in the remark [*M*] of the article CALIGULA, and in the remark [*O*] of the article of the Emperor HADRIAN; but I nevertheless will be pretty concise on that subject. The Reader may easily consult Philip Camerarius, who has given very good collections relating to this subject in Tom. 1. book 2. chap. 1. of his historical meditations. Some citations relating to this purpose are also seen in the *Peintures Morales* of Father le Moine. He did not forget Caligula; but has represented his folly in such affected terms, that it is impossible for me to resist the inclination I have to transcribe them here. *An Emperor*, says he (15), *caused a palace of marble to be built for a horse. He had it furnished in a princely manner, and ordered him to have the retinue of a Monarch. Not contented with this, he nominated him Consul, gave him a seat in the Senate, and had his name registred in the Fasti* or Roman Calendar, *with Cato, Pompey, and such like illustrious personages. Had he survived him, he doubtless would have made a god of him, by a new kind of apotheosis; and forced the twelve Gods of the capitol to admit him into their number.* Pliny (16) also gives us some instances of honours which have been paid to horses.

All military men have not been so grateful to their horses as our Rosen. A Neapolitan Gentleman having forsaken his horse, was sentenced to keep him. Father Pardies quotes Spondanus on this occasion, and says, that *a great Prince* (17) *of former times, famous for his virtue, and his zeal in doing justice to every one, thought he pronounced a sentence worthy of his exalted rank, when he decreed in favour of an old horse, who, having been forsaken by his master in his old age, and to whom he had done very remarkable service in war, went, by I know not what instinct or accident, and rung a bell that was hung up at the palace gate, purposely that all who met with ill treatment, might ring it, in order to make their complaints, and sue for justice* (18). Sabba Castiglione, a Gentleman of Milan, who, at his death, was Knight of Malta, and Commander of Faenza, in March 1554 (19), relates this story very much at large in chap. 122 of his *Ricordi necessarii dal principio della vita civile, fino à fine di quella*, &c. See Camerarius, in the chapter cited above.

I fancy that the Judges who pronounced sentence (20) in a law suit, against the cat of *Madam du Puis, a celebrated player on the harp* (21), would have acted otherwise, had such a cause for the horse of the Neapolitan Gentleman been brought before them. This Lady's Will made *a great noise*: and a suit was carried on, *in order to have it set aside. Messieurs Maurice, Vautier, and de Ferriere, all famous Lawyers,* displayed *their genius and abilities, the former in defending it, and the two others in pleading against it. The pension which the deceased Lady* settled *on her cat, and the visits which she* ordered should be paid her every week, were *the circumstances most* inveighed against (22).

(9) See Turenne's *Life*, p. 221, 222.

(10) Franckenst. *in Indice Hist. Prioli.*

(11) Priolus, *de Rebus Gall.* lib. 5. num. 36. p. m. 225.

(12) Tom. 23. p. 696, 699. ad ann. 1640.

(13) Franckenst. ibid.

(14) Concerning the honours paid to the Camel, see the rem. [*DD*] of the art. MAHOMET. See in the *Mercure Galant*, for July 1678, some honours paid to brutes.

(15) Father le Moine, in his *Peintures Morales*. See Suetonius, *in Caligula*, cap. 55.

(16) Plin. lib. 8. cap. 42. See also lib. 10. chap. 43. concerning the funeral of a raven.

(17) This was Charles duke of Calabria, son to Robert, King of Naples. See Spondanus's *Ann.* ad ann. 1328. n. 18. He quotes Summonte, lib. 3.

(18) Pardies, dedication to the treatise, *de la Connoiss. des Betes.*

(19) Ghilini, Tom. 2. p. 224.

(20) *Mercure Galant*, for July 1678. p. 136. Dutch edit.

(21) Ibid. p. 132.

(22) Ibid.

ROSEO or ROSEUS (MAMBRIN), an Italian Author, lived in the 16th Century. He published in 1549 the Institution of a Christian Prince, in which he neither imitated those who describe Government as it is commonly managed, nor those who represent it according to the most perfect speculation or theory. He steered a middle course between these two extremes [*A*], which was to shew what the rules of common policy allow. He continued the history of the world which John Tarcagnota had writ from Adam till the year 1513; he continued it, I say, till the year 1558. and afterwards till 1571 (*a*). This work is in Italian, and was continued by Don Bartholomew Denys de Fano, till the year 1582. Roseo was dead when the edition I make use of was printed, *viz.* that of Venice, *appresso i Gunti* 1585 in 4to. At the same time they reprinted Tarcagnota's work, the second edition of which is of the year 1562 (*b*). The reader may have seen elsewhere (*c*), that Roseo translated into Italian a treatise of the art military, which was supposed to be written by William du Bellai. He also wrote a history of the Kingdom of Naples. He shews prodigious partiality, in his continuation of Tarcagnota, every time he speaks of the Protestants; and it appears that he follows the methods of bad historians, who never examine the testimonies of each party, but only those of the

(*a*) This continuation was printed at Venice in 1573, 4to.

(*b*) I speak in this manner, because the dedication to Cosmo of Medicis, Duke of Florence, was dated at Naples, the 1st of Jan. 1562.

(*c*) Rem. [*G*] of the art. BELLAI (William de).

[*A*] *He steered a middle course between these two extremes.*] I am obliged to Naudæus for this observation. *Niphus*, says he (1), *& Machiavellus Principes suos effinxére, quales ut plurimùm esse deprehenduntur: Erasmus, Osorius, Foxius, Natta, Omphalius Wimphelingus, ut se moraliter gerere deberent: Mambrinus Roseus, Frachetta, & Lælius Marettus Senensis, cujus liber publici juris nondum factus est, ut illis Politicæ communis legibus agere conceditur. Bellarminus denique, Ribadeneira, & Scribanius, ut se ad Christianæ Religionis Præcepta componere deberent.* i. e. "Niphus and Machiavel have drawn their Princes, such as they "are commonly found; Erasmus, Osorius, Fox, "Natta, Omphalius, Wimphelingus, such as they "ought to behave, according to the dictates of mo"rality: Mambrinus Roseus, Frachetta, and Lælius "Marettus of Sienna, whose work is not yet made "publick, such as the common laws of policy will "allow them to be. Lastly, Bellarmin, Ribadeneira, "and Scribanius, as they ought to behave, in confor"mity to the principles of the Christian Religion." The reader sees, by this passage, the various methods which different Writers have employed for the instruction of Sovereigns. I shall observe, that as early

(1) Naudæus, *Bibliogr. Polit.* p. m. 47.

the party they favour. Beſides, he is guilty of a vaſt number of errors in the proper names.

early as the year 1549, Mambrin Roſeo's work was publiſhed in French, and entitled, *Le Parangon de vertu pour l'Inſtitution de tous Princes, Potentats, & Seigneurs Chreſtiens, contenant en Sommaire les Hiſtoires Hebraïques, Greques, Latines, & Modernes faiſans à propos. Pris de l'Italien de Membrin de la Roſe, à Paris per Eſtienne Groulleau* 1549 *in* 8vo (2). A Latin verſion of this work was publiſhed at Straſburg in 1608. upon which Konig imagined very falſely, that Mambrin Roſeo wrote that book in 1608 (3). He is often guilty of ſuch miſtakes.

(2) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, *Bibl. Franc.* p. 839.

(3) Konig, *Bibl.* p. 701.

ROSES, a City of Catalonia. It was only an abbey, when the Emperor Charles V. built a city and a fortreſs there, at the diſtance of thirty five fathoms from the ſea, in the open country (*a*). This city has the Mediterranean to the South of it, the plain of Lampurdan and a pond to the Weſt; and the Pyrenees to the Eaſt and North. It is fortified with five baſtions, lined with free-ſtone. It continued faithful to the King when all Catalonia revolted to France in 1640. Du Pleſſis-Pralin beſieged it in 1645, and made himſelf maſter of it fifty ſeven days after the opening of the trenches, for which he was rewarded with a Marſhal's Staff. The Spaniards, having recovered the greateſt part of Catalonia during the civil wars of France, were yet not able to poſſeſs themſelves of Roſes. They blockaded it nine months, on which occaſion they reduced the garriſon to the greateſt extremities of famine; but at the approach of the ſuccours ſent from France they retired. This was in 1653. Roſes was reſtored to them by the peace of the Pyrenees in 1659. They loſt it in 1693 [*A*], and recovered it by the treaty of Ryſwick in 1697. The Bay of Roſes is above four leagues in circumference; beginning at the end of the Pyrenean mountains, at Trinity-Caſtle, and ending almoſt at the little town called Empurias. It has no harbours; being only a ſhallow road, to which neither ſhips nor gallies can come, for want of ſufficient water. However, between Trinity-Caſtle and the town is a ſmall hollow, where large ſhips may lye, for ſome time, when forced to it by neceſſity. A league and a half on the other ſide of the Caſtle, towards Rouſſillon and out of the Bay, is a town called Capdequiers (*b*), ſubject to the Governor of Roſes, and where there is a pretty good harbour (*c*).

(*a*) Baudrand, *in Rhoda.*

(*b*) It formerly was a ſtrong hold. See the cloſe of the rem. [*G*] of the art. REVEREND DE-BOUGY.

(*c*) Extracted from a *Relation of the ſiege of Roſes*, publiſhed in 1693.

[*A*] *They loſt it in* 1693.] Marſhal Duke de Noailles beſieged it about the end of May, and obliged Don Pedro Robi, the Governor, to capitulate the 9th of June. Trinity-Caſtle ſtanding at the entrace of the Bay of Roſes, and within canon ſhot of the place, was taken four days after.

ROSIER (*a*) (HUGH SUREAU DU), in Latin *Hugo Suræus Roſarius* (*b*), was a famous Proteſtant Miniſter of the Church of Orleans, under the reign of Charles IX. He was born at Roſoi in Tierache, in the Province of Picardy (*c*). He was impriſoned at Orleans in 1566 (*α*), upon his being thought Author of a book filled with ſeditious maxims [*A*]; but not being convicted of it, he was ſet at liberty. He and another Proteſtant Miniſter,

(*a*) Some call him Des Roriers.

(*b*) Thuan. calls him Sorellus Roſerius, book 34. p. 687. and Sorellus Roſarius, book 52. p. 1088.

(*c*) La Croix du Maine, p. 173.

(*α*) It was therefore very probably at Orleans, and for the particular uſe of the Proteſtant Church of that place, that Hugh Sureau cauſed to be printed in 1565, by Abel Clemence, the Pſalms of Marot and Beza, ſet in four parts by Goudimel, but in a more ſimple and eaſy muſic, with a particular diſtinction to each Pſalm, that part which is to be ſung in the ſervice. He alſo wrote a *treatiſe of the marks of the true Church of* GOD, in 8vo, Heidelberg 1574 *, and a Latin tranſlation of du Bellai's Memoirs, printed in 8vo. with a beautiful letter and on a fine paper, at Frankfort, by John Marſhal, anno 1575. I know not whether this is the ſame which Andrew Wechel had publiſhed the year before, without the Tranſlator's name †. By the way, it is related in the *Memoires de l'Etat de France*, under Charles IX. Tom. I. folio 277. that the reſtleſs temper of Hughes Sureau the Proteſtant Miniſter, occaſioned his being taken from Orleans, ... and firſt placed in ... and afterwards in the little Church of which he was Miniſter, when he was taken during the maſſacres of the year 1572. To conclude, I ſuppoſe that his ſirname *du Roſier* might be only a nickname, which might have been given him from his being born at Roſoi in Turache. REM. CRIT.]

* *Thuan. Bibl. tom.* 1. *p.* 175.

† *Draud. Bibl. tom.* 1. *p.* 1105.

[*A*] *Upon his being thought Author of a book filled with ſeditious maxims.*] Beza ſpeaks as follows concerning this Libel. "There was printed privately "at that time (1) in Lyons, without the Author's or "Printer's name, a book entitled, *La defenſe civile "& militaire des innocens & de l'Egliſe de Chriſt*, "compoſed no doubt by ſome wicked and ſeditious "ſpirit. This book falling into the hands of ſome "good people, the utmoſt endeavours were uſed to "diſcover the Author, but without effect, except "that it was ſtrongly ſuſpected that Charles du Mou-"lin, a famous Advocate of the Parliament of Paris, "who was then at Lyons, and had ſided with the "Proteſtants from the time of King Henry, was "Author of it; he having appeared both before and "after, a fantaſtical man. However, he denied it "with great oaths, whether right or wrong I ſay "not (2)." Lyons was then poſſeſſed by the Proteſtants. Soubiſe, who commanded in it, ordered the Miniſters to examine this work, and the judgment they paſſed upon it was as follows. "We Miniſters "of the word of God in the Proteſtant Church at "Lyons, ... after calling upon the name of God, "and peruſing a certain book publiſhed not long "ſince, entitled, *La defenſe civile & militaire des "hommes & de l'Egliſe de Chriſt*, certify and declare, "that it is full of falſe and evil doctrine, agreeing, "in ſome points, with that of the Anabaptiſts, ex-"citing men to ſedition, rebellion, and diſobedience "to Kings and Princes, contrary to the expreſs com-"mand and ordinance of God; and ſo much the "more, becauſe the Author of it wreſts ſeveral "teſtimonies and examples of ſcripture, which he "applies very ill to his purpoſe, contrary to their "true ſenſe and meaning, as we are ready to ſhew "and maintain by the word of God: for which "reaſon we deſire and requeſt, that the ſaid book "may be entirely deſtroyed, to prevent mankind "from being infected with ſuch ſeditious and peſti-"lent doctrine (3)." Soubiſe, in conſequence of this cenſure, commanded all thoſe who had this book to bring it in in four and twenty hours; and that all thoſe who ſhould ſell or diſperſe it ſhould be hanged, *without being brought to a trial* (4), and cauſed

(1) This is, in 1563.

(2) Beze, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* liv. 11. p. 244.

(3) Beze, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* liv. 11. p. 244.

(4) Ibid. p. 245.

caused it to be burnt by the hangman, in the four principal squares of the city, the 12th of June 1563 (5). *Thus matters went with regard to this book*, adds Beza (6); "and many years after du Rosier, a Minister "of Orleans, was accused of being the Author of "it. He was not then at Lyons but at Orleans, he "not knowing any more what was then doing in "Lyons, than what passed in the Indies. However, "he was prosecuted for it, and carried prisoner to "Paris with great noise, as though the Protestants "approved that doctrine. But God was afterwards "pleased to make the truth known, though du Ro-"sier had powerful enemies, particularly Birague, "who some years after, was the unworthy Governor "of Lyons." Thuanus relates, in few words, the prosecution carried on against this book; but observes that it was falsely ascribed to Charles du Moulin the Civilian (7). Deckherus has not given the title of this book exactly, *Eodem* (superiori seculo) says he (8), *non expresso Authoris nomine vulgatus libellus* de potestate Principis *Lugduni combustus, &c.* i. e. "Last century was published an anonymous libel, *con-*"*cerning the power of the Prince*, which was burnt in "Lyons, *&c.*" One of the Censurers of Deckherus expressed, on occasion of these words, a doubt which he should not have entertained. He is in doubt whether this work differed from that which was printed at Paris in 1589, and entitled, *Traité de la puissance des Rois contre le Roi de Navarre.* Had he known that du Moulin died (9) long before any mention was made of the rights of the King of Navarre, he would have asserted in a very positive manner, that these two books were not the same; we here have a *non liquet*, which is no ways to his honour. *An vero iste tractatus idem sit de quo Cl. Deckherus, pag.* 338, *loquitur tanquam Lugduni combusto, & falso adscripto Carolo Molinæo J. C. sed quem alii tribuant* Hugoni Sorello Roserio, *non mihi liquet* (10). i. e. "I am not "certain whether this treatise be the same with that "mentioned by Deckherrus, page 338, as burnt in "Lyons, and falsely ascribed to Charles du Moulin a "Civilian; and ascribed by others to Hugh Sorellus "Roserius."

Here follow some errors of Davila. He says that in 1566, a Protestant Minister, born at Orleans, preached in a seditious manner, after having published a book to maintain, that the French ought no longer to obey the King, but might lawfully kill him, he being an idolatrous Prince. *Nè erano meno ardite le penne de gli Ugonotti di quello, che si fossero l'armi, perche in questo medesimo tempo un Ministro, nativo di Orliens, andava seditiosamente predicando contro alla podestà del Rè, & havea anco stampato un libro, nel quale sosteneva, che il popolo Francese non era più in obligo d'obbedire al Rè, per esser egli diventato idolatra, & per questa ragione contendeva ancora, che si potesse lecitamente ammazzare, dalla quale empia è diabolica semente è poi successivamente derivata in altri tempi, & in altre persone, quella pestifera dottrina, che con horribile perversione d'ogni legge divina & humana ha insegnata à gli huomini ad insanguinarsi le mani sotto protesto di pietà, è di religione, nelle viscere de i Rè legitimi, constituiti sopra gli huomini per rappresentanti di Dio* (11). i. e. "The pens of "the Huguenots were as bold as their swords; for "at the same time a Minister, a native of Orleans, "used to preach seditious sermons against the King's "power; he having likewise printed a book, where-"in he asserted, that the French nation were no "longer obliged to obey their King, because he was "turned idolater. Hence he likewise was prompted "to maintain, that it was lawful to kill him; from "which impious and diabolical seed afterwards "sprung up, in other persons, and at other times, "that pestiferous doctrine, which, to the utter per-"version of all laws divine and human, taught men, "under the pretence of piety and religion, to im-"brue their hands in the blood of lawful Monarchs, "appointed by Heaven to reign over men, as his "representatives." It is plain he there speaks of Rosier the Protestant Minister, who was imprisoned that year, upon pretence of his having writ a seditious libel. But I. This Minister was not born in Orleans. II. He did not preach against the King's power; for had his sermons been seditious, he might easily have been found guilty of rebellion. Birague his enemy, who threw him into prison as Author of a libel, would not have failed in his prosecution for want of proofs; for had he had no valid ones with respect to the book, he would have found such with regard to the sermons: consequently as our Protestant Minister was set at liberty, it plainly shews that his sermons were not such as Daval represents them. III. I can never believe, that the book burnt at Lyons inculcated that it was lawful to murder Kings; but am persuaded, that had it contained so execrable a doctrine, the Ministers, who censured him, would have censured it in much stronger terms. I confess that la Croix du Maine, a Protestant Author, tells us, that *du Rosier* wrote, among other French books, *one wherein he endeavours to shew that it is lawful to kill a King and Queen, who refuse to embrace the Protestant Religion, and side with the Protestants* (12): but I am persuaded, that though he says this, he yet had not seen the libel, which Soubise caused to be burnt. He only speaks, if I mistake not, on the testimony of the Authors cited by him. *See*, continues he, *on this subject, the history of France, of our times, the last edition, enlarged by John Frere de Naval, and likewise Belleforest, in volume the second of his annals, at large, of France, folio* 1689, 1653, *&c.* (13). Varillas, who certainly was not of a character to endeavour to extenuate the heinousness of this libel, represents it as a work, in which monarchical authority was opposed. It is plain to every one, that here is an infinite difference between this, and the doctrine which authorizes the murder of Kings. But it will be proper for me to quote the whole passage of this historian. "Soubise, before he left it (4), caused to be "there burnt, by the hands of the hangman, a sedi-"tious book printed there a little before. The Cal-"vinists ascribed it to Charles du Moulin, a famous "lawyer; and probably this was out of malice, be-"cause he was the only Frenchman who would not "leave the Lutheran Sect, to go over to theirs; for "this book does not seem to be writ in du Moulin's "style nor manner. It was properly a satyr against "all the Monarchs in Christendom, which he pre-"tended to destroy, by passages from scripture, cur-"tailed or perverted to a wrong sense. The Catho-"lic Authors say, that it was a Calvinist Minister; "that this was not the first time they had attempted "to defame the regal power in their writings; and "that three years before, *viz.* in the year one thou-"sand five hundred and sixty two, they had held a "synod in the city of Châlon on the Saone, wherein "they laid it down, that the equality of conditions "was the most certain privilege of the Gospel Li-"berty, which the blood of Christ had purchased for "true Christians. But this synod is not found in "the collection * of the first twenty six held by the "Protestants in France. There is nothing to be seen "about it except in the writings of their adversa-"ries; besides, it is not probable that their Ministers "should not at first have taken upon themselves, and "without the consent of Calvin, to lay down, as "the foundation of their religion, a paradox, which "Aristotle has refuted with so much solidity in his "ethicks, and which is so dangerous, that it tended "to overthrow, not only the Calvinistical principles "which it endeavoured to establish, but likewise "all civil societies of what kind soever (15)." The Protestants cannot complain of many particulars here; on the contrary, they ought to applaud the Author's equity, which justifies them pretty strongly. But his marginal note had led some very learned persons into a mistake; and their error, though excusable, is of great consequence. I say it is excusable, because a French reader must examine it very attentively, otherwise he will be apt to take this note of the historian, in the same sense as it was understood by the Authors of *Acta Eruditorum*. The first reflection, which presents itself to the reader of Varillas's note, is, that he saw, among the manuscripts of Lomenie, the synod which the Protestants have not inserted in the collection of their twenty six first synods. In this manner it was understood by the learned Authors of *Acta Eruditorum*. But this sense is very injurious to the Protestants; for were it true, that, in the collection of their synods, among the manuscripts of Lomenie, a synod held in 1560, which declares in favour of an equality of conditions, this would induce me to believe, that they had pronounced a decision there-

(5) Beze, *Hist. Eccles.* p. 236.

(6) Ibid.

(7) *Quem vonnulli, sed falso, Carolo Molinæo J. C. alii Hugoni Sorello Roserio tribuebant.* Thua. lib. 34. p. 687. ad. ann. 1563.

(8) Deckherus, *de Scriptis Adespotis*, p. 338.

(9) He died in 1566.

(10) Petrus Bælius, *Epistola ad Almeloveenium de Scriptis Adespotis ad calcem Tractatus Deckheri*, p. 371. edit. 1686.

(11) Davila, *delle Guerre Civili di Francia*, lib. 4. p. m. 160. ad ann. 1566.

(12) La Croix du Maine, *Bibl. Franc.* p. 173.

(13) He might have cited Miles Piguerre, *Hist. de France*, p. 457. edit. of 1582.

(14) *i. e.* Lyons.

* *I have seen it among those of Lomenie.*

(15) Varillas, *Hist. de l'Heresie*, book 26. p. 10, 11. ad ann. 1563. Dutch edit.

Miniſter, diſputed the ſame year againſt two Doctors of Divinity of Paris [*B*], in Duke de Nevers's palace, at the deſire of Duke Montpenſier, who flattered himſelf with the hopes, that this would prevail with his daughter, the Dutcheſs of Bouillon, to return to the Roman Catholick Religion, but he was deceived in his expectations. Du Roſier ſaved his life in the maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's-Day, by abjuring his religion; and as he was employed immediately after to exhort the King of Navarre, the Prince of Condé, *&c.* to embrace the Romiſh Communion, and had all the ſucceſs on this occaſion, which the Court of France expected from it, he was thought extremely well qualified to be a converter (*d*). For this reaſon he was employed for this purpoſe in ſeveral parts of Paris; and the Court was ſo well ſatisfied with the progreſs he made, that he was ſent, with Maldonat the Jeſuit, to the country about Metz, where there was a plentiful harveſt. He harangued, he inveighed againſt the Proteſtant Religion, but was not perſuaded of the truth of what he ſaid [*C*]; for ſome Proteſtant Miniſter having an opportunity of ſpeaking to him in private, and repreſenting the ſad ſtep he had taken, he ſeemed quite

(*d*) See in Thuanus, book 52. p. 1088, a long account of all this.

thereupon in 1560, which yet they afterwards thought proper to ſuppreſs, with all the records of that aſſembly. I muſt therefore inform every one, that the article *Le*, in the marginal note, refers, not to ſynod, but to collection. Varillas's meaning is, that he ſaw, among the collections of Lomenie, the collection of the firſt twenty ſix ſynods held by the Proteſtants, and that he did not therein find the ſynod of 1560, in which it is pretended that a deciſion was made concerning the equality of conditions. *Ex* Manuſcriptis Lomenianis *decretum Synodi à Reformatis* Catalauni (16) *habitæ allegat, quo contra regiam poteſtatem ſtatuerint*, æqualitatem conditionis humanæ inter potiſſima privilegia libertatis Evangelicæ eſſe, quam Chriſtus ſuo ſanguine veris Chriſtianis promeruerit (17).

(16) It ſhould be *Cabiloni*, for *Catalaunum* is Châlons on the Marne; now, according to Varillas, the Synod in queſtion was held at Châlons on the Saone, which city is called in Latin *Cabilonum*.

(17) *Acta eruditorum*, Lipſ. 1691. p. 31.

[*b*] *He and another Proteſtant Miniſter diſputed .... againſt two Doctors of Divinity of Paris.*] The Duke of Mompenſier was perſuaded, that the Ducheſs of Bouillon would quit the Calviniſtical principles, provided ſhe would but hear Doctor Vigor. He conſented however that du Spina, the Proteſtant Miniſter, ſhould be preſent, whilſt the Doctor juſt mentioned was ſpeaking. To content him, the Duke of Bouillon and Admiral Coligni ſettled conditions of a conference, which was to be held, at his houſe the 1ſt of July 1566. De Spina, accompanied by Barbaſte, Miniſter to the Queen of Navarre, went thither on the appointed day. They were aſked, whether they would *pray, according to the manner of the Proteſtant Churches, before they began the conference*; to which anſwer was made, that they were reſolved; and becauſe they perſiſted in the reſolution to begin with a prayer, pronounced aloud, in the place where the diſpute was to be carried on, the whole deſign was defeated; and they went away again, having rejected all the expedients, which were propoſed to them, to induce them not to make any prayer. Doctor Ruze told them, that if they were determined to pray, he would leave the room, and *go and piſs whilſt they were at prayer*. He deſired them to pray only mentally, or to go and pray in ſome neighbouring houſe: but all theſe propoſals were rejected, and ſo no conference was held (18). A report was ſpread, that *they had fled from the diſpute*. The Admiral aſſerted the contrary before the King and Queen; and ſaid they ſhould be ever ready to hold a conference with the Doctors, and to defend the faith they profeſſed by ſcripture. And now Duke de Nevers beſought their Majeſties that the conference might be revived, and the conditions of it were ſettled. Accordingly Doctor Vigor and de Sainctes on one hand, and de Spina and Sureau, the Proteſtant Miniſters, on the other hand, began the diſpute at his houſe the 9th of July 1566, and continued it ſeveral days. Some Hiſtorians affirm that Hugh Sorel (19) was taken out of priſon; Mezerai (20) and Varillas are among thoſe who ſay ſo, the latter of whom writes as follows: "Duke de Montpenſier imagined, that the beſt me-" thod to bring back the Ducheſs de Bouillon his " daughter, to the communion of the Catholick " church, would be, to have a publick conference " between two Doctors, and the ſame number of Pro-" teſtant Miniſters; and accordingly one was held in " the hotel de Nevers. The Doctors were, Simon Vi-" gor, afterwards Archbiſhop of Narbonne, and Claude " de Sainctes, afterwards Biſhop of Evreux. The " two Proteſtant Miniſters were to be John de l'Eſpine, " abovementioned, and Charles Barbaſte, who had " been a Carmelite: but Barbaſte not being able to " come to the conference, the Calviniſts deſired that " Hugh Sorrel des Roſier might be put in his room. " Des Roſiers was a Proteſtant Miniſter, who was im-" priſoned for writing a libel concerning the authority " of Magiſtrates; wherein he pretended that it was " lawful to extirpate, by any method whatſoever, a " King of a contrary religion. He deſerved to be " condemned to perpetual impriſonment for this " crime; but he obtained his pardon, by the ſolici-" tations of thoſe of his own perſuaſion, and the " credit of Duke de Montpenſier. It was judged " proper that the Ducheſs de Bouillon ſhould have no " cauſe to complain, upon pretence that ſhe could not " have the two Miniſters whom ſhe thought to be " the beſt diſputants *; and the diſpute was carried " on without heat, out of reſpect to the illuſtrious " perſons who aſſiſted at it. But notwithſtanding " this temper, both Catholicks and Calviniſts gave " out that they had been victorious. Nor did the " event clear up the truth of the matter, for if on " one hand, &c." (21). The account written by the Proteſtant Miniſters ſeems to inform us, that du Roſier was releaſed out of priſon, before any mention was made of his being a diſputant. For hearing that Vigor was ſick, and that Sainctes had left Paris, they were afraid leſt the conferences being interrupted, would continue too long ſo. They therefore deſired to return to their reſpective homes; and declared that they were come to Paris *only by accident, viz. that de Spina was come thither in his way to Anjou; and the other, who was Paſtor of the church of Orleans, was but lately come out of priſon, whither he had been carried in the preceding month of June, on a falſe accuſation, forged by the enemies of the church of God againſt him, by which he was charged with being the Author of a pernicious and wicked book, written againſt the obedience we owe to Kings and Princes; and that therefore it would be very inconvenient for him to make a long ſtay in a town, to which he was come againſt his will* (22). Claude de Sainctes printed the particulars of that diſpute (23).

* The Relation or Records of it are printed.

(21) Varillas, *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie*, book 27. p. 88.

(22) *Records of the Conference*, p. 323.

[*C*] *He harangued, he inveighed againſt the Proteſtant religion; but was not perſuaded of the truth of what he ſaid.*] I cannot do better than to make uſe of the words of the Hiſtorian of the Churches. Marſhal de Rets, Governor of the country about Metz, "tried " another expedient, he having brought to Mets an " unhappy Miniſter that had changed his religion, " named de Roſier, accompanied by one Maldonat, " a Spaniſh Doctor, and a Jeſuit, who was looked up-" on as the moſt learned and moſt ſubtle man in his " whole order. As for du Roſier, he had done all " that lay in his power, at Paris, to make others ab-" jure, inſomuch that he printed his abjuration, and " other books filled with falſities, and reſulting from " an evil conſcience; whereas before he paſſed for " a learned man, as he really was; he having even " been choſen to diſpute at Paris with Dr. Vigor " and Dr. des Sainctes. This man's abjuration proved " a great ſcandal to many; but he afterwards en-" deavoured to mend the matter as well as he could; " but, from that time, he never had a ſound judg-" ment

(23) In 1568, according to all the Bibliographers I have conſulted It is not likely this was the firſt edition. The Relation of the Proteſtant Miniſters was publiſhed two years before.

(18) Extracted from the preface to the *Records or Relation of a Conference held at Paris, in July and Aug.* 1566, *between two doctors of the Sorbonne, and two Proteſtant Miniſters.* I make uſe of the Antwerp edit. of 1566. 8vo.

(19) It ſhould be *Sureau*. Thuanus's Latin *Sorellus* has miſled the Hiſtorians on this occaſion.

(20) Mezerai, *Hiſt. de France*, fol. Tom. 3. p. 145.

quite diſpoſed to make amends for it. He thereupon left Maldonat, and withdrew to Heidelberg, where he again turned Proteſtant. However, he could never recover the eſteem he before had among thoſe of his perſuaſion; and would have been, not only greatly deſpiſed, but miſerably poor, had not Andrew Wechel (*e*) made him corrector of his preſs in Frankfort. He died of the plague in that city, with his whole family [*D*]. When he was travelling to Metz, he was deſired to go to Sedan, to convert the ſame Dutcheſs of Bouillon, on whoſe account he had held a conference with two Romiſh Doctors; but he made no impreſſion on that Lady's mind (*f*). I ſhall ſpeak of his writings [*E*].

(*e*) See the rem. [*D*].

(*f*) See Thuan. lib. 52. p. 1088.

He is repreſented as a man of a wrangling temper, fond of particular opinions; and one who had ſowed the ſeeds of diſcord in the Church of Orleans [*F*], by the correſpondence

" ment, nor an upright conſcience; and, at laſt, " himſelf, with his wife and all his children, died of " the plague in Frankfort. To return to our Hiſto- " ry, theſe two being arrived in Mets, and moſt of " the Proteſtants being obliged, one Sunday, to re- " pair to the epiſcopal palace, du Rozier made a " long ſpeech to them, wherein he ſpoke concern- " ing the ſucceſſion of Biſhops, which, he ſaid, was " the characteriſtic of the true churches (24)." Beza adds (25), *that being partly convicted by his own conſcience, and alſo adviſed by perſons of worth to take pity on himſelf, he beſought them to help him to get out of this quagmire, which was done; and this miſerable creature was carried to the church of Heidelberg, where he acknowledged his faults, of which he publiſhed a little treatiſe, contrary to what he had printed in Paris.* What follows was publiſhed by a Proteſtant Miniſter, a great ſlanderer, who had abjured his religion. " They " (26) were greatly afraid, leſt du Roſier ſhould in- " ſiſt farther on that point (27). For this cauſe, ſome " perſons of Sedan went to him to a place called " Chemery, where they ſoon made him believe (he " being a fearful, inconſtant and credulous man) that " if he returned to Paris with Maldonat, he would " certainly, after they had triumphed over him, be " put to death; and that Duke de Bouillon had had " information of this, which was falſe. Moreover, " they told him that Maldonat had hinted towards " this, ſaying, that he had ſtill ſomething heretical " about him; inſomuch, that at Mets, their per- " ſuaſions wrought ſo far upon him, that he left the " Jeſuit without taking leave of him, and retired to " Germany; to enable him to do which, money was " given him; and afterwards a gathering (amount- " ing to upwards of 250 livres) was made, and ſent " to him (28)." I remember, ſays he elſewhere (29), " that this was the firſt crime they laid to du Roſier's " charge, when he ſeemed inclined to ſeparate from " them, and to return to the pale of the Chriſtian " and Catholick church. But when they ſaw that " this, and ſome other common faults, ſuch as the be- " ing a mumper, an everlaſting liar, &c. a man of no " reſolution, were not ſufficient to ruin his reputati- " on, ſome of them caſt a blemiſh on his wife's " chaſtity, giving out that ſhe had proſtituted herſelf " to ſome Canons of Orleans, a circumſtance that is " no ways probable, for reaſons which I had rather " leave to the conſideration of thoſe who have ſeen " and know her, than publiſh them."

(24) Beza, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* book 16. p. 475.

(25) Ibid.

(26) *i. e.* The Miniſters of Sedan.

(27) That which related to the vocation of the Miniſters.

(28) Matthew de Launoy, *Declaration & Refutation des fauſſes ſuppoſitions*, folio 139.

(29) *Defenſe de Matthieu de Launoy contre les fauſſes Accuſations*, folio 37.

[*D*] *He died of the plague.*] This Beza has related already, and we are alſo told the ſame by Philip Lonicerus. *Ex improviſo ſiquidem anno ſuperiori, in ipſa Vindemia, peſte Rempublicam noſtram tunc infeſtante, ex hac vita, non ſine magno doctorum virorum, quibus ille notus erat, tuoque cum primis dolore, ex hac miſera vita, una cum uxore ſua, in cæleſtem illam avocatus eſt* (30), *i. e.* " In the vintage-time laſt year, when our coun- " try was troubled with the plague, he, together with " his wife, was ſuddenly ſnatched from this wretch- " ed life, (to the great regret of learned men to " whom he was known, and yours in particular) and " tranſlated to a better in heaven." He writes in this manner to John Fichard, Syndic of the city of Frankf. in the dedication (to him) of a poſthumous piece of our Sureau, viz. of the Latin verſion of a work of John Corras (31). Had Lonicerus put a date to his dedication, we ſhould have known the exact year in which du Roſier died. The year of my edition (1588) is of no uſe to me. It is very certain that our Proteſtant Miniſter did not die the year before; he being dead when Beza publiſhed his Hiſtory of the Churches in 1580. Here follows another paſſage of Lonicerus, in which du Roſier is greatly applauded. *Quæ ſit humanarum rerum fragilitas, Fichardе clariſſime, ſuperiore anno præmatura ſua morte, etiam noſter ille Hugo Suræus, non ſine doctiſſimorum virorum ſuſpiriis, teſtatus eſt. Qui cum laudatiſſimæ Andreæ Wecheli, viri optimi & humaniſſimi, Typographiæ ſtrenuam navaret operam, talem ſuæ induſtriæ, quam exacta, non ſolum Latinæ & Græcæ, verum etiam Hebraicæ atque Chaldaicæ linguæ notitia ornabat, laudem conſequutus eſt, ut omnibus bonis & doctis viris eſſet gratiſſimus* (32), i. e. " How frail and uncertain all human things are, " moſt illuſtrious Fichard, was evident laſt year, by " the too early death of our Hugh Sureau, greatly " lamented by the learned: who, whilſt he was em- " ployed in the noble printing-houſe of Andrew " Wechel, a perſon of great humanity and good- " neſs, was ſo extremely diligent, and ſo well ſkilled " not only in the Greek and Latin, but likewiſe in " the Hebrew and Chaldee tongues, that he gained " the eſteem of all perſons of worth and learning."

(30) Phil. Lonicerus, *Epiſt. Dedicat.*

(31) The decree of the Parliament of Toulouſe, againſt the pretended Martin Guerre; which decree Corras, who reported the cauſe, wrote a large commentary upon.

(32) This is the beginning of the dedication.

I find by Geſner's Bibliotheque (33), that this Latin verſion of Corras's work was printed at Frankfort in 1579, *apud Andream Wechelum.* If this was the firſt edition, du Roſier muſt have died in autumn 1578. The Author of the Notes on the Confeſſion of Sanci (34), fixes his death to the year 1575 (β).

(33) p. m. 425.

(34) p. 470, 471, edit. of 1699.

§ (β) We find in *Memoires de l'etat de France ſous* Charles IX. tom. 2. f. 74, *verſo* of the 2d edition, under the year 1572, that Hugh Sureau, who eſcaped from the city of Metz, the 19th of December, died *about three years after*, at Frankfort, where he had reſumed his employment of Corrector of the preſs. REM. CRIT.]

[*E*] *I ſhall ſpeak of his writings.*] He compoſed ſeveral in French, according to La Croix du Maine (35), who mentions only two, that concerning the killing of Kings, and *a treatiſe* concerning *his confeſſion of faith, with an abjuration of the Huguenot principles, &c.* printed at Paris in 1573. The Reader has ſeen above, that he wrote one concerning his return to the Proteſtant religion. He had publiſhed ſome controverſial works at Orleans, before the maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's day, as appears from the anſwers of Gentianus Hervetus, mentioned in La Croix du Maine (36). I obſerved elſewhere (37), that he tranſlated du Bellai's Memoirs into Latin. Had Konig ſaid, that *Hugo Suræus* gave a Latin verſion of an Arret of the Parliament of Toulouſe, he would not have expoſed himſelf to cenſure; but he uſed the following expreſſion, *edidit arreſtum Parlamenti Tholoſani in caſu admirabili matrimoniali ann.* 1588 (38); but it is faulty in two reſpects; 1ſt, It does not diſtinguiſh, whether Sureau is the Tranſlator or Author, or barely the Publiſher of this decree. 2d, Sureau could not publiſh ſuch a piece in 1588, he dying before. There are a great number of ſuch errors in our Bibliographers.

(35) La Croix du Maine, *Bibl. Franc.* p. 173.

(36) *Reſponſe à Hugues Sureau dit des Roſiers, Maiſtre d'Eſcole à Orleans. L'Anti-Hugues, ou Reſponſe à Hugues Surreau dit des Roziers, imprimé par Cheſneau, l'an.* 1566. ibid. Here is an *Anti* not mentioned by Baillet.

[*F*]. *He . . . . had ſowed the ſeeds of diſcord in the church of Orleans.*] The following character is given of this Miniſter, in the Memoirs *de ſtatu Religionis & Reipublicæ in Regno Galliæ*, a work aſcribed to John de Serres. *Vir non ineruditus* (Rozarius) *ſed fœdiſſimo lapſu oſtendens quid ſit infirmitas humana, & quam periculoſum etiam ſit, pacato tempore, dum nullo hoſte urgemur, indulgere inſanientis noſtræ rationis commentis, ut certam exploratamque veritatem ſempiternis principiorum firmamentis*

(37) In the article BELLAI (William du) rem. [*D*].

(38) Konig, *Bibl.* p. 786.

reſpondence he held with ſome Fanaticks; ſo that there was reaſon to fear that the Church of France would have been ſadly divided, had the peace laſted; and had not the maſſacre put a ſtop to ſchiſm of every kind.

firmamentis cælo & terra firmiorem, in dubium pro arbitratu noſtro revocemus: quo curioſæ licentiæ morbo Rozarius laborabat, corrupto quodam more & ambitioſiore de Eccleſiæ ſucceſſione, diſciplina, & de aliis etiam Religionis capitibus ſuperciliose diſputans, ſeque ſuis collegis hac in re excellentiorem importuno quodam ſtudio exiſtimans. Non obſcurarum enim turbarum ſemina in Eccleſia Aureliana inſeminarat, dum ſeſe cum novorum commentorum architectis, phanaticis ingeniis familiarius conjungeret: unde, niſi periculoſæ tranquillitatis incommoda, novo hoc remedii genere Deus præcidiſſet, magnæ & periculoſæ turbæ in Eccleſiis Gallicis erant haud dubie exundaturæ (39), *i. e.* "Rozarius, who was a man of ſome learning, ſhewed, by his moſt ſhameful fall, what human frailty is; and how dangerous it is, in times of peace, when we are not attacked by any enemy, to give a looſe to the fictions of our bewildered reaſon; and to call in queſtion, at pleaſure, truth, which is eſtabliſhed on principles more ſolid than the foundations of heaven and earth. Rozarius was infected with this too licentious curioſity; he diſputing haughtily, in a corrupt and ambitious manner, concerning the ſucceſſion and diſcipline of the church, and other articles of religion; and imagining himſelf, on account of his unſeaſonable diligence on this occaſion, ſuperior to the reſt of his Collegues. Rozarius ſowed the ſeeds of troubles and diviſions in the church of Orleans; he contracting a familiarity with men of a fanatical turn, who projected innovations; whence, mighty and moſt dangerous commotions would doubtleſs have enſued in the churches of France, had not heaven prevented, by this new kind of remedy, the ill conſequences that muſt have flowed from a dangerous tranquillity." Another Author of that age writes as follows: "One du Roſier, a Proteſtant Miniſter, a man of ready wit, but reſtleſs and irreſolute, having been taken priſoner within a day's journey from Paris, as he was running away, began to waver, and ſoon after, changed his religion (40)."

(39) *De Statu Religionis & Reipubl.* part. 4. ad ann. 1572. folio m. 4.

(40) *Hiſt. des choſes memorables avenues en France*, ad ann. 1572, p. m. 444.

ROTAN (JOHN BAPTIST), a Proteſtant Miniſter of Rochelle, was highly eſteemed for his genius and erudition; but was ſuſpected to have betrayed his party [*A*], by favouring clandeſtinely the deſire which Henry IV. had to go to maſs. It is related that, having promiſed to let himſelf be overcome, in diſputing with du Perron, before that Prince in 1593; either remorſe of conſcience or vanity obliged Rotan to feign himſelf ill, to prevent his diſputing [*B*]. We are told that he continued to prevaricate

[*A*] *He was ſuſpected to have betrayed his party.*] d'Aubigné relates (1), that *Rottan the Proteſtant Miniſter, a Piemonteze (2), a deep Divine, and a ſubtle Philoſopher*, was deſirous to be a Courtier; and imagined that the third party, which was formed ſome time after the death of Henry III. would open a breach by which he might come into buſineſs. He joined with Morlas, who had the ſame deſign; after which both of them concerted, with du Perron, the methods how to bring over the King to the Romiſh religion. They met with favourable treatment from the Director of the Finances; a circumſtance that brought over other people to their faction. Rotan and Morlas *diſputed on ſeveral points, againſt du Perron, in his Majeſty's preſence; and prevaricating, yielded to that prodigy in learning; inſomuch, that from the time of the ſiege of Roan, he had inſinuated himſelf into the King's favour, by his eaſy and inchanting eloquence. . . Whilſt this was doing, each of them giving an opportunity to his friend, they propoſed a change of religion.* I am to obſerve, that Rotan began to be pleaſed with a Court-life, when he ſolicited there for *ſome monies which he had lent, or rather cauſed other perſons to lend in Geneva, for the levies raiſed by Sanſi* (3). This ſhews that he did not confine himſelf to the duties of his function, he concerning himſelf with politicks; whence we are no longer to wonder, that the inſtant he had breathed the air of courts, that he bent his thoughts to the making of his fortune, by preferring his temporal intereſt to religion. He was ſent to Mante, with ſeveral others, to repreſent to the King the grievances of the Proteſtants; but he had got himſelf privately choſen to diſpute againſt du Perron (4). *Now he had promiſed to prevaricate very artfully; but the time being come for him to do it, it ſo happened that the fear of his reputation, or fear, ſtruck him to ſuch a degree, that he choſe rather to feign himſelf ſick; upon which Beraud, the Proteſtant Miniſter of Montauban, was put in his room. Both parties diſputed eagerly, on the ſufficiency or inſufficiency of the ſcriptures, and the words of the epiſtle to Timothy. But the conference was interrupted by the prohibition of the Clergy.*

(1) D'Aubigné, *Hiſt. Univerſ.* Tom. 3. book 3. chap. 24. p. m. 405. ad ann. 1593.

(2) Others ſay that he was born among the Griſons. See the paſſage hereunder of CAYET, citation 6.

(3) D'Aubigné, *Hiſt. Univerſ.* Tom. 3. book 3. chap. 24. p. 405.

(4) Ibid. book 4. chap. 11. p. 505.

[*B*] *Rotan feigned himſelf ill, to prevent his diſputing.*] The reader has ſeen that d'Aubigné ſays ſo: and I'll now add, to his relation, that of the Hiſtorian of the Edict of Nants. We find, by him, that Rotan's conduct was approved in a national Synod. "Rotan, a famous Proteſtant Miniſter, was ſuſpected to favour thoſe artifices, whether or no he had been really allured by the hopes of a reward, or only pretended to approve them, in order to get himſelf deputed; that commiſſion then doing great honour to thoſe on whom it was beſtowed. A conference was accordingly opened, in which du Perron, by the colluſion of his antagoniſt, appeared as certain of being victorious. The diſpute turned upon the ſufficiency of the ſcriptures; and the interpretation of verſe 16. chap. iii. of St. Paul's ſecond epiſtle to Timothy. But Rotan, not daring, either through honour or conſcience, to act ſo baſe a part as it is ſaid he had promiſed to do, feigned an indiſpoſition, and by that means brought himſelf off. Beraud, a Proteſtant Miniſter of Montauban, took his place; but the conference was not carried on very far, when it was found, that the cheat contrived with Rotan would prove ineffectual. The Clergy found means to diſcontinue it, without ſeeming to break it; and, on the other hand, the Proteſtant Miniſters offered to renew it, every time that an opportunity ſhould preſent itſelf for that purpoſe. But becauſe the Clergy, notwithſtanding thoſe offers, boaſted they had forced the Proteſtant Miniſters to give out; Beraud and Rotan cauſed the national Synod, held at Montauban the following year, to approve all they had done in the conference. Rotan was ſheltered under Beraud's protection; which approbation put an end to the ſuſpicion that was entertained of the former's colluding with his antagoniſts (5)." We don't find clearly, neither by this relation, nor by that of d'Aubigné, whether Rotan feigned indiſpoſition after ſome conferences, or before any were held. For this reaſon, in order to give the Reader a more diſtinct idea of this particular, I ſhall tranſcribe what I find in another Hiſtorian. "Among theſe Deputies, ſays he (6), were ſeveral Proteſtant Miniſters; and, among others, one Rotan, born among the Griſons, who boaſted, when in Rochelle, that he would vanquiſh any Catholick Doctor in diſputation, and was himſelf perſuaded he could do it. That even to ſhew this was his opinion, he had ſent for a great number of books from Rochelle to Mantes; on which occaſion he was very much aſſiſted by Mr. du Pleſſis, Governor of Saumur. . . . On the day appointed, the ſaid Sieur du Perron, and Rotan the Miniſter, after

(5) *Hiſt. de l'Edit de Nantes*, Tom. 1. book 3. p. 112. ad ann. 1593.

(6) Peter Victor Cayet, *Chronologie Novenaire*, part. 2. fol. 269 *verſo*.

varicate during the remainder of his life; and that he and de Serres intended to ſet about a fraudulent deſign in a national Synod [C], but both of them died before the holding of it. Rotan had taught Divinity in Rochelle (a). He publiſhed a controverſial work concerning the Euchariſt [D], and another (b) to refute the motives of Cayet's converſion. There is reaſon to believe, that he had been Miniſter of the Church of Geneva [E]. He had been admitted to his Doctor's degree (in Divinity) at Heidelberg in 1573. Zanchius, who performed the ceremony on that occaſion, declares, that this Candidate had been baniſhed fifteen years, on account of his religion; and that he ſubmitted

(a) *Cum Rupellam rediiſſet* (Andreas Rivetus) *publice profitentem audivit Joannem Baptiſtam Rotanum Italum, doctiſſ. & eloquentiſſimum Doctorem, qui ſcholam Theologicam aperuerat.* Meurſius, *Athen. Batav.* p. 316.

(b) Printed at Rochelle, in 1596. It contains 215 pages in 8vo.

" ter certain preambles of challenging and reſpect " mixed together, each party proteſting that they " were moved only by a zeal for truth, they began " to talk on the ſufficiency of the ſcriptures (7)." This Hiſtorian having given the ſubſtance of the objections and anſwers, in a very partial manner againſt the Proteſtants, concludes as follows: *Rotan was then in a little confuſion, and began to praiſe the ſaid du Perron, and then the aſſembly broke up for that day. Rotan never came to the conference after this; but in his room came Berault, Miniſter of Montauban, who, during the ſix days following, was carried by the ſaid Sieur du Perron,* per omnes locos dialecticæ, *about the word* σοφίσαι, to make wiſe. *Hiſtory, Poetry, Mathematicks, Philoſophy, Phyſicks, Morality, Metaphyſicks, Scholias and Commentaries, were brought in, which Berault diſputed upon right or wrong; but all his endeavours were vain to prove, that this word ſignified or included* ſufficiency. *And indeed, after having applauded the ſaid Sieur du Perron, he hinted that he was not come prepared to diſpute. Thus ended this conference; and the Proteſtant Miniſters returned to their reſpective provinces* (8).

(7) Cayet, ibid. fol. 270 *verſo.*

(8) Idem, ibid. folio. 271 *verſo.*

[C] *He and de Serres intended to ſet about a fraudulent deſign.*] I have read this no where but in d'Aubigné, who informs us of the arts employed by the court to corrupt the Proteſtant Miniſters; and afterwards ſays, *The effect of it appeared particularly in the Miniſters Rotan, Serres, Cahiers, Morlas and de Vaux. The whole ſecret of theſe artifices, and particularly of thoſe of Mante, was diſcovered by the latter, who owned his prevarications to ſeveral eminent perſons, with dreadful cries* (9). D'Aubigné was own of thoſe perſons. *After,* ſays he (10), *he had depoſited his confeſſion in my boſom, with ſighs, he put into my hands three indentures or bonds, one of two thouſand five hundred crowns, and the other two of a little leſs value, which I reſtored to his heirs.* In the confeſſion Catholique de Sancy, he feigns that Cahier relates all theſe particulars; and introduces him affirming, what d'Aubigné had not dared to affirm (11), with regard to the circumſtances of this de Vaux's death. " Being " in this perplexity," (ſays Sancy) (12), " I ſpied Mr. " Cahier walking in the court. I flew to aſk him " what was become of de Vaux the Miniſter. Sir, " ſays he, this wretch, after the ſpecious promiſes he " had made to the Biſhop of Evreux, and received " money from him, in order to have an opportunity " of performing them, was ſeized with a pannick; " he crying and bawling that God's cauſe had " been betrayed by himſelf and five of his companions, whom he pointed at, but without naming " them. He added, that God would pardon him, " in caſe he went to his houſe, and there reſigned " up his ſoul into the hands of God, as ſoon as he " ſhould be got to Millaud. In the mean time he offered to write letters to the Biſhop of Evreux, " which he would ſend by ſome truſty perſon, " whereby the Biſhop of Evreux would diſcover the " prevarication of the diſpute of Mantes, and the " reſt of the prevarications of Rohan (13) and de Serres, whom, you are ſenſible, had promiſed their " perfidious aſſiſtance very early. But the Huguenots " were ſo ſilly as to refuſe his offer, ſaying, that " Chriſt's Kingdom ought not to be eſtabliſhed by artifice (14). I aſked, how will it be poſſible for " Rohan (15) and Serres, and the reſt, to juſtify themſelves? to which Cahier anſwered, theſe need no " cover or juſtification, they being covered with earth, " and I will tell you how they came to die. The " inſtant they heard of de Vaux's confeſſion, they encouraged one another by letters; got themſelves " elected for the national Synod of Montpellier, firm" ly determined to hazard all; and endeavoured, " before they retreated, to get ſomething by the " confederates. But it unhappily fell out, that they " both died at the opening of the Synod." The Author of the Notes on the Confeſſion of Sancy obſerves (16), that this is the national Synod which was held at Montpellier in May 1598; and againſt which Reboul compoſed, in 1600, the ſatyr entitled, *Actes du Synode univerſel de la ſainte Reformation,* i. e. " Acts or Records of the general Synod of the Re" formation."

(9) D'Aubigné, Tom. 3. liv. 5. chap. 1. p. 625.

(10) Ibid. p. 626.

(11) See the original, I do not relate it.

(12) *Confeſſion Catholique de Sancy,* lib. 2. laſt chap. p. 547. edit. 1699.

(13) It ſhould be Rotan.

(14) *Confeſſion Catholique de Sancy,* liv. 2. laſt chap. p. 548.

(15) Read *Rotan.*

(16) *Notes ſur la Confeſſion de Sancy,* p. 560.

[D] *He publiſhed a controverſial work concerning the Euchariſt.*] It was printed in Rochelle, and entitled, *Traité orthodoxe de l'Euchariſtie* (α). Doctor Julius Cæſar Bulenger refuted it in a book printed at Paris for Frederick Morel in 1598, in 8vo. He refers to it in the Preface to his Catholick anſwer to Du Pleſſis Mornai's book on the Euchariſt.

§ (α) The treatiſe, to which, be it ſaid by the way, Rotan did not put his name, was not printed later than 1596, ſince there was printed the ſame year, by Giles Robinot, an anſwer written by Cayet under the following title: *Levray Orthodoxe de la foi Catholique du Sainct Sacrement de l'Autel, pour reſponſe au traité pretendu orthodoxe anonyme.* REM. CRIT.]

[E] *There is reaſon to believe, that he had been Miniſter of the Church of Geneva* (β).] It appears by Melchior Adamus, that he was one of the three Proteſtant Miniſters (17) who went from Geneva to Berne in 1588, to be preſent at a ſynod aſſembled on occaſion of the diſputes which Samuel Huberus and Claude Auberi had excited (18). I have ſpoke elſewhere (19) of this Samuel Huberus; and will now obſerve that this Claude Auberi was Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Lauſanne; and that going out of his ſphere, and taking upon him to teach Divinity, he had taught both by word of mouth and writing, that man's righteouſneſs, before the tribunal of God, is an inherent quality. The ſynod condemned this opinion, and obliged Auberi and his adherents to acknowledge, that they embraced the doctrine contained in the confeſſion of faith of the Churches of Switzerland and France, *viz.* that we are juſtified before the throne of God by faith as by an inſtrument, with which we take hold of Chriſt our righteouſneſs. *Claudius Alberius Triunturianus cum ſuis, receptæ doctrinæ & in confeſſione tam Gallicana quam Helvetica comprehenſæ: de noſtra ad tribunal Dei juſtificatione per fidem tamquam inſtrumentum, quo Chriſtus, juſtitia noſtra apprehendatur, profeſſus ſit penitus aſſentiri* (20). I ſhall obſerve by the way, that he ſubmitted only verbally to the deciſions of this ſynod. I have a book publiſhed by one Anthony Leſcaille in 1591; and I therein find that Doctor Gryneus ſpoke in this manner in an aſſembly held at Baſil in December 1590, with regard to the diſputes between this Anthony Leſcaille, with Meſſieurs Conſtant and Couët, Miniſters of the French Church. " That there was " one Aubery, who had formerly writ a book, " which was ſince condemned at Berne, who had " ſubſcribed to ſome poſitions, which nevertheleſs " he afterwards had departed from. That paſſing " by Baſil, and returning to it as he came from " Frankfort, he had ſcatterred the ſeeds of his er" rors in ſeveral houſes at Baſil, and to ſeveral per" ſons; but that no one dared to maintain his errors " but Leſcaille, to whom the ſaid Aubery had left " a compoſition of his own writing. He therefore, " at his going away, ſhall give notice thereof to the " Magiſtrates of Berne, in order that the ſaid Au" bery may be puniſhed (21)." This Leſcaille was an illiterate Lay-man, who pretended to dogmatize; and put into the hands of his paſtors a piece upon good

(17) The two others were *Beza* and *La Faye.*

(18) Melch. Adam. *in Vita Stuckii,* p. 771. *Vitarum Theol. German.* Note, he puts this under the year 1578; but in *Beza's Life,* p. 229, where he relates the ſame thing, he puts 1588. See, on this ſubject, the text of the art. BEZA.

(19) Rem. [E] of the art. HUNNIUS.

(20) Melch. Adam. *in Vitis Theolog. Germ.* p. 771.

(21) *La Doctrine ancienne du premier, deuxieme, troiſieme & dernier Jugement, ... par ALPDDGGH,* p. 50, 51.

mitted with great chearfulneſs to the loſs he had ſuſtained of a conſiderable eſtate (*c*). Father Maimbourg may juſtly be criticiſed [*F*].

(*c*) *Exilium quod propter Domini Jeſu Chriſti cauſſam, annos jam totos quindecim, cum non parvis ſuorum bonorum, eorumque non tenuium jactura conjunctum, æquiſſimo ſemper animo tulit, imo magnæ gloriæ loco habuit.* Zanchius, *Epiſt.* lib. 2. p. 603.

(22) *La Doctrine ancienne du premier, deuxieme, troiſieme & dernier Jugement, ... par* ALPDDGGH. p. 27.

good works (22). Beza ſpoke to him as follows, in Auguſt 1591. "Take notice of what I ſay; you "did not write that piece, but Aubery, though he "denied it at Berne, againſt his conſcience. Leſcaille "ſaid, it is my compoſition, and Mr. Aubery never "ſaw it ſuch as it is. I do not deny but that I "learned of him, and of others, ſome things which "are in that piece. Beza ſaid, it is a bad piece, "to which Leſcaille anſwered, I did not give it as "though the whole was good; and when any per-"ſon ſhall ſhew me, by the ſcriptures, that there is "any thing bad in it, I will believe him: Beza "continued to ſay, Aubery has writ a bad book, "and you applaud it; to which Leſcaille replied, "what I underſtand in Mr. Aubery's book I think "extremely good; but as to what I do not under-"ſtand therein, I will neither praiſe nor condemn "it (23)."

(23) p. 92, 93.

§ (*B*) In the Citadin of Geneva, page 42, mention is made of the name of *John Baptiſt Rotan, an Italian*, as written in gold letters, among thoſe of the moſt famous Proteſtant Divines, in the regiſter of the Univerſity of Geneva. REM. CRIT.]

[*F*] *Father Maimbourg may be juſtly criticiſed.*] His words are as follow. "What have they not ſaid "to diſhonour the memory of Sponde, Lieutenant "General in Rochelle, of Salette, Counſellor to the "King of Navarre, of Morlas Counſellor of State, "and Superintendant of the Store-houſes of France, "of du Fay, Clairville, Rohan, and an hundred "more of their moſt famous Miniſters, who, after "having behaved very worthily among them, and "been the chief perſons in their conſiſtory, were on "a ſudden ſtrongly metamorphoſed into wicked vil-"lains and the worſt of wretches, for their having "abjured the Calviniſtical principles (24)?" He ſup-poſes in this paſſage, 1. That du Fay was a Proteſ-tant Miniſter. 2. That there was a Proteſtant Mi-niſter named Rohan (25). 3. That theſe two pre-tended Miniſters abjured the Proteſtant Religion. Now all this is falſe. They indeed were looked up-on as falſe brethren; but it does not appear that ei-ther Rohan or du Fay died really and open Papiſts. See the notes on the Confeſſion of Sancy, page 357 and 358 of the edition of 1699.

(24) Maimb. preface to the *Hiſtory of the League.*

(25) He was miſled by an er-ror of the preſs, which crept into the *Catholick Confeſſion of Sancy.*

ROTTERDAM, is one of the moſt conſiderable cities in Holland, and ſituated ſo advantageouſly on the Meuſe, as is of great advantage to the trade of it. There is no doubt but it was ſo called from its being built at the mouth of the Rotte (*a*). The time when it was begun to be built is not known; but we know that it was made a city about the year 1270, it being then ſurrounded with ramparts, and endowed with privileges (*b*). Nothing has made it more conſpicuous than its giving birth to the great Eraſmus [*A*], and it was not inſenſible to this glory, the inhabitants having taken care to honour

(*a*) It is the name of a river.

(*b*) Boxhornius, *Theatr. Holland.* p. m. 281.

[*A*] *Nothing has made it more conſpicuous than its giving birth to the great Eraſmus.*] Had Homer been as much eſteemed during his life time, as he was after his death, ſeveral cities would have aſpired to no purpoſe to the glory of having given birth to him; for that, which would really have had this advantage, had given indiſputable proofs of it, before a ſeries of years could have given other cities an occaſion of contending for it. This is the reaſon why there is no diſpute with regard to the place of Eraſmus's birth, the great reputation he enjoyed, during his life time, having prevented ſuch conteſts. Rotterdam was early ſenſible of this glory; and ſecured ſo well, whilſt the memory of things was recent, its claim to the poſſeſſion and ſplendor which accrued to it by being the birth-place of ſo great a man, that it cannot be chicaned upon any account. His mother was forced to fly to Rotterdam, to conceal her delivery, ſhe being poor. With regard to the place where he was begot, we muſt leave it entirely to the city of Tergou, which is not a little proud of that advantage. What would it be if this conception was not defiled with a double original ſin, or rather by an actual ſin, beſides the original? A Burgomaſter (1) of this town, aſſerted that Eraſmus was even born in it; and that Rotter-dam could boaſt of nothing but the education of him. But it is to no purpoſe for him to aſſert and repeat it; and though the records of the Convent of Stein agree in this fiction, yet the whole world is perſuaded, that Eraſmus was not born in Tergou, but in Rotterdam. What follows is confeſſed by the par-ties concerned. In a letter of the Burgomaſters and Counſellors of Tergou, inſerted in the deſcription of Flanders, tranſlated from the Italian of Lewis Guic-ciardin, are the following words (2): *Oriundus etiam hac urbe magnus ille Deſiderius Eraſmus, Goudæ enim conceptus & utero geſtatus* ROTERODAMI *(quo cum ad pariendum vicina eſſet mater ſe certa de cauſa contulerat)* IN LUCEM EDITUS EST. i. e. "The famous Deſi-"derius Eraſmus, was originally of this town. For "being begot in Tergou, and his mother continuing "there during her pregnancy, ſhe went to Rotterdam "and was DELIVERED OF HIM, ſhe having re-"tired thither for certain reaſons, a little before her "delivery." There is ſhewn, in the library of Tergou, a head of Eraſmus, which may be conſider-ed as a publick monument of the renunciations of that town with regard to the claim to his birth; the inſcription which is round that head declares that he was begot in Tergou, and born in Rotterdam. Not long ſince Mr. Almeloveen revived the diſpute be-tween thoſe two cities by a curious incident (3): he pretends that Eraſmus is rather a Burgomaſter of Ter-gou, than a Burgomaſter of Rotterdam, becauſe that, according to the laws, any place, where a child is accidentally born, is not conſidered as the place of his birth. If a woman, when upon a journey, hap-pens to be delivered in a town, in caſe ſhe did not intend to make any ſtay there, and made another place her ſettled abode; the child ſhe is delivered of is not conſidered as a citizen of that town; but the ſpot where her father and mother reſide is looked upon as its native place. At this rate Eraſmus ſhould be called *Goudanus* rather than *Roterodamus*, his fa-ther and mother living in Tergou; and his mother's not being delivered of him at Tergou, but at Rot-terdam, was merely an accident. She withdrew to conceal her guilt; ſhe concealed herſelf in a neigh-bouring town, only for ſome days, until ſuch time as ſhe was delivered of the burthen which, to her great ſhame, ſhe carried in her womb (4).

I will obſerve by the way, that ſome French Au-thors, grounded upon a very antiquated right, I mean the ancient Geography, and the diviſion of Gaul men-tioned in Cæſar's Commentaries, were deſirous of adding luſtre to their nation, by declaring Eraſmus to be born in it. Robert Cenalis (5), Biſhop of Avran-ches declared expreſsly, that Eraſmus was a native of France, and that ſhe owes great obligations to him, *ut pote homini in Gallia nato.* Eraſmus has favoured this pretenſion, he ſaying ſometimes that he was born in Gaul (6), and conſidered the great erudition of Bu-dæus, as a great honour done to France, which he looked upon as his country. Some Germans were jea-lous at this, and therefore humbly beſought Eraſmus not to let France engroſs him to themſelves: *Ne pa-tiar ut Gallia ſibi me aſſerat, ſed ingenue fatear Bata-viam eſſe Germaniæ partem, videlicet ne tanta gloria fraudetur* (7). His anſwer, in which he ſhews the greateſt affection for Literature, and the greateſt mo-deſty

(1) He was a Phyſician, and named *Reynerus Snoyus*, (See *Journal des Savans*, 1690, p. 540.) He pub-liſhed ſeveral books, and had enjoyed very good employments. He was Eraſ-mus's friend. Val. Andreas Deſſelius, *Bibl. Belgica*, p. 175, ſays, *that he read in the Records of the Monaſtery of Stein, where Eraſmus lived many years, what this* Snoyus *ſays.*

(2) p. m. 294. edit. Arnhem. 1616.

(3) In his *Amœnitates Theologico-Philologicæ*, p. 40, *& ſeq.* edit. Amſtel. 1694.

(4) See the *Letter* of Mr. Coſterus a Lawyer, to Mr. Almelo-veen, on this ſubject, inſerted in the *Amœnita-tes Theologico-Philologicæ.*

A diſpute between Germany and France concern-ing Eraſmus.

(5) *Hiſt. Galliæ*, lib. 1. fol. 30, 39, 40.

(6) *Et priſtinam illam laudem noſ-træ aſſeras Gal-liæ. Nihil enim vetat eundem di-tione Germanum eſſe, & veterum Coſmographorum deſcriptione Gal-lum.* Eraſmus, *Epiſt.* 7. lib. 11.

(7) Idem, *Epiſt.* 43. lib. 13.

honour the memory of this illuſtrious man [*B*], who has diffuſed ſuch glory on it [*C*]. The

deſty, is to this effect, that he was born on the confines of Gaul and Germany, but a little nearer the former than the latter. *An Batavus ſim non mihi ſatis conſtat. Hollandum eſſe me negare non poſſum, ea in parte natum ut ſi Coſmographorum picturis credimus magis vergat ad Galliam quàm ad Germaniam, quamquam extra controverſiam eſt totam eam regionem in confinio Galliæ Germaniæque eſſe.* Hence he ſays in another letter (8), that he does not affirm whether he is a Frenchman, but neither does he deny it; he looking upon it as a doubtful matter. *Gallum eſſe me nec aſſevero, nec inficior, ſic natus ut Gallus ne an Germanus ſim anceps haberi poſſit.*

(8) *Epiſt.* 18. lib. 6.

[*B*] *The inhabitants of* Rotterdam *having taken care to honour the memory of this illuſtrious man.*] The city of Rotterdam ordered, 1. That the houſe in which Eraſmus was born ſhould be honoured with an inſcription, to acquaint its inhabitants, and all foreigners, with this glorious prerogative. 2. That the College in which Latin, Greek, and Rhetoric are taught, ſhould be called Eraſmus's College, and dedicated to him in the inſcription of the front. 3. That a ſtatue of wood ſhould be erected to his memory in 1549; and that a ſtone one was ſet up in its place in 1557. The Spaniards having pulled it down in 1572, it was ſet up again (9) as ſoon as the Dutch had freed themſelves from their tyranny; and at laſt a braſs one (10) was erected to his memory in 1622, which is admired by all judges. It ſtands in the great ſquare of the city, on the ſide of a canal, on a pedeſtal adorned with inſcriptions, and with iron rails about it. As the ſubſtance of thoſe different ſtatues roſe, by degrees, in value, Eraſmus had this in common with the deities of old Rome: for not only the offerings of particular perſons were not, at firſt, of very great value,

(9) Verheiden ſays in his Elogiums, *that the Spaniſh ſoldiers who were in garriſon at Rotterdam, did not commit thoſe outrages, till they had been inflamed by the invectives which a Monk, their countryman, levelled againſt Eraſmus in a ſermon; and that the Magiſtrates did not ſet up the ſame ſtatue again, but cauſed another to be made.*

(10) Quenſtedt, *de Patriis illuſtr. Viror.* p. 121, is miſtaken, in ſuppoſing it of marble.

Nunc te marmoreum pro tempore fecimus: at tu
Si fœtura gregem ſuppleverit aureus eſto (11).

(11) Virgil. *Eclog.* 7.

" But if the falling lambs increaſe my fold,
" Thy marble ſtatue ſhall be turn'd to gold."
DRYDEN.

(12) *Propert.* lib. 4. eleg. 1. ver. 5.

but likewiſe thoſe of cities and whole nations conſiſted, in the beginning, of mean and common things.

Fictilibus crevere Diis hæc aurea templa (12).

" They temples rais'd, of gold, to earthen gods."

(13) *Voiage de Munſter*, p. 145.

(14) Lib. 2. cap. 54.

(15) This is an error for 1549.

Few travellers who have given an account of what they ſaw in the united Provinces, but ſpeak of Eraſmus's ſtatue. Mr. Joli, a canon of Paris, mentions a particular concerning it which I will tranſcribe here. He had juſt before mentioned this ſtatue, and the houſe in which Eraſmus was born (13), and adds, *that the great reputation of Eraſmus makes thoſe two things, though very ſmall, the moſt conſiderable in the city, though in reality they cannot be called ſmall, ſince Sebaſtian Munſter relates, in his Coſmography* (14), *that Philip King of Spain, ſon to the Emperor Charles V. going in September* 1545 (15) *to Rotterdam, this ſtatue was ſet up in honour of his joyful coming; that a poem in his honour was put into Eraſmus's hand, in order to be preſented to that Prince* (16); *and that afterwards the King, Mary Queen of Hungary, and all the Princes who accompanied them,* out of love *for the* memory of ſo great a man, went and viſited reſpectfully the houſe in which he was born. Monconis (17) does not ſay ſo much; he only taking notice of the altitude of the ſtatue, and the inſcriptions fixed on the little houſe; and adds, that *Eraſmus found out the uſe of turfs* (18), *and ſails fitted for all winds, as thoſe of barks and yachts*; which ſeems to me as falſe as what he had before ſaid, that *the Scheld and the Rhine, joining their waters, flow before the city of Rotterdam, and compaſſing part of it, run into the city by two great canals.* But Bullart (19) confirms the paſſage of Mr. Joli, he ſaying, that *when Philip II. made a ſolemn entry into the city of Rotterdam, as ſovereign Prince of the Netherlands, the Senate cauſed the ſtatue of Eraſmus to be placed, as their greateſt ornament, before the houſe in which he was born, in an eccleſiaſtical habit, holding a pen in his right hand, and preſenting with his left hand to the Prince, a paper containing the following lines.*

(16) Fuit, ſays Munſter, *imago Eraſmi ad vivum expreſſa, adventi* (Philippo) *oppoſita, quæ exerto brachio gratulatorium carmen Principi offerebat.*

(17) *Voiage*, part 2. p. 129, 130. All theſe errors of Monconis, are in a book printed in 1692, and entitled, *Teatro Belgico.* See there the part relating to Rotterdam.

(18) Æneas Silvius mentions turfs, in a book publiſhed by him in 1458. See *Martinus Schoockius de Turffis*, p. 3.

(19) Bullart, *Acad. des Scienc.* vol. 2. p. 162.

Sereniſſimo Hiſpaniarum Principi D. Philippo à Burgundia Deſiderius Eraſmus Rotterodamus.

Rotterodamus ego non inficiabor Eraſmus,
Ne videar cives deſeruiſſe meos.
Ipſorum inſtinctu, Princeps clariſſime, ſalvum
Ingreſſum precor ad limina noſtra tuum,
Atque hunc quo poſſum ſtudio, commendo popellum
Maxime præſidiis Cæſare nate tuis.
Te Dominum agnoſcunt omnes, te Principe gaudent
Nec quicquam toto charius orbe tenent.

" To the moſt Serene Prince, of Spain, Philip of
" Burgundy, Deſiderius Eraſmus of Rotterdam.

" Eraſmus I from Rotterdam am call'd,
" That I my countrymen may not deny.
" At their requeſt, great Prince, I here thee hail,
" And bid thee welcome to their joyful city.
" Great Cæſar's ſon, to thy auſpicious arm;
" To thy protection, ſuppliant, now they fly.
" Thee, mighty Prince, the people all acknow-
" ledge;
" And thee prefer to all terreſtrial things."

I will obſerve, that Mr. Joli might have cited a more authentick Author, with regard to this incident, than Sebaſtian Munſter; I mean the Spaniſh relation of the journey of Don Philip, Prince of Spain, written by Juan Chriſtoval Caluete of Eſtrella. It is alſo to be obſerved, that in 1672, the populace mutinying in moſt parts of the province of Holland, Rotterdam was during ſome days at their diſpoſal; and, during this anarchy, Eraſmus's ſtatue was taken from its place, as ſavouring of popery. It was carried to a publick houſe, and there the rabble deliberated whether it would not be proper to melt it down. The Magiſtrates of Baſil had no ſooner heard of this, but they ordered ſome Merchants in their city, to deſire one of their correſpondents in Rotterdam, to purchaſe that ſtatue at a certain price. The correſpondent accordingly treated about, and had like to have purchaſed it. Having given an account of his commiſſion, freſh orders were ſent him to pay the Magiſtrates of Rotterdam the full price they demanded; but they had bethought themſelves in the mean time, and concluded, that it would not be proper either to ſell or melt down that ſtatue, but put it up again where it had before ſtood, which was accordingly performed. I was told this two days ago (20) by the Merchant who had the commiſſion from the Magiſtrates of Baſil to purchaſe it.

(20) I write this the 28th of July 1699.

[*C*] . . . . *who has diffuſed ſuch glory on it.*] There are few Authors who write any particulars concerning Eraſmus's life, but take notice of the honours he reflected on his native country. Du Verdier Vau-Privas (21), and Bullart (22), take notice of this circumſtance firſt, in their elogium of this youth of Rotterdam. Rhenanus's words, on this occaſion, are ſo beautiful, that I cannot forbear tranſcribing them. *Natus eſt*, ſay he to the Emperor Charles V (23), *abavi tui Friderici III. Aug. primis imperii annis ad quintum Calend. Novembris, Roterodami in Hollandia tua inferioris Germaniæ Provincia, quam olim Batavi poſſederunt, nunc magis notam ſtudioſis omnibus ob unius indigenæ Eraſmi incunabula, quam veterum incolarum memoria quamlibet bellico robore præſtantium. Hoc alumno Roterodamum oppidum ſe ſemper jactabit, & doctis erit commendatum*, i. e. " He was born the 26th of October,
" about the beginning of the reign of Frederick III.
" your renowned anceſtor, at Rotterdam, your pro-
" vince of Lower Germany, anciently poſſeſſed by
" the Batavi; but in this age better known to all the
" learned, for having given birth to Eraſmus, than
" for the renowned martial exploits of its ancient
" inhabitants,

(21) *Proſopogr.* Tom. 3. p. 2389.

(22) *Acad. des Sciences*, Tom. 2. p. 159.

(23) *Epiſtola præfixa Operibus Eraſmi.* See alſo Quenſtedt, p. 121, of his dialogue *de Patriis illuſtrium doctrina & ſcriptis Virorum.*

The Admiralty of the Meuſe is in that city.

" inhabitants. The city of Rotterdam will ever glory " in ſuch a birth, and be valued for it by men of " learning." I could quote many authors, who, to heighten the glory of Rotterdam, join the two following circumſtances together, firſt, that it is the birth-place of the famous Eraſmus; and ſecondly, that this city ſet up a ſtatue in his honour.

ROVENIUS (PHILIP), Archbiſhop of Philippe, and Apoſtolical Vicar in the United Provinces, was born at Deventer (*a*). He publiſhed ſeveral works, and one among the reſt *De Republica Chriſtiana*, printed in 1648. I ſhall cite a paſſage from it, to ſhew the ſtrange jargon, which he greatly condemns, of ſome female devotees [*A*].

(*a*) Valer. Andr. *Bibl. Belg.* p. 778.

[*A*] *The ſtrange jargon, which he greatly condemns, of ſome female devotees.*] He writes as follows concerning ſome nuns, who affected certain exerciſes of devotion and ſpirituality (1): *Non raro etiam ſuperbium aliquam conjunctam habent, ut ambulent in magnis & mirabilibus ſuper ſe, ut vileſcant illis ordinaria pietatis exercitia approbata ab Eccleſia, vel à Patribus commendata: nihil crepent niſi uniones cum Deo, cum uniantur proprio (ſi non pejori) ſpiritui: jactant tranſubſtantiationes myſticas, cordis concentrationes: potentiarum, imo omnis ſui eſſe, annihilationem, connubium eſſentiæ creatæ & Divinitatis: ſpirituale Sacramentum inſeparabilitatis, ſomnium omnium affectionum, abſorptionem & liquefactionem in amplexu ſponſi, triplicem animæ hierarchiam, orationem in quiete paſſiva, ebrietatem ſpiritualem, cordis ſilentium, meditationes negativas, uniones ſupereſſentiales, puteum & gurgitem annihilationis, amorem Deificum, transformantem, unientem, ſtringentem, amplexantem, ſuavitatem, cor auferentem, ſugentem ſponſi ubera, ruminantem collum, abſorbentem enthuſiaſmum, inſenſibilitatem & oblivionem omnium inducentem abyſſalem cum Deo identificationem, confricationem Deificam, incendentem & conſumentem cor: elevationem ad ſuavitatem cæleſtem ex infernali languore, introverſionem ſuper cæleſtem, caliginem, & umbram Dei, allocutiones internas, elevationes incognitas, extenſiones & applicationes amoroſas, animæ ſuſpenſiones, deliquium, ſuſpiria, mortem ſenſuum & omnium affectuum, ecſtaſim continuam, juſtitium ratiocinii, cordis contactum & patefactionem, liquefactionem, influxum, inflammationem, aſſultus qui ferri nequeant, penetrationes ad intima, vulnerationes, conſtrictiones, alligationes inſeparabiles, aſpectus penetrantes & oblectantes, voces tremulas, murmura columbina, guſtus ſuaviſſimos, odores gratiſſimos, auditus melodiæ cæleſtis, hypermyſticas Dei & animæ perichoreſes, impudentiam ſpiritualem, aſpirationes Myſanthropicas, ignem ſine carbone, flammam ſine corpore, holocauſtum meridianum in viſcerali & medullari penetrabilitate, contactum mirabilem & ſuaviſſimum, obſcuræ noctis gaudia & caliginem. Hæc & ſimilia ſeſquipedalia verba in nova pietatis ſchola inter ſponte electos Magiſtros, & diſcipulas curioſas, adeo frequenter tenero proferuntur palato, ut intimis in viſceribus ſentiantur* (2), *i. e.* " They frequently alſo ſhew a pride in attempting " to do great and ſurpriſing things, above the reach " of their abilities; whence they contemn the uſual " exerciſes of piety approved by the church, and " recommended by the Fathers. Their whole talk " is concerning their union with God, at the ſame " time that this union is only with their own ſpirit, " if not with a worſe: they boaſt of myſtical tranſub- " ſtantiations, concentrations of the heart, the annihi- " lation of powers, nay, of their whole being; the " marriage between created eſſence and the deity; " the ſpiritual ſacrament of inſeparability; the dream " of all the affections; the abſorption and diſſolv- " ing in the ſpouſe's embrace; the triple hierarchy " of the ſoul; prayer in paſſive quietude, ſpiritual " ebriety, ſilence of heart, negative meditations, ſu- " pereſſential unions, the well and whirl-pool of an- " nihilation, love that deifies, transforms, unites, " preſſes, embraces; ſweetneſs that raviſhes the " ſoul, ſucking the ſpouſe's breaſts, a ruminating " neck, an abſorbent enthuſiaſm; inſenſibility and " oblivion of all things, producing an abyſſal indem- " nification with God; deific confrication, *firing and " conſuming the heart; an elevation* * to celeſtial ſweet- " neſs from an infernal languor; ſuperceleſtial in- " troverſion; darkneſs and ſhadow of God; internal " allocutions, unknown elevations, amorous ſtretch- " ings and applications; ſuſpenſions of the ſoul, " fainting away, ſighs; death of all the ſenſes and " paſſions; uninterrupted extaſy; a ceſſation of rea- " ſoning; the contact and opening of the heart; diſ- " ſolving, flowing in, inflammation, inſupportable " leapings-up, penetration to the inward receſſes; " wounds; faſt bindings; inſeparable allegations, " looks that penetrate and delight, tremulous words, " dove-like murmurs, ſweeteſt taſtes, moſt grateful " odours; ſounds of celeſtial melody; ſupermyſtical " walks of God and the ſoul; ſpiritual impudence; " myſanthropic breathings; fire without coal; flame " without a body; a meridian burnt-ſacrifice in a " viſceral and medullar penetrability; a wonderful " and moſt delightful contact; joys and darkneſs of " obſcure night. Theſe and ſuch like high-ſound- " ing words are frequently ſpoke, in this new ſchool " of piety by the choſen maſters and inquiſitive ſhe- " diſciples, with ſo tremulous a voice, that they are " felt in the moſt intimate receſſes of their hearts."

(1) Philip. Rovenius, *de Republ. Chriſtiana*, lib. 1. cap. 43. p. 278.

(2) Dr. Stillingfleet has collected ſome ſuch like phraſes of myſtical Writers. See his treatiſe concerning *the fanaticiſm of the Church of Rome*, p. m. 240, 307, *& ſeq.* See the like jargon, in rem. [*K*] of the art. BRACHMANS.

* Note, the original of theſe words, viz. *Deificam incendentem & conſumentem cor: elevationem*, are omitted, p. 931. col. 2. Tom. 4. of the Paris edit. of Bayle's Dict. There are a vaſt number of errors in that edit.] Rem. by the Tranſl.

☞ ROWE (NICHOLAS), deſcended from an ancient family in Devonſhire [*A*], and ſon of John Rowe, Eſq; Serjeant at Law [*B*], was born at Little Berkford in Bedfordſhire, at the houſe of Jaſpar Edwards, Eſq; his mother's father, in the year 1673 (*a*). He began his education at a private grammar-ſchool in High-gate (*b*); but the taſte he had there of the claſſic Authors was improved and finiſhed under the care of the famous Dr. Buſby in Weſtminſter-ſchool, where about the age of twelve years he was choſen one of the King's ſcholars. Beſides his ſkill in the Latin and Greek languages, he had made a tolerable proficiency in the Hebrew; but poetry was his early bent

(*a*) Preface to Mr. Rowe's *Tranſlation of Lucan*, by James Welwood, M. D. p. 18. edit. Lond. 1718. in fol.

(*b*) *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Nicb. Rowe, Eſq*; by Dr. *George Sewell*, prefixed to the *Miſcellaneous Works of Mr. Rowe.*

[*A*] *Deſcended of a good family in Devonſhire.*] This family had for many ages made an handſome figure in that county, and was known by the name of the Rowe's of Lambertoun. Mr. Rowe could trace his anceſtors in a direct line up to the times of the holy war, where one of them ſo diſtinguiſhed himſelf in the Holy Land, that at his return he had the arms given him, which they have borne ever ſince, that being in thoſe days all the reward of military virtue, or of blood ſpilt in theſe expeditions. From that time downward to Mr. Rowe's father, the family kept themſelves to the frugal management of a private fortune, and the innocent pleaſures of a country life. Having an handſome ſeat and a competent eſtate, they lived beyond the fear of want, or reach of envy. In all the changes of Governments, they are ſaid to have ever leaned towards the ſide of publick liberty, and in that retired ſituation of life to have beheld with grief and concern the many encroachments that have been made in it from time to time (1).

[*B*] *John Rowe, Eſq; Serjeant at Law.*] He was the firſt of the family, who changed a country life for a literal profeſſion. After he had paſſed the ſchools at home, he was brought up to London, and entered a ſtudent of the law in the Middle-Temple, where ſometime after he was called to the bar, and at length made Serjeant at law. He was a Gentle-

(1) Dr. Welwood's Preface to Mr. Rowe's *Tranſlation of Lucan*, p. 18.

man

bent and darling ſtudy. He compoſed at that time ſeveral copies of verſes upon different ſubjects both in Greek and Latin, and ſome in Engliſh, which were much admired, and the more that they came with very little pains, and ſeemed to flow from his imagination, almoſt as faſt as his pen. His father, deſigning him for his own profeſſion, took him from that ſchool, when he was about ſixteen years of age, and entered him a ſtudent in the Middle-Temple, whereof himſelf was a Member, that he might have him under his immediate care and inſtruction. Being capable of any part of knowledge he applied his mind to, he made very remarkable advances in the ſtudy of the law; and was not content to know it as a collection of *Statutes* or *Cuſtoms* only, but as a ſyſtem founded upon right reaſon, and calculated for the good of mankind. Being afterwards called to the bar, he appeared in as promiſing a way to make a figure in that profeſſion, as any of his Contemporaries, if the love of the *Belles Lettres*, and that of poetry in particular, had not ſtopped him in his career. He had the advantage of the friendſhip and protection of the fineſt Gentlemen, as well as one of the greateſt Lawyers of that time, Sir George Treby, Lord Chief Juſtice of the Common Pleas, who was fond of him to a great degree, and had it both in his power and inclination to promote his intereſt (*c*). But the ſpirit of poetry ſoon got the aſcendant over him, and his firſt Tragedy, *The Ambitious Step-Mother* [*C*], meeting with univerſal applauſe, he laid aſide all thoughts of riſing by the law; and afterwards wrote ſeveral Tragedies [*D*], and a Comedy [*E*], and a great many copies of verſes upon different ſubjects [*F*]. Being a great admirer of Shakeſpeare, he obliged the publick with a new edition of his works, and prefixed to it a ſhort account of his life. But Mr. Rowe's laſt, and perhaps his beſt poem is his tranſlation of *Lucan* [*G*], which he juſt lived to finiſh. The love of learning and poetry made him not leſs fit for buſineſs, and no body applied himſelf cloſer to it, when it required his attendance.

(*c*) Welwood, *ubi ſupra*, p. 18, 19.

man in great eſteem for many engaging qualities, of very conſiderable practice at the bar, and ſtood very fair for the firſt vacancy on the bench, when he died April the 7th 1692, and was buried in the Temple Church May the 7th following. Let it be mentioned to the honour of this Gentleman, that when he publiſhed Serjeant Benloe's and Judge Deliſon's *Reports*, he had the honeſty and boldneſs to obſerve in the Preface, how moderate theſe two great Lawyers had been in their opinions concerning the extent of the Royal Prerogative; and that he durſt do this in the reign of King James II. at a time when a *diſpenſing Power* was ſet up as inherent in the Crown (2).

(2) Dr. Welwood's Preface to Mr. Rowe's *Tranſlation of Lucan*, p. 18, 19.

[*C*] *His firſt Tragedy*, The Ambitious Step-Mother.] It was acted at the Theatre in Lincoln's-Inn Fields, and dedicated to the Earl of Jerſey. Mr. Rowe wrote it, when he was but twenty five years of age, and as a trial only of his genius that way. The purity of the language, the juſtneſs of his characters, the noble elevation of the ſentiments, were all of them admirably adapted to the plan of the play (3).

(3) Idem, ibid. p. 20.

[*D*] *Several other Tragedies.*] The Tragedy, which he valued himſelf moſt upon, and which was moſt valued, was his *Tamerlane*, acted at the Theatre in Lincoln's-Inn-Fields, and dedicated to the Marquis of Hartington. "In this play, ſays Dr. Welwood (4), he aimed at a parallel between the late King "William of immortal memory and Tamerlane; "as alſo between Bajazet and a Monarch who is "ſince dead (5). That glorious ambition and noble "order in Tamerlane to break the chains of enſlaved "nations, and ſet mankind free from the encroach-"ments of lawleſs power, are painted in the moſt "lively as well as the moſt amiable colours. On the "other ſide, his manner of introducing on the ſtage "a Prince, that thinks mankind is made but for "him, and whoſe chief aim is to perpetuate his "name to poſterity by that havock and ruin he "ſcatters through the world, are all drawn with that "pomp of horror and deteſtation, which ſuch "monſtrous actions do deſerve. And ſince nothing "could be more calculated for raiſing in the minds "of the audience a true paſſion for liberty, and a "juſt abhorrence of ſlavery, how this play came "to be diſcouraged next to a prohibition in the lat-"ter end of a late reign (6), I leave it to others to "give a reaſon."

(4) Ibid. p. 20.

(5) Lewis XIV. of France.

(6) That of Q. Anne.

Mr. Rowe's other Tradigies were, *The Fair Penitent*, acted at the Theatre in Lincoln's-Inn-Fields, and dedicated to the Dutcheſs of Ormonde; *Ulyſſes*, acted at the Queen's Theatre in the Hay-Market, and dedicated to Charles Earl of Halifax; The Tragedy of *Jane Shore*, written in imitation of Shakeſpeare's ſtyle, and acted at the Theatre Royal in Drury-Lane, and dedicated to the Duke of Queenſberry and Dover; and *The Tragedy of the Lady Jane Grey*, acted at the Theatre Royal in Drury-Lane, and dedicated to her Royal Highneſs the Princeſs of Wales. His plays were collected into two volumes in 8vo, and dedicated to the Earl of Warwick. It may be juſtly ſaid of all our Author's Tragedies, "that never Poet painted virtue or reli-"gion in a more charming dreſs on the ſtage, nor "were ever vice or impiety better expoſed to con-"tempt and hatred. There runs through every one "of them an air of religion and virtue, attended "with all the ſocial duties of life, and a conſtant and "untainted love of his country. The ſame princi-"ples of liberty he had early imbibed himſelf, and "ſeemed a part of his conſtitution, appeared in "every thing he wrote, and he took all occaſions "that fell in his way to make the ſtage ſubſervient "to them. His muſe was ſo religiouſly chaſte, that "I do not remember, continues Dr. Welwood (7), "one word in any of his plays or writings, that "might admit but of a double *entendre* in point of "decency or morals. There is nothing to be found "in them to humour the depraved taſte of the age "by nibling at ſcripture, or depreciating things in "themſelves ſacred. And it was the leſs wonder, "that he obſerved this rule in his Dramatic perfor-"mances, ſince in his ordinary converſation, and "when his mirth and humour enlivened the whole "company, he uſed to expreſs his diſſatisfaction, in "the ſevereſt manner, with any thing that looked "that way. Being much converſant in the Holy "Scriptures, it is obſervable, that to raiſe the high-"eſt ideas of virtue, he has with great art in ſeveral "of his Tragedies made uſe of thoſe expreſſions and "metaphors in them, that taſte moſt of the ſub-"lime."

(7) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 20.

[*E*] *A Comedy.*] It was entitled *The Biter*, and contained three acts, and was performed at the Theatre in Lincoln's-Inn-Fields, but without ſucceſs, for Mr. Rowe's genius did not lye towards Comedy.

[*F*] *A great many copies of verſes upon different ſubjects.*] They were publiſhed together at London in one volume in 12mo. the third edition of which was printed in 1733, under the title *Of the Miſcellaneous Works of* Nicholas Rowe, *Eſq*; To which is added Mr. Rowe's tranſlation of *Quillet's Callipædia*.

[*G*] *His tranſlation of Lucan.*] It was publiſhed at London 1728, in folio. The language of this tranſlation is pure, and the verſification both muſical and adapted to the ſubjects. "I have no reaſon "to

attendance. The late Duke of Queenſberry, when he was Secretary of State, made him Secretary for publick Affairs, and when that truly great man came to know him well, he was never ſo pleaſed as when Mr. Rowe was in his company. After the Duke's death, all avenues were ſtopped to his preferment, and during the reſt of Queen Anne's reign, he paſt his time with the muſes and his books, and ſometimes the converſation of his friends (*d*). We are told indeed (*e*), that he went one day to pay his Court to the Earl of Oxford, Lord High Treaſurer of England, who aſked him, if he underſtood Spaniſh well? He anſwered, no; but thinking, that his Lordſhip might intend to ſend him into Spain on ſome honourable commiſſion, he preſently added, that in a ſhort time he did not doubt but he ſhould be able both to underſtand it and ſpeak it. The Earl approving of what he ſaid, Mr. Rowe took his leave, and immediately retired out of town to a private country farm, and within a few months he learnt the Spaniſh tongue, and then waited again on the Earl to give him an account of his diligence. His Lordſhip aſking him, if he was ſure he underſtood it thoroughly, and Mr. Rowe anſwering in the affirmative, the Earl burſt into an exclamation; *How happy are you, Mr.* Rowe, *that you can enjoy the pleaſure of reading and underſtanding the Hiſtory of Don Quixot in the original?* Upon the acceſſion of King George I. to the throne, he was made Poet Laureate, and one of the Land Surveyors of the Cuſtoms in the Port of London. The Prince of Wales conferred on him the place of Clerk of his Council, and the Lord Chancellor Parker made him his Secretary for the Preſentations the very day he received the Seals, and without his aſking it. He was twice married, firſt to a daughter of Mr. Auditor Parſons, and afterwards to a daughter of Mr. Deveniſh of a good family in Dorſetſhire. By his firſt wife he had a ſon, and by the ſecond a daughter. He died December the 6th 1718. in the 45th year of his age, like a Chriſtian and a Philoſopher

(*d*) Welwood, *ubi ſupra*, p. 19, 20, 21, 24.

(*e*) *Life of Michael de Cervantes Saavedra. Written by Don Gregorio Mayans and Siſcar, his Catholick Majeſty's Library-Keeper*, §. 145.

(8) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 22.

" to doubt, ſays Dr. Welwood (8), but the true " meaning of the original is faithfully preſerved " through the whole work; and if I may venture to " judge, the tranſlation comes up to the ſpirit of the " original, as far as the difference between the Ro- " man and Engliſh languages will allow of . . . . . " I know May has tranſlated it near an age ago, " and I confeſs it is many years ſince I read it. But " it muſt be owned, that it is but a lame perfor- " mance, and does not reach the ſpirit or ſenſe of " Lucan. The language and verſification are yet " worſe, and fall infinitely ſhort of the lofty num- " bers and propriety of expreſſion in which Mr. " Rowe excells. I know of no other tranſlation of " Lucan in any of the living languages, in verſe, " except that of Brebeuf in French. I have a very " great value for it and the Author, if it were for " no other reaſon, but that he had the honeſt bold- " neſs to publiſh ſuch a work in his native language, " that was diametrically oppoſite to the maxims of " Government purſued by the Prince then reigning. " His courage in this matter deſerves yet the more to " be applauded, that when all the other claſſics were " publiſhed for the uſe of the Dauphin, Lucan alone " was prohibited. It is obſervable, he has carried " in ſome places in the French language the heat of " Lucan farther than Lucan himſelf in the Latin; " and that by attempting the fire of his Author, " he has, if I may be allowed the expreſſion, fired " himſelf much more. This is what happens to him " frequently. But again at other times he flags; " and when Lucan happily hits on the true beauty of " a thought, Brebeuf falls infinitely below him, " through an affectation of appearing eaſy and natu- " ral. I might give a great many inſtances of this " laſt, but ſhall confine myſelf to one which will " ſet in a true light the difference between the two " tranſlations of Lucan by Brebeuf and Mr. Rowe. " That ſtrong celebrated line in Lucan,

" *Victrix cauſa Diis placuit, ſed victa Catoni,*

" is with the whole period thus done by Mr. Rowe " tho' none of the brighteſt lines in his tranſlation:

" *Juſtly to name the better cauſe were hard,*
" *While greateſt names for either ſide declar'd:*
" *Victorious Cæſar by the Gods was crown'd,*
" *The vanquiſh'd party was by Cato own'd.*

" When Brebeuf comes to tranſlate this paſſage, he " does it after this manner:

" *De ſi hauts partiſans s'arment pour chacun d'eux,*
" *Qu'on ne ſcait qui defendre, ou qui blamer des deux,*
" *Qui des deux à mieux plus juſtement l'epée;*
" *Les Dieux ſervent Cæſar, & Caton ſuit Pompée.*

What can be poorer than this laſt? It does not an- " ſwer the nobleneſs of the Latin; and beſides, it " maims the ſenſe of the Author. For Lucan, who " had his imagination full of the virtue of Cato, in- " tended to raiſe him above, or at leaſt equal him " to the Gods, as to the merits of the cauſe, that oc- " caſioned the oppoſition. But Brebeuf, inſtead of " raiſing him to a competition with the Gods, makes " him only a Retainer of Pompey's. This puts me in " mind of an obſervation I have frequently made " upon moſt of our Engliſh tranſlations: wherever " there happens an expreſſion or period of diſtin- " guiſhed beauty, it is there they fall often not " only ſhort of the original, but miſtake intirely the " ſenſe. I ſhall give but one inſtance in Dryden's " Virgil. There is not in all the inimitable Æneid a " more beautiful period, than that in the ſixth book " concerning Marcellus, which Virgil ſums up in " this hemiſtichon:

Tu Marcellus eris.

" Dryden turns it thus;

" *O! couldſt thou break thro' fate's ſevere decree,*
" *A new Marcellus ſhall ariſe in thee.*

" which is altogether wide from the meaning of " Virgil, and ſinks infinitely below the dignity of " verſe." *I might take notice here of ſeveral paſſages of Lucan left out in Brebeuf, which well deſerved a place in his tranſlation. I ſhall only mention one in the ſixth book concerning the witch* Erictho, *which in my opinion is a very beautiful picture of Horror.* Brebeuf *cuts it ſhort, and in its place gives us a love-ſtory of his own invention, between* Burrhus *and* Octavia, *which is nothing to the purpoſe, and falls infinitely ſhort of the ſpirit of* Lucan. *Yet after all it cannot be denied, but* Brebeuf's *performance is in the main admirably well done, and in many places he appears animated with the ſame fire we find in* Lucan. *I cannot omit one inſtance of this, in that paſſage of the third book concerning the origin of authors, which is one of the fineſt in Lucan, and excellently done into French by Brebeuf. Lucan has it thus:*

Phœnices primi, famæ ſi creditur, auſi
Manſuram rudibus vocem ſignare figuris.

Brebeuf turns it after this manner;

C'eſt de luy que nous vient cet art ingenieux
De peindre la parole & de parler aux yeux,
Et par des traits divers des figures trucées
Donner de la couleur & du corps aux penſées.

Philoſopher in charity with all mankind, and with an abſolute reſignation to the will of God. He kept up his good humour to the laſt, and took leave of his wife and friends, immediately before his laſt agony, with the ſame tranquillity of mind, and the ſame indifference, as though he had been upon taking but a ſhort journey. He was interred on the 19th of December in Weſtminſter-Abbey, over againſt Chaucer, his body being attended by a ſelect number of his friends, and the Dean and Chapter officiating at the funeral (*f*). Mr. Pope wrote an epitaph for a tomb intended to be erected there to his memory by his wife [*H*]. We ſhall give his character in the remark [*I*].

(*f*) Welwood, *ubi ſupra*, p. 24, 25.

The tranſlation of this paſſage by Brebeuf is excellently imitated by a young Lady (9), *that I had the honour to be acquainted with, which, if I miſtake not, tranſcends Brebeuf, or even Lucan himſelf. It is thus:*

(9) A daughter of the Viſcount Moleſworth.

The noble art from Cadmus took it riſe
Of painting words, and ſpeaking to the eyes.
He firſt in wond'rous magic fetters bound
The airy voice, and ſtop'd the flying ſound.
The various figures by his pencil wrought,
Gave colour and a body to the thought.

[*H*] *Mr. Pope wrote an epitaph for a tomb intended to be erected there to his memory by his wife.*] It is as follows:

" Thy reliques, *Rowe*, to this fair urn we truſt,
" And ſacred place by *Dryden*'s awful duſt.
" Beneath a rude and nameleſs ſtone he lyes,
" To which thy tomb ſhall guide inquiring eyes.
" Peace to thy gentle ſhade, and endleſs reſt!
" Bleſt in thy genius, in thy love be bleſt!
" One grateful woman in thy fame ſupplies
" What a whole thankleſs land to his denies."

[*I*] *We ſhall give his character in the remark.*] As to his perſon, it was graceful and well made, his face regular and of a manly beauty. As his ſoul was well lodged, ſo its rational and animal faculties excelled in a high degree. He had a quick and fruitful invention, a deep penetration, and a large compaſs of thought, with a ſingular dexterity and eaſineſs in making his thoughts to be underſtood. He was maſter of moſt parts of polite learning, eſpecially the claſſical authors, both Greek and Latin; underſtood the French, Italian, and Spaniſh languages, and ſpoke the firſt fluently, and the other two tolerably well. He had likewiſe read moſt of the Greek and Roman hiſtories in their original languages, and moſt that are writ in Engliſh, French, Italian, and Spaniſh. He had a good taſte in Philoſophy; and having a firm impreſſion of religion upon his mind, he took a delight in Divinity and Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, in both which he made great advances in the times he retired into the country, which were frequent. He expreſſed on all occaſions his full perſuaſion of the truth of revealed religion; and being a ſincere Member of the eſtabliſhed church himſelf, he pitied, but condemned not, thoſe that diſſented from it. He abhorred the principle of perſecuting men upon the account of their opinions in religion; and being ſtrict in his own, he took it not upon him to cenſure thoſe of another perſuaſion. His converſation was pleaſant, witty, and learned, without the leaſt tincture of affectation or pedantry; and his inimitable manner of diverting and enlivening the company, made it impoſſible for any one to be out of humour, when he was in it. Envy and detraction ſeemed to be entirely foreign to his conſtitution; and whatever provocations he met with at any time, he paſt them over without the leaſt thought of reſentment or revenge. As Homer had a Zoilus, ſo Mr. Rowe had ſometimes his; for there were not wanting malevolent people, and pretenders to poetry too, that would now and then bark at his beſt performances; but he was ſo much conſcious of his own genius, and had ſo much good nature as to forgive them, nor could he ever be tempted to return them an anſwer (10). Mr. Pope, in a letter to Edward Blount, Eſq; dated February the 10th, 1715-6, obſerves, that there was *a vivacity and gaity of diſpoſition almoſt peculiar to Mr. Rowe, which made it impoſſible to part from him, without that uneaſineſs, which generally ſucceeds all our pleaſures.*

(10) Welwood, *ubi ſupra*, p. 244

☞ ROWE (ELIZABETH), an Engliſh Lady eminent for her excellent writings both in proſe and verſe, was born at Ilcheſter in Somerſetſhire, September 11. 1674, being the eldeſt of three daughters of Mr. Walter Singer, a Gentleman of a good family [*A*], and Mrs. Elizabeth Portnell, both of them perſons of very great worth and piety (*a*). Of Mrs. Rowe's two ſiſters, one died in childhood; the other ſurvived to her twentieth year, a lovely concurrent in the race of virtue and glory (*b*) [*B*]. Thoſe who were acquainted with the extraordinary perſon, who is the ſubject of this article, in her childiſh

(*a*) *Life of Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe*, p. 4. prefixed to the firſt vol. of her *Miſcellaneous Works*, edit. Lond. 1739, in 8vo.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 9.

[*A*] *Mr. Walter Singer, a Gentleman of a good family.*] He was not a native of Ilcheſter, nor an inhabitant before his impriſonment there for Non-conformity in the reign of King Charles II. Mrs. Portnell thinking herſelf obliged to viſit thoſe who ſuffered on that account, from hence that acquaintance commenced, which terminated in the nuptial union. During the life of his wife Mr. Singer reſided at Ilcheſter; but ſoon after her deceaſe removed into the neighbourhood of Frome in the ſame county, where he became ſo well known and diſtinguiſhed for his good ſenſe, primitive integrity, ſimplicity of manners, uncommon prudence, activity, and faithfulneſs in diſcharging the duties of his ſtation, inflexible adherence to his principles, and at the ſame time truly Catholic ſpirit, as to be held in high eſteem, even by perſons of ſuperior rank; the Lord Weymouth, who was reckoned a very good judge of men, not only writing to him, but honouring him with his viſits; as did the devout Biſhop Kenn very frequently, ſometimes once a week, ſuch a charm is there in unaffected goodneſs, and ſo naturally do kindred ſouls, warmed and actuated by the ſame heavenly paſſion, and purſuing the ſame end, run and mingle together with the greateſt pleaſure, after they are once acquainted, notwithſtanding any accidental diverſity of ſentiments in ſome ſmaller things (1). But the publick will be beſt pleaſed with the character of this good man, as drawn by his daughter, after her beautiful and eaſy manner, in one of her familiar letters to a friend. " I have " eaſe and plenty to the extent of my wiſhes, and " can form deſires of nothing but what my father's " indulgence would procure; and I aſk nothing of " Heaven but the good old man's life. The perfect " ſanctity of his life, and the benevolence of his " temper, make him a refuge to all in diſtreſs, to " the widow and fatherleſs. The people load him " with bleſſings and prayers whenever he goes a- " broad, which he never does but to reconcile his " neighbours, or to right the injured and oppreſſed; " the reſt of his hours are entirely devoted to his " private devotions, and to books, which are his " perpetual entertainment." He died Auguſt the 18th 1719 (2).

(1) *Life of Mrs. Eliz. Rowe*, p. 4, 5.

(2) Ibid. p. 6.

[*B*] *The other ſurvived to her twentieth year, a lovely concurrent in the race of virtue and glory.*] She had the ſame extreme paſſion for books, chiefly thoſe of medicine, in which art ſhe arrived to a conſiderable inſight; and if it could not be ſaid of her and her eldeſt

childiſh years, could not but have obſerved a great many things common in that age of life, which then promiſed the bright day, that afterwards enſued. She received the firſt ſerious impreſſions of religion probably as ſoon as ſhe was capable of it [*C*]; at once perceiving her obligations to the Author of her Being, and in the ſame meaſure, as her opening reaſon diſcovered theſe to her, feeling the force of them (*c*). There is ſo great a ſimilitude between painting and poetry, that it is no ways ſurpriſing, that one who poſſeſſed the latter of theſe faculties in ſo high a degree of perfection, did very early diſcover an inclination to the other; which has often the ſame *Followers*, perhaps always the ſame *Admirers*. Accordingly Mrs. Rowe loved the pencil, when ſhe had hardly ſtrength and ſteadineſs of hand ſufficient to guide it; and in her infancy (one may almoſt venture to ſay ſo) would ſqueeze out the juices of herbs to ſerve inſtead of colours. Her father perceiving her fondneſs for this art, was at the expence of a maſter to inſtruct her in it; and it never ceaſed to be her amuſement at all times, till her death. She was alſo, what every one acquainted with her writings will ſuppoſe of ſuch a well-turned ſoul, very much delighted with muſic, chiefly of the grave and ſolemn kind, as beſt ſuited to the grandeur of her ſentiments, and the ſublimity of her devotion. But her ſtrongeſt bent was to poetry and writing. Poetry indeed was her favourite employment in youth, her moſt diſtinguiſhing excellence. So prevalent was her genius this way, that her very proſe hath all the charms of verſe without the fetters, the ſame fire and elevation, the ſame bright images, bold figures, rich and flowing diction. She could hardly write a familiar letter, but it bore the ſtamp of the Poet. One of her acquaintance remembers to have heard her ſay, that ſhe began to write verſes at twelve years old, which was almoſt as ſoon as ſhe could write at all. In the year 1696, the 22d year of her age, a collection of her poems on various occaſions was publiſhed at the deſire of two of her friends [*D*], which we may ſuppoſe did not contain all that ſhe had by her, ſince the ingenious Prefacer gives the reader to hope, that the Author might in a little while be prevailed with to oblige the world with a *ſecond part*, no way inferior to the former (*d*). What firſt introduced her into the notice of the noble family at Longleat, was a little copy of verſes of hers, with which they were ſo highly delighted as to expreſs a curioſity to ſee her; and the friendſhip that commenced from that time, ſubſiſted ever after, not more to her honour, who was the favourite of perſons ſo much ſuperior to her in the outward diſtinctions of life, than to the praiſe of her judgment and taſte, who knew how to prize, and took a pleaſure to cheriſh ſuch blooming worth. She was not then twenty. Her Paraphraſe on the 38th Chapter of Job was written at the requeſt of Biſhop Kenn, who was entertained in that family, and gained her a great deal of reputation. She had no other tutor for the French and Italian languages, than the honourable Mr. *Thynne*, ſon to the Lord Viſcount Weymouth, and Father to the Right Honourable the Counteſs of Hartford, who willingly took the taſk upon himſelf, and had the pleaſure to ſee his fair ſcholar improve ſo faſt under his leſſons, that in a few months ſhe was able to read Taſſo's Jeruſalem with great eaſe. Her ſhining merit with the charms of her perſon and converſation, had procured her a great many admirers. Among others, it is ſaid, the famous Mr. Prior made his addreſſes to her; ſo that allowing for the double licenſe of the *Poet* and *Lover* in the manner of expreſſion, the concluding lines in his anſwer to Mrs. Singer's Paſtoral

(*c*) *Life of Mrs. Eliz. Rowe*, p. 10, 11.

(*d*) Ibid. p. 11—16.

eldeſt ſiſter, in the letter, as of the virtuous woman in the Proverbs, that their *candle went not out by night*, yet it frequently burnt till after the middle of it; ſo great was their thirſt of knowledge, and the pleaſure they had of gratifying it (3).

(3) *Life of Mrs. Eliz. Rowe*, p. 9, 10.

[*C*] *She received the firſt ſerious impreſſions of religion, probably as ſoon as ſhe was capable of it.*] In one of her pious addreſſes ſhe herſelf thus ſpeaks to God: *My infant-hands were early lifted up to thee, and I ſoon learned to know and acknowledge the God of my fathers* (4).

(4) *Devout Exerciſes of the Heart*, &c. p. 36.

[*D*] *In the year* 1696, *the* 22*d of her age, a collection of her poems on various occaſions was publiſhed at the deſire of two of her friends.*] They were publiſhed under the title of *Poems on ſeveral Occaſions. By* PHILOMELA. The Preface ſigned *Elizabeth Johnſon* is dated from Harding's Rents, May the 10th 1696; and the Author vindicating her ſex againſt thoſe of the men, who would monopolize ſenſe, wit, learning and genius, writes thus: "Nor is "our defenſeleſs ſex forgotten: we have not only "*Banducas* and *Zenobias*, but *Sapphos* and *Daciers*, "*Schurmans*, *Orindas*, and *Behns*, who have hum"bled the moſt haughty of our antagoniſts, and "made them them do homage to our wit as well "as to our beauty. It is true, their miſchievous "and envious ſex have made it their utmoſt endea"vours to deal with us, as Hannibal was ſerved at "Capua, and to corrupt that virtue, which they can "no otherwiſe overcome, and ſometimes they pre"vailed. But if ſome Angels fell, others remained "in their innocence and perfection, if there were "not alſo ſome addition made to their happineſs "and glory by their continuing ſtedfaſt. Angels love, "but they love virtuouſly and reaſonably, and nei"ther err in the ſubject nor the manner. And if "all our Poeteſſes had done the ſame, I wonder "what our enemies could have found out to have "objected againſt us. However, here they are "ſilenced; and I dare be bold to ſay, that whoever "does not come extremely prejudiced to theſe poems, "will find in them that vivacity of thought, that "purity of language, that ſoftneſs and delicacy in "the love part, that ſtrength and majeſty of num"bers almoſt every where, eſpecially on heroical "ſubjects, and that clear and unaffected love to vir"tue; that height of piety and warmth of devo"tion in the *Canticles* and other religious pieces, "which they will hardly find exceeded in the beſt "Authors on theſe different kinds of writings, much "leſs equalled by any ſingle Writer. And now I "have nothing more, I think, lyes upon my hands, "but to aſſure the reader, that they were actually "writ by a young Lady, (all but ſome of the an"ſwers, as is well known to many perſons of qua"lity and worth) whoſe name had been prefixed, "had not her own modeſty abſolutely forbidden it. "The way of thinking and writing is all along the "ſame, only varying with the ſubject; and the "whole a mixture ſo very agreeable, that unleſs

Paſtoral on *Love and Friendſhip*, were not without all foundation in truth. She was the nameleſs Lady, to whom the following copy of verſes in the ſame Author is inſcribed. But Mr. Thomas Rowe, a very ingenious and learned Gentleman, of whom we ſhall give an account in the remark [*E*], was the perſon reſerved by Heaven to be the happy man, both to be made, and make happy. Being at Bath in the year 1709, Mr. Rowe was introduced into her company, who lived in a retirement not far diſtant from that city. The idea, he had conceived of her from report and her writings, charmed him; but when

" *Philaret* and myſelf, who have the honour to be " her friends, and who perſuaded her to publiſh " this ſpecimen, are very partial, it is more than " probable, they will meet with ſo favourable a re- " ception with the pious and ingenious reader, that " we may e're long prevail with her to oblige the " world with ſome others no way inferior to theſe."

The occaſion of Mrs. *Singer's* poetical name, *Philomela*, which from this time ſhe was known by to the world, and whether ſhe aſſumed it herſelf, or was complimented with it by her friends, is not known. The latter is moſt probable, and that it was given her at the publication of her poems, before which her modeſty not conſenting that her own name ſhould appear, this was ſubſtituted in the room of it, as bearing a very eaſy alluſion, and happily expreſſing the ſoftneſs and harmony of her verſes, not leſs ſoothing and melodious than the ſtrains of the nightingale when from ſome leafy ſhade ſhe fills the woods with her melancholly plaints (5).

(5) *Life*, p. 16.

[*E*] *Mr.* Thomas Rowe, *a very ingenious and learned Gentleman, of whom we ſhall give an account in the remark.*] He was born at London April the 25, 1687, the eldeſt ſon of the Reverend Mr. Benoni Rowe, who, with a very accurate judgment, and a conſiderable ſtock of uſeful learning, joined the talents of preaching, and a moſt lively and engaging manner in converſation. He was of a genteel deſcent, both on his father's and mother's ſide; being grandſon of William Rowe, Eſq; a Gentleman of worth and conſiderable eſtate, and Alice, a Lady of diſtinguiſhed ſenſe, beauty and virtue, daughter of Thomas Scot, Eſq; Member of Parliament for Aileſbury, in the county of Bucks; and by the maternal ſide, he was deſcended from the Rowes of Devon. But he thought too juſtly to value himſelf on ſuch extrinſick circumſtances. His ſuperior genius, and inſatiable thirſt after knowledge, were conſpicuous in his earlieſt years. He was able to read as ſoon almoſt as he could ſpeak; had ſuch a pleaſure in books, as to take none at all in the diverſions which children are ſo fond of; and when he was ſometimes prevailed on to make one in the recreations of his companions, his unreadineſs and inattention plainly ſhewed it was not out of choice he engaged, but purely from his good nature and complaiſance, to which he ſhould offer too much violence, always to deny their importunity. He commenced his acquaintance with the Claſſics at Epſom, while his father reſided there; and by his ſwift advances in this part of learning, quickly became the delight of his Maſter, a man very able in his profeſſion, and was treated by him with a very particular indulgence, in ſpite of the natural ruggedneſs and ſeverity of his temper. When his father removed to London, he accompanied him, and was placed under the famous Dr. Walker, Maſter of the Charter-houſe ſchool. His exerciſes here never failed of being diſtinguiſhed even among thoſe that had the approbation of that excellent Maſter, who would fain have perſuaded his father to ſend him to one of our Engliſh univerſities. But how honourably ſoever Mr. Rowe might think of the learning of thoſe noble ſeats of the Muſes, not having the ſame advantageous notion of the principles in credit there, he choſe to enter him in a private academy in London; and ſome time before his death, determined to ſend him to Leyden. Here he ſtudied Jewiſh Antiquities under Witſius, Civil-Law under Vitriarius, the *Belles Lettres* under Perizonius, and Experimental Philoſophy under Senguerdius; and eſtabliſhed a reputation for capacity, application, and an obliging deportment, both among the Profeſſors and Students. He returned from that celebrated mart of literature with a vaſt acceſſion of treaſure; in books he had purchaſed, and knowledge he had amaſſed; and intirely incorrupt in his morals, which he had preſerved as inviolate, as he could have done under the moſt vigilant eye and ſtricteſt hand, though left without any other reſtraints but thoſe of his own virtue and prudence.

The love of liberty had been always one of Mr. Rowe's moſt darling paſſions. He was very much confirmed therein by his familiar acquaintance with the Hiſtory and noble Authors of ancient Greece and Rome, whoſe very ſpirit was transfuſed into him; and reſiding ſo long in a Republick, where he had continual examples of the ineſtimable value of freedom, as the parent of induſtry, the nurſe of arts and ſciences, and univerſal ſource of ſocial happineſs. Tyranny of all ſorts he moſt ſincerely deteſted; but moſt of all eccleſiaſtical, in every ſhape, deeming the ſlavery of the mind as the moſt abject and ignominious, ſo in its conſequences more pernicious than any other.

His deſires after knowledge enlarged with his acquiſitions. All his morning hours, and a large part of the afternoon, were devoted to ſtudy, till the time of his being ſeized with the diſtemper of which he died. His library, in collecting which he was aſſiſted by his accurate knowledge of the beſt editions of books, conſiſted of a great number of the moſt valuable Authors, and amounted at his death to above five thouſand volumes. He was a perfect Maſter of the Greek, Latin, and French languages; and, which is ſeldom known to happen, had at once ſuch a prodigious ſtrength of memory, and inexhauſtible fund of wit, as would ſingly have been admired, and much more united. Theſe qualities, with an eaſy fluency of ſpeech, a frankneſs and benevolence of temper, a communicative diſpoſition, and a life and ſpirit, which nature muſt beſtow, ſince it can be but poorly imitated, made his company deſired by all who knew him. It was impoſſible there ſhould be a drowſy ſoul, where Mr. Rowe was preſent; he animated the converſation; every one was awake, and every one pleaſed. He had a penetration and quickneſs of thought hardly to be imagined, ſo as upon juſt glancing over an Author, to ſee to the bottom of his ſentiments. None of the politer kinds of learning were neglected by him. He was a good judge in Poetry, and had it in his power to have been himſelf an eminent Poet, for he had actually the moſt eſſential parts belonging to that character, the *vivid fire*, the *rich vein*, the *copious diction*. But as Poetry was not his predominant inclination, his genius had not all the poliſhing, which art and conſtant practice might have added to nature. Hiſtory was his favourite ſtudy, for which his vaſt memory and exquiſite judgment peculiarly qualified him.

He had formed a deſign to compile the lives of all the illuſtrious perſons in antiquity omitted by Plutarch; and for this purpoſe read the ancient Hiſtorians with great care. This deſign he in part executed. Eight lives were publiſhed ſince his deceaſe in 8vo, by way of ſupplement to that admired Biographer; in which, though ſo young a guide, he ſtrikes out a way like one well acquainted with the dark and intricate paths of antiquity. The ſtyle is perfectly eaſy; yet conciſe and nervous; the reflections juſt, and ſuch as might be expected from a lover of truth and mankind; and the facts intereſting in themſelves, or made ſo by the ſkill uſed in relating them. Beſides theſe lives, he had finiſhed and fitted for the preſs, the Life of Thraſybulus, which being put into the hands of Sir Richard Steele for his reviſal, was unhappily loſt, and could never ſince be recovered. The famous Mr. Dacier having tranſlated Plutarch's Lives into French, with remarks hiſtorical and

when he had ſeen and converſed with her, he felt another kind of impreſſion, and the eſteem of her accompliſhments was heightened into the rapture of a lover [*F*]. He married her in the year 1710 [*G*]; and Mrs. Rowe's exalted merit and amiable qualities could not fail to inſpire the moſt generous and laſting paſſion. Mr. Rowe knew how to value that treaſure of wit, ſoftneſs, and virtue, which providence had favoured him with by putting her into his poſſeſſion; and made it his ſtudy to repay the felicity, with which ſhe crowned his life. The eſteem and tenderneſs he had for her is inexpreſſible, and poſſeſſion ſeemed ſcarce to have abated the fondneſs and admiration of the lover. It was ſome conſiderable time after his marriage, that he wrote to her a very tender Ode under the name of *Delia*, full of the warmeſt ſentiments of connubial friendſhip and affection [*H*]. As he had not a robuſt natural conſtitution, ſo an intenſe application to ſtudy beyond what the delicacy of his frame would bear, might perhaps contribute to that ill ſtate of health, which allayed the happineſs of his marriage-life, during the greater part of it. In the latter end of the year 1714, his weakneſs increaſed, and he appeared to labour under all the ſymptons of a conſumption. This fatal diſtemper, after it had confined him ſome months, put a period to his valuable life, at Hamſtead near London, May the 13th 1715, when he was but juſt paſt the twenty eighth year of his age. The exquiſite grief and affliction Mrs. Rowe felt for his loſs is not to be imagined. She wrote a beautiful elogy on his death [*I*]; and continued to the laſt moments of her life to expreſs the higheſt veneration and affection for his memory, and a particular regard and eſteem for his relations. It was only out of regard to Mr. Rowe, that with

and critical, the Abbé Bellenger added in 1734, a ninth tome to the other eight, conſiſting of the Life of Hannibal, and Mr. Rowe's Lives made French by that learned Abbé; in the preface to which verſion he tranſcribes from the preface to the Engliſh edition on the character of the Author, with viſible approbation; and ſays, that the Lives were written with taſte, though being a poſthumous work, the Author had not put his laſt hand to it.

[*F*] *The eſteem of her accompliſhments was heightened into the rapture of a lover.*] During the courtſhip, he wrote a poetical epiſtle to a friend, who was a neighbour of Mrs. Singer, and intimate in the family; in which were the following lines:

Youth's livelieſt bloom, a never-fading grace,
And more than beauty ſparkles in her face.
How ſoon the willing heart her empire feels?
Each look, each air, each melting acting kills:
Yet the bright form creates no looſe deſires;
At once ſhe gives and purifies our fires,
And paſſions chaſte as her own ſoul inſpires.
Her ſoul, heav'n's nobleſt workmanſhip deſign'd,
To bleſs the ruin'd age, and ſuccour loſt mankind,
To prop abandon'd virtue's ſinking cauſe,
And ſnatch from vice its undeſerv'd applauſe.

[*G*] *He married her in the year* 1710.] On this occaſion Mr. John Ruſſel, a friend of Mr. Rowe, wrote the following epigram:

In nuptias Thomæ Rowe & Elizabethæ Singer.

Quid doctum par uſque tuum, ſocioſque labores
Favræ & Dacerii *Gallia vana crepas?*
Par majus gens Angla dedit, juvenem utque puellam,
Quos hodie ſacro fœdere junxit amor.
Namque ea, quæ noſtri Phœbo cecinere docente,
Explicuiſſe tuis gloria ſumma foret.

Thus tranſlated by a young Gentleman.

No more, proud Gallia, bid the world revere
Thy learned pair, *Le Fevre* and *Dacier:*
Britain may boaſt this happy day unites
Two nobler minds in Hymen's ſacred rites:
What *theſe* have ſung, while all th' inſpiring Nine
Exalt the beauties of the verſe divine;
Thoſe (humble criticks of th' immortal ſtrain,)
Shall bound their fame to comment and explain.

[*H*] *He wrote to her a very tender Ode under the name of* Delia, *full of the warmeſt ſentiments of connubial friendſhip and affection.*] The following lines in it may appear remarkable, as it pleaſed heaven to diſpoſe events in a manner ſo agreeable to the wiſhes expreſſed in them.

So long may thy inſpiring page
And bright example bleſs the riſing age;
Long in thy charming priſon mayſt thou ſtay,
Late, very late aſcend the well-known way,
And add new glories to the realms of day!
At leaſt Heav'n will not ſure this pray'r deny;
Short be my life's uncertain date,
And earlier long than thine the deſtin'd hour of fate!
Whene'er it comes, mayſt thou be by,
Support my ſinking frame, and teach me how to die;
Baniſh deſponding nature's gloom,
Make me to hope a gentle doom,
And fix me all on joys to come.
With ſwimming eyes I'll gaze upon thy charms,
And claſp thee dying in my fainting arms;
Then gently leaning on thy breaſt,
Sink in ſoft ſlumbers to eternal reſt.
The gaſtly form ſhall have a pleaſing air,
And all things ſmile, while heav'n and thou art there.

[*I*] *She wrote a beautiful Elegy on his death.*] It is as follows.

In what ſoft language ſhall my thought get free,
My dear Alexis, when I talk of thee?
Ye Muſes, Graces, all ye gentle train
Of weeping loves, aſſiſt the penſive ſtrain!
But why ſhould I implore your moving art?
'Tis but to ſpeak the dictates of my heart;
And all that knew the charming youth will join
Their friendly ſighs and pious tears to mine;
For all that knew his merit muſt confeſs,
In grief for him, there can be no exceſs.
His ſoul was form'd to act each glorious part
Of life, unſtain'd with vanity or art.
No thought within his gen'rous mind had birth,
But what he might have own'd to heav'n and earth.
Practis'd by him each virtue grew more bright,
And ſhone with more than its own native light.
Whatever noble warmth could recommend
The juſt, the active, and the conſtant friend,
Was all his own——but, oh! a dearer name,
And ſofter ties my endleſs ſorrow claim.
Loſt in deſpair, diſtracted, and forlorn,
The lover and tender huſband mourn.
Whate'er to ſuch ſuperior worth was due,
Whate'er exceſs the fondeſt paſſion knew;
I felt for thee, dear youth; my joy, my care,
My pray'rs themſelves were thine, and only where
Thou waſt concern'd, my virtue was ſincere.
Whene'er I begg'd for bleſſings on thy head,
Nothing was cold, or formal, that I ſaid;
My warmeſt vows to heav'n were made for thee,
And love ſtill mingled with my piety.

O thou

with his ſociety ſhe was willing to bear London during the winter-ſeaſon; and as ſoon after his deceaſe as her affairs would permit, ſhe indulged her unconquerable inclinations to ſolitude by retiring to Frome in Somerſetſhire, in the neighbourhood of which place the greateſt part of her eſtate lay. When ſhe forſook the town, ſhe determined to return to it no more, but to conceal the remainder of her life in an abſolute retirement; yet on ſome few occaſions ſhe thought it her duty to violate this reſolution. In compliance with the importunate requeſt of the Honourable Mrs. Thynne, ſhe paſſed ſome months with her at London, after the death of her daughter the Lady Brooke; and on the melancholly occaſion of the deceaſe of Mrs. Thynne herſelf, ſhe could not diſpute the commands of the Counteſs of Hartford, who earneſtly deſired her company, to ſoften the ſevere affliction of the loſs of ſo excellent a mother; and once or twice more the power, which this laſt Lady had over Mrs. Rowe, drew her by an obliging kind of violence to ſpend a few months with her at ſome of the Earl of Hartford's ſeats in the country. Yet even on theſe occaſions ſhe never quitted her retreat without very ſincere regret, and always returned to it, as ſoon as ever ſhe could, with decency, diſengage herſelf from the importunity of her noble friends (*a*). It was in this receſs, that ſhe compoſed the moſt celebrated of her works, *Friendſhip in death* [*K*], and the ſeveral parts of the *Letters Moral and Entertaining* [*L*]. In the year 1736, the importunity of ſome of Mrs. Rowe's acquaintance, who had ſeen the *Hiſtory of Joſeph* in manuſcript, prevailed on her (though not without real reluctance) to ſuffer it to be made publick. She wrote this piece in her younger years, and when firſt printed had carried it no farther than the marriage of the Hero of the Poem; but at the requeſt of her friends (particularly of an illuſtrious Lady (*b*), (to whom ſhe could ſcarce refuſe any thing) that the relation might include Joſeph's diſcovery of himſelf to his brethren, ſhe added two books, the compoſing of which is ſaid to have been no more than the labour of three or four days. This

(*a*) *Life*, p. 29, 34.

(*b*) The Counteſs of Hartford.

O thou waſt all my glory, all my pride!
Thro' life's uncertain paths my conſtant guide;
Regardleſs of the world, to gain thy praiſe,
Was all that could my juſt ambition raiſe.
Why has my heart this fond engagement known?
Or why has heav'n diſſolv'd the tie ſo ſoon?
Why was the charming youth ſo form'd to move?
Or why was all my ſoul ſo turn'd for love?
But virtue here a vain defence had made,
Where ſo much worth and eloquence could plead.
For he could talk——'twas extaſy to hear,
'Twas joy, 'twas harmony to ev'ry ear!
Eternal muſick dwelt upon his tongue,
Soft and tranſporting as the Muſes ſong.
Liſt'ning to him, my cares were charm'd to reſt,
And love, and ſilent rapture fill'd my breaſt:
Unheeded the gay moments took their flight,
And time was only meaſur'd by delight.
I hear the lov'd, the melting accents ſtill,
And ſtill the kind, the tender tranſport feel;
Again I ſee the ſprightly paſſions riſe;
And life and pleaſure ſparkle in his eyes.
My fancy paints him now with every grace,
But, ah! the dear deluſion mocks my fond embrace;
The ſmiling viſion takes its haſty flight;
And ſcenes of horror ſwim before my ſight.
Grief and deſpair in all their terrors riſe;
A dying lover pale and gaſping lies.
Each diſmal circumſtance appears in view;
The fatal object is for ever new.
His anguiſh with the quickeſt ſenſe I feel,
And hear this ſad, this moving language ſtill.
My deareſt wife! my laſt, my fondeſt care!
Sure Heaven for thee will hear a dying prayer.
Be thou the charge of ſacred Providence;
When I am gone, be that thy kind defence:
Ten thouſand ſmiling bleſſings crown thy head;
When I am cold, and number'd with the dead.
Think on thy vows, be to my mem'ry juſt;
My future fame and honour are thy truſt.
From all engagements here I now am free,
But that which keeps my ling'ring ſoul with thee.
How much I love, thy bleeding heart can tell,
Which does, like thine, the pangs of parting feel.
But haſte to meet me on theſe happy plains,
Where mighty love in endleſs triumph reigns.
He ceas'd; then gently yielded up his breath,
And fell a blooming ſacrifice to death.
But oh! what words, what numbers can expreſs,
What thought conceive the height of my diſtreſs?
Why did they tear me from thy breathleſs clay?
I ſhould have ſtaid, and wept my life away.
Yet, gentle ſhade, whether thou now doſt rove
Thro' ſome bleſt vale, or ever verdant grove,
One moment liſten to my grief, and take
The ſofteſt vows, that conſtant love can make.
For thee all thoughts of pleaſure I forego:
For thee my tears ſhall never ceaſe to flow:
For thee at once I from the world retire,
To feed in ſilent ſhades a hopeleſs fire.
My boſom all thy image ſhall retain;
The full impreſſion there ſhall ſtill remain.
As thou haſt taught my conſtant heart to prove
The nobleſt height and elegance of love;
That ſacred paſſion I to thee confine;
My ſpotleſs faith ſhall be for ever thine.

[*K*] Friendſhip in Death.] It was publiſhed at London 1728 in 8vo, under this title; *Friendſhip in Death, in twenty Letters from the Dead to the Living. To which are added Thoughts on Death, tranſlated from the* Moral Eſſays *of the Meſſieurs* du Port Royal. The Author of the *Preface* obſerves, that "the drift of "theſe letters is to impreſs the notion of the ſoul's "immortality; without which, all virtue and re"ligion, with their temporal and eternal good "conſequences, muſt fall to the ground. Some, who "pretend to have no ſcruples about the Being of a "God, have yet their doubts about their own eter"nal exiſtence, though valuable Authors abound in "Chriſtian and Moral proofs of it. But ſince no "means ſhould be left unattempted in a point of "ſuch importance, I hope endeavouring to make "the mind familiar with the thoughts of our future "exiſtence, and contract, as it were, unawares, an "habitual perſuaſion of it, by writings built on that "foundation, and addreſſed to the affections and "imagination, will not be thought improper, either "as a doctrine, or amuſement; amuſement, for "which the world makes by far the largeſt demand, "and which generally ſpeaking, is nothing but an "art of forgetting that immortality, the firm belief "and advantageous contemplation of which this "amuſement would recommend."

[*L*] *The ſeveral parts of the* Letters moral and entertaining.] The firſt part was printed in 1729 in 8vo, the ſecond in 1731, and the third in 1733. The deſign of theſe, as well as of *Friendſhip in Death*, is by fictitious examples of the moſt generous benevolence and heroic virtue, to allure the reader to the practice of every thing, that ennobles human nature, and

This additional part, which was her laſt work, was publiſhed but a few weeks before her death. This grand event, to prepare for which ſhe had made ſo much the buſineſs of her life, befel her according to her wiſh, in her beloved receſs. She was favoured with an uncommon ſtrength of conſtitution, and had paſſed a long ſeries of years with ſcarce any indiſpoſition ſevere enough to confine her in her bed. But about half a year before her deceaſe ſhe was attacked with a diſtemper, which ſeemed to herſelf, as well as others, attended with danger. Though this diſorder (as ſhe expreſſed herſelf to one of her moſt intimate friends) found her mind not quite ſo ſerene, and prepared to meet death as uſual; yet when, by devout contemplation on the atonement and mediation of our bleſſed Redeemer, ſhe had fortified herſelf againſt that fear and diffidence, from which the moſt exalted piety does not always ſecure in ſuch an aweful hour, ſhe experienced ſuch divine ſatisfaction and tranſport, that ſhe ſaid with tears of joy, *ſhe knew not that ſhe had ever felt the like in all her life*; and ſhe repeated, on this occaſion, Mr. Pope's verſes, entitled, *The dying Chriſtian to his Soul*, with an air of ſuch intenſe pleaſure, as evidenced that ſhe really felt all the elevated ſentiments of pious ecſtaſy and triumph, which breathe in that exquiſite piece of ſacred poetry. After this threatning illneſs, ſhe recovered her uſual good ſtate of health; and though at the time of her deceaſe ſhe was pretty far advanced in age, yet her exact temperance and the calmneſs of her mind, undiſturbed with uneaſy cares and paſſions, encouraged her friends to flatter themſelves with a much longer enjoyment of ſo valuable a life than it pleaſed Heaven to allow them. On the day, in which ſhe was ſeized with that diſtemper, which in a few hours proved mortal, ſhe ſeemed to thoſe about her to be in perfect health and vigour. In the evening of it, at about eight of the clock, ſhe converſed with a friend with all her wonted vivacity, and not without laughter; after which ſhe retired to her chamber. At about ten her ſervant hearing ſome noiſe in her miſtreſs's room, ran inſtantly into it, and found her fallen off the chair on the floor, ſpeechleſs, and in the agonies of death. She had the immediate aſſiſtance of a Phyſician and Surgeon; but all the means uſed were without ſucceſs, and after having given one groan, ſhe expired a few minutes before two of the clock on Sunday morning February the 20th 1736-7. Her diſeaſe was judged to be an apoplexy. A pious book was found lying open by her, as alſo ſome looſe papers, on which ſhe had written ſome devout ejaculations [*M*]. In her cabinet were found letters

and benefits the world; and by juſt and lively images of the ſharp remorſe and real miſery, that attend the falſe and unworthy ſatisfaction of vice, to warn the young and unthinking from being ſeduced by the enchanting name of pleaſure, to inevitable ruin; the piety of which deſign is the more worthy of the higheſt panegyrics, as it is ſo uncommon. The greater part of the Poets of our country have apparently employed all their wit and art to diſguiſe the native deformity of vice, and ſtrew flowers on the paths to perdition. But this excellent Lady (as was obſerved of Mr. Cowley) *poſſeſſed ſo much ſtrength and firmneſs of mind, and ſuch a perfect natural goodneſs, as could not be perverted by the largeneſs of her wit, and was proof againſt the art of poetry itſelf.* The elegant *Letters*, which gave occaſion to remark this diſtinction in Mrs. Rowe's character as a polite Writer, are not only chaſte and innocent, but greatly ſubſervient to the intereſt of Heaven, and evidently deſigned, by repreſenting virtue in all her genuine beauty, to recommend her to the choice and admiration of mankind.

[*M*] *Some looſe papers, in which ſhe had written ſome devout ejaculations.*] They were as follow:

O guide, and counſel, and protect my ſoul from ſin!
O ſpeak, and let me know thy heavenly will.
Speak evidently to my liſtning ſoul!
O fill my ſoul with love, and light, and peace,
And whiſper heav'nly comfort to my ſoul!
O ſpeak celeſtial ſpirit, in the ſtrain
O love and heav'nly pleaſure to my ſoul!

Theſe papers contained a few more lines, but ſo ill written (occaſioned perhaps by the trembling of her hand at the approach of death) that it was not poſſible to make any conſiſtent ſenſe of them.

Thus it appeared, that in reading pious meditations, or forming devout ejaculations for the divine favour and aſſiſtance, Mrs. Rowe made the laſt uſe of the powers of reaſon below the ſkies. As ſhe was greatly apprehenſive, that the violence of pain, or languors of a ſick-bed might occaſion ſome depreſſion of ſpirits and melancholly fears unſuitable to the character and expectations of a Chriſtian, her manuſcript book of devotions contains frequent petitions to heaven, that ſhe might not in this manner diſhonour her profeſſion. And to her friends ſhe often expreſſed herſelf deſirous of a ſudden removal to the ſkies, as it muſt neceſſarily prevent any ſuch indecent behaviour in her laſt moments. So that the ſuddenneſs of her death may be interpreted as a reward of her ſingular piety, and a mark of the divine favour in anſwer to her prayers. Indeed (to borrow Mr. Henry Grove's expreſſions in a letter wrote to a friend ſoon after this Lady's deceaſe) *though her death be univerſally lamented, yet the manner of it is rather to be eſteemed a part of her happineſs. One moment to enjoy this life; the next, or after a pauſe we are not ſenſible of, to find ourſelves got beyond not only the fears of death, but death itſelf, in poſſeſſion of everlaſting life, and health, and pleaſure: this moment to be devoutly addreſſing ourſelves to God, or employed in delightful meditations on his perfections; the next in his preſence, and ſurrounded with ſcenes of bliſs perfectly new, and unſpeakably joyous; is a way of departing out of life to be deſired, not dreaded by ourſelves, and felicitated, not condoled by our ſurviving friends. When all things are in a readineſs for our removal out of the world, it is a privilege to be ſpared the ſad ceremony of parting, and all the pains and ſtruggles of feeble nature.*

She ſeemed by the gaiety and chearfulneſs of her temper, to be peculiarly fitted to enjoy life and all its innocent ſatisfactions; yet inſtead of any exceſſive fondneſs for things preſent and viſible, her contempt for what ſhe uſed to term a low eſtate of exiſtence, and a dull round of inſipid pleaſures, and the ardor with which ſhe breathed after the divine enjoyments of a future world, were inconceivably great. When her acquaintance expreſſed to her the joy they felt at ſeeing her look ſo well, and poſſeſſed of ſo much health as promiſed many years to come, ſhe was wont to reply, *That it was the ſame as telling a ſlave, his fetters were like to be laſting; or complimenting him on the ſtrength of the walls of his dungeon.* And the fervour of her wiſhes to commence the life of Angels irreſiſtibly broke from her lips in numberleſs other inſtances. This ſatiety of all things beneath the ſkies, and impatience after the perfect fruition of God, might perhaps be the occaſion, that in ſeveral periods of her life ſhe had flattered herſelf, that ſhe was near that bleſſed ſtate, on which ſhe had fixed

letters to ſeveral of her friends, which ſhe had ordered to be delivered to the perſons, to whom they were directed, immediately after her deceaſe (i) [N]; ſince which, likewiſe, agreeably to her requeſt, the Reverend Dr. Iſaac Watts has reviſed and publiſhed her devotions under the title of *Devout Exerciſes of the Heart, &c.* [O]. We ſhall give her character

(i) *Life*, p. 35—38.

all her hopes. And in particular, a little time before her death, ſhe expreſſed to ſeveral of her friends her firm perſuaſion, that her continuance on earth would be very ſhort, but without aſſigning any peculiar reaſon for this opinion (6).

(6) *Life*, p. 38, 39, 40.

[N] *In her cabinet were found letters to ſeveral of her friends, which ſhe had ordered to be delivered to the perſons, to whom they were directed, immediately after her deceaſe.*] That to the Right Honourable the Counteſs of Hartford was as follows.

" Madam,

" This is the laſt letter you will ever receive from " me; the laſt aſſurance I ſhall give you on earth " of a ſincere and ſtedfaſt friendſhip. But when we " meet again, I hope it will be in the heights of " immortal love and exſtaſy. Mine perhaps may " be the firſt glad ſpirit to congratulate your ſafe " arrival on the happy ſhores. Heaven can witneſs " how ſincere my concern for your happineſs is. " Thither I have ſent my ardent wiſhes, that you " may be ſecured from the flattering deluſions of the " world; and after your pious example has been " long a bleſſing to mankind, may you calmly re- " ſign your breath, and enter the confines of unmo- " leſted joy.

" I am now taking my farewel of you here; but it " is a ſhort adieu, for I die with full perſuaſion, " that we ſhall ſoon meet again: but oh! in what " elevation of happineſs? in what enlargement of " mind, and perfection of every faculty? What " tranſporting reflections ſhall we make on the ad- " vantages, of which we ſhall find ourſelves eter- " nally poſſeſſed? To him that loved, and waſhed " us in his blood, we ſhall aſcribe immortal glory, " dominion, and praiſe for ever.

" This is all my ſalvation and all my hope! " That name, in whom the Gentiles truſt, in whom " all the families on earth are bleſſed, is now my glo- " rious, my unfailing confidence; in his merits alone " I expect to ſtand juſtified before infinite purity and " juſtice. How poor were my hopes, if I depended " on thoſe works, which my own vanity, or the par- " tiality of men, have called good; and which, exa- " mined by divine purity, would prove perhaps but " ſpecious ſins! The beſt actions of my life would be " found defective, if brought to the teſt of that un- " blemiſhed holineſs, in whoſe ſight the heavens are " not clean. Where were my hopes but for a Re- " deemer's merits and atonement! how deſperate, " how undone my condition! With the utmoſt ad- " vantages I can boaſt, I ſhould ſtart back and trem- " ble at the thoughts of appearing before the un- " blemiſhed Majeſty. O Jeſus, what harmony dwells " in thy name! Celeſtial joy and immortal life is in " the ſound! Let Angels ſet thee to their golden " harps! Let the ranſomed nations for ever magnify " thee!

" What a dream is mortal life! what ſhadows are " the objects of ſenſe? All the glories of morta- " lity, my much-loved friend, will be nothing in " your view at the awful hour of death; when you " muſt be ſeparated from the whole creation, and en- " ter on the borders of the immaterial world.

" Something perſuades me this will be my laſt " farewel in this world: heaven forbid that it ſhould " be an everlaſting parting! May that divine pro- " tection, whoſe care I implore, keep you ſtedfaſt " in the faith of Chriſtianity, and guide your ſteps " in the ſtricteſt paths of virtue!

" Adieu, my moſt dear friend, till we meet in " the Paradiſe of God.

" *Eliz. Rowe.*"

We ſhall add another to the Earl of Orrery.

" My Lord,

" There ſeems to be ſomething preſaging in the " meſſage you ordered me to deliver to your charm- " ing Henrietta, when I met her gentle ſpirit in the " bliſsful regions, which I believe will be very ſoon. " I am now acting the laſt part of life, and compoſing " myſelf to meet the univerſal terror with a for- " titude becoming the principles of Chriſtianity. It " is only through the great Redeemer's merits " and atonement, that I hope to paſs undaunted " through the fatal darkneſs:

" *Before him death, the griſly tyrant, flies;*
" *He wipes the tears for ever from our eyes.*

" All human greatneſs makes no figure to my pre- " ſent apprehenſion; every diſtinction vaniſhes, but " thoſe of virtue and real merit. It is this which " gives a peculiar regard for ſuch a character as " yours, and gives me hopes your example will not " fall ſhort of thoſe of your illuſtrious anceſtors. The " approaches of death ſet the world in a true light; " its brighteſt advantages appear no more than a " dream, in that ſolemn period. The immortal mind " perhaps will quit a cottage with leſs regret than it " would leave the ſplendor of a palace; and the " breathleſs duſt ſleep as quietly beneath the graſſy " turf, as under the parade of a coſtly monument. " Theſe are inſignificant circumſtances to a ſpirit " doomed to an endleſs duration of miſery or bliſs. " It is this important concern, my Lord, that has " induced me to ſpend my time in a peaceful retire- " ment; rather than to waſte it in a train of thought- " leſs amuſements. My thoughts are grown famili- " ar with the ſolemnity of dying, and death ſeems " to advance, not as an inflexible tyrant, but as the " peaceful Meſſenger of liberty and happineſs. May " I make my exit in that elate manner, thoſe charm- " ing lines of Mr. Pope deſcribe.

" *The world recedes, it diſappears;*
" *Heav'n opens on my eyes, my ears*
" *With ſounds ſeraphic ring:*
" *Lend, lend your wings! I mount! I fly!*
" *O Grave, where is thy victory?*
" *O Death, where is thy ſting?*

" The nearer I am approaching to immortality, the " more extenſive and enlarged I find the principles " of amity and good-will in my ſoul. From hence " ariſe the moſt ſincere wiſhes for your happineſs, " and of the charming pledges your lovely Henrietta " left. Oh! my Lord, if you would diſcharge the " ſacred truſt, keep them under your own inſpec- " tion.

" This will not reach you, my Lord, till I am paſt " the ceremony of ſubſcribing,

" Your humble ſervant,

" *Eliz. Rowe.*"

[O] *The Reverend Dr. Iſaac Watts has reviſed and publiſhed her devotions under the title of* Devout Exerciſes of the Heart, &c.] The whole title is as follows: *Devout Exerciſes of the Heart in Meditation and Soliloquy, Prayer, and Praiſe. By the late pious and ingenious Mrs.* Rowe. *Reviewed and publiſhed at her Requeſt by* I. Watts, *D. D.* The firſt edition was publiſhed in 1737, and the ſecond in 1739. Dr. Watts, in the *Preface* (7) tells us, that *theſe* Devout Exerciſes *are animated with ſuch fire, as ſeems to ſpeak the language of holy paſſion, and diſcovers them to be the dictates of her heart; and thoſe, who were favoured with her chief intimacy, will moſt readily believe it. The ſtyle, I confeſs, is raiſed above that of common meditation or ſoliloquy; but let it be remembered ſhe was no common Chriſtian. As her virtues were ſublime, ſo her genius was bright and ſparkling, and the vivacity of her imagination had a tincture of the muſe almoſt from her childhood.*

(7) p. 11, & *ſeq.*

character in the remark [*P*]. She was favoured with the eſteem and acquaintance of the Counteſs of Winchelſea, the Viſcounteſs Weymouth, the Viſcounteſs Scudamore, the Lady Carteret, the Lady Brooke, the Honourable Mrs. Thynne, the Earl of Orrery, Dr.

childhood. This made it natural to her to expreſs the inward ſentiments of her ſoul in more exalted language, and to paint her own ideas in metaphor and rapture near a-kin to the diction of poeſy. The Reader will here find a ſpirit dwelling in fleſh, elevated into divine tranſports, congenial to thoſe of Angels, and unbodied minds. Her intenſe love to her God kindles at every hint, and tranſcends the limits of mortality. I ſcarce ever met with any devotional writings which give us an example of a ſoul, at ſpecial ſeaſons, ſo far raiſed above every thing that is not immortal and divine. . . . Let it be obſerved, that it was much the faſhion, even among ſome Divines of eminence in former years, to expreſs the fervours of the devout love to our Saviour in the ſtyle of the Song of Solomon. *And I muſt confeſs, that ſeveral of my compoſures in verſe, written in younger life, were led by theſe examples unwarily into this track. But if I may be permitted to ſpeak the ſenſe of maturer age, I can hardly think this the happieſt language, in which Chriſtians ſhould generally diſcover their warm ſentiments of religion, ſince the clearer and more ſpiritual revelations of the New Teſtament. Yet ſtill it muſt be owned, there are ſome ſouls favoured with ſuch beatifying viſits from Heaven, and raptured with ſuch a flame of divine affection, as more powerfully engages all animal nature in their devotions, and conſtrains them to ſpeak their pureſt and moſt ſpiritual exerciſes in ſuch pathetick and tender expreſſions, as may be perverſely profaned by an unholy conſtruction. And the biaſs and propenſity towards this ſtyle is yet ſtronger, where early impreſſions of piety have been made on the heart by devout writings of this kind. It ſhould be remembered alſo, there is nothing to be found here, which riſes above our ideas; here are none of thoſe abſurd and incomprehenſible phraſes, which amuſe the ear with ſounding vanity, and hold reaſon in ſovereign contempt. Here are no viſionary ſcenes of wild extravagance, no affectations of the tumid and unmeaning ſtyle, which ſpreads a glaring confuſion over the underſtanding; nothing that leads the Reader into the region of thoſe myſtical ſhadows and darkneſs, which abound in the Romiſh Writers, under the pretence of refined light and ſublime ecſtaſy.*

[*P*] *We ſhall give her character in the remark.*] She was not a regular beauty, yet ſhe poſſeſſed a large meaſure of the charms of her ſex. She was of a moderate ſtature, her hair of a fine colour, and her eyes of a darkiſh gray inclining to blue, and full of fire. Her complexion was very fair, and a natural roſy bluſh glowed in her cheeks. She ſpoke gracefully, and her voice was exceeding ſweet and harmonious, perfectly ſuited to that gentle language, which always flowed from her lips. But the ſoftneſs and benevolence of her aſpect was beyond all deſcription; it inſpired irreſiſtible love, yet not without ſome mixture of that awe and veneration, which diſtinguiſhed ſenſe and virtue, apparent in her countenance, are wont to create (8).

(8) *Life*, p. 55.

Her acquaintance with the great had taught her all the accompliſhments of good breeding, and complacency of behaviour; and without formality and affectation, ſhe practiſed in a diſtant ſolitude all the addreſs and politeneſs of a court; but ſhe learned no more than the real elegancies of grandeur. She ſeemed to have perfectly ſubdued the love of the vain ſhew of life. She juſtly deſpiſed the arts of dreſs and ornament, and endeavoured to infuſe the ſame contempt of them into all her acquaintance; yet without falling into the other extreme of indecent negligence (9).

(9) Ibid. p. 55, 56.

The love of ſolitude, which ſeems almoſt inſeparable from a poetick genius, diſcovered itſelf very early in her, and never forſook her but with life itſelf. However, ſhe did not recommend this conduct to others; for ſhe thus expreſſes her ſentiments on this ſubject in a letter to a friend, which ſhe wrote about three weeks before her death. *It is an injury to mankind, to wiſh you had been born to a life of repoſe and leiſure. There are too few examples of generoſity and juſtice in the world, to wiſh any perſon of good character concealed. There are indeed a ſet of inſignificant and profligate mortals, who, if they ſhould take it into their heads to elope from mankind, and run wild in the woods, the publick would be ſo far from being detrimented, that they would be highly obliged by it; that ſo thoſe only, who are a grace to human nature, might appear in active and publick ſtations.* "I do not, *ſays ſhe in a* "*letter to another friend*, affect any recluſe notions of "religion; my thoughts of that are juſt the reverſe, "and all eaſy and ſociable." Upon the whole, it may be ſaid with the greateſt truth, in defenſe of Mrs. Rowe's retreat, that ſhe did not fly to deſerts, that ſhe might wholly reſign herſelf to ſloth, and a monaſtick kind of devotion, unprofitable to the world; but amidſt the ſilence and quiet of ſolitude, ſhe employed no ſmall part of her time in actions of munificence and charity; or in compoſing thoſe works, with which ſhe has obliged the publick, which, as they inſpire the nobleſt ſentiments of benevolence and piety, may be of the moſt laſting and extenſive benefit to mankind (10).

(10) *Life*, p. 56, 57.

She had the happieſt command over her paſſions, and maintained a conſtant calmneſs of temper and ſweetneſs of diſpoſition, that could not be ruffled with adverſe accidents. It has been queſtioned whether ſhe was ever angry, eſpecially with regard to thoſe little misfortunes and diſpleaſing incidents, that commonly occur in life, and which, though really of a trivial nature, frequently prove too ſtrong temptations to indecencies of paſſion. She was only wont to turn theſe into ſubjects of mirth and agreeable raillery (11).

(11) Ibid. p. 58, 59.

She was in the utmoſt degree an enemy to ill-natured ſatyr and detraction. She was as unacquainted with envy, as if it had been impoſſible for ſo baſe a paſſion to enter into the human mind. She exceedingly loved to praiſe, and never failed to obſerve and applaud every appearance of merit in thoſe, with whom ſhe was acquainted; but over-looked all their failings with more than even the uſual partiality of friendſhip (12).

(12) Ibid. p. 59——61.

She had few equals in her excellent turn of converſation. Her wit was inexhauſtible, and ſhe expreſſed her thoughts in the moſt beautiful and flowing eloquence. It was hardly poſſible to be in her company without becoming wiſer and better, or to leave it without regret (13).

(13) Ibid. p. 62, 63.

Under the ſtrongeſt temptations to pride, ſhe retained all the humility of the meaneſt and moſt obſcure perſon of the human race. She was exquiſitely ſenſible of her own defects. She aſſumed no indecent ſhare in converſation, and was frequently ſilent on ſubjects ſhe well underſtood, and on which ſhe could have diſplayed her wit to great advantage. She never dictated to others, nor arrogated any reſpect or deference to her own ſentiments; but in converſing with perſons of parts and abilities far beneath her own, ſtudied to make the ſuperiority of her genius eaſy to them, by the moſt obliging goodneſs and condeſcenſion of behaviour. She infinitely loved and reverenced true goodneſs, and paid a peculiar reſpect to ſincere piety, when great degrees of ignorance, and extremely mean circumſtances, might have quite obſcured it to leſs humble and generous minds (14).

(14) Ibid. p. 63, 64.

She was perfectly untainted with that love of pleaſure, which has ſo univerſally corrupted the preſent age, and is juſtly thought to have the moſt unfriendly influence on the nobleſt kinds of virtue. The native grandeur of her ſoul preſerved her from a fondneſs for any kind of luxury, judging it much beneath the dignity of a Being poſſeſſed of reaſon, and born for immortality.

(15) Ibid. p. 64, 65.

She had a contempt of riches, that has been rarely equalled, and which may be regarded as the certain mark of a truly great mind. The love of money ſhe thought the moſt ſordid and ignoble of paſſions. She could ſcarce bare the mention of injuſtice without trembling; and the tenderneſs and delicacy of her conſcience with regard to this ſin was ſo great, that ſhe hardly thought ſhe could keep far enough from it (16).

(16) Ibid. p. 66, 67, 68.

Dr. Kenne, Lord Biſhop of Bath and Wells, Sir Richard Blackmore, Dr. Iſaac Watts, Mr. Prior, Mr. Grove, &c. But above all ſhe poſſeſſed the higheſt degree of friendſhip with another illuſtrious ornament of the age, which as it began as ſoon as ever her Ladyſhip was capable of this generous paſſion, ſo it continued without the leaſt interruption to the laſt moments of Mrs. Rowe's life; and there cannot be a more advantageous concluſion of the character of this excellent perſon, than to remark that her life was honoured with the friendſhip, and her death lamented with the tears of the Counteſs of HARTFORD. In the preſent year 1739, Mrs. *Rowe's Miſcellaneous Works* were publiſhed

Her indifference to fame was no leſs remarkable. As ſhe ſeemed to ſhun it by concealing herſelf during almoſt the whole of her life in an obſcure ſolitude, ſo ſhe practiſed no arts to promote her reputation (17).

(17) *Life*, p. 69.

She was exemplary for every relative duty, filial piety was a remarkable part of her character. She loved the beſt of fathers as ſhe ought, and repaid his uncommon care and tenderneſs by all juſt returns of duty and affection. She has been heard to ſay, *That ſhe could die rather than diſpleaſe him*; and the anguiſh ſhe felt at ſeeing him in pain in his laſt ſickneſs was ſo great, that it occaſioned ſome kind of convulſion, a diſorder, from which ſhe was wholly free in every other part of her life.

When ſhe was entered into a marriage ſtate, the higheſt eſteem and moſt tender affection appeared in all her conduct to Mr. Rowe; and by the moſt gentle and obliging manners, and the exerciſe of every ſocial and good-natured virtue, ſhe confirmed the empire ſhe had gained over his heart. She complied with his inclinations in ſeveral inſtances, to which ſhe was naturally averſe, and made it her ſtudy to ſoften the anxieties, and heighten all the ſatisfactions of his life. Her capacity for ſuperior things did not tempt her to neglect the leſs honourable cares, which the laws of decency impoſe on the ſofter ſex in the connubial relation; much leſs was ſhe led by a ſenſe of her own merit to aſſume any thing to herſelf inconſiſtent with that duty and ſubmiſſion, which the precepts of Chriſtian piety ſo ſtrictly enjoin. Mr. *Rowe* had ſome mixture of natural warmth in his temper, of which he had not always a perfect command. If at any time this broke out into ſome little exceſſes of anger, it never awaked any paſſion of the like kind in Mrs. *Rowe*; but on the contrary ſhe always remained miſtreſs of herſelf, and ſtudied by the gentleſt language and moſt ſoothing endearments to reſtore Mr. *Rowe's* mind to that calmneſs, which reaſon approves. And ſhe equally endeavoured in every other inſtance by the ſofteſt arts of perſuaſion, and in a manner remote from all airs of ſuperiority, to lead Mr. *Rowe* on towards that perfection of virtue, to which ſhe herſelf aſpired with the trueſt Chriſtian zeal. During his long illneſs, ſhe ſcarce ever ſtirred from him a moment, and alleviated his ſevere affliction by performing with inconceivable tenderneſs and aſſiduity all the offices of compaſſion ſuited to that melancholly occaſion. She partook his ſleepleſs nights, and never quitted his bed, unleſs to ſerve him, or watch by him. And as ſhe could ſcarce be perſuaded to forſake even his breathleſs clay, ſo ſhe conſecrated her future years to his memory, by honouring his aſhes with a reſolution of perpetual widowhood, which ſhe inviolably maintained. Her conduct in this laſt inſtance, on the review of it after an interval of ſeveral years, afforded her great ſatisfaction; for ſhe thus expreſſes herſelf in a letter intended, after her own deceaſe, to be delivered to Mrs. Marrow, if that Lady had ſurvived her. *Whatever ſuch diſtinguiſhed ſenſe and merit could claim, I have endeavoured to pay my much-loved huſband's memory. I reflect with pleaſure on my conduct on this occaſion, not only from a principle of juſtice and gratitude to him, but from a conſcious ſenſe of honour and love of a virtuous reputation after death . . . But if the ſoul in a ſeparate ſtate ſhould be inſenſible of human cenſure or applauſe, yet there is a diſintereſted homage due to the ſacred name of virtue.* She mourned over the death of her huſband and father with all that becoming tenderneſs and ſenſibility, which ought to touch every humane and generous heart at the loſs of the deareſt perſons on earth; yet her ſubmiſſion to the will of heaven was without the leaſt murmur, and altogether ſuitable to that eminent piety, which appeared in every other part of her life.

She was a gentle and kind miſtreſs, treating her ſervants with great condeſcenſion and goodneſs.

She was a warm and generous friend; juſt, if not partial, to the merit of thoſe, whom ſhe loved, and moſt gentle and candid to their errors.

She had a moſt god-like diſpoſition. The exerciſe of charity was half the pleaſure, we may add, the buſineſs of her life. Nor was this only the peculiar ſoftneſs of her ſex, or a natural felicity of temper, but the moſt virtuous deſire to diffuſe happineſs. Her zeal to do generous actions is inexpreſſible; it broke out on all occaſions. Her charities were ſo great (if we conſider the mediocrity of her fortune) that they can ſcarce be parallel'd (18).

(18) Ibid. p. 69——77.

She practiſed ſecret prayer three times a day; and had an inexpreſſible love and veneration for the holy Scriptures, and was aſſiduous in the reading of them, particularly the New Teſtament, the Pſalms, and thoſe parts of the prophetical writings, which relate to our Bleſſed Saviour. The fervour of her zeal in the cauſe of religion was beyond the rate of common examples. As ſhe could not command tears of tranſport, when ſhe was witneſs to any eminent inſtances of piety, ſo on the other hand, the fatal advances of infidelity in this nation rent her very ſoul.

She ſpoke with the higheſt eſteem and gratitude of thoſe excellent perſons, who in the preſent age have defended Chriſtianity by their learned writings, and truly venerated them as publick benefactors to mankind (19).

(19) Ibid. p. 90, 91, 92, 93.

She ſeemed born for the practice of ſublime and aſcetic piety; it was the ſupreme pleaſure of her life; yet ſhe did not ſet too high a value on ſtrong emotions of the paſſions and religious fervours, nor was tempted by the love of devotion to prefer it to ſocial virtue. For ſhe thus expreſſes herſelf in a letter to a noble friend. *I have wrote no pious meditations of late. The warmth of devotion, perhaps, as well as other paſſions, declines with life. But I hope the calm, the reaſonable, and ſolid part of religion will ſtill be improved.* And in another letter to the ſame Lady ſhe ſays, *I have no reſtitution to make, nor the leaſt known injury to repair. I lay a much greater ſtreſs on this part of religion that regards mankind, than I do on any height of devotion, as neceſſary, I think, to reconcile the mind to death.* She poſſeſſed a large meaſure of that ſerenity and chearfulneſs of temper, which ſeem naturally to flow from conſcious virtue, and the hopes of the divine favour (20).

(20) Ibid. p. 94, 95.

" Her love of piety was not confined to thoſe of " her own party in religion; and it ought to be re- " lated as an exemplary inſtance of Chriſtian mode- " ration, that ſhe continued all the latter part of her " life in conſtant communion with ſome, who differ- " ed from her in articles, which ſhe thought of great " importance; though ſhe was frequently ſolicited to " an oppoſite conduct by perſons of a narrow ſpirit, " and could not eſcape cenſure for her adherence to " the charity of the Goſpel. And as her zeal did " in no part of her life degenerate into religious " fury, ſo towards the cloſe of it, her gentle and " charitable diſpoſitions increaſed, and ſhe ſeemed " to be viſibly ripening into the temper of that " bleſſed Region, to which ſhe was ſoon to be re- " moved (21)." And here we ſhall relate an incident, which happened while Mrs. Rowe was at the ſeat of the Lady Worſeley, daughter of the Lord Viſcount Weymouth, and aunt to the Counteſs of Hartford, in Hampſhire, where ſhe ſpent eight months. She had, upon

(21) Ibid. p. 96.

liſhed at London in two volumes in 8vo [Q].

upon a mature conſideration of the point, reſolved to receive the communion according to the rites of the Church of England; but upon hearing, on the day, wherein the ſacrament was to be adminiſtred, a ſermon from the Miniſter of the pariſh, full of exceſſive rancour, againſt all who diſſent from the eſtabliſhed church, ſhe was ſo offended at it, that ſhe thought neither herſelf nor the Preacher were then in a proper diſpoſition to partake of an inſtitution, which is the bond of Chriſtian charity.

[Q] *In the preſent year* 1739, *Mrs.* Rowe's Miſcellaneous Works *were publiſhed at London in two volumes in* 8vo.] The title is as follows: *The Miſcellaneous Works in proſe and verſe of Mrs.* Elizabeth Rowe. *The greater part now firſt publiſhed by her order from her original manuſcripts, by Mr.* Theophilus Rowe. *To which are added, Poems on ſeveral occaſions, by Mr.* Thomas Rowe. *And to the whole is prefixed, an account of the Lives and Writings of the Authors.* To the firſt volume are prefixed ſeveral poems to Mrs. Rowe, or upon her death; two of which we ſhall inſert here, as being written by perſons of her own ſex, the former a Lady of great diſtinction for quality and merit, and the latter a young Lady of uncommon genius and ſkill in the ancient and modern languages, to whom we are obliged for an excellent * tranſlation from the Italian of Signior Algarotti's *Il Newtonianiſmo per le Dame*, publiſhed in the preſent year 1739, at London, in two volumes in 12mo, under the title of *Sir* Iſaac Newton's *Philoſophy explained, for the Uſe of the Ladies. In ſix Dialogues on Light and Colours.* The poems are as follow.

* See the *Hiſt. of the Works of the Learned, for June* 1739. Art. 31.

Verſes to the Memory of Mrs. ROWE. *By a Friend.*

While penſive in the lonely ſhade I ſtray,
Or thro' enamel'd meads purſue my way,
A gloomy ſorrow hangs about my heart,
And ſudden tears o'er my dim eye-balls ſtart.
In vain (I cry) in vain, delightful ſpring,
Thou deck'ſt the plains, who now thy charms ſhall ſing?
Who from the radiant beauty of the fields,
And ev'ry herb thy genial influence yields,
Shall teach us their great Author to diſcern,
And from each tree and flow'r his goodneſs learn?
Since PHILOMELA her laſt debt has paid,
And cold and ſilent in the tomb is laid.
No more the echoes ſhall repeat her ſong,
Nor cryſtal Riv'lets, as they glide along,
Shall on their waters bear her tuneful lays,
Devoted all to her Redeemer's praiſe.
No more ſhall I her friendly converſe ſhare,
Nor hear the dictates of her pious care.
Yet tho' the bright example is remov'd,
Be its idea ſtill rever'd and lov'd:
To imitate her virtues may I try,
And on the path ſhe mark'd ſtill fix my eye.
Tho' far behind, imperfect, and diſtreſt,
Fain would I ſeek the climes of balmy reſt;
Where ſin no more can tempt, nor pain annoy,
Nor pining ſorrow interrupt their joy;
Where rivers of eternal pleaſure flow,
And gales of peace for ever round them blow.
Say, could I ſee her in this happy ſtate,
And that ſhe lives no more on earth, regret?
That freed, and victor in the glorious ſtrife,
No more ſhe labours thro' the toil of life,
But wears the ſtarry crown, the bright reward,
By God himſelf for all his ſaints prepar'd?
How often, when I join'd her ev'ning walk,
Would ſhe in rapture of this period talk!
How oft the fetters of her clay bemoan,
And wiſh them broke, impatient to be gone!
Yet ſtill reſign'd to wait th' appointed day,
Nor dar'd to murmur at her fate's delay.
The thought of earthly bliſs ſhe long had fled,
Deſirous to be number'd with the dead,
And meet her dear *Alexis* on that ſhore,
Where fear of parting can torment no more.
Faithful to him ſhe from the world retir'd,
Tho' by that world diſtinguiſh'd and admir'd.
In ſolitude ſhe paſt the circling days,
Fearleſs of cenſure, negligent of praiſe.
In contemplation all her hours were ſpent,
Her thoughts on heav'nly objects ever bent;
Till by the hand of death from hence remov'd,
Whoſe dart ſhe met in the retreat ſhe lov'd.
Obſcure and peaceful may her aſhes lye,
No marble pomp attract the curious eye;
Nor weeping Angel ſhall her grave adorn,
And teach the careleſs paſſenger to mourn;
No ſun-burnt pilgrim from afar ſhall come,
With ſuperſtitious rites to hail her tomb;
Nor ſhining tapers thro' the gloom of night
Upon her urn diffuſe a trembling light.
Her worth a far more laſting fume ſhall give,
Her worth in ev'ry virtuous breaſt ſhall live.

On the Death of Mrs. ROWE.

Accept, illuſtrious ſhade! theſe artleſs lays,
The Muſe a tribute to thy mem'ry pays:
Thy loſs to no one private grief confin'd,
Demands the gen'ral ſorrow of mankind.
Oft did intrigue its guilty arts unite
To blacken the records of female wit;
To tuneful ſong loſt ev'ry modeſt grace,
And lawleſs freedoms triumph'd in their place.
The Muſe, for vices not her own accus'd,
With bluſhes view'd her ſacred gifts abus'd;
Thoſe gifts for nobler purpoſes deſign'd,
To raiſe the thoughts, and moralize the mind,
The chaſte delights of virtue to inſpire,
And warm the boſom with ſeraphick fire,
Sublime the paſſions, lend devotion wings,
And celebrate the firſt great cauſe of things.
Theſe glorious taſks were PHILOMELA's part,
Who charms the fancy, and who mends the heart.
In her was ev'ry bright perfection join'd,
Whate'er adorns or dignifies the mind;
Her's ev'ry happy elegance of thought,
Refin'd by virtue, as by genius wrought.
Each low-born care her pow'rful ſtrains controul,
And wake the nobler paſſions of the ſoul.
When to the vocal grove, or winding ſtream,
She hymn'd th' almighty Author of its frame,
Tranſported ecchos bore the ſounds along,
And all creation liſten'd to the ſong;
Bold as when raptur'd Seraphs ſtrike the lyre,
Chaſte as the Veſtal's conſecrated fire,
Soft as the balmy airs, that gently play
In the calm ſun-ſet of a vernal day,
Sublime as virtue, elegant as wit,
As fancy various, and as beauty ſweet.
Applauding Angels with attention hung,
To learn the heav'nly accents from her tongue:
They in the midnight hour beheld her riſe
Beyond the verge of theſe inferior ſkies;
Where wrapt in joys to vulgar minds unknown,
She felt a flame ecſtatic as their own.
Oh! while diſtinguiſh'd in the realms above,
The bliſsful ſeats of harmony and love,
Thy happy ſpirit joins the heav'nly throng,
Glows with their tranſports, and partakes their ſong,
Fix'd on my ſoul, ſhall thy example grow,
And be my genius and my guide below:
To this I'll point my firſt, my nobleſt views;
Thy ſpotleſs verſe ſhall regulate my muſe.
And oh! forgive (tho' faint the tranſcript be,
That copies an original like thee).
My higheſt pride, my beſt attempt for fame,
That joins my own to PHILOMELA's name.

ELIZABETH CARTER.

T.

ROY (JAMES LE), Baron of the Holy Empire, and Lord of St. Lambert, deſcended from an ancient and noble family which came originally from France [A], acquired great reputation

[A] *Deſcended from an ancient and noble family, that came originally from France.*] The anceſtors of Baron le Roy, left France to follow Philip le Bon, the Duke of Burgundy, and ſettled in Flanders.

reputation by the works publiſhed by him. He was a native of Antwerp, where he was born the 28th of October 1633. As ſoon as he was of an age fit for travelling, Baron le Roy (a) his father ſent him to the moſt famous Univerſities of Europe; and at his return, made over to him his employments at the Court of Bruſſels, which he had filled with honour. Our Baron alſo diſcharged the duties of thoſe employments ſo well, that Marquis de Caracene, Governor of the Netherlands, ſent him to Spain, to inform Philip IV. his Catholick Majeſty, of the ſtate of his Government. After having performed his Commiſſion in a laudable manner, he returned to the Low Countries, but could not agree with the Marquis de Caſtel Rodrigo, then Governor of them; which made him reſolve to give up his employments, and accordingly he retired to an eſtate poſſeſſed by him near Antwerp. Had it not been for this, he would have raiſed himſelf to the moſt conſiderable employments, but this would have been a loſs to the Commonwealth of Learning, ſince he then could not have enjoyed ſo much leiſure, which he employed ſo well in compoſing books that have been publiſhed [*B*]. See the remark [*B*].

(a) PHILIP LE ROY, Lord of Revels Broughem, and of St. Lambert in Brabant. See the rem. [*A*].

The Readers will there meet with ſome particulars relating to Mrs. Bourignon, and which gave offence to her Partizans. I ſhall examine what one of them ſays in anſwer to my remark [*C*].

RUA

PHILIP LE ROY, Knight-Banneret, Lord of Brouchem, &c. father of him who is the ſubject of this article, bought of Dame Margaret Baudewyns, the Lordſhip of *Chapelle St. Lambert*, the 15th of December 1654 (1). He was created free Baron of the holy empire, by the letters patents of the Emperor Leopold, dated at Laxemburg the 30th of May 1671 (2). He was then Counſellor to his Catholick Majeſty, in the ſupreme Council of the Finances of the Low-Countries and Burgundy.

(1) *Topograph. Gallo-Brabantiæ*, p. 185.

(2) The reader will find the ſubſtance of it, in p. 70, of the book the title of which I ſhall give hereunder, citat. 10.

[*B*] *He compoſed books which have been publiſhed.*] The firſt work he undertook after his being withdrawn from buſineſs was, *Notitia Marchionatus ſacri Romani Imperii* (3). It was printed at Amſterdam in folio, anno 1678. See *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (4). He afterwards publiſhed in the ſame city in 1683, a work entitled, *Achates Tiberianus, ſive Gemma Cæſarea, antiquitate, argumento, arte, hiſtoria, prorſus incomparabilis, D. Auguſti apotheoſin, Imp. Cæſ. Tiberii, Auguſtæque Juliæ Domus ſeriem & iconas, genteſque bello captas repræſentans, notis hiſtoricis illuſtrata*, in folio. See Acta eruditorum (5), and the Journal des Savans (6). He printed in 1693, at Amſterdam, a folio book entitled, *Topographia Hiſtorica Gallo-Brabantiæ, qua Romanduæ oppida, municipia, & dominia illuſtrantur, atque monaſteria, Nobiliumque Prætoria, Caſtellaque in æs inciſa exhibentur*. This work gives a very particular deſcription of that part of the Low-countries called Walloon Brabant; and had we ſuch a deſcription of all Europe, it would be a complete ſtorehouſe of entertainment and inſtruction. I add, that he has writ a commentary on the chronicle of Baldwinus de Avennis; and that he is now writing (7) that of the Monk Albericus *Trium fontium*, which has never been printed, and the publication whereof has been long deſired. He lately publiſhed (8) a ſmall book, conſiſting but of 13 pages, entitled, *Prædictio Anthoniæ Bourignon de vaſtatione urbis Bruxellarum per ignem*, in which, after a ſhort deſcription of the calamities which that city ſuffered, the 13th of Auguſt 1695, when bombarded by the French; he mentions what is related concerning Antoinette Bourignon, in the ſupplement to Moreri's dictionary; and the following paſſage from one of her letters: *I don't find that I can make any ſtay at Bruſſels, though I ſhould have full liberty to do it; nor could I ſtay long in it*, BECAUSE BRUSSELS MUST BE DESTROYED BY FIRE, *if I have had a true viſion, as I told you at Mr. Maſuriel's* (9). The ſpirit, that revealed this conflagration to Mrs. Bourignon, did not ſpecify the time well; ſhe imagining, in 1666, that the city of Bruſſels would be ſoon burnt; and yet it was not bombarded till twenty-nine years after.

(3) Antwerp is the capital of that Marquiſate, which is one of the ſeventeen provinces of the Low-countries.

(4) For Sept. 1685. art. 5. p. m. 1004.

(5) *Acta eruditor.* Lipſ. 1684. p. 255.

(6) *Journ. des Savans*, March 19, 1685.

(7) Ann. 1696.

(8) At Amſt. 1696.

(9) Theſe words are extracted from a letter written from Ghent to Mr. de Cort, the 15th of Jan. 1666. It is the 12th of the 3d part, of the book entitled, *Tombeau de la fauſſe Theologie.*

Since this article was firſt printed, Baron le Roi has publiſhed, *Caſtella & Prætoria Nobilium Brabantiæ, Cœnobiaque celebriora ad vivum delineata ærique inciſa . . . . cum brevi eorumdem deſcriptione.* At Antwerp in 1696, folio; and *L'Erection de toutes les Terres, Seigneuries, & Familles tirées du Brabant, prouvée par des Extraits des Lettres Patentes tirées des Originaux* (10). Such a work as this ſhould be publiſhed in every province of Europe; which would be the beſt method of diſcovering thoſe who ſo boldly uſurp the title of Marquis or Count.

(10) This book was printed at Leyden, by Peter Vander Aa, in 1699, folio.

[*C*] *I ſhall examine what one of Mrs.* Bourignon's *partizans ſays in anſwer to my remark.*] His anſwer is inſerted in a piece entitled, *Lettre touchant les Auteurs Myſtiques*, printed a year ſince (11), with *La Theologie réelle vulgairement ditte la Theologie Germanique*. The anonymous perſon who publiſhed this, quotes my words, and then ſays as follows (12): "No, by your leave, to lay aſide all equivocation, "no time was either exactly, or not exactly, fixed in "the prediction, as you would inſinuate; and be"ſides, it was not a verbal revelation, as you would "have it, in order to make it ſuſceptible of falſity "with regard to time; but it was viſual, and never"theleſs of ſuch a nature, as not to point out expreſsly "any time. Mrs. B. (Bourignon) did not ſuppoſe that "Bruſſels would be abſolutely burnt, ſooner or later: "but as nothing was determined on that point, no "time fixed, nor excluded, this indetermination was "directly the reaſon why ſhe did not look upon her"ſelf as ſecure from that danger at any time; and "why ſhe had reaſon to be upon her guard at all "times." He adds that *it was in the ſame manner Chriſt and his Apoſtles having foretold, in general, his ſecond coming, exhorted the Chriſtians, of that age, to be watchful at all times, in order that they might not be ſurpriſed; on which occaſion ſome malicious and profane perſon might have much more pretence than our Author to ſay as he did: the ſpirit, who had revealed this ſecond coming to them, did not ſpecify well the time; they imagining ſeventeen hundred years ago, that this would happen in their life-time, and yet nothing of this has been ſeen yet. St. Peter informs us, that profane perſons uſed to criticiſe in that manner.* In this manner the anonymous Writer has criticiſed my *remark*; but I will now ſhew how illuſory it is.

(11) At Amſt. by Henry Wetſtein, 1701, 12mo. See *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, Nov. 1700. p. 555, *& ſeq.*

(12) *Lettre touchant les Auteurs Myſtiques*, p. 114.

I obſerved that the ſpirit *did not ſpecify well the time*, and this Author owns that it fixed no time. What can I deſire more? Is it not plain, that whoſoever omits to ſpecify the time does not ſpecify it either well or ill; and conſequently, it may be affirmed, that he has not ſpecified it well. My propoſition is therefore true; and it will be certain, at leaſt, that Mrs. Bourignon drew a falſe conſequence from what had been revealed to her *viſually*. She concluded from thence, that the city of Bruſſels would ſoon be deſtroyed by fire; for ſhe believed that the permiſſion granted her of reſiding there would *ſerve her* only *for a little time*; ſhe judged this, I ſay, becauſe of this viſual *revelation* mentioned to us. The reſolution ſhe herſelf took (to retire from a city which ſhe ſuppoſed would ſoon be burnt down,) ſhe doubtleſs would have adviſed all to follow, who would have ſubmitted to her direction; and conſequently ſhe would have adviſed all the inhabitants of Bruſſels to retire, had they been her diſciples. I now leave the Reader to judge how ſtrangely theſe people would have been deluded, had they complied with her advice? A vaſt number of perſons who were to live not above ten, twelve, fifteen or twenty years, would have abandoned their native country, to prevent their loſing their lives in a fire which was not to happen till twenty nine years after. They would have

ſuffered

ſuffered themſelves to be guided by falſe prophecies: for a revelation, though true in itſelf, becauſe it exhibits only images, becomes falſe and deceitful the inſtant it is applied to times or places which do not ſuit to it. Though we take it for granted that the revealing ſpirit will not deceive; nevertheleſs, the perſon, to whom it communicates itſelf, will nevertheleſs deceive by falſe applications; and in this manner Mrs. Bourignon's advocate furniſhes us, without being aware of it, wherewith to conclude, that ſhe was a falſe Propheteſs in that reſpect. It were better not to be favoured with any revelations, than to receive ſuch prophecies as are not underſtood; and which are ſo badly explained, that perſons are thereby induced to engage in ſeveral unneceſſary meaſures, and to arm themſelves with groundleſs precautions. Had Mrs. Bourignon continued quiet in the city which ſhe imagined was threatened with fire, ſhe would have paſſed the reſt of her days without ſeeing the effects of her prophecy, ſhe dying fifteen years before Bruſſels was bombarded. She conſequently was ſeized with a needleſs terror, and a panic fear made her quit Bruſſels. I would not have it ſuppoſed, that I grant her advocate, that the revelation he ſpeaks of was *evidently verified in the event* (13). The bombarding of Bruſſels has no more connexion with the viſions of Mrs. Bourignon, than with the dreams of other people. I believe no one will deny, but that ſome perſon, one time or other, ſees, in their dreams, a city on fire. When a perſon dreams that a houſe is on fire, it is commonly his own houſe. If ſuch dream that a town is overflowed or conſumed by the flames, it is generally ſuch a city as they are beſt acquainted with, that of their birth, or which they live in. I therefore will not ſcruple to obſerve, and believe that ſuch as attend to their dreams, will not accuſe me of raſhneſs, that ſeveral citizens of Bruſſels imagined they ſaw, in ſleep, every corner of the city in flames, and that ſome fancied they even ſaw it bombarding (14). Now ought theſe to be conſidered as prophetical dreams? Such viſions, in the brain of devout people, may more juſtly be ſuſpected, than thoſe which come from the worldly-minded; for devout people imagine, when awake, that the wickedneſs and corruption, they ſee in great towns, will draw down fire from Heaven. Now perſons commonly ſee, in dreams, thoſe objects which they ſaw when awake (15). I omit obſerving, that according to Mrs. Bourignon's prophecy, Bruſſels was to be deſtroyed by fire. It is evident to every one, that this intimates a total deſtruction, conſequently this was not the bombarding in 1695: for this bombardment did not deſtroy that city, ſeveral houſes being only ruined or damaged by it. It was made much more beautiful and magnificent a very few years after; and the inhabitants valued ſo little the havock made by the bombs, that they declared publickly, when they ſpoke of the uneaſineſs which the news of the forwarding of the peace of Reſwick gave them, that they would rather be bombarded three or four times in that manner, than ſee an end put to a war which brought in ſuch vaſt ſums of money among them.

(13) *Lettre touchant les Auteurs Myſtiques*, p. 114.

(14) Eſpecially ſince the Newspapers mentioned ſo often cities that had been bombarded.

(15) See the art. LOTICHIUS (PETER) rem. [G].

The beſt thing, the anonymous Author has advanced, is the example of the Apoſtle's prophecy with regard to the laſt coming of the ſon of God. They declared it as near at hand (16); and nevertheleſs ſeventeen hundred years have been elapſed, without its being yet fulfilled. The ſolution of this difficulty may be ſeen in the commentaries on ſcripture. I ſhall only obſerve, that this was never thought a reaſon ſufficient to juſtify thoſe, who, in the ſucceeding ages, foretold things that never came to paſs. The world always imagined they had a right to call them falſe Prophets, or falſe interpreters of the Revelations. Why ſhall I be the only perſon who may not be allowed to employ ſuch an argument, to refute ſuch as pretend to prophecy? It is well known that thoſe, who are engaged to vindicate the new Prophets, anſwer the objections, as this anonymous Author does, at the expence of the true Scripture Prophets. They have not forgot the paſtoral letters of the Writer whom he ſpoke of ſome pages before. *Who declares* (17), *I know not how many great and ſmall imaginary Prophets, to be inſpired; and who expects that his party in France will be re-eſtabliſhed, by way of inſpiration.* It was to no purpoſe that he ſought, in the behaviour of the Prophets of the Old Teſtament, what was conſidered as marks of falſe prophecy in thoſe pretended inſpired ones of Dauphiné; perſons of wiſdom and piety nevertheleſs concluded, in oppoſition to thoſe perſons, what right reaſon might infer from thoſe marks; and when the time fixed upon for the deliverance was expired, they aſſerted that his prophetical interpretations were falſe. They were not afraid that the prediction concerning Chriſt's ſecond coming, which the anonymous writer alledges, would be alledged againſt them. I imitate the conduct of thoſe Gentlemen, which has been obſerved by all the graveſt Divines, whenever any Fanaticks ſtarted up, whoſe predictions have been refuted by the event.

(16) They exhorted ſuch of the faithful as they then addreſſed, to keep themſelves in readineſs for it.

(17) *Lettre touchant les Auteurs Myſtiques*, p. 108.

I muſt now anſwer another complaint made by Mrs. Bourignon's advocate. He is of opinion that *I take a ſingular pleaſure in ſatyriſing her*, and expatiates largely on this. He adds, that I frequently refer my readers to a libel of Mr. de Seckendorf; and cites a long paſſage from Mr. Thomaſius, Profeſſor at Hall, which ſhews, that Mr. de Seckendorf was blinded by paſſion when he wrote againſt Mrs. Bourignon. I anſwer in few words, 1. That none but perſons, who are prepoſſeſſed by an infatuating admiration, could charge me with a pretended deſire *of ſatyriſing her*. Enraptured with the perfections they fancy they perceive in a certain perſon, they cannot diſcover any imperfection in ſuch an one; they conſecrate all their actions, and are highly exaſperated at all thoſe who diſcover any penetration, and who dare to ſhew the weak ſide of ſuch a perſon. I have not ſaid any thing reflecting in any manner either on the chaſtity or zeal of Antoinette Bourignon; I drew up, with plainneſs and ſimplicity, a ſhort account of her life; and I referred my readers to a ſmall piece communicated to me by Mr. Poiret, which our anonymous Writer looks upon as highly advantageous to the young woman in queſtion. If I imagined that it was lawful for me, as an hiſtorian, to take ſome notice of her petulant humour, and the watchful eye with which ſhe managed her fortune, I did no more than what truth required. I have advanced nothing without proofs. But I will leave the deciſion of all this to unprejudiced readers. I anſwer, 2dly, that among a great number of citations out of Antionette's life and works, ſcarce more than five or ſix are taken from Mr. de Seckendorf. Wherefore then does our anonymous Author inſinuate that I ground myſelf entirely on that account. Laſtly, I ſay, that I did not then know what Mr. Thomaſius obſerves with regard to the procedure of that illuſtrious German. Mr. Thomaſius is a worthy Gentleman, for whom I have long had a great regard. I have no occaſion to oppoſe his remarks; for he ſeems to have accuſed Mr. de Seckendorf with curtailing ſome paſſages only in what relates to the tenets of Mrs. Bourignon; and as to myſelf, I only quoted him for a matter of fact; and I generally confirm, by other paſſages, what I have taken from him. I have no reaſon to believe that ſhe was blinded in this reſpect, by prejudice. After all, if he was ſo guilty as is pretended, would he not have been attacked on all hands? Would not Mr. Poiret, whom he refuted, have reſumed the pen to ſhew his unfair dealing?

I make no anſwer to ſeveral obſervations made by the anonymous Writer. They all are random reproaches, and manifeſt indications of his being too touchy, and the need he ſtill has to mortify his internal ſenſes. It is not enough that a perſon mortifies his external ſenſes; but he ought to make it his chief endeavours to overcome his iraſcible appetite. I would adviſe him to think ſeriouſly of it, and refer him either to the obſervations I have already made (18), or to the following general obſervation, that nothing could be more trifling and inſignificant than to attempt a juſtification with regard to complaints advanced without any direct proofs. If any perſon raiſes a particular objection to me, and examines certain arguments fairly taken from ſome part of my Dictionary, I will not refuſe ſuch a perſon an anſwer; but with regard to general reproaches, I ſhall content myſelf with appealing to all unbiaſſed Readers.

(18) In my reflections on the Judgment of the public, which he cited in his letter *Sur les Auteurs Myſtiques*, p. 312, 313.

RUA (PETER), a learned Spaniard, who taught polite literature in Soria, the place of his birth [*A*], lived in the 16th Century. He publiſhed three letters (*a*) againſt Antonio de Guevara, which are very curious, and filled with great erudition; wherein he refuted a numberleſs multitude of falſities publiſhed by that Author, and the ridiculous ſubterfuge he employed. This will appear from the paſſage of Andreas Schottus which I quote [*B*]. Moreri has committed a very groſs blunder [*C*].

(*a*) Entitled, *Cartes del Bachiller Rua.* Nicol. Anton. *Bibli. Hiſt.* Tom. 2. p. 187.

[*A*] *In Soria, the place of his birth.*] One would conclude, at firſt ſight, that Andrew Schottus and Don Nicholas Antonio are not agreed in any manner. The former ſays, *Petrus Rhua Numantinus primum Abulæ, poſt Numantiæ in patria annos plurimos ad extremam uſque ætatem bonas literas docuit* (1). i. e. "Peter Rua, a Numantine, taught philoſophy, firſt "in Abula, and afterwards in Numantia, the place "of his birth, for many years, to a very old age." The latter writes thus: *Petrus Rua, Sorienſis, Abulæ primum, mox in patria urbe juventutem humanioribus imbuit literis ad extremam uſque ætatem* (2). i. e. "Peter Rua, of Soria, firſt in Abula, and afterwards "in the city where he was born, inſtructed youth "in learning, till he was very far advanced in "years." But theſe Writers ſay exactly the ſame thing in the main; for Soria, built near the ruins of Numantia, is called Numantia by ſome; and among others, by Andrew Schottus.

(1) Andr. Schottus, *Bibl. Hiſp.* 567.

(2) Nicol. Ant. *Bibl. Script. Hiſpan.* Tom. 2. 187.

[*B*] *This will appear from the paſſage of Andrew Schottus which I quote.* It is as follows: *In quo egregie verſatum fuiſſe teſtantur*, epiſt. 3. *Hiſpanicè ſcriptæ eruditionis plenæ, & humanitatis ſatis copioſæ: quibus Ant. Guevarræ (qui tum ſolus doctrinæ, & eloquentiæ arcem tenere videbatur) errores, mendaciaque in hiſtoriis antiquorum, veteribuſque monumentis lapidum, & nummorum explicandis, egregie refellit. Valde ut mirer Gallos, Guevarræ epiſtolas converſas* Aureo *titulo decoraſſe, manibuſque ita tenere ſolitos, ut pro oraculis circumferant, quæ tot mendaciis, quot verſibus ſcatere dicantur.* Rhua *itaque de tot millibus multa indicavit, facemque prætulit, ne quis poſthac credulus in errorem induceretur. Epiſt.* 1. *numiſmatum inſcriptiones, & confinxiſſe, & ridicule explicaſſe, in Chronologia & magiſtratuum dignitate turpiter hallucinatum. Epiſt.* 2. *erraſſe in Hiſtoria Rom. temporum ratione, locorumque nominibus, ſolenne illud ſuum ſervando, audacter ut omnia pronunciet, quaſi poſteris imponere volens, aut credens omnes ei temere aſſenſuros audito illo Pythagoreorum αὐτὸς ἔφα, cornicum oculos confixit, citans identidem, & prodigioſa nomina propria hiſtoricorum, cudenſque arbitratu ſuo, ad hanc diem inaudita. De numiſmatis inepta & ridicula leges; ut & de legibus Rom. & legum auctorib. de lege Julia Poppæa, Carnelia, Falcidia, aliiſque: de medicina & empirica. Tertia epiſtola ut mole ſua ita rerum pondere cæteris major eſt. Cum enim Guevarra omnem antiquitati fidem derogare niteretur, epiſtola quadam, quo ficta mendacia tegeret, velaret, vel tueretur; cum à ſacris litteris diſceſſeris, omnia incerta fabuliſque plena affirmat. Refellit virum deſerte* Rhua *ex Athenagoræ Apologia pro Chriſtianis, & hoc eſſe omnem artium tractationem, fidemque ut ſocietatis humanæ, ita & ſcientiarum vinculum è medio tollere* (3). i. e. "His great knowledge in this appears "from his three epiſtles, written in the Spaniſh "tongue, and filled with erudition. He therein "excellently well confutes the miſtakes and falſities "of Anthony Guevara, who then ſeemed to be the "only maſter of learning and eloquence with regard "to ancient hiſtory, and the explication of inſcriptions on ſtones and coins. I am greatly ſurpriſed "that the French ſhould have adorned the title of "the verſion of Guevara's epiſtles, with the epithet "golden; and ſhould ſtudy and carry them about "with them as though they were ſo many oracles, "though they contain as many errors as lines. Rua "therefore, from among ſo many thouſands, pointed "out ſeveral, and held forth a light, that no perſon "might hereafter be miſled by their credulity. His "firſt epiſtle ſhews, that Guevara has forged, and "given a ridiculous explanation to the inſcriptions "of coins; and that he committed moſt ſhameful "blunders in chronology and the dignity of Magiſtrates. By the ſecond epiſtle it appears that he "committed errors in the Roman Hiſtory, with "regard to chronology, the names of places; boldly aſſerting, as is cuſtomary with him, on all "things, as though he deſigned to impoſe on poſterity; or imagining that all perſons would lightly "give credit to him; frequently citing, and inventing at pleaſure, ſtrange names of hiſtorians, never "heard of to this day. He has advanced many "filly and ridiculous particulars with reſpect to coins; "as alſo concerning the Roman laws, and the Authors of them; of the Julian, Poppæan, Cornelian, Falcidian, &c. and of Phyſick. The third "epiſtle, as it is longer than the others, ſo the "ſubject of it is of more conſequence: for Guevara, "in a certain epiſtle, endeavouring to deſtroy as "much as poſſible the credit of all antiquity; he, "in order to ſcreen or defend his falſities, affirms "that all writings, the Scripture excepted, are uncertain and ſtuffed with fables. But Rua has expreſsly confuted him, from Athenagoras's apology "for the Chriſtians; and ſhews, that this would deſtroy the whole foundation of the arts, ſciences, "and the bonds by which mankind are united in "ſociety." This is a curious Supplement to Guevara's article.

(3) Andr. Schottus, *Bibl. Hiſp.* 567.

[*C*] *Moreri has made a very groſs blunder,*] He ſays that *Peter Rhua* wrote a treatiſe *De Lege Julia, Poppæa, Cornelia, Falcidia, &c. de Medicina & Empyrica*; and cites Father Schottus. What a horrid blunder is this! This Father ſays very plainly, not that Rhua wrote a treatiſe on theſe ſubjects; but that the deſign of his ſecond epiſtle was to ſhew the errors committed by Guevara in ſeveral matters, and particularly in that. Beſides, *Lex Julia* and *Lex Poppæa* are not different laws, but one and the ſame, which Father Schottus ſhews plainly enough, he not putting a comma between *Julia* and *Poppæa*.

RUARUS (MARTIN), a Socinian Miniſter, was born in Krempen (*a*) in Germany. He was infected with the Socinian hereſy by Erneſt Sonerus, Profeſſor in Altdorf, who taught them ſecretly; and perſevered ſo obſtinately in them, that he choſe to loſe his patrimony, rather than quit the above-mentioned principles. He was eſteemed both in his own, and in foreign countries, for his judgment, learning, and rectitude of mind (*b*). He was principal of the College of Racovia, and afterwards Paſtor to the Socinians of Dantzic, both in the city, and in the town of Straſſin; and died in that quality in 1657 (*c*), aged ſeventy years (*d*). He was a Miniſter in 1635, as appears from the travels of James (*a*) Ogier [*A*]. He wrote ſome pieces which have

(*a*) A city of Holſtein.

(*b*) *Ob eruditionis, judiciique præſtantiam, morumque integritatem, in magno & apud iſtos & alios eruditos fuit pretio.* Mollerus, *Iſagoge ad Hiſt. Cherſoneſ. Cimbricæ*, part. 3. p. 106.

(*c*) Idem, ibid.

(*d*) Sandius, *in Bibl. Antitrinit.* p. 114.

[*A*] *From the travels of James Ogier.*] This Author was at Dantzic in 1635, in the retinue of Count d'Avaux, his moſt Chriſtian Majeſty's Embaſſador. He relates, that being in a bookſeller's-ſhop, one Ruardus (he ſhould have ſaid Ruarus) came up to him, and that he diſcourſed for two hours with him in Latin, and afterwards in French. *Aggreſſus me eſt quidam N. Ruardus, quocum per duas horas collocutus ſum Latinè, ac deinde Gallicè, qui me ad ædes ſuas adeundas invitavit. Didici poſtea ab aliquo, eum eſſe Arianorum*

have been printed [*B*]. The famous Calixtus employed his utmoſt endeavours to convert him, during the conference of Thorn in 1646, but to no purpoſe (*e*).

(*e*) *Nulli ut popularium hunc ſuum in viam revocaret, peperci opera, ſed pertinaciam ejus ſuperare non potuit.* Mollerus, *Iſagoge ad Hiſt. Cherſ. Cimbricæ*, part. 3. p. 107.

rianorum Paſtorem : ſunt quippe Gedani hujuſmodi homines, qui clam congregantur, inſcio vel diſſimulante Senatu (1). i. e. "There came up to me one N. Ruarus, "with whom I diſcourſed two hours in Latin, and "then in French, and he invited me to his houſe. "Some perſons told me afterwards, that he was "Paſtor of the Arians: for there are ſuch perſons in "Dantzic, who aſſemble ſecretly, either unknown "to, or by the connivance of the Senate."

(1) Carol. Ogerius, *in Itiner. Polonico*, p. 418, 419.

§ (α) It ſhould be *Charles Ogier*, as Bayle calls him here in the margin, citation (1), in the remark [*Q*] of the article ULEFELD. Here follows the complete title of his travels: *Caroli Ogerii Ephemerides, ſive iter Danicum, Suecicum, Polonicum, cum eſſet in comitatu Illuſtriſſ. Claudii Munici, Comitis Avenuxii, ad Septentrionis regis extraordinarii Legati. Lutetiæ Pariſiorum, apud Petrum Le Petit* 1636, in 8vo. He has been called *Ogier the Dane*, becauſe of his journey to Denmark. His brother the Prior was called Francis. REM. CRIT.

[*B*] *He wrote ſome pieces which have been printed.*] He wrote notes on the Catechiſm of the Socinian Churches of Poland, which notes were added to the edition of this Catechiſm printed in 1665, and they alſo are inſerted in the edition of 1680. He wrote other notes on the ſame piece, but they were never printed (2). There are two centuries of his letters; the firſt was printed at Amſterdam by DAVID RUARUS, the Author's ſon, in 1677, with a Preface by JOACHIN RUARUS, David's brother. The ſecond century was alſo printed in 1681, by David, who added a Preface to them. Theſe letters are very curious (3). He was thought to be Author of the German verſion of the New Teſtament, made in Racovia, and publiſhed in 1630 (4), but it is an error, *Quos falli mihi conſtat, tum ex Sandio *, illam Johann. Crellio & Joach. Stegmanno Seniori vindicante, tum ex indicio Filii, quem noſter reliquit, cognominis, Amſtelodami viventis, à quo, adornatum eam credi à Chriſtoph. Oſtorodo ac συνέργοις aliquot, reviſam autem eſſe à toto Societate, & in hac parente ſuo, ac præfationem tandem à Crellio adjectam, A.* 1684, *ſum edoctus* (5). i. e. "Whom I am "ſure are miſtaken, as well from Sandius's a- "ſcribing it to John Crellius, and Joachim Steg- "mannus the elder; as likewiſe from the information "of his ſon, of the ſame name, now reſiding in "Amſterdam, who told me that it was thought to "have been prepared by Chriſtopher Oſtorodus, &c. "and reviſed by the whole ſociety; and by his fa- "ther, among others; and that at laſt, Crellius add- "ed a preface to it."

(2) Extracted from Sandius, *in Bibl. Antitrinit.* p. 114.

(3) *Eruditæ & lectu digniſſimæ.* Mollerus, *Iſagoge ad Hiſt. Cherſ. Cimbricæ*, part 3. p. 107. See Morhof, *Polyhiſt.* cap. 24. p. 309.

(4) See Matt. Zimmermanni, *Diſſert. inaug. de acceptilatione*, p. 27 and 31. *apud* Mollerum, ibid.

* *In Bibl. Ant.* p. 94, 116, 133.

(5) Mollerus, ibid.

RUBENUS (LEONARD), born at Eſſen (*a*) in Germany, entered into the Order of St. Benedict at Colen, the 11th of July 1596 (*b*). He had ſpent many years in Livonia, Lithuania, and Tranſylvania, to advance the Romiſh Religion. He was in Tranſylvania in 1588, and there publiſhed ſome theſes or poſitions concerning idolatry, and dedicated them to Prince Sigiſmund Battori. He propoſed them in a publick diſputation, but no one offered to oppoſe them. He was deſired, in ſeveral places, to publiſh a ſecond edition of them; for which reaſon he ſet about that ſubject again, and treated it more at large (*c*); and it ſwelled to a book containing 327 pages in 8vo, which he printed at Colen in 1597. A particular related by him ſhews, that Livonia was ſtill infected with the errors of the Heathens [*A*]. Konig knew nothing of this Author, except that he ſet about a work *De falſis Prophetis* (concerning falſe Prophets) in 1600 (*d*).

(*a*) A little town within three leagues of the Rhine and of Duisburg.

(*b*) See the dedication to his treatiſe *de Idololatria*.

(*c*) See his advertiſement to the Reader.

(*d*) In the catalogue of the Bodleian library is a work of Leonardus Rubenus, *de falſis Prophetis & Lupis rapacibus*, printed at Paderborn, in 8vo, anno 1606.

[*A*] *A particular related by him ſhews, that Livonia was ſtill infected with the errors of the Heathens.*] Having received an order from his ſuperiors to go to Dorpat, which is very near the farthermoſt town in Livonia; he met, in his journey, with the ſacred woods and groves of the Eſtonians. He there ſaw a pine-tree of a prodigious height and bulk, the branches of which were filled with ſeveral pieces of old cloth; and the roots covered with many bundles of ſtraw and hay. Enquiring of a man in the neighbourhood what that meant, he was told, that the inhabitants hereabouts worſhipped that tree, and that ſuch women as had a happy delivery, carried thoſe bundles of hay thither. That they alſo uſed, at certain ſeaſons, to offer up a hogſhead of beer to it, and to throw a hogſhead of that liquor into the lake of Marienburg, whenever it thundered; that they looked upon thunder as the ſon of God, and thought he was appeaſed by the pouring out of that liquor. He aſked for a good ax, that which he had in his chariot being blunt; and being aſked what he intended to do; I'll ſhew you, ſays he, the weakneſs of this object of your worſhip. The Eſthonian replied, that he would run the utmoſt danger in what he intended; and cried out aloud to him, not to go under that tree, for that, if he ventured to do it, both himſelf and his chariot would be carried up into the air. Nevertheleſs, he drove his horſes under it, when taking up his ax, he in a devout manner, cut the figure of a croſs on the tree; and for fear leſt that figure, made by a man whom they honoured ſo highly as to call him the great Temple of God, ſhould increaſe their ſuperſtition, he cut a gibbet on the ſame pine-tree, when laughing at them, there, (ſays he), is your God (1).

(1) Extracted from Rubenus, lib. 1. *de Idololatria*, cap. 18. p. 66.

RUCELLAI (JOHN), a noble Florentine, and a good Poet, lived in the 16th Century. I obſerved on another occaſion (*a*), that he wrote in 1524, at Rome, a Poem entitled, *Le Api* (the Bees) to which I now add, that he was then Governor of St. Angelo; and that PALLA RUCELLAI, his brother, printed that Poem in Florence, anno 1539 in 8vo, and dedicated it to Gio. Giorgio Triſſino, Author of *Italia liberata da Goti* (Italy delivered from the Goths) printed at Rome in 1547. John Ruccellai compoſed alſo a Tragedy, entitled, *Oreſte*, which is mentioned by Leo Allazzi, page 605 of his *Drammaturgia* (*b*).

(*a*) In the rem. [*E*], of the art. ORICELLARIUS, towards the cloſe.

(*b*) Extracted from *Bibl. Aproſiana*, p. 458, 459.

RUFFI (ANTHONY DE), Counſellor in the Seneſchal's Court of Marſeilles, the place of his birth, diſcharged the duties of his employment with the greateſt integrity, and the utmoſt, and moſt ſingular ſcrupulouſneſs of conſcience. He alſo applied himſelf to hiſtorical enquiries, with wonderful application and patience. This appears from his hiſtory of Marſeilles printed in 1642, which was reprinted with large additions in 1696, in two volumes in folio (*a*). He was but thirty five years old when it was firſt printed. He was honoured with the poſt of Counſellor of State in 1554, as a *teſtimony of*

(*a*) See *Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Savans*, for June 1697.

of the eſteem which was paid to his learning and merit. The proof I ſhall give of the ſcrupulouſneſs of his conſcience [*A*], will give me occaſion to debate a queſtion with regard to the ignorance that excuſeth from ſin; and to examine the anſwers that may be made to the compariſons taken either from judges whoſe ſentences are unjuſt, contrary

[*A*] *The ſcrupulouſneſs of his conſcience.*] We "may "judge of this, from the reſtitution he made to a "perſon, whoſe cauſe he had reported, imagining he "had not allowed time enough for the examination "of a law-ſuit in which he was concerned; and to "have contributed to the loſs of it by his being a "little negligent; ſo far from ſearching for ſuch "excuſes and reaſons as ſelf-love never fails to ſug-"geſt, in ſuch examinations, he paſt a very ſevere "ſentence upon himſelf, and got a Prieſt of the ora-"tory to reſtore the ſum which had been loſt; on "which occaſion, the ſcrupulouſneſs of the Judge's "conſcience might have been more favourable to the "party concerned, than a more ſtrict enquiry into "his right and his reaſons would have been. And "indeed, this great probity of Ruffi was acknow-"ledged in an authentick manner by the Parliament "of Provence, in an arret or decree paſſed in 1655, "at the deſire of the King's Attorney-General." This paſſage is extracted from the elogium of Mr. de Ruffi (1), immediately after theſe words: *He never ſeated himſelf upon the bench, but his mind was filled with that Court of Juſtice, which the royal Prophet hints at in one of his pſalms; God was preſent in the aſſembly of the Gods, and being in the midſt of them, he judged them;* ſtetit in ſynagoga Deorum in medio autem Deos dijudicat: *poſſeſſed with the ſentiments which ſuch a thought is capable of inſpiring, he weighed every thing in the balance of the ſanctuary: neither the ties of blood and charity, the dangerous allurements of friendſhip, nor the force of intereſt, ever made him ſwerve from the dictates of juſtice. He employed every expedient which might bring to him a knowledge of truth; the reſolution with which he defended innocence, and puniſhed guilt, was equal to his penetration; and he never gave his opinion, nor pronounced ſentence, without ſeriouſly conſidering whether he could maintain it, at the tribunal of that ſevere God, who, at the laſt day, will judge the righteouſneſs of men.*

(1) It is prefixed to the 2d edit. of the *Hiſt. of Marſeilles.*

Remarks concerning ignorance that excuſes.

It was neceſſary for me to obſerve, that theſe laſt words precede immediately thoſe which inform us, that he reſtored a ſum of money which a client had loſt. This gives me an opportunity of making a reflection which I look upon as pretty important. The Author of the elogium means, without doubt, that Mr. de Ruffi had examined the cauſe with his uſual accuracy and diligence; but that he, from too rigid a ſcrupulouſneſs, imagined he had been a little negligent. This Author, I ſay, no doubt would have us ſuppoſe, that this Judge's ſcruples were grounded on the information he had received ſince he had pronounced the decree. Here follows, in few words, the ſenſe in which we are to underſtand this affair. The judge, who reported his cauſe, employed all his knowledge, his utmoſt application, and integrity on this occaſion; but after ſentence had been pronounced on the cauſe, he diſcovered, by I know not what method, that the party, which had loſt the cauſe, had more right than he at firſt imagined. He therefore imagined, that had he more cloſely examined all the writings, he would have made a more favourable report; whence he concluded, that he was not innocent, and therefore thought himſelf obliged to make reſtitution; whence one would conclude, that he had a very tender and ſcrupulous conſcience. This could not be ſaid of him, if his memory ſuggeſted to him an affected negligence, indolence or impatience; for, on ſuch an occaſion, a Judge who reports a cauſe, is evidently guilty; his ignorance does not excuſe him; and though he be troubled with remorſe, this is no indication that he has a tender conſcience; for a perſon might have a hard conſcience, and yet be ſtrongly allarmed by inward convictions. But I ſuppoſe, in conſequence of the expreſſions employed by the Writer of the elogium, that Mr. de Ruffi had no ſuch reproaches to make himſelf. It was his ſincere intention to make a faithful report; he had not neglected any thing which he thought neceſſary; and was ſenſible that, in a hundred other cauſes, the attention with which he had examined this, had been ſufficient. He therefore reproached himſelf only for imagining he had done all that a juſt man who reports a cauſe ought to do; he having found, that it was poſſible for him to have made a better report of that cauſe than he had done. Since his conſcience would not let him be eaſy in ſuch circumſtances, it might have diſturbed him even though he had known that it was ſcarce poſſible, humanly ſpeaking, to do better than he had done, and that his ignorance was invincible. To what purpoſe is all this, will my reader ſay to me? But this will ſoon appear.

Within theſe ten years (2) ſome pieces have been publiſhed in Holland, relating to the rights of an erroneous conſcience. Such Authors as have aſſerted, that ignorance does not excuſe, have inſtanced ſome Saints, who had an extreme regret for what they had done with a good intention, and in the deſign of ſerving God, and imagined that they ſtood in need of mercy, &c. Such examples, generally ſpeaking, prove nothing; for tender conſciences, ſuch as glow with a love for virtue, are troubled at a fault that is purely material, I mean ſuch a one as has been committed through invincible ignorance. A Phyſician who ſhould be informed by revelation, that a doſe he adminiſtred proved the death of his patient, notwithſtanding that, according to all the rules of the art of Phyſick, and all the knowledge mankind are capable of, he ought to have preſcribed it him; ſuch a Phyſician, I ſay, who was very conſcientious and kind, would be prodigiouſly grieved at what he had done. He would allow for it, to the utmoſt of his power, by beſtowing alms to the family of his deceaſed patient, in caſe they were reduced to poverty by loſing their head. He would nevertheleſs be entirely innocent before the Almighty; for I take it for granted that his ignorance was invincible, and ſuch as it ought to be, to excuſe him, according to the opinion of the moſt ſevere Divines (3). Let us ſay the ſame, with regard to a Judge who ſhould have made a cauſe be loſt, in ſuch circumſtances wherein the utmoſt knowledge and penetration of mankind could not have diſcovered the truth. He would be grieved for the ſentence, in caſe he afterwards diſcovered the right of the party who had loſt his ſuit; he would be grieved at it, I ſay, and compenſate for the loſs, in caſe his conſcience and virtue were perfect. The Author of the elogium of Mr. de Ruffi furniſhes us with an example of this. Such a grief, and ſuch compenſations, ought not therefore to be alledged, as a proof that undeſigned ignorance does not excuſe. The more pious a perſon is, the more he is grieved for ſuch material faults as he may have committed through miſtake. Conſcience, either out of humility or precaution, becomes more ſevere than God himſelf. A thouſand inſtances might be cited, in which a man, though innocent, grieves, compenſates, reſtores, &c. Does not an honeſt man, who hears that his horſe has lamed ſome perſon, grieve very much on that account? Does he not ſometimes pay the ſurgeon who attends the perſon thus hurt? And if he has a very tender conſcience, is he not afraid that God will call him to an account for his negligence, and for keeping ſo vicious an animal? Nevertheleſs, all Caſuiſts of good ſenſe will pronounce this honeſt man innocent, if they know that he could not help what his horſe had done? Would not an Orator who had been at a ſtand, and by that very involuntary misfortune had prejudiced another perſon, be extremely grieved at it? But in caſe he begged pardon of God for it, and compenſated for the injury he had done, muſt we conclude that he had ſinned; muſt we transform that into a moral fault, what is merely a phyſical imperfection, which is as independent on our reaſon, and liberty, as the weakneſs of the eye, ſuddenly dazled by too ſtrong a light flaſhing upon it? I take it for granted, that the Orator neglected nothing that he knew was neceſſary, for the well retaining all his ſpeech. But let us keep to the ignorance of upright Judges.

(2) I write this in Sept. 1697.

(3) The reader may have ſeen rem. [*A*] of the art. RIMINI, that they acknowledge, properly ſpeaking, no invincible ignorance in religious matters; but they are not ſo rigid with reſpect to facts, and human eſtabliſhments or diſcipline.

trary to their intention [*B*] ; or from Phyſicians whoſe medicines, ſpite of their honeſty and

Judges. The firſt Preſident of the Parliament of Paris, made a ſpeech at the opening of that Court, in 1693. He repreſented, that *when a Judge imagines he has not every expedient in order to get light into an affair, he nevertheleſs commits injuſtice, at the ſame time that he ſuppoſes he is pronouncing an equitable decree ; as was manifeſt from the cauſe of the late Mr. Langlade, in which, notwithſtanding the skill and underſtanding of the Judge, and all the care they took in that matter, in order to find out the truth, yet could not prevent their condemning an innocent man, which they had endeavoured to repair by their ſentence* (4). Here then we have Judges of integrity and application, who do their duty to the utmoſt of their abilities, and who yet are grieved at their miſtake, and have atoned for it. Had theſe been ſnatched away by death, before they had diſcovered their miſtake, and with a conſcioufneſs that they had employed their utmoſt endeavours to find out the truth, need they be under any dread with regard to the divine juſtice? Can it be pretended, that they were obliged to overcome ſome obſtacles, which, with regard to them, were invincible. See the Author of the *Commentaire Philoſophique* (5), who has ſo fully ſhewn, that in certain caſes, an innocent man may be condemned, and a guilty one acquitted, without ſinning, that the learned Miniſter of Utrecht wrote againſt him (6) has not attacked this doctrine.

(4) *Mercure Gallant*, for Nov. 1693. p. 315.

(5) In the *Supplement*, p. 33. & *ſeq.* p. 62 & *ſeq.* to p. 81. See alſo Montagne's *Eſſays*, book 3. chap. 13. p. m. 518.

(6) See Mr. Saurin's *Reflexions ſur les droits de la Conſcience*, printed at Utrecht, in 1697.

[*B*] *I ſhall . . . . examine the anſwers that may be made from the compariſons taken from Judges, whoſe ſentences are unjuſt, contrary to their intention.*] Ought ignorant Judges, will my reader ſay, to be excuſed, they who occaſion ſo many diſorders? Don't you know that they are puniſhed? For if the party aggrieved addreſſes the Sovereign, or ſome ſuperior Court, their ſentence is annulled, they are cenſured, and even ſometimes degraded? *Such is the uſual courſe of juſtice among men.* Now if Princes puniſh in this manner ſuch as are ignorant of their laws, will any one preſume to ſay, that God will not puniſh thoſe who are ignorant of his word? This compariſon is conſequently not advantageous to ſuch as preach up for toleration. I have three things to anſwer.

I. A Judge who, through a profound ignorance, ſhould take the wrong way in a cauſe that might have been very eaſily judged, would doubtleſs deſerve to be degraded, not as a diſhoneſt man, in caſe he had followed the dictates of his conſcience (7), with a firm reſolution to do juſtice to the parties concerned ; but as a diſhoneſt man, who was no ways qualified for that employment ; and if thoſe who degrade him, knew the rectitude of his heart, they would declare him a good man, conſcientious, a lover of juſtice ; and would ſhew in the moſt authentic manner that he only wanted learning. It is juſt as if an Embaſſador ſhould diſcharge his Secretary, whoſe hand is not very legible, though he knew perfectly that he was a man of fidelity and capacity. He would not pretend to brand him as a diſhoneſt man, or a fool ; but would only ſay that he was not fit for his purpoſe, becauſe he could not write a good hand. Let us compare two Judges, the one very learned, and the other a perſon of ſmall abilities, and both of them of equal integrity. If one of theſe, in a cauſe, be for the affirmative, and the other for the negative ; if they act according to the dictates of their conſcience, in this caſe, after both have employed their utmoſt application and diligence to diſcover the truth ; though the opinion of the moſt learned Judge be juſt, and that of the other unjuſt, I aſſert that, with regard to the rectitude of the mind, one does not ſurpaſs the other. I grant that he is a better judge, and better qualified for his employment, becauſe the qualifications of an upright judge comprehend knowledge and rectitude of mind ; but he has no more probity, nor is more zealous for juſtice.

(7) Suppoſing that ſuch a Judge can be ſaid to have a very upright conſcience. See citat. 10, below.

II. With regard to that *uſual courſe* of puniſhing ignorant judges, mentioned to us, I do not know whether any inſtances could be produced of this. Nothing is more common than for a cauſe, loſt in an inferior Court, to be gained in a ſuperior Court. But this does not throw an odium on thoſe Courts whoſe decrees are not confirmed. The inferior Judges are neither removed or cenſured, unleſs there happen to be ſome plain indications of bribery or partiality ; or at leaſt, of the moſt groſs ignorance ; and if it be thought that a Court has judged according to the beſt of its knowledge, though ever ſo ſmall, the ſuperiors go no farther than to correct their decrees. I would wiſh one ſingle inſtance could be given of Judges removed for their want of knowledge, at the ſame time that they were looked upon as conſcientious, incorruptible, and extremely diligent in examining the ſeveral cauſes that came before them. I am perſuaded that when Judges are puniſhed, it is always on the ſuppoſition that they have been bribed ; were turned away by paſſion or prejudice, or were guilty of wilful ignorance. But here follows an expreſs inſtance to confirm the opinion laid down in the *Commentaire Philoſophique*. " Though we pretend " to be innocent, it does not follow that the Judges " are unjuſt ; it not being an inconſiſtency, with re- " gard to Courts of Judicature, which are compoſed " of men, who may deceive or be impoſed upon by " others, for an innocent man to be condemned, and " a criminal cleared, by an upright Judge. It fre- " quently happens in cauſes both civil and criminal, " that Judges are often divided in opinion, where " the caſe is doubtful, and yet all of them ſhall be " directed by the law. It likewiſe may happen that " all of them are unjuſt, both thoſe who acquit, " and thoſe who condemn, notwithſtanding this con- " trariety in opinions, every one judging agreeably " to the dictates of his conſcience *. When King " Henry II. their Predeceſſor had heard that Peliſ- " ſon, Preſident in the Parliament at Chamberry, at " that time belonging to France, had been removed " from his employment, by a decree of the Parlia- " ment of Dijon, at the ſuit of Tabouet the King's " Attorney ; and that the cauſe being afterwards " brought before the Parliament of Paris, by virtue " of an order for that purpoſe, Peliſſon was cleared, " and the Attorney condemned : the King, I ſay, " cleared all the Judges, notwithſtanding this con- " trariety of their opinions, with ſaying, that ſome " had judged according to the dictates of their con- " ſcience, and others purſuant to the merits of the " cauſe (8)."

* *Reſponſe du Roy Henry II. ſur deux jugemens contraires.*

III. We muſt not depart from the true ſtate of the queſtion. The Author of the *Commentaire Philoſophique* compares together thoſe who miſtake in a lawſuit, and ſuch as err in religious controverſies : but he ſuppoſes that neither of them ought to be excuſed, unleſs they have ſincerely and cordially employed the utmoſt efforts of their genius and underſtanding to find out the truth. When he ſays that there are ſome caſes in which Judges condemn an innocent perſon, and abſolve a criminal, without incurring any guilt themſelves ; he ſuppoſed, at the ſame time, that they do all that lyes in their power, and whatever the laws enjoin, in order to diſcover the truth ; and that nothing but the intricacy of the cauſe, and which could not poſſibly be ſeen through, and thereby occaſioned their pronouncing a falſe ſentence, which however was conformable to the dictates of their conſcience, and the forms of proceeding in Law-Courts. If there are inſtances that ſuch Judges have been removed by ſuperiors who thought them equally learned and upright ; and if ſuch a removal appears juſt to wiſe people, there is ſome reaſon to draw conſequences from it, in favour of the opinion, that God will puniſh ſuch perſons as are ignorant, notwithſtanding their ſincerity. But if the very contrary is found among mankind, what will become of all thoſe conſequences? May we not juſtly infer quite contrary ones, and this in particular, that ſince Kings do not puniſh thoſe who, notwithſtanding all their application, and the utmoſt rectitude of mind, cannot help miſtaking in a very perplexed ſuit ; much more will God, who is juſtice and goodneſs itſelf, bear with thoſe who cannot diſcover the true ſenſe of a very obſcure paſſage in Scripture.

(8) Richeome, *Plainte Apologetique au Roy Henry IV. pour les Jeſuites*, p. m. 182.

I have two things more to ſay : one is, that a Judge who is groſsly ignorant, can ſcarcely be looked

and ſkill prove mortal [C]. Our Ruffi lived to ieghty two years of age. We cannot diſcover from the elogium cited by me (b), either the year of his birth, or that of his death, which is an omiſſion which deſerves cenſure [D]. LEWIS ANTHONY DE RUFFI, his ſon, had a hand in the additions to the ſecond edition of the Hiſtory of Marſeilles.

(b) See his elogium prefixed to the *Hiſtory of Marſeilles*, publiſhed in 1696, writen by Peter Anthony de Paſcal, his nephew, a Monk belonging to the abbey of Toronet.

upon as a good man; for this ſuppoſes that he neglected to inſtruct himſelf; and that he either is inexcuſably indolent (9) or too much devoted to his pleaſures. It is impoſſible for that man to have an upright conſcience (10), who conducts himſelf in this manner, in the exerciſe of ſuch an employment; and if ſuch a man is removed, it does not imply that he was puniſhed for his ſincerity, and involuntary ignorance. The ſecond thing I have to ſay is, that I advance all theſe obſervations only as ſo many doubts, or ſo many probabilities which may be examined; and without pretending to eſpouſe the cauſe or aſſert the doctrine of the *Commentaire Philoſophique*. And to ſhew the Reader, that it is no ways my intention to extenuate the faults of a Judge which proceed merely from ignorance, I ſhall tranſcribe a fulminating judgment againſt them. "Mr. Lamoignon, the "firſt Preſident, would have thought he had been "wanting in the moſt eſſential duty of his office, "had he not endeavoured to improve the conſcious "rectitude of his intentions by knowledge. And indeed he uſed often to ſay, that there was but a "ſmall difference between a wicked and an ignorant "Judge. The former has, at leaſt, before his eyes, "the rules of his duty, and the image of his injuſtice; but the latter does not ſee the good or evil he "does; the former ſins with knowledge, and is the "more inexcuſable upon that account; but the latter "ſins without remorſe, and is more incorrigible: "but they are equally guilty with regard to ſuch as "they condemn, either through error or malice. If "a perſon is wounded by a mad or a blind man, he "feels his wound the ſame. And with regard to a "perſon who is ruined, it is little to the purpoſe if "his misfortunes were occaſioned, either by a man "who impoſed upon him, or by a man who was "impoſed upon (11)."

(9) Obſerve, that if ſuch a man ſtudied very cloſe, and yet continued very ignorant, this would denote a ſtupidity of mind. He therefore would deſerve condemnation, for ſetting himſelf up for a Judge; ſuch an one muſt not have examined himſelf; muſt have accepted of an employment that was above his abilities; and even continued in it, after he had found that his ſtudy was to no purpoſe.

(10) See citat. 7.

(11) Flechier, *Oraiſon funebre de Mr. le premier Preſident de Lamoignon*, p. 435, of the volume of his *Oraiſons funebres*, Dutch edit.

[C . . . . . *or from Phyſicians, whoſe medicines, ſpite of their honeſty and ſkill, prove mortal.*] I ſhall not be ſo prolix on this ſubject. A Phyſician, will my reader ſay, who, being firmly perſuaded that arſenic is a ſalutary medicine, ſhould preſcribe it to his patients, and by that means, ſend them *by ſhoals into the other world*, would be puniſhed, both in this life, and that which is to come, though he ſhould plead in excuſe his involuntary ignorance. This is the image of an Hereſiarch. I anſwer that it is impoſſible, morally ſpeaking, there ſhould be ſuch a Phyſician; and conſequently this is no fit example. No man can believe that arſenic is a ſalutary remedy, without being like thoſe who fancy themſelves to be Kings of France; that they are made of butter, and therefore that they muſt not come near the fire. The relations of ſuch perſons never let them go out of their ſight, or confine them in mad-houſes: and no perſon conſults them either in ſickneſs, or about a law-ſuit. If it be ſuppoſed that a chemiſt may ſincerely believe, that he is able to prepare arſenic in ſuch a manner as to make a ſalutary medicine of it, here is a good way how to form a judgment with regard to his ignorance. He either has tried the efficacy of that medicine, or he has not tried it. If he has not, we muſt ſuppoſe, either that he does not believe what he ſays, or that he is a madman. If he has made an experiment on it, and yet perſiſts in the ſame opinion, he may certainly be looked upon as a villain or a madman. An honeſt and ſincere ignorance ſuppoſes a perſon ſet about examining reaſons, with a ſincere deſire of finding out the truth of them; and without being prompted by avarice, pride, or an intention to cheat. We cannot reaſonably compare Hereſiarchs with ſuch an imaginary Phyſician, who murders ſo many people, unleſs ſuch Hereſiarchs had been eye-witneſſes to the eternal damnation of their firſt followers. If this ſhould not convert them, they muſt either be mad, or have ſpoke againſt the dictates of their conſcience; and in both theſe caſes, they ought to be delivered over to the Magiſtrate; in the former caſe, in order to be put into a mad-houſe; and in the ſecond, to ſuffer the puniſhment due to thoſe who blaſpheme the God they know. Toleration is not deſired for ſuch ſorts of people.

With regard to the puniſhment, before the Almighty, which that Phyſician would deſerve who had given his patient arſenic, it may eaſily be determined thus: if he was a mad-man, his actions would be judged like thoſe of madmen. If he was not a madman, it would be judged according as his ignorance had been voluntary or involuntary. Now by voluntary ignorance, we are to underſtand that which ariſes from idleneſs, or ſome other fault, which it is in our own power to amend.

[D] *This is an omiſſion that deſerves cenſure.*] Paulus Jovius, Scævola Sammarthanus, and ſeveral other panegyrical Writers have frequently been guilty of the ſame fault. Were they afraid that a date would ſpoil the cadence of a period? Were they ſtudious of brevity? How trifling would all ſuch excuſes be? If they were regulated by ſuch ridiculous motives, why did they not put in the margin what they are blamed for having omitted? I am certain that, on ſome occaſions, they were ſilent, becauſe they did not know in what year their heroes were born or died. The Author of the elogium of Ruffi cannot therefore be excuſed upon ſuch an ignorance. But, will it be ſaid in his favour, does not he ſay that the Hiſtory of Marſeilles was printed, when the Author was but five and thirty? Does not he ſay that the Author lived to the age of eighty two? Is it not eaſy to infer from thence that he was born in 1607, and died in 1689? I anſwer in the negative, becauſe he does not tell us that the Hiſtory of Marſeilles was printed in 1642; and that we do not find ſuch a date either in the dedication, in the Preface, in the King's licence, or in any part of the Prolegomena. Conſequently another book is wanted to diſcover the year in which this Author lived, and that in which he died. This conſequently is a fault; for with regard to ſuch particulars, a reader ſhould not be put to the trouble of conſulting other pages of the ſame book, much leſs ſhould he be obliged to have recourſe to another?

RUFINUS, the Emperor Theodoſius's favourite, "was born in Gaul, in the Pro- "vince of Aquitain (a), in mean circumſtances, but poſſeſſed an exalted genius; of a "ſupple, inſinuating, and polite turn, fit to divert a Prince, and capable even of do- "ing him ſervices. He came to the Court of Conſtantinople, where he got friends and "patrons; was known to Theodoſius, and ingratiated himſelf into his favour. He "made ſuch good uſe of this riſe of fortune, that he ſoon obtained conſiderable prefer- "ments. The Emperor appointed him high Steward of his Palace *; admitted him "into all his Counſels; honoured him with his friendſhip and confidence, and at laſt "made him Conſul with his ſon Arcadius. This man preſerved himſelf, as he had "begun, in his employments, by his artifices rather than his virtue. His ambition "grew with his fortune; he endeavouring to enrich himſelf with the ſpoils of thoſe "whom he oppreſſed by his calumnies †. Whoever poſſeſſed extraordinary merit, and "could contend with him for his exalted ſtation, was ſure to be his enemy. However, "being

(a) Born in Eluſis, according to Claudian. It was then the chief city of the country, now called Armagnac, in Gaſcony, properly ſo called.

* *Zozim. l. 4. Ambr. Ep. 53.*

† *Claudian. l. 1. contra Ruff.*

" being afraid of losing his Prince's friendship, in case he did not preserve his esteem, " he put on a shew of modesty and disinterestedness. He covered his evil Counsels " with the specious pretence of justice or policy; and knew so well how to set off his " good qualities, and conceal his bad ones, that the Emperor, though possessed of so " much knowledge, and so jealous of his authority, was frequently imposed upon and " governed without perceiving he was so. The chief Lords of the Court were exaspe- " rated at the rise of this favourite ** ; accordingly they conspired against him, and " resolved to ruin him (*b*);" but all their endeavours proved either their own destruction, or strengthened his authority [*A*]. He was baptised with great pomp and ceremony in 394 [*B*]. His vexation to see Stilico above him, after Theodosius's death, prompted him to some treasonable attempts which undid him. *He took advantage of his master's weakness; divided the Empires and the Emperors, by his secret practices with the Huns, the Goths, and the Alans*; *and* attempted *to make himself Sovereign, at least independent both on his masters and enemies* (*c*). He was killed in 395 (*d*). See Moreri. His death put an end to the doubts, which Claudian entertained, with regard to a providence;

** *Zos.*

(*b*) Flechier, *Hist. de Theodose*, lib. 4. p. 433. Paris edit. 1680, 12mo.

(*c*) Idem, ibid. p. 500.

(*d*) But according to Mr. Flechier, ibid. p. 437, this must be the year 397.

[*A*] *All their endeavours proved either their own destruction, or strengthened his authority.*] The persons who conspired his ruin were (1) *Timasius and Promotus, who were come from commanding the army, and had done some important services. . . . . Tatianus who had governed all the East during the absence of Theodosius, . . . and Proculus the son of Tatianus, Governor of Constantinople, a bold and enterprising young man. Rufinus being informed of all their machinations, prepossessed the Emperor in his favour, and represented to him* (2), that the favours he received daily from his Majesty made him odious to the whole Court; that how careful soever he was to stop the murmurs of those who envied him, factions and cabals were daily formed against him; that he must inevitably sink, if he was not supported by the same hand which had raised him; that he was conscious of his own demerits; and gloried only in the kindness his Majesty was pleased to have for him, and the thankfulness he should for ever entertain on that account. *Having in this manner engaged the Emperor to protect him, he not only endeavoured to guard against all snares, but also to ruin his enemies . . Being in the Council with Promotus, they disputed very warmly together* *. *The Emperor being gone out of the Council, their dispute broke out again; each insisted upon his opinion, and they grew warm insensibly. Rufinus speaking some injurious words, Promotus flew into a passion, and struck him in the face. . . . . The Emperor, to whom Rufinus went immediately and made his complaint, was highly exasperated. He openly declared,* that he was weary of those divisions and intrigues, and those who were Authors of them; that he would oblige them to live without variance, and regard the persons for whom he had an affection; and that if the jealousy conceived against Rufinus did not cease, he would raise him so far above those who envied him, that they should be obliged to respect, and perhaps to obey him. *This Prince, who spoke with authority, and could make himself be feared, whenever it was necessary, spoke those words with so much warmth, that no person dared to murmur. He banished Promotus from the Court; and bestowed, soon after, on Rufinus, the employment of Præfect of the Prætorium. The new honour, to which this favourite was raised, and the Emperor's protection, which he was sure of, gave him a more easy opportunity of revenging himself on his enemies. Promotus did not long survive this disgrace; for having received orders to go and join the army, and to march against the Bastarnæ who plundered Thrace, he was killed, by a party of those barbarians, in an ambuscade; on which occasion many charged Rufinus with being, treacherously, the cause of it. Proculus came to no less fatal an end* †. *Rufinus impeached him of several high crimes; bribed the Commissioners who were appointed to try him; forced them clandestinely to sentence him to death; and disposed matters so, that the pardon, which Theodosius sent him, did not arrive till after the execution. He had crossed Tatianus* ** *in his domestick concerns; and Timasius would not have escaped better than the rest, had he not sued for his favourite's friendship, and shared in his crimes.*

(1) Flechier, *Hist. de Theodose*, book 4. p. 434. ad ann. 391.

(2) Ibid. p. 435. ad ann. 392.

* *Zos. l. 4.*

† *Zos. l. 4.*

** *Ambr. ep. 53.*

[*B*] *He was baptised with great pomp and ceremony in* 394.] Flechier gives us a beautiful description of this, which is preceded by a passage that is a masterpiece in its kind, for which reason I shall give his words somewhat at length. " Rufinus, who go- " verned the Empire with absolute sway in Theodo- " sius's absence, . . . had for many years covered his " vanity and ambition with the specious appearances " of an affected modesty; and whether to ingratiate " himself the more with the Emperor, who loved " him, or to give less jealousy to the Courtiers who " envied his fortune, he grew every day more power- " ful, without appearing prouder. He secretly en- " deavoured to enrich himself; and though he was " naturally fond of splendor and noise, yet his co- " vetousness restrained his pride. But when he found " himself secure of his master's favour, and grown " very rich, either by his munificence, or by his " own rapacious and unjust conduct, he gave a loose " to his natural temper, and grew insolent, as soon " as he thought he could safely shew himself so " with impunity. He procured himself a great " number of creatures; appeared in publick with " a greater retinue than became a private man, " and raised palaces that were more splendid than " even those of the Emperors. He had been espe- " cially solicitous about building near one of the " suburbs of Chalcedon, called the Suburb of the " Oak *, a country seat, so vastly large, that it " looked like a town; and so richly adorned, and " furnished so magnificently, that one would have " concluded a private man could scarce be rich " enough to lay out such prodigious sums. On one " side was seen a great Church, in honour of the " Apostles St. Peter and Paul; and on the other ap- " peared at a distance, and standing on an adjacent " hill, a Monastery, which was to be a kind of nur- " sery to supply that Church with Ministers; as " soon as these buildings were finished, Rufinus re- " solved to be baptised; and to solemnize, at the " same time, with all imaginable pomp, the dedi- " cation of that new Church (3). . . . . With great " ostentation and pride, blended with a small pro- " portion of religion, he † summoned the Bishops " from all parts of the East, those especially who " possessed the principal Sees. He even besought, " by repeated letters, the most famous Anchorets of " Egypt to leave their solitude, and come and assist " in that famous ceremony. The rank he held in " the Empire, the chief direction of which he had " under Arcadius, prompted a great number of Bishops " to set out immediately upon their receiving this " invitation; bringing with them the most holy per- " sons in their several Provinces. The assembly was " very numerous. Nectarius of Constantine, Theo- " philus of Alexandria, and Flavianus of Antioch, " three Patriarchs: Gregory Bishop of Nyssa, Amphi- " lochus of Iconium, Paul of Heraclea, Dioscorus of " Helenopolis, and many more famous Prelates were " come thither first. The principal Nobility and " Clergy, and a numberless multitude of people re- " sorted thither; some to honour this Festival, others " to pay their Court to that favourite, and many to " satisfy their curiosity. This ceremony was per- " formed in September. The Church was hung with " rich tapestry, and the altar glittered with gold " and jewels. The consecration was performed with " the utmost order and magnificence. Divine ser- " vice being ended, they proceeded, with the like

* *Zos. l. 3. c. 17.*

(3) Flechier, *Hist. de Theodose*, book 4. p. 486. ad ann. 394.

† *Theodoret. l. 1. c. 31. Socrat. l. 2. c. 5. Pallad. in Lausiac. c. 4.*

vidence ; he being fully perſuaded of it, after the fall of ſo inſolent and unjuſt a favourite. I ſhall make ſome reflections on his words [C] ; and this will give me occaſion to

" pomp, to the baptiſm of Rufinus. He was made
" a Chriſtian by Nectarius the Patriarch ; and the
" famous Evagrius of Pontus, who had been ſent
** *Pallad. in Lauſiac.* " for from Egypt with Ammonius the Anchoret, re-
" ceived, after the baptiſm was ended **, this re-
" generated man, who did not long retain his inno-
" cence. Thus ended that ſolemnity, which would
" have been one of the holieſt and moſt magnificent
" the Eaſtern Church ever ſaw, had it not been in-
" termixed with profane luxury; and had not this
" Stateſman attempted to get again from the people,
" by his unjuſt practices, the immenſe ſums which
" he ſeemed, on that occaſion, to have laid out in
(4) Flechier, *Hiſt. de Theodoſe*, book 4. p. 488. " the ſervice of God (4)."

[C] *I ſhall make ſome reflections on* Claudian's doubts (5).] He declares that the beautiful order, which is
(5) Relating to divine providence. ſeen in nature, prompted him to believe, that it is governed by the moſt wiſe laws of an infinite God ; but that the irregularities and diſorders which are found among mankind, the proſperity of the wicked, and the infelicity of the virtuous, prompted him to follow the hypotheſis of Epicurus, who ſuppoſed that all things were the effect of chance, and that the Gods did not concern themſelves with the government of the world. However, ſays he, the puniſhment of Rufinus has removed my doubts. I entirely abſolve the Gods. I no longer complain becauſe the wicked obtain ſo much power ; for they are raiſed with no other deſign, but in order that they may fall the lower. But it is better to hear Claudian himſelf.

Sæpe mihi dubiam traxit ſententia mentem,
Curarent Superi terras, an nullus ineſſet
Rector, & incerto fluerent mortalia caſu.
Nam cum diſpoſiti quæſiſſem fœdera mundi,
Præſcriptoſque maris fines, annique meatus,
Et lucis, noctiſque vices, tunc omnia rebar
Conſilio firmata Dei, qui lege moveri
Sidera, qui fruges diverſo tempore naſci,
Qui variam Phœben alieno juſſerit igne
Compleri, Solemque ſuo : porrexerit undis
Littora ; tellurem medio libraverit axe.
Sed cum res hominum tanta caligine volvi
Adſpicerem, lætoſque diu florere nocentes,
Vexarique pios : rurſus labefacta cadebat
Relligio, cauſſæque viam non ſponte ſequebar
Alterius, vacuo quæ currere ſemina motu
Affirmat, magnumque novas per inane figuras
Fortuna, non arte, regi : quæ Numina ſenſu
Ambiguo vel nulla putat, vel neſcia noſtri
Abſtulit hunc tandem Rufini pœna tumultum,
Abſolvitque Deos. Jam non ad culmina rerum
Injuſtos creviſſe queror, tolluntur in altum,
Ut lapſu graviore ruant (6).

(6) Claudian, *in Rufin.* lib. 1. *init.*

" Frequent my mind ſad doubts has entertain'd,
" Whether the Gods regard terreſtial things ;
" Or, (none preſiding) they, by chance, are hurl'd.
" For, when my eyes beheld this beauteous frame,
" And all things moving in ſuch glorious order ;
" The ſwelling ſea within its bounds reſtrain'd ;
" The various progreſs of the rolling year ;
" And the alternate change of day and night :
" I thence concluded, that a Deity
" Directed all with an almighty ſway.
" That he gave motion to the circling planets ;
" And bid the fruits in various ſeaſons riſe.
" Bid the fair moon with borrowed luſtre ſhine,
" And Phœbus glitter by his native rays.
" Bid the proud waves extend to every ſhore,
" And this round ball to hang on its own axis.
" But when I ſaw all human things involv'd
" In ſuch deep gloom ; the wicked flouriſh high,
" And good men groan beneath a load of woe :
" Religion's dictates ſoon forſook my boſom,
" And I the fam'd hypotheſis maintain'd,
" Which wildly fancies, that the ſeeds of things,
" Confus'dly hurl'd thro' the extended void,
" Not by amazing art, but chance, produc'd
" Th' unnumber'd worlds that compaſs us around :
" Which vainly thinks no deities exiſt,
" Or that they proudly diſregard vain mortals.
" But now, the puniſhment Rufinus met with,
" Has clear'd my anxious doubts, and juſtified
" Th' immortal Gods. I now no more complain
" To ſee the wicked rais'd to forune's ſummit :
" For ſuch are lifted to a greater height,
" Only to make their ſudden fall more dreadful."

I promiſed, in the Article of Marſhal d'Ancre (7), to mention here the reflections of Balzac on a thought of Malherbe, which is like that of Claudian, and will now be as good as my word. " (8) It is true that
" men ſpoke in this manner, before they had been
" better inſtructed by the Chriſtian Religion. The
" Gods were accuſed of all the wicked actions com-
" mitted by men. Divine providence was daily im-
" peached, by ſome one or other who complained of
" the things of this world, as not going as they
" would have them. THIS FORTUNATE TY-
" RANT BEARS WITNESS AGAINST GOD, is
" an old ſaying mentioned by your Tully ; and no-
" thing is ſo common in the verſes of the heathen
" Poets, as the guilt of their gods, and of their fate :
" *Crimen Deorum, Fatorum crimen, &c.* Cynthia is
" ſick ; and if her ſickneſs ſhould kill her, ſays the
" Poet who was in love with her, *the God of phyſic will*
" *be the guilty cauſe of ſo great a beauty's death.*

(7) See the art. CONCINI, rem. [F].

(8) Balzac, *Socrate Chretien*, p. m. 237.

" *Tam formoſa tuum Mortua crimen erit.*

" Nay, ſince the reign of Conſtantine, and under
" Theodoſius's ſon's, there are inſtances of this poeti-
" cal blaſphemy and profane liberty. If Rufinus had
" not been puniſhed for his crimes, the gods would
" have been impeached, as Rufinus's fautors and ac-
" complices.

" *Abſtulit hunc tandem Rufini pœna timorem* (9),
" *Abſolvitque Deos.*

(9) It ſhould be *tumultum*. Menage in his *Obſer. ſur Malherbe*, p. 431, did not take notice of this miſtake of Balzac, whoſe words he cites.

" One of our Poets has wrote ſomething like to this,
" but in a moſt excellent manner, and his copy exceeds
" all his originals. I offer it as a maſter-piece, in
" the ode which may be put in parallel with the
" moſt beautiful and moſt finiſhed pieces of antiqui-
" ty. The God of the Seine addreſſes himſelf to a
" favourite, who was going over the *pont-neuf* (new
" bridge)." I ſhall not copy thoſe verſes of Mal-herbe, cited by Balzac ; the concluſion of them being tranſcribed in the remark [E] of the article CONCINI. To theſe words of Balzac I will add the following of Menage (10). By the way this thought,

(10) Menage, *Obſervat. ſur Malherbe*, p. 432.

And heav'n, accus'd of winking at thy crimes,
Is now reſolv'd to juſtify itſelf,

was not hit upon originally by Claudian ; it being mentioned by ſeveral authors who lived long before him. Tully, in his de Natura deorum, *book III:* Diogenes quidem Cynicus dicere ſolebat, Harpalum, qui temporibus illis prædo felix habebatur, contra Deos teſtimonium dicere, quòd in illa fortuna tam diu viveret. *And in another place in the ſame book,* Improborum igitur proſperitates, ſecundæque res redarguunt, ut Diogenes dicebat, vim omnem Deorum ac poteſtatem, *Martial :*

Nullos eſſe Deos, inane cœlum
Affirmat Selius ; probatque, quòd ſe
Factum, dum negat hæc, videt beatum.

" Selius affirms, there are no Gods,
" But empty ſkies ; which well he proves,
" Since he, who ſays ſo, yet is happy.

Seneca ſays in this ſenſe, Deorum crimen, Sylla tam felix ; i. e. " The Gods are guilty in Sylla's being ſo
" happy ;" *and an ancient Greek comic Poet,*

Θεῦ δ' ὄνειδος, τοὺς κακοὺς εὐδαιμονεῖν.

" It is a reproach to God when villains flouriſh."

Barthius

to enquire, whether all thoſe who have maintained the orthodox opinion with regard to providence,

(11) Barthius, *ad Claudian. in Rufin.* lib. 1. *init.* p. 1078, & *ſeq.*

(12) *Apud Regem Prophetam Pſalm.* 73 & 93. *Hiobum cap.* 23. *Habacuc cap.* 1. *Maleachum, c.* 3. Barthius, ibid. p. 1082.

(13) See rem. [H] of the art. PAYS.

(14) Plin. lib. 2. cap. 7. p. m. 145.

(15) See, on this ſubject, an obſervation againſt Coſtar, citat. 51, of the art. HERCULES.

Barthius (11) has collected a very great number of the like ſayings, and did not omit ſuch as are found in the Scriptures (12). We may bring under this head all thoſe paſſages of the ancients, in which fortune is exclaimed againſt, as a blind, inconſtant, vagabond, unjuſt being; as one who patronizes the worthleſs (13). One of theſe paſſages may ſerve here as a ſpecimen of the reſt, and it ſhall be borrowed from Pliny (14): *Invenit inter has utraſque ſententias medium ſibi ipſa mortalitas numen, quo minus etiam plana de Deo conjectatio eſſet. Toto quippe mundo, & locis omnibus, omnibuſque horis omnium vocibus Fortuna ſola invocatur: una nominatur, una accuſatur, una agitur rea, una cogitatur, ſola laudatur, ſola arguitur, & cum convitiis colitur* (15): *volubilis, à pleriſque vero & cæca etiam exiſtimata, vaga, inconſtans, incerta, varia, indignorumque fautrix. Huic omnia expenſa, huic omnia feruntur accepta: & in tota ratione mortalium, ſola utramque paginam facit. Adeoque obnoxiæ ſumus ſortis, ut Sors ipſa pro Deo ſit, qua Deus probatur incertus.* i. e. "Mankind have invented, between theſe two opinions, a medium, whereby the conjecture with regard to the exiſtence of a God is become more uncertain than before. For in every part of the world, in all places, and at all times, fortune alone is invoked by all perſons; is only named, accuſed, condemned, thought on, praiſed, cenſured, and adored with reproaches; fickle, and thought by moſt people to be blind; inconſtant, uncertain, various, and a fautor of the undeſerving. To her all things given and received are aſcribed; and ſhe is conſidered as all in all in human affairs. And we are ſo greatly ſubjected to chance, that chance itſelf is looked upon as a God, whereby the exiſtence of a God is made uncertain." It may be affirmed that, in all ages and in all nations, not excepting our age nor the Chriſtian world, the proſperity of the wicked has made people murmur againſt God, and occaſioned many doubts with regard to a Providence. On the other hand, this objection has been anſwered in all times and places; ſince therefore it has been perpetually revived, notwithſtanding all the replies made to it, we muſt conclude, that it has ſomething very ſpecious; and bears I know not what proportion to our underſtandings, which makes it eaſily return to our minds, though we ſhould attempt to drive it out in the moſt forcible manner (16). One would conclude, that what is beautifully ſaid of the palm-tree might be applied to it, *curvata reſurgo* (I riſe by oppreſſion); replies may indeed make me bend a little, but I immediately am reſtored to what I was before. The buſineſs is not to enquire whether it be ſolid, for we ought ot be firmly perſuaded that it is falſe, and inſignificant; but perhaps it may not be improper to enquire whether Claudian made a good anſwer to it.

(16) It is like nature, *Naturam expellas furca, tamen uſque recurret.* Horat. Epiſt. 10. lib. 1. ver. 24.

Conſiderations concerning the methods of anſwering the doubts with regard to a providence. Laws of diſputation.

Some perſons might ſay to him, you did not take a right courſe; the only anſwer you ought to have made to your difficulty was, to conſider the vaſt and immenſe idea of the ſupremely-perfect Being, and to draw the following conſequence from it; he is author of all things, he governs them all; nothing is therefore done but what is governed and conducted in an infinitely juſt, and infinitely admirable manner. This is doubtleſs the right way to remove all doubts; put reaſon to ſilence, and oblige it to ſubmit to authority (17); God ſaid it, *αὐτὸς ἔφα*; God has done it, God has permitted it; it is therefore true and juſt; wiſely done and wiſely permitted. If you will deſcend to particular reaſons, you will never extricate yourſelf; and after a thouſand diſputes, you will be forced to have recourſe to authority, and to the immenſe idea of the ſupremely perfect Being. But ſince we muſt come to it at laſt, let us keep, and adhere immoveably to it: let us lay our finger on our mouth, ſilence our imperfect knowledge; firmly perſuaded that, in ſuch things, the beſt uſe we can make of our reaſon is not to reaſon at all. Let us inforce more ſtrongly the motives of this method. When a perſon engages in a diſpute, he ought to affirm, that he will prove to his adverſary that he is in the wrong; but he muſt not affirm, that he will make him acquieſce in his firſt or ſecond anſwers.

(17) I was dumb, I opened not my mouth; becauſe thou didſt it. *Pſalm* xxxix. ver. 10.

The laws of this ſort of diſputations require, that each party reply to the other, ſo often as they can oppoſe argument to argument, and till the matter be brought to its firſt principles. If I can ſhew a man, that his poſition is repugnant to the common notions, and that mine is a natural and neceſſary conſequence of theſe notions, I may juſtly ceaſe to hear him, and ſilence him with the following axiom, that we ought not to diſpute againſt a man who denies the principles, *Adverſus negantem principia non eſt diſputandum:* but if I give only a probable ſolution to his difficulties, to which he may oppoſe new doubts, equally probable, or almoſt as probable, as thoſe of my ſolution, I have no reaſon to inſiſt upon his acquieſcing to my anſwers: I ought to ſearch for new ſolutions to his new difficulties; and if I do not find any evident ones, or ſuch as do not admit of a ſpecious reply, I ought to retire from the combat, without declaring myſelf victorious; for otherwiſe I ſhould imitate thoſe, who attempted to make converts of the Proteſtants in France. The Romaniſts in queſtion began about the year 1680, to offer to diſpute on religion with their miſtaken brethren, to inform and inſtruct them cordially; but after they had replied two or three times, they would no longer ſuffer themſelves to be contradicted; they would oblige thoſe whom they were converting, to ſubmit to their explanations, otherwiſe they declared that they were obſtinate. But it would have been much better, if they had ſaid this at firſt: it is ridiculous for a perſon to enter into diſcuſſions, if he will not permit his adverſaries to make an hundred replies, if he is able to do it, and if he is able to alledge againſt the tenth reply, an argument as probable, as the objection might be, which he propoſed to the main poſition or aſſertion. This is the true ſtate of diſputations. Your adverſary attacks your aſſertion; you reply; but your reply often lyes more open to difficulties than the poſition itſelf. You ought therefore to confute his reply. Your new anſwer contains I know not what, which raiſes new difficulties more plauſible than the firſt. They therefore muſt be examined, and ſo on *in infinitum*, unleſs you bring common notions (18) on your ſide, to confound your antagoniſt. Such are the laws of diſputation: if you do not intend to keep to them, you had better not enter the liſts, but ſay at once, this muſt be believed without entring into argument: God has ſaid ſo, that is ſufficient.

(18) I underſtand, by common notions, all the principles which the two contending parties are agreed upon.

But this would be an unjuſt way of diſputing, was the ſtate of the queſtion as follows; *Has God ſpoke?* but it would not be unjuſt, when we diſpute with perſons, who acknowledge the exiſtence of a ſupremely-perfect Being; and who ſuggeſt doubts to themſelves, upon pretence that the good are unhappy, and the wicked proſperous. The only anſwer, which ſhould be made to perſons who doubt thus, is this. You are perſuaded of the exiſtence of a ſupremely-perfect being or nature; you ought therefore to believe that it governs all things perfectly well; for if you did not draw this conſequence from the principle you admit, you muſt be ignorant of the firſt rules of common ſenſe, and you might as well argue thus; the ſun cannot produce darkneſs, and therefore he has produced it. To ſhew that we ought to keep to ſuch a ſhort anſwer, and this general principle of the exiſtence of God, I will ſhew the inconveniencies which ariſe from a diſcuſſion of particular reaſons. In the firſt place, it is certain that, in ſuch a caſe you are obliged to anſwer all the replies of your adverſary, till you can bring an argument to which no reaſonable reply can be made; and theſe are the laws of diſputation, as I obſerved above. Secondly; it is certain that your particular reaſons will be oppoſed *in infinitum*, by other reaſons full as ſpecious, at leaſt. I will here give a little ſpecimen of this. Our Poet would have alledged to another man, the ſame reaſon which removed all his doubts. He would have ſaid to him, ſince Rufinus was puniſhed, there is a providence which governs all things with wiſdom and juſtice. The proſperous condition of this wicked man did not prove that providence was aſleep, but on the contrary, that it had a more ſevere puniſhment

Providence, have well obſerved the rules of diſputation.

Naudæus aſſerts a very great falſity, *viz.* that Rufinus has been applauded by three or

in ſtore for him: it lifted him up, in order that, precipitating from a greater height, he might have a worſe fall, and break all his bones

Tolluntur in altum,
Ut lapſu graviore ruant.

" For ſuch are lifted to a greater height,
" Only to make their ſudden fall more dreadful."

Claudian might have been anſwered; if this is all you know, the difficulty is as great as ever; though your ſolution be ever ſo ancient, this does not make it better. Juvenal had before ſaid of Sejanus:

Nam qui nimios optabat honores,
Et nimias poſcebat opes, numeroſa parabat
Excelſæ turris tabulata, unde altior eſſet
Caſus, & impulſæ præceps immane ruinæ (19).

(19) Juven. ſat. 10. ver. 104.

" For he who graſp'd the world's exhauſted ſtore,
" Yet never had enough, but wiſh'd for more,
" Rais'd a top-heavy tow'r of monſtrous height,
" Which mould'ring, cruſh'd him underneath the
" weight." DRYDEN.

Whilſt you ſolve one difficulty you raiſe another ſtill greater. Your particle *UT* ſtrikes with horror, and one cannot read it without trembling. You aſcribe to the moſt ſupremely-perfect Being, and conſequently infinitely good, a motive and a final cauſe, which, ſo far from containing the leaſt characteriſticks of goodneſs, are the moſt tyrannical and malicious that can be conceived. It is as if one of our Emperors, deſirous of putting to death ſome of his domeſticks, ſhould appoint new Governours of provinces; permit them there to exerciſe violence of every kind, and ſuck their marrow, as it were; it is, I ſay, as if he ſhould permit this, in order to puniſh them with the greater ſeverity. If Claudian had preſumed to advance the ſame with regard to Theodoſius as he did of God, viz. that he raiſed Rufinus to the higheſt employments, only to cruſh him with greater ſeverity, and, to ſhew his ſubjects the ſupreme power with which he could raiſe or depreſs, he would have ordered him to be hanged, as a ſatyrical Poet who had inſolently defamed him. Claudian would doubtleſs perceive the enormity of the particle *UT*, and of his final cauſe; and beg that his words might not be taken in a ſtrict and criminal ſenſe. He would ſay the deſign of Providence, in heaping up ſuch vaſt riches upon the infamous Rufinus, was not to inflict the heavier puniſhment upon him, but in hopes that this favourite would make a good uſe of it. He would add, that, according to the laws of nature, bodies would fall with the more violence, according to the height of the place from whence they fell; and conſequently that Rufinus's elevation would aggravate his puniſhment, when his continual abuſe of the heavenly favours called out for his being puniſhed. But this, would Claudian be anſwered, does not ſolve the difficulty; hope has nothing to do with the divine Being. God knows moſt certainly whatever ſhall come to paſs; he knew very certainly how much Rufinus would abuſe the favours indulged him by heaven. It therefore would have been better to have prevented, and reſtrained his hand, than wink'd at his crimes for many years, in order to inflict a puniſhment on him which cannot compenſate for the evil he has committed; the oppreſſion of ſo many innocent perſons, the death of ſuch multitudes, and the ruin of ſo many families (20). It is but a poor ſatisfaction for a province ruined by its Governor, for the people to be aſſured that he ſhall be puniſhed for it. It is ſtill as miſerable as before, whilſt the criminal finds his advantage in it.

(20) *Cur omnium crudeliſſimus tamdiu Pinna reſervavit? At dedit pœnas. Prohiberi melius fuit, impedireque ne tot ſummos viros interficeret, quam aliquando pœnas dare.* Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*, lib. 3. cap. 32.

Exul ab octava Marius bibit, & fruitur Diis
Iratis: at tu victrix provincia ploras (21).

(21) Juven. ſat. 1. ver. 49.

" Marius
" Enjoys his exile; and, condemn'd in vain,
" Leaves thee, prevailing province, to complain.
DRYDEN.

I ſhall not carry farther the replies, which the Poet might make; I don't doubt but he might have a very large number of them; but then his adverſary would have as great a number, and be always like to thoſe which the Reader has ſeen; I mean, that they would be more proportionate than thoſe of Claudian to the notions of our minds, and to the ideas, according to which we judge of the perfection of a Government. I ſuppoſe that, after a long diſpute, his adverſary would ſay to him, I believe, as well as you, that whatever happened in the affair of Rufinus, is juſt, wiſe and perfect with reſpect to God; but it is not the force of your arguments that makes me believe ſo, for theſe are apt rather to raiſe doubts, than to calm the irreſolution of the mind. However, make uſe of them with regard to ſuch as will be paid in ſuch coin, but do not employ them to ſuch as carry arguments to a great length. The idea of the ſupremely perfect Being ought to ſuffice, and does ſuffice them, when they make right uſe of their reaſon. I knew ſome perſons, who had read over ſeveral times Boetius *de Conſolatione Philoſophiæ*, and were greatly ſurprized at the difference they always obſerved between that Author's objections and anſwers. Boetius was both an able Philoſopher and a very good man. Groaning under the weight of his dreadful misfortunes, and his ſoul being oppreſſed with grief, he ſuppoſes that Philoſophy comes to comfort him. He raiſes ſeveral objections to her with regard to Providence, and Philoſophy anſwers them as well as ſhe can; but whereas the difficulties raiſed by Boetius are adapted to perſons of the leaſt capacity, and pierce, with their ſtrong light, the dulleſt underſtandings, the ſolutions cannot be underſtood without the ſtrongeſt attention, and the utmoſt vivacity. Philoſophy cannot conceal her diffidence; ſhe is perpetually deſiring that ſhe may wind about, and to trace matters higher; and how juſt ſoever what ſhe ſays may be, we ſometimes are ſo unhappy as not to underſtand her; and though ſhe ſometimes convinces us, it is almoſt always without enlightening the mind. This is what ſome Readers of Boetius ſay. They obſerved to me, that a very ſubtile Profeſſor of the 17th century defended the honour of Philoſophy with greater dexterity than he did; for after introducing a heathen, who raiſes in his own mind a thouſand doubts with regard to Providence, he gives him no other expedient but the grace of the holy ſpirit (22).

(22) *Unde Philoſophus noſter ethnicus tot difficultatibus oppreſſus, niſi afflatu divino animetur ad cognitionem Dei unius ac diſtincti ab univerſo nunquam aſſurget.* Claudius Berigardus, *in priores Libros Phyſ. Ariſtot.* Circulo 20. *in fine.*

I muſt not conclude this remark, without obſerving the injuſtice of certain people, who fancy that ſuch as reject the reaſons they give for a doctrine reject the doctrine itſelf. But there is the utmoſt difference between theſe two things. Perſons of an equitable and judicious turn of mind will not fail to diſtinguiſh them; and permit others very patiently, and without entertaining the leaſt ſuſpicion, to oppoſe the raſhneſs of the orthodox, in the weak arguments they too often make uſe of to aſſert the truth. It is not but that many abuſes may be committed on this occaſion; for inſtance, the Scepticks, upon pretence of only combating the arguments of the Dogmatiſts with regard to the exiſtence of a God, did actually undermine the doctrine itſelf. They declared at firſt (23), that they followed the common opinion, without adhering to any particular ſect; that they owned there are Gods, that they honoured and aſcribed a providence to them; but that they could not bear to have the Dogmatiſts reaſon about them; after this they propoſed objections to them, which, by overthrowing Providence, tended to overthrow the exiſtence of a Deity. See Sextus Empiricus (24), who, inſtead of grounding his doubts, as Claudian does, on the proſperity of the wicked, grounds them on the adverſity and evil, with which the world abounds. He alledges

(23) Sext. Empiricus, *Pyrrhon. Hypotyp.* lib. 3. cap. 1.

(24) Idem, ibid.

or four famous Hiſtorians [*D*].

alledges an argument which has been better told than refuted by Lactantius. See remark [*E*], citation (16), of the article PAULICIANS, and the following words of a Jeſuit, who obſerves that Arnobius owns this argument is unanſwerable. *Poſſet denique cum Sexto Empirico, lib.* 1. (it ſhould be ſaid the third.) *Pyrrhonicarum hypotypoſeon, cap.* 1. *fieri tale argumentum, quòd ſi Deus ſit, cùm ſit bonus infinitè, & perfectiſſimus, nulla in mundo eſſet malitia aut imperfectio: nam contrarium unum infinitum deſtruit totaliter aliud. Cui argumento reſponſurus Arnobius, lib.* 2. *num.* 49. *poſt multam exaggerationem difficultatis, inſolubilem exiſtimare videtur. Alexander autem quem refert & latè rejicit Simplic.* 2. *cœli*, in fine, *concedit Deum non poſſe mala excludere, alioqui ea omnino fuiſſe prohibiturum. Et verò hoc ipſum argumentum multos Philoſophos vexaſſe, teſtatur Lactantius libro de ira Dei, cap.* 13. *Sed rectè reſpondet Scot, &c.* (25).

(25) Theoph. Raynaud. *Theolog. naturali*, diſtinc. 5. num. 166. p. m. 532, 533.

[*D*] *Naudæus aſſerts a very great falſity*, viz. *that Rufinus has been applauded by three or four famous Hiſtorians.*] "Claudian inveighs ſtrongly againſt Ru-
" finus ..... who nevertheleſs is prodigiouſly ap-
" plauded by Zozimus, Zonaras, Eutropius, and Pau-
" lus Oroſius (26)." Theſe are Naudæus's words.

(26) Naudé, *Dialog. de Maſcurat*, p. 630.

If we take a view of theſe four Authors, it will ſoon appear that he is miſtaken. Oroſius (27) ſpeaks ill of Rufinus; and Eutropius ſays neither good nor ill of him; his hiſtory ending with the death of Jovian, who lived before Theodoſius. I do not find any thing in Zonaras's Annals relating to our Rufinus. The Rufinus ſpoken of by this Annaliſt (28), was Conſul of Rome at the ſame time that Pyrrhus made war with the Romans: and with regard to Zozimus, ſo far from his praiſing prodigiouſly Rufinus, he repreſents him as a wicked man. I could tranſcribe ſeveral paſſages in his hiſtory, which prove this evidently, but it will be ſufficient for me to copy the following. Ρυφῖνος μὲν οὖν, ἰδίᾳ τε πολλοῖς κακῶν ἀποφορήτων γενόμενος αἴτιος, καὶ τῇ πολιτείᾳ λυμηνάμενος ἁπάσῃ, δίκην ἔξετισε τῶν πεπεηρευμένων ἀξίαν (29). i. e. " But Rufinus, who, in his private character, had great-
" ly injured many, and done the utmoſt prejudice to
" his country, met with the puniſhment due to his
" horrid crimes." We can ſcarce conceive how it was poſſible for Naudæus, who had read ſo much and had ſo ſtrong a memory, to commit ſo many faults in ſo few lines.

(27) See chap. 37. of book 7.

(28) Zonaras, *Ann.* lib. 8. p. 377, 379. edit. Paris 1686.

(29) Zozimus, lib. 5. p. 297. edit. Oxon. 1679.

RUGGERI (*a*) (COSMO), a Florentine, introduced himſelf at the Court of France as a great aſtrologer, at the time that Catharine de Medicis patronized thoſe people. He was a man of ſenſe, and looked upon as a ſcholar; beſides, he was bold even to impudence, whereby he inſinuated himſelf among the nobility, and was a great man at intrigue (*b*). Catharine de Medicis gave him the Abbey of St. Mahé in Lower Brittany. He had calculated the nativity of all the Noblemen of the Court; on which occaſion he gave them ſuch informations, as he thought would draw moſt money from them (*c*). He at laſt was looked upon as a ſoothſayer and magician; and in 1574 was involved in the proſecution of la Mole and Coconas [*A*], accuſed, among other crimes, of employing ſorcery, in order to kill King Charles IX. He is called Coſmo the Italian in that proſecution (*d*), the reſult of which, with regard to him, was, his being ſentenced to the gallies; but the Queen-mother releaſed him from them ſome time after (*e*). He perſuaded la Mole, and ſeveral others, that he could make waxen images, ſome of which would inſpire women with love; and others make any perſon they pleaſed die in a lingring condition.

(*a*) Balzac, *Socrate Chretien*, p. m. 253, calls hm *Coſme Roger.*

(*b*) Garaſſe, *Doctrine Curieuſe*, p. 155.

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) *Mercure François*, Tom. 4. p. 46. ad ann. 1615.

(*e*) See the rem. [*A*].

[*A*] *He ... was involved in the proſecution of La Mole and Coconas.*] Theſe were two favourites of Duke d'Alenzon, brother to Charles IX. who had prompted, or aſſiſted their Sovereign, in the commiſſion of ſome very criminal deſigns. I will take it for granted that they were charged falſely with ſome crimes; but they juſtly ſuffered death for ſuch as they were truly charged with. I will firſt quote Mezerai, and afterwards le Laboureur. *In la Mole's houſe an image was found, which one Coſmo Rugier, a Florentine, and a great impoſtor, had made for him, to engage the affection of a Gentlewoman whom he was in love with. The Queen-mother would have had it thought, that it was made for the King. However, la Mole perſiſted always in denying it; notwithſtanding which he and Coconas loſt their heads. It is ſaid that two Princeſſes, who were in love with them, cauſed their heads to be ſtole away, and embalmed them in order to keep them. Another of their accomplices was broke upon the wheel, and Rugier ſent to the gallies: but the Queen-mother, who was extremely credulous in affairs of divination and ſorcery, took him out of that captivity, in order to make uſe of him* (1). The Author, whom I am going to cite, informs us that the Queen-mother would have had Coſmo hanged, and does not aſcribe to her Majeſty the delivery of this galley-ſlave. I call him by this name, though I am ſenſible that he did not really tug at the oar. " Tourtai was ſentenced to be hang-
" ed, after having been put to the rack..... Be-
" ing aſked whether one Coſmo an Italian knew any
" thing of the matter, he replied, that *there is an*
" *Italian, a black man, ugly faced, who plays on muſical*
" *inſtruments, wears ſometimes round, and ſometimes*
" *taffety breeches, and always dreſt in black; that this*
" *Italian is a luſty man, who is often at la Nocle's; but*
" *whether he knows any thing of that attempt, he cannot*
" *ſay* (2)." Le Laboureur explains this paſſage as follows (3). " This Italian is the Coſmo Rogieri I
" before ſpoke of (4), whom the Queen herſelf
" placed with the Duke her ſon, upon pretence of
" teaching him Italian, but in reality to ſerve as a
" ſpy: upon the notice ſhe had received, or her be-
" ing afraid, that a party was forming, to ſet him
" on the throne, after the death of Charles IX. in-
" ſtead of the King of Poland his brother; and to
" oppoſe his return to France. He afterwards con-
" feſſed to ſome one, that after he had communi-
" cated certain things to the Queen, he found that
" the party or faction would be ſo ſtrong, on ac-
" count of the hatred which the Paris maſſacre had
" raiſed in the minds of the people, and for the cruel
" temper which this Prince was ſuppoſed to have,
" not to mention that this would give the Govern-
" ment again into the hands of the Queen and the
" Guiſes; that no longer doubting but it would
" ſucceed, becauſe of the mutual conſpiracy of the
" great men, of the Secretaries of State, and ſeveral
" Members of Parliament, he reſolved to follow his
" maſter's fortune. He was ſtill more firmly per-
" ſuaded of this, when after diſcovering to him the
" ſecret converſations he had with the Queen, the
" Duke truſted him with all his deſigns; and em-
" ployed him to amuſe his mother with ſome parti-
" culars of ſmall conſequence, by which he converſ-
" ed with her, and ſaw through her deſigns. By this
" means he was deeply concerned in the affair; how-
" ever, the Queen having diſcovered the whole af-
" fair, cauſed him to be ſeized with the reſt, and
" brought to a trial. But ſhe was not ſucceſsful in
" this, he ſupporting, with great bravery, the uſual
" torture, upon more than fourſcore queſtions which
" were put to him; and even upon many which he
" himſelf had diſcovered, without confeſſing any
" thing relating either to the converſation, or the in-
" chanted medals which he was accuſed of making;
" one of King Charles, in order to bring him to his
" end, and the other for the Duke of Alenzon and la
" Mole his favourite, who wore them in their hats, in
" order

(1) Mezerai, *Abregé Chronolog.* Tom. 5. p. 180. ad ann. 1574.

(2) Le Laboureur, *Addit. à Caſtelnau*, Tom. 2. p. 408.

(3) Ibid.

(4) Viz. in p. 401, we read as follows: *There are few criminals who would not ſuffer every kind of torture, if their lives depended on their confeſſion. This will appear from Coſmo Rogieri, whom I ſhall ſpeak of hereafter and who was known to be one of the chief perſons in the ſecret, and had been wanting in fidelity to the Queen, who had placed him, as a Spy, with the Duke her ſon.*

dition (*f*). In 1604 he began to make almanacks, continued to make them for many years, and intermixed them with ſentences extracted from Latin Authors (*g*). He lived to a great age, and ſurvived all the Italian Courtiers of Catharine de Medicis (*b*). He died at Paris in 1615; and as he had declared publickly and inſolently that he would die an Atheiſt [*B*], his body was thrown in the fields. He had been accuſed, in 1598, of attempting to kill Henry IV. by witchcraft [*C*]; and being examined about it by Thuanus, was cleared. The relation I ſhall give (*i*) of that incident, will ſhew the inſolence [*D*].

(*f*) *Mercure François*, Tom. 4. p. 47.

(*g*) Ibid.

(*b*) Garaſſe, *Doctrine Curieuſe*, p. 155.

(*i*) In the remark [*D*].

" order to preſerve an inviolable friendſhip between " them; but which, in reality, was to ruin Mole, " who, on that vain aſſurance, ſet up for a mighty " man; but ſo far from meeting with any friends " in his misfortunes, his own maſter and this good " friend were witneſſes againſt him, as though our " flower-de-luces, ſent from Heaven as we are told, " had not received a virtue from Heaven, againſt " charms. If Coſmo gave any away, he kept a " very good one for himſelf, which preſerved him " from the gallows, and was very ſucceſsful againſt " his countrywoman the Queen. Catharine de Me- " dicis wanted to ſee him hanged, but he did not " care to come to that end; and the only ſatisfaction " ſhe had, was to ſee him chained, where he had no " other toil but the journey to Marſeilles. He there " got friends, who obliged the Captain of the gal- " ley to which he belonged, to lodge him in his " own houſe; and his houſe was never ſo much vi- " ſited, on his own account, as for that of this illuſ- " trious ſlave, who made it an academy for the ma- " thematicks and judicial aſtrology; having a keeper, " who ſeemed to be given him for honour ſake rather " than to watch him, and prevent his eſcaping." Thuanus affirms, that la Mole had an image of wax pricked in the heart; and that Ruggeri having been proſecuted as a magician, was ſet at liberty by the Queen-mother. I ſhall cite Thuanus's words in the remark [*E*], with la Mole's anſwers.

[*B*] *He had declared publickly and inſolently that he would die an Atheiſt.*] Here follows a paſſage from the *Mercure François*. *He being reduced, by old age, the gout, and the gravel, to the confines of death, his friends adviſed him to apply his mind to God, and ſent for the Rector of the Pariſh, but he would not ſee him; upon which ſome Capuchins were brought to him, but he only laughed at them. And as he was deſired to prepare himſelf in ſuch a manner, as might enable him to obtain the favour of Heaven, and dread the laſt Judgment: ye fools, ſays he, begone: there are no Devils but thoſe which torment us in this world; nor any God, but Kings and Princes, who can raiſe and do us good* (5). If the reader ſhould prefer the paraphraſe made by a Jeſuit to the ſimplicity of this relation, he may read what follows (6). " The gout and the gra- " vel . . . having, like two officers of death, ſeized " him as a perſon who did not pay his debts well, " conſumed him piece-meal; and nevertheleſs were " ſo kind to him, as to leave him his judgment " ſound, to repent of his ſins, if he would have taken " warning. Being in bed four days before he died, " he was viſited by the Rector of St. Medard, who " endeavoured to put him in mind of his duty, but " he would not hear him. Recourſe was then had " to the Capuchins, to ſee whether they could have " any good effect upon him. They came to ſee him " at the requeſt of ſome of his friends, and ſet before " him the ſeverity of God's judgments, and Satan's " malice and power, in this laſt ſtage of a man's life, " and therefore that he ought to think of his ſalva- " tion. Ruggeri, then ſpeaking, ſaid thus to them " with a voice of rage and deſpair, ye fools! leave " my chamber; and know that there are no other " devils in the world but our enemies, who afflict us " during our life; no other Gods but Kings and " Princes, who do us good: I have lived in this be- " lief, and in it I will die. They employed gentle " words and threats, in order to reform him, but all " to no purpoſe; he venting moſt horrid blaſphe- " mies, like Lucilio Vanini on the funeral pile, till " at laſt he ended his unhappy life like Judas, *Infe- " licem ſpiritum non emiſit ſed amiſit*, he did not pour " forth his wretched ſpirit, but loſt it. The report of " his deſpair was immediately ſpread over Paris; " the people loaded him with curſes, and his body " was thrown, as an example to others, into the " fields as unworthy of Chriſtian burial (7)."

(5) *Merc. Franc.* Tom. 4. p. 46.

(6) Garaſſe, *Doctrine Curieuſe*, p. 156, 157.

(7) Spizelius, *in Scrutinio Atheiſmi*, p. 130, ought not to have ranked him among ſuch Atheiſts as have been burnt alive.

[*C*] *He had been accuſed, in* 1598, *of attempting to kill Henry IV. by witchcraft.*] This monarch being in Nantz anno 1598, was informed that Coſmo Ruggeri was guilty of that crime. It was ſaid that this man, being at that time an Eccleſiaſtic, had a private cloſet in the caſtle of Nantz, in which he uſed to ſhut himſelf up daily upon pretence of painting; but that the real deſign was to prick, with a needle, an image that reſembled the King. He imagined, by this means, to reduce this Prince to a languiſhing condition, which would conſume him by inſenſible degrees. *Coſmus Rugerius tunc ſacris addictus ad regem delatus fuerat, quaſi ipſius vitæ deteſtandis magiæ artibus perniciem molitus eſſet. Nam in arce Namnetenſi ſpecie pingendi cellam peculiarem habuiſſe, in qua ceream imaginem, quæ regis ſpeciem referebat, diris epodis excantatam cottidie acu figebat, eaque re fore ſpem fecerat, ut rex mox mortifero languore ſenſim abſumeretur* (8). The King commanded Thuanus and another perſon, to inquire into that affair. Coſmus being interrogated juridically, immediately anſwered the objection made to him, grounded on his having been put to the torture for the like crime in 1574. He affirmed that it was calumny, with regard to him, on that occaſion, and that he was pronounced innocent by thoſe who then judged him. That his being ſuſpected to be a Magician by ſeveral perſons, who alſo accuſed him of it, was wholly owing to the particular ſkill he had in Aſtrology; it being imagined, that he could not have foretold ſo many things without the aſſiſtance of the Devil; though the truth was, he found them out by the exact knowledge he had of calculating nativities (9). He added, that the affection he had long entertained for his Majeſty juſtified him with regard to the crime he was accuſed of. He ſaid that, after the Paris-Maſſacre, the Court of France debated on what they ſhould do with the King of Navarre, and the Prince of Conde; and that Catharine de Medicis aſked him, if he had not calculated their nativity; that he anſwered he had; and that he thereby knew they would not occaſion the leaſt diſturbance in the Kingdom. He added, that this anſwer prevented the ill deſigns which were entertained againſt them; that he had revealed this affair to la Noue, and deſired him to give them notice of it; in order that, for the future, they might behave in ſuch a manner, as might confirm what he had told Catharine concerning them, merely out of affection for them; thoſe not being things which could be certainly diſcovered by Aſtrology (10). He concluded with ſaying, that he hoped his Majeſty, remembring the good ſervice he had done on that occaſion, would have much more regard to that, than to the malicious and ſlanderous accuſations of his enemies. Thuanus told all theſe ſeveral particulars to the King, who, after walking ſome time, remembered that la Noue had ſpoke to him about it at this time, and gave orders that Ruggeri ſhould be ſet at liberty, and the proſecution be ſuperſeded. The Ladies had before obtained a pardon for that wretch, who ſoon appeared at Court very familiar with them. *Intermiſſa ulterior in Coſmum inquiſitio, & ipſe libertati reſtitutus fuit, & in arctam familiaritatem cum gynæceo venit, cujus favore à Rege, cum hæc diceret, jam gratia in arcano facta fuerat* (11). Thuanus relates afterwards a particular, which muſt not be omitted. Ruggeri was ſo impudent as to affirm, that it was not himſelf, but a Gardiner of the ſame name, who was impeached and puniſhed at the ſame time with la Mole; and he impoſed upon them ſo far, that a penſion was ſettled upon him as Hiſtoriographer. *Homo impudentiſſimus ac perditiſſimus poſtea auſus eſt palam dicere, quæ ad annum* 73. *de Coſmo Rugerio commemorantur, ad ſe minime pertinere, ſed Thu-*

(8) Thuan. *de Vita ſua*, lib. 6. ad ann. 1598. p. 1234, col. 1, *G*.

(9) *Ob id autem pleriſque ſuſpectum fuiſſe, quod Aſtrologiæ peritus certiorem ac ſibi cum paucis cognitam natalium horarum conficiendarum ſcientiam calleret, cujus ope ac ductu cum multa multis prædixiſſet, in eam veniſſe opinionem, quaſi occulta cum malis ſpiritibus familiaritate hæc didiciſſet.* Idem, ibid.

(10) *Id autem non tam ex arte, quam adfectu erga ipſos bene animato feciſſe, quippe cum res ejuſmodi eſſet, ut per aſtrologicæ artis rationem præſtari non poſſet.* Idem, ibid, col. 2, *A*.

(11) Idem, ibid. *B*.

ſolence of this villain, and how greatly he was in favour with the Ladies. Many reflections might be made on his applying himſelf to aſtrology and magic, though he did not believe either God or Devil [D]; for it is a general opinion among Chriſtians that if

anum olitoris cujuſdam cognominis tunc poſtulati errore allucinatum eſſe; eoque væſaniæ venit, ut emendicato ſtipendio in aula obtinuerit, ut ſcribendæ hiſtoriæ munus ſibi demandaretur (12). Admire the impudence of this fellow. The anſwers he made to the two Commiſſioners who examined him in Nantz were in being, ſigned by him; and he acknowledged that he was the ſame Coſmo Ruggeri, who had been ſlandered in the affair of la Mole; but Ruggeri affirmed that he had been honourably acquitted by the Judges. This laſt circumſtance alſo ſhews his impudence; it appearing, from the records of his trial, that he was ſentenced to the gallies. *Iis* (confeſſionibus) *eundem ſe eſſe minime diffitetur, ſed per calumniam accuſatum, & poſtea honorifice, ſicuti jam dixi, dimiſſum; in quo rurſus inſigniter mentitus eſt, nam ex archivis Curiæ itidem conſtat, eum poſt quæſtionem ad triremes damnatum eſſe, ſed aulicorum in hoc hominum genus prono favore pœnam remiſſam fuiſſe, & cum duceretur, vinculis exemptum in aula ſtatim comparuiſſe* (13). I'll alſo add what follows. When Ruggeri was examined in Nantz, he was told, that as judicial Aſtrology was an impious ſtudy, and unworthy of a Chriſtian, he was greatly in the wrong, being a Prieſt, to concern himſelf about it. Upon which he made the beſt excuſe he could; ſpoke even contemptuouſly of that ſcience; and ſwore, that from the time of his being in orders, he had not calculated a ſingle nativity (14).

(12) Thuan. *de Vita ſua*, lib. 6. ad ann. 1598. p. 1234. col. 2, *B.*

(13) Idem, ibid. *C.*

(14) *Ipſe ſe quibus potuit verbis etiam elevata ea, excuſavit, & inter alia adjecit ac religioſe affirmavit ſe poſtquam ſacris addictus eſſet, quod diu poſtea fuit, nunquam natalem cujuſquam horas confeciſſe.* Idem, ibid. *D & E.*

[D] *His applying himſelf to aſtrology and magic, though he did not believe either God or devil.*] Take particular notice of the confeſſion he made on his death-bed. *There are no other devils*, declared he (15), *but the enemies who torment us in this world; nor any other god but kings and princes, who alone can advance us, and do us ſervice.* He added, according to Garaſſe (16), *in this belief I have lived, and in it I will die.* If the Jeſuit added theſe words, I am of opinion that it may be juſtified by the laws of paraphraſe; for it may be looked upon almoſt as indiſputable, that every old man who dies an atheiſt, had been many years ſuch. Perſons do not grow irreligious on their death-beds, nor in the decline of life; on the contrary, moſt free-thinkers, libertines, unbelievers, &c. leave their impious notions in ſickneſs (17); and, in their dying moments, declare themſelves to be orthodox (18). We may therefore ſuppoſe with great probability, that our Ruggeri had been, for many years, the ſame man as he died. What then could he mean by calculating nativities, and thoſe images of wax he gave as cauſing love and hatred? Theſe things agree ill together; all thoſe, who ſpeak of his end, make the following reflection upon it. *He had formerly made people believe, that he knew how to make images, &c. and YET that atheiſt did not believe there were devils* (19). *The wiſeſt men at that time* (20) *were of opinion, that he was not ſkilled in* necromancy, and INDEED THE END he *made ſhewed it clearly* (21). It is certain that, as he did not believe the exiſtence of any ſpirit diſtinct from the ſoul of man, he muſt neceſſarily look upon all that was related concerning magic as fabulous: conſequently, it was merely to get money, that he pretended to make images which ſhould have the power to kill, or inſpire with love. He himſelf knew the vanity of his promiſes, and that his pricking the images with a needle were of no effect. It is not ſo certain that he was ſenſible of the vanity of aſtrology; a perſon of genius and learning is perfectly ſenſible, that a piece of wax worked up into the ſhape of a man, or woman, and pricked in the heart, is not capable of producing, in a perſon at a diſtance, either a deſire of marrying ſuch a perſon, or any other kind of paſſion. He knows evidently that a piece of wax repreſenting Henry IV, and which is put near the fire in Nantz, or is pricked in different parts in the ſame city, has not the power of infecting that monarch with a ſlow and mortal fever in Paris. And therefore every man of genius, ſenſe and learning, who is perſuaded that theſe waxen images have the virtue in queſtion, know moſt certainly, that their effects are produced by an inviſible ſpirit, which acts immediately and phyſically on certain perſons, whilſt thoſe images are in certain circumſtances. Since therefore Ruggeri did not acknowledge any ſuch ſpirit, he plainly knew that thoſe images had no virtue of any kind. But it does not appear as evidently, that celeſtial bodies are incapable of producing a numberleſs multitude of effects on earth. It is known that perſons who were looked upon as atheiſts, have been firmly perſuaded of the efficacy of the influence of the ſtars, even with regard to the free actions of men, and what we call fortune, or contingent events. We therefore are not certain that Ruggeri knew the vanity of judicial aſtrology. I believe, however, that it would not be very raſh to aſſert, conſidering the turn of Ruggeri's mind (22), that he only calculated nativities after the manner of cheats, without giving any credit to them, and only to get money.

(15) *Merc. Franc.* Tom. 4. p. 46.

(16) Garaſſe, *Doct. Curieuſe*, p. 157.

(17) See rem. [E] of the art. BION, the Boriſthenite.

(18) That is, orthodox with regard to the providence of God, of Heaven and Hell.

(19) *Mercure Franc.* Tom. 4. p. 47. See alſo Thuanus's *Continuator*, book 8. p. 537.

(20) That is, at the time la Mole was beheaded.

(21) Garaſſe, *Doct. Curieuſe*, p. 155.

(22) The reader may have ſeen in the preceding page, citat. 10, that he affirmed that the horoſcope of the King of Navarre, and that of the Prince of Conde, promiſed that they would not make any commotions; and yet he did not learn this from Aſtrology.

It will perhaps be objected to me, that it is as difficult to conceive that a certain ſtar, ſituated in a certain manner in the ſcheme of a perſon's nativity, is a phyſical cauſe of the gracious reception a man of fifty years of age meets with from a Prince, who ſalutes him at ſuch an hour, as to be perſuaded that images of wax, pricked in the heart, can raiſe the paſſion of love in a perſon, at an hundred leagues diſtance. I anſwer, that there are great numbers of perſons, who look upon this effect of the planet quite as chimerical as the effect of the image, and I myſelf am one of thoſe. But I repeat it again; a perſon may be more eaſily deceived with reſpect to the power of the planets, than with regard to that of waxen images. No perſon can inſtance to me one man of learning, who imagined that theſe figures, by their own power, and without the interpoſition of any ſpirit, inſpire with love, or kill, at an hundred leagues diſtance; but ſome learned perſons may be inſtanced, who imagined that, without the aſſiſtance of good or bad angels, the planets in a man's horoſcope, are the cauſe of his moſt fortuitous adventures. We conceive very clearly, that a piece of wax, pricked at Nantz, heated and ſhaped at pleaſure, cannot be the phyſical cauſe of any thing in Rome; but experience teaches us, that the ſun's virtue produces a thouſand things phyſically, and as a true cauſe on the earth. Hence people are led into error; and fancy that the reſt of the ſtars extend alſo their operations to the earth; which, being admitted, will carry a perſon a great way by inſenſible degrees; ſo that they, at laſt, conſider them as the cauſe of all things.

That if judicial Aſtrology diſcovered things to come, it would be a kind of black art or magic.

I muſt obſerve by the way, that this is an illuſion or error, which ought to be more ſeverely checked than it is; for were it true for inſtance, that by horoſcopes one might fortel the happineſs or infelicity of people, the circumſtance of their marriage and death, &c. were it true, for inſtance, that Gauricus, in an aſtrological operation, diſcovered that King Henry II would be killed in a duel; aſtrology muſt in that caſe be ranked in the number of the magical arts, and of thoſe kinds of divination which are grounded on a compact with the devil. The pains aſtrologers take to calculate a nativity, and to conſult the rules eſtabliſhed by them with regard to the diſtinctions of ſigns, the properties of the houſes, the different aſpects of the planets &c. their pains, I ſay, in this reſpect, would be like that which magicians take in drawing circles, making ſeveral poſtures, uttering certain words &c (13). What a man would do on either ſide, would only be an eſtabliſhed or appointed ſign, upon making whereof a wicked angel would act after a certain manner. It is plain, when we attend to it, without prejudice, that magical ceremonies, a circle, a bow, a wand, pointed ſucceſſively to the four cardinal points of the horizon; certain words uttered, certain words written on pieces of paper &c. are not more incapable of curing a man dangerouſly ſick, or killing a man in good health, than horoſcopes are incapable of diſcovering whether a man ſhall be happily married; whether he ſhall be loved by his Prince; ſhall be ſent into baniſhment; whether his

(23) See a long deſcription of the ceremonies of magic, in letter 12 of *Cyrano de Bergerac*.

if there are Devils, there is a God; and that thoſe who do not believe the exiſtence of a God,

wealth will conſiſt in lands or money; whether he will die at ſea, or at the ſiege of a city. This ſhews that an aſtrologer ought to be puniſhed the more, as his horoſcopes would more ſurely diſcover the truth of futurity; for the certainty of his predictions would be a ſign, that he punctually performed thoſe ceremonies, in preſence of which the devils had eſtabliſhed, by their original compact, to reveal futurity. This alſo proves that judicial aſtrology cannot be a way of fortelling things to come different from that of a ſieve, a glaſs, ſmoke, and an hundred more abominable practices (24); whence I conclude, that the indulgence, which ſpiritual and ſecular Courts ſhew with regard to judicial aſtrologers, is highly criminal. Very good laws, both civil and canonical, have been enacted againſt them; all which have been diligently collected by a profeſſor of Padua, in a work publiſhed by him at Venice in 1662 (25); but then they are not put in execution. John Baptiſt Morin, regius profeſſor at Paris, enjoyed undiſturbed his penſions and employments till his death, though he calculated nativities in publick, and openly profeſſed that he had a wonderful talent at them (26)? But had he been ſo bold as to aſſert, that relicks ought not to be worſhipped, he would have been removed immediately from his employments; he would have been driven away in the moſt ſhameful manner; and had any powerful perſons preſumed to protect him, all the Clergy would have roſe up, and not have ceaſed their clamours till the impious wretch had been turned out of his places. What a partiality is this to errors! He was permitted to practiſe, with impunity, an art, all his life-time, which in the main muſt be magic, if there is a way of diſcovering futurity. Pleaſe to obſerve, that it is difficult to comprehend how this can be found out by the aſſiſtance of the devil; for how vaſt ſoever we ſuppoſe the knowledge of the angels to be, it does not ſeem to include the concatenation of all objects which muſt be known, to ſay certainly that ſuch and ſuch things will come to paſs; and it would be abſurd to ſay, that God reveals it to them every time they will execute the horrid compact they had made with man. Abbé Furetiere exhibits this objection in a very clear manner (27), but he omits the moſt eſſential one. He does not ſay, that man's free-will would be a mere chimæra, in caſe angels could divine what a man will think ten years hence; could he, I ſay, divine it by the knowledge of the connexion, which is between natural cauſes and their effects.

(24) See the alphabetical catalogue of theſe, in chap. 35. of a book printed at Paris, and afterwards in Holland, in 1692, entitled, *Remarques ou Reflexions Critiques, Morales, & Hiſtoriques, ſur les plus belles & agreables Penſees.. des Anciens & des Modernes.* I believe the Author borrowed all this from Martin Delrio's book.

(25) Don Joſeph Maria Maravigliа, Clerk regular, in his *Pſeudomantia veterum & recentiorum exploſa, ſive de fide Divinationibus adhibenda.*

(26) See the art. of this MORIN.

(27) See the *Furetieriana*, p. 109 *& ſeq.* Bruſſels edit.

Whether it follows, that becauſe Devils exiſt, there muſt be a God.

Nothing would be more abſurd than to aſk, whether it be poſſible that Ruggeri, believing neither God nor good nor bad angels, imagined that the waxen images in queſtion could have any efficacy or power; but it would not be an abſurdity to put this queſtion to all atheiſts. It is generally thought, that every perſon, who denies the exiſtence of God, denies alſo, by a neceſſary conſequence, the exiſtence of all ſpirits, and the immortality of the ſoul. I am not ſurprized that this ſhould be a common opinion; for I believe we have no example of theſe blaſphemies being ſeparated (38); I mean, either that there ever were Atheiſts, who believed the exiſtence of Devils, and the immortality of the ſoul; or that there ever was a man who believed the reality of magic, and yet did not believe the exiſtence of a God. We meet with ſome Chriſtians, who, tho' orthodox in all other reſpects, cannot perſuade themſelves that bad Angels concern themſelves with any thing; and who abſolutely reject whatever is ſaid concerning magic and ſorcery. If theſe contented themſelves with ſaying, that the Scriptures only can prove the exiſtence and operation of wicked Angels, we ſhould not wonder at their opinion; for it is certain that reaſon ſuggeſts very powerful objections againſt the Devil's empire, grounded on the notions we entertain of the wiſdom and goodneſs of God: but it is great raſhneſs, to ſay no worſe of it, in thoſe, who ſay the Devil has no power, to reconcile their opinion with Scripture. However this be, the following conſequence is falſe and unjuſt. *You do not believe the exiſtence of Devils, and therefore you do not believe the exiſtence of a God.* With regard to this other conſequence, *you do not believe the exiſtence of a God; conſequently you do not believe the exiſtence of good or bad Angels*, this conſequence ſeems very certain; for as I obſerved above, we do not meet with one inſtance to diſprove it. Here follows another conſequence that ſeems to be certain: *Devils exiſt, and conſequently a God exiſts.* We are ſo firmly perſuaded of the juſtneſs and neceſſity of ſuch a concluſion, that we immediately affirm, that ſuch as deny the exiſtence of Demons, deprive the orthodox of an indiſputable proof of the exiſtence of God. I confeſs I have not yet met with any perſon, who ſeemed to me fully perſuaded, that the exiſtence of the Devil proves neceſſarily and invincibly that God exiſts; and we do not meet with one man, who doubts ever ſo little this laſt truth (29), but abſolutely denies that there are Angels. I will nevertheleſs confeſs, that I have not underſtanding enough, to ſee the ſtrong connexion which every one finds between theſe two Theſes, *Devils exiſt; conſequently there is a God.* To lay aſide Scripture, and argue only from metaphyſical principles, may it not be aſſerted, that God created no other ſpirits but the ſoul of man? If it ſhould be aſked, why ſo powerful a Being did not give exiſtence to other ſpirits, it will be anſwered, that he did not think fit to do it. He produced or created all things with a ſupreme liberty, more of one kind of Beings, and fewer of another; he being always guided by no other rule, but his infinitely wiſe will. What objection can be made to ſuch a reaſon? If you ſpeak to an Atheiſt, and aſk him why he denies the exiſtence of Demons, his anſwer will be quite trifling; and if you puſh him home, he will ſoon be put to ſilence. Will he dare to ſay, that the univerſe being infinitely eternal, the ſupremely perfect Being, which exiſts neceſſarily, contains nothing that exceeds man in underſtanding and knowledge? What! becauſe a man has two eyes, a noſe, a mouth, a brain, nerves and veins, he therefore muſt poſſeſs all the knowledge and induſtry in nature? Muſt there be no will, no underſtanding, no paſſions, or art of applying bodies one to the other, any where elſe? If you could ſhew, that a free agent thought proper to indue with knowledge ſuch creatures only as have a brain, you would put me to a ſtand; but you acknowledge no ſuch cauſe. According to your principles, all things exiſt neceſſarily; you therefore cannot tell me, why impalpable matter ſhould be leſs ingenious than that which we call fleſh and blood, man, beaſt, &c. And if you reaſon juſtly, you ought to believe, that ſince the infinite Being thinks in man, he thinks every where elſe; and that if there are on earth ſeveral living bodies which love or hate one another, and ſome of whom oppreſs one another, there alſo are, in the air and elſewhere, ſome compounded beings which love man, and others that hate him, which have more wit and power than man. Here we have good and bad angels. In a word, ſince an atheiſt cannot deny but that there are wicked, envious and revengeful beings (30), which take a pleaſure in the evils of others, which, by the application of bodies produce ſtrange changes in nature, conformably to their paſſions; it would be ridiculous in him, ſhould he preſume to deny, that, beſides thoſe wicked beings which are the object of his ſight, there are many others unſeen by him, and ſtill more malicious and ſkilful than man. We therefore may ſay, that if the univerſe was not God's work, it would neceſſarily contain bad angels, in like manner as it contains wolves and men; but if it be the work of God, it is no ways neceſſary that it ſhould contain ſuch and ſuch things; and conſequently the exiſtence of devils is not ſo ſtrong a proof, as might be imagined, of the exiſtence of God; but is more proper to ſtrengthen the Manichee ſyſtem (31) than to ſupport the orthodox faith. I propoſe this only as a doubt to be diſcuſſed.

(28) See hereafter, in this art. the reſtriction which is put to this, ſpeaking of Eaſterns.

(29) That is, with regard to the exiſtence of a God.

(30) By theſe Beings mankind are meant.

In this manner it would be poſſible, though it is very probable no ſuch thing ever happened, for perſons as atheiſtical, in certain reſpects, as Ruggeri, nevertheleſs to believe that images of wax, by the help of certain ceremonies, ſhould produce love or hatred

(31) Becker ſtrongly reproaches Divines with introducing Manicheiſm, by the empire they aſcribe to Devils. But he ought not to reproach them with this, ſince they ground their opinion on the ſcriptures. I here conſider things only in a philoſophical light.

a God, do not believe there are Devils. I ſhall take ſome notice of that opinion, and point out Father Garaſſe's errors [*E*].

RUSH-

hatred at an hundred leagues diſtance. They would conſider theſe ceremonies only as the ſign of a compact, which ſhould determine a devil to produce certain effects, by the application of bodies whoſe force would be known to him.

Reflection on the religion of the Eaſterns.

I muſt deſire my readers to take notice, that I hitherto have only conſidered the knowledge we have of the opinions of the ancient heathens, and thoſe of the modern Europeans; for I will confeſs that what is related concerning the Religion of the Eaſterns, does not permit me to uſe the general expreſſions I employed. It is affirmed (32) that the inhabitants of Siam do not acknowledge any Deity; and that they nevertheleſs (33) believe the return and apparition of ſpirits; that they are afraid of the dead, and practiſe certain ceremonies to appeaſe them (34). *Beſides, they offer up, on almoſt all occaſions, prayers to good genius's, and imprecations againſt bad ones.* Theſe people are in a fair way of becoming magicians, without believing the exiſtence of a Deity. The relation (35) I cited juſt now adds, that the *modern Indians believe, as the ancient Chineſe, that there are good and bad ſouls every where; on whom they have beſtowed, as it were, divine omnipotence.* This means, that they do not recognize any ſupreme God, but a numberleſs multitude of good and bad genius's; conſequently they may be atheiſts and magicians at the ſame time. The notions of the learned men in that country are ſomething more like thoſe of the Europeans; for if, on the one hand, they are atheiſts, they deny, on the other, the exiſtence of ſpirits, and the immortality of the ſoul. *It is affirmed, in ſeveral relations of China, that learned perſons, who, in that country, are the moſt conſiderable men, conſider the ceremonies made at funerals only as ſo many duties of civil life, at which they uſe no prayers; that they have not, at this time, any ſenſe of Religion, and do not believe the exiſtence of any God, nor the immortality of the ſoul; and that though they ſtill pay to Confucius an outward worſhip, in the temples dedicated to him, they yet do not beg of him the learning which the Litterati of Tonquin beſeech him to beſtow upon them* (36). This exterior worſhip of Confucius is therefore only grimace in them; and they conform to it only out of policy. Read the following paſſage, and we ſhall find they not only deny a ſupreme intelligence, but likewiſe inferior beings endowed with intelligence. *The men of letters, that is thoſe who have taken ſome degree in literature, and who are the only perſons that are concerned in the government, became, by inſenſible degrees, totally impious; and though they have made no alteration in the ſtyle and language of their predeceſſors, they yet have changed the ſoul of the heavens, and that of all other ſouls, into I know not what aerial ſubſtances, devoid of underſtanding; and have ſet up, as the only judge of our works, a blind fate, which, in their opinion, performs all that almighty and omniſcient juſtice could do* (37).

(32) La Loubere, *Relation de Siam*, Tom. 1. chap. 22. num. 6. p. m. 501.

(33) Ibid. chap. 20. num. 20. p. 481.

(34) Ibid.

(35) Ibid. chap. 23. num. 8. p. 508.

(36) Ibid. chap. 20. num. 4. p. 467, 470.

(37) Ibid. chap. 23. num 14. p. 514. Compare t his with citat. 55, of the art. MALHERBE.

[*E*] *I ſhall . . . . point out father Garaſſe's errors.*] I. He ſays (38) that *about a fortnight before the deceaſe* of Coſmo Ruggeri, in 1615, a little book was diſperſed about Paris, and entitled, *The dreadful hiſtory of two conjurers ſtrangled by the devil in paſſion week* (39). But we are aſſured in the *Mercure François* (40), that Ruggeri's death gave occaſion to that book. There is no doubt but that the author of this *Mercure* is more accurate and worthy of credit than the author of *Doctrine curieuſe*; and conſequently all the moral reflections of the latter, grounded on previous reports, fall to the ground. I muſt not omit the following paſſage in the *Mercure* (41): *The firſt of thoſe two magicians was that impudent cheat Cæſar, who drew money from all the inquiſitive of his age, either to ſhew them devils, or direct them to treaſures, and afterwards laughed at them. It was reported that he was ſtrangled by his devil, and nevertheleſs he is ſtill living in the Baſtile. The ſecond was this Abbot of St. Mahé.* II. Garaſſe goes on as follows (42). *In MDLXXIV, la Mole and Caconas* (43), *having been condemned by the ſentence of the Court, as guilty of ſorcery and inchantments, on occaſion of the death of King Charles IX, Coſmo Ruggeri was accuſed at the ſame time, as having aſſiſted them by his magical arts.* La Mole and Coconas were executed in the life-time of Charles IX, and conſequently this was not *on occaſion of his death.* It does not appear that their ſorcery was levelled at that King's death, and it cannot be ſaid that they were convicted of it. Here follows the ſubſtance of the anſwers made by la Mole when upon the rack. *Being told, that he had, in his houſe, ſome waxen images, having two holes in their heads; he anſwered that he had not. Being aſked concerning the image of wax which was ſaid to be found in his houſe; ah! my good God, ſays he, I deſire to die, if I made any waxen image for the King. Being aſked with regard to the golden figures in his hat, he replied, that he knew nothing about them. Being again faſtned to the buckles and rings, he ſaid, that he knew no more than what he had revealed. The little treſtle being again brought in, and he admoniſhed to ſpeak truth, ſaid, Gentlemen, I know nothing more, upon the damnation of my ſoul; I know nothing before the living God, on my damnation. True God eternal, my God, I know not whether the image of wax was made for the King or Queen. Being aſked, where the ſaid waxen image is, and whether Coſmo carried it to him; he ſaid, that this image was made for a woman, whom he was deſirous of marrying, his country-woman; and if it be ſhewn, it will appear to be in the form of a woman; that the ſaid Coſmo has the ſaid image; that the ſaid image has two thruſts in the heart, and that he will ſhew it ſuch. Being aſked concerning the King's ſickneſs, he replied, may I die, if poor la Mole ever harboured any thought about it; and I deſire that Coſmo may be ſent for, who will ſay it is nothing elſe. Being interrogated where the ſaid waxen image is, he anſwered, that Coſmo has it; that it was made for a woman, and that he did not deſire Coſmo to do any thing elſe; and that the ſaid Coſmo gave it thoſe thruſts in the heart. Being asked why he thruſt it ſo in the heart, he replied that he could not tell. Water being brought in, he deſires that it may be taken away, and he will tell the truth. Being brought before the fire, and admoniſhed to tell the truth with regard to that waxen image, he ſaid, I deny my God, and may he damn me eternally, if it was for any other purpoſe than what I ſaid* (44). Here follows the ſubſtance of the confeſſions extorted from Coconas by the torture. *Being queſtioned with regard to the waxen image, he ſaid that he knew nothing of it; and that Coſmo and la Mole were vaſtly intimate. Being aſked whether he knows of any pictures or characters made againſt the King, he replied, that he did not; and that he ſpoke about it to a Captain of this town, who told him that they had broke all la Mole's rings; and that he aſked the ſaid Captain, whether they had broke a ring as big as one's finger; and that if there was any thing, it would be found there. He ſaid farther, that with regard to any attempt upon the King's perſon, he had never heard of any ſuch thing. Being queſtioned whether he knew any thing of the waxen image, he replied in the negative; and that if any one knew ſomething of it, it muſt be Coſmo* (45). Thuanus declares, that la Mole proteſted that this image of wax was intended only to inſpire a woman with love. *Tortus Mola & interrogatus de imaguncula cerea, quam magicis præſtigiis ab ipſo confictam, & acu in corde tactam conſtabat, quem in rei uſum id faceret, & cujus opera ad id uteretur; reſpondit, ut puellam quandam in Provincia, quam efflictim deperiebat, hac arte ad mutuo ſe redamandum accenderet, id feciſſe; eaque in re uſum opera Coſmi Rugerii Florentini, qui mox comprehenſus & tanquam maleficus omnino raſus, Reginæ favore, quæ illius & hujuſmodi hominum opera perfamiliariter utebatur, periculo exemptus eſt* (46). III. Garaſſe is not accurate in the following paſſage. "This man eſcaping this danger "by his miſtreſs's favour, let himſelf be ſeduced by "the wretched deſire he had of being looked upon "as a great judicial Aſtrologer, and wonderfully "well ſkilled in that art; ſo that he promiſed waxen "images to all the curious debauchees, to inſpire "hearts with love or hatred: and as both theſe paſſions are equally ſilly, he had more cuſtom at Pa"ris, than if he had promiſed to give pardons or "plenary indulgences (47)." Here we have an Author, who, in order to prove that Coſmo deſired to be reputed extremely well ſkilled in judicial Aſtrology,

(38) Garaſſe, *Doct. Curieuſe*, book 2. ſect. 8. p. 155.

(39) Ibid. p. 154. See alſo Thuanus's *Continuator*, book 8. p. 537.

(40) Tom. 4. p. 47.

(41) Ibid.

(42) Garaſſe, *Doct. Curieuſe*, p. 155.

(43) It ſhould be Coconas.

(44) Le Laboureur, *Addit. à Caſtelnau*, Tom. 2. p. 411.

(45) Ibid. p. 412, 413.

(46) Thuan. *Hiſt.* lib. 57. p. 64. col. 1, *A.* See d'Aubigné, who here, as in an hundred other places, has only abridged Thuanus. See d'Aubigné, *Hiſt. Univerſelle*, Tom. 2. lib. 2. cap. 6. p. m. 688.

(47) Garaſſe, p. 156.

☞ RUSHWORTH (JOHN), famous for his *Hiſtorical Collections* [*A*], was deſcended of a good family in Northumberland, and born about the year 1607. He ſtudied for ſome time in the Univerſity of Oxford in the latter end of the reign of King James I. but left it without being matriculated, and retiring to London, entered himſelf a ſtudent in Lincoln's-Inn, of which he afterwards became a Barriſter. But his genius leading him more to State-Affairs than the Common Law, he began early to take down in characters, ſpeeches, and paſſages, at conferences in Parliament, and from the King's own mouth what he ſpoke to both Houſes; and was continually an eye and an ear-witneſs of the greateſt tranſactions. He perſonally attended and obſerved all occurrences of moment, during the eleven years interval of Parliament, in the Star-Chamber, Court of Honour, and Exchequer-Chamber, when all the Judges of England met there upon extraordinary caſes; and at the Council Table, when great cauſes were tried before the King and Council. Afterwards when matters were agitated at a great diſtance, he was there alſo, and went on purpoſe, out of curioſity, to obſerve the paſſages at the Camp at Berwick, at the fight at Newborne upon Tyne with the Scots, at the Treaty of Rippon, and at the great Council at York in 1640. Upon the opening of the long Parliament, November the 3d the ſame year, he was choſen aſſiſtant to Mr. Henry Elſyng, Clerk of the Houſe of Commons, who ſent by him their addreſſes to the King, when his Majeſty was at York; and upon theſe occaſions Mr. Ruſhworth rode with ſuch expedition between London and York, which is 150 miles, that he ſeveral times performed the journey in 24 hours. In 1643 he took the Covenant, and being nearly related to Sir Tho. Fairfax (for his father and mother were natives of Yorkſhire of ancient extract) he was appointed Secretary to him, as General of the Parliament's Forces. In 1649 he attended that General with ſeveral Officers of note to the Univerſity of Oxford, where he was created Maſter of Arts; and at the ſame time, as a Member of Queen's College, was made one of the Delegates to take into conſideration the affairs then depending between the citizens of Oxford, and Members of the ſaid Univerſity. After Fairfax had reſigned his Commiſſion, Mr. Ruſhworth reſided in Lincoln's-Inn; and in Jan. 1651 was appointed one of the Committee to conſult about the Reformation of the Common Law. In 1658 he was choſen a Burgeſs for Berwick upon Tweed to ſerve in the Parliament, which began at Weſtminſter January the 27th the ſame year; and again for the ſame place in that Parliament, which began April the 25th 1660. In September 1667, upon Sir Orlando Bridgman's being made Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of England, he was appointed his Lordſhip's Secretary, and continued ſo as long as his Lordſhip held that office. He was elected Burgeſs for Berwick upon Tweed in the Parliament, which began March the 6th 1678, and in that which began October the 17th 1679, and in that which met at Oxford; after the diſſolution of which laſt Parliament he lived obſcurely in Weſtminſter, till he was committed priſoner for debt to the King's Bench in Southwark, where he ſpent the laſt ſix years of his life, and died May the 12th 1690, aged eighty three years, and

logy, ſays, that he *promiſed waxen images*. Now theſe images have always been conſidered, either as effects or fooleries of Magic, and do not relate in any manner to judicial Aſtrology. They are not looked upon as Taliſmans; the manner how, it is ſaid, they muſt be uſed, ſhew manifeſtly that their virtues, whether true or falſe, do not depend on the conſtellations. We are told that they muſt be pricked with needles; muſt be heated at a ſlow fire, &c. which occaſions great alterations in the perſons who are the objects of ſuch practices. This cannot be natural; the influence of the ſtars cannot produce ſuch effects; it is the black art, the work of the devil. The Heathens aſcribed this practice to none but Witches.

(48) Ovid, ſpeaking of Medea, in *Epiſt. Hypſip. ad Jaſon.* See Frommann, *de Faſcinatione*, lib. 3. part. 5. cap. 6. p. m. 718. He alſo quotes Horace, *ſat.* 8. l. 1. *and Cujas, in Paratit. cod. de Maleſic. & Mathemat.*

Devovet abſentes, ſimulacraque cerea fingit
Et miſerum tenues in jecur urget acus (48).

" The abſent curſes; pricks the waxen image;
" And thruſts ſharp needles in th' ill-fated liver."

(49) It is nevertheleſs certain, that theſe images are ſometimes made in order to inſpire hatred. See Servius, on the following words of Virgil, Eclog. 8. ver. 80. *Limus ut hic dureſcit, & hæc ut cera liqueſcit Uno eodemque igni.*

I obſerve the Mercure François does not ſay, with Garaſſe, that Coſmo promiſed images, *to inſpire hearts with love or hatred* (49). He promiſed images, *ſome to make women fall in love with thoſe who are fond of them; and others to make any perſons, at pleaſure, linger till they died, by repeating their names, and calling upon certain Devils* (50). A whimſical ſtory is told of Tamerlane's daughters. It is related that their father cauſed them to be taught Magic; and that, by the help of certain images, they facilitated the conqueſt of ſuch provinces as he intended to ſubdue. *Audivi ab aliquibus qui dictum Tamerlanum diu noverunt, quod habuit tres filias quas in arte magica fecit inſtrui, in qua mirabiliter profecerunt, quæ incantationes, & exorcizationes, & IMAGINES contra provincias quas ſibi ſubjicere voluit facere conſueverunt, quæ plerumque effectum ſortitæ fuerunt* (51). IV. The argument in the following words is not juſt. *This wretch . . . . carried on, from the year* 1604, *theſe infamous practices, though an Abbot; he fomenting the irregular paſſions of all the debauched courtiers. From this year M. DC IV. he began to take another courſe; he betaking himſelf to make almanacks, ſome under the name of Quelberus, others under the name of Vannerus, or the weeping Pilgrim of Savoy* (52). Garaſſe had juſt before joined the making of waxen images, and the ſtudy of Aſtrology, as two things that prove one another; and then he immediately tells us, that as ſoon as Coſmo made almanacks, he left off giving thoſe images to debauched courtiers. We here have, beſides a contradiction, bad reaſoning. Though a perſon makes almanacks, he ſtill may be a cheat with regard to the images in queſtion. The Mercure François does not agree with Garaſſe, with regard to all prefixed to Ruggeri's almanacks. Compare the Jeſuit's words with the following (53). *From the year one thouſand ſix hundred and four, he had made almanacks annually: ſome under the name of Querberus, others under the names of Vannerus, and the weeping Pilgrim of Savoy, which he embelliſhed with verſes or ſentences from the beſt Latin Poets or Orators.*

(50) *Mercure Franc.* Tom. 4. p. 47. See alſo Thuanus's *Continuator*, book 8. p. 537.

(51) Theodoricus à Niem, *de Schiſmate*, lib. 2. p. m. 114.

(52) Garaſſe, p. 156.

(53) *Mercure Franc.* Tom. 4. p. 46.

[*A*] *Famous for his* Hiſtorical Collections.] The firſt volume was publiſhed at London 1659 in folio, under the title of *Hiſtorical Collections of private paſſages of State, weighty Matters in Law, and remarkable proceedings in five Parliaments. Beginning the* 16*th year of K. James*, ann. 1618, *and ending the* 5*th year of K. Charles*, ann. 1629. *digeſted in order of time.* Mr. Wood tells us (1), that when the Author " was " fitting

(1) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 847.

and was interred on the Wedneſday following behind the pulpit in the Church of St. George's Southwark. He had ſeveral daughters, one of whom was married to Sir Francis Vane (*a*).

(*a*) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 846—849.

" fitting this book for the preſs, he made uſe of " certain manuſcripts in the hands of Bulſtrode " Whitelocke, one of Oliver's Lords; and when it " was finiſhed, he preſented it to the view of Oliver " himſelf; but he having no leiſure to peruſe it, " appointed the ſaid Whitelocke to do it, January " 1657, and accordingly running it over more than " once, he made ſome alterations in, and additions " to it. After it was finiſhed at the preſs, he dedi- " cated the book to Richard Cromwell, then Lord " Protector." The *ſecond part* of the *Hiſtorical Collections*, was printed at London in 1680, in folio, and the other parts. The whole was reprinted at London in 1722 in ſix volumes in folio. Dr. John Nalſon, LL. D. in his *Impartial Collection of the great Affairs of State from the beginning of the Scotch Rebellion*, ann. 1639. *to the Murder of King Charles I.* &c. printed at London in 1682 and 1683, in folio, endeavours to deſtroy the credit of Mr. Ruſhworth's *Collections* in ſeveral reſpects; but Mr. Rapin de Thoyras in his *Hiſtory of England* has undertaken to ſhew, that the exceptions of Dr. Nalſon are not ſufficient to diſcredit that work. T.

☞ RUSSEL, the name of an ancient and illuſtrious family [*A*], from which was deſcended William Lord Ruſſel, of whom we ſhall give an article, in order to inſert ſome original letters and papers never before publiſhed. He was third ſon of Francis Earl and afterwards Duke of Bedford by Anne daughter of Robert Carr Earl of Somerſet. In April 1679 he was appointed one of the new Council to his Majeſty, and in 1680 was elected Member of Parliament for the county of Bedford in that which began on the 21ſt of October the ſame year; and with great vigour promoted the Bill for the excluſion of the Duke of York from the Throne, which being paſſed the Houſe of Commons, he was ordered to carry it up to the Houſe of Lords, which he did on the 15th of November, attended by almoſt all the Members. But the Lords having rejected the Bill upon the firſt reading, the Commons were exaſperated at it, and Lord Ruſſel in particular ſaid, that if ever there ſhould happen in this nation any ſuch change, as that he ſhould not have liberty to live a Proteſtant, he was reſolved to die one; and therefore would not willingly have the hands of their enemies ſtrengthened, and alſo deſired the Lords not to deſtroy themſelves by their own hands; and if the Commons might not be ſo happy as to better the condition of the nation, he prayed the Lords would not make it worſe by giving money to the King, while they were ſure it muſt go to the hands of the Duke's creatures. But this and the like ſpeeches having diſguſted the Court, the Parliament was prorogued on the 10th of January, and diſſolved by Proclamation on the 18th 1680-1. However the neceſſity of the King's affairs requiring the meeting of another Parliament, his Majeſty called one, which aſſembled at Oxford on the 21ſt of March following, in which Lord Ruſſel ſerved again as Knight of the Shire for the County of Bedford. But another Bill of excluſion being moved for by Sir Robert

[*A*] *An ancient and illuſtrious family.*] It has been of long ſtanding in the county of Dorſet, where they were poſſeſſed of ſome fair Lordſhips for many ages paſt, as is manifeſt from the account of the Sheriff, the third of King John, *anno* 1202, when John Ruſſel gave that Prince fifty marks for licence to marry the ſiſter of a great man, called Doun Bardolf. This John was Conſtable of Corfe Caſtle in the county of Dorſet, *anno* 1221, the 5th of Henry III. and from him was deſcended John Ruſſel, Gentleman of the Privy Chamber to K. Henry VII. and created Baron of this Realm by Henry VIII. in 1538. and afterwards made Knight of the Garter, Lord Admiral, and Lord Privy Seal. He died at his houſe in the Strand in London, March the 14th 1554, and was ſucceeded by his ſon Francis, who was twice Embaſſador in France in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and died in 1584, leaving iſſue by his firſt wife, Margaret, daughter of Sir John St. John, four ſons, Edward, John, Francis, and William, and three daughters, whereof Anne was married to Ambroſe Dudley, Earl of Warwick, Elizabeth to William Bouchier Earl of Bath, and Margaret to George Clifford, the third Earl of Cumberland. Of the ſons, Edward died without iſſue; John married Elizabeth daughter of Sir Anthony Cook, Knt. and widow of Sir Tho. Holby, Knt. and dying in the year 1584 in his father's life-time, the eſtate and title deſcended to Francis, third ſon of Francis, the ſecond Earl of Bedford, who marrying Julian daughter of Sir John Forſter, Knt. had by her a ſon named Edward, but being ſlain on a day of truce by the Scots on the Borders, *viz.* June the 27th 1585, and his father dying on the 28th of July following, the ſaid Edward, the ſon of Francis who was ſlain, ſucceeded his grandfather, and was the third Earl of Bedford. He married Lucy eldeſt of the two ſiſters and coheirs of John Lord Harrington of Exton; but dying on the third of May 1627 without iſſue, we now return to Sir William Ruſſel, the fourth and youngeſt ſon of Francis, the ſecond Earl of Bedford; which Sir William in Auguſt 1594 had been appointed Lord Deputy of Ireland, and on the 2d of July 1603 created a Peer of England by the title of Lord Ruſſel of Thornhaugh in the county of Northampton; and having married Elizabeth, daughter and heir to Stengay Long of Shengay in the county of Cambridge, Eſq; by her left Francis his ſon and heir in his honour; which Francis, ſucceeding Edward his Couſin German in the Earldom of Bedford, became the fourth Earl thereof. This Francis having married Catharine ſole daughter of Giles Bridges, Lord Chandos, had by her four ſons and as many daughters; whereof Catharine the eldeſt was married to Robert Lord Brooke; Anne, to George Earl of Briſtol; Margaret, to James Earl of Carliſle; and Diana, to Francis Lord Newport, anceſtor to the preſent Earl of Bradford. Of the ſons, which were William, Francis, John, and Edward, the laſt marrying Penelope, daughter of Moſes Hill of Aileſbury in the Kingdom of Ireland, by her had a ſon named Edward, and a daughter Letitia; which daughter was married to Thomas Cheek of Pyrgo in the county of Eſſex, Eſq; and by him had a daughter named Anne, who was their heir, and ſhe being married to Sir Tho. Tipping of Whitfield in the county of Oxford, Bart. and dying January the 21ſt 1727-8, left two daughters by the ſaid Sir Thomas Tipping, one married to Thomas Archer of Umberſlade in the county of Warwick, Eſq; and the other to Samuel Sandys, Eſq; of Ombersley Court in Worceſterſhire, who has ſerved for the city of Worceſter in ſeveral Parliaments. Edward, the ſon of Edward Ruſſel,

bert Clayton, who was ſeconded by Lord Ruſſel, the Parliament was ſoon after diſſolved, and no other ever was called during the reign of King Charles II. In 1683 his Lordſhip was committed priſoner to the Tower upon a charge of High-Treaſon, and on the 13th of July was tried at the Old Baily for conſpiring the death of the King, *&c.* and condemned. His behaviour after condemnation and at his death will appear from an account drawn up by Dr. Gilbert Burnet, which we ſhall give the reader from the original [*B*], and of which he has given an abſtract in the *firſt volume* of the *Hiſtory of his own Time.*

While

Ruſſel, and Penelope Hill before-mentioned, was May the 7th 1697 created Earl of Orford, and married the Lady Margaret, third and youngeſt daughter to William the firſt Duke of Bedford, his father's brother, and died without iſſue November the 26th 1727, in the 75th year of his age. We now return to William, Francis, and John, the three eldeſt ſons of Francis Earl of Bedford by Catharine Bridges his wife beforementioned; whereof John the youngeſt was a Colonel in the civil wars for King Charles I, and after the reſtoration of King Charles II made Colonel of the firſt regiment of foot-guards. Francis, the ſecond ſon, died unmarried; but William, the eldeſt, ſucceeded his father, and was the fifth Earl of Bedford. Upon the breaking out of the civil wars, he was appointed General of the Parliament's Horſe, which poſt he quitted in 1643. In 1672 he was elected Knight of the Garter. May the 11th 1694, he was created Marquis of Taveſtock and Duke of Bedford. He died September the 7th 1700. By Anne, daughter to Robert Earl of Somerſet, he had ſeven ſons and three daughters; whereof Diana, the eldeſt, was firſt married to Sir Grevil Verney of Compton-Verney in the county of Warwick, Knight of the Bath, and afterwards to William Lord Allington; Anne the ſecond died young; and Margaret was married to Edward Ruſſel, Earl of Orford beforementioned. Of the ſons, which were Francis, John, William, Edward, Robert, James, and George; James, who was ſeated at Maidwell in the county of Northampton, and died June the 22d 1712, aged 67, left by Elizabeth his ſecond wife, an only daughter named Trephena, wife of Thomas Stawen Eſq; Knight of the ſhire for the county of Surrey. Edward, the fourth ſon, died June the 21ſt 1714; Francis, the eldeſt, died without iſſue; and John, the ſecond, died in his infancy; but William, the third ſon, was beheaded July the 21ſt 1683, in his father's life-time. He married the Lady Rachel, ſecond daughter and coheir of Thomas Wriotheſly, Earl of Southampton, Lord High Treaſurer of England, and widow of Francis Lord Vaughan, eldeſt ſon of Richard Earl of Carbery; and by her, who died September the 29th 1723, aged 87 years, left iſſue one ſon named Wriotheſly, and two daughters; whereof the Lady Rachel, the eldeſt, was married to William Cavendiſh Duke of Devonſhire, and the Lady Catharine to John Manners, Marquis of Granby, afterwards Duke of Rutland. May the 23d 1695 the ſaid Wriotheſly, ſon of Lord William Ruſſel, who was beheaded, married Elizabeth, only daughter and heir of John Howland of Stretham in the county of Surrey Eſq; (by Elizabeth his wife, half-ſiſter to Sir Richard Child Bart. now Earl Tilney) and was thereupon created Baron Howland of Stretham, June the 13th 1695, and on the 7th of September 1700 ſucceeding his grandfather became Duke of Bedford, and March the 13th 1702-3 he was inſtalled Knight of the Garter, and died of the ſmall-pox May the 26th 1711, in the 31ſt year of his age, leaving iſſue three ſons and two daughters; of whom the Lady Rachel, the eldeſt, is married to Scroop Egerton Duke of Bridgwater, and the Lady Elizabeth to William Capel, Earl of Eſſex. Of the ſons, who were William, Wriotheſly, and John, the eldeſt died in his infancy; Wriotheſly, who was born in 1708, and ſucceeded his father as Duke of Bedford, on the 22d of April 1725 married the Lady Anne Egerton only daughter of the abovementioned Scroop Duke of Bridgewater by the Lady Elizabeth Churchill, third daughter and coheir to John Duke of Marlborough, but died without iſſue October the 23d 1732; by which means the Honour deſcended to his only ſurviving brother the Lord John Ruſſel, now Duke of Bedford, born September the 30th 1710, who, October the 11th 1731, married the Lady Diana Spencer grand-daughter to John Duke of Marlborough, and younger daughter of Charles late Earl of Sunderland, by whom he had a ſon, who died the day he was born, on the 6th of November 1732, and her Grace alſo died on the 27th of September 1735. His Grace has ſince married a daughter of the Right honourable the Lord Gower.

[*B*] *His behaviour after condemnation and at his death will appear from an account drawn up by Dr. Gilbert Burnet, which we ſhall give the reader from the original.*] It is as follows:

" The firſt time I came to my Lord *Ruſſel*, which " was on Monday at three a clock, he received me " with his ordinary civility and ſmiling countenance, " in all reſpects as he uſed to do. He was then " folding up his letter to the Duke, which he ſhewed " me, and ſaid, *This will be printed, and will be ſelling about the ſtreets as my ſubmiſſion, when I am led out to be hanged.* He ſaid, there was nothing in the " letter that went againſt him, but the whole of " writing to one, whom he had ſo much oppoſed. " As he was folding up the paper, he told me the " ſtory of Colonel *Sidney's* raſor with as much chearfulneſs as ever I ſaw in him. Then he fell a lamenting my Lord of *Eſſex's* misfortune, and ſaid, " a great part of it was on his account; which he gathered from a meſſage he had ſent to his father " the night before, that he was ſorrier for his ſon's " condition than he was; and from the time in " which he did it; and the reaſon of it he believed " was, that the Earl of *Eſſex* had almoſt forced him " to admit my Lord *Howard* to a meeting at his " houſe. For when he ſaw the Lord *Howard*, Colonel *Sidney*, and Mr. *Hampden* coming in, he ſaid " to the Earl of Eſſex, who was come before, *What have we to do with this* R——? and would have " gone out, but the Earl of *Eſſex* made him ſtay. " Yet he ſaid, having that miſtruſt he ſaid very little. And (to put all that belongs to this matter " together) the night before his death, he ſaid to me " in my Lady's hearing, that my Lord *Howard* in " many particulars had ſworn falſely, and done him " wrong. But I did not reckon them up. He " added concerning the Earl of Eſſex, that the day " before he, ſeeing his window open, looked towards " it through the glaſs in the head of his ſtaff, and " ſaw him leave the window as ſoon as he appeared, " and go into the room. So that he believed his " condition gave the fatal criſis to his melancholy. " He ſpoke often of him to me, and very largely, " the day before his death. He ſaid, he was the " worthieſt, the juſteſt, the ſincereſt, and moſt concerned for the publick of any man he ever knew. " And he alſo told me, that my Lord of *Eſſex* was " afterwards much troubled for admitting the Lord " *Howard* to their meetings, and thought he would " betray them; upon which he anſwered, he had " ventured upon the confidence the other had in him; " for, added he, if you ſhould betray me, every body " would blame you, and not me; but if we ſhould " let ſuch a man as my Lord *Howard* betray us, every " body would blame us, as much as him. Theſe " diſcourſes laſted about half an hour till my Lady " was gone with the letter, and then he entered upon " the ſerioueſt diſcourſes I ever heard. He told " me, for death, he thanked God, as a man he ne" ver was afraid of it, and did not conſider it with " ſo much apprehenſion as the drawing of a tooth. " But he ſaid, he found the courage of a man, that " could venture in the heat of blood, was very diffe" rent from the courage of a dying Chriſtian and " dying in cold blood. That muſt come from an in" ward peace of conſcience and aſſurance of the " mercy of God; and that he had to ſuch a degree,

" that

While he lay under ſentence of death he wrote a letter to the Duke of York dated from Newgate July the 16th, which was delivered to the Dutcheſs of York by the Lady Ruſſel;

" that though from the firſt day of his impriſonment " he reckoned he was a dead man, it had never " given him any ſort of trouble. He added, that " God knows, the trouble, I ſaw him in ſome weeks " ago when his ſon was ill, had gone nearer his " heart, and taken more of his reſt from him, than " his preſent condition had done. And he remem- " bered of a colic he had lately, which had filled " him with ſo much pain, and ſo oppreſſed his ſpirits, " that he ſaw how little a man could do, if he came " to die in ſuch a manner; whereas he had now all " his thoughts perfectly about him, and had no other " apprehenſions of death, but being a little gazed at " by his friends and enemies, and a moment's pain. " He ſaid, though he had been guilty of many de- " fects and failings (amongſt which he reckoned his " ſeldom receiving the Sacrament) yet he thanked " God, he had a clear conſcience, not only in rela- " tion to the publick, (in which he had gone ſo ſin- " cerely, that he was ſure he had nothing to anſwer " for but the ſins of ignorance, and ſome indecent " diſcourſes, in which he had been generally more " guilty by hearing them, and being pleaſed with " them, than by much ſpeaking) but in relation to " all his other concerns. He had ſpent much, but " it was in no ill way. He could never limit his " bounty to his condition; and all the thoughts he " had of the great eſtate that was to deſcend upon " him was to do more good with it; for he had " reſolved not to live much above the pitch he was " then at. He thanked God, that now for theſe " many years he had made great conſcience of all " he did; ſo that the ſins of omiſſion was the chief " thing he had to anſwer for. God knew the " ſincerity of his heart, that he could not go into a " thing he thought ill, nor could he tell a lie. Af- " ter an hour's diſcourſe, we prayed together. Then " he came to talk of his condition. He then " thought the ſentence would perhaps be executed by " hanging. But he ſaid, if his friends could bear " that as well as he could, it was no matter. He " next fell to ſpeak of a paper to be left behind " him. He was reſolved to ſay very little on the " ſcaffold, but to leave a larger paper. So he went " over the heads he thought fit to ſpeak to, which " I perceived he had conſidered much. He ſaid he " had much leiſure in the Tower, and had always " looked for this, for that he did not doubt but the " Sheriff would take care to return ſuch a Jury as " was reſolved to condemn him, if the King's Coun- " cil ſhould bid them. So he had been forming in " his mind what was fit for him to do in this matter; " for in moſt of the particulars he expreſſed himſelf " very near in the ſame words that are in his paper. " So I left him for that night. He deſired me to " come again the next day at noon; and in his mo- " deſt way deſired as much of my time as I could " conveniently ſpare.

" Next day I came to him, and found him in the " ſame temper I had left him, ſo ſedate, and upon " occaſion ſo chearful, that I never ſaw the like " before. He then went again over the heads of " his paper, and a minute was made of the points " he was to write of according to their order. I ſhall " not mix in this relation any thing of what I ſaid " to him upon any of them; but this in general, " that I diſcharged my conſcience in all reſpects, " both as a faithful ſubject to the King, and as a " ſincere Miniſter of the Goſpel ought to have done. " The thing is as it is, and I will neither ſay what " I approved or diſapproved; but this I will add, " that all the critical and nicer parts were very well " weighed, to an exactneſs in the choice of every " word. He thought it was incumbent upon him to " write all he writ; but he promiſed me to conſider " every thing, that I had offered to him. When " this was done, he run out into a long diſcourſe of " the providence of God in this matter. *Rumſey* " and Lord *Howard* were two men he had always a " ſecret horror at. *Shepherd* he thought better of, " till he was told he had betrayed *Walcot*. Then he " ſaid he wondered not he had ſworn falſely of him; " but till then he thought he had forgot himſelf. " His coming up to town occaſionally; his being " called by the Duke of *Monmouth* with ſo good an " intention; his not going to a formal meeting, " where *Rumſey* was not, but to that where he was " preſent; and the fatal melancholy of the Earl of " Eſſex that morning; all had ſuch marks of a " Providence of God, that he was fully ſatisfied, it " was well ordered by God for ſome good ends, that " it ſhould be as it was. After two hours diſcourſe " my Lady came. He dined, eat, and drank as " heartily, and did every thing in as chearful a man- " ner, as he uſed to do. Then he heard (though but " doubtfully) that Saturday was the day. So he " wiſhed to have two days more, that he might finiſh " his paper. After dinner he called for tea, and " talked of the State of Hungary and the affairs of " Europe juſt as he uſed to do. When my Lady " was gone, he expreſſed great joy in the magnani- " mity of ſpirit he ſaw in her; and ſaid, the part- " ing with her was the greateſt thing he had to do; " for he was afraid, ſhe would be hardly able to bear " it. The concern about preſerving him filled her " mind ſo now, that it in ſome meaſure ſupported " her; but when that would be over, he feared the " quickneſs of her ſpirits would work all within her. " From this he turned to ſpeak of his condition, " which he did in the ſame ſtrain he had done the " day before. He ſaid he was ſtill very glad he had " not fled; for he could not have lived from his " children, and wife, and friends: that was all the " happineſs he ſaw in life. He was glad, that " ſome, who had not lived ſo as to be fit to die, had " eſcaped. And a propoſition being ſent him by one " of the generouſeſt and gallanteſt friends in the " world, of a deſign for making his eſcape, he, in " his ſmiling way, ſent his thanks very kindly to " him; but ſaid, he would make no eſcape. But " (now I remember better) this was on Wedneſday. " After this we prayed, and I left him.

" On Wedneſday I came to him at noon (the hour " he had appointed) and found he had writ three " pages of the eight, of which his paper conſiſts, but " had left ſome ſpaces void for ſome nicer things; " and he drew in other pieces of paper what he had " intended to fill them up with. And after dinner, " (during which, as in all his meals, he behaved " himſelf in his ordinary manner) he ſhewed it to " my Lady; and after a little diſcourſe he filled up " the void ſpaces; which he did with that ſevere " ſtrictneſs, that it was viſible he would not ſay a " word but what was exactly according to his con- " ſcience. Then upon ſome diſcourſe upon his writ- " ing to the King, he chearfully reſolved on it. For " though he always ſaid, he never did any thing " that he thought contrary to his intereſt; yet many " railleries and other indecent things had paſſed, for " which he prayed God to forgive him, and reſolved " to aſk the King's pardon. And he ſaid, he thought " he muſt likewiſe let the King know, that he alſo " forgave him; and he himſelf hit on that expreſ- " ſion [*of all concerned in his death from the higheſt to the loweſt.*] After ſome more diſcourſe, his father " and uncle came to ſee him; and we all prayed " again, and I left him for that night.

" On Thurſday I came at noon, and found he " had got very near the end of his paper; ſo that " he concluded it before dinner. Only again I ſaw " new void ſpaces, and ſaw on other papers blotted " draughts of what he deſigned to put in them. " And he likewiſe filled them up before he dined; " ſo that he was at great eaſe. Upon this my Lady " came in, and told him the reſpite till Monday " was denied. This touched him a little; but I " perceived it only in his looks; but he ſaid no- " thing but that he thought ſuch a thing was never " denied to common felons. Yet when he conſi- " dered, that he had done with his papers, he was

" preſently

Ruſſel; and another to the King, dated July the 19th, to be delivered to his Majeſty after

" preſently very well ſatisfied, and ſaid afterwards, " he was glad it was not granted, for all that he " deſired it for, was that he might have one whole " day for the concerns of his ſoul, and have nothing " to mix with them. So he dined, and after dinner " he wrote his letter to the King. Then he wrote " his ſpeech he intended to make to the Sheriffs. " Only upon the report of what Capt. Walcot had " ſaid of him, he added thoſe words relating to " that on Friday. Then he was more compoſed " than ever; for all was done, that could have given " him any uneaſy work to his thoughts. He ſpake " of all people, that had appeared againſt him, par- " ticularly of the Lord Howard, with great pity, " but with no reſentment. He ſaid he had been " well enough known before; but now it was ſo " much better, that he could betray no body any " more. When my Lady went, he ſaid, he wiſhed " ſhe would give over beating every buſh, and run- " ning ſo about for his preſervation. But when he " conſidered, that it would be ſome mitigation of " her ſorrow afterwards, that ſhe left nothing un- " done, that could have given any probable hopes, " he acquieſced; and indeed I never ſaw his heart " ſo near failing him, as when he ſpake of her. " Sometimes I ſaw a tear in his eye, and he would " turn about, and preſently change the diſcourſe. " He reſolved to receive the Sacrament on Friday; " and ſo reſolved to ſpend that day, as he intended " to have done the Lord's-day, had he lived ſo long. " The Sacrament was to be given him early in the " morning, becauſe of Captain Richardſon's attend- " ance on the other executions that day. So the " Dean of Canterbury, who was with him every " day, except Thurſday (in which he was engaged) " come in the morning, and gave it him according " to the Common-Prayer; which he received with " that grave and ſedate devotion, that ſtill appeared " in him. His man deſired to receive with him; " ſo the Captain took our promiſe, that there ſhould " be nothing done, while his man was in the room " but the giving of the Sacrament; and therefore " till it was over, the Dean ſpake nothing to him. " But after that, the Dean aſked him of his believ- " ing all the Articles of Chriſtian Religion, which " were indeed the doctrine of this Church. He ſaid " he did believe them truly. Then he aſked him " of his forgiving all perſons. That, he ſaid, he " did from his heart. And in the laſt place he told " him, he hoped he would diſcharge his conſcience " in full and free Confeſſion. He aſſured him he " had done it; ſo the Dean left him. None but " my Lady and I ſtaid; and that morning I preach- " ed two ſermons to him; the firſt was on *Rev. xiv.* " 13. the ſecond on *Pſalm xxiii.* 4. They were a- " bout half an hour in length, and there was an " interval of about two hours between. He was " pleaſed to tell me at night, that what I ſpake came " into his heart, and he believed it was ſent to him " from God. In the interval he told me, he could " not pretend to ſuch high joys and longings, but on " entire reſignation of himſelf to the will of God, " and a perfect ſerenity of his mind. He ſaid he " once had ſome trouble, becauſe he found not thoſe " longings, Mr. Hampden the younger had, of whom " he ſpake often with great kindneſs and eſteem. " He had a few days before his commitment given " him from Mr. Baxter his late book of *Dying* " *Thoughts*; and he found many things in that ſo pat " to his own condition, that he bleſſed God for the " comforts of that book. He dined as he uſed to " do. After dinner he ſigned the copies of his pa- " pers, and wiſhed it might be that night ſent to " the preſs; which my Lady ordered by his direction.

" After Dinner his children were brought to " him. I ſaw him receive them with his ordinary " ſerenity; but I ſtaid not till he diſmiſſed them. " I left him for about three hours, and came to him " at eight a clock. He ſupped very chearfully, and " after ſupper fell into a long and pleaſant diſcourſe " of his two daughters; and of ſeveral other things. " He deſired me to pray both before ſupper and at " his parting with my Lady. He talked of ſeveral " paſſages concerning dying men with that freedom " in his ſpirit, that made us all ſtare one upon ano- " ther. And when a note was ſent to my Lady of " a new project for his preſervation, he did ſo treat " it in ridicule, that I was amazed, and I wondered " much, that when he ſaw us, that were about him, " not able to contain our griefs, he, who was ſo " tender himſelf, was not by that more ſoftned.

" At ten a clock my Lady left him. He kiſſed " her four or five times, and ſhe kept her ſorrow " ſo within herſelf, that ſhe gave him no diſturbance " by their parting. After ſhe was gone, he ſaid, " *Now the bitterneſs of death is paſt*; and ran out into " a long diſcourſe concerning her; how great a " bleſſing ſhe had been to him; and ſaid, what a " miſery it would have been to him, if ſhe had not " had that magnanimity of ſpirit joined to her ten- " derneſs, as never to have deſired him to do a baſe " thing for the ſaving of his life. Whereas other- " wiſe what a week ſhould have paſſed, if ſhe had " been crying on me to turn Informer, and be a Lord " Howard! Though he then repeated what he had " often before ſaid, that he knew of nothing where- " by the peace of the nation was in danger; and " that all that ever was, was either looſe diſcourſe, " or at moſt embryos, that never came to any thing; " ſo that there was nothing on foot to his knowledge. " But he left that diſcourſe, and returned to ſpeak " of my Lady. He ſaid, there was a ſignal Provi- " dence of God in giving him ſuch a wife, where " there was birth, fortune, great underſtanding, great " Religion, and great kindneſs to him; but her " carriage in his extremity was beyond all. He ſaid, " he was glad that ſhe and his children were to loſe " nothing by his death; and it was great comfort to " him, that he left his children in ſuch a mother's " hands; and that ſhe had promiſed to him to take " care of herſelf for their ſakes; which I heard her " do. Then he left this diſcourſe, and talked of his " change, how great a change death made, and how " wonderful thoſe new ſcenes would ſtrike on a ſoul. " He had heard how ſome, that had been born " blind, were ſtruck, when, by the couching of " their cataracts, they ſaw. But what, ſaid he, if " the firſt thing one ſaw were the ſun-riſing?

" About twelve he undreſſed himſelf, and was lock- " ed in, having given order to call him at four; ſo " at four we called him, and he was faſt aſleep. He " dreſſed himſelf as he uſed to do, neither with " more nor leſs care; only he would not loſe time " to be ſhaved. He was in the ſame temper he had " always been in, and thanked God he felt no ſort of " fear nor hurry in his thoughts. We prayed toge- " ther with ſome intervals, five or ſix times; and be- " tween hands, he often went into his chamber, " and prayed by himſelf. Once he came out with " more than ordinary joy, and ſaid he had been " much inſpired in his laſt prayer, and wiſhed he " could have writ it down, and ſent it to his wife. " The Dean came, and prayed, and ſpake alſo with " him. We both looked at one another, amazed " at the temper he was in. He gave me ſeveral com- " miſſions to his relations; but none more earneſt " than to one of them, againſt all revenges for " what had been done to him. He told me, he was " to give me his watch, and wound it up, and ſaid, " *I have done with time; now eternity comes.* The " ring, in which the ribband goes, broke in his " hands; which he thought a little ſtrange. He " once was giving me his watch in the priſon; but " he thought it would be more decent to do it on the " ſcaffold. He alſo called a ſtory to mind, which " might perhaps come to be talked of, in which " another was concerned; and though his part was " worthy and truly religious, there is a very good " reaſon why it ſhould not be ſpoken of; ſo he charg- " ed me never to ſpeak of it, unleſs I heard it talked " of, and then he left me to my diſcretion. I con- " feſs, when he began with a charge of ſecrecy, I " thought it was ſomething relating to the publick; " and I told him, I could not promiſe it. But it " was wholly of another nature.

" He continued in this temper to the laſt. He " called

after his Lordſhip's death. Theſe two letters ſhall be inſerted from the copies of them written by the Lady Ruſſel's own hand [C]. His Lordſhip was beheaded in Lincoln's-Inn-Fields July the 21ſt 1683. The paper, which he left in the Sheriff's hands, gave great

" called for tea, and drank two diſhes; and about " half an hour before he expected to be called on, he " drank a glaſs of ſherry, and eat a mouthful of " bread. He aſked the Dean how Sir *Richard Cor-* " *bet* (who he heard was ſick) did, and when he " ſaw Col. *Titus*, and deſired to be remembered to " him; and was aſking, if they were taking up any " more, juſt as Capt. *Richardſon* told him the Sheriffs " were come. So he withdrew for half a quarter " of an hour, and then came out with no alteration " in his looks.

" As he came down, my Lord *Cavendiſh* was be- " low, and he took leave of him; but when he " left him, he remembered of ſomewhat of great " importance, and went back to him, and ſpake to " him with great earneſtneſs. He told me what it " was in general, and wiſhed me to ſecond it. He " went out to his coach with his ordinary chearful- " neſs, and wondered to ſee ſo great a crowd.

" As we were going, he looked about him ſtill, " and knew ſeveral perſons. Some he ſaw ſtaring " on him, who knew him, and did not put off their " hats. He ſaid there was great joy in ſome; but " that did not touch him ſo much as the tears he ob- " ſerved in other people's eyes; for that, he ſaid, " made him tender. I obſerved he was ſinging of- " ten within himſelf, but could not hear the words. " I aſked him what he ſang? He ſaid it was the " beginning of the 119th Pſalm; but he ſhould ſing " better very ſoon. And obſerving the crowd, he " ſaid he ſhould ſoon ſee a greater and better company.

" As we came by Warwick-houſe, obſerving all " ſhut up there, he aſked, if my Lord Clare was out " of town. I told him, he could not think any " windows would be open there upon this occaſion.

" As we came to turn into Little-Queen-ſtreet, he " ſaid, I have often turned to the other hand with " great comfort; but now I turn to this with greater; " and looked towards his own houſe, and then, as " the Dean of Canterbury, who ſat over againſt him, " told me, he ſaw a tear or two fall from him.

" When we came into the field, he wondered to " ſee ſuch a crowd. I remember it rained as we " were in the way; and he ſaid to us, this rain may " do you hurt, that are bare-headed. And the " night before at ſupper, when he heard it rain hea- " vily, he ſaid it would ſpoil the ſhew to morrow, " if the rain ſhould continue; for a ſhew in a rainy " day was a very dull thing.

" After all was quiet, he ſpake to the Sheriffs " what he intended, of which he read the greater " part. Then he deſired the Dean to pray. After " that, he ſpake a word to the Dean, and gave him " his ring, and gave me his watch, and bid me go " to Southampton-houſe and to Bedford houſe, and " deliver the commiſſions that he had given me in " charge. Then he kneeled down, and prayed about " three or four minutes by himſelf. Afterwards he " undreſſed himſelf. He had brought a night-cap " in his own pocket, fearing leſt his man might not " get up to him. But on the way he obſerved him " walking very ſad by the coach, and ſaid, Taun- " ton has been a faithful ſervant to me; and I hope, " if my ſon lives, he ſhall ſerve him as long as he " has done me.

" He threw off his periwig, and put on his night- " cap, and then unbuttoned his coat, and let it be " drawn off. After that he took off his cravat; and " all this without the leaſt change of countenance. " And with the ſame courage, after he had given " the Executioner what he intended him, (which he " had forgot to do at firſt) he laid himſelf along, " and ſaid he would give no ſign. But when he had " lain down, I looked once at him, and ſaw no " change in his looks; and though he was ſtill lift- " ing up his hands, there was no trembling, though " in the moment in which I looked, the Executioner " happened to be laying his ax to his neck, to di- " rect him to take aim: I thought it touched him; " but am ſure he ſeemed not to mind it.

" This is a punctual and true relation of all that " I can remember between him and me.

" *G. B.*"

[C] *Theſe two letters ſhall be inſerted from the copies of them, written by the Lady Ruſſel's own hand.*]

The former is endorſed, *A copy of my Lord's letter to the Duke, which I delivered to the Ducheſſe.*

" May it pleaſe your Royal Highneſs,

" The oppoſition I have appeared in to your Royal " Highneſs's intereſt, has been ſuch, as I have ſcarce " the confidence to be a petitioner to you, though in " order to the ſaving of my life. Sir, God knows " what I did, did not proceed from any perſonal ill " will or animoſity to your Royal Highneſs; but " merely becauſe I was of opinion, that it was the " beſt way for preſerving the religion eſtabliſhed by " law; in which, if I was miſtaken, yet I acted ſin- " cerely, without any ill end in it. And as for any " baſe deſign againſt your perſon, I hope your Royal " Highneſs will be ſo juſt to me, as not to think me " capable of ſo vile a thought. But I am now reſolved, " and do faithfully engage myſelf, that if it ſhall " pleaſe the King to pardon me, and if your Royal " Highneſs will interpoſe in it, I will in no ſort " meddle any more in the leaſt oppoſition to your " Royal Highneſs; but will be readily determined to " live in any part of the world, which his Majeſty " ſhall preſcribe, and will never fail in my daily " prayers, both for his Majeſty's preſervation and ho- " nour, and your Royal Highneſs's happineſs; and " will wholly withdraw myſelf from the affairs " of England, unleſs called by his Majeſty's orders " to ſerve him; which I ſhall never be wanting to " do to the uttermoſt of my power. And if your " Royal Highneſs will be ſo gracious to me, as to " move on my account, as it will be an engagement " upon me beyond what I can in reaſon expect, ſo it " will make the deepeſt impreſſions on me poſſible; for " no fear of death can work ſo much with me, as ſo " great an obligation will for ever do upon,

" May it pleaſe your Royal Highneſs,
" Your Royal Highneſs's moſt humble
Newgate, " and moſt obedient ſervant,
16 July,
1683, " W. Ruſſell."

The latter is endorſed, *A copy of my Lord's letter to the King, to be delivered after his death, and was ſo by his uncle Colonel Ruſſell.*

" May it pleaſe your Majeſty,

" Since this is not to be delivered till after my " death, I hope your Majeſty will forgive the pre- " ſumption of an attainted man's writing to you. My " chief buſineſs is humbly to aſk your pardon for any " thing that I have either ſaid or done, that might " look like want of reſpect to your Majeſty, or duty " to your government; in which, though I do to " the laſt moment acquit myſelf of all deſigns againſt " your perſon, or of altering of the government, and " proteſt I know of no deſign now on foot againſt " either; yet I do not deny but I have heard many " things, and ſaid ſome things, contrary to my duty; " for which, as I have aſked God's pardon, ſo I " humbly beg your Majeſty's. And I take the liber- " ty to add, that though I have met with hard mea- " ſure, yet I forgive all concerned in it from the " higheſt to the loweſt; and I pray God to bleſs both " your perſon and government, and that the publick " peace and the true Proteſtant religion may be pre- " ſerved under you. And I crave leave to end my " days with this ſincere proteſtation, that my heart " was ever devoted to that which I thought was your " true intereſt; in which, if I was miſtaken, I hope " your diſpleaſure againſt me will end with my life, " and that no part of it ſhall fall on my wife and

great offence to the Court; and Dr. Gilbert Burnet was particularly charged as the Author of it, from which imputation he vindicated himſelf in a paper, which ſhall be given from the original in the remark [*D*]; and the Lady Ruſſel wrote a letter to his Majeſty

" children; which is the laſt petition will ever be " offered you from,

" May it pleaſe your Majeſty,

" Your Majeſty's moſt faithful, moſt

Newgate, " dutiful, and moſt obedient ſubject,

July 19,

1683. " W. Ruſſell."

[*D*] *He vindicates himſelf in a paper, which ſhall be given from the original in the remark.*]

Indorſed in the Lady Ruſſel's hand, *An account of what paſt concerning his laſt ſpeech and paper betweene my Lord and the Doctor. The larger papers of paſſages and diſcourſe I gave my ſon about* 705.

" An Account of all that paſſed between the " late Lord Ruſſell and me concerning his laſt ſpeech " and paper.

" On Monday the 16th of July my Lady Ruſſell " told me, that her huſband deſired me to come to " him. So I went to Newgate about three a clock " in the afternoon; and after ſome hours diſcourſe " on other ſubjects he told me, he intended to leave " ſomewhat behind him in writing, and went over " the heads of it very near in the ſame words, in " which they are expreſſed in the paper. There was " one thing indeed, that I ſuggeſted, which he had " not in his thoughts: it was concerning practice " with the witneſſes in the Popiſh plot. I told him, " I did not think he was capable of any ſuch thing; " but if by any hint he had reaſon to think there was " any practice in that matter, it was a great ſin for " him to have carried on any thing upon ſuch evi- " dence. He thanked me for ſaying this to him, " and ſaid he would clear himſelf of it. We had " alſo great diſcourſe about the unlawfulneſs of re- " ſiſtance; and I thought that by the ground I gained " at firſt, it would be eaſy to perſuade him, that it " was abſolutely unlawful. But indeed he went no " further at firſt than he did at laſt; yet I thought " the ſtep he made, gave further hopes; and ſo I " told the Dean of Canterbury, that I believed he " was convinced of it; but the ſequel of this will " appear afterwards. On Tueſday I went to him a- " gain, and he went over the points, concerning " which he intended to write, and a memorandum was " made on a little piece of paper in 8vo of the heads, " and the order, in which he intended to ſay them. " I again went over the point of the unlawfulneſs of re- " ſiſtance, and laid it fully open to him. So having " thus prepared himſelf, he ſent away my Lady on " Wedneſday morning, and ordered that none ſhould " be admitted till noon. When I came to him at " noon, I found he had written three pages of the " twelve, of which his paper conſiſts; and that he " had left two void ſpaces; the reſt he had writ with " the run of his pen; but theſe paſſages he would " not fill up till he had firſt formed them in other " pieces of paper. My Lady came in ſoon after me, " and ſaw how far he had gone, together with the " void ſpaces; and after dinner he filled them up. " But he ſaw by his memorandum, that he had much " yet before him; and it was that that made him " ſo deſirous of a reprieve till Monday. But doubt- " ing that might not be granted, he reſolved to ſet " cloſe to it on Thurſday. So he ſent away my " Lady by ſix a clock, and was ſo preſſing to be left " alone, that he would not let her ſtay till her coach " ſhould come, and he renewed his orders, that none " might be admitted to him till one a clock. When " I came to him at that hour, I found that he had " not above half an hour's writing before him; but " there were again ſome void ſpaces; two of which " I well remember, and I ſaw lying before him the " draughts of what he had intended for filling them " up; and I believe there were more of thoſe blotted " draughts, for I ſaw him burn a handful of foul " papers after dinner; but I only looked on the " blotted draughts of thoſe two parts of his paper. " My Lady came in ſoon after me, and ſaw likewiſe " all he had written, and one of the void ſpaces not " yet filled up. She likewiſe ſaw the foul draughts " he had written for ſome of them. After dinner " he writ his letter to the King, and what he in- " tended to ſay to the Sheriff. Only having a report " of Captain Walcot's having accuſed him as know- " ing the plot, and being deep in it, he added on " Friday that part of his ſhort ſpeech, which relates " to it; and ſo he concluded all he had to write. " In his paper he writ theſe words relating to the " matter of reſiſtance: *For my part, I cannot deny,* " *but that I have been of opinion, that a free nation* " *like this might defend their Religion and Liberties,* " *when invaded, and taken from them, though under* " *pretence and colour of law. But ſome eminent and* " *worthy Divines, who have had the charity to be* " *often with me, and whom I value and eſteem to a* " *very great degree, have offered me weighty reaſons to* " *perſuade me, that Faith and Patience are the proper* " *ways for the preſervation of Religion, and the method* " *of the Goſpel is to ſuffer perſecution rather than to uſe* " *reſiſtance. But if I have ſinned in this, I hope God* " *will not lay it to my charge, ſince he knows it was* " *only a ſin of ignorance.* In this he thought not fit " to come up to a poſitve renunciation of that opi- " nion. So the Dean of Canterbury, when a great " part of the paper was read to him on Friday morn- " ing, was ſorry to find it ſo defective; but being " then called away ſuddenly, by reaſon of Captain " Richardſon's being obliged to attend the execu- " tions, he had not leiſure to ſpeak of it at that " time, but came in the afternoon, and preſt my " Lord very earneſtly to deliver himſelf more fully " in that matter, and gave him a paper concerning " it; and as he came out meeting me, he had much " diſcourſe with me about it, and wiſhed me to preſs " my Lord home in the thing, which I aſſured him " I had done, and would again reinforce it, though " I did not think it likely he would go much fur- " ther. He wiſhed me either to carry him further, " or to daſh out that whole paragraph, ſince the con- " cluſion of it was ſo cold; and he wiſhed, that the " firſt part of it might be quite left out. So I " waited on my Lord, and ſpake home to him about " it. He told me, he could not ſay a lie, and he " was ſure I would not deſire it; and he was ſure, if " he went further, he muſt needs lie. He ſaid, he " had not leiſure now to ſtudy Politics. The notion " he had of laws and of the Engliſh government " was different from ours; yet he ſaid, ſo far did " he ſubmit to us, and to the reaſons we had offered " him, that he was willing to go ſo far as he had " done, but he could not go further without being " diſingenuous. So when at laſt I propoſed the daſh- " ing out the whole paragraph, he was very well " ſatisfied, and ſaid his chief reaſon for putting it " in was to prevent any inconveniency that might " come to us; ſo it was ſtruck out. But he ſaid " often, that whatever his opinion might be in caſes " of extremity, he was againſt theſe ways, and ever " thought a Parliamentary cure was the proper reme- " dy for all the diſtempers of the nation; and ſaid " that he and a few more (I think he ſaid either " half a dozen or half a ſcore) had taken much " pains to moderate people's heats for three years " together, and had ever perſuaded their friends to " be quiet, and wait for a Parliament. I am far " from covering myſelf with a pretence of the ſeal " of confeſſion, and upon that refuſing to anſwer to " any thing, that has been aſked me; for I will " know nothing, in which the ſtate is concerned, un- " der ſecrecy; of which I gave this clear inſtance: " for about half an hour before he was carried out, " he called me to his chamber, and told me, he was " to lodge a ſecret with me, but deſired a promiſe

" of

Majeſty a few days after his Lordſhip's death, to aſſure him, that her huſband was the real Author of that paper delivered to the Sheriff [*E*].

" of ſecrecy, except it happened to be talked of, " I ſtopped him, and ſaid, if it concerned the go- " vernment, I would not promiſe ſecrecy. But I " found it was of another nature. It is true, I ſaid, " that as to the diſcourſes, that paſt between him " and me, and what I had diſliked in his paper, I " thought I was not bound to give an account of " it; for though there is nothing of confeſſion in " the caſe, yet it would look too like a pretending " to merit in me, and a caſting a load on him, that " I thought I could not do it, and therefore begged " to be excuſed, ſince the conferences between a dying " man and a Divine, to whom he particularly opens " himſelf, ſeem to me ſacred things.

" As to all theſe particulars in matters of fact, I " am ready, whenſoever I ſhall be called upon, to " take my oath upon them.

" G. BURNET."

[*E*] *The Lady Ruſſel wrote a letter to his Majeſty . . . to aſſure him, that her huſband was the real Author of the paper delivered to the Sheriff.*]

Indorſed by Lady Ruſſel, *My letter to the King a few days after my dear Lord's death.*

" May it pleaſe your Majeſty,

" I find my huſband's enemies are not appeaſed " with his blood, but ſtil continue to miſrepreſent " him to your Majeſty. 'Tis a great addition to my " ſorrows, to hear your Majeſty is prevailed upon to " beleve, that the paper he delivered to the Sheriffe " at his death was not his own. I can truly ſay, " and am ready in the ſolemneſt manner to atteſt, " that [during his impriſonment *] I often heard " him diſcourſe the chiefeſt matters contained in that " paper in the ſame expreſſions he therein uſes, as " ſome of thoſe few relations, that were admited " to him, can likewiſe averr. And ſure 'tis an ar- " gument of no great force, that ther is a phraſe " or two in it another uſes, when nothing is more " common then to take up ſuch words we like, or " are accuſtomed to in our converſation. I beg " leave further to avow to your Majeſty, that al that " is ſet downe in the paper read to your Majeſty on " Sunday night, to be ſpoken in my preſence, is " exactly true; as I doubt not but the reſt of the " paper is, which was written at my requeſt; and " the Author of it in al his converſation with my " huſband, that I was privy to, ſhowed himſelfe a " loyal ſubject to your Majeſty, a faithful frind to " him, and a moſt tender and conſciencious Miniſter " to his ſoule. I do therefore humbly beg your " Majeſty would be ſo charitable to beleve, that he, " who in al his life was obſerved to act with the " greateſt clearneſſe and ſincerity, would not at the " point of death doe ſo diſingenious and falſe a thing, " as to deliver for his own what was not properly " and expreſsly ſo. And if after the loſſe, in ſuch " a manner, of the beſt huſband in the world, I " were capable of any conſolation, your Majeſty only " could afford it by having better thoughts of him; " which, when I was ſo importunat to ſpeak with " your Majeſty, I thought I had ſom reaſon to be- " leve I ſhould have inclined you to, not upon the " credit of my word, but through the evidence of " what I had to ſay. I hope I have writ nothing " in this, that wil diſpleaſe your Majeſty. If I have, " I humbly beg you to confider it as coming from " a woman amazed with grief; and that you wil " pardon the daughter of a perſon, who ſerved your " Majeſty's father in his greateſt extremityes, [and your " Majeſty in your greateſt poſts *,] and one that is " not conſcious of having ever done any thing " to offend you [before**]. I ſhal ever pray for " your Majeſty's long life and happy reign, who am, " with all humility,

" May it pleaſe your Majeſty, &c."

T.

* The words included in the Brackets are croſſed out.

* Theſe words are likewiſe croſſed out.

** This word was alſo croſſed out.

RUSSILIANUS (TIBERIUS), a very ſubtle as well as bold Philoſopher, lived in the 16th Century. He was born in Calabria, and was one of the moſt famous Diſciples of Auguſtin Niphus. He was ſo haſty and paſſionate, that when he diſputed with other ſtudents he uſed ſometimes to fight; for which reaſon Niphus, in a jeſt, which at that time might paſs for wit, called him *Turberius* (*a*) inſtead of *Tiberius* (*b*). He was ſo ambitious as to imitate Joannes Picus, and perhaps even to ſurpaſs him; for he propoſed, to be publickly diſputed upon, in ſeveral Univerſities of Italy, four hundred propoſitions, taken from almoſt all ſciences (*c*). This exaſperated the inquiſitors, as they had been at the like attempt of Joannes Picus; and were greatly ſurprized that Ruſſilianus, being ſo young a man, was ſo impudent as to maintain ſeveral opinions which they thought impious [*A*]. They cauſed him to be proſecuted, which did not terrify

(*a*) That is, a turbulent perſon.

(*b*) Auguſt. *Niphus de Viro aulico*, cap. 59. p. 316.

(*c*) See Naudæus, *in Judicio de Aug. Nipho*, p. 40.

[*A*] *The Inquiſitors . . . were greatly ſurprized that Ruſſilianus . . . . was ſo impudent as to maintain ſeveral opinions which they thought impious.*] He aſſerted that Chriſt, with regard to the temperature of his body, and the courſe of his life, was ſubject to the influence of the ſtars; that time and the heavens never had any beginning; that the flood under Noah was not a ſingular accident. He revived many of the doctrines of John Picus, which had been condemned, as Gabriel Naudæus affirms. *Tam ardenter Pici Mirandulani veſtigiis inſtitiſſe certum eſt, ut non ſecus ac ille, propoſitiones ſupra quadringentas, ex omni ferme ſcientiarum genere ſelectas, publicis in Italiæ Gymnaſiis, diſputandas propoſuerit; ſed invitis tamen ac frementibus, quemadmodum etiam Pico contigerat, ſacris fidei quæſitoribus, qui patienter ferre non poterant, ab hoc tam præcocis ut ſapientiæ, ſic ætatis Philoſopho, Chriſtum quoad ſui corporis temperiem, & vitæ mortiſque hiſtoriam legibus Aſtrorum ſubjici: tempus, & Cœlum, durationis æternæ conſtitui; Inundationem illam univerſalem, quam nos Chriſtiani ſemel dumtaxat accidiſſe contendimus, ſannis, & dicacibus verbis excipi, quaſi certis temporum inclinationibus reverti ſolitam: Cætera denique Placita, quæ dudum à Pico in medium propoſita, temeritatis, & hæreticæ labis damnata fuerant, rurſum in ſcenam, Academicarum concertationum palæſtram, revocari* (1). i. e. " It is very certain he trod ſo exactly in Picus Mi- " randula's ſteps, that, in imitation of him, he pro- " poſed upwards of four hundred propoſitions, in " almoſt all ſciences, to be diſputed upon in the uni- " verſities of Italy. This highly exaſperated the " Inquiſitors, (to whom Picus Mirandula alſo had gi- " ven great offence on the like occaſion;) for they " could not bear to hear a Philoſopher, ſo very " young, and of ſo forward an underſtanding, af- " firm that Chriſt, with regard to the diſpoſition or " temperature of his body, and the hiſtory of his life " and death, was ſubject to the power of the ſtars: " that time and the heavens ſhould be aſſerted as of " eternal duration; that the flood, which we Chriſti- " ans declare to have happened but once, ſhould " be laughed at, as a thing that had already happen- " ed at certain ſeaſons. Laſtly, that the reſt of Pi- " cus's doctrines, long ſince propoſed by him, and " condemned as raſh and heretical, ſhould be again " revived, and made a ſubject for academical diſ- " putations." Heidegger accuſes him of aſſerting the opinion of one Henry Mechlinius, a diſciple of

(1) Naudæus, *in Judicio de Nipho*, p. 40.

(d) Rem. [B] of the first NIPHUS.

terrify him; on the contrary, he had the courage to publiſh a very ſharp apology againſt the Monks [B]. I have quoted elſewhere (d) a ſpeech, in which he introduces philoſophy repreſenting her grievances to Leo X.

Albertus Magnus, viz. that the flood was cauſed by the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn, at the extremity of the ſign Cancer, oppoſite to the conſtellation Argo. *Et Mechlinius quidem in Commentariis, quas edidit in magnas Albumaſaris conjunctionis, refert, ſe inveniſſe ex aſtronomicis ſupputationibus, quod Noeticum Diluvium præceſſerit conjunctio quædam Aſtrorum, generalem Aquarum Illuvionem inducens, nimirum Jovis & Saturni in fine Cancri, e regione Argolicæ Navis per quam etiam Arca Noe ſignificatur. Verum hanc Sententiam ſuperiori ſeculo à Tiberio Calabro defenſam refutavit Hieronymus Armellinus Dominicanus, edito peculiari adverſus eum volumine, in quo eam tamquam hæreticam æſtuante ſtomacho damnavit* (2). i. e. "Mechlinius, in his commentaries on the great Albumaſar, relates, that he found by aſtronomical calculations, that Noah's flood was preceded by a certain conjunction of the ſtars, which occaſioned the univerſal deluge, viz. the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in the extremity of Cancer, oppoſite to the conſtellation Argo, which alſo denoted Noah's ark. But this opinion, which Tiberius of Calabria defended in the laſt age, was confuted by Jerom Armellinus, a Dominican Frier, in a book he wrote profeſſedly againſt him; and wherein he, in the moſt furious terms, condemns that opinion as heretical."

(2) Heidegger. *Hiſt. Patriarch.* Exercitat. 17. p. 538. Tom. 1. He ſays the ſame in his diſſertation *de Signis cæleſtibus*, p. 679.

[B] *He had the courage to publiſh a very ſharp apology againſt the Monks.*] Here follows another paſſage from Gabriel Naudæus. *Quamobrem ſeverius in illum, & diligentius inquirere cæperunt, ſed eo tamen veluti dubiæ pugnæ exitu, ut Tyberius edito adverſus cucullatos Apologetico, talem enim libello ſuo titulum eſſe voluit, & opiniones ſuas liberius quam antea feciſſet propugnaſſe, & acrius ejuſmodi cenſores ſuos, quam rationi conſentaneum eſſet, pupugiſſe videretur* (3). i. e. "For this reaſon they began to inform againſt him with greater ſeverity and diligence than before; but Ruffilianus, on the other hand, publiſhed an apology againſt the hooded Friers, for ſuch was the title he gave his book, wherein he defended his own opinions with greater freedom than ever he had done; and ſeemed to have fallen upon his cenſurers in a ſharper manne than was conſiſtent with reaſon."

(3) Naudæus, *in Judicio de Niphbo*, p. [illegible].

☞ RUST (GEORGE), an excellent Engliſh Writer and Divine in the 17th Century, was educated in Chriſt College in the Univerſity of Cambridge, of which he was Fellow, and where he lived in great eſteem and reputation for his eminent learning and virtues, and was one of the firſt in the Univerſity who overcame the prejudices of the education of the times before the Reſtoration, and was very inſtrumental to enlarge others. He had too great a ſoul for the trifles of that age, and ſaw early the nakedneſs of phraſes and fancies. He out-grew the pretended orthodoxy of thoſe days, and addicted himſelf to the primitive learning and theology, in which he even then became a great maſter (a). In 1651 he delivered in his own Chapel a diſcourſe upon *Proverbs* xx. 27. [A], which in 1655 he preached at St. Mary's in Cambridge upon *John* xviii. 38. This piece was firſt publiſhed by Mr. *Joſeph Glanvil* at London in 1682 in 8vo, under the title of *A Diſcourſe of Truth*, in a volume entitled, *Two choice and uſeful Treatiſes; the one* Lux Orientalis: *Or an enquiry into the opinion of the Eaſtern Sages concerning the Pre-exiſtence of*

(a) Mr. Joſeph Glanvil's *Preface* to Biſhop Ruſt's *Diſcourſe of Truth.* Edition London 1682, in 8vo.

[A] *A diſcourſe upon* Proverbs xx. 27.] In this diſcourſe our Author obſerves (1), that "there are two "things, God and a man's own ſoul, the want of right "apprehenſion whereof is a great foundation both of "thoſe miſapprehenſions, that are concerning the "providences and diſpenſations of God in the world, "and alſo of the looſeneſs and irregularity in the "practices and behaviour of men. For we are to "judge of the truth of our opinions relating to the "providence of God, by their conformity to the na"ture and attributes of God. And therefore if we "have miſapprehenſions of divine attributes and per"fections, we muſt neceſſarily miſtake in divine diſ"penſations. And becauſe every one deſires to be "what his God is, therefore if we misjudge and "miſunderſtand the nature of God, we ſhall be ir"regular and amiſs in our own practices; for we "can never condemn that as a fault in ourſelves, "which we take for a perfection in our God. And "therefore it is rightly brought as one great reaſon "of the wickedneſs of the Heathen, that their Gods "were repreſented to them, as taken with the ſame "luſts and pleaſures, which they themſelves were ſo "much inclined and given up to. So ſome men's "apprehenſions of God lead them to a kind of cru"elty, rigour, and ſevereneſs towards others, and to "the deſire of an exerciſe of arbitrarious power and "dominion over them, even in things mental and "intellectual. And as wrong apprehenſions of God's "nature, ſo alſo miſconceits of the nature of the "ſoul, and its operations, muſt needs cauſe miſtakes "concerning the great providences of God, which "relate to the minds of men. For it being agreeable "to the wiſdom and goodneſs of God, to deal "with us in a way ſuitable to our faculties, and the "principles of our conſtitution; if we miſtake here, "we ſhall neceſſarily conceive amiſs of thoſe diſ"penſations of God, which concern the govern"ment of us, in reference to our minds and under"ſtandings. And farther, becauſe every being doth "act ſuitably to its principles; therefore voluntary "agents, if they do not rightly underſtand the nature "and diſpenſations of their powers and faculties, "what objects and operations are thereto proportion"ed, will certainly neglect the attempting of ſuch "objects, and the exerciſe of ſuch actions, which "they do not conceive to be in their ſphere and ca"pacity." He then remarks, that the meaning of the text in Prov. xx. 27. is, that the *ſoul of man is, as it were, a candle lighted and ſet by God, to ſearch into, and take notice of all the ſecrets, which are inwombed in man, his thoughts, deſires, affections, &c.* And he enquires, 1. What is meant by the *Candle of the Lord?* 2. What is meant by the *Spirit of Man?* 3. How the *Spirit of Man* is the *Candle of the Lord?* With regard to the firſt, he obſerves, that by the *Candle of the Lord* is meant nothing elſe but *Truth*; for Truth is the light of the intellectual world. Truth, ſays he, *is twofold: Truth in things, which you may call Truth in the objects; and Truth in the underſtanding, which is truth in the ſubject. By the firſt*, ſays he (2), *I mean nothing elſe, but that things neceſſarily are what they are; and that there are neceſſary mutual reſpects and relations of things one unto another. Now that things are what they are, and that there are mutual reſpects and relations, eternal and immutable, and in order of nature antecedent to any underſtanding, either created or uncreated, is a thing very plain and evident. For it is clearer than the meridian light, that ſuch propoſitions as theſe,* Homo eſt Animal rationale; Triangulum eſt quod habet tres angulos, *are not arbitrarious dependences upon the will, decree, or underſtanding of God, but are neceſſary and eternal truths, and wherein it is as impoſſible to divide the ſubject, and what is ſpoken of it, as it is for a thing not to be what it is; which is no leſs than a contradiction. And as indiſpenſable are the mutual*

(1) See *The Remains of Dr. George Ruſt, late Lord Biſhop of Dromore, in the Kingdom of Ireland. Collected and publiſhed by Henry Hallywell*, p. 21. London 1686, in 4to.

(2) Ibid. p. 23.

of ſouls: being a Key to unlock the grand Myſteries of Providence in relation to Man's Sin and Miſery. The other, A diſcourſe of Truth, *by the late Reverend Dr. Ruſt, Lord Biſhop of Dromere in Ireland. With Annotations on them both.* The *Annotations* are ſuppoſed to be written by Dr. Henry More. Mr. Glanvil in his *Preface* obſerves with regard to this

mutual reſpects and relations of things, both in ſpeculatives and morals. For can it be imagined, that every argument can be made a proportioned medium, to prove every concluſion? That any thing may be a ſuitable means to every end? That any object may be conformable to any faculty? Can Omnipotence itſelf make theſe propoſitions, that twice two are four, or that parallels cannot interſect, clear and convincing arguments to prove thoſe grand truths, That Chriſt came into the world to die for ſinners, and is now exalted as a Prince and Saviour at the right hand of God? *Is it poſſible that there ſhould be ſuch a kind of Geometry, wherein any problems ſhould be demonſtrated by any principles,* quidlibet ex quolibet, *as that a quadrangle is that, which is comprehended of four right lines; therefore the three angles of a triangle are not equal to two right ones? Can the infinite wiſdom itſelf make the damning of all the innocent and the unſpotted Angels in Heaven, a proportionate means to declare and manifeſt the unmeaſurableneſs of his grace, and love, and goodneſs towards them? Can lying, ſwearing, envy, malice, nay hatred of God and goodneſs itſelf, be made the moſt acceptable ſervice of God, and the readieſt way to a man's happineſs? And yet all theſe muſt be true, and infinitely more ſuch contradictions than we can poſſibly imagine, if the mutual reſpects and relations of things be not eternal and indiſpenſable.* Which that they are, our Author endeavours to prove; in order to which he premiſes, that "divine underſtanding cannot be "the fountain of the truth of things, nor the foun- "dation of the references one to another; for it is "againſt the nature of all underſtanding to make "its objects. It is the nature of underſtanding, *ut "moveatur, illuminetur, formetur, &c.* of its object, *ut "moveat, illuminet, formet. Intellectus in actu primo* "hath itſelf unto its object, as the eye unto the ſun; "it is irradiated, enlightened, and actuated by it. "And *Intellectus in actu ſecundo* hath itſelf unto its "object, as the image to that it repreſents; and the "perfection of underſtanding conſiſts in being actuat- "ed by and in an adequate conformity to its ob- "ject, according to the nature of all ideas, images, "or repreſentations of things. The ſum is this: "no ideas or repreſentations are or make the things "they repreſent; all underſtanding is ſuch; there- "fore no underſtanding doth make the natures, "reſpects, and relations of its objects. It remains "then, that abſolute, arbitrarious, and independent "will muſt be the fountain of all truth, and muſt "determine the references and dependences of things; "which aſſertion would in the firſt place deſtroy the "nature of God, and rob him of his attributes. "For then it is impoſſible that there ſhould be ſuch "a thing as divine wiſdom and knowledge, which "is nothing elſe but an apprehenſion of common "notions, and the natures and mutual reſpects and "relations of things. For if the nature of God be "ſuch, that his arbitrarious imagination, that ſuch "and ſuch things have ſuch and ſuch natures and "dependences, doth make thoſe things to have thoſe "natures and dependences, he may as eaſily unima- "gine that imagination; and then they that before "had a mutual harmony, ſymphony, and agree- "ment with one another, ſhall now ſtand at a great "diſtance and oppoſition. And thus the divine un- "derſtanding will be a mere *Protean Chimæra*, a ca- "ſual conflux of intellectual atoms. Contradictions "are true, if God will underſtand them ſo; and "then the foundation of all knowledge is taken away, "and God may as truly be ſaid to know nothing as "every thing; nay, an angel or man may as truly "be ſaid to know all things, as God himſelf; for "then every thing will be alike certain, and every "apprehenſion equally conformable to truth. Theſe "are infallible conſequences, and a thouſand more "as abſurd as theſe, if contradictory propoſitions "may be both true; and whether they be ſo or no, "it is a mere caſual dependence upon the arbitrarious "pleaſure of God, if there be not a neceſſary immu- "tability and eternal oppoſition betwixt the being "and not being of the ſame thing, at the ſame time, "and in the ſame reſpect. Likewiſe all thoſe truths "we call *Common Notions*, (the ſyſtem and compre- "henſion of which is the very eſſence of divine "wiſdom) as the concluſions iſſuing from them, "not by any operoſe deduction, but a clear intuitive "light, are the very nature of divine knowledge, "(if we diſtinguiſh thoſe two attributes in God;) I "ſay, all theſe propoſitions of immediate and inde- "monſtrable truth, if theſe be only ſo, becauſe ſo "underſtood by God, and ſo underſtood by God, be- "cauſe he pleaſed to have them, and not becauſe "there is an indiſpenſable relation of harmony and "proportion betwixt the terms themſelves; then it "is a thing merely caſual, and at the pleaſure of "God to change his former apprehenſions and ideas "of thoſe truths, and to make their contradicto- "ries as evident, radical, and fundamental as them- "ſelves but even now were; and ſo divine wiſdom "and knowledge will be a various, fickle, and muta- "ble thing, a mere tumult and confuſion. All "theſe conſequences infallibly flow from this cer- "tain principle, that upon a changeable and uncer- "tain cauſe, effects muſt needs have a changeable and "uncertain dependence. And there is nothing ima- "ginable in itſelf more changeable and uncertain "than a will not regulated by the dictates of reaſon "and underſtanding. If any deny theſe conſequen- "ces and deductions, becauſe they ſuppoſe that God "is mutable and changeable; I anſwer, by bring- "ing this as another abſurdity, that if there be no "indiſpenſable and eternal reſpects of things, it "will rob God of his immutability and unchange- "ableneſs. For if there be no neceſſary dependence "betwixt unchangeableneſs and perfection, what "ſhould hinder, but that if God pleaſe to think ſo, "it will be a perfection to be changeable? And if "will, as ſuch, be the only principle of his actions, "it is infallibly his perfection to be ſo. For it is "the perfection of every Being to act according to "the principle of its nature; and it is the nature of "an arbitrarious principle to act or not, to do or "undo upon no account but its own will and plea- "ſure: to be determined and tied up, either by it- "ſelf or from abroad, is violent and contranatural."

He tells us then (3), that *to deny the mutual reſpects and* (3) p. 27.
Rationes Rerum *to be immutable and indiſpenſable, will ſpoil God of that univerſal rectitude, which is the greateſt perfection of his nature. For then juſtice, faithfulneſs, mercy, goodneſs,* &c. *will be but contingent and arbitrarious iſſues of the divine will. This is a clear and undeniable conſequence. For if you ſay, theſe be indiſpenſable perfections in God; for inſtance, if* Juſtice *be ſo, then there is an eternal relation of right and equity betwixt every Being, and the giving of it that which is its propriety; if* Faithfulneſs, *then there is an indiſpenſable agreement betwixt a promiſe and the performance of it; if* Mercy, *then there is an immutable and unalterable ſuitableneſs and harmony between an indigent creature, and pity and commiſeration; if* Goodneſs, *then there is an everlaſting proportion and ſymmetry between fulneſs and its overflowing and diſpreading of itſelf, which yet is the thing denied. For to ſay they are indiſpenſably ſo, becauſe God underſtands them ſo, ſeems to me extreme incogitancy; for that is againſt the nature of all underſtanding, which is but the idea and repreſentation of things, and is then a true and perfect image, when it is exactly conformed to its object. And therefore if things have not mutual reſpects and relations eternal and indiſpenſable, then all thoſe perfections do ſolely and purely depend upon abſolute and independent will, as will; and conſequently it was and is indifferent in itſelf, that the contrary to theſe, as injuſtice, unfaithfulneſs, cruelty, malice, hatred, ſpite, revenge, fury, and whatever goes to the conſtitution of Hell itſelf, ſhould have been made*

this *Diſcourſe of Truth*, that " the ſubject of it is of vaſt moment, and the truth aſſerted " in it with an irreſiſtible ſtrength and force of reaſoning; and not to be convinced by " it, will argue either great weakneſs of underſtanding, in not perceiving conſequences, " that are ſo cloſe and plain; or great obſtinacy of will, in being ſhut up by prejudices " and preconceived opinions againſt light, that is ſo clear and manifeſt." It was reprinted

the top and higheſt perfections of the Divine Nature; which is ſuch blaſphemy, as cannot well be named without horror and trembling. For inſtead of being a God, ſuch a nature as this is, joined with Omnipotency, would be a worſe Devil than any in Hell. And yet this is a neceſſary and infallible conſequence from the denial of theſe mutual reſpects and relations of things unto one another, to be eternal and unchangeable. He remarks then (4), that " as by the denial of theſe the nature of " God is wholly deſtroyed, ſo in the ſecond place " the mind of man would have no certainty of " knowledge, or aſſurance of happineſs. He can " never come to know there is a God, and conſe- " quently not the will and mind of God, which if " there be no intrinſecal and indiſpenſable reſpects " and relations of things, muſt be the ground and " foundation of all knowledge; for what means or " arguments ſhould we uſe to find out or prove a Di- " vine Nature? It were folly and madneſs to ſit down " and conſider the admirable contrivement and arti- " fice of this great fabrick of the Univerſe; how that " all natural things ſeem to act for ſome end, though " themſelves take no cognizance of it; how the " ſun by its motion and ſituation, or (which is all " one) by being a centre of the earth's motion, pro- " vides light, and heat, and life for this inferior " world; how living creatures bring forth a moſt " apt compoſure and ſtructure of parts, and with that " a Being endued with admirable faculties, and yet " themſelves have no inſight into, nor conſultation " about this incomparable workmanſhip; how they " are furniſhed with powers and inclinations for the " preſervation of the body, when it is once brought " into the world; how without previous deliberation " they naturally take in that food, which without " their intention or animadverſion is concocted in " their ventricle, turned into chyle, that chyle into " blood, that blood diffuſed through the veins and ar- " teries, and therewith the ſeveral members nouriſh- " ed, and decays of ſtrength repaired; I ſay, the " gathering from all theſe, (which one would think " were a very natural conſequence) that there is a " wiſe principle, which directs all theſe Beings un- " known to you, in their ſeveral motions, to their " ſeveral ends, (ſuppoſing the dependence and rela- " tions of things to be contingent and arbitrarious) " were a piece of folly and incogitancy. For how " can the order of thoſe things ſpeak a wiſe and un- " derſtanding Being, which have no relation or re- " ſpect unto one another, but their whole agreement, " ſuitableneſs, and proportion, is a mere caſual " iſſue of abſolute and independent will? If any " thing may be the cauſe of any effect, and a pro- " portionate mean to any end, who can infer infinite " wiſdom from the dependence of things, and their " relations to one another? For we are to know, that " there is a God, and the will of that God, before " we can know the mutual harmony or diſproportion " of things; and yet if we do not know theſe prin- " cipal reſpects, that things have among themſelves, " it is impoſſible we ſhould ever come to the know- " ledge of a God. For theſe are the only arguments, " that any logic in the world can make uſe of to " prove any concluſion. But ſuppoſe we ſhould come " to know that there is a God, which, as I have " demonſtrated, denying the neceſſary and immuta- " ble truth of common notions, and the indiſpenſa- " ble and eternal relations of things, is altogether " impoſſible; however, let it be ſuppoſed, yet how " ſhall we know, that theſe common notions and " principles of natural inſtinct, which are the foun- " dation of all diſcourſe and argumentation, are " certain and infallible truths, and that our ſenſes, " (which, with theſe former principles, we ſuppoſe " this divine nature to have given us to converſe " with this outward world) were not on purpoſe be- " ſtowed upon us, to befool, delude, and cheat us, " if we be not firſt aſſured of the veracity of God? " And how can we be aſſured of that, if we know " not that veracity is a perfection? And how ſhall " we know it is ſo, unleſs there be an intrinſecal " relation betwixt veracity and perfection? For if " it be an arbitrarious reſpect depending upon the " will of God, there is no way poſſibly left whereby " we ſhould come to know, that it is in God at all. " And therefore we have fully as much reaſon to be- " lieve, that all our common notions and principles " of natural inſtinct, whereupon we ground all our " reaſonings and diſcourſe, are mere chimæras to " delude and abuſe our faculties, and all thoſe ideas, " phantaſms, and apprehenſions of our external ſenſes, " we imagine are occaſioned in us by the preſence " of outward objects, are mere ſpectrums and " gulleries, wherewith poor mortals are befooled and " cheated; as that they are given us by the firſt " goodneſs and truth to lead us into the knowledge " of himſelf and nature. This is a clear and evi- " dent conſequence, and cannot be denied by any " that doth not complain of darkneſs in the brighteſt " and moſt meridian light. And here you have the " foundation of the higheſt *ſcepticiſm*; for who can " ſay he knows any thing, when he hath no baſis, " on which he can raiſe any true concluſion? . . . . " Here you have likewiſe the true foundations of " that we call *Rantiſm*; for if there be no diſtinction " betwixt truth and falſhood, good and evil, in the " nature of the things themſelves, and we can never " be aſſured what is the mind and pleaſure of the ſu- " preme abſolute will, (becauſe veracity is not in- " trinſecally, and *ex naturâ Rei* a perfection, but only " an arbitrarious, if any attribute in the Deity) then " it infallibly follows, that it is all one what I do, " or how I live; and I have as much reaſon to be- " lieve, that I am as pleaſing to God, when I give " myſelf up into all filthineſs, uncleanneſs, and ſin, " when I ſwell with pride, envy, hatred, malice, " *&c.* as when I endeavour with all my might and " ſtrength to purge and purify my ſoul from all pollu- " tion and defilement both of fleſh and ſpirit; and " when I purſue the mortification of all my carnal " luſts and inclinations. And I have fully as much " ground and aſſurance, that the one is the ready " way to happineſs as the other." *And this is another branch of this ſecond abſurdity, from the denial of the intrinſecal and eternal reſpects and relations of things, that a man would not have any aſſurance of future happineſs. For though it be true indeed, or at leaſt we fancy to ourſelves, that God hath ſent Jeſus Chriſt into the world, and by him hath made very large and ample promiſes, that whoſoever believes in him, and conforms his life unto his precepts, ſhall be made heir of the ſame inheritance and glory, which Chriſt is now poſſeſſed of and inveſted with in the Kingdom of his Father; yet what ground have we to believe, that God does not intend only to play with and abuſe our faculties, and in concluſion to damn all thoſe that believe and live as is above expreſſed, and to take them only into the enjoyments of heaven and happineſs, who have been the great oppoſers of the truth and goſpel, and life, and nature of Jeſus Chriſt in the world? For if there be no intrinſecal evil in deceiving and falſifying, in the damning the good, or ſaving obſtinate and contumacious ſinners, (whilſt ſuch) notwithſtanding any promiſes or threatnings to the contrary; and if the things be in themſelves indifferent, it is an unadviſed confidence to pronounce determinately on either ſide. Yea, farther, ſuppoſe we ſhould be aſſured, that God is* verax, *and that the ſcripture doth declare what is his mind and pleaſure; yet if there be not an intrinſecal oppoſition betwixt the Being and not Being of a thing at the ſame time, and in the ſame reſpect; then God can make a thing, that hath been done undone, and that whatever hath been done or ſpoken, either by himſelf, or Chriſt, or his Apoſtles, ſhould never be done or ſpoken by him or them; though he hath come into the world, yet he ſhould not*

(4) p. 28.

printed by Mr. Henry Hallywell with the addition of two Prefaces [*B*], among our Author's *Remains*, at London in 1686 in 4to. In 1656 our Author performed an exerciſe upon this ſubject, *Meſſias in S. Scripturâ promiſſus olim venit*, in the Divinity-ſchools at Cambridge, publiſhed by Mr. Hallywell among his *Remains*, who in his Preface to them obſerves, that in this piece *we have a ſolid and rational refutation of all the cavils and exceptions, which the greateſt and moſt learned Rabbins of the Jews could invent to invalidate the force of thoſe predictions, which the Chriſtians urge againſt them, to prove that the promiſed Meſſiah is long ſince come. And by this we gain thus much, that ſince the objections of the naſuteſt Jews are ſo weak, and their exceptions againſt thoſe prophecies the Author here makes uſe of ſo very trifling and frivolous, and that they are at ſo great an uncertainty among themſelves both as to the perſon and the time of the Meſſiah's coming, it is a very ſtrong confirmation of us Chriſtians in the belief of this great article of our faith, that our Jeſus is really the promiſed Meſſiah, and that the Jews themſelves ought to have received him as ſuch, and ſubmitted themſelves to his laws, as the Son of God and the King of Iſrael.* In 1658 our Author preached at St. Mary's in Cambridge a diſcourſe upon 1 *John* iv. 16. [*C*], and the ſame year he anſwered the Divinity Act on Commencement Tueſday, upon

not be come; though he hath made theſe promiſes, yet that they ſhould not be made; though God hath given us faculties, that are capable of the enjoyment of himſelf, yet that he ſhould not have given them us; and that we ſhould have no Being, nor think a thought, while we fancy and ſpeak of all theſe contradictions. In fine, it were impoſſible, we ſhould know any thing, if the application of contradictory terms depend upon the arbitrarious reſolves of any being whatſoever. If any ſhould affirm, that the terms of common notions have an eternal and indiſpenſable relation unto one another, and deny it of other truths, he exceedingly betrays his folly and incogitancy. For theſe common notions and principles are foundations and radical truths, upon which are built all the deductions of reaſon and diſcourſe, and with which, ſo far as they have any truth in them, they are inſeparably united.

[*B*] *Reprinted by Mr. Henry Hallywell with the addition of two Prefaces.*] One of theſe Prefaces is added to his edition of the Diſcourſe upon *Prov. xx.* 27. The other is the Preface to it, as it was delivered at St. Mary's in Cambridge in 1655 upon *John xviii.* 38. This Preface is finely written, and is as follows. " *What is truth?* Pilate's queſtion hath always been " the great enquiry of the world, but eſpecially in " theſe days of ours, when to doubt of all things be- " gins to be a principle in Divinity as well as Philo- " ſophy. The foundations, that men have ſo long " built their opinions and faith upon, are ſhaken and " ſtaggered in this ſceptical age. Every one upon " a particular and ſeveral ſect is in queſt after truth; " and ſo fooliſh and full of vain affectation is the " mind of man, that each one confidently believes " himſelf in the right; and however others call " themſelves, that he and thoſe of his party are the " only orthodox. Should we go abroad in the world, " and aſk as many as we meet, *What is truth?* we " ſhould find it a changeable and uncertain notion, " which every one cloaths his own apprehenſions " with. Truth is in every ſect and party, though " they ſpeak inconſiſtencies among themſelves, and " contradictions to one another. Truth is the Turkiſh " Alcoran, the Jewiſh Talmud, the Papiſts Councils, " the Proteſtants Catechiſms and models of Divinity; " each of theſe in their proper place and region. Truth " is a various uncertain thing, changes with the air " and climate. It is Mahomet at Conſtantinople, " the Pope at Rome, Luther at Wittemberg, Calvin " at Geneva, Arminius at Oldwater, Socinus at Cra- " cow; and each of theſe are ſound and orthodox " in the circuit of their own region and dominion. " And as it is mutable according to places, ſo alſo " according to the ages of the world. It was one " while Arianiſm under ſeveral Emperors, in ſeveral " Councils, among ſeveral fathers. It was for ſome " hundreds of years a company of foppiſh and ridi- " culous ſuperſtitions and ceremonies, pardons and " indulgencies, redemptions from purgatory, and the " like. And we know in our days into what new " ſhapes this Proteus hath transformed itſelf. Truth, " it is worm-eaten antiquity, an infallible chair, the " ſtrongeſt lungs, the longeſt ſword, the moſt voices. " Truth is confident ignorance, aſſiſted with heady " and turbulent Zeal, and backt with mercileſs per- " ſecution of all gainſayers. It is preſumptuous in- " cogitancy, accompanied with rigid and uncharita- " ble cenſures of all diſſenting judgments. It is a " confeſſion of faith, with an Anathema at the foot " of every article. It is that which confutes opi- " nions, and anſwers arguments by branding them " with names of reproach and ſcandal. It is a " ſtandard meaſure in the hands of ſome particular " ſect, to which all men's underſtandings muſt be " evened and ſquared. It is a State-mould commit- " ted to the keeping of ſome party, that is in the " greateſt favour; whereinto all opinions are caſt; " and thoſe that are beyond its capacity, are reject- " ed as droſs." *In a word, truth is a piece of education, intereſt, humour, fancy, and temper: it is that we are born to, ſuck in with our mothers milk, learn with our A B C. It is an inveterate prejudice, that is bred in our minds, which all arguments, that can be brought to the contrary, do irritate, but not convince: it is an opinion firſt taken up, and then reaſon ſought out to maintain it. Truth, it is that which ſerves every man's turn or intereſt; it is the ſureſt and ſtrongeſt ſide; it is that which ſecures a man's eſtate, liberty and outward advantages; it is that which ſaves a man the coſt and expence of ſelf-denial and patience under the reproach and perſecution of a prevailing ſect; it is that which leads the way to applauſe and preferment, and gives the pompous title of ſound in the Faith, that is, in the opinion of the place and Church, where one lives. Otherwiſe, Truth is a piece of humourſome ſingularity; the man is unwilling to go with a multitude, or truſt himſelf in a crowd, leſt he be loſt, forgotten, and not taken notice of. It is a deſire to appear μέγας τις, the Author of ſome new diſcoveries; the head and father of a particular ſect. It is a piece of over-weening pride, of fond ſelf-flattery and conceit, that thinks itſelf wiſer than the Church, where it lives, and all the world beſides. Many times again, Truth is nothing elſe but the boilings of an heated and melancholic, of an unwieldy and untamed fancy; and hence ſpring moſt of the new lights of the preſent age. Truth to theſe men is a bundle of empty and airy words, that ſound well, but have no ſenſe; it is a company of non-ſignificant phraſes handſomly put together; it is a ſeraphic and myſtical nonſenſe; a diſcourſe made up of high-flown expreſſions, to which there anſwers no repreſentation or idea in the mind. Once more; Truth is a piece of temper and complection; it is light in a coloured glaſs, diverſified according to the diſpoſitions of men; it is the ſeveral tinctures of men's paſſions and affections; it is cruelty in rigid and ſevere, it is fond indulgence in ſoft and effeminate natures; it is that which beſt gratifies a man's luſts and corruptions.* " But is this " the beſt repreſentation can be made of Truth? " Surely no. Truth is the firſt-begotten of the Divine " goodneſs; it is the life and nature of the ſecond " hypoſtaſis in the Deity; it is the ſun of the in- " tellectual world, that rays into pure and holy and " unprejudiced ſouls, and fills them with joy and " happineſs; it is the higheſt accompliſhment next " to goodneſs and righteouſneſs, that our minds and " underſtandings are capable of. It will not be " amiſs therefore to make a ſtricter enquiry and " ſearch into its nature, and to give a more particu- " lar anſwer to Pilate's queſtion, *What is Truth?*

[*C*] *A diſcourſe upon* 1 John iv. 16.] In this diſcourſe he obſerves (5), that *God is nothing elſe but Ens ſummè perfectum; and Goodneſs is the flower and ſum-*

(5) *Remains*, p. 9.

upon this queſtion, *Fore Reſurrectionem Corporis ſuadet Scriptura, nec refragatur Ratio*; but Dr. Ruſt's poſition upon this ſubject was not come to the hands of Mr. *Hallywell*, when he publiſhed his *Remains*. Beſides theſe tracts of our Author, we have *A Diſcourſe of the uſe of Reaſon in matters of Religion; ſhewing that Chriſtianity contains nothing repugnant to right Reaſon, againſt Enthuſiaſts and Deiſts*: written in Latin by our Author, and tranſlated into Engliſh with *Annotations* upon it by Mr. *Henry Hallywell*. Upon the Reſtoration, Biſhop Taylor, foreſeeing the vacancy in the Deanery of Connor in Ireland, ſent to Cambridge for ſome learned and ingenious man, who might be fit for that Dignity. The motion was made to Dr. *Ruſt*, which correſponding with the great inclination he had to be converſant with that incomparable perſon, he gladly accepted of it, and haſtened to Ireland [*D*], and landed at Dublin about Auguſt 1661. He was received with great kindneſs and reſpect by Biſhop Taylor, and preferred to the Deanery as ſoon as it was void, which was ſhortly after. Upon the Biſhop's death, Auguſt 13 1667, he preached his Funeral Sermon, which was printed. The Biſhopricks were now divided; Dr. Boyle, Dean of Cork, was nominated Biſhop of Downe and Connor, and Dr. Ruſt, Dean of Connor, Biſhop of Dromore, in which he continued till his death, which was occaſioned by a fever in Dec. 1670, and was interred in the Choir of the Cathedral of Dromore in a vault made for hisp redeceſſor Biſhop Taylor, whoſe body was depoſited there (*b*). Mr. Glanvil, who was very particularly acquainted with him, tells us, that he was a man of a clear mind, a deep judgment, and ſearching wit, greatly learned in all the beſt ſorts of knowledge, old and new, a thoughtful and diligent enquirer, of a free underſtanding and vaſt capacity, joined with ſingular modeſty and unuſual ſweetneſs of temper, which made him the darling of all that knew him. He was a perſon of great piety and generoſity, a hearty lover of God and man, an excellent Preacher, a wiſe Governor, a profound Philoſopher, a cloſe Reaſoner, and above all, a true and exemplary Chriſtian. In ſhort, he was one, who had all the qualifications of a primitive Biſhop, and of an extraordinary man.

(*b*) Mr. Joſeph Glanvil's *Preface* to Biſhop Ruſt's *Diſcourſe of Truth*. Edition London 1682, in 8vo.

ſummity, nay more, the root and original of all perfection. Socrates in Plato's Sympoſion *ſaith concerning love, that it is* πρισβύταλος καὶ τιμιώτατος Θεῶν, *or ſimple goodneſs is the firſt hypoſtaſis in the Platonic Triad; and the Apoſtle tells us, that* love is the fulfilling of the law; *and all moral excellencies are contained in it by way of eminency and tranſcendency, and (as he ſaith) in the ſuper-eſſential cauſes. Goodneſs is the richeſt and moſt eſſential attribute of the Divine Nature, which if you take from God, you rob him of the Deity. And all other perfections are only ſo far morally ſuch, as they partake of this, and are ſerviceable thereunto. Juſtice, that gives to every one his right and due, is ſo far only commendable, as it communicates with goodneſs; for* ſummum Jus ſumma Injuria; *and ſtrict juſtice many times borders upon cruelty, at leaſt it is no perfection to exact it. Even this goodneſs it is that enſtamps upon all the notion of perfection; the partaking or not partaking of goodneſs makes all things undergo divers cenſures. Even power and wiſdom disjoined from goodneſs; what is it but ſubtile miſchief, and armed wickedneſs? And all perfections whatever are only ſo far good and deſirable, as they are found built on this foundation. Let there be a Being of infinite ſubtilty and cunning, that can contrive ways, and carry on deſigns; and let it have almighty power, that can compaſs and bring to paſs whatever it would, and let it be, as to its ſubſiſtence, immutable and immenſe; yet if you add to its being principles of envy and malice, it will be ſo far from deſerving the name of Good, that it will be a worſe devil than hell itſelf can ſhew . . . Goodneſs is the moſt high and eſſential perfection of the Deity. God is no narrow, contracted, ſelfiſh being, carries on no deſigns and particular intereſts of his own. That is a piece of beggarly policy, that becomes not an all-ſufficient Being. The cauſe, which God alone manages in the world, is the cauſe of Goodneſs, Righteouſneſs, Equity, and Juſtice, and whatever hath any thing of beauty and comlineſs in it. God is a Being neither fond nor cruel, nor dotes upon any, but only intends this, that all things may be ordered and diſpoſed according to the laws of Eternal Goodneſs, Wiſdom, and Rectitude.*

[*D*] *Haſtened to Ireland.*] Dr. John Worthington in a letter to Mr. Samuel Hartlib, dated April the 19th 1661, writes thus (6): "Mr. Ruſt (whom Mr. Brere-
" ton knows, and you know him by his MS.) is go-
" ing over into Ireland to be Dean of Downe, being
" invited thither by Dr. Taylor the Biſhop; and
" Mr. Marſh (ſometime my Pupil, and Fellow of
" Caius College) is there already, and made Dean
" of Armagh. They are both excellent perſons, and
" preferred to theſe places by the care of the above-
" mentioned Biſhop." T.

(6) *Miſcellanies*, p. 245. edit. London 1704, in 8vo.

RUTILIA, a Roman Lady, ſiſter to the Publius Rutilius who ſubmitted ſo patiently to his unjuſt baniſhment, and wife of Marcus Aurelius Cotta, had a moſt deſerving ſon, whom ſhe tenderly loved, and whoſe death ſhe bore very couragiouſly (*a*). Seneca propoſed her as an example for others [*A*]. Cicero would have done the ſame; but not

(*a*) See near the cloſe of the rem. [*A*].

[*A*] *Seneca propoſed her as an example for others.*] In the book he wrote during his exile, to conſole his excellent mother, he exhorts her to imitate, among other couragious ladies, our Rutilia. *Rutilia* ſays he (1), *Cottam filium ſecuta eſt in exſilium, & uſque eo fuit indulgentia conſtricta, ut mallet exſilium pati, quam deſiderium: nec ante in patriam, quam cum filio rediit. Eumdem jam reducem, & in Rep. florentem tam fortiter amiſit, quam ſecuta eſt: nec quiſquam lacrimas ejus poſt elatum filium notavit. In expulſo virtutem oſtendit, in amiſſo prudentiam, nam & nihil illam à pietate deterruit, & nihil in triſtitia ſupervacua ſtultaque detinuit. Cum his te numerari fœminis volo, quarum vitam ſemper imitata es, &c.* i. e. "Rutilia followed her ſon into exile;
" and, ſo great was her fondneſs, that ſhe choſe to
" ſuffer baniſhment rather than live without him;
" nor did ſhe return to her country till he came back
" with her to it. She bore with as much courage his
" death, after his return and proſperity, as ſhe had
" ſhewed bravery in following him; nor did any per-
" ſon obſerve her to weep at his funeral. She mani-
" feſted her courage when he was in exile, and her
" wiſdom when he died: for as, in the former, ſhe
" could not be deterred from diſcovering her piety;
" ſo, in the latter, nothing could make her indulge
" a ſilly ſuperfluous grief. Now I would have you
" rank'd among theſe women, whoſe life has always
" been your pattern." I am ſure the Reader will permit me, on this occaſion, to extract a paſſage from Father Senault's treatiſe on the uſe of the paſſions, in that part of it where he explains the characteriſticks of deſire. "Baniſhment is doubtleſs one of the moſt
" cruel puniſhments that Judges have invented, to
" puniſh the guilty. It ſeparates us from every thing
" we love; and it ſeems to be a long death, which
" leaves us only a ſmall portion of life, to make us
" ſtill

(1) Seneca, *de Conſolatione ad Helviam*, cap. 16. p. m. 787.

not being ſufficiently acquainted with the particulars of that incident, he enquired of Pomponius Atticus about it, but the latter could not give him the neceſſary informations concerning it [B]. As the work (b) in which he intended to introduce our Rutilia is loſt, we do not know whether he procured all the informations he wanted; and whether he really ſpoke of her, though it is very probable he did. A ſingular circumſtance is, it is ſaid that he enquired about ſome particulars which had before been publiſhed by him in his works (c); a circumſtance which would ſhew, that even eminent Authors forget incidents they had publiſhed.

(b) In his book *de Conſolatione.*

(c) See the rem. [B].

" ſtill more miſerable. Nevertheleſs there was a mo-
" ther, who choſe to ſuffer the rigours of this tor-
" ment, rather than the pangs of deſire; and who
" would follow her ſon into baniſhment, in order that
" ſhe might not be condemned to regret his abſence,
" and wiſh his return." But who told Father Senault, that the accompanying her ſon would free her from the pain of wiſhing his return to Rome? By the way, Rutilia's ſon was named Caius Aurelius Cotta. He was a good Orator (2); was ſent into baniſhment during the diſcord between Marius and Sylla, and returned to Rome when the party of the latter was triumphant there. He was Conſul in the year of Rome 678. He probably died of a wound two years after, that bled afreſh; and which deprived him of the honour of the triumph that was decreed for him (3). He is not Cotta, one of the interlocutors in Tully's books *de Natura Deorum*, as is affirmed by Glandorpius (4.

(2) Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. 1. cap. 8. and in *Bruto*, cap. 30. See Corradus, *in Brutum Ciceronis*, p. 310 & *ſeq.*

(3) See Sigonius, *in Faſtis Conſul.* ad ann. 678, 680.

(4) Glandorp. *Onomaſt.* p. 144.

[B] *He enquired of Pomponius Atticus about it, but he could not give him the neceſſary informations concerning it.*] He wanted to know whether Rutilia died before or after her ſon. *Rutilia vivo ne C. Cotta filio ſuo mortua ſit, an mortuo? Pertinent ad eum librum quem de luctu minuendo ſcripſimus* (5). i. e. " Whether Rutilia died " while her ſon Cotta was living, or after him? " Theſe particulars belong to the book I wrote con- " cerning the motives of aſſwaging grief." In another book he writes as follows; *de Rutilia, quoniam videris dubitare, ſcribes ad me cum ſcies, ſed quam primum* (6). *i. e.* " As you ſeem to be in doubt with regard to " Rutilia, write to me as ſoon as you are fully ſatisfied " about it; but with all the expedition poſſible." Corradus's note is ſo curious, that I cannot forbear tranſcribing it. *Mortuo mortua eſt . . . . quod mirum Ciceronem quæſiſſe, quum in libris oratoriis jampridem ſcripſiſſet Cottam ipſum ſibi ſermonem illum retuliſſe: quin Atticus etiam dubitabat, quum tamen uterque & Cottam & Rutiliam vidiſſet* (7). i. e. " She died after him . . . . " I am ſurprized Cicero ſhould aſk ſuch a queſtion, " ſince he himſelf had long before ſaid, in his books " on Rhetorick, that Cotta himſelf had told him ſo. " But we find that Atticus himſelf was dubious about " it, though he and Cicero had ſeen Cotta and Ru- " tilia."

(5) Cicero, *Epiſt.* 20. lib. 12. *ad Atticum.*

(6) Idem. *Epiſt.* 22. *ejuſd. libri.*

(7) Corradus, *in Epiſt.* 20. lib. 12. *ad Atticum*, p. 328. edit. Græviana.

RUYSBROECK (JOHN DE), in Latin *Ruſbrochius*, was ſo called, becauſe he was born in the Village of Ruyſbroeck, in Brabant, between Bruſſels and Hall. He was firſt Curate, and afterwards Rector of St. Gedula's Church in Bruſſels; and afterwards Founder and Prior of a Monaſtery of Canons Regular of St. Auſtin, at Groendal, in the Foreſt of Seignies, two leagues from Bruſſels; and laſtly, Reformer of the Order throughout the Low Countries (a). He was an ignorant man, but very devout [A], contemplative, and altogether internal; and went ſo far into the depths of myſtical divinity, that he is looked upon as one of the greateſt maſters in that ſcience. He has been called a ſecond Dionyſius Areopagita (b). He wrote ſeveral books in the Flemiſh tongue, the manuſcripts of which are preſerved in the Monaſtery of Groendal; with a Latin tranſlation of ſome of them by William Jordan, Contemporary and of the ſame Order of our Author (c). It is concluded from his ignorance, that he muſt be ranked among thoſe who have writ by inſpiration (d). There is a Latin tranſlation of all his works, by Laurence Surius, and printed three times in Colen, *viz.* in 1553, 1609, and 1692. His treatiſe on the ſpiritual marriage had been printed before in Latin, at Paris in 1512. John de Schoonhave wrote an apology for this treatiſe, againſt the criticiſm of John Gerſon. He is not the only perſon who wrote an anſwer to this criticiſm. Denis the Carthuſian replied to it alſo (e). It is remarkable that our Ruyſbroeck compoſed with no other aſſiſtance but that of a profound meditation. He uſed to go and hide himſelf in ſome corner of the foreſt; wait there for inſpirations from above (f); and, in proportion as he was favoured with them, wrote them down in his pocket-book. Theſe were the only materials of his works, which he uſed to draw up and digeſt when he returned

(a) Val. Andreas, *Bibl. Belg.* p. 555.

(b) Dionyſ. Carthuſianus, tract. 2. *de Donis Spiritus Sancti*, art. 13.

(c) Val. Andr. *Bibl. Belg.* p. 556, 557.

(d) See the rem. [A].

(e) See Gothofr. Arnoldus, *Hiſt. Theolog. Myſticæ*, p. 308.

(f) See the rem. [A].

[A] *He was an ignorant man, but very devout.*] This we are told by Abbot Trithemius; *vir, ut ferunt devotus, ſed parum literatus* (1). Dennis the Carthuſian obſerves, that though Ruſbrochius was an idiot, he nevertheleſs had ſuch ſublime thoughts, that they raviſhed to admiration, and even almoſt to extaſy, the moſt excellent Profeſſors in Divinity, who own they cannot comprehend them. He aſcribes this to the inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt. *Nonne rite mirabile cenſemus, quod Ruſbrochius, cum idiota eſſet, nihilominus merito Sanctitatis & ſimplicitatis ſuæ, tam ſupernaturales divinitus theorias ſortitus eſt, & in ſuo quoque vulgari idiomate tam ſubtiliſſimas veritates conſcripſit, ut excellentiſſimi Sacræ theologiæ profeſſores Spiritum præ admiratione vix habeant, ſeque ſententias ejus non poſſe intelligere ediſſerunt* (2). Several other Writers have had recourſe to the ſame cauſe; they affirming that Ruſbrochius received all his knowledge immediately from the Holy Ghoſt; and obſerved, that he himſelf thought ſo. *Fundamentum & originem horum ejus ſcriptorum, Lector, qui illuminatis mentis oculis, ſanoque Spirituali guſtu, ad diſcernendum bonum à malo gaudet, facile purum & divinum cognoſcet. Qua cauſa & Editores promiſcue fere Inſcriptionibus Librorum ejus ejuſmodi teſtimonia propoſuerunt.* Hos nempe libros divinitate & illuminatione plenos, ac à Deo inſpiratos eſſe. *Et in vitæ ejus Hiſtoria narratur. Cap. IIX. p. 4. quod à Gerardo Magno interrogatus, ſic reſponderit*; Certum ac firmum habeto, nullum me unquam verbum ſcriptis meis inſeruiſſe, niſi ex inſtinctu Spiritus S. & in ſingulari quadam & dulciſſima præſentia ſuperſanctiſſimæ Trinitatis. *Et ſequente capite IX. commemoratur; quod plerumque ſolus in ſylvæ abdita ſe recipere conſueverit, atque ibi ſummo ſilentio, quæ ex Dei Spiritu hauſiſſet, in ſcripta redegerit, hocque pacto omnia ſua opera conſcripſerit, atque ita minime ex aliis congeſſerit. Quippe nulla literarum cultura ornatus, artem hanc neſcivit* (3). i. e. " Reader, who- " ſoever has his mental eyes illuminated, and is of a " ſound, ſpiritual taſte, will plainly perceive, that the " foundation and origin of theſe writings is pure and " holy. For this reaſon the Editors of his works " have generally publiſhed the following teſtimonies " concerning

(1) Trithem. *apud* Geſner. *Bibl.* folio 452, *verſo.*

(2) Dionyſ. Carthuſianus, ſerm. 1. *de Confeſſ. non Pontif. apud* Gothofr. Arnoldum, *Hiſtoria Theolog. Myſticæ*, p. 307, where he ſays alſo, *& hinc* Dionyſium *illum nuncupavit* alterum, ob excellentem ejus ſapientiam, cujus ſolum Spiritum S. habuit Doctorem. Tract. 2. *de Donis Spirit. S.* art. 13.

(3) Gothofr. Arnoldus, ibid. p. 310.

turned to his Monaſtery. They are greatly eſteemed by ſome perſons, and applauded even by ſome Proteſtants [B]. The character of this myſtical divine may be known from what the reader has ſeen elſewhere, and in what will be ſeen hereunder [C]. Ruyſbroeck's ſubmiſſion to the divine will, extended even to the torments of Hell [D]. He died the ſecond of December 1381, aged fourſcore and eight years. It is related that he performed

" concerning them. *Theſe books are filled with divine* " *illumination, and were inſpired by God.* And it is " related in chap. 8. p. 4. of his Life, that he made " the following anſwer to Gerardus Magnus. *Be* " *perfectly aſſured, that I never inſerted a ſingle word* " *in my writings, without being inſpired by the Holy* " *Ghoſt; and in a certain ſingular and moſt delightful* " *preſence of the moſt holy Trinity.* And it is ſaid in " the following chapter (the 9th), that he uſed com- " monly to retire alone into the moſt unfrequented " part of the foreſt; and there, in the deepeſt ſilence, " wrote down whatever he had received from the " holy ſpirit; that in this manner he wrote all his " works, and conſequently did not collect them from " others: for as he had not the leaſt tincture of learning, " he was ignorant of that art." What I am going to cite from Valerius Andreas will illuſtrate and confirm all that has been ſaid above. *Vir divinæ contemplationi addictiſſimus, & ſanctitatis majoris quam doctrinæ; cum ea, quæ ſcripſit, divino ſpiritu edoctus videatur. Narrat enim Henricus à Pomerio, ejuſdem inſtituti ac loci Religioſus, Vitæque Scriptor, quod antequam libros ſuos dictaret, habuerit pro conſuetudine,* ut, dum divinæ illuſtrationis radio immadeſceret, ſolus ſecederet in abdita ſylvæ, ibique dictante Spiritu ſancto ea, quæ ſibi occurrebant, in tabula cerea ſcripto commendans, ſecum ſolebat, ad monaſterium rediens, apportare: *ſicque interpolatis vicibus edidiſſe ſuos libros* (4). Will any one after this wonder at the complaint many people have made, viz. that Ruyſbroeck's books are very obſcure (5)? How could it be poſſible it ſhould be otherwiſe, as they were writ by an unlearned perſon; and on ſubjects of myſtical divinity, in which nothing is ſcarce underſtood, even when they are treated by the moſt delicate and moſt learned pens?

(4) Val. Andr. *Bibl. Belg.* p. 555, 556.

(5) Arnold. *Hiſt. Theol. Myſticæ*, p. 311.

[B] *They are greatly eſteemed by ſome perſons, and applauded even by ſome Proteſtants.*] Mr. Arnoldus (6) points out ſeveral paſſages of Romiſh Writers, who admired Ruyſbroeck. He does not omit the Lutherans who applaud him; and he alſo ſpeaks of Calviniſts who have judged favourably of them; but he ought not to have ranked among theſe (7) Francis Swertius, who is a zealous Papiſt. Perhaps the circumſtance that miſled him is, his calling to mind that there is a work entitled, *Athenæ Batavæ*, the Author of which is a Calviniſt; and his not obſerving the difference there is between that book and the *Athenæ Belgicæ* of Swertius. It is ſcarce poſſible, how careful ſoever an Author may be, not to commit ſuch errors ſometimes.

(6) Ibid. p. 307 & *ſeq.*

(7) Ibid. p. 309.

[C] *The character of this myſtical Divine may be known from what the reader has ſeen elſewhere* (8), *and in what will be ſeen hereunder.*] It is affirmed in the work, whence we borrowed the character of Taulerus, that Ruſbrochius *his contemporary, and in ſome meaſure his maſter, is much ſuch a man; and that he ſometimes ſoars higher, and is more methodical* (9). It is affirmed two pages after, that Henry Harphius is pretty near ſuch a man as Taulerus. " That before, " and perhaps after him, no man has penetrated, as " he has done, into the depths of the inward ſtate of " a ſoul reſigned to God: in which it is plain Ruſ- " brochius was of great ſervice to him. His charac- " ter is, to propoſe the gradual reſurrection of the " ſtates of the ſpiritual life, in a purified and tried " ſtate. He ſhews in what manner, after various " mortifications, purifications, and trials of the ſoul, " there are raiſed in it, gradually, new ſtates of di- " vine life, firſt active and afterwards paſſive, in the " inferior powers of the ſoul; and after this in the " ſuperior ones (the memory, underſtanding, and " will) afterwards in its eſſence; and laſtly, over its " Being, and the operations of its powers, by the in- " veſtiture which the three perſons of the holy Tri- " nity make of it, and which then manifeſt their " adorable operations. This is the moſt beautiful, " the moſt ſubſtantial, the moſt advanced and deep " ſyſtem of myſtical divinity that ever was ſeen (10)." Mr. Arnoldus (11) quotes Authors who obſerve, that Henry Harphius borrowed from Ruyſbroeck almoſt all the matter of the contemplation in his ſecond and third book. We therefore may form an idea of Ruſbrochius's turn of mind by examining the character of Harphius.

(8) Rem. [E] of the art. TAULERUS.

(9) *Lettre touchant les Auteurs Myſtiques*, printed with the *Theologie Germanique*, p. 13. edit. Amſterd. 1700.

(10) *Lettre touchant les Auteurs Myſtiques, &c.* p. 15.

(11) Arnold. *Hiſt. Theol. Myſtic.* p. 308.

[D] *Ruyſbroeck's ſubmiſſion to the divine will extended even to the torments of Hell.*] That is, he thought nothing better than to be ready to ſuffer whatever God might pleaſe to ſend, either death, life, or even the pains of hell. He declared this, as ſome perſons were endeavouring to make him afraid of hell. *In Hiſtoria illius, Cap. VIII. legitur.* " *Quod Gerhardus* " *cum quandoque inſolitam in Ruſbrochio erga Deum* " *fiduciam, non ex temeritate, timorem foras mittente,* " *conceptam perſpexiſſet, quandoque divini judicii & in-* " *ferni metum ei incutere multis Scripturæ commemoran-* " *dis ſententiis attentaverit.*" *Sed quanto plus ei quandam injicere formidinem connitebatur, tanto vir plus majori in Deum amore ferveſcebat; & tandem reſpondit:* Magiſter Gerharde, fixum & certum habe, me ex animo paratum eſſe ad perferenda omnia, quæ Dominus mihi accidere volet, ſive mors ſit, ſive vita, ſive etiam ipſi intolerabiles cruciatus inferorum. Neque enim quicquam mihi vel jucundius, vel melius, vel ſalubrius judico, nec quicquam aliud vel peto, vel deſidero, quam ut amantiſſimus Dominus Deus meus promptum me ſemper atque paratum inveniat, ad ſuæ arbitrium voluntatis. *Hoc breviter totum viri hujus Principium detegit* (11). i. e. In chapter 8. of his life, is the following paſſage. " When Gerhard ſometimes ob- " ſerved Ruyſbroek to put an unuſual truſt in, and " have the greateſt love for God, and would there- " fore endeavour to excite in him a fear of God's " judgment and of hell, by mentioning ſeveral " paſſages of Scripture to that purpoſe; the more " Gerhard endeavoured to make him afraid, the " more he ſeemed to be inflamed with the love of " the Almighty, and at laſt anſwered him thus: " Mr. *Gerhard*, be aſſured, that from the bottom of " my ſoul I am ready to ſuffer any thing that the " Lord ſhall pleaſe to inflict upon me, whether " death, life, or even the dreadful torments of hell. " For I judge that nothing is more pleaſant, or more " to my advantage; nor do I deſire or ſeek any thing " elſe, than that my moſt loving Lord God may al- " ways find me ready and prepared to obey his will. " This ſhews, in few words, the principles of this " man." Mr. Arnoldus, from whom I borrowed all this, had juſt before ſaid, that Ruyſbroeck did not regulate his actions ſo much as the other myſticks do, by the ſervile fear, and the activity which reſults from it, and the unpleaſant exerciſes of the law; but all his ſtudy was the exerciſe of a free evangelical virtue, and the efficacy of the new alliance, manifeſting itſelf by the filial ſpirit that operates in every true believer. *Character Myſtici hujus Doctoris* (Ruſbrochii) *in multis ad Tauleri ſupra excerptum accedere videtur. Attamen judico, Ruſbrochii propoſitionem longè puriorem & vivæ ac fiduciali* fidei in nomen Jeſu in nobis *conformiorem eſſe. Dum minus, ac omnes ferè alii antiquorum Myſticorum theologorum, timorem ſervilem & inde orientem propriam activitatem, ac legales anxiaſque exercitationes intendat, & è contrario ad liberam Evangelii virtutem & efficaciam Novi Fœderis tantummodo ducat, eo modo, quo hæc ſe per unctionem filialis Spiritus unicuique vere credenti revelat* (13).

(12) Idem, ibid. p. 313.

(13) Idem, ibid. p. 312.

I will obſerve by the way, that there are few doctrines, for which the myſticks are more inveighed againſt, than their conſenting to eternal damnation. Mr. Jurieu has not forgot it (4); but he is accuſed of not faithfully quoting the words of Francis de Sales. Conſult Arnoldus (5), who reproaches him pretty warmly on that account, and for ſeveral other faults, and eſpecially for contradicting himſelf (16); but he did not rightly underſtand the following words in page

(14) In his *Traite Hiſt. ſur la Theol. Myſt.* printed at Rotterdam, in 1699.

(15) Arnold. *Hiſt. Theolog. Myſt.* p. 543 & *ſq.*

(16) Idem, ibid. p. 537 & *ſeq.*

performed miracles, and endeavours were uſed to get him canonized [*E*]. I ſhall point out the errors of Moreri, and thoſe of the Author, *Des Eſſais de Literature* [*F*]. I ſhall not explain the ſubject of the diſpute in which Gerſon engaged againſt the book concerning ſpiritual marriage. The reader need but conſult du Pin, who ſays, in a few words, all that is neceſſary to be known on this head (*g*).

(g) Du Pin, *Bibl.* Tom. 11. p. 84. Dutch edit.

page 158: *Theſe words of Francis de Sales ſhew the weakneſs of the Archbiſhop of Cambray's divinity*, which he tranſlates thus: *hæc verba monſtrant nobis amentiam Archiepiſcopi Cameracenſis*, which ought to have been rendered thus: *hæc verba monſtrant nobis locum debilem Theologiæ Archiepiſcopi Cameracenſis*. There is a wide difference between the folly of a man, and the weakneſs of his tenets.

[*E*] *It is related that he wrought miracles, and endeavours were uſed to get him canonized.*] This appears from the following Latin paſſage. *Plura de Vita & Miraculis ſancti hujus viri, poſt* Henr. à Pomerio, Marcus Maſtelinus, *ejuſdem loci Religioſus, in ſuo Necrologio Viridis Vallis, lib. II. cap. I. & ſeqq. Deſcripſit & acta Vitæ ejuſdem* Thomas de Jeſu, *Carmelita Excalceatus, Gregorio XV. pro obtinenda illius beatificatione præſentata* (17). i. e. "More particulars concerning "the life and miracles of this Saint, after Henricus "a Pom. are related by Marcus Maſtellinus, a "Frier of the ſame houſe, in his *Necrologium Viridis Vallis*, book II. chap. I. & ſeqq. Thomas de "Jeſu, a barefooted Frier, alſo wrote the particulars "of his life, which he preſented to Pope Gregory "XIV. in order to get him canonized."

(17) Val. Andr. *Bibl. Belg.* p. 557.

[*F*] *I ſhall point out the errors of Moreri, and thoſe of the Author* Des Eſſais de Literature.] I. He ought not to have ſaid, that the Village of *Ruiſbroeck* is *on the Sambre in Brabant*. It would be very difficult to find, on the banks of the Sambre, any Village belonging to Brabant; but this would not, in any manner, ſuit with Ruſbrochius's country. It ſtands on the river of Senne, between Bruſſels and Hall. Valerius Andreas and Father Labbe, who were Moreri's Authors in his drawing up this article, declare this expreſsly. How then could he think that a place ſituated between thoſe two cities ſtood on the river Sambre? II. When he ſays that Ruſbrochius *was firſt Prieſt and Curate of St. Gudili's Church*, he did not attend ſufficiently to the words of the original which he intended to tranſlate, *fuit primo Eccleſiæ D. Gudilæ Vicarius & Preſbyter* (18). I believe they mean, that he was ſucceſſively Curate and Rector of St. Gudila's Church; for I believe it would be of no uſe to obſerve, that he was a Prieſt, whilſt he was Curate of a Parochial Church. However this be, Moreri has wrongly tranſpoſed Ruſbrochius's two titles; he putting that of Prieſt before that of Curate, in oppoſition to Valerius Andreas whom he copied. III. No ſuch place is known as the *Monaſtery of Val-vert*, in the neighbourhood of Bruſſels, that which Ruſbrochius was Prior of being called Groendal. Valerius Andreas latinizes it *Viridis Vallis*; but Moreri ought not to have tranſlated that Latin into French, but have given the name by which that convent always went. Du Pin ſhould not have ſaid, that Ruſbrochius was Prior of the *Monaſtery of Canons Regular of Wavre in the Foreſt of Soignies* (19); Wavre not ſtanding in this Foreſt, and being a Priory of Benedictins; and after all, Ruſbrochius was Prior of Groendal, not Wavre. The French name of that foreſt is *la Foret de Soigne*, or *de Soignies*, and not *de Soignien* as Moreri has it. V. Dionyſius the Carthuſian is not one of the Latin tranſlators of Ruſbrochius's works. VI. Ruyſbroeck died at eighty eight years of age, and not aged *forty eight* (20). VII. Inſtead of citing Marcus Maſtellinus *in Necro Viridis Vallis*, it ſhould have been *in Necrologio Viridis Vallis*. VIII. He ſhould have quoted book 2. article 13. of Dionyſius the Carthuſian, *de Donis Spiritus Sancti*, and not book 1. article 3.

(18) Idem, ibid. p. 555.

(19) Du Pin, *Bibl.* Tom. 11. p. m. 84.

(20) This error is in the Paris edit. of 1699, and not in the preceding ones.

The anonymous Author, who began in 1702 to publiſh at Paris *Eſſays de Literature pour la connoiſſance des Livres*, wrote the article of Ruſbrochius in the eſſays of November for the ſame year (21). It is ſcarce any thing more than a paraphraſe on Moreri. He has been guilty of the ſix firſt faults I juſt now obſerved, and has added other very groſs ones. I. He ſays that Ruſbrochius's works printed at Colen in 1552, and in 1609, are in 4to; but this is true only of the edition of 1609, the other being in folio. II. He does not know the Colen edition of 1692. III. He ſays it *was obſerved that* Gerſon *was ſo greatly prejudiced againſt this Author, that he could not bear ſo much as to hear him mentioned*. Du Pin, on the contrary, affirms, that Gerſon *confeſſed afterwards that* Ruſbrochius *might be excuſed* (22). IV. The anonymous Author declares, that there was one John Ruſbach, who was confounded with John Ruyſbroeck. He declares this John Ruſbach to be Author of the following books: *Tractatus de præcipuis virtutibus. Liber de fide & judicio. De quatuor tentationibus. De ſettem cuſtodiis. De ſeptem gradibus amoris. De perfectione filiorum Dei. Regnum amantium Deum. De vera contemplatione. Epiſtolæ & cantiones*. He affirms that Ruſbroch *flouriſhed in the year* 1390, *as Trithemius obſerves, who alſo confounded him with John Ruſbach*: and yet he had ſaid juſt before, that *Ruſbrochius was young when he died; that this was in the year* 1381, *aged forty eight years, contrary to the opinion of Trithemius, who places his death no earlier than the year* 1390 (23). He declares that ſeveral Authors have obſerved, that this diſtinction ought to be made between John Ruſbach and John Ruſbroeck. He adds, that he has beſides, for his Author, *Conrad Geſner, whoſe hiſtorical library is greatly eſteemed; and who certainly was better acquainted with the Authors of his own country than any other Annaliſt*. He has here committed many errors in few words; for, in the firſt place, Geſner's hiſtorical library does not contain any particular concerning John Ruſbach; and ſecondly, Geſner was a Swiſs, and not of the ſame country with John Ruyſbroeck; and our Author does not ſay any thing of the native country of his pretended John Ruſbach. Will he have him to be a Swiſs; and that this conſequence may be inferred from what he has ſaid of Geſner? But in this caſe it alſo muſt be concluded that Ruyſbroeck was a Swiſs. Thirdly, He confounds, with Geſner, thoſe who abridged his *Bibliotheque*, and added new articles to it. It is they who ſpeak, not only of *Joannes Ruſbachius*, but alſo of *Joannes Ruſberus*, as of two Authors different from *Joannes Ruſbrochius*. They are groſsly miſtaken, and ſplit one Author into two, as Father Labbe conjectures very well (24). The books they aſcribed to this John Ruſbachius, and which, they ſay, were printed at Colen in 1552, *apud hæredes Quenteli*, are in the edition of John Ruſbroch's works, printed in Colen in 1552, by the ſame printers. With regard to the book which they aſcribe to John Ruſberus, *De ornatu ſpiritualium nuptiarum Libri* 3. it is certainly a work of our Ruyſbroeck (25); and the Author of the *Eſſais* is himſelf of this opinion (26).

(21) p. 132 & *ſeq.*

(22) Du Pin, *Bibl.* Tom. 11. p. m. 84.

(23) It is under this year that Trithemius places the flouriſhing ſtate, and not the death of Rusbrochius.

(24) Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſ.* Tom. 1. p. 604.

(25) See Valer. Andr. *Bibl. Belg.* p. 556.

(26) *Eſſais de Literature*, Nov. 1702. p. 136.

RYER (ANDREW), Sieur de Malezair, Gentleman in ordinary of the King's Bed-Chamber, and Knight of the Holy Sepulchre, lived in the 17th Century. He reſided a conſiderable time at Conſtantinople for his Majeſty's ſervice, and afterwards was Conſul for the French Nation in Egypt. He attained to a conſiderable ſkill in the Turkiſh and Arabic languages, as appears by his writings [*A*]. He was born in Marcigni (*a*), a ſmall town ſtanding on the Loire, on the Frontiers of Forez (*b*).

(*a*) *Marciniacenſis*. See Colomeſius, *Gallia Orient.* p. 163.

(*b*) See Baudrand, *voce* Marciniacum.

I muſt

[*A*] *He attained to a conſiderable ſkill in the Turkiſh and Arabick languages, as appears by his writings.*] He publiſhed a Turkiſh grammar at Paris in 1630; and four years after publiſhed, in that city, a French verſion

I must not omit that ſome criticks have cenſured his tranſlation of the Korân [B].

ſion of Guliſtan, or the Empire of the Roſes, written by Sâdi, Prince of the Turkiſh and Perſian Poets. His principal work is a French tranſlation of the Korân, which has born ſeveral impreſſions. He publiſhed it after he had been Conſul of the French nation in Egypt, as appears from the advantageous teſtimonial, with which the Conſuls of Marſeilles favoured him, dated the 12th of February 1633, and annexed to the verſion in queſtion.

[B] *Some criticks have cenſured his tranſlation of the Korân.*] The learned Windet accuſes him of taking too great a liberty in tranſpoſing, adding and ſuppreſſing ſeveral things. *Hunc locum male reddidit* Gallus *interpres* Sieur du Ryer; *& ſolet nimium licenter intervertere, addere, ac demere. Verſio autem* Anglica, ex Gallica *ejus facta, itidem male habet* (1). The Engliſh verſion, made from du Ryer's, has the ſame defects.

(1) Ja. Windet, *de functorum ſtatu*, ſect. 9. p. 223. edit. Lond. 1677.

RYER (PETER), a Pariſian, ſucceeded Faret in the French Academy, the 21ſt of November 1664 (*a*). He tranſlated a vaſt number of books into French, and wrote ſome plays (*b*). Moſt of his verſions are from the Greek or Roman Authors. With regard to the Greeks, he only put into modern French the old French tranſlations (*c*); or, at moſt, has followed the Latin verſions; and, with reſpect to the ancient Latin Authors, he often miſunderſtood their meaning; as he ſometimes did in his tranſlation of the Moderns [A], I mean Thuanus and Strada. It is thought that his verſions would have been done with more ſpirit and accuracy, had the bookſellers been a little more generous to him [B]; but as they paid but a ſmall price for every ſheet, he was forced to whip

(a) Peliſſon, *Hiſt. de l'Academie Franc.* p. m. 229.

(b) See the liſt of theſe in *l'Hiſt. de l'Acad.* p. 356, 357; and in Baillet's *Jugemens ſur les Poetes*, num. 1486.

(c) See Baillet, *Jugem. des Sav.* num. 949, which refers us to *Parnaſſe Reformé*, p. m. 26 *& ſeq.*

[A] *He often miſunderſtood the meaning of the* ancient Authors, *as he ſometimes did in the tranſlation of the moderns.*] (1) The leaſt imperfect of his tranſlations, *in the judgment of many, is that of Cicero's works, though he omitted ſeveral paſſages which he did not underſtand, particularly in the orations; though in order to come off, and fill up the chaſms, he ſubſtituted in the room of them ſeveral inſignificant and nonſenſical things, that are fit only to dazle and puzzle young perſons* (2). He is leveled at, if I miſtake not, in the following paſſage of *l'Hexameron ruſtique*. "He who tranſlated, into French, "Tully's beautiful work *de amicitia*, has not been "more lucky in his tranſlation of the following "words, *Agrigentinum doctum quendam virum*, "which he tranſlates as follows: *A learned man "named Agrigentinus*, without perceiving that Tully "ſpeaks of Empedocles Agrigentinus, whom he de"notes by the name of his native place *Agrigentum* or "*Agragas*, a city of Sicily. Beſides, there is no "learned man whoſe proper name is Agrigentinus. "The ſame Writer, in his verſion of Valerius Max"imus, in the very firſt chapter, example 4. p. 6. "tranſlates *vitio tabernaculum captum*, in this manner, "the tabernacle had been touched by chance; inſtead "of, *They had been wanting in the ceremonies that "ought to be obſerved, when they take the place of the "Augurs called Tabernaculum*. By his not underſtand"ing theſe words, *tabernaculum captum*, according to "the ſenſe in which they ſhould have been taken in "that place, and by not knowing the cuſtom of the "Augurs, he imagined this ought to be expounded "according to the cuſtom of the Jews, among whom, "none but the Levites were allowed to come near "the tabernacle (3)." To this I will add a paſſage from the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (4). "Teiſſier took notice of ſome errors in du Ryer's "tranſlation, and among others the following. Thu"anus, ſpeaking of John Rivius, who died in 1553, "ſaid *annos cum ſeculo numerabat*, which ſignifies "that Rivius died at 53 years of age; whereas du "Ryer ſays, *he died at an hundred years of age*. If he "has committed ſuch faults, in tranſlating a mo"dern Author, whoſe ſenſe, though ever ſo elegant, "may be more eaſily diſcovered than that of the an"cients, we may ſuppoſe that he has made ſome "miſtakes in tranſlating Cicero. And indeed we "ſee, in Leſcalopier the Jeſuit's Commentaries on "*Cicero de natura Deorum*, continual complaints of "poor du Ryer's verſion (5)." I obſerved another fault, which Teiſſier has taken notice of, relating to the following words of Thuanus: *Hulrico Huteno equiti Franco . . . . quadamtenus comparandus* (6), which du Ryer tranſlates thus: *He may be compared, in ſome meaſure, to Ulric Hutten, a French Knight*, which Teiſſier criticizes thus: *Hutten was a German, born in Franconia; and not a Frenchman, as du Ryer ſays, who did not underſtand the ſignification of the Latin word* Francus (7). Teiſſier overlooked the like blunder in the article of Duaren. *Eaque* (Duareni Opera) *Cujacius ipſe plurimi ſemper fecit, cum ex quatuor Franciſcis qui eadem ætate eandem ſcientiam profitebantur, unum Duarenum ſibi placere, cæteros jus tantum deligurire diceret* (8). Du Ryer tranſlated this paſſage of Thuanus in manner following: *Cujas himſelf highly eſteemed Duaren's works; and ſaid, that among the four French Profeſſors, who taught the ſame ſcience at the ſame time, Duaren only pleaſed him, &c.* What a miſtake is this! To ſuppoſe that *Franciſcus* is the name of a nation, and not a Chriſtian name. Thuanus's meaning is this. There lived at the ſame time, four Profeſſors of Civil Law, all whoſe Chriſtian names were *Francis*; and, of theſe four, Duaren was the only perſon whom Cujas eſteemed. The three others were Francis Baudoin, Francis Hotman, and Francis Roaldes. I met with ſeveral more errors in the tranſlation of Thuanus. To all theſe I will add the blunder obſerved by Colomeſius, whoſe words are as follow (9). "Mr. "du Ryer . . . has done great ſervice to devout per"ſons, in tranſlating theſe pſalms (10) into our lan"guage with ſo much elegance. There is only one "place, where I wiſh he had been a little more at"tentive to the Latin; I mean in page 17 *& ſeq.* of "the ſecond edition, where du Ryer's tranſlation "runs thus; *and, as if I was ſtill a child at a hun"dred years of age, broke and diſabled as I am, I ſtill "perform the actions of a child*. But he ought to "have tranſlated it in manner following, *and as "though I was an hundred of age, I do, in the age at "which I am arrived, all the actions of a child*. If "theſe pſalms were writ by Antonio King of Portu"gal, du Ryer's error is inexcuſable; it being cer"tain that this unhappy Prince was not ſixty four "when he died."

(1) Baillet, *Jugemens des Sav.* num. 549.

(2) He adds, that Father l'Eſcalopier often complains of the errors he commits through every part of his Tully.

(3) *Hexameron ruſtique*, p. 27, 28.

(4) *Nouv. de la Republ. des Lettres*, October 1684. art. 2. p. 774, in the Elogiums extracted from Thuanus, publiſhed with notes by Teiſſier.

(5) It is to be obſerved, that l'Eſcalopier cenſures only the verſion of *de Natura Deorum*.

(6) Thuan. lib. 13. p. 271. ad ann. 1524.

(7) Teiſſier, *Addit. aux Eloges*, Tom. 1. p. 91.

(8) Thuan. lib. 23. p. 471. ad ann. 1559.

(9) Colomies, *Bibl. Choiſie*, p. 145.

(10) That is, *Pſalmi confeſſionales inventi in ſcrinio Antonii Portugalliæ Regis*, Lutetiæ 1595, 16.

[B] *It is thought that his verſions would have been done with more ſpirit and accuracy, had the Bookſellers been a little more generous to him.*] After the paſſage I quoted above from the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, are the following words (11). "This ought to be "a leſſon to ſeveral petty Authors, who know only a "little Latin they brought from the college, not to "venture to tranſlate. This is a taſk that requires "greater abilities than is commonly imagined, and "requires perſons who do not labour for bread. I "obſerve this without hinting in any manner at the "following paſſage of Richelet's Dictionary, page "110, part 2 (12). *The late du Rier wrote for bread, "that is, wrote merely to ſupport himſelf.*" Baillet furniſhes us with two paſſages. *And indeed it has been thought, that his learning, and his ſkill in languages, was not of a great extent; and that being hired by the Bookſellers, who maintained him, they did not allow him time enough to poliſh and complete his writings* (13). This is the firſt paſſage, but the other is ſtill more entertaining. "(14) Such kind of Writers, who are re"ſolved never to go back, or who by choice, or "their bad circumſtances, are always obliged to go "forward, whatever obſtacle they may meet with, "would imagine themſelves maimed, ſhould they ſup-

(11) *Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres*, Octob. 1684. art. 2. p. 775.

(12) This is according to the Geneva edit. of 1680; but as many of my Readers may have other editions, I ſhall obſerve that it is under the word *Pain* (Bread).

(13) Baillet, *Jugemens*, num. 949.

(14) Idem, ibid. Tom. 1. p. 445, 446.

whip and ſpur to ſupport his family. He died in 1656 (*d*). A particular is related concerning him in the *Menagiana* [*C*], which I ſhall give in the remark.

(*d*) And not in 1658, as Moreri ſays. S. Remuald, *Journal Chronologique*, Tom. 2. p. 570, fixes his death, not to the 6th of Novemb. 1658 (as Moreri) but to the 21ſt.

" preſs any thing. And thoſe particularly, whoſe " ſubſiſtence depends on the weight and meaſure of " their writings, would imagine they ſhould loſe a " penny, in eraſing an uſeleſs or improper word. " This was the reaſon why William Xylander, Ludo- " vico Dolce, John Baudoin, Peter du Ryer, and ſe- " veral other hireling Writers, who are in the Book- " ſellers pay, are obliged to lengthen out and en- " large, as much as poſſible, all the writings they " put to preſs. By this means, to keep themſelves " alive, they ſubmitted to ſully their reputation, " ſome by the neceſſity they were under of tranſlating " at the rate of 30 French ſols, or a crown a ſheet: " others of writing verſes at four livres a hundred " when long ones, and forty pence, when they were " ſhort, as we are told by Furetiere *." Peruſe what I have ſaid of Cardan (15).

* *Nouvell. Allegor.* p. 161. *des Troubles du R. d'Eloq.*

(15) Rem. [*T*] of his article.

[*C*] *A particular is related of him in the* Menagiana.] " I believe Mr. du Ryer was a native of Paris. He " was like Xylander, *qui fami magis quam famæ inſer-* " *viebat*, i. e. " one who ſought to fill his belly, ra- " ther than gain fame." He tranſlated for money, " and died before he had finiſhed his tranſlation of " Thuanus. To ſave expence, he lived out of Paris, " beyond the Piquepuces, where he reſided with his " wife and children. I went once to ſee him with " ſome company, on which occaſion he treated us " with ſome cherries he gathered in a little garden " belonging to him. He wrote a tragedy, entitled, " *Alcyonée*, which is an admirable piece, and equal " in all reſpects to thoſe of Corneille. There are " ſome wonderful verſes in it, and it is finely con- " ducted. Mondory acted his part in it very well " (16)."

(16) *Menagiana*, p. 366. 1ſt edit. Dutch.

Vigneul Marville, page 196. Tom. 1. of his *Melanges*, ſpeaks of a viſit which himſelf and ſome others paid du Ryer; and ſays that the entertainment he gave them, conſiſting of milk, cherries, water, and brown bread, made them bewail the fate of ſo excellent a man.

The End of the Eighth Volume.